



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: 21 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/25/3368234

3 Sanderling Way, Middleton, Leeds, West Yorkshire, LS10 3UH

- 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 Mrs. Lisa Taylor against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/01842/FU.
 - The development proposed is outbuilding within garden/ drive of dwelling for dog grooming.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for an outbuilding within garden/ drive of dwelling for dog grooming at 3 Sanderling Way, Leeds, LS10 3UH in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 25/01842/FU, and the plans submitted with it, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied or the use commenced until details for the provision of bin stores (including siting, materials and means of enclosure) and (where applicable) storage of wastes and access for their collection shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved measures shall be implemented in full before the use commences and shall be retained thereafter for the lifetime of the development.
 - 2) The approved dog grooming salon shall only be occupied/ operated by the occupier(s) of 3 Sanderling Way, Middleton or a related family member.
 - 3) The opening hours for the use hereby permitted shall be limited to between 09:00 – 16:30 hours Monday to Saturday, closed on Sundays and National Holidays.
 - 4) There must be no more than three clients during the day at the premises and no cross overs/ overlaps between customers should occur. Customers must visit on an appointment only basis, records of which shall be kept and made available to the Local Planning Authority upon request.

Preliminary Matters

2. During my site inspection the works appeared to be complete with the outbuilding showing the name of the dog grooming business. This has had no bearing on my decision.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would provide adequate parking arrangements to accommodate the dog grooming business without causing undue harm to the wider area as a result of increased demand of on-street parking.

Reasons

4. The site subject of this appeal is situated within a dense residential area of a mix of dwelling types. Properties have designated parking and there are limited restrictions for on-street parking.
5. From the Council's evidence the property originally had two parking spaces, but a shed now occupies part of the parking area reducing it to a single space. There is no suggestion that this is unauthorised, so I have taken the current situation to allow for a single parking space.
6. The appellant's evidence comments that the dog grooming business already operates from their kitchen, and they are seeking to move this to an external building. An existing shed will be shortened to allow for the new, thus the parking situation is remaining the same. Therefore, the business is already operating at the same intensity in the same situation.
7. From my site inspection I did not witness any formal parking restrictions relating to the surrounding streets. Nor did I witness much pressure for on-street parking.
8. The Council's reason for refusal states that Policy T2 requires provision for a minimum of two vehicles within the curtilage of the site. However, the policy does not specify this and refers to "current guidelines" and "Appendix 3 – Accessibility Standards". Neither of these are before me therefore I refer to the Transport Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for which the Council has provided an extract but not the cover sheet. This document states "driveways shall preferably be sufficiently long for either 1 or 2 cars". There is no evidence before me that requires the property to maintain two vehicular spaces. The SPD references minimum space sizes but this has not been disputed by the Council. Therefore, I consider that the existing situation to be a single parking space.
9. Considering the above the issue turns to the potential increase in parking demand. The officer's report clearly states that there are no known issues of highway safety at this location, and the local highway authority raised no concern. Equally, the officer's report accepts that the proposed arrangement could be acceptable should there be sufficient space between appointments so that only one customer attends the premises at a time.
10. I find the potential attendance of two – three customers per day with the resultant maximum six vehicular movements to be non-material to highway safety in an area where there are no parking restrictions and no evidence of congestion, as per the officer report. I find the potential increase of a maximum of six vehicular movements per day during Monday to Friday 09:00 to 16:30 to be acceptable in this location.
11. Therefore, the development provides adequate parking arrangements and would not result in undue harm to on-street parking in the wider area. The development would accord with Policy T2 of the Core Strategy (2019) and Policy GP5 of the Unitary Development Plan (Review 2006). Together these seek to ensure proposals provide sufficient parking and protect the safety of highways users.

Conditions

12. In the interests of the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers a condition is necessary to ensure waste from the business is managed in an appropriate

manner. Given that the building is within the curtilage of the house on the site, if the business were operated other than by an occupier of this dwelling it would give rise to conflicts in terms of disturbance. As such a condition is necessary to only permit the business to be operated by an occupier of the dwelling. To avoid undue impacts for on-street parking and related highway safety issues, and the living conditions of nearby residents, conditions are necessary to limit the hours of operation and prevent overlapping appointments/ customer visits.

13. A condition relating to the material finish of the shed is not necessary as the details are already included on the plans and the building has been erected. Similarly, a condition in respect of the commencement of the development, or that the building be constructed in accordance with the submitted plans are not necessary.

Conclusion

14. The proposal would accord with the development plan when considered as a whole. For the reasons given above, the appeal is allowed.

D M Love

INSPECTOR