



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 November 2025

by **David Cross BA(Hons) PgDip(Dist) TechIOA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6th January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/C4235/W/25/3367504

52A Osborne Street, Bredbury, Stockport SK6 2BT

- 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 S Al-Karagouli against the decision of Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is DC/094389.
 - The development proposed is demolish existing lean-to dining room extension to flat. Construct new lean-to dining room extension for flat on side elevation and new single storey pitched roof dental practice attached to rear.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on highway safety;
 - Whether the proposal would make suitable provision for the parking of vehicles, including for disabled badge holders;
 - The provision of cycle parking; and
 - Servicing and refuse storage.

Reasons

Highway Safety

3. The appeal site is located at the end of a parade which contains a mixture of commercial and other uses in a predominantly residential area. There is a road to the front of the commercial units which provides parking and access, and which is separated from the through-road of Osborne Street. Parking is also provided by a lay-by adjacent to Osborne Street.
4. Access to the appeal site would be via Cottage Gardens, which loops around the rear of the commercial parade, and provides access to the rear of the parade as well as to a number of residential properties.
5. Although there is a footway on one side of much of Cottage Gardens, there is no dedicated footway leading to the appeal site from Osborne Street due to the limited width of the access. This would mean that pedestrians accessing the proposal would share the carriageway with vehicles, leading to an increased risk of

collisions. There would also be limited intervisibility between drivers entering from Osborne Street and pedestrians emerging from the building, which would add to the risk of accidents.

6. The appellant has provided data which shows no evidence of incidents in this part of the highway in the last 5 years. Traffic speeds adjacent to the appeal site are also likely to be low. However, even in that context it would not be sensible to increase the flow of pedestrians on the substandard highway adjacent to the proposed dental practice, due to the increased risk of collisions with vehicles.
7. There is an existing pedestrian access from the flat onto Cottage Gardens. However, this would not generate the same degree of pedestrian movements as the appeal proposal and does not establish a principle for a new pedestrian access of the form proposed in this location.
8. The evidence suggests that the volume of traffic generated by the proposal would not harm the capacity of the wider highway network, but this does not lead me to a different conclusion in respect of the inadequate access provided to the appeal site.
9. I therefore conclude that the proposal would lead to unacceptable harm to highway safety due to inadequate pedestrian access to the site. The proposal would be contrary to the highway safety and pedestrian access considerations of Policies CS9, T-1, T-3, and SIE-1 of the Core Strategy DPD 2011 (the Core Strategy).

Parking

10. There is no off-street parking proposed in association with the proposal. The appellant refers to parking provided in the surrounding area, including to the front of commercial units in the parade. However, at the time of my visit the parking spaces to the front of the parade were fully occupied, with some evidence of parking stress including vehicles parked partially on the pavement. The appellant contends that this is a management and enforcement issue, but these measures would be likely to be intermittent and would not address the turnover of vehicles associated with the parade or the appeal proposal. The lack of parking provided in association with the proposal would therefore be likely to increase the levels of parking stress that I observed, with subsequent harm to highway safety and the free-flow of traffic.
11. The Council's Adopted Parking Standards require that a minimum of 1 disabled parking space is provided in association with the proposal. There are no parking spaces, disabled or otherwise, proposed in association with the proposal, and based on what I have seen and read there are no disabled parking spaces in the vicinity of the site. Although disabled users may be a small proportion of the customer base, given the needs of disabled customers and the nature of the proposed use, I consider that the requirement for at least 1 disabled parking space is reasonable. The appellant refers to the potential for patients with mobility issues to be dropped off directly outside the entrance. However, given the time taken to transfer the patient to/from the vehicle and the building this would create an unacceptable barrier to the movement of vehicles along Cottage Gardens.
12. The appellant emphasises that the proposal would serve a local area rather than a wider catchment, and that patients and staff may walk to the premises or use public transport. However, there is no certainty that this would be the case. In any

event, even if a relatively high proportion of patients and staff use sustainable means of transport to access the site, the proposal would still generate parking demand which would add to the parking stress that I observed.

