

PROPOSED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, DICKENS MILL, GREENFIELD LANE, ROCHDALE – RESPONSE TO ROCHDALE BOROUGH COUNCIL AND TRANSPORT FOR GREATER MANCHESTER COMMENTS – SEPTEMBER 2026

Introduction

Eddisons have been instructed by MCI Developments to advise on the traffic and transport matters relating to a planning application (ref: PL/2026/0684) for a residential development on land at the site of the former Dickens Mill on Greenfield Lane in Rochdale.

This note provides a response to comments made by Rochdale Borough Council (RBC), the local highway authority, and Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM), the advisory highway body for the wider area. RBC's comments are dated 1st September 2026 and are contained in **Appendix 1** and TfGM's comments are dated 19th August 2026 and are contained in **Appendix 2**.

RBC Comments

The RBC response only includes one pertinent comment which is the request for a formal footway in front of Plots 15 to 20 within the site. The applicant's view is that is not required given the fact that traffic flows in that part of the site would be extremely low as would be the number of pedestrian movements. Furthermore, it is highly likely that vehicular speeds would be very low and the vast majority of pedestrians walking in this area would be well aware of the lack of a formal footway, as would drivers, and both negotiate this part of the site safely without the need for any formal footway provision.

TfGM Comments

The TfGM response includes comments on the proposed site access off the A664. TfGM have suggested that the as the visibility splays would traverse the parking area to the south of the site that these areas should be covered by a new traffic regulation order that prohibits parking in this area. However, RBC disagree that this should be the case. TfGM acknowledge that they would defer to RBC as highway authority on this matter.

TfGM have also requested that a 2m wide footway be provided on both sides of the site access. This has resolved by RBC who are content that the site is served by one formal 2m wide footway along the site access/Greenfield Lane.

TfGM have requested that the redundant access to the east of the site on the A664 be reinstated. This is accepted by the applicant and will form part of the subsequent Section 278 works at the Site Access.

TfGM have also requested that cycle parking be provided within the curtilage of all properties. This will be provided by the applicants.

Conclusion

In summary, all transport and highways matters have now been satisfactorily resolved.

Enclosures

Appendix 1 – RBC Comments

Appendix 2 – TfGM Comments

The proposed development is unlikely to cause any significant volume of traffic in the peak period and falls below the threshold for further assessment of junction capacities or traffic analysis.

Access to the site from Greenfield Lane is suitable although junction protection measures may prove unpopular with existing residents and businesses. The extent of the TRO is a separate decision making process and the extent should be agreed with the Network Management team as a part of the TRO process.

The parking provided is broadly in line with what we would expect for a development of this size and nature.

The internal road layout is generally acceptable however a 2m footway should be added to the front of units 15-20 to provide a pedestrian defensible area.

There is no changes to the external highways layout nor are any required.

We have no concerns regarding the servicing of this location which should be easily accessed by emergency services and refuse collection vehicles.

Our only road safety concern relating to this development is the lack of footway fronting units 15-20. We also have concerns about junction visibility at the access of the site but we are confident this will be resolved as part of the TRO process.

We defer our recommendation regarding this application to allow the applicant time to consider our consultation response and make any amendments to the application.

