

We are writing to reiterate and reinforce our original objection to this application to increase the open hours of the small business next to our house:-

We are writing to object to the increase in hours which will almost double the amount of hours that this customer led business will attract into our small residential environment. This "small business" could mean that if open for 9 hours for 5 days a week and 6 1/2 half hours every Saturday, (this is a 51 1/2 hours per week) which is 15 appointments a day, this would amount to around 90 visitors a week, over 4,680 visitors a year. If you lived in our road would you like that to be happening near to you when most people living in a residential street would expect maybe 1-3 visitors a week.

We feel if they want to run a full time business they should rent one of the hundreds of empty retail units available in our area, we should have the right to enjoy our home environment 7 days a week instead of one!

All our original objections to this application to run this business still stand and we are very unhappy that now that they achieved permission for part time hours they are now being completely disrespectful of their neighbours by trying to run it on a full time basis. Most of the comments supporting this application are from customers who do not live in this vicinity and cannot comment on how this is affecting the neighbours.

An Estate Agent who recently valued our property said the value will have dropped due to having a small business operating in close proximity and will drop further if the operating hours are increased.

This application should be refused. Where do you draw the line with people's right to enjoy their own homes.

## **PRINCIPLE OF DEVELOPMENT**

The current business is situated right in the middle of an urban residential area with modestly sized bungalow type properties and the area is not designed to be a retail site. It is clearly out of character with the surrounding quiet residential environment. To increase the hours as proposed would mean that the site would be visited every day of the week except Sundays, giving the neighbours no respite from the additional traffic, parking difficulties, noise and smell.

## **HOURS OF OPERATION**

The applicant originally applied to have hours of opening Monday – Friday plus Saturday mornings. But this clearly raised concerns over the level of activity with Planning Officers at the time that would result in adverse impact on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties by reason of noise and disturbance created by the level of comings and goings. To increase the hours of operation now after being refused twice would only exasperate the current situation. The hours proposed now would increase to 51 hours per week. As previously stated this "small business" could be open for 9 hours a day for 5 days a week and 6 and a half hours every Saturday, (this is a 51 and a half hour week) which is 15 appointments a day, this would amount to around 90 visitors a week, over 4,680 visitors a year. If you lived in our road would you like that to be happening

near to you when most people living in a residential street would expect maybe 1-3 visitors a week.

The original approval clause 5 refers to operating criteria.

*Clients shall visit the premises by appointment only;*

*There shall be a maximum of 5 appointments on any one day;*

*Each appointment will be for a maximum of 3 people arriving together;*

- It is unclear as to how this should be interpreted. We understood this was to be 3 people arriving in 1 car (family members) but these 3 clients arrive separately and at staggered times. This actually needs clarification and to be applied to the current operating hours to avoid misinterpretation.

*There shall be one member of staff – Mrs A. Beasley;*

*A detailed register of appointments shall be kept and available for inspection by the Local Planning Authority upon request.*

- Have the Local Planning Authority ever inspected the appointments register?

There is currently no restriction on people arriving on Bank Holidays including Easter and Christmas Day.

Customers are there past the 6pm finish time, presumably arriving within allowed hours but overrunning past this time to finish treatment, sometimes as late as 8.30pm. Better management of length of appointments is needed to ensure business sticks to its approved opening times and does not overrun.

## **CAR PARKING**

The current car parking arrangement, although approved on previous application, does not comply with Havant Borough Council car parking standards and clearly does not work. The applicant household have 5 cars between them so parking on the road is already an issue. Section 4 of the SPD states

Residential Car Parking Space Size and Arrangement

*4.06 An individual car parking space should measure a minimum 2.4m in width by 4.8m in length. Space should also be provided for car doors to be opened and car boots to be accessed or garage doors to be opened. These should be regarded as minimum lengths as cars continue to increase in size.*

*4.07 In addition, sufficient space for turning facilities on site to allow vehicles to enter and leave in a forward gear will be encouraged. Where vehicles reversing from or onto the highway would give rise to highway safety issues, on-site turning space will be compulsory.*

*4.08 In car parking courts, sufficient space should be provided to allow vehicles to reverse. Six metres between sets of spaces is normally sufficient for this purpose.*

Because of the limited space available on the forecourt visitors to the site are not using the spaces allocated but are instead parking in the road, across neighbours drives and

on grass verges also across pavements restricting pedestrian access. The applicant is not adhering or policing the Approval they have regarding parking arrangements. Even when politely asked to move cars no consideration has been shown to residents.

The parking spaces provided are not big enough to allow cars to turn and leave safely in forward gear as SPD states. The parking behind does not comply and there is not a 6.0m reversing space. Cars are having to reverse into the road causing safety issues. If the current proposal is approved this will only make the situation worse and be even more inconvenient to neighbours than it already is.

### **IMPACT ON RESIDENTIAL AMENITY**

I note that Environmental Heath raised no objection to the original application or the current refused application. I am not sure if anyone from Environmental Health visited the application site during opening hours so missed an opportunity to experience first-hand the inconvenience. If they did they would realise that there are unfavourable smells associated with this business, and when you live close by it is very unpleasant when using rear garden space. It is not something that should be associated within a residential area when trying to relax in your own space. At the moment we do at least get a couple of days a week when the air is clear and the garden is quiet. If the hours are extended we would have to suffer this every day except Sunday.

### **NOISE**

There is no getting away from the fact there is noise associated with this business. With the noise from constant car manoeuvring, people arriving and leaving all day long, and constant activity in the rear garden. The scale and level of noise and activity should be considered unacceptable for the neighbouring residents living close to a business located in a small residential area with the current hours of operation. Increasing the hours will make this worse and even more unacceptable.

The use of the rear garden has become unpleasant and restricted by the activity and noise associated with the business.

We ask that the Inspector takes all these factors into consideration when reaching a decision on this Appeal and respects the increased impact its approval would have on the lives of people living in neighbouring properties. The activity is completely out of character with the quiet residential area.