
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 July 2019

by Karen Taylor MSC URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 August 2019

Appeal Ref: APP/B4215/W/19/3226564

38 Broughton Street, Manchester M8 8NN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr S Soni (Risky Clothing) against the decision of Manchester City Council.
 - The application Ref 121703/FO/2018, dated 14 November 2018, was refused by notice dated 11 January 2019.
 - The development proposed is the erection of double-storey extension to 38 Broughton Street to form an extended wholesale warehouse (Use Class Sui Generis).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposal makes adequate provision for off-road parking and servicing and the effect on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site is located within a commercial area identified as Strangeways Employment Area. At the time of my visit Broughton Road was heavily congested with vehicle parking and numerous lorries making deliveries. There are highway restrictions on this road with areas of double yellow lines, as such it appears that demand for parking is high with limited spaces. The present parking area serving the business is enclosed by fencing, and directly adjacent to the site appears to be an informal car parking area/courtyard serving neighbouring premises.
4. The proposed development would no doubt generate additional visitors in vehicles in the form of customers, servicing and deliveries to the premises and this is set out in the appellants Transport Statement on trip generation. The proposed extension would lead to a significant reduction of on-site parking and this would intensify demands for on-street parking. This in turn, would lead to double parking and congestion, whilst placing additional pressure on neighbouring occupiers and their business requirements. As such the effects of the proposed extension would lead to an over-intensive use at the site resulting in an unacceptable impact on the parking and servicing for the area causing harm to highway users and their safety.

5. Two parking spaces would be incorporated within the rear of the new extension and a new service road to the rear accessed off Bradstone Road. The appellants Transport Statement at paragraph 3.2.1 advises that the new access will be used solely by No.38. However, this fails to take account of the rear access points serving adjoining premises. Neither does the swept path analysis take account of the existing obstructions which include doorways with ramped and stepped areas and a side entrance serving No.2/No.4 Bradstone Road.
6. I also noted on my site visit that Bradstone Road has no parking restrictions but there was kerb side parking along this road where the proposed site access would be. There is no dropped kerb and it is enclosed with palisade fencing. Although the fencing would be removed there are no restrictions to prevent kerb side parking along this road and there is no evidence by the appellant to suggest how this would be overcome to ensure suitable servicing and access for the proposed development.
7. Therefore, the area could not be utilised as a service road without significant alterations to other existing businesses, which are not within the appellants ownership. The access road would be narrow, obstructed and as such would have an unrealistic and unsuitable layout for vehicles to safely access and manoeuvre freely from Bradstone Road to the appeal site, which would not be in the best interests of highway safety for both vehicles and pedestrian safety.
8. I find that the proposed development would have inadequate provision for parking and servicing and would significantly affect highway safety. It would conflict with Policies DM1, T2 of the Core Strategy Development Plan Document (2012) and SP1 and Saved Policy CC10 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (UDP), (1995), which together and amongst other criteria, require development, including commercial uses, to be accessible and to have regard to the availability of safe, convenient and appropriate arrangements for car parking and servicing.

Other Matters

9. I have been referred to other developments for commercial premises, including warehouses. However, I do not have full details of the circumstances that led to these proposals being accepted and so cannot be sure that they represent a direct parallel to the appeal proposal, including in respect of scale, location, use, parking and development plan policy. In any case, I have determined the appeal on its own merits.
10. I acknowledge the appellants' desire to enlarge the business and that the site is located within a sustainable location and can be served by public transportation, furthermore that Saved Policy CC10 of the UDP supports economic growth within the Strangeways area. However, these matters do not outweigh the concerns I have raised above.

Conclusion

11. Having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

Karen Taylor

INSPECTOR