Site Address:	Unit 7, Langstone Technology Park, 2B Langstone Road, Havant, PO9 1SA		
Proposal:	Amendments to Unit 7 to include: East elevation: New windows to ground floor and first floor and 1 Louvre vent. South elevation: 3 No. Exhaust vents and 1 Louvre oven room vent. West elevation: New first floor windows.		
Application No:	APP/25/01040	Expiry Date:	02/05/2025
Applicant:	Mr Peter Cross		
Agent:	Sean Reading JB Architects	Case Officer:	Abdi Dirir
Ward:	St Faiths		

Recommendation: **GRANT PERMISSION**

1 Site Description

1.1 Langstone Technology Park is located to the south of the A27 dual carriageway, to the west of the A3023 Langstone Road and to the East of Brookside Road and the Southmoor Lane Industrial Estate. Unit 7 is situated on the South-eastern corner of Langstone Technology Park.

1.2 The site is accessed from Langstone Road to the east and Brookside Road to the west. Both accesses are joined by interior service roads. The eastern access road also serves the Premier Inn hotel and the Langbrook Farm public house/restaurant.

1.3 The site has a 'campus' appearance originally forming an IBM business park with extensive buildings developed in the 1970's with substantial footprints and a horizontal emphasis with a conformity of materials. The buildings are surrounded by extensive car parking and landscaping. The site is now occupied by a range of individual companies including high tech uses.

2 Planning History

2.1 The wider application site has been subject to numerous planning and advertisement applications, the more significant/relevant applications are listed below:

92/50238/022 - Single storey extension to Building 24, undercroft area enlarged fire exit lobby/link from Building 26, new facade to night security entrance, PERMITTED, 07/09/1992.

92/50238/024 - Variation of condition 2 of P.P.18838/82 for 2,000000sq.f of industrial/office floor space to extend time period for submission of reserved matters from 6 to 8 years. PERMITTED, 15/10/1992

93/50238/031 - Construction of new building for class B1 (business) use together with parking and service areas, access roads and landscaping (site area 3.32 hectares), PERMITTED, 05/08/1994

94/50238/038 - Infill of building 25 undercroft area to provide additional floorspace, PERMITTED, 18/01/1995

94/50238/041 - Extension of existing car park (South) to provide approx. 250 replacement spaces, PERMITTED, 16/02/1995

95/50238/044 - Extension of existing car park to provide approximately 216 new spaces., PERMITTED, 11/05/1995

95/50238/049 - Extension of existing car park (south) to provide 77 new spaces., PERMITTED, 05/09/1996

96/50238/061 - Creation of new ditch and culverts for the purposes of diverting the existing water courses, including the construction of a new footbridge along the line of the existing footpath (No.49), PERMITTED, 06/11/1997

00/50238/068 - 1) Demolition of buildings (21 and part 24) on A27 frontage and redevelopment with DIY Retail Store (11,288 sq.m), Garden Centre (2,787 sq.m) External Trade Area (1,858 sq.m) and car parking (640 spaces), with vehicular access to Langstone Road (A3023) and Brookside Road (incorporating revised junction layout arrangements), new cycleway and landscaping. 2) Erection of 2 No. B1 Production Units (9, 290 sq.m) in south west corner with service access road, 310 parking spaces and landscaping.3) Demolition of building (16) and revised parking layout for remainder of site including landscaping. 4) Demolition of 4 dwellings (39a, 39b, 43 and 47 Brookside Road) (Re-Consultation), REFUSED,16/07/2001

02/50238/076 - Demolition of four dwelling houses. New access road layout, including formation of new roundabout with Brookside Road and construction of car park adjacent to northern boundary with A27. PERMITTED, 21/01/2003

APP/10/00272 - Demolition of existing steel clad building and two portacabins to make way for a single storey timber framed building to house a 52 place nursery school., PERMITTED,10/09/2010

APP/11/01298 - Installation of 4No. roof mounted cooling units and chiller plant; extension at ground floor (level 1) to provide room for 2No. stand-by generators with attenuating exhaust baffles and louvred roof top air intake housing., PERMITTED, 04/10/2011

APP/14/00631 - Variation of Condition 1 of Planning Permission APP/11/01297 (which varied condition 3 of original Planning Permission APP/10/00272) to remove restriction on catchment area., PERMITTED, 17/10/2014

APP/15/00484 - Change of use from store to gym facility., PERMITTED, 09/07/2015 APP/15/01225 - Installation of 2No. roof mounted condenser units and associated chiller pipe work to support 2No. additional internal computer room air conditioning units., PERMITTED, 11/12/2015

APP/19/00297 - Proposed alteration to the existing east facing elevation to accommodate a new entrance threshold and associated external works., PERMITTED, 13/06/2019

GEN/19/00354 - EIA Screening Opinion - Erection of new industrial units and rationalisation of south car park, demolition of part of the northernmost building with new elevation on the remaining part of the building, new screen on adjacent building and extension to existing car park.- Not EIA development 29/05/19

GEN/19/00370 - Development Consultation Forum (DCF) proposal for (1) outline permission for part demolition and reconfiguration of Building 1000 and reconfiguration of car park layout and (2) detailed permission for new employment (B1c, B2 and B8) units. Officer Comment: Development Consultation Forum held 21st May 2019

GEN/19/00681 - Notification of application for listed building status, 19/08/2019 Officer Comment: This request in relation to Building 6000 was considered by English Heritage who confirmed on the 3rd February 2020 the following: We have taken into account all the representations made and completed our assessment of the building. Having considered our recommendation, the Secretary of State for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport has decided not to add the former IBM Building 6000, Langstone Technology Park, Havant to the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest. Building 6000 is not therefore a Listed Building.

APP/19/00703 - Part-demolition of Building 1000 and associated works; the erection of new flexible use industrial units; and a new parking layout with associated works to layout and access and felling of two trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order (Norway Maples). (22.07.20). Request to discharge conditions 3,4,5 & 6 (02.11.20). PERMITTED 22/07/20

APP/19/00806 - Variation of Condition 2 of Planning Permission APP/19/00296 (Erection of a new building entrance structure, reception/lobby refurbishment and associated hard and soft landscaping works) to amend approved plans., PERMITTED, 09/10/2019

APP/21/00134 - Application for non material change to Planning Permission APP/19/00703 relating to change to approved plans and amendment to proposed elevations., REFUSED, 18/03/2021

APP/21/00405 - Variation of Conditions 2, 3, 8, 18, 19, 22 and 25 of Planning Permission APP/19/00703 relating to the erection of the flexible use industrial units in the south-western corner of the site (Phase 1). (25.08.21). Request to discharge conditions 4,7,9,10,11,12,13,14 & 15 (06.09.21). Request to discharge conditions 5 & 6 (24.12.21)., PERMITTED, 25/08/2021

APP/21/00517 - Display of 4No. non-illuminated totem signs; 2No. non-illuminated marketing board signs; 1No. illuminated wall mounted sign. – PERMITTED, 13/08/2021

APP/21/00926 - Application for non-material change to Planning Permission APP/21/00405 relating to amendments to Condition 2 plans approved (changes to elevational treatment of Buildings 1000 and 4000) – PERMITTED, 01/10/2021

GEN/22/00093 - Screening Opinion - Proposed Redevelopment of land at Langstone Technology Park, Havant. The proposals include phased demolition of existing buildings (predominantly office but including labs, industrial, data centre and ancillary uses) and construction of up to 52,000

sqm Gross External Area (GEA) flexible use employment floorspace (Use Classes E(g) (i)- (iii) / B2 / B8) and ancillary uses (Use Classes E(b), E(d) and E(f)); and associated works (all matters reserved except access).– Opinion Issued 1st April 2022 Development not EIA development Officer Comment: This relates to the current development proposals.

APP/22/00172 - Outline Planning Application for Phased demolition of existing buildings and the erection of new flexible use employment floorspace (Use Classes E(g)(i)-(iii)/B2/B8) and ancillary uses (Use Classes E(b), E(d) and E(f)); and associated works. All matters reserved except Access. PERMITTED, 22/12/23 Officer Comment: The current Reserved Matters application relates to Phases 2A and 2B of this Outline Consent.

