HAVANT BOROUGH COUNCIL

Town & Country Planning Act 1990

Consultation on Planning Application

MEMORANDUM

From:	**Environmental Health**	**To:**	**Development Control**
Our Ref:	CONS/15/00732	**Your Ref:**	APP/15/00438
EH Case Officer Extn:	44 6677	**Date:**	08 June 2015

DC Case Officer: Daphney Haywood
DC Case Officer Extn: 44 6513
Application Number: APP/15/00438
Site Address: 35 Greywell Road, Havant, PO9 5AH
Proposed Development: Prior notification for change of use from a retail use (class A1/A2) or a mixed retail and residential use to C3 residential use subject to prior approval covering flooding, highways and transport issues and contamination.

Observations / Comments:

I have reviewed the above referenced application & documentation.

Contamination

The site comprised open space (Billy Lawn) from <1867 to >1956. Greywell was constructed sometime before 1971 on previously undeveloped land. No potentially contaminating landuses are known to have been associated with the plot, or within 150m of property at Greywell, and it is consequently considered unlikely that any risks exist at the site that could be materially relevant to sensitive receptors located at first & second floor level(s).

Given the construction date, it is not unlikely that asbestos will be contained within the fabric of the existing building that may be disturbed during conversion works. This is considered to fall outside the scope of 'contamination' (meaning substances in association with soils/ground); instead falling within the general responsibilities of the site owners under the Control of Asbestos Regulations (2012, and previous), and for others (e.g. contractors) under Health & Safety at Work (etc.) Act 1974.

No adverse comment on contamination grounds.

Other - Form / Amount

I note that the submitted schedule of accommodation provides floor areas "attributed" to addresses. This is not necessarily the same as being "located within the boundaries of-" (addresses). There may be comments/concerns that Environmental Health may wish to raise which fall outside the scope of comment under the prior notification procedure. The form / amount is relevant as if a development does not meet the permitted development criteria, and a full plans application is therefore required - Environmental Health would have a platform on

which to voice concerns / request information / impose conditions (etc.).

Internal unit divisions are unclear from the supplied plan. The distribution of accomodation across the defined units is therefore similarly unclear. If units are functionally operating as a single unit (i.e. original unit definitions are unknown, and the units are no longer internally divided in a way that means units are or could be identifiably separate, as presumably was the case originally), it may be appropriate to assign 50% accomodation to each (i.e. <150 sq. m per unit - within scope of permitted development).

If the original unit definition were asymmetric, this approach may not be appropriate, and a planning application may be needed - if this were the case it is possible that Environmental Health would wish to comment upon:

- The proximity of residential areas & operational retail storage on the same level that could be a source of noise nuisance without appropriate acoustic separation.
- Concerns in respect of shared access corridors, and the potential for blocking of fire escapes (for 35-37, doorway adjacent Flat 4 for example).
- noise from external sources affecting future residents (indoor noise levels, and attenuation of external noise - e.g. by means of vest / glazing etc.)

I note that the associated works to fenestration require consent, and an application has been submitted under separate cover - determined to be minor works & not put out to consultation.

In the context of a permitted development conversion from "non-noise sensitive" to "noise-sensitive" landuse, I would argue that the specification of fenestration is a non-trivial issue, and that Environmental Heath would likely wish to review applications made under these circumstances.

If Development Control accept that this application falls within the scope of Permitted Development, I acknowledge that the potential concerns outlined above fall outside the scope of this consultation.

I would request however, if possible, that a consultation is sent through for APP/15/00012 (35-37 Greywell, Glazing) so that there is opportunity to consider mitigation of external noise for future residents, as we would for a normal application.

Best Regards,

Mr. Jonathan Driver
Environmental Control Officer