



Appeal Decision

Site Visit made on 8 June 2021 by Emma Worby BSc (Hons) MSc MRPTI

Decision by Martin Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12 July 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/Y2620/W/21/3269693

Church Farmhouse, 20 Church Street, Southrepps NR11 8NP

- 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 Olga Brennand against the decision of North Norfolk District Council.
 - The application Ref PF/20/0932, dated 3 June 2020, was refused by notice dated 28 August 2020.
 - The development proposed is a change of use from residential (C3 dwellinghouse) to mixed use C3 dwellinghouse and boutique skin health clinic.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a change of use from residential (C3 dwellinghouse) to mixed use C3 dwellinghouse and boutique skin health clinic at Church Farmhouse, 20 Church Street, Southrepps, NR11 8NP in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PF/20/0932, dated 3 June 2020, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The premises shall only be open for customers between 1000 - 1700 Mondays – Fridays and closed on Saturday and Sunday.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by an Appeal Planning Officer whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons for the Recommendation

4. The appeal property is a two-storey, grade II listed dwelling with off-street parking for two vehicles to the side of the property, and is located in the Southrepps Upper Conservation Area. It is within a residential area and is located on the junction of Church Street and Clipped Hedge Lane. Both of these roads are relatively quiet, with limited vehicle and pedestrian movements, and the road is restricted to 30mph with a further reduction to 20mph indicated as proposed by Norfolk County Council, with many vehicles already travelling at lower speeds due to the nature of the road. The proposal would change the use of the building to part dwelling and part skin health clinic. The clinic would be

based in one room of the property with customers visiting on an appointment basis, between 1000 and 1700 on weekdays only.

5. As the change of use is intended to provide a small, at home business, the appellant has stated that there would be a maximum of four customers per day. Although there is no certainty that this limit on customer numbers would be met in perpetuity, due to the nature of the proposed business, there would be limited facilities to accommodate a larger number of customers at any one time. Due to the location of the appeal site, with no public transport options, it is very likely that customers would travel to the appeal site by car and therefore there would be around 8 additional vehicular movements per day.
6. The appellant intends to use one existing off-road car parking space, to the side of the building, for visitors to the clinic. This car parking area is limited in size and does not provide any manoeuvring or turning facilities. Furthermore, visibility when exiting the car parking space onto the highway is limited due to existing structures either side of the space, contrary to the requirement in Manual for Streets. However, the car parking space is already in use by the occupiers of the dwelling and although the proposal would increase the use of this access, due to the number of customers proposed, the intensification would be nominal. Therefore, although Church Street is shared by both cars and pedestrians and when exiting the space drivers may have to reverse onto the highway, due to the limited amount of movements into and out of the access and the quiet nature of Church Street, I see no reason why there would be a significant increase in the likelihood of a collision.
7. The comments regarding the width of the access from the Highways Officer are noted. However, as it is only 0.1 metre smaller than their requirement this would not result in the access being overly inadequate, particularly as it is already in use and would only have a limited increase in movements.
8. It is also noted that, whilst off-road parking is preferable, the addition of a limited amount of on-street parking resulting from the proposed change of use would not have a significant impact on highway safety. There are no on-street parking restrictions and the road is wide enough to allow the free flow of traffic with some vehicle parking, as seen during my site visit. Furthermore, although the adopted parking standards for a clinic is two car parking spaces per consulting room, due to the nature of the clinic and the availability of some on-street parking, one car parking space is deemed acceptable in this instance.
9. Therefore, the proposed change of use would not have a harmful impact on highway safety and would therefore not conflict with Policies CT5 and CT6 of the North Norfolk Core Strategy (2008). These policies require proposals to be capable of being served by safe access to the highway network with adequate vehicle parking facilities to serve the needs of the development.

Other Matters

10. Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the Act) places a duty upon the decision-maker, in the exercise of planning functions, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas. I also have a statutory duty, under Section 66 of the Act to consider the impact of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of a listed building and its setting.

The appeal property is a grade II listed building and is located within the Southrepps Upper Conservation Area.

11. However, as the proposed change of use would not result in any physical changes or structural works to the listed building, it would not affect the listed building, and I am satisfied that the increased use of the existing parking area would not adversely affect its setting or the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, as concluded by the Council. Therefore, the proposal would preserve the significance of both heritage assets.

Conditions

12. In addition to the standard time period for commencement of the development, I have also attached a condition ensuring that the clinic is only open to customers between 1000 and 1700 on Mondays to Fridays, in line with the appellants requirements. This is to prevent excessive use which may impact on parking provision and highway safety.
13. The Highways Officer has requested a condition to secure the on-site car parking area and retain it for this use. However, as the area is already used for car parking in relation to the dwelling, no works are required and therefore this condition is not necessary. The Council have also submitted a list of suggested conditions in Appendix A of their statement, however these do not relate to the appeal before me and therefore have not been included.

Conclusion and Recommendation

14. For the reasons given above and having had regard to all other matters raised, the proposal would not conflict with the development plan taken as a whole, and I recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

Emma Worby

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

15. I have considered all the submitted evidence and the Appeal Planning Officer's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed.

Martin Seaton

INSPECTOR