

Variation of Condition 2 of APP/18/00459. Limited use of Pilates Studio Mrs Perkins submitted by Mark Leedale Planning Consultants.

In relation to this application, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] wish to strongly object to the use of the outbuilding as a Pilates studio.

The original application, APP/18/00459 was approved with the intention that the use of the building was to be 'incidental to the main family home, and used for the enjoyment of the family' ONLY.

In the original application, the Council felt it essential and justifiable to impose condition 2, which restricted the use of the outbuilding to exclude any commercial use. This was imposed in order to protect the amenities of neighbouring homes. Nothing has changed so this protection is still necessary.

It is clear that this building was always intended to be used as a business premises, and that the first planning application was a step towards operating a considerable business from this outbuilding.

Although the building was already being advertised as 'Project Training' even before construction finished, the applicants have tried to make out that it was for use incidental to the existing dwelling. Why, after 3 attempts (the pre-application, the first application for variation which was withdrawn and now this application), and knowing the considerable and reasonable objections from neighbouring residents, are they still pursuing their commercial plans?

Despite repeated assurances that the building was for family use only and definitely NOT for business use the applicant quickly made an request for a variation of the conditions in order to pursue her plans to run a business. A pre-application was made, then an application, and now a further application which shows how single minded the applicant is to start her business up. We have no doubt that should she be successful with this application she will very soon make further requests to increase the hours and number of clients. If the building was genuinely to be used only as incidental to the home then why would the applicant continue to pursue her business plans?

The operation of a Pilates Studio 6 days a week has far more impact on surrounding homeowners and the amenities of our family home than just using it as a home office, where just a computer was being used.

The applicant has still applied for a considerable number of hours - 34 in total, over a period of 6 days a week, despite protesting that only 10 hours a week would be used. This is a contradiction in itself. If the applicant is granted 34 hours then what is to stop her using them?

Who is going to monitor the number of people or the number of classes she holds?

This sort of enterprise is not acceptable in a purely residential area, especially one which is so closely packed, and in the garden of a small semi-detached house. The building itself is close to boundary walls. Applying for 34 hours a week is certainly not 'limited use,' and is completely unacceptable in a residential area.

The application is full of contradictions such as the number of hours applied for and the number of hours they suggest they will use.

They also state that classes will be for one person and one instructor only (paragraph 4.9) and yet in another paragraph (4.12) they say that 'it would OFTEN comprise a single person. This implies that for much of the time there would be MORE than one person.

If more than one person attends classes then the same problems of parking would result. There is not room on the driveway for more than 3 cars at a time so any classes of more than one would result in parking in the road,

where there is very limited on-street space available. Additional vehicles visiting the property each day would be noisy as cars move on and off the driveway, and people slam car doors during the day and into the evening and at the weekend.

Any addition to the numbers of cars parking or exiting or entering the driveway would make it dangerous for neighbours to enter or exit their driveways and the driveway of number 19B is close to two junctions. This is a hazard and could cause accidents.

The applicants stated firmly that Mrs Perkins works full time and has numerous classes in the area so why is she asking for 34 hours a week? We would suggest that this is because she would have to give up her full time commitments and would need to replace her income - something which one client for 10 hours a week could not achieve

Any business which invites members of the public will generate noise, and strangers will also be able to look straight into primary rooms in our house such as bedrooms. This impacts our privacy and amenity.

As the proposed Pilates Studio is so large it will accommodate more than the proposed 1 client at a time. It is highly likely that this business will grow and a further application will be made to increase its commercial use.

If this commercial use is passed we will have strangers looking straight into our bedroom windows, and these are primary rooms. I believe that any weekend use is unreasonable and holding classes 6 days a week has a significant impact on our privacy and amenity.

Statements have been made about sound proofing but, as the building has no building regulations approval, then there is no scientific basis for their claims. There appear to have been no tests carried out by professionals to ascertain potential noise problems. Simply standing in the garden listening to the volume demonstrated by the applicant is not scientific. How can anyone be sure that once permission is granted the noise will not increase? Who will monitor the noise?

There are also statements about air conditioning and cooling of the building but again there is no professional report about this. A stand alone fan will not be able to remove the heat generated by the building due to its timber construction and its flat black roof, plus the heat generated by people exercising. There would need to be extraction of such heat and yet apparently windows and doors will remain closed. As the doors have been kept open continuously since its erection even when nobody is in the building it is unlikely that a stand alone fan could cope with the temperatures.

Curtains will not prevent heat generation, nor will they stop noise. They only provide concealment.

These houses were built with a restrictive covenant on permitted development and their use for commercial purposes. Allowing such a

commercial use will conflict with residential use and open the floodgates to more businesses.

I therefore strongly oppose any use of the building as a Pilates Studio.