



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 16 December 2020

by David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 January 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/V2004/W/20/3259191

79 Hornscroft Park, Kingston-upon-Hull HU7 3GS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mrs Karen Williams against the decision of Kingston-upon-Hull City Council.
 - The application Ref 20/00637/FULL, dated 8 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 11 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is change of use from integral domestic garage (C3) to hairdressers (A1), and alterations to garage frontage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by an amended version on the decision notice and in subsequent appeal documents. I consider that subsequent description to accurately reflect the proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on:
 - The living conditions of nearby residents with regard to noise and disturbance; and
 - Parking and highway safety.

Reasons

Living Conditions

4. The proposed hairdressers would be located in a garage within one of a pair of semi-detached houses located on a residential estate. Due to the close-knit relationship with the adjoining dwelling, the comings and goings of customers would be readily apparent to neighbouring residents. The appellant refers to the relatively low level of custom proposed, as well as restricting opening to standard working hours on weekdays. However, I consider that the noise and disturbance generated by people accessing the proposal as well as the increase in traffic movements would exceed what neighbouring residents could reasonably expect in this residential area. The disturbance to the living

conditions of neighbouring residents is apparent from the comment raised in relation to the appeal.

5. With regards to noise and disturbance from vehicle movements, the appellant submits that customers of the business would not rely on the private car as many would live in the area as well as the proximity of a bus service. However, there is no certainty that this would be the case and I consider that many customers would use the car for reasons of convenience. The increase in noise and disturbance from traffic movements in this residential area adds to my concerns in respect of this appeal.
6. I conclude that the proposal would lead to significant harm to the living conditions of nearby residents in respect of noise and disturbance. The proposal would therefore conflict with policies 22 and 23 of the Hull Local Plan 2017 (the Local Plan) in respect of the effect of house alterations and employment development on the context of the area and the effect on residential properties.

Parking and Highway Safety

7. The proposal would lead to the loss of a parking space provided by the garage. However, the Council accepts that the provision of a further space in the front garden would meet the parking requirements for the dwelling itself in accordance with the adopted parking standards.
8. However, the proposal would not provide for customers of the business who would need to park on the highway should they arrive by car. That said, the Council has not provided evidence in respect of its adopted parking standards in relation to the proposed business use. I saw that there was suitable on-street parking provision in the immediate area at the time of my site visit. This is also supported by the car parking survey submitted by the appellant. I am also mindful that the business would operate at day times during the working week, when the peaks of demand in this residential area for parking would be at the evenings and weekends.
9. Based on what I have seen and read, whilst I conclude that the proposal would lead to an increase in on-street parking, this would not be of a volume or nature which would be harmful to highway safety. It has not been demonstrated that the proposal would conflict with policy 32 of the Local Plan regarding parking standards.

Other Matters

10. The appellant refers to a planning permission in the area for the change of use of a garage to a beauty salon. However, this would not appear to be a direct parallel to the appeal proposal in respect of the relationship to neighbouring properties and the nature of the access. In any event, I have determined this appeal on its own merits.
11. I acknowledge that many people work from home, particularly in the current circumstances. However, this does not weigh in support of a proposal which relies on customers accessing a property in a residential area.

Conclusion

12. Notwithstanding my conclusions in respect of parking and highway safety, I conclude that the proposal would lead to significant harm to the living conditions of nearby residents. The proposal would therefore conflict with the development plan as a whole in respect of the harm to the context of the area and the effect on residential properties.
13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR