

Report to Planning and Licensing Committee



Date of Meeting	5 August 2021
Portfolio	Councillor John Blundell, Cabinet Member for Economy and Communications
Report Author	Mubeen Patel
Public/Private Document	Public

<b>Application:</b> 20/01011/FUL	<b>Township:</b> Rochdale South	<b>Ward:</b> Milkstone & Deepdish
<b>Appeal Reference:</b> APP/P4225/W/21/3269687		<b>Decision level:</b> Delegated
<b>Site Address:</b> 53-61 Tweedale Street, Rochdale, OL11 1HH		
<b>Proposal:</b> Erection of two and a half-storey building with dormers to rear roofslope comprising of 4 no. retail units (Class A1) at ground floor with 4 no. self-contained apartments (Class C3) above		
<b>Applicant:</b> Jeffries Amusements		<b>Agent:</b> A J Cocker Associates
<b>Planning Inspectorate Decision:</b> Appeal Dismissed and Costs Refused – 18 June 2021		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The application was refused by the Council as it would provide inadequate off-street parking, significantly increase the instances of hazardous parking and congestion and therefore be detrimental to both highway safety and the living conditions of nearby residents.</li> <li>– The proposed four parking spaces was significantly below the requirement for 14 and therefore did not accord with the parking standards. The Council's Highway Engineers did not raise any objections to the scheme due to the sites sustainable location.</li> <li>– However, the Inspector stated that the introduction of four retail units would attract some customers that travel to the area by means of a vehicle and therefore the proposal would create a demand for parking in connection with the retail part of the development. Also, many of the streets immediately surrounding the appeal site are also narrow with vehicles parked either side which further restricts vehicle movement. Local resident representations received detailed concerns over parking in the area.</li> <li>– The inspector considered that the development would result in vehicles associated with the development being parked on the surrounding streets which are already saturated. In addition, the narrowness of the roads would create congestion and obstruction on the highway which would have an adverse effect on highway safety in the area.</li> <li>– The Inspector did state that the proposal would result in the development of a redundant site that would use sympathetic materials that would have positive effects on the character of the area, it would provide employment opportunities and good quality apartments in an accessible part of the Borough. But, he went to say that these matters and benefits, given the scale of the proposal, would only amount to minimal weight and would not outweigh the significant harm to highway safety.</li> <li>– The appeal was therefore dismissed.</li> <li>– A costs application was also submitted. The applicant indicated that the Council did not consider previous planning history, a previous appeal or their own planning statement regarding the sale of the land. However, the inspector found that the officer had considered all these aspects and had clearly demonstrated on planning grounds why the proposal is unacceptable with clear evidence to substantiate that reasoning. The inspector therefore did not find unreasonable behaviour resulting in unnecessary or wasted expense and the costs application was refused.</li> </ul>		

