



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 August 2025

by **David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/25/3366563

GL Motors, Adjacent to 13 Sycamore Avenue, Leeds, West Yorkshire LS8 4DZ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr G Singh of RDG Property Holdings against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/05380/FU.
 - The development proposed is erection of a three bay single storey workshop.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The description of the development provided on the planning application form has been replaced by an amended version on the decision notice and in subsequent appeal documents. I consider that subsequent description to accurately and concisely represent the proposal and I have therefore used it within this decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the living conditions of nearby residents with regard to noise and disturbance as well as outlook; and
 - Whether the proposal would make suitable provision for vehicle parking and manoeuvring space.

Reasons

Living Conditions

4. The appeal site is used as a garage business including vehicle maintenance and repairs. Although there are some other commercial uses in the vicinity, the character of the area is predominantly residential, including dwellings and gardens adjoining the appeal site.
5. The proposal consists of the erection of a three bay workshop close to the northern boundary of the site. The planning application states that the building would be in place for a temporary 3 year period before being dismantled and moved to another site.
6. The proposed building would be located close to the boundary with a small complex of residential bungalows to the north. The bungalows are located in very

close proximity to the appeal site with a number of windows looking directly onto it. The appellant emphasises that the proposal would not involve paint spraying and that no air handling or conditioning plant would be installed. However, the building would enable a greater intensity of operations compared to the extant open area of the site. Even given the nature of valeting operations, it is reasonable to assume that the level of activity associated with the building would be materially greater compared to the existing open area. Considered objectively and in context, the noise generated by valeting operations and associated activity, such as the movement of vehicles, would be unduly intrusive to residents of the closest dwellings to the north of the site.

7. There is a greater separation distance from dwellings to the south. However, the bay openings of the proposed building would face towards these residential properties which would reduce the effect of any noise mitigation provided by the structure. In any event, the access to the site is adjacent to a dwelling and garden, and the increase in vehicle movements arising from the proposal would be readily apparent to residents.
8. The existing use of the site would also generate a degree of noise and disturbance. However, the appellant has provided no substantive evidence in respect of the existing noise levels or demonstrated that the proposal would not unduly exacerbate them.
9. The building may provide some sound attenuation given that it would be of a construction substantial enough to stay in place for a number of years. However, it has not been demonstrated that this would be sufficient to mitigate for the noise generated by activities associated with the building. Compliance with Building Regulations would not be sufficient to demonstrate that the building would include sufficient mitigation to prevent noise disturbance to nearby residents. I am also mindful that the building is temporary and would be dismantled at some point, which may limit the form of noise insulation that could be provided. In any event, noise attenuation provided by the building would not address the noise and disturbance from vehicle movements.
10. The appellant refers to a Noise and Vibration SPG in relation to noise generated by commercial or industrial activity in residential areas. However, this specifies that a noise impact assessment should be carried out taking account of a number of criteria, and based on the evidence before me no such assessment has been undertaken.
11. Contrary to the submissions of the appellant, the effect of the proposal on the outlook from a neighbouring property is a material planning consideration. However, the proposed workshop would be set at a lower level compared to the adjacent bungalows, and screening would also be provided by an adjacent wall and fence. Although part of the roof of the building may be apparent from windows of the bungalows, this would be the part furthest away from the site boundary. Given the difference in levels, the relative arrangement of the buildings, and the existing screening, I consider that the proposal would not have an overdominant or oppressive effect on the outlook from the bungalows.
12. Notwithstanding my conclusions in respect of outlook, I conclude that the proposal would lead to significant harm to the living conditions of nearby residents due to noise and disturbance. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the amenity

requirements of Policies GP5 and BD5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) (UDP).

13. I have found no harm in respect of outlook, and the proposal would therefore comply with the design requirements of Policy P10 of the Core Strategy 2019. However, this does not outweigh the harm and policy conflict I have identified in respect of noise and disturbance.

Parking and Manoeuvring Space

14. The building would be constructed on an open part of the site which currently enables the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles. Although the appeal site is relatively open, the extent of parking and manoeuvring space is reduced due to an access ramp leading from Sycamore Avenue.
15. The location of the building would reduce the parking and manoeuvring space available close to the existing buildings on the site. Although an open area would be retained, it has not been demonstrated that this would be sufficient to enable vehicles to turn so that they could enter and leave the site in forward gear. The reduction in manoeuvring space would particularly affect movements by larger vehicles, such as commercial delivery vehicles. Furthermore, the need for vehicles to manoeuvre in this more restricted area would also limit the area available for parking, as well as the parking lost due to the location of the building.
16. The appellant states that they have cleared the eastern extent of the site to provide car parking spaces. However, although some vehicles were parked in this area at the time of my visit, it also included storage containers. The parking that I observed in this area was also not conducive to the amount of parking spaces and associated manoeuvring area referred to by the appellant. Although it may be possible to ensure that this area is retained for parking, it has not been demonstrated that vehicles would be able to enter and leave this part of the site in forward gear due to the restrictions of the access ramp and the proposed building.
17. Due to the effect on parking and manoeuvring space within the site, as well as the more intense use enabled by the appeal proposal, this may lead to the displacement of vehicle parking onto Sycamore Avenue. There is also a significant potential that the reduction in manoeuvring space would lead to convoluted vehicle manoeuvres, such as reversing into or out of the site. This would lead to increased parking on Sycamore Avenue with harm to the free flow of traffic, as well as an increase in the risk of collisions between vehicles and other highway users to the detriment of highway safety.
18. I have considered whether these concerns could be addressed by condition. However, given the constraints of the site and the evidence provided to me, I am not persuaded that conditions would ensure that sufficient parking and manoeuvring space is provided within the site.
19. I therefore conclude that the appeal proposal would not make suitable provision for vehicle parking and manoeuvring space, with significant harm to highway safety. The proposal would therefore conflict with the parking and highway safety requirements of Policies P10 and T2 of the Core Strategy and GP5 of the UDP. The proposal would also be contrary to the advice of the Leeds City Council Transport SPD 2023 which seeks to ensure that car parking is usable and safe.

Other Matters

20. I have had regard to the comments from interested parties, including support of the proposal and the business. I also note the comments of the appellant that some of the concerns raised relate to a separate site. However, these matters do not lead me to a different conclusion on the harm arising from the appeal proposal.
21. I note the frustrations expressed by the appellant in relation to the level of communication from the Council leading up to this appeal. However, this is not a matter for this appeal which I have determined on its planning merits.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR