SPEAKERS PANEL (PLANNING)

20 October 2021

Commenced: 10:00 am Terminated: 11:00 am

Present: Councillor McNally (Chair)

Councillors: Boyle, Choksi, Dickinson, P Fitzpatrick, Glover,

Jones, Naylor, Owen and Ward

Apologies: Councillors Affleck and Ricci

20. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Member	Subject Matter	Type of Interest	Nature of Interest
Councillor P Fitzpatrick	Agenda Item 4 – Proposed Diversion to Part of Footpath 95 Stalybridge	Personal	Route of proposed diversion would cross a friend's property.

During consideration of the above item, Councillor P Fitzpatrick, left the meeting and played no part in the discussion and decision making process thereon.

21. MINUTES

The minutes of the proceedings of the meeting held on 15 September 2021, having been circulated, were approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

22. HIGHWAYS ACT 1980 – APPLICATION TO DIVERT A LENGTH OF DEFINITIVE FOOTPATH STALYBRIDGE 95

Consideration was given to a report of the Assistant Director, Operations and Neighbourhoods outlining proposals to divert part of Footpath 95 Stalