

Objection to Planning Application

158 Hawthorne Way, Shelley, Huddersfield, HD8 8PX

Application: Change of use of garage to treatment room for hairdressing, including installation of bi-fold doors (Agent ref: 383-26-R1)

Council application reference: 2026/62/91926/E

From:

Date: 18-07-2026

Dear Planning Officer,

I wish to object in the strongest terms to the above application. My objection is based on highway safety, loss of residential amenity, loss of privacy, noise and pollution plus significant factual inaccuracies within the application itself, each of which I set out below.

1. The application materially misrepresents the parking provision

The application states the property benefits from off-street parking for four vehicles, with a dedicated fourth space for clients. This is factually incorrect and I ask that the case officer verify it independently before determination:

- Properties on this development were built with and **two** internal garage spaces **and two** off-street parking spaces, positioned in front of the garage. The property has never benefited from four external spaces.
- The current owners have recently laid an additional tarmacked vehicle-width strip **directly across the 2-metre service strip** that runs around the perimeter of the properties on this estate. This service strip is subject to restrictions preventing it being built upon or obstructed, and the works appear to have been carried out in breach of those restrictions. This unauthorised hardstanding should not be accepted as legitimate parking provision in support of this application.
- I would further draw the Council's attention to the fact that the site plan submitted with the application is **misleading as to the extent of the driveway**. The concrete divider line that originally separated the driveway from the protected service strip was removed by a previous owner, who tarmacked the drive and service strip over as one continuous surface, contrary to the restrictions applying to the strip. The application drawings present this enlarged tarmacked area as though it were all legitimate driveway, when in fact part of it is the service strip which should never have been surfaced over. The plans therefore do not accurately reflect the lawful extent of the parking area, and the Council should not rely on them when assessing the parking provision.
- The claimed fourth "client parking" space is in fact the **communal layby** provided by the original developer (Redrow) when the estate was constructed and subsequently adopted as publicly maintained highway. It does not belong to the applicant and cannot be allocated as private client parking. I have concerns that the applicant will attempt to tarmac the layby area

and join this into their existing drive and cause the removal of access to the parking for the other residents of the cul-de-sac.

- The submitted plans show three parking spaces on the drive, with two positioned up to the property boundary. This takes no account of the clearance needed to **open the proposed bi-fold doors**, which are likely to require in the order of a metre of space and if access to the business is through those doors, a clear gap would be required at all times. In practice there is not space for three cars on the drive: the third vehicle would have to sit partly across the bottom of the drive and partly on the road, obstructing the neighbour opposite when reversing into or out of their own drive.

2. The ownership claim over the layby is disputed and should be independently verified

The application relies on a solicitor's letter asserting private ownership of the layby area. This claim is contradicted by the position on the ground and by the official records:



Deed plot lines of 160 and 158



Deed plot bound build from Land Registry Inspire polygons



Public Layby from 2009 before previous owners applied gravel and hard standing to the grassed area.

- The boundary of the properties, as shown on the official records where the dashed lines and in the case of 158 and the border of 160 it runs along the stone wall at the rear of the property and the fence line along the inside edge of the layby. The layby itself sits **outside** the ownership boundary.
- The layby forms part of the adopted highway and the 2m service strip. If it was adopted along with the estate roads, it is publicly maintained land and no private party can claim exclusive use of it or designate it as customer parking.
- The layby has been openly used by residents and the public for approximately **25+ years**, and has throughout that time been recognised by all the houses in the cul-de-sac as **designated visitor parking** exactly like the equivalent parking area further down the cul-de-sac next to 170 Hawthorne Way, and the matching spaces in the neighbouring cul-de-sacs on either side. These visitor parking areas were, on any reasonable reading, provided by the developer as a requirement of the original planning consent for the estate, and it would be extraordinary if the developer had been able to allocate one of them to a single property.

Given that a central plank of the application, the availability of a dedicated client parking space rests on this disputed claim, I ask the Council to obtain confirmation from its own Highways records of the

extent of the adopted highway before determining the application. If the layby is adopted highway, the application's parking case collapses entirely.