PP/22/00360 - Display of 1No. wall mounted fascia sign. PERMITTED, 10/06/22

APP/22/00615 – Application for non-material change to planning permission APP/21/00405 relating to amendment of parking provision. PERMITTED, 24/10/22

APP/24/00043 - Application for Non-material amendment to condition 2 of Planning Permission APP/21/00405, to alter door openings, provide dock levellers with associated excavation, and revisions to drainage - all relating to Unit 3, PERM, 21/03/2024

APP/24/00058 - Application for non-material amendment to planning permission APP/22/00172 relating to condition 35 BREEAM., PERM,12/04/2024

APP/24/00156 - Display of 1No. boxed illuminated fascia sign., PERM,22/04/2024

APP/24/00274 - Submission of reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) for Phase 2 only (excluding phases 2a and 2b) pursuant to outline planning permission APP/22/00172 for phased demolition of existing buildings and the erection of new flexible use employment floorspace (Use Classes E(g)(i)-(iii)/B2/B8) and ancillary uses (Use Classes E(b), E(d) and E(f)); and associated works. PERM, 20/12/24.

APP/25/00596-Approval of reserved matter phase 2A and 2B pursuant to Planning Permission ref, APP/2200172-Permitted .

3 Proposal

The proposed development comprises the installation of five windows at ground-floor level and six windows at first-floor level on the east elevation, together with four first-floor windows on the west elevation. The proposal also includes the installation of three exhaust vent pipes on the south elevation, and one louvre vent on both the south and east elevations.

4 Policy Considerations

National Planning Policy Framework
Havant Borough Council Borough Design Guide SPD December 2011
Havant Borough Council Parking SPD July 2016

Havant Borough Local Plan (Core Strategy) March 2011

CS16	(High Quality Design)
CS17	(Concentration and Distribution of Development within the Urban Areas)
CS2	(Employment)
DM10	(Pollution)

Havant Borough Local Plan (Allocations) July 2014

AL1	(Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development)
AL2	(Urban Area Boundaries and Undeveloped Gaps between Settlements)

Listed Building Grade: Not applicable.
Conservation Area: Not applicable.

5 Statutory and Non Statutory Consultations

Councillor Daniel Berwick
No Comments received.

Councillor Gillian Harris
No Comments received.

Councillor Munday
No Comments received.

Hampshire Highways

Final Comments
The Highway Authority provided a response on 11 February 2026 noting that the application does not relate to highway matters. This appears to remain the case and therefore the Highway Authority are not required to comment on this application.

Original Comments
Thank you for consulting the Highway Authority on the above planning application. The Highway Authority do not believe this proposal is relevant to highway matters. Therefore, no comments regarding this proposal will be provided at this time.

Ecology
Thank you for consulting me on this application. I can confirm that I have no concerns in relation to ecological maters.

Environmental Health

Final Comments:
The Syntegra Consulting Technical Note (TN) entitled 'Subject: Mitigation Calculations of Extraction Fans | Ref 26-16285' has been reviewed. The TN includes modelled spectral data for a centrifugal fan noise source. However, the derived spectral sound data do not indicate a low-frequency-dominated source as suggested by the original report. The highest sound power levels within the derived spectrum occur in the 500 Hz and 1 kHz octave bands.

Furthermore, the TN applies the insertion loss to the spectral frequency data but then reverts back to a single figure A-weighted predicted noise level at receptors, instead of presenting the predicted spectral noise data at the receptor. It is unclear how the figure of -23dB attenuation has been derived due to the ducting and fan attenuator arrangement.
Despite the above points, it is accepted that the information requested has been provided and the acoustic consultant's assessment indicates low impact at the nearest receptors. I am therefore satisfied that the submitted information is sufficient for the application to proceed with regards to noise concerns.
However, given the remaining uncertainty in the modelled outcome as outlined above, the following conditions are recommended requiring noise from plant not to exceed the background levels and post completion noise testing to demonstrate there shall be no resultant adverse noise impact at the nearest sensitive receptor.

