



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/25/3364434

J Miles Ltd, Grove Street, Stanningley, Pudsey, Leeds LS28 6JN

- 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 Kevin Miles against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/07237/FU.
 - The development proposed is change of use from class B8 storage facility to auction house, use class: Sui Generis.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appellant has submitted a series of photographs into the appeal which were not before the council when they made their decision. Given they do not add further detail to what is proposed, or require comment from other parties, I have accepted them.
3. The description of development in the banner heading is from the council's decision notice as it more accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issues

4. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - highway safety; and
 - living conditions of nearby residents with respect to disturbance and parking provision.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is on the edge of an industrial estate with housing opposite and a vacant site adjacent. Grove Street is a short private road serving the appeal site on one side and a bus depot/ workshop on the other. The site offers no off-street parking facilities therefore the appellant would be reliant on parking on Grove Street and the wider area.

Highway Safety

6. According to the existing site plan the appellant seeks to provide car parking spaces out with the site boundary along Grove Street and to the rear of the building. According to the council's Highways Authority consultation response there is a

requirement of 45 spaces for a 'professional service' use as set out in the 2023 Transport Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), but they acknowledge that this might be excessive given the online nature of the auctions business. They consider that it might be possible for the appellant to provide eight spaces along Grove Street. The council's officer report indicates that there would be around 20 visitors during auction days, while an interested party indicates 10 – 20.

7. The appellant has indicated that they can provide some parking along Grove Street, but it is not clear from the submitted plans if the areas identified for parking are within the appellant's control as they are out with the site boundary as per the location plan. Parking along Grove Street has the potential to narrow the street and restrict access into the bus depot thus creating a potentially hazardous situation for both pedestrians and vehicles. Additionally, interested parties have commented on occasions when buses are unable to turn into Grove Street as a result of parking adjacent to the junction with Arthur Street. Furthermore, there are no details as to turning arrangements which may result in vehicles reversing onto Arthur Street.

8. I do not have a formal parking arrangement before me from the appellant and how they would seek to control parking, i.e. appointment only etc., and without such a proposal the development could encourage parking on Grove Street and the junction with Arthur Street. This would narrow Grove Street and potentially restrict the junction with Arthur Street causing safety issues for users of the appeal proposal and the bus depot, which although the evidence suggests does not operate on Saturdays this may not always be the case.

9. Core Strategy (as amended by Core Strategy Selective Review 2019) Leeds Local Plan (Core Strategy) Policy T2 and the SPD Transport 2023 make up the council's policy towards highway safety. Without specific details of the parking arrangements the proposal presents a safety issue to pedestrian and vehicular users of Grove Street and Arthur Street. For the reasons above I find the proposal conflicts with these policies as it would cause harm to highway safety.

Living Conditions

10. Parking disruptions would be kept to a Saturday out with the peak periods of commuting to work and school whilst the bus depot is not currently operational on a Saturday. But I find that without a formal parking arrangement it is not possible to determine to extent of potential disruption to nearby residents with pressure on parking and disturbance from opening/ closing of car doors, engines starting etc.

11. Core Strategy Policy P10 and Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan make up the council's position with respect to residential amenity. Without a formal parking arrangement, even allowing for the online nature of the business and in-person auctions taking place on a Saturday morning only, I find the proposal would harm residential amenity for the reasons provided above and conflict with these policies.

Other Matters

12. The appellant has commented that the proposal would make use of what was a vacant building and that there would be employment benefits. I have attached moderate weight to these matters in the planning balance.

13. The appellant has raised concerns regarding the council's conduct. It is not for this appeal process to arbitrate in such matters.

14. While noting the concerns about the effect buses have on the area in terms of manoeuvring along Arthur Street, the operation of the nearby coach work is not within the remit of this appeal decision.

Conclusion

15. Despite the works the appellant has carried out to the building and that the proposal could result in less disruption for residents with fewer large vehicles accessing the site I do not find that these benefits outweigh the potential adverse impact on highway safety and residential amenity with respect to parking provision. The proposal would therefore conflict with the development as a whole and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it.

16. For this reason, the appeal is dismissed.

D M Love
INSPECTOR