13. The appellant questions the Council's estimated number of patients generated by the practice. However, even if the Council has overestimated the number of patients, the evidence suggests that the proposal will lead to an increase in parking demand in an area suffering from parking stress. It may be possible to operate the dental practice so that staff park some distance from the site rather than in the immediate area. However, patients would reasonably wish to park within a convenient distance of the dental practice, which would lead to an increase in parking demand in the vicinity of the appeal site.
14. I am also not persuaded that an appointment system operated by the dental practice will address concerns regarding the number of vehicle and pedestrian movements generated by the proposal, as even with an appointment system the proposal would lead to a material increase in vehicles parking in the area.
15. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not make suitable provision for the parking of vehicles, with subsequent harm to highway safety and the free flow of traffic and pedestrians. The proposal would also not make appropriate provision for vehicle parking for disabled badge holders. The proposal would therefore be contrary to the parking and highway requirements of Policies SIE-1, CS9, T-1, T-2 and T-3 of the Core Strategy.
16. The Council's third reason for refusal does not refer to policy T-1 of the Core Strategy. However, this is referred to in the Council's Appeal Statement and the appellant has had the opportunity to respond to this. I have therefore considered Policy T-1 in respect of this main issue.

Cycle Parking

17. In accordance with the Council's adopted parking standards, 2 cycle parking spaces are required for the proposed dental practice as well as a replacement parking space for the flat. It is reasonable that cycle parking is provided in the interests of promoting access to the site by a mix of sustainable modes of transport. However, no cycle parking is indicated on the submitted plans.
18. The appellant contends that this matter could be addressed by condition. However, given the constraints of the site, it has not been demonstrated that there is sufficient space for the provision of cycle parking. The appellant refers to vertical or wall mounted racks or a compact locker, but although there is some space around the proposed building, access to cycle storage may be hindered by features such as bins. Given the constraints of the site, cycle storage could also create a barrier to pedestrian access as well as the movement of bins. On that basis, there is no certainty that a condition could ensure that suitable cycle parking is provided.
19. The proposal would make no provision for cycle parking and I do not consider that this issue could be addressed by condition. On that basis, the proposal is contrary to the cycle parking requirements of Policy T-1 of the Core Strategy.

Refuse Storage and Servicing

20. The submitted plans indicate that space for 3 bins would be provided adjacent to the proposed dental surgery building. However, the proposal would remove the existing bin storage area that I observed serving the flat and would also result in the loss of an open area to the rear of the existing commercial use which is located in the parade. It has therefore not been demonstrated how sufficient refuse storage, with suitable access for occupants as well as servicing access, can be provided for the existing residential and commercial uses.
21. Furthermore, the lack of bin storage for the existing uses may result in bins being stored on the highway, which would hinder the movement of vehicles and pedestrians with subsequent harm to highway safety.
22. The proposed business would also require service deliveries and collections. Due to the location of the site adjacent to a narrow access road, service vehicles parking in this area would create a barrier to the movement of vehicles and pedestrians along this access road, and it has not been demonstrated that there is suitable space available for service vehicles in the vicinity of the site. Given the variety of commercial and residential movements in this area, it has not been demonstrated that service vehicles can be scheduled to avoid conflict with existing traffic.
23. The appellant considers that refuse storage and servicing could be addressed by condition. But given the physical constraints of the site and the highways issues identified in the surrounding area, there is no certainty that suitable provision could be made within or around the site.
24. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not make suitable provision for refuse storage and servicing, and that the proposal is therefore contrary to the access and servicing requirements of Policies CS9, T-1, T-3 and SIE-1 of the Core Strategy.

Other Matters

25. I am mindful of the benefits arising from the proposal, including the provision of a new healthcare facility in a location served by sustainable modes of transport, as well as the employment it would create. However, these benefits would not outweigh the significant harm I have identified arising from the proposal.
26. The proposal would remove a vehicular access to the rear of the flat. Given the poor visibility from this access when emerging onto Cottage Gardens, its removal would be a benefit. However, given the limited number of vehicle movements associated with this existing access this would not be sufficient to outweigh the harm from the significant pedestrian movements generated by the proposal on this sub-standard extent of highway, as well as the harm arising from increased parking demand and servicing access in this area.

Conclusion

27. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR