

Comments for Planning Application 135647/FO/2022

Application Summary

Application Number: 135647/FO/2022

Address: 550 Mauldeth Road West Manchester M21 7AA

Proposal: Erection of a new Lidl foodstore (Use Class E) with associated car parking and landscaping

Case Officer: Jennifer Connor

Customer Details

Name: Not Available

Address: Not Available

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Member of the Public

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

Comment: I object to the proposal to build a LIDL on Mauldeth Road West.

The main reason for my objection is the substantial increase in traffic. This will cause harm to children locally, both in terms of crossing the road and potential accidents, in addition to increased air pollution with a corresponding decrease in air quality and health.

The site will have 85 car parking spaces and will generate over 200 more car journeys per hour (based on LIDLs projections). This is too much traffic for the surrounding roads.

The proposals state that the supermarket will be built on a dual carriageway, but this is misleading. The entrance and exit of the store is proposed to be on Nell Lane, a single lane residential street, and less than 50 yards from the exit of Chorlton High School. This is a dangerous proposal. Mauldeth Road West is a two-lane road for a portion of its length, rather than a typical dual carriageway. If you were to measure the volume of traffic on Mauldeth Road West it would be less than the nearby single lane Wilbraham Road or Barlow Moor Road, and nowhere close to the numbers on a typical dual carriageway such as Princess Parkway.

The peak time for LIDL traffic, according to their documents, is at the same time that the neighbouring schools finish. Chorlton High, Chorlton Park Primary, Chorlton High South, Loreto High and Didsbury High are all within a short (15 minute walk) of the proposed site and thousands of children each day will be put at risk by the increase in traffic that this store would generate.

I strongly believe that this proposal should be rejected and the safety of our children and residents should be prioritised above corporate profit.