

# Item No. 15

<b>APPLICATION NUMBER</b>	<b>CB/18/04625/FULL</b>
<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>Glebe House, 4 Station Road, Blunham, Bedford, MK44 3NZ</b>
<b>PROPOSAL</b>	<b>Change of use: Conversion of redundant telephone exchange building for use as a hairdresser' salon (Use Class A1)</b>
<b>PARISH</b>	<b>Blunham</b>
<b>WARD</b>	<b>Sandy</b>
<b>WARD COUNCILLORS</b>	<b>Cllrs Maudlin, Smith &amp; Stock</b>
<b>CASE OFFICER</b>	<b>Nicola Stevens</b>
<b>DATE REGISTERED</b>	<b>12 December 2018</b>
<b>EXPIRY DATE</b>	<b>06 February 2019</b>
<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>Mrs Clayton</b>
<b>AGENT</b>	<b>GC Planning Partnership Ltd</b>
<b>REASON FOR COMMITTEE TO DETERMINE</b>	<b>Call in by Ward Cllr P Smith for the following reason:</b>
	<b>Loss of amenity - Existing business provides a valuable service to older residents and has been doing so for over 8 years</b>
<b>RECOMMENDED DECISION</b>	<b>Full Application - Recommended for Refusal</b>

## Site Location:

The application site is 4 Station Road in Blunham, known as "Glebe House" it is a large detached residential dwelling. The house is constructed from red brick, with a brown tile roof. Station Road is the main link road between Blunham and Moggerhanger, number 4 is to the west side of the road, close to the junction with Barford Road. Within the front garden of the property there is an old telephone exchange which is the subject of this application.

The area is residential in character and is located within the Village Settlement Envelope.

## The Application:

Full planning permission is sought for Change of use and external alterations of redundant telephone exchange building for use as a hairdressers' salon (Use Class A1).

This is a resubmission following refusal of CB/18/03647/FULL in December 2018. The applicant is now proposing changes in opening hours and restriction of use of salon and suggests conditions are attached.

## RELEVANT POLICIES:

**National Planning Policy Framework (July 2018)**  
Section 12 - Achieving well designed places

## Core Strategy and Development Management Policies - North 2009

CS14 - High Quality Design

DM3 - High Quality Design

The Central Bedfordshire Local Plan has reached submission stage and was submitted to the Secretary of State on 30 April 2018.

The National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 48) stipulates that from the day of publication, decision-takers may also give weight to relevant policies in emerging plans unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The apportionment of this weight is subject to:

- the stage of preparation of the emerging plan;
- the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies;
- the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the Framework.

Reference should be made to the Central Bedfordshire Submission Local Plan which should be given limited weight having regard to the above. The following policies are relevant to the consideration of this application:

HQ1 High Quality Development

T3 Parking

### Supplementary Planning Guidance/Other Documents

1. Central Bedfordshire Design Guide (March 2014)

### Relevant Planning History:

<b>Case Reference</b>	<b>CB/18/03647/FULL</b>
Location	Glebe House, 4 Station Road, Blunham, Bedford, MK44 3NZ
Proposal	Change of use and external alterations of redundant telephone exchange building for use as a hairdressers' salon (Use Class A1)
Decision	Full Application - Refused  1. The proposal, by way of increased noise generation, activities and general disturbance, would result in an undesirable and unacceptable intensification of development to the detriment of the amenities of adjacent occupiers; as such the proposal is contrary to Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 12 of the NPPF.  2. The proposal would result in an undesirable and unacceptable form of development such that it would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area; as such the proposal is contrary to Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 12 of the NPPF.
Decision Date	03/12/2018 11:19:41

<b>Case Reference</b>	<b>CB/10/03360/FULL</b>
Location	Glebe House, 4 Station Road, Blunham, Bedford, MK44 3NZ
Proposal	Full: Extension to outbuilding (retrospective)
Decision	Full Application - Granted
Decision Date	01/11/2010

<b>Case Reference</b>	<b>MB/07/00192/FULL</b>
Location	Glebe House, 4 Station Road, Blunham, MK44 3NZ
Proposal	Full: Two storey front extension, first floor side extension over existing garage and replace existing flat roof to front with pitched. Part retrospective.
Decision	Full Application - Refused
Decision Date	27/03/2007

<b>Case Reference</b>	<b>MB/92/01021/FULL</b>
Location	Glebe House, 4 Station Road, Blunham, MK44 3NZ
Proposal	FULL: FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION
Decision	Full Application - Granted
Decision Date	14/10/1992

<b>Case Reference</b>	<b>MB/88/01735/OA</b>
Location	Glebe House, 4 Station Road, Blunham, MK44 3NZ
Proposal	OUTLINE: CONSTRUCTION OF GRANNY ANNEXE
Decision	Outline Application - Refused
Decision Date	13/12/1988

**Parish Council:**

Blunham Parish Council Blunham Parish Council supports this application, which provides a much needed new local amenity. It is a suitable location in the heart of the village, providing a welcome service to the large elderly population of Blunham, as well as able bodied. It is within easy walking distance from the new village developments as well as the traditional village envelope & as such, reduces the need for car travel (in a village which is not well served by public transport). It also makes use of a redundant building in an appropriate way.

**Internal Consultees:**

CBC Highways No objection suggest attach conditions and notes

CBC Pollution No Comments to make

CBC Trees No objection.

**Other Representations:**

Neighbours A signed petition in support with 44 signatures together with 6 letters (submitted by the applicant).

site notice 11.1.19

- 1 letter of report received summarised as
1. good that the building is being used.
  2. people coming and going from the building is good for security.
  3. As a neighbour they have never experienced any disturbance relating to use of the building, such as by parked cars, noise, etc.
  4. Blunham is poorly served by buses. It is useful for elderly residents to have such a facility in the village.

## **Considerations**

### **1. Principle**

- 1.1 The site lies within the settlement envelope of Blunham which is identified as a Large Village in the adopted Core Strategy. Policy DM4 states that within Settlement Envelopes in Large Villages, small-scale housing and employment uses, together with new retail and service facilities to serve the village and its catchment will be permitted.
- 1.2 As such the proposal for retail purposes may be considered to be acceptable in some instances provided it meets other planning criteria which will be assessed below.

### **2. Effect on the Character and Appearance of the Area**

- 2.1 The applicant states that the existing salon has been established for many years on an appointment only basis with limited opening hours but acknowledges that based on the planning history the lawful use remains a utilities building in this case a telephone exchange building.
- 2.2 It is noted that in the 2010 a householder application was granted planning permission for a retrospective extension to the outbuilding.
- 2.3 The applicant states that the use has continued for many years and that this planning application has been submitted without prejudice to a s191 application (an application for a certificate of lawfulness to establish the lawful use of the building). The Council has no evidence of the use being in operation as a separate A1 use for 10 years or more (which is the relevant time period to determine that the development is immune from planning enforcement).
- 2.4 The proposal is for change of use and external alterations of the building for use as a hairdressers' salon (Use Class A1).
- 2.5 Minor external changes are proposed to the building to incorporate change from window to door on the front. The single storey building is located to the front of the dwelling but is partially screened by existing soft landscaping along the road frontage.
- 2.6 A 1.8m close boarded fence is proposed to subdivide the single storey building from the main front elevation of the dwelling which will be well set back from the road frontage. An enlarged parking area and turning area is provided to the front of the site to accommodate the proposed use.
- 2.7 In this revised application the applicant puts forward in the Design and Access statement that there will be no demonstratable change in character given the scale of the proposed use. The applicant considers that the use of buildings for commercial/leisure or retail purposes cheek by jowel with residential uses is a common feature in village locations for example the chip shop in Blunham is located adjoining residential uses.
- 2.8 In addition it is proposed to limit the use to a hairdressing salon only to limit the scope of the A1 use together with other restrictions on hours of operation.
- 2.9 As noted above planning permission has been previously refused on the basis of the impact on the character of the site and surroundings associated with the change of use of the building. Its a residential area and there will be more comings and goings with a retail use and so will fundamentally alter the

character of the site. The existing use appears to be very low key (an appointment only basis) but there can be no guarantee that this low key operation will remain. The changes to the layout have been partially implemented in terms of the parking. Whilst there is soft landscaping to the front this could be removed and further increase the visibility of the building as a retail unit. As a result it is considered that a retail use would be out of keeping with the character and appearance of the streetscene and for this reason should form a reason for refusal.

- 2.10 Although the applicant has suggested attaching a condition to restrict the use to a hairdressing salon only, the issue is whether or not an A1 retail use is acceptable in this residential area. As such it is not considered that it is reasonable to restrict the specific use to a hairdressers.
- 2.11 As such it is considered that the proposal is contrary to policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North of Central Bedfordshire and Section 12 of the NPPF.

### **3. Neighbouring Amenity**

- 3.1 The building is sited to the front of No 4 Station Road in fairly close proximity and it is proposed to separate it with a new fence but vehicular access will be shared.
- 3.2 No 26 Station Road to the side is separated by its own single storey double garage which is blank sided at the rear. There are two existing entrance doors to the side of the building adjacent to the front boundary with No 26 although a new one is also proposed on the front.
- 3.3 No 2 Station Road has two ground floor and two first floor windows on its side elevation facing the application site which it is assumed the majority are secondary windows to rooms served at the front and rear. It is separated by the access at No 4 by its own vehicular access and a fence along the shared boundary.
- 3.4 Due to the minor external changes proposed there would be no undue loss of light, privacy or overbearing impact for adjoining occupiers.
- 3.5 However, as noted above the proposal is for use of the building as a hairdressers' salon (Use Class A1).
- 3.6 To overcome the previous reason for refusal the applicant now proposes to reduce the hours of operation further from that previously sought. The application was submitted omitting Mondays and Saturdays but the applicant has now stated that this should only be Mondays.
- 3.7 Suggested hours are now 09.00am to 17.00pm Tuesdays to Fridays and 09:00am to 13:00pm on Saturdays and not at all on Mondays, Sundays and Bank Holidays and limited to appointments only. It is also stated that the size of the unit may limit the level of activity in any event. It is also noted that the number of employees is now stated as one (it was previously proposed as two employees).
- 3.8 However, as considered previously whilst it is proposed to limit the hours of operation (and previously suggested employees) it is not considered enforceable. Notwithstanding the proposed reduction in hours of operation from 5 and a half to 4 and a half days a week, given the relationship with existing residential dwellings, there is concern that a retail use in this

residential area will result in undue noise and disturbance with associated comings and goings, use of the driveway and banging of car doors etc, in relation to neighbouring properties including No 4 and as such would be unacceptable.

#### **4. Highway Considerations**

- 4.1 The Highway Officer notes that the proposal is for change of use to hair salon. The proposal also is for a new fence and gate within the site, separating the dwelling from the business, 4 parking spaces for the business and a widened access.
- 4.2 It is proposed by that the business will be limited to employ 1 member of staff and be open from 09:00 to 17:00 Tuesday to Friday and 09:00am to 13:00pm on Saturdays.
- 4.3 The Highway officer confirms that the parking provision for the business and dwelling are adequate and conditions could be attached regarding widening of the access, provision of staff parking and customer parking and turning within the site.
- 4.4 Although it is suggested it would be beneficial if a condition could be included to limit the customers to 2 at any one time this is not considered enforceable.

#### **5.0 Conclusion**

- 5.1 It is acknowledged that the site is within the settlement envelope and would provide a valuable service to the community, as acknowledged by the Parish Council and third parties. However, the provision of a retail operation in this position would be at odds with the character of the street and result in harm to living conditions of neighbours. Planning permission has been previously refused for this development.

#### **6. Other considerations**

##### **6.1 Human Rights issues:**

The proposal raises no Human Rights issues.

##### **6.2 Equality Act 2010:**

The proposal therefore raises no issues under the Equality Act but an informative to advise of the responsibilities of the applicant is attached.

#### **Recommendation:**

That Planning Permission be REFUSED for the following reason:

#### **RECOMMENDED REASONS**

- 1 The proposal, by way of increased noise generation, activities and general disturbance, would result in an undesirable and unacceptable intensification of development to the detriment of the amenities of adjacent occupiers; as such the proposal is contrary to Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 12 of the NPPF.
- 2 The proposal would result in an undesirable and unacceptable form of development such that it would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area; as such the proposal is contrary to Policy DM3 of the Core Strategy for the North and Section 12 of the NPPF.

**Statement required by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 - Part 6, Article 35**

In the Council's view the proposal is unacceptable in principle and the fundamental objections cannot be overcome through dialogue. The applicant was invited to withdraw the application to seek pre-application advice prior to any re-submission but did not agree to this. The Council has therefore complied with the requirements of the Framework (paragraph 38) and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

**DECISION**

.....

.....