

Planning Application No: 2026/62/91926/E

Address: 158 Hawthorne Way Shelley

Description: Change of use of garage to treatment room for hairdressing including installation of bi-fold doors to existing opening

Dear Elenya Jackson,

I'm writing to you to again to express my additional concerns about the above proposed development at 158 Hawthorne Way, Shelley, following the submission of amended plans and a Sequential Test.

The location plan has now removed the visitors parking space from the application redline, the drive has been altered to show three parking spaces side by side and that the bi-folds now open inwards.

Its positive news that the intended customers parking space is retained for visitors within the cul-de-sac.

The amended 383-26-PL02 Rev B submitted 14.9.26 shows three parking spaces which can now be accessed independently of one another, a preferred requirement of DC highways officers in my experience. The three spaces are the minimum required for any garage conversion due to the loss of 2 spaces from within the garage, regardless of its use.

However, the application as amended now doesn't provide the 4th off-street parking for customers, due to the proposed business use. Given our previous comments which clearly show that 75% of the time there are always 2 customers at the property at any one time surely the application should provide for two additional spaces. As this cannot be provided the application should be refused on highways grounds.

As residents within the cul-de-sac, it would be unacceptable for customers to park on the roadside, visitors parking bay or on neighbours' grass, as previously shown in our earlier objection. None of these areas are within the applicant's control therefore cannot be considered as an option for customer parking. I appreciate anyone can park on the street, as there are no restrictions, however, the cul-de-sac has no pavement to walk on and in parts is narrow for two cars to park, any persistent and continuous street parking 6 days a week would reduce turning within the cul-de-sac, access to drives and for cars to pass, especially if cars are parked lower than the applicant's property. These options would be unreasonable given that this is a residential area with no commercial properties within the vicinity.

In order for the three spaces to be provided as shown, the existing drive will need to be extended again. The drawings don't indicate how this will be done nor has it been added to the description. Unless drainage is to be provided planning permission would also be required for this, however given the sloping nature of the drive appropriate drainage would be difficult to achieve.

The amended plans showing the bi-fold inwards does reduce the obstruction on the drive for parking, but doesn't overcome our previous concerns with regards: -

- Visual amenity within the street scene
- Residential Amenity

- Overlooking
- Running a business from home
- Noise from the open bi-fold
- Light during winter months

These issues are fully explained in my previous comments and should be read in conjunction with this objection letter, and my concerns are un-changed.

Sequential Test

The agent has also sent a Sequential Test in at the request of the planning officer, which doesn't really give a lot of information to support the application to allow a business in this residential area to be acceptable.

Firstly, the starting village that has been used is Shepley, rather than Shelley which is where the property is. Clearly there are limited business properties in Shelley as it doesn't have a shopping centre.

There are three villages surrounding Shelley, which are Shepley, Kirkburton & Skelmanthorpe and all have shopping premises. However, Shepley is the smallest of the three with a row of three shops, Public House and an Accountants, with a village library in close proximity.

In Shepley, on the corner of Marsh Lane and the A629 is Bridge House, a detached building over three floors which has some vacancies. In the past there has been a hairdressing salon and physiotherapy clinic within the building.

Also within a one-mile radius of Shepley is Whitby Court, Abbey Road. This is advertised as an office space over two floors, however along with office space the photos clearly show a treatment room.



If the agent had chosen Skelmanthorpe, for example, which is a village the applicant has operated business premises from in the past and did a 1-mile search, these are office spaces that fall within the same use class as hairdressers:

- 335B Wakefield Road
- Nortonthorpe Mills Unit 7 plus 4 other premises within
- 195 Wakefield Road Scissett

- Advertised as offering 3 retail options within the building: Ground & lower ground floor plus First floor

If the agent had chosen to conduct a search within 3 miles from Shelley which is not an unreasonable distance to travel to work an office space in a mixed use building with the 1st Floor Millfields House, Thongsbridge is advertised as vacant. Therefore, the screen shot of nothing available gives limited weight to demonstrate that there are no commercial properties available for the applicant's business.

My understanding of a sequential test is where the applicant/agent should demonstrate that there are no other reasonably available sites which can accommodate the proposed development. I would presume this would include, the applicants' requirements, size of property and parking availability unless in a shopping centre to name but a few. None of this information has been provided to support the screen shot submitted.

Regardless of this, my search has resulted in 10 premises available and albeit all may not be suitable, the agent has not demonstrated why they are unacceptable as mentioned above. Furthermore, doing only a 1 mile radius is very small distance for comparison given our rural setting.

The applicant has daily access to her own vehicle and over 90% of customers visiting the property already arrive by car so moving the hairdressing salon within a 3 miles radius should have a negligible effect on customers travelling distance.

I believe that Bridge House would be ideal and Whitby Court is another option both of which are in Shepley.

Further comments regarding the additional information submitted by the agent hasn't addressed any of the other planning related concerns previously raised in our objections. These are related to the discrepancies stated in the planning statement and on the application form on how the applicant intends to run the business and how the applicant has actually been running the business over the last 3 months.

Therefore, my conclusion and final comments to the current application at 158 Hawthorne Way are unchanged.

In my opinion, I feel that the proposed planning application to convert the existing double garage incorporating full width bi-folds into a treatment room for hairdressing at 158 Hawthorne Way is inappropriate within a residential area. Any approval would set a precedent for similar uses with the use class order class E and would be detrimental to the occupiers of the cul-de-sac and surrounding area as a whole. The proposed use would have an impact on the visual amenity within the street scene due to its design, along with our residential amenity with regards noise emanating from the property, as well as cars and potential light pollution from the large expanse of glazing.

The application would also have an impact on highway safety due to the increase level of car movement within this quiet cul-de-sac, there is insufficient off-street parking which the applicant has sole use off and with additional parked cars parking, existing residents parking will be restricted.

It should also be noted that the design of our cul-de-sac, where you exit cul-de-sac onto the main spine road and the exiting planting either side reduces visibility with poor sight lines available. Therefore, with the increased traffic and visitors who don't frequently exit the cul-de-

sac, its only time before an accident happens, as you have to have your car bonnet sticking out into the road before you can see both ways clearly.

The hours of operation are those of a full business, proposing 44 hours of opening times which are more suitable for a commercial premises within a local shopping centre.

It is considered that the approval at 46 Westerly Lane wasn't fully assessed and should have been refused. Regardless of this, the approved scheme isn't identical to that being proposed here and would result in a material change of use inappropriate within a residential area.

If the application was approved the bi-folds should be removed to match other garage conversions within the area, hours should be reduced to that of the application at No. 46, Westerly Lane or the hours reduced further to accommodate only 5 customers a day.

Any conditions to be added should include the applicant only with no employees, restricted to a hairdressing treatment and for no other use. The use should also cease when the homeowner moves.

Finally, if the application is refused, enforcement action should be taken for the exiting use to cease.

Regards

166 Hawthorne Way, Shelley