



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 10 September 2025

by D M Love BA(Hons) PGCert MRTPI PISEP

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 1st October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/25/3368474

85 Holts Crest Way, Armley, Leeds LS12 2AH

- 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 Michael Jacks against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02782/FU.
 - The development proposed is change of use from dwelling house to short term let.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use from dwelling house to short term let at 85 Holts Crest Way, Leeds, LS12 2AH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/02782/FU, subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has made reference to other appeal decisions. However, these are not before me, so I have determined this appeal based on the submitted information.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the potential impact on the living conditions of existing residents, specifically noise and disturbance.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is a corner property in a residential block of four houses. It has a single dedicated parking space and a visitors' space accessible via a permit.
5. The council's concern relates to the potential disturbance resulting from the proposal on the existing residential properties. A short-term holiday let would likely have a greater turnover of occupancy compared to a residential use with occupants regularly coming and going with the disturbance of guests moving into the property for a short period of time. Finally, concern has been raised regarding the potential for inconsiderate parking and the further noise from excessive and late night vehicular movements.
6. The council has not submitted any substantial evidence that supports their concerns relating to these issues. There is no evidence that equates small scale tourist accommodation with increased anti-social behaviour in residential areas.

Equally, there is no clear evidence to suggest that this particular property would attract visitors who would be any noisier than permanent residents.

7. Given the size of the property the levels of activity that would be generated from the short term let would unlikely be materially different to that of a single household, which would also generate activity in the form of comings and goings for work, leisure and social events. Nor would other potential forms of noise and disturbance such as the playing of music or social activities in the property necessarily be any more likely to cause harm to neighbouring residents than would be the case with a single household engaging in similar activities. The property only has a very small outdoor area and so it is unlikely that occupants would spend a significant amount of time there or that large numbers of people would congregate.
8. The property has a dedicated parking space within a residents' only car park and is remote from all residential properties. Given the distance involved there would unlikely be any adverse impact on the living conditions of residents due to engines starting, doors opening/ closing etc. The parking space, and further second space via a permit, means inconsiderate parking would not be expected to be a particular issue as the property only has two bedrooms and would not reasonably be anticipated to accommodate a large number of people requiring further vehicles.
9. Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006) and paragraph 198 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) seeks to ensure proposals avoid problems of loss of amenity amongst other considerations. I find the proposal accords with this policy and the NPPF given there is no substantive evidence to suggest this proposal would erode the living conditions of existing residents with regards to noise and disturbance.

Other Matters

10. An interested party has commented that this is an unsuitable use of a family home and, if approved, will reduce affordability and availability of houses in the area. I do not have evidence to determine the current level of housing supply in the council area and whether there is an issue of supply and affordability. Therefore, I afford this little weight.
11. Concerns have been raised regarding the potential to set a precedent and erase the sense of community and residential character. Each planning application is assessed on its own merits. I am not aware of any properties in the area with planning permission to operate as a short-term holiday let and it would be for the council to act against those operating without permission. Therefore, I put negligible weight on these concerns.

Conditions

12. Conditions covering the time limit to implement the permission has been attached as this is a necessary requirement of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The council has proposed a condition requiring a Noise Management Plan and a time limit on operation. However, I find that these are unnecessary with the former unenforceable.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above the appeal should be allowed.

D M Love

INSPECTOR