3. Highway safety — the stated “1 in 1 out” operation does not reflect reality

The business has already been operating from the property prior to this application being submitted, and the actual pattern of activity directly contradicts what is claimed:

- Client traffic is demonstrably **not** “one in, one out.” On most operating days, several client vehicles have been present at once. With generally two to three client vehicles being present particularly in the morning periods.
- Client cars have repeatedly been **parked across the highway on both sides, blocking access** to the houses at the top of the cul-de-sac. This is a serious and recurring obstruction, and in an emergency could prevent access by fire, ambulance or police vehicles.
- Client cars have repeatedly been **parked on the service strip adjacent to the properties 156, 168 and 170** which not only causes suffering to those owners but it also causes a pedestrian obstruction for residents walking down from the top of the Cul-de-sac as we now have to walk in the middle of the main road to access the bottom.
- On most days, **more than the claimed maximum of five clients per day** have been witnessed attending the property. New customers frequently arrive at roughly half-hour intervals — at that rate, allowing an hour for lunch, the business could in principle see **16 customers a day**; even one client per hour would mean 8 a day.
- The claimed “maximum of 5 clients per day” also sits oddly against the opening hours applied for. On the Planning Statement's own hours (28 hours per week), at the shortest possible appointment of half-hour this equate to up to **56 customers per week** driving up and turning around in a small cul-de-sac serving just six properties; on the Application Form's hours (44 hours per week — see below), that rises to **88 customers per week**. If the business genuinely intends to serve no more than 5 clients per day, the opening hours should be conditioned down to reflect that.
- The business customer appointments have been observed between 8 and 15 visiting per day with an average of around 10 people. With an average week from appearing to be around 40 customers.
- Some clients have also taken to **parking on the grass of the neighbouring property**, and residents have already experienced inconsiderate parking and unobservant manoeuvres in the cul-de-sac including one which **nearly resulted in an accident**.
- Every car entering the cul-de-sac has to turn around at the top and is causing excessive traffic, causing a nuisance and is at times dangerous to my children.

The application's assurances about scale and operation are therefore already contradicted by the applicant's own conduct. Conditions limiting client numbers would be unenforceable in practice the Council has no realistic means of monitoring daily client visits, and the evidence to date shows the stated limits are not being observed even before consent has been granted.



Examples of client parking obstructing the road and pedestrian areas

4. Discrepancy in the stated operating hours

There is a material discrepancy within the application itself as to when the business would operate:

- The **Planning Statement** states hours of 09.00–18.00 on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday, with Saturday 09.00–13.00, and no trading on Monday, Tuesday, Sunday or Bank Holidays.
- The **Application Form** states Monday to Friday 09.00–18.00, plus Saturday 09.00–13.00 — a **six-day-a-week operation of some 44+ trading hours**.

The business is already operating from the house outside of these hours with clients attending for treatments after 19:00 with customers leaving significantly later. I personally witnessed one client still having a treatment in the front former study late in the evening at 20:30. Saturday appointments are also running to nearly 15:00.

These two documents describe fundamentally different businesses. The Council cannot properly assess still less condition an application whose own supporting documents contradict each other on so basic a point. If the true intention is a full-time, six-day-a-week business, then this is not the “very small in scale” proposal the Planning Statement describes, and a commercial premises would be the appropriate location for it. I ask that the applicant be required to clarify the intended hours, and that

any consent (if granted at all, which I oppose) be strictly conditioned to the narrower hours with no scope for extension.

5. The size of the conversion is inconsistent with the claimed scale of operation

The application describes a sole operator seeing one client at a time, with no waiting room. Yet the proposal is to convert a full **double garage of approximately 5.2m x 5.2m (some 27 square metres)** — a strikingly generous space for one hairdresser and a single customer.



12 of 21 SALON



13 of 21 SALON

A space of this size plainly lends itself to multiple styling stations, additional staff and several clients at once. Taken together with the six-day hours on the Application Form and the client volumes already being witnessed, the fabric of what is proposed points to a materially larger operation than the one described and once consent is granted, the Council would have very limited practical means of preventing that intensification.

The salon when operating at the previous address had two customer chairs plus the sink highlighting that two customers are being serviced at the same time as is the norm with hairdressing businesses.

I would also ask the Council to clarify what other categories of business use could be carried on from the premises if this consent were granted, and how any such drift would be controlled.

