

DARLINGTON BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE DATE: 26th August 2026

APPLICATION REF. NO:	26/00320/FUL
STATUTORY DECISION DATE:	27 th July 2026 Extension of Time Agreement 31 st August 2026
WARD/PARISH:	Brinkburn and Faverdale
LOCATION:	4 Glanton Court Darlington DL3 0NY
DESCRIPTION:	Change of use of habitable room to aesthetics clinic (Use Class E)
APPLICANT:	Mrs Ranjit Kaur

RECOMMENDATION: GRANT PERMISSION SUBJECT TO CONDITIONS

Application documents including application forms, submitted plans, supporting technical information, consultations responses and representations received, and other background papers are available on the Darlington Borough Council website via the following link: [26/00320/FUL | Change of use of habitable room to aesthetics clinic \(Use Class E\) | 4 Glanton Court Darlington DL3 0NY](#)

UPDATED INFORMATION

1. This application was due to be presented to the Members of the Planning Applications Committee on 29th July 2026 but following a motion and a vote, no decision was made and the application was deferred to allow Officers to obtain further information regarding disabled access and accessibility requirements.
2. The applicant has also submitted a document entitled “Statement for Change of Use Class E and Accessibility” with supporting photographs which show that wheelchair users would be able to gain access to the rear of the dwelling and the treatment room through an existing gate to the side (north) of the dwelling. Portable ramps would then be provided which allow access from an existing paved patio and decking area that is located immediately to the rear elevation of the dwelling and into the property. Once inside the property, there is a route through the internal rooms that can be used to gain access to the treatment room. The Statement confirms that the existing internal doors are wide enough for a 25” wheelchair.

3. As access to the gate at the side of the dwelling is currently across a grassed area to the front of the property, an additional planning condition has been agreed with the applicant to secure the submission of details of a proposed path (route, dimensions, materials and design) which would be created across the grassed area. The path would need to be fully implemented prior to the commencement of the use (Condition 7).
4. An additional planning condition (No 8) has been recommended to ensure that ramps are in place in accordance with the submitted Statement.
5. Furthermore, the applicant has confirmed within the Statement they can also offer bespoke home visits for any potential clients who have mobility issues.
6. Having considered the additional information, the applicant has shown that there are measures which can be used to enable a person with mobility issues to access the treatment room in accordance with Policy IN2 of the Local Plan. The remainder of this report remains unchanged other than the addition of Conditions 7) and 8) within the recommendation.
7. The updated information above supersedes the information contained in the section of the report entitled "Disabled Access" and is to be considered as an addition to the section headed "Public Sector Equality Duty".

APPLICATION AND SITE DESCRIPTION

8. The application property is a detached dwelling located on the High Grange Estate to the northwest of Darlington within a predominantly residential area. It is located within a cul-de-sac of other detached dwellings and is accessed via a shared drive which gives access to a further two properties, 2 and 3 Glanton Court. The property is surrounded by other dwellings to its north, south and west sides, and the Aldi Regional Distribution Centre is to the east of the property.
9. Planning permission is sought for the change of use of a former double garage serving the property to an aesthetic clinic (Use Class E). The building adjoins, although is set back from the front of the property, with parking to the front. Planning permission was granted for the conversion of the former garage to habitable rooms in connection with the dwelling in 2013. The garage doors have been retained giving the appearance of a garage, although are not in use. Access to the clinic would be via a set of existing double doors to the rear of the building from the applicant's garden. No external alterations are proposed.
10. The clinic will provide aesthetic treatments including botox, dermal fillers, skin boosters and microneedling. Information submitted with the application sets out the clinic would operate on an appointment only basis, typically 45 minutes each, with a 15-minute break to ensure no overlap. The applicant would be the sole practitioner, and no additional staff would work at the premises. The clinic would be open Monday – Friday 9am – 6pm, Saturdays 9am – 2pm with no opening on a Sunday or Bank/Public Holidays.

11. Parking would be provided on the applicant's driveway to the front of the former garage. A parking plan submitted with the application properties confirms that the property can accommodate parking for 4 vehicles.

MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

12. The main issues for consideration are:

- a) Impact on the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area
- b) Impact on residential amenity
- c) Highway safety
- d) Disabled Access
- e) Flood Risk
- f) Other Matters

PLANNING POLICIES

13. Relevant planning policies include those seeking to ensure that new development: -

- Promotes good design to create attractive and desirable places to live, work and invest and follows the design principles of the Design of New Development SPD (DC1).
- Will be designed to mitigate and adapt to climate change (Policy DC2)
- Is sited, designed and laid out to protect the amenity of existing users of neighbouring land and buildings and the amenity of the intended users of the new development (DC4).
- Provides suitable access and facilities for people with mobility issues (IN 2)
- Provides suitable and safe vehicular access and parking arrangements (IN 4).

RESULTS OF TECHNICAL CONSULTATION

14. Darlington Borough Council's Highways Engineer and Environmental Health Officer have raised no objections to the proposal.

RESULTS OF PUBLICITY AND NOTIFICATION

15. Four letters of objection have been received from the occupants of 2, 3, 5 and 6 Glanton Court. Their comments can be summarised as follows:

- Highway safety, increase in traffic, narrow access, no pedestrian pavements and lack of parking provision within a residential cul-de-sac
- Clinic is already operating in contravention of planning rules
- Business would be more suited in one of the empty shop units in Darlington
- Inaccessible proposal
- Loss of residential amenity including noise disturbance and loss of privacy
- Loss of planning control from an unrestricted Use Class E
- Introduce commercial activity into a residential area.

16. A number of issues have been raised which are not material planning considerations and these will be dealt with in the 'Other Matters' Section of the report.

PLANNING ISSUES/ANALYSIS

(a) Impact on the character and appearance of the property and surrounding area

17. The application property is a large, detached dwelling located within a cul-de-sac, accessed via a shared drive which gives access to a further two properties, 2 and 3 Glanton Court.
18. This proposal seeks full planning permission to change the former double garage which has been converted into habitable rooms into an Aesthetics Clinic. There will be no external changes given that the garage doors will remain in place and the property will retain the appearance of a double garage associated with a residential dwelling. In this regard the proposal is considered to comply with the requirements of Local Plan Policy DC1 insofar as it relates to good design.
19. A business use within a residential area has the potential to impact upon the character of an area. The acceptability of such a proposal depends on the extent to which the proposed use would impact upon the living conditions of nearby residents with regard to noise and disturbance arising from proposed comings and goings of customers, including vehicle movements, and the nature of the proposed use. This will be considered in the following sections of this report.

(b) Impact on residential amenity

20. The former garage where the clinic is to be located is attached to the application property dwelling in the southeast corner of the application site, set in approximately 0.8m from the shared boundary with 3 Glanton Court to the south. Customers would access the property via a gate to the side of the garage and from existing double doors to the rear. The proposed aesthetic clinic would be operated entirely within the building and the treatments carried out are unlikely in themselves to generate any discernible noise impacts.
21. It is acknowledged that there would be additional comings and goings to the property over and above that associated with normal visits to a residential property. Opening hours would be Monday to Friday 9am – 6pm, Saturday 9am - 2pm. There would be no early morning or late evening opening and no opening on a Sunday or Bank Holidays. These hours are consistent with other domestic business settings elsewhere within the Borough and are during daytime hours when residents are generally up and about and going about their daily business. They are not at unsociable hours or times when residents would expect a quieter residential environment. The clinic would operate on an appointment only basis with the applicant being the sole practitioner, and appointments would be on a 1-1 basis with a 15-minute break between appointments to avoid overlap between customers. Opening hours would be controlled by planning condition.
22. Further planning conditions are proposed which would make any permission granted personal to the applicant and in the event of the applicant vacating the property the clinic would revert to its former use as habitable accommodation and limiting the use of

the premises to an aesthetics clinic only with no other permitted changes within Use Class E being allowed. Such conditions would allow the Local Planning Authority to retain control over the current and future use of the building.

23. It is acknowledged that the proposed use would give rise to additional comings and goings of customers and their vehicles to the premises, which has the potential to impact upon the living conditions of nearby residents. However, subject to the conditions outlined above, it is not considered that these impacts would be so unacceptable in terms of noise and disturbance to warrant refusal of the application on these grounds, and the proposal would satisfy the requirements of Local Plan Policy DC4.

