

HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	Environmental Health	To:	Development Control
Our Ref:	CONS/22/03368	Your Ref:	APP/21/01244
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6666	Date:	22 December 2022
DC Case Officer:	David Eaves		
DC Case Officer Extn:	44 6549		
Application Number:	APP/21/01244		
Site Address:	32 New Lane, Havant, PO9 2NG		
Proposed Development:	c.25 Boundary Treatment		
	Request to discharge condition 25 (27.09.22).		
	RECONSULTATION REQUEST for revised plans and/or documents received		

Observations / Comments:

In response to the request to discharge Condition 25 under App/21/01244, I can advise as follows:

25 No part of the development shall be first brought into use until details of the type, siting, design and materials to be used in the construction of all means of enclosure including boundaries, screens or retaining walls and acoustic fences have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the approved structures have been erected in accordance with the approved details. The structures shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the locality and occupiers of neighbouring property and having due regard to policy CS16 of the Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

I have not had sight of the Tetra Tech Noise constraints assessment Rev 4 which relates to 'Updated Fencing and Plant Detail'; so have referred to Rev 5 which relates to 'Minor Amendments' & which also covers the plant noise & fencing detail.

Under Item 6.0 Conclusions of Noise assessment, in the above Rev 5 assessment, it is advised that:

'Intrinsic mitigation in the form of 4.0m high barriers in strategic locations (with barriers stepping down from 4.0m to 1.0m at the site access points) as well as the effect of the operational noise management plan that will be implemented to ensure the effective and efficient management of the site.

Combined operational noise levels during the daytime and night-time periods are predicted to be below the guideline noise intrusion criteria at nearby properties assuming both a windows-open

and a windows-closed scenario. Therefore, operational noise levels are considered to be within the No Observed Adverse Effect Level.'

Also it has been noted that the boundary treatments, including the advised acoustic fencing appear to have now been installed on the site.

As such I am satisfied that Condition 25 can be discharged.

Mr. Mark Moss

Regulatory Officer, Environmental Health