



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 June 2025

by **S Simms BSc (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29th August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0240/W/25/3362381

216 Station Road, Lower Stondon, Henlow SG16 6JE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Yujun Wang against the decision of Central Bedfordshire Council.
 - The application Ref is CB/24/03389/FULL.
 - The development is a change of use of existing room at the front of the property to a nail bar, alter front window to door.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The word 'Retrospective' was added to the end of the description of development on both the application form and decision notice.
3. It was apparent on site that the development has already been implemented as shown and described in the application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on highway safety, with particular regard to the provision of parking.

Reasons

5. The appeal site contains a two-storey semi-detached house with single storey side extension containing a door and full height window. The original main house door remains, and both are accessed directly from the front garden, the whole of which is block paved. The driveway measures about 10m in depth and 9m in width, with space for two or three cars. There is no front boundary treatment and access from the road is via a verge crossover to one side of the driveway.
6. The site is about 50m from a pharmacy, post office, hairdresser and bus stops, and is 100m from a roundabout with the A600 (Bedford Road) and A659 (Hitchin Road), around which there are shops, services, takeaways and a pub. This section of Station Road is quite busy, serving the western part of the village and others beyond, and is lined with residential accesses and side roads. It is also narrow and has marked parking spaces to keep accesses clear and allow passing.
7. The road has a 30mph speed limit and double yellow lines nearer the roundabout. Bollards have been installed on the same side as the site to protect the footways from parking on kerbs. During my site visit at about 3pm on a term-time weekday,

there was one on-street space available near the site and a vehicle was parked on a section of footway with double yellow lines near the post office.

8. The development converts about 20sqm of ground floor living space in the side extension into a nail bar including a toilet and shower room. Retaining an internal connection to the house, this effects a mixed use of the whole property as a nail bar and dwelling. The driveway has space for three cars, but only if parked in a tandem arrangement, leaving little space for bins or in which to turn cars, which may therefore have to reverse on to the highway.
9. The Council's Parking Standards for New Developments Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) requires a minimum of two spaces and 0.25 visitor spaces for three-bedroom houses and one space per 30sqm of gross floor area for uses like nail bars plus operational requirements determined on a site-by-site basis. The local highway authority advises a total of four are required if staff live off site, and objects due to the increased risk of unsafe on-street parking.
10. Whether staff reside at the premises or not, and even with a condition to require the nail bar to remain a part of the house, future members of staff might not live there. On balance, as the layout does not meet the SPD design standards even for three spaces, I am persuaded that parking provision is inadequate. As this could result in reversing across the footway and into the carriageway, or parking illegally or inconsiderately, this also jeopardises highway safety.
11. Consequently, the development is contrary to Policies T2 and T3 of the Central Bedfordshire Local Plan (2021), which require development not to harm highway safety and to have regard to the Council's parking standards. I attach significant weight to this conflict with policy.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal should be dismissed.

S Simms

INSPECTOR