6. Commercial waste

A hairdressing business generates commercial waste — hair clippings, chemicals, dyes, foils, colour tubes and similar — which cannot lawfully be disposed of through domestic household collections. The application is silent on how this waste would be stored and disposed of. If the answer is a commercial waste contractor, that means yet another vehicle regularly visiting and manoeuvring in the cul-de-sac, adding to the traffic and disturbance already described.

7. Loss of residential amenity and character of the cul-de-sac

- Hawthorne Way is a quiet residential cul-de-sac consisting of just 6 houses. Introducing a commercial operation generating a continuous flow of visiting traffic fundamentally changes its character.
- The increased vehicle movements have made the street **unsafe for children playing**, an established and valued feature of life in this cul-de-sac. Cars belonging to unfamiliar visitors arriving throughout the day, turning, and manoeuvring in a confined cul-de-sac head present a clear and ongoing risk to child safety.
- The disturbance from comings and goings across four days of trading each week (including Saturdays) amounts to a sustained loss of amenity for neighbouring residents.

8. The proposed bi-fold doors are visually inappropriate and create a shop front

The proposal to replace the garage door with full-height opening glass doors is entirely inappropriate in this setting and should be a significant concern in its own right:

- Full-height glazed bi-fold doors facing the street are a feature of **commercial premises, not domestic garages**. On a residential estate of traditional design, this alteration would read unmistakably as a **shop front**, visually announcing a commercial operation at the heart of a residential cul-de-sac.
- The application itself confirms this commercial character: the doors are to incorporate “integrated blinds to maintain privacy **during operational hours**” — language that describes retail premises, not a dwelling.
- The design is entirely out of keeping with the character and appearance of the street scene, where properties present traditional garage doors and domestic frontages. No other property on the estate has anything resembling a glazed commercial frontage.
- There is an established local precedent for how garage conversions should be handled on this estate: at **168 Hawthorne Way**, the garage door was replaced with brickwork and two windows, in keeping with the domestic character of the street. If any conversion were to be permitted here, that is the appropriate treatment — not a full-width glazed opening.
- Openable full-width glass doors also raise the prospect of the business operating with the frontage open to the street — potentially from ten minutes at a time to full business hours — projecting the noise of customer conversation and salon equipment directly into a quiet cul-de-sac and further eroding its residential character.
- The physical alterations would **entrench the commercial use** in the fabric of the building, making any future reversion to residential use less likely and signalling a permanent change in the character of the property.

9. Restrictive covenants applying to the estate

While I understand that restrictive covenants are a private law matter, they are indicative of the intended character of the estate, which is a material consideration. The title deeds for properties on this development include the following covenants:

“2. Not to do use or permit or suffer to be used the property or any part thereof of any dwellinghouse to erected thereon within the perpetuity period for the carry on of any trade or business or occupation whatsoever but to use the same as private dwelling houses in single family occupation.”

“3. Not to do or permit or suffer to be done on or about the Property anything which may be or become a damage disturbance nuisance or annoyance to the Transferor or the owners lessees or occupiers for the time being of any other parts of the Estate.”

“7. Not to develop and use the Property otherwise than for residential purposes or amenities connected therewith and in accordance with plans approved by the competent authorities.”

“10. Not to obstruct the roads, footpaths and landscaped areas on the estate and permit the same to be used at all times for public purposes ”

1.1.4 “the perpetuity period” means the period commencing the first day of January 1994 and enduring for eighty (80) years.

The estate was designed, sold and purchased on the basis that it would remain wholly residential. A commercial hairdressing operation is plainly at odds with that intended character, and the disturbance already being caused is precisely the kind of nuisance and annoyance the covenants were designed to prevent.

Conclusion

The application understates the intensity of the proposed use, overstates the parking provision, and rests its client-parking case on land that does not belong to the applicant. Its own documents contradict each other on the operating hours, the size of the conversion is wholly out of proportion to the sole-operator business described, and the proposed full-height glazed frontage would create what is in effect a shop front on a residential street. The operation, as already experienced by residents, is causing highway obstruction, risk to children, and a material loss of amenity in a quiet residential cul-de-sac serving just six properties.

I respectfully request that the application be **refused**. Should the Council be minded to approve it notwithstanding these objections, I request that the matter be referred to the Planning Committee rather than determined under delegated powers, and that the Council’s Highways team first confirm the extent of the adopted highway at this location, including the layby.

Yours faithfully,