

**SPEAKERS PANEL
(PLANNING)**

20 March 2024

Commenced: 10:00am

Terminated: 11:20am

Present: **Councillor McNally (Chair)**
Councillors Affleck, Bowerman, Boyle, Dickinson, Mills, Owen, Pearce and Ricci

Apologies: **Councillor Quinn**

39. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest from Members of the Panel.

40. MINUTES

The minutes of the proceedings of the meeting held on 14 February 2024, having been circulated, were approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

41. OBJECTIONS TO THE TAMESIDE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH (BANK STREET AREA, ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE) (PROHIBITION OF WAITING ORDER) 2023

Consideration was given to a report of the Assistant Director, Operations and Neighbourhoods outlining the objections received to the Bank Street Area, Ashton-under-Lyne (Prohibition of Waiting Order) 2023.

Details of development at Cavendish Wharf, comprising of 51 new dwellings sited on Bank Street, Ashton-under-Lyne, were provided to the Panel. The development included landscaping, a parking area and new access roads. It was explained that following completion, the developer had approached Tameside Council with regard to a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions within the entrance to the Cavendish Wharf development.

Members were informed that the restrictions had been requested to facilitate vehicular access to the development and prevent obstructive parking in the turning head. Panel was advised that the Council's Highway Engineers agreed with the rationale for the proposals and also sought to include an extension of the existing 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions on the west side of Bentinck Street. The reason for this was to prevent obstructive parking at the footway build out and on the east side of Bentinck Street at its northerly junction with Higher Wharf Street.

The outlined proposals were advertised on 21 December 2023 for a period of 28 days and during the consultation, one objection to the proposed waiting restrictions on the west side of Bentinck Street was received. It was reported that the objection was from a company called Tameside Healthcare Ltd, a mobility aids company whose premises were based on Bentinck Street.

Panel was advised that the grounds for the company's objection was that the proposed location for the waiting restrictions was where their engineers parked whilst loading and

unloading their vehicles. The company also received regular deliveries from HGVs that need to park adjacent to the good entrance whilst making their deliveries. In addition, owing to the nature of their business, disabled customers parked on Bentinck Street adjacent to company premises.

In response to the objections, the reporting officer informed Members that the proposed waiting restrictions would prevent parking on the west side of Bentinck Street, adjacent to Tameside Healthcare Ltd. However, the Traffic Regulation Order contained an exemption for a vehicle to wait on double yellow lines for 'so long as may be necessary for the purpose of enabling goods to be loaded onto or unloaded...' from that vehicle.

Moreover, if parking were left to be unrestricted on the west side of Bentinck Street there was a risk that other vehicles could park there, blocking access to their goods entrance, which could result in failed deliveries for the business.

Regarding accessibility for disabled customers to the business, it was explained that there was an exemption for disabled Blue Badge holders to park for up to three hours on the double yellow lines in the vicinity of Tameside Healthcare Ltd, provided they caused no obstruction. It was also noted that the business had a car park to the rear of the premises.

RESOLVED

That approval be given to make a legal order for the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions as advertised in the first notice attached at Appendix 1 to the submitted report.

42. OBJECTIONS TO THE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER TO INTRODUCE WAITING RESTRICTIONS WITHIN THE KING STREET AND OVAL DRIVE AREA, DUKINFIELD

Consideration was given to a report of the Assistant Director, Operations and Neighbourhoods, outlining the objections received to the proposed waiting restrictions within the King Street and Oval Drive area of Dukinfield.

Members were informed that King Street in Dukinfield was a classified road (A627), which formed part of the borough's strategic road network. It was reported that in recent years concern had been raised about the inter-visibility between road users at the junction of King Street and the unnamed access road between 196 and 198 King Street. Whilst the latter was unadopted, it provided access to the rear for a number of residential properties on King Street, a business premises and two residential garages.

It was explained that concrete bollards had been installed at the junction in an attempt to deter obstructive parking and prevent vehicles from driving over the unadopted footway but vehicles continued to park on King Street up to both sides of the junction. Vehicles emerging were unable to have a clear view onto the busy road they were joining.

