



Town planning and development



Head of Planning
Manchester City Council
PO Box 532
Town Hall
Manchester
M60 2LA

Orbis town planning
Rivers Lodge
West Common
Harpenden
AL5 2JD

t:0333 987 4286
m:07792900429

e: paul@orbistownplanning.co.uk

15th May 2023

Dear Sir/Madam,

7 Poplar Road, Manchester, M19 1QH

Planning Application: Erection of outbuilding and use for provision of hairdressing services to individual clients

I write in respect of the above site and attach a new planning application for consideration by the council.

This application follows a pre-application enquiry to the council by the applicant (Ms. Hayley Emmanuel) in which she enquired as to whether the low-key use of a new outbuilding within the garden of her home would require planning permission. The response given was that since the outbuilding would not be used for purposes incidental to the enjoyment of a dwelling house then planning permission would be required for the outbuilding. No comment was received on the use itself however, after due consideration, the applicant has decided to apply for formal planning permission.

The site

The site comprises a semi-detached house on the south side of Poplar Road in Burnage. The house sits in a small close, accessed off Kingsway, and forms part of a large residential area. The house is a typical mid 20th century three bed semi, having front and rear gardens and a driveway to the side which can accommodate 3 cars if parked in tandem.

Leeds | London | Harpenden | Manchester | Durham

www.orbistownplanning.co.uk



Site and surrounding area

In terms of accessibility, Burnage station is located nearby, whilst main bus routes serve the area on Kingsway. Poplar road itself is not heavily trafficked and there is little parking stress, but especially so in daytime working hours.



Existing side access drive



Existing rear garden



Existing parking in Poplar Road

Proposed 'development'

The applicant proposes to erect a new timber outbuilding within their rear garden and to use this to provide hairdressing services to clients. The building would be purpose built but resembling a garden shed/garden room, sited at 90 degrees to the house along the western boundary of the garden, but sited some 500mm off it. The outbuilding would be some 6m in length, 2.5m wide, and have a maximum height of 2.5m, this being the highest part of the proposed monopitch roof. If used for purposes incidental to the use of the main dwelling the outbuilding would meet permitted development criterion for a 'Class E' development as set out in the current GPDO.

As for the use, the applicant is a hairdresser and intends to start a business from home, providing hairdressing to clients on a one-to-one basis. The business would be run solely by the applicant and there would be no further employees. It is anticipated that clients would book pre-arranged timeslots and appointments would be suitably staggered so there would only ever be one visitor at any one time. It is proposed to operate on a part-time basis on weekdays, Closed Saturdays/Sundays/Mondays, with operating times Tuesday-Friday being between 10am and a maximum of 6.30pm on Thursdays. It is anticipated a standard cut service would be around 1 hour, with longer colouring services taking between 2-3 hours. On average this would result in there being a maximum of 5-6 customers per day.

Whilst there is space to park vehicles at the site, it is anticipated that many clients would come from the immediate local area and so could easily walk to the site. However, should on-street parking be required there is ample space for this to take place without causing any issues.

Relevant planning policy

The Core Strategy (2012) provides the main planning policy document when considering development in the city. Understandably, this considers significant strategic issues on the whole. Relevant retained UDP policies do provide more localised considerations, including DC1 (residential extensions) and DC26 (Development and Noise). Considerations of residential extensions are as to be expected, seeking to protect amenity and visual character, whilst considerations on noise seek to reduce the impact of noise on residents, where developments likely to lead to unacceptable levels of noise will not be permitted near noise-sensitive development.

The SPD ‘Guide to Development in Manchester’ (April 2007) offers further planning guidance but again is generally concerned with strategic considerations. However, on more detailed area-based policy the SPD does advocate an approach that seeks to maintain and create sustainable communities, recognizing that one of the best ways to achieve this is by providing a balanced mix of uses, whether this is within different parts of a neighbourhood; in different parts of a development scheme; in adjacent buildings along a street; or in buildings that accommodate a number of uses.

Considerations

The ‘issues’ for consideration in this case are two-fold. Firstly, a physical building is proposed within the rear garden of the host building; whilst it is proposed to use this for a low-impact, home-based business.

As for the building, this is of a domestic scale and form and as such, if it was to be used as a garden room or other use incidental to the use of the dwelling, it would meet the restrictions on size set out under the GPDO. In this respect, one could safely say that the proposed outbuilding would not look out of place in any residential garden setting. Given it would meet the size and siting requirements of the GPDO, we would also suggest it could have no material adverse impacts upon amenity.

As for the proposed use, this would not be excessive by any means. It involves the homeowner utilising space at her property to provide one-to-one hairdressing for a limited number of pre-booked clients. As stated, clients would book beforehand and visit at their allotted time. Space between appointments would be deliberately placed to ensure only one client was on site at any one time. In our view the use would be of such low impact that had it been entirely confined to the existing dwellinghouse we would be confident that it would not result in a material change in the use of the dwelling and as such, would not require planning permission. As proposed, the

council has determined it does require permission, but this would be of such small scale that we would be confident no adverse impacts would occur.

Notwithstanding the above it is relevant to compare the proposed use here with other, more intensive 'commercial' uses that have been generally deemed to be acceptable in domestic settings across the city and indeed, country-wide. The first comparable example of use is with the provision of childminding services, which can take place within existing houses for up to 6 children without requiring planning permission. Furthermore, there are of course also many examples of larger childcare operations that do require planning permission, taking place within residential houses in the daytime, before reverting back to wholly domestic family use in the evenings and weekends. Whilst these latter uses do need planning permission, it is nonetheless the case that relative impacts (including the use of outside garden space for playing) are often deemed to be acceptable and do not lead material concerns over amenity impacts or parking. Further cases that we ourselves have been successfully involved in involved the use of private swimming pools/outbuildings in gardens being used to provide swimming lessons for individuals or small groups of children, across the week. Again, whilst these have required planning permission due to their nature (though there are cases where such uses were deemed lawful due to their very limited, ancillary impact), councils and more often, Planning Inspectors, have deemed such uses to have minimal impact upon residential amenity or matters of parking, despite these aspects having often been raised by residents or officers.

Compared to the above example uses the proposed use is obviously very low key in nature. It involves the provision of hairdressing to individual clients on a one-to-one basis. Given its very low impact we are confident that the use would not lead to any adverse impacts in this case.

Summary

The proposals here involve the erection of a garden outbuilding which itself would meet permitted development criterion in other circumstances and a small-scale commercial use of this for the provision of hairdressing services. The building would have no adverse impacts and the use would be of such low intensity that no adverse impacts would occur to the amenity of neighbours or matters such as parking within this quiet street. We therefore submit that in the absence of any harm, planning permission should be granted for the proposals.

Yours sincerely,

Paul Robinson MRTPI
Planning Director

Orbis town planning and development

t: 0333 9874286 - m: 07792900429 - w: www.orbistownplanning.co.uk