Industrial noise rating limit
The cumulative rating level (LAr,Tr) of noise emitted from all fixed plant and equipment associated with the development shall not exceed the typical background level derived in the Syntegra Consulting Plant Noise Assessment reference: 26-16285 measured at the nearest noise-sensitive receptor, or at an agreed representative location, when assessed in accordance with BS 4142:2014+A1:2019. That is, 48dB LAr,1hr between 07:00hrs - 23:00hrs. Measurements or calculations shall be undertaken in free-field conditions at the boundary of the nearest noise-sensitive receptor or an agreed representative location with any appropriate noise characteristic penalties applied.

Reason: to protect residential amenity

Post completion noise testing
A post-completion noise validation survey shall be undertaken by a suitably qualified acoustic consultant and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval within 2 months of the plant becoming operational. The survey shall:
- Confirm that the plant installed corresponds to the models and sound power levels detailed in the Syntegra Consulting Plant Noise Assessment reference: 26-16285.
- Demonstrate that the rating level of noise from the plant at the nearest noise-sensitive receptor does not exceed 48 dB LAr,Tr, as predicted in the report, and
- Demonstrate that low frequency noise generated by the approved plant does not result in adverse impact to the nearest sensitive receptor.

Where the survey identifies that the rating level exceeds 48 dB or that the installed mitigation does not sufficiently attenuate noise from the plant, further mitigation measures shall be agreed with the Local Planning Authority and further implemented on site to an agreed timetable and further verified to achieve compliance before continued operation of the plant. The final mitigation measures shall thereafter be maintained on site to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority for the duration of the life of the equipment.

Reason: to protect the amenity of occupiers of nearby premises

The following condition is also recommended to restrict construction hours.

Construction Hours
Construction of the development including site traffic and deliveries shall only be carried out between 8:00 am and 6:00 pm Mondays to Fridays and 8:00 am and 1:00 pm on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays and Public Holidays.

Reason: To ensure that the amenities of the area are not detrimentally affected by the construction of the site outside reasonable working times.

Please include the following informative note on the Decision Notice.

Informative – Environmental Permits and Atmospheric Emissions
The applicant/occupier is advised that separate environmental controls may apply to activities undertaken at the site. It is the responsibility of the operator to ensure that any necessary permits, consents, licences or approvals required in relation to atmospheric emissions arising from operations at the premises are obtained from the relevant regulatory authority prior to commencement of the activity. Compliance with any planning permission granted does not remove the need to obtain any separate environmental authorisations where required.

Further Comments:
Thank you for sending through the information.
I am broadly satisfied with the consultant's responses to my queries. However, an evidence gap remains regarding the impact of low frequency noise at the nearest receptor. I appreciate that no spectral data is available for the exhaust fans, however the presumed broadband attenuation of 14dB does not robustly demonstrate effective attenuation at lower frequency ranges. I accept there is significant likelihood of effective attenuation throughout the frequency range which may result in low impact at the nearest receptor, however that conclusion is an assumption that is not supported by robust evidence. This introduces risk of the Local Planning Authority basing a decision on incomplete information.
It is therefore requested that the acoustic consultant derives spectral data values using standard acoustic engineering principles to present a conservative estimate for dominant low frequencies in exhaust fan sound sources with sound power levels of 84dB and 81dB respectively. The resultant calculated noise levels for each frequency range at 30m with frequency analysis of insertion loss from the silencer applied, and perceived cumulative noise impact of all plant at the receptor should then be provided.

Further Comments:
The submitted Noise Impact Assessment identified that a minimum attenuation of 8 dB is required to achieve compliance with BS4142 criteria. While duct attenuation and/or silencers are proposed, no detailed acoustic design has been provided to demonstrate that the selected mitigation will achieve the required level of noise reduction.