Concerns had also been raised by local residents and a Ward Member with regard to vehicles double parking on the 'S' bend of Silver Close Dukinfield. The road was narrow and double-parked vehicles could make it difficult for motorists to negotiate, as well as restricting access for larger vehicles. In addition, vehicles parking too close to this junction also hindered visibility for vehicles emerging from Silver Close onto Oval Drive. Due to the likely displacement of vehicles due to the proposals, waiting restrictions were also proposed at the junction of Oval Drive and Angel Close.

The outlined proposals to introduce waiting restrictions within the King Street and Oval Drive Area were advertised on 27 April 2023. During the consultation period, the Council received 10 objections to the proposed scheme. These were summarised as follows:

- There was concern that the proposed waiting restrictions within the Oval Drive area would further reduce the availability of on street parking for residents and their visitors. Some residents on King Street had no access to off road parking and currently parked where the restrictions were proposed.
- There was concern regarding neighbour disputes if vehicles which currently parked on Silver Close or Oval Drive were displaced either further into the residential housing estate or onto Boyds Walk.
- Some objectors did not believe there were any problems at the locations and there had been no reports of any accidents to justify the proposed restrictions.
- It was claimed by one objector that the access road off King Street was only used infrequently and the proposed restrictions were disproportionate to the hazards this presented.
- The owner of Spike's Barbershop located at 196 King Street argued that the proposed restrictions would make it awkward for customers to park within the vicinity of their business.

In response, the reporting officer explained that whilst it was desirable for residents to park on the public highway close to their home, there was no legal entitlement to do so. The primary function of the highway was the conveyance of traffic. However, having considered the objections, it was advised that it was proposed to amend the restriction on the east side of Silver Close from 43 metres to 10 metres, which would restrict parking to within 10 metres of the junction but would also allow for parking on the east side of Silver Close.

Regarding the potential for neighbour disputes because of displaced vehicles, residents and visitors were advised to contact the police should they be the victim of criminal activity or vandalism.

Following concerns from residents, councillors and the Council's own onsite observations, it was deemed necessary to introduce the proposed restrictions on Silver Close due to reduced visibility at the named junctions and double parking on the 'S' bend. The Council aimed to take a proactive approach when a safety concern had been brought to its attention.

Concerning the unadopted access road between 196 and 198 King Street, it was noted that this provided vehicular access to a number of residential properties, a business premises and two garages. There had been reports of a number of 'near misses' when exiting onto King Street owing to visibility being severely reduced by parked vehicles.

Noting the objection from the owner of Spike's Barbershop, the reporting officer advised Members that the business had a private forecourt at the front of their shop. In addition, there was parking on the east side of King Street between Boyds Walk and Brownlea Avenue that was unrestricted and in the vicinity of the shop.

RESOLVED

That authority be given for the necessary action to be taken in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to introduce the Traffic Regulation Order, as detailed in Section 2.2 of the submitted report, subject to the amendments detailed in Section 6.2 of the submitted report.

43. OBJECTION TO THE TAMESIDE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH (CLARE STREET AND PALATINE STREET AREA, DENTON) (PROHIBITION OF DRIVING) (EXPIREMENTAL) ORDER 2023

Consideration was given to a report of the Assistant Director, Operations and Neighbourhoods, outlining the objection received to the experimental prohibition of driving order within the Clare Street and Palatine Street area of Denton, remaining in force indefinitely.

Members were informed that an Executive Decision Report was approved on 5 December 2022 giving consent to introduce a School Street scheme experimentally for Russell Scott Primary School in Denton. The scheme was implemented in March 2023 and involved the temporary closure of the streets around the school access / egress at opening and closing times.

It was explained that the closure comprised signs and cones along with a representative of the school, positioned at the junction of Palatine Street and the junction of the service road to the rear of the Crown Point North retail area. The features were left in position until the school had started in the morning and after it had finished in the evening. The school was responsible for the day-to-day management of the scheme and had asked that it be made permanent as the effect on the school and surrounding area had been beneficial to the children attending Russell Scott.