(c) Highway Safety, Parking Provision and Accessibility

24. The application property is served by a driveway to the front of the former garage which provides a total of 4 no. parking spaces. As the former garage has been converted to habitable space, the proposed use would not result in any loss of parking to the property beyond the existing arrangement. One of the four spaces would be made available for customer parking.
25. The Council's Highways Engineer has noted that the supporting documentation sets out that any bookings will be limited to one at a time, with 15 minutes between appointments. Additional car parking is therefore limited to one space at a time which can be accommodated on the existing in curtilage driveway which can accommodate four vehicles. This is considered sufficient to meet the needs of both the existing household and proposed business use. While additional vehicle movements will be generated within the existing residential environment of Glanton Court, at one arrival and departure per hour, this would not warrant refusal on highway safety grounds.
26. Concerns have been raised by objection regarding highway safety and the lack of parking provision and maneuverability with the small cul-de-sac which has narrow access and which allows only one car in or out at a time. In addition, the limited available parking with the cul-de sac cannot accommodate the increase in traffic generated by the business, which would have an adverse impact on both highway safety and the safety of residents given that there are no pedestrian footpaths.
27. The objections also consider that the tandem parking for four cars is not sufficient and manoeuvring within the narrow road and shared access is not safe and is likely to result in cars being parked in front of other residential properties, which is not considered appropriate in a narrow cul-de-sac.
28. These objections have been further considered by the Highway Engineer who advises that while these raise highway safety concerns relating to the highway layout of Glanton Court, the proposal does not make any material change to this layout. The context of the street is a small residential cul-de-sac serving 10 properties from a single point of access via a shared surface carriageway. Local guidance permits a maximum of 25 dwellings can be served via a shared surface road, and so the current arrangement offers resilience of access and limited pedestrian and vehicle movements and does not raise any fundamental concerns over intensification of use.

29. Predicted additional vehicle movements are de minimis of the local highway network and have no demonstrable impact on capacity or safety at just one arrival and departure per hour as set out in the application. Given that no material changes are made to the existing highway layout or driveway access, it would not be reasonable to request swept path analysis for any delivery service vehicles associated with the proposal. Glanton Court is served by the Council's kerbside refuse collection service using a full sized 11.2m refuse vehicle. Given that the location is accessible to a refuse vehicle, there is no reason to conclude that it would not be easily accessed by delivery vehicles or emergency service vehicles, all of which are smaller than a full-sized refuse vehicle.
30. There is no requirement for a private shared driveway to accommodate two-way traffic. The shared driveway to 4 Glanton Court serves just three properties and is of limited length with good clear open visibility to enable give and take between users. There is no reason to conclude that minor intensification of use would lead to driver conflict or a safety issue.
31. Based on this analysis of the site, the Highway Engineer advises that refusal of the proposal on the grounds of highway safety or inadequate parking could not be evidenced. The Highway Engineer raises no highway objection subject to any permission granted being personal to the applicant. On this basis, the proposal is considered to satisfy the requirements of Local Plan Policies DC1 and IN4.

(d) Disabled Access

32. Policy IN2(a) sets out that proposals for new buildings of the change of use or alteration of existing buildings to which the public and employees have access will be required to provide suitable access and facilities, particularly for people with mobility issues.
33. Access to the proposed clinic would be via a narrow path to the side of the garage into the rear garden from which the clinic would be accessed by existing double doors to the rear. These double doors open outwards into the garden and have stepped access. The applicant has submitted an accessibility statement which advises that due to the physical constraints of the building it is not reasonably practicable to provide step-free wheelchair access to the proposed clinic. The existing access route is too narrow to safely accommodate a wheelchair, and the stepped entrance cannot be altered without significant structural works. The installation of a ramp or handrails is also not feasible because of the configuration of the entrance and the outward opening double doors.
34. The accessibility statement also outlines that the treatment couch is fixed at a static height and cannot be lowered or adjusted. To ensure treatments are carried out safely, clients must be able to transfer onto and off the treatment couch independently. This requirement arises from the nature of the equipment and the treatments provided, and from the need to ensure the safety of both clients and practitioner.
35. Darlington Association on Disability (DAD) has commented on the proposal and the accessibility statement. While they are disappointed that the proposed clinic is unable to offer facilities for disabled people or those with mobility issues, they consider the

applicant could argue that it would be impractical and unreasonable to physically alter the building. While it is not possible for the proposed use to comply with the requirements of Local Plan Policy IN2(a), given that it has been demonstrated that it is not reasonable or practical to make the necessary alterations to the property, for this reason it is not considered that this in itself would be a reason to refuse planning permission.