The submitted silencer technical data is generic and relates to a range of products of varying diameters, lengths and insulation thicknesses. No specific unit has been selected, and no calculation has been provided to demonstrate the expected insertion loss for the proposed installation. The Syntegra Noise Impact Assessment does not include octave or 1/3 octave band sound power data for the plant. As silencer performance is highly frequency dependent, particularly with limited attenuation at low frequencies, it is not possible to determine whether the proposed mitigation would be effective across the relevant frequency range. This is of particular concern given the identified low frequency characteristics of the plant noise.
In the absence of spectral data and a detailed silencer selection and performance

calculation, the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation cannot be verified.
It is acknowledged that the level of attenuation required is relatively modest (8 dB), which is likely achievable by an appropriately specified silencer. However, further information is required to demonstrate this.
It is therefore recommended that the applicant be required to provide the following information before the application is determined, to demonstrate the proposed noise mitigation measures shall be sufficient:
• Octave or 1/3 octave band sound power levels for all plant.
• Identification of specific silencer(s) to be used.
• A revised BS4142 assessment demonstrating compliance with the proposed mitigation applied.

Further Comments:
The submitted Noise Impact Assessment identified that a minimum attenuation of 8 dB is required to achieve compliance with BS4142 criteria. While duct attenuation and/or silencers are proposed, no detailed acoustic design has been provided to demonstrate that the selected mitigation will achieve the required level of noise reduction.
The submitted silencer technical data is generic and relates to a range of products of varying diameters, lengths and insulation thicknesses. No specific unit has been selected, and no calculation has been provided to demonstrate the expected insertion loss for the proposed installation.
The Syntegra Noise Impact Assessment does not include octave or 1/3 octave band sound power data for the plant. As silencer performance is highly frequency dependent, particularly with limited attenuation at low frequencies, it is not possible to determine whether the proposed mitigation would be effective across the relevant frequency range. This is of particular concern given the identified low frequency characteristics of the plant noise.
In the absence of spectral data and a detailed silencer selection and performance calculation, the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation cannot be verified.
It is acknowledged that the level of attenuation required is relatively modest (8 dB), which is likely achievable by an appropriately specified silencer. However, further information is required to demonstrate this. It is therefore recommended that the applicant be required to provide the following information before the application is determined, to demonstrate the proposed noise mitigation measures shall be sufficient:- Octave or 1/3 octave band sound power levels for all plant.- Identification of specific silencer(s) to be used.- A revised BS4142 assessment demonstrating compliance with the proposed mitigation applied.

Further Comments:
The Syntegra Consulting document entitled 'Unit 7, Langstone Technology Park, Havant, Hampshire, PO9 1SA | Plant Noise Assessment | Ref: 26-16285 PNA' (dated March 2026) has been reviewed.
I am satisfied that the report considers appropriate guidance and that the methodology and findings are reliable.
The findings include that there is potential for adverse impact to the nearest sensitive receptor without implementation of noise mitigation measures.
The report recommends duct attenuation by using lined ducting, this is predicted to result in a noise rating level 21dB below the measured typical background noise level at the nearest receptor, indicating low noise impact.
The quotation from Fugro GB Marine Ltd, ref: WD020925-03 includes installation of an airflow silencer to the inlet and outlet side of the extraction fan to dampen the airflow noise by up to 10dB(A), enlarged the ducting size on two fans and commitment to installing anti-vibration collars.
This does not align with the recommendations in the Syntegra report, and the resultant noise rating level at the nearest sensitive receptor cannot be reliably determined from

the information provided. It is therefore unknown as to whether the applicant's proposed mitigation measures would prevent noise from the plant being intrusive inside the nearest offices if windows are open.
Given the above, further assessment of the proposed mitigation measures is required to demonstrate that noise from the plant shall not be intrusive.
Further information is also required to demonstrate that the proposed filtration arrangement shall adequately abate any odour or fumes to prevent adverse impacts to the nearest sensitive receptors.

Original Comments:
The JB Architect's Noise Assessment has been reviewed. While some indicative noise information has been provided (e.g., extraction systems listed as having a sound level of <80 dB), and the report notes that the plant will be located within an industrial area, the submission lacks sufficient detail to determine the cumulative noise impact from the proposed three exhaust vents and the potential effect on nearby sensitive receptors, including the offices within neighbouring units.
Further information is therefore required to include a noise impact assessment compiled by a suitably qualified acoustician. The report must identify sensitive receptors in the vicinity and demonstrate that the cumulative noise level from the proposed plant shall not cause adverse impact to occupiers of nearby buildings. The assessment must consider all relevant guidance including BS4142:2014+A1:2019 and BS8233:2014 and include noise mitigation measures where appropriate.
It is anticipated that the operator shall ensure that any permits that may be required (e.g. for solvent use) are obtained prior to operation.

6 Community Involvement

This application was publicised in accordance with the Council's Code of Practice for Publicity of Planning Applications approved at minute 207/6/92 (as amended), as a result of which the following publicity was undertaken:

Number of neighbour notification letters sent: 8

Number of site notices: 1

Statutory advertisement: 11.02.2026.

Number of representations received: 2.

Comment	Officer Comment
Concerned about the proposed windows in the east elevation would lead to overlooking thus impacting adversely upon the amenities of the residents. The proposed windows will lead to light pollution towards the neighbouring properties in Broadmead way, particularly during autumn, winter and spring. And so far, no mitigation plan to offset the light pollution has been submitted. The proposed extraction vents will release fumes and odours towards the residents in Broadmead way, thus adversely impacting their amenities.	See Part 7

Also, the noise associated with the extraction vents will be high to the detriment of the residents nearby.	
Having examined the submitted documents I confirm Langstone Residents' Association has no comment or objection to the proposed scheme.	Noted.

7 Planning Considerations

7.1 Having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan it is considered that the main issues arising from this application are:

(i) Principle of development
(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area
(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

(i) Principle of development

The application site is situated within an urban area where further development is considered acceptable subject to the usual development control criteria. Furthermore, the site is set within Langstone Technology Park and would install a number of windows, louvre vents and exhaust vent pipes in the elevations of the building respectively and is therefore considered acceptable in principle.

(ii) Impact upon the character and appearance of the area

The proposed windows on the eastern and western elevations would reflect the style, proportions and design of the existing casement windows within the building. The proposed aluminium frames would match the materiality and appearance of the existing window frames, ensuring a consistent and cohesive appearance. Furthermore, the proposed fenestration would be installed flush with the existing external walls and would not project beyond the building envelope. As such, the proposed alterations are considered sympathetic to the host building and acceptable in design terms.

The proposed vent pipes would be modest in scale and, due to their location, would be largely screened by mature trees to the east of the site. The windows and vent pipes would not be readily visible from the surrounding public streets and would primarily be viewed from within the Technology Park. Consequently, the proposed works would not appear visually intrusive or detract from the character and appearance of the host building or the wider area.

Overall, the design, scale and appearance of the proposed development are considered appropriate to their context and would not result in any material harm to the visual amenity of the host building or the surrounding area. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable and would not have a significant adverse effect on the character or appearance of the area.

(iii) Impact upon residential amenity

The proposed development would not result in any change to the existing massing or bulk of the host building. The proposed windows on the eastern elevation would be positioned at a substantial distance from neighbouring residential properties on Broadmead Way, Langbrook Close and The Mallards. The separation distance between the application site and the nearest dwelling would exceed 100 metres. Furthermore, the existing trees and vegetation located between the site and surrounding residential properties would provide effective screening of the proposed windows.

Considering the significant separation distances and intervening landscaping, it is considered that the proposed windows would not give rise to unacceptable overlooking or any material increase in overlooking beyond the existing situation. In addition, there are no residential properties within the immediate vicinity of the application site. Accordingly, the proposed development is not considered to have a

significant adverse impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Following the submission of additional information regarding the potential noise associated with the proposed extractor vents, the Environmental Health Officer has confirmed that they are satisfied that future noise levels are likely to be low. The Environmental Health Officer has recommended a number of planning conditions to ensure that noise generated by plant and machinery does not exceed existing background noise levels. These conditions will also require post-installation noise testing to verify that the development does not give rise to adverse noise impacts on occupiers of nearby industrial units or surrounding residential properties

The proposal is not considered likely to give rise to any significant adverse impacts on neighbouring amenities. The host building is well screened from the public realm and is situated a substantial distance from the nearest residential properties. It is considered that the proposed windows within the eastern elevation would not result in harmful light-spill or light pollution affecting residents of Broadmead Way or Longstone Close. The building is significantly set back from these properties and would only be occupied and illuminated during normal office operating hours. As such, the proposal would have no unacceptable impact on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
Consequently, the proposal would not appear unduly dominant or overbearing, nor would it result in any unacceptable loss of daylight, outlook, or privacy. Overall, it is considered that the proposal would have a limited impact on the amenities of neighbouring occupiers and is therefore acceptable in planning terms.

