



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **C Mayes CMLI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22nd December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N4720/W/25/3371725

191 Low Lane, Horsforth, Leeds LS18 5QW

- 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 Dilip Prajapati against the decision of Leeds City Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/03337/FU.
 - The development proposed is change of use of 2 no. bedrooms ancillary to shop unit - Class Ea - to short term holiday lets - sui generis.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The application form confirms that the development has been completed, and I was able to see this during my site visit. I have therefore determined the appeal on that basis.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on:
 - the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties, with particular reference to noise and disturbance; and,
 - highway safety, with particular regard to the provision of adequate parking.

Reasons

Living conditions

4. The appeal property is an end-terrace building with a ground-floor retail unit and residential accommodation above. The development involves the use of two first-floor bedrooms for short-term letting, with a maximum of four guests at any one time.
5. The short-term letting of the property introduces a pattern of transient occupation, with frequent changeovers and a lack of continuity in occupancy. Unlike a single household or long-term tenants, short-term guests are less likely to have a connection to the local community or a vested interest in maintaining good relations with neighbours. This can undermine the sense of community cohesion that is characteristic of established residential areas such as this terrace.
6. The increased comings and goings associated with short-term letting, particularly at unsociable hours, are likely to result in greater levels of noise and disturbance

than would be expected from a typical family dwelling. The use of the rear lane by unfamiliar guests, often arriving or departing with luggage or vehicles, can also give rise to a perception of reduced privacy and security for neighbouring residents, even if no actual anti-social behaviour occurs. The close-knit nature of the terrace, with shared boundaries and party walls, means that such impacts are likely to be readily experienced by adjoining occupants.

7. While I acknowledge the management measures proposed by the appellant, such as guest vetting, occupancy limits, quiet hours and a neighbour contact arrangement, these cannot fully mitigate the inherent differences between short-term letting and permanent residential occupation. On the evidence before me, the development results in a material change in the character and intensity of use, leading to a loss of amenity for neighbouring residents through increased noise and disturbance.
8. Furthermore, in assessing the likely effect on neighbouring living conditions, I have considered the appellant's view that the use would be indistinguishable from ordinary residential occupation and would not result in anti-social behaviour, loss of community cohesion or harm to privacy, and that the use of the rear lane by guests would be no different from its use by residents or visitors. However, I do not find those submissions persuasive in the particular context of this site.
9. I have also taken into account the economic and social benefits of the development, including support for local businesses and the provision of visitor accommodation. However, these benefits do not outweigh the significant harm I have identified to residential amenity, having regard to the relevant policies of the development plan.
10. Therefore, to conclude on this main issue, the development causes unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants, with particular reference to noise and disturbance. Therefore, the scheme conflicts with the aims of Policy GP5 of the Leeds Unitary Development Plan, 2006, (UDP), which seeks among other things, to avoid loss of amenity.

Parking and highway safety

11. The development increases the parking demand from two to three spaces. The evidence indicates that two on-site spaces (garage and driveway) are available, with a third space identified off-site at 138 Low Lane. However, the off-site parking space is not within the application site boundary and is not controlled by the appellant. There is no legal agreement in place to secure its long-term availability for the appeal development, nor would a condition attached to any planning permission be effective or enforceable in this regard, given the space lies outside the control of the appellant and the application site boundary. Without such formal control, there is no certainty that this space would remain available for use by guests or occupants of the appeal property, and its provision cannot be relied upon in perpetuity as part of the required parking arrangements for the site.
12. The appellant has provided photographs to demonstrate that a modern vehicle can be accommodated within the garage. However, the Leeds City Council Transport Supplementary Planning Document, February 2023, (SPD) indicates that garages should have minimum internal dimensions of 6 metres by 3 metres, to allow for the storage of bicycles and other items in addition to a vehicle. Notwithstanding the photographs provided, no dimensions for the garage have

been provided, and I am therefore unable to confirm that it meets the SPD standard and thereby provide adequate parking provision. Even if I were to accept that the garage can be used for parking, this would not alter my overall conclusion, as there would still be a shortfall in provision given the reliance on a third parking space beyond the application site boundary, which is not secured by a legal or other enforceable agreement.

13. At my site visit I observed that on-street parking along Low Lane was already heavily used, with limited available spaces and vehicles parked on both sides of the carriageway in places. This confirms the evidence before me that parking demand in the area is high. In such circumstances, and overspill parking from the appeal development would be likely to exacerbate existing pressure and increase the risk of haphazard parking and congestion, to the detriment of highway safety.
14. I have considered the appellant's arguments regarding the prevalence of off-street parking among neighbouring properties and the suitability of the garage, but these do not overcome my concerns regarding the reliance on an unsecured off-site parking space to meet the required parking provision.
15. Taking the above into account, I conclude that the parking arrangements are not adequate to prevent overspill parking and associated highway safety risks. The development is therefore contrary to Policy T2 of the Leeds Local Plan Core Strategy, 2019, and Policy GP5 of the UDP, which seek, among other things, that development results in adequate parking provision in order to maximise highway safety.

Other Matters

16. The appellant has referred to various legal precedents. I have considered these, but each case turns on its own facts. In this instance, the particular characteristics of the site and its relationship to neighbouring dwellings, together with the parking arrangements advanced, lead to the conclusions I have reached against the relevant development plan policies.
17. I have considered all other matters, including those concerning the 'retrospective' status, complaint history, and comparisons with other lawful residential scenarios. However, these matters do not alter the conclusions reached on the main issues.

Conclusion

18. The proposal conflicts with the development plan, when it is read as a whole, and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Mayes

INSPECTOR