Prior to the introduction of the scheme, Panel was advised that a survey was undertaken of residents and businesses in the area that were served by the roads that were potentially being closed. The survey results raised no cause for concern and the scheme was introduced with 'permits' being issued to residents and businesses as required. Disabled drivers were also permitted to drop off and pick up children in the area, as were deliveries. Following observations and discussions with the school, the scheme was said to be running well.

One objection to the proposed scheme was received based on the lack of parking for the school, which the scheme had exacerbated. Whilst the objector recognised the roads around the school were much safer, concern was raised regarding the displaced parking that was widespread and often inconsiderate. The hours of operation of the scheme were also questioned, as was a lack of available parking at Crown Point North as an alternative causing problems when picking children up from school in the evenings.

In response, the reporting officer acknowledged that it was true that parents parked on the roads around the school entrance but the purpose of the scheme was to make that area free from parked and moving cars, or reduce the number of vehicles as much as possible, to help promote active travel to and from school.

Regarding the displacement of vehicles, Members were informed that this would occur over a wider, less condensed area or parents would choose to walk to school where they could. In addition, whilst Crown Point North was a well-used car park, there were often spaces available for short periods.

The hours of operation of the school were limited to the days and times around school opening and closing and were not in force outside of these periods.

RESOLVED

That the experimental prohibition of driving order within the Clare Street and Palatine Street area of Denton be made permanent, as outlined at Appendix 3 to the submitted report.

44. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Panel gave consideration to the schedule of applications submitted and it was:-

RESOLVED

That the applications for planning permission be determined as detailed below:-

Name and Application No:	23/0110/FUL Miss Laura Hopkinson
Proposed Development:	Change of use of the existing dwellinghouse (Class C3) to a children's care home for 2no children (Class C2). 180 Clarendon Road, Hyde, SK14 2JY
Speakers(s)/Late Representations:	Cllr Colbourne, Ward Member, and Jo Cooper, a local resident, addressed the Panel objecting to the application. Mohamed Dawood addressed the Panel on behalf of the applicant.
Decision:	That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions as detailed within the submitted report.

Name and Application No:	23/01121/FUL VUR Village Trading No 1 Limited
Proposed Development:	Erection of a 48 bedroom extension with link bridge connecting to the existing Village Hotel Ashton including reconfiguration of the existing car park, landscaping and associated works. Village Hotel Ashton, Pamir Drive, Ashton-under-Lyne, OL7 0LY
Speakers(s)/Late Representations:	Kate Roberts addressed the Panel on behalf of the applicant.
Decision:	That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions detailed within the submitted report and the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure off-site highway improvements, following deferral to officers to determine that the highways and parking situation at the site is acceptable following the receipt of an updated Transport Statement and parking survey.

Name and Application No:	23/01124/FUL Ashton Alban (Central) Limited
Proposed Development:	Erection of a three-storey building providing 35 affordable rented residential apartments and associated works. 217 Stamford Street Central, Ashton-under-Lyne, OL6 7QB

Speaker(s)/Late Representations:	Richard King addressed the Panel on behalf of the applicant.
Decision:	That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions detailed in the submitted report.

45. APPEAL DECISIONS

Application Reference/Address of Property	Description	Appeal/Cost Decision
APP/G4240/D/23/3331645 3 Linksfield Road, Denton, M34 3TE	Proposed first floor front elevation.	Appeal dismissed.
APP/G4240/C/23/3318913 3 Burkitt Street, Hyde, SK14 1QQ	Breach of planning control: the erection of a second storey extension to the rear of the premises in excess of the parameters set out within Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 1, Class A of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015. (GPDO).	Appeal dismissed.
APP/G4240/D/23/3332202 21 Claremont Gardens, Ashton-under-Lyne, OL6 9RE	Proposed two storey rear extension.	Appeal dismissed.

46. URGENT ITEMS

The Chair advised that there were no urgent items of business for consideration by the Panel.

47. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

RESOLVED

That the next meeting of the Panel would take place on 17 April 2024.

CHAIR