8 Conclusion

The proposed development is considered acceptable subject to appropriate conditions to control the development. The scheme is therefore recommended for approval.

---

9 RECOMMENDATION:

That the Head of Planning be authorised to **GRANT PERMISSION** for application

APP/25/01040 subject to the following conditions:

1 The development must be begun not later than three years beginning with the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:

Plans:
Proposed Elevations, Drawing no. 04, Rev A uploaded 14/04/2026
Amended Proposed First Floor, Drawing no, 03 uploaded 14/04/2026
Proposed Ground Floor, Drawing no. 02 uploaded 14/04/2026
Location and Site Plan, Drawing 01, Rev B
Location Plan, Drawing no, 06, Rev A
Proposed Window Installation, Drawing no, 05, Rev B

Documents:
Supporting Statement Rev C, received 05.02.2026
Noise Impact Assessment, received 28.01.2026
Noise Mitigation and Fume Extraction details, received 14.04.2026
Plant Noise Assessment, received 14.04.2026
Circular straight silencer with pod Technical Data, received 05.06.2026
Further Plant Noise Assessment, received 12.06.2026
Mitigation Calculation of Extraction Fans, received 29.06.2026

Reason: - To ensure provision of a satisfactory development.

3 The cumulative rating level (LAr,Tr) of noise emitted from all fixed plant and equipment associated with the development shall not exceed the typical background level derived in the Syntegra Consulting Plant Noise Assessment reference: 26-16285 measured at the nearest noise-sensitive receptor, or at an agreed representative location, when assessed in accordance with BS 4142:2014+A1:2019. That is, 48dB LAr, 1hr between 07:00hrs - 23:00hrs. Measurements or calculations shall be undertaken in free-field conditions at the boundary of the nearest noise-sensitive receptor or an agreed representative location with any appropriate noise characteristic penalties applied.

Reason: to protect residential amenity

4 A post-completion noise validation survey shall be undertaken by a suitably qualified acoustic consultant and submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval within 2 months of the plant becoming operational. The survey shall: Confirm that the plant installed corresponds to the models and sound power levels detailed in the Syntegra Consulting Plant Noise Assessment reference: 26-16285. • Demonstrate that the rating level of noise from the plant at the nearest noise-sensitive receptor does not exceed 48 dB LAr,Tr, as predicted in the report, and • Demonstrate that low frequency noise generated by the approved plant does not result in adverse impact to the nearest sensitive receptor. Where the survey identifies that the rating level exceeds 48 dB or that the installed mitigation does not sufficiently attenuate noise from the plant, further mitigation measures shall be agreed with the Local Planning Authority and further implemented on site to an agreed timetable and further verified to achieve compliance before continued operation of the plant. The final mitigation measures shall thereafter be maintained on site to the satisfaction of the Local

Planning Authority for the duration of the life of the equipment.

Reason: to protect the amenity of occupiers of nearby premises.

5 Construction of the development including site traffic and deliveries shall only be carried out between 8:00 am and 6:00 pm Mondays to Fridays and 8:00 am and 1:00 pm on Saturdays and at no time on Sundays and Public Holidays.

Reason: To ensure that the amenities of the area are not detrimentally affected by the construction of the site outside reasonable working times.

Informatives:

1 In accordance with paragraphs 38-50 of the NPPF Havant Borough Council (HBC) takes a positive and proactive approach and works with applicants/agents on development proposals in a manner focused on solutions by:
Offering a pre-application advice service, and
Updating you of any issues that may arise in the processing of your application and where possible suggesting solutions

2 The applicant/occupier is advised that separate environmental controls may apply to activities undertaken at the site. It is the responsibility of the operator to ensure that any necessary permits, consents, licences or approvals required in relation to atmospheric emissions arising from operations at the premises are obtained from the relevant regulatory authority prior to commencement of the activity. Compliance with any planning permission granted does not remove the need to obtain any separate environmental authorisations where required.