

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 am writing to strongly object to the proposed construction of a new Lidl foodstore on 550 Mauldeth Road.

The location is entirely unsuited to the development of a large drive-in destination foodstore due to its close proximity to

- Three secondary schools
- One primary school
- One SureStart nursery centre
- A well-used family-park.

In particular, the development of a foodstore of this scale, with parking facilities designed to encourage car journeys, will impact negatively in terms of

- Traffic congestion / associated safety risks for an area regularly used by unaccompanied children walking to and from school. The traffic will be generated not only by customers (facilitated by 88 number of parking spaces), but also delivery lorries. Recent safety measures have already had to be introduced along this road following accidents in order to manage current levels of traffic. The proposed development will necessarily increase risk. Any loss of life is a risk too far, but it is children who will be most at risk by this decision.
- Increase in traffic-related pollution, which has been shown to be directly related to ill-health and death among children (particularly those with pre-existing conditions such as asthma (see for example Dyer, BMJ 2020;371:m4902). This references the case of Ella Adoo Kissi-Debrah, who lived near a heavily congested road in south London, and is thought to be the first in which exposure to air pollution has been recorded as a medical cause of death. Under the City Council's own Clean Air Zone monitors, the junction between the M56 and A5103 has already been

highlighted as an area of pollution concern

(<https://www.manchestereveningnews.co.uk/news/greater-manchester-news/manchesters-worst-ever-roads-traffic-25192800>) and the proposed development will only add to the pollution levels in this area.

The application indicates that the anticipated traffic is 85 parking spaces accessed from Nell Lane. This presentation of traffic flow is disingenuous to say the least. It is hard to anticipate the business case for a development with such a low number of journeys to a large foodstore (within which the application consistently emphasises the quality of the network links to deliver pass-by traffic). Even Lidl's own consultants note that there will be "30 additional vehicles per hour are forecast to be added to the junction of Nell Lane with Mauldeth Road West in the weekday AM peak period. This rises to around 60vph additional forecast turning movements in the weekday PM peak."

During winter periods of restricted visibility at a time when children are returning home from the school (the weekday PM peak), the conservative estimate from Lidl's own consultants, will see, at least, 60 additional vehicles coming through the area. This is a significant risk factor alone from a road safety perspective, notwithstanding the pollution damage.

This presentation is a further example of the supporting documentation submitted by the developer significantly under-estimating the associated risks with the development.

Building another foodstore with significant car-parking spaces runs contrary to City Council and GMCA commitments to build better integrated transport in order to reduce car journeys and to support the achievement of net zero commitments. This development will undermine these commitments, at a point at which car ownership with all of its attendant problems is rising in Manchester (<https://cleancitiescampaign.org/new-analysis-reveals-more-cars-than-ever-in-manchester/>). The City Council needs to continue to demonstrate environmental leadership by refusing to approve a further development which will fuel car usage - particularly in areas within which the highest risk to short and medium term health will occur.

In summary, we object to the proposed development on the basis that:

- its scale and intended use are entirely incompatible with the local area (heavily used for pedestrian journeys for school attendance)
- It will drive up traffic use with attendant risks in terms of
 - o Road traffic accidents, particular among children
 - o Pollution exposure, particularly among children (and most especially those with pre-existing conditions such as asthma).
- Approving such a development which will be heavily responsible for generating these traffic and environmental harms is entirely incompatible with the City Council's stated public commitments to net zero and clean air and would, therefore, be an unreasonable decision for the public authority to take.

It is the wrong development, in the wrong place at the wrong time, and I wish to record my objection in the strongest possible terms.