

**SPEAKERS PANEL
(PLANNING)**

25 May 2016

Commenced: 10.00am

Terminated: 12.00pm

Present: Councillor McNally (Chair)

**Councillors: Ballagher, Glover, D Lane, Pearce, Ricci, Sweeton,
Ward and Dickinson**

Apologies for absence: Councillors: P Fitzpatrick, J Lane and Middleton

58. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Member	Subject Matter	Type of Interest	Nature of Interest
Councillor Dickinson	Planning application no: 16/00174/FUL	Prejudicial	Friend of objector

Councillor Dickinson left the room during consideration of the above planning application and took no part in the voting or discussions thereon.

59. MINUTES

The Minutes of the proceedings of the meeting held on 27 April 2016 having been circulated, were taken as read and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

60. OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED PAID PARKING TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER PROPOSALS, ASHTON TOWN CENTRE

The Assistant Executive Director submitted a report, which outlined objections from local residents, businesses and community leaders concerning the proposed implementation of paid parking within Ashton Town Centre.

By way of background information, it was reported that, recently, there had been significant changes and improvements in the public realm in Ashton Town Centre as a result of investments in the redevelopment of Ashton market, the relocation of Tameside College into the Town Centre, the planned Transport Interchange and other developments which supported economic growth to the area. These positive changes to the public realm had the effect of substantially increasing and changing vehicular and pedestrian movements in the Town Centre. The Council had identified that these changes and improvements needed to be supported by a strategy that included a balanced provision for motorists (both for the free movement of traffic and the provision of suitable parking) and for pedestrians and shoppers to move in a safe environment.

In November 2014, the Council made the decision to reduce charges on its town centre car parks to encourage greater patronage and promote economic growth. This had seen an increase in patronage of the car parks and increased footfall in the town centre. In total there were spaces for around 628 cars on Council owned Pay and Display car parks with an additional 880 spaces available on private car parks, making a total of over 1,500 available spaces.

It was reported that much of the traffic movement in the town centre could be attributed to vehicles travelling around searching for 'free' limited waiting spaces. This created unnecessary traffic flows,

both to the detriment of the flow of pedestrian movement and also to the frustration of other drivers looking to move freely through the area. In order to combat this driver behaviour the Council proposed to introduce on street paid parking using a 'smart' and cashless system, which would allow motorists to find available parking spaces via a mobile phone app and make payment for their parking via telephone. It would also allow the customer to pay for and increase the length of time occupying the space from their mobile phone without revisiting the vehicle. There would be no machines holding cash which would be damaged or stolen, or any requirements for daily cash collections.

The majority of streets identified as locations for the paid parking scheme had lengths of existing 'limited waiting' restrictions which were proposed to be changed to paid parking. This would introduce approximately 140 on-street paid parking spaces. The operating hours for the scheme would be consistent with existing waiting restrictions: Monday to Saturday, 8.00am to 6.00pm.

It was further reported that, in identifying which streets (and sections of streets) to introduce on-street paid parking, care was taken to ensure that areas with residential properties were not adversely affected and in order to mitigate any displaced parking to residential areas surrounding the town centre, several residential areas had been questioned as to their support for the implementation of Controlled Parking Schemes. This would secure parking for residents, businesses and their visitors to the exclusion of others. The streets/areas identified were as follows:

- Union Street
- Adam Street
- Crown Street
- Newton Street
- Enville Street
- Wellington Street

In order to encourage the use of off-street car parks, the existing charging regimes for the Council run pay and display car parks would remain at their current levels with the tariffs for the on street paid parking proposed as follows:

- £1 for first half hour
- £2 up to one full hour
- £5 for over one hour

The proposals were approved for advertisement via Executive Decision Notice on 25 February 2016. Consequently, the proposals to introduce paid parking and other associated ancillary Traffic Regulation Orders in Ashton Town Centre were advertised on 3 March 2016 for a period of 21 days. In accordance with the legal requirements of the process the notice was advertised on street furniture within the affected area, published in the Tameside Reporter newspaper and copies of all the relevant paperwork were available at Ashton Customer Services in Clarence Arcade. Additionally, businesses and residents within the affected area were letter dropped; the proposal was advertised on the Council's website and set out as part of a consultation on the Council's Big Conversation consultation portal. The consultation was promoted via the Place Directorate and Council's corporate Twitter accounts.

A full schedule of proposals was detailed in an appendix to the report.

During this period, the areas identified as possible Controlled Parking Schemes (CPSs), were sent letters and questionnaires informing them of the proposals for the town centre and the possible consequences of displaced parking and detailed how such a CPS would work and asked for their views on whether they would like such a scheme to be implemented. Only one area met the criterion of over 51% of those questioned being in favour of the introduction of such a scheme. The scheme for this area would be introduced in due course. The other areas would be monitored post introduction of any changes to the parking arrangements in the town centre and there would be the opportunity for the residents to revisit the option of a CPS should they feel that it would be of benefit in the future.

An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) had been completed regarding these proposals and a copy was attached to the report.

With regard to objections, it was reported that 68 objections were received via the online survey, 75 written objections were received either via letter or email and 4 petitions with a total of approximately 2250 signatories were received. There were some instances of duplication across the various methods of lodging an objection but all had been accepted.

Objections were categorised as follows:

- Charging tariff;
- Cashless parking system effect on businesses in the town centre;
- Effect on businesses in the town centre; and
- Access to amenities such a nursery, doctors, dentists, community groups, library, post office.

19 objectors raised other objections not covered in the above categories, which were summarised as follows:

- How the proposals would be enforced and whether there would be an increase in civil enforcement officers as a consequence;
- Some objectors felt that there seemed to be an excessive number of vehicles using blue badges to park in the town centre and, as such, felt that there would not be a reduction in on street parking due to those numbers;
- Reference was made to how deliveries could be made/accepted within the proposed scheme;
- Questions were asked about what would happen when Council officers came back in to Ashton Town Centre, where they would park and it they would be subject to the same charging regime;
- One objector was concerned that the proposals would cause an increase in trespass on privately owned land used for parking;
- One objector questioned whether the multi-storey car park situated on Dale Street would be opened before these proposals were implemented on street; and
- Some objectors noted that the proposals would not be successful in raising revenue. Whilst another noted that some car parks had signs saying that money raised was donated to charity and wondered if this was something that still happened.

It was further noted that some objectors rejected the idea of paying for on street parking outright and did not offer more specific details regarding their thoughts on the proposals, in particular the charging tariff.

The report also detailed a response to each of the areas of objection raised. It was further noted that, in an effort to compromise and address some of the concerns raised, changes were made to the charging tariff in the scheme proposed initially, as follows:

Charging hours - Monday to Saturday inclusive 8am – 6pm	Charge
Up to ½ hour	*FREE
1 hour	£2.00
1-3 hours	£3.00
Over 3 hours	£5.00
<p>*FREE ½ period subject to terms and conditions, including registration to the on-street parking app & registration of vehicle at the start of each stay.</p>	

A number of objectors attended the meeting and voiced their objections, particularly with regard to:

- Charging tariff – that the charges were excessive, not competitive with other town centre on-street parking charges and that the high costs would deter people from stopping in the town centre to run small errands or pick up low value items from specific shops;
- Cashless parking system – objectors raised the issue that significant numbers of people did not have smart phones and that this was discriminatory towards older residents/visitors who were the least likely to own mobile phones. Issues were also raised with the payment method, in that it was considered that using a mobile phone to process a payment may make them more likely to be victims of crime;
- Effect on businesses in the town centre - a significant number of objections from the business community, expressing the view that the town centre was in decline and that this scheme would encourage people to seek alternative places to shop at big supermarkets and out of town retail parks, where parking was free. Also having paid parking would not encourage new businesses to the town centre;
- Access to amenities such as doctors, dentist, community groups, library, post office, etc. A representative of the Church of the Nazarene made particular reference to significant number of activities that are based in the church and which provided support and services to some of the most vulnerable residents. It was felt that the proposals may cause people to reconsider volunteering for these types of community projects.

The Panel gave full consideration to the proposals/points raised, including all the comments/views/objections raised by members of the public in attendance at the meeting and it was:

RESOLVED

That the proposed Paid Parking Traffic Regulation Orders, Ashton Town Centre, be refused.

61. OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED HARROP STREET, STALYBRIDGE OFF STREET CAR PARK'S ASSOCIATED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

The Assistant Executive Director submitted a report, which outlined objections received to the above proposed waiting restrictions.

By way of background information it was explained that Stalybridge Train Station had recently undergone an extensive upgrade in order to provide enhanced services to commuters using it to travel to Manchester or Sheffield and Leeds. It was located to the west of Stalybridge Town Centre. The area was largely industrial with a number of units requiring access for HGV's. Stalybridge Fire Station was located next to the train station. The Station had extremely limited off street parking provision with 12 free parking spaces. There was a council owned pay and display car park located opposite the station with provision for 35 parking spaces; long stay parking on this car park was charged at £1 for over four hours. Observations showed that this was usually fully occupied during the working day. There were a number of small businesses and pubs/bars in the immediate vicinity on Rassbottom Street and market Street, with some struggling to gain customer access. The existing parking restrictions and road marking lay out were illustrated in an appendix to the report.

The introduction of a public off street car park on Harrop Street providing 45 spaces required a review of the Traffic Regulation Order within the area to facilitate access and safer movement of pedestrian and vehicular traffic to the car park. Consideration was also given to concerns raised by member of the public regarding the length of single lane traffic forming along Rassbottom Street due to parking of vehicles; complaints from local haulage companies associated with accessing their premises.

A scheme was designed, which proposed to introduce No Waiting at Any Time restrictions within the area of Harrop Street and along the corridor of Rassbottom Street/Market Street. The proposals were advertised in line with the Council's legal obligations. As a result of the advertised

scheme; 29 objections were received, 2 from local residents, 1 from a local business and 26 from commuters using Stalybridge train station.

Details of the recommended scheme were set out in the report.

With regard to commuter objections; twenty three objectors complained that there was limited availability of free or cheap parking for commuters using Stalybridge Train Station and that the proposals would have an effect on their ability to access the station.

Twelve objectors felt that the proposals and lack of parking could deter people from using the station and that this would increase traffic on the public highway, directly impacting on congestion and pollution. Three objectors felt that if commuters were deterred from the area local businesses would be affected.

Eight objections raised concerns that the proposed restrictions would cause displaced parking to residential areas. Objectors felt that the existing parking arrangements did not cause any disruption/congestions and that introducing limited waiting would increase the number of vehicular movements.

Three objectors questioned the process by which the proposals had been advertised.

In respect of local residents objections; two local residents raised objections to the proposal. One objector lived on West Street and sated that there was already a high demand for parking on that street caused by non-residential parking. The other objector lived in Stalybridge Town Centre and felt that the proposals would increase parking demand to the detriment of town centre residents and could affect local businesses.

With regard to local business objections; a local take away business objected to the all day waiting restrictions outside their premises which presently had a 'No Waiting Monday to Saturday, 9am – 6pm restriction. The existing restriction enabled customer parking on the evening and access for delivery vehicles.

The report also detailed a response to each of the areas of objection raised.

One objector attended the meeting to voice his concerns with regard to traffic congestion issues in Stalybridge Town Centre in general.

Following full deliberation of the proposals and the objections received, both written and verbal, the Panel agreed the recommendations contained within the report as follows:

RESOLVED

That authority be given for the necessary action to be taken in accordance with Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to make the following order THE TAMESIDE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH (MARKET STREET, HARROP STREET AREA, STALYBRIDGE) (PROHIBITION AND RESTRICTION OF WAITING) ORDER 2016 as follows:

No Waiting at Any Time	
Market Street / Rassbottom Street (north side)	From its junction with Waterloo Road to a Point 138 metres south-east of its junction with Stamford Drive.
Market Street (north side)	From its westerly junction with Waterloo Road for a distance of 15 metres in an easterly direction.
Market Street (north side)	From its junction with King Street for a distance of 15 metres in a westerly direction.
Market Street (south side)	From its junction with Water Street to its junction with Chapel Street.
Market Street	From a point 39 metres west of its junction with Chapel Street

(south side)	to a point 5 metres west of its junction with Harrop Street.
Market Street / Rassbottom Street (south side)	from its junction with Hully Street to a point 25 metres north-west of its junction with the Fire Station Access Road.
Hully Street (both sides)	From its junction with Market Street to the gated entrance to Waterloo Court.
Harrop Street (west side)	From its junction with Market Street a point 15 meters south of its junction with Crossley Street.
Harrop Street (east side)	From its junction with Market Street to its southerly junction with Water Road (including the whole triangular area of Harrop Street to the rear of 11 Market Street).
No Waiting Monday – Saturday, 7am – 7pm	
Market Street (north side)	From a point 15 metres west of its junction with King Street to a point 15 metres east of its junction with Waterloo Road.
Limited Waiting 1 hour, Monday – Sunday, 8am – 6pm, No return within 2 hours	
Rassbottom Street (north side)	From a point 120 metres south east of its junction with Stamford Drive for distance of 18 metres in a south-easterly direction.

It was noted that the restriction indicated in the schedule above will be enforceable through the zebra crossing on Rassbottom Street; however these restrictions in accordance with legislation will not be placed down on street where the Zig-Zag road marking are present

62. APPEAL DECISIONS

Application reference/Address of Property.	Description	Appeal Decision
Appeal APP/G4240/W/15/3136085 21, Luzley Road, Luzley, Ashton-under-Lyne OL9 9AL	Ref: Outline application for one 3 bed dwelling.	Appeal dismissed.
Appeal APP/G4240/W/15/3139353 Land off Birbeck Street bounded Hanover Street and George Street, Stamford Road, Mossley, Tameside.	Ref: Construction of 12 apartments.	Appeal allowed and costs awarded.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

63. 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.	15/1038/FUL Mr T Mirza
Proposed Development	Demolition of existing fire damaged care home to allow for the redevelopment of the site to form a new build block of 16, one and two bed self-contained apartments. Charlotte House Residential Home, Albert Road, Hyde
Speaker(s)/Late Representations:	Mr Rafiq, on behalf of the applicant, spoke for the application.
Decision	That the Head of Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the condition set out in the report and also the prior signing of an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for a £6,400 contribution towards open space to support the development.

Name and Application No.	16/00174/FUL Mr K Myhill
Proposed Development	Change of use from offices to mixed use comprising of an extension to the adjoining public house (use class A4) at first floor level and residential (use class C1) at ground floor. Harewood Arms, 2 Market Street, Broadbottom
Speaker(s)/Late Representations:	Peter Hayes spoke against the application. Phil Wild, applicant, spoke for the application.
Decision	Approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

Name and Application No.	16/00096/REM Commercial Development projects Limited (CDP Ltd)
Proposed Development	Proposed employment uses comprising light industrial (B1c), general industrial (B2) and storage and distribution (B8). Former Frank Hoyle Transport Ltd, Broadway, Hyde
Decision	That the Head of Planning be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out in the report and also the prior signing of an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for a £6,400 contribution towards open space to support the development.

CHAIR