(d) Flood Risk

36. The site is within a low flood surface water risk area. Given that the proposal does not result in any further built development it would therefore give rise to any increase in surface water drainage.

(e) Other Matters

37. Concerns have been raised that the storage of hazardous materials on site could be unpleasant and hazardous for nearby residential properties. This is not a matter for consideration as part of this planning application, rather it is dealt with by separate legislation (dealt with by the Council's Licensing team). The license considers infection control and the correct storage and disposal of sharps etc. In relation to Health and Safety (other than those matters controlled by the licence) the responsibility for the enforcement of the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 in domestic premises rests with the Health and Safety Executive (HSE).

THE PUBLIC SECTOR EQUALITY DUTY

38. In considering this application the Local Planning Authority has complied with Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 which places a statutory duty on public authorities in the exercise of their functions to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination and advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it. The application has considered and assessed the impact on the proposal on those with mobility issues in section C of this report.

SECTION 17 OF THE CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998

39. The contents of this report have been considered in the context of the requirements placed on the Council by Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, namely the duty on the Council to exercise its functions with due regard to the likely effect of the exercise of those functions on, and the need to do all that it reasonably can to prevent crime and disorder in its area. It is not considered that the contents of this report have any such effect.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

40. Subject to planning conditions controlling the hours of operation, requiring the use to be personal to the applicant and limiting it to an aesthetic clinic only, the proposed use is considered to be acceptable and would not unduly harm the character of the wider area or the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. As has been set out in the report,

the proposal would not give rise to any adverse impacts in terms of parking or highway safety. While it is not possible for the proposed use to comply with the requirements of Policy IN2(a) in this instance the applicant has demonstrated that it is not reasonable or practical to make the necessary alterations and this in itself would not be a reason for refusal. It is therefore recommended that:

PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS

1. A3 Implementation Limit (Three Years)

The development hereby permitted shall be commenced not later than the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

REASON - To accord with the provisions of Section 91(1) of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plan, as detailed below:

- Proposed Site Layout Plan to Rear Dwg. No. 25.109 04 Rev A
- Proposed Elevations Dwg. No. 25.109 05
- Proposed Block Plan Dwg. No. 25.109 06

REASON – To ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the planning permission.

3. This permission shall be solely operated for the benefit of the applicant, Mrs Ranjit Kaur and shall not run with the land and in the event of Mrs Ranjit Kaur vacating the premises the detached garden structure shall revert to a use ancillary to the main residential use of the application property.

REASON – In granting this permission the Local Planning Authority has had regard to the special circumstances of the case and wishes to have the opportunity of exercising control over subsequent use in the event of Mrs Ranjit Kaur vacating the premises.

4. The Aesthetics Clinic hereby approved shall not be open for business outside the hours of 9am – 6pm Monday to Friday, 9am - 2pm on a Saturday, and there shall be no opening on Sunday or Bank/Public Holidays.

REASON – In the interest residential amenity.

5. The premises shall be used only as an Aesthetics Clinic and for no other purpose (including any other use in Class E of the schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order).

REASON – The Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the use hereby approved would not result in detriment to adjoining properties but would wish to control future changes of use within the same class in the interests of amenity.

6. A minimum of one parking space shall be provided within the curtilage of the property and shall remain available for use by customers during the hours set out in condition 4 of this permission.

REASON – In the interest of highway safety.

7. Prior to the commencement of the use, the details of a path (dimensions, materials and design, route) across the front grassed area to enable wheelchair access shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The path shall then be fully implemented and be available for use prior to the opening of the business and shall remain in place and free from obstruction for the lifetime of the business use.

REASON – To accord with Policy IN2 of the Darlington Local Plan (2016-2036).

8. Access ramps shall be available for use prior to the commencement of the business use in accordance with the submitted document entitled “Statement for Change of Use Class E and Accessibility”. The ramps shall remain available for use for the lifetime of the business use.

REASON – To accord with Policy IN2 of the Darlington Local Plan (2016-2036).