

## **Planning Statement for application of Rear extension at Hayling Garage 2-4 Church Road Hayling Island Hampshire PO110NT**

This document has been produced to offer an alternative solution for the provision of a work shelter at the application premises. The original application APP/20/00032 was for a side extension on the above property and had been constructed without planning permission. This was followed by revised application which was also refused and resulted in an appeal which was dismissed (Appeal reference APP/X1735/W/20/3264502)

This application should it be approved would provide the required space.

The applicant intends to remove the existing non approved structure in line with the enforcement process currently underway however they are also happy for this to be a condition of any potential approval for the rear extension.

### Parking

It should be noted that the appeal supported the application with regards to parking and stated in section 8 the requirements for parking.

‘The Council has confirmed that the proposal would require 4 on-site parking spaces to in order to meet the Havant Borough Council Parking Supplementary Planning Document (2016) (the Parking SPD) standards in respect of B2 use floorspace, and an additional 5 on-site spaces in respect of the service bay and forecourt display of cars for sale.’

And in section 16 and 17 supports the application in terms of parking

‘16. For the above reasons, whilst the development does not strictly accord with the parking standards of the Parking SPD, and in the absence of compelling evidence to the contrary, I find that this small shortfall is capable of being addressed, having regard to the transport needs of the appeal site, without resulting in demonstrable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring residents, having regard to on-street parking.

17. As such, I find that the development accords with the objectives of Policies CS16 and DM14 of the Havant Borough Core Strategy (2011) (the Core Strategy) and the Parking SPD, in so much as they seek to ensure that new development helps create places where people want to live, work and relax, and that parking in proposed developments does not create street congestion, road safety issues or tensions within a community.’

The new application has provided the required parking in the same way as the previous application (reduction of sales spaces) and to the numbers required in the appeal decision, we therefore believe this part of the previous refusal has been addressed.

This New proposal was subject to a pre app enquiry in July 2020 which raised concerns in some areas. The parking part of these concerns has been addressed by the appeal decision outlined above, in terms of the other points, we would like to address these as part of this document.

### Impact on the character of the area

The pre app response was generally positive in this area although the officer requested more clarity in terms of roof materials. The visible hipped mansard roof would use concrete interlocking tiles to match those of the existing and neighbouring buildings and the walls would be clad in the same material as the ground floor of the existing building.

### Impact on neighbour amenity

The area now been proposed for the service bay is currently (and has always been) used for servicing cars, this area contains a hydraulic lifting ramp within close proximity to the boundary which lifts vehicles up to 2 m in the air 5-10 times a day for servicing and repairs (see photo) In addition any minimal pollution that may be generated is done so in the open air.

See Below





The aim of this application is simply for that use to be internal not external. The applicant is happy for the use of these bays to be restricted to the lands current use i.e servicing and not to allow (by way of conditioning) any alternative use that may generate additional noise or pollution (such as spray painting etc)

The creation of an enclosed service bay to undertake this work can only offer a substantial improvement to the noise, pollution and visual impact on the neighbouring dwellings.

In terms of the design, care has been taken to create a design which reflects what would be permissible under permitted development, if this site were a domestic dwelling rather than a business, since this is the criteria deemed as been acceptable without planning for a residential neighbour we can see little difference why this should be seen as visually unacceptable just because it is a business (as long as the materials are appropriate) The eaves height of the building is below 3m and the roof height is below 4m. Both these being the permitted development limits within 2m of any boundary.

The officer stated in the pre app response that the building would bring activity closer to the neighbouring dwellings thus potentially increasing noise and pollution. As can be seen by the images provided, we do not believe this to be the case, in fact the opposite is true, at present the service area goes right up to the boundary but as part of the proposal a 1metre buffer zone would be created by the walls of the extension and the gap to the boundary, in addition the noise and any potential pollution would be contained within the structure.

As previously stated, the aim of this proposal is purely to bring the existing out door service area into a single storey structure which can only improve the impact on the neighbouring dwellings.

### Background

This extension is required to replace the unauthorised side extension which was created due to the success of Hayling Garage and the increased workload coming into the garage. This allowed the company to take on additional work and also to create three additional Jobs. These were filled by three new employees William Wickens, Luke Hollis and Ethan Clark. It is important to understand that at the time of constructing the structure, the business owner believed he did not require planning permission. Although he recognises ignorance is no defence, in no way did he intend to act against planning requirements. He has followed

the appeals process in the hope of retaining the structure, but having lost the appeal, is now preparing to remove the structure in line with the enforcement process.

The new proposed structure would replace the indoor space which has provided additional work areas and would tidy the external space as well as reducing noise levels generated. Should this internal space be lost, it would risk the employment of at least two and possibly all three of the new employees which would be a great shame. In addition, this would cause significant damage to the business and its viability of continued success in the future.

As examples of the positive impact the business and the extension has had on the Island and its community, Ethan Clark (one of the new employees) was employed following a work experience request from Helen Cox of Hayling College. (Mrs Cox would be happy to confirm this 07732213558)

Ethan was a young man who had received an Antisocial Behaviour Order (ASBO) and was experiencing behaviour challenges at Hayling college his life was very much heading in the wrong direction, he was initially offered a work experience placement by the garage on the request of Mrs Cox. Ethan worked really well and on construction of the extension was offered a part time role until he finishes at school in the summer at which point, he will commence a full-time apprenticeship at the garage. This is really giving him a focus and thus, the opportunity to turn things round and grow into a responsible young man.

The completion of the extension released areas in the main garage to allowed it to take on the building of custom exhausts as part of the eurosport exhaust system network and engine decarbonisation as part of the terraclean network. This brings business to the island as customers are on hayling for the day or part of the day while waiting for work to be completed, recently a customer had his car exhaust custom built and spent the day on hayling, he went for lunch at the Inn on the beach before shopping in Mengham and returning to collect his car.

Whilst we except the error made by the business in building the unauthorised extension, we believe this alternative proposal offers benefits in terms of services, employment and income that it delivers to the Local community. We would therefore ask that this revised application be considered favourably, and the extension be approved.