



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2026

by N Teasdale BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/X4725/W/25/3375887

8 Back Grantley Street, Wakefield WF1 4LG

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant full planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Buz Hussain against the decision of Wakefield Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00799/FUL.
 - The development proposed is change of use from vehicle storage to valeting and minor repairs to vehicles.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue of the appeal is the effect of the proposed development on highway and pedestrian safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is a red brick building with a slate roof located to the northwest of Back Grantley Street. The existing building has a metal galvanised roller shutter door that faces directly on to Back Grantley Street.
4. The Block Plan shows that there are five parking spaces to the north of the building which is accessed to the side of unit 9 via a gated entrance from Back Grantley Street. Parking along Back Grantley Street is only available by permit parking, and the bays are located along the eastern side of the street. Back Grantley Street also serves as rear access to the residential properties located to the east and there are many domestic garages that open up onto the Street.
5. The proposed development seeks planning permission for a change of use from vehicle storage to valeting and minor repairs to vehicles.
6. Whilst only a snapshot in time, I observed that cars were indeed parked within the permit holders parking bays to the east of the site and these tended to be very well occupied and take up half of the carriageway. This means that there is limited carriageway width remaining for vehicles to travel through. The Block Plan shows access/egress to be taken from the roller shutter door that faces onto Back Grantley Street. However, access/egress would be restricted in terms of vehicle movement and visibility due to the buildings being built up to the highway, road layout and parking to the east.

7. A vehicle tracking plan has been submitted but this does not adequately track a large car in and out of the proposed garage and it does not provide sufficient evidence that the garage and yard area are adequately accessible without causing a risk to other vehicles using the permit holders parking bays across from the site. Further, the plan also shows the perceived swing of a vehicle crossing the centre of the carriageway into what would be the parked vehicles across from the access point. Regardless of the ability of a driver and road worthy status of the vehicle, this would likely lead to collisions with parked vehicles in the permit holders parking bays and difficult vehicle movements for those accessing/egressing the garage and yard.
8. The submitted plans therefore fail to provide sufficient evidence in relation to vehicular manoeuvring, turning and visibility. As a result, the proposed development fails to demonstrate that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on highway and pedestrian safety.
9. I do not dispute that planning permission exists for industrial uses in the area, and I note the claims of a car repair garage use at the appeal site. However, no previous approval exists for this, and those other permissions do not directly relate to the appeal site in question or the proposed development. They are not therefore directly comparable, and I have assessed this scheme based on its own merits. Whilst there are entrance points adjacent to the highway on the western side, I am unsure of their planning history. My attention has also been drawn to an approval for a garage at 29 Stanley Road, but I have very limited details of this to provide full comment. Notwithstanding, I note the Council's comments that this garage is fronted by a residents parking bay, has rear pedestrian access from the garden and is expected to be utilised primarily for storage of general items instead of vehicle parking. That scheme is not therefore directly comparable.
10. The appellant claims that the user would be for the operator's cars only with repairs and valeting on his own car stock only. It is therefore argued that the number of vehicles entering and leaving the building will be minimal and identical to the use for vehicle storage. I have very limited details relating to the existing operations as a vehicle storage facility and planning history for such operations. I cannot therefore conclude with certainty that the movements associated with the scheme would be no more harmful and in order to draw such conclusions I would also need more detail in terms of the proposed use and its specific operations.
11. For the above reasons, the proposed development would be prejudicial to highway and pedestrian safety. It would therefore be contrary to Policy LP27 of the Wakefield District Local Plan, 2024 which amongst other matters, seeks to ensure suitable access to and within the development whilst not presenting an unacceptable impact on highway safety. For the same reasons, the proposed development would also be contrary to Chapter 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework relating to promoting sustainable transport.

Other Matters

12. The appellant may live nearby with the majority of attendees to the site being family members, but this would not alter my findings in relation to the above main issue.

Conclusion

13. The proposed development would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole. There are no material considerations, either individually or in combination that would outweigh the identified harm and associated plan conflict. I conclude that the appeal is therefore dismissed.

N Teasdale

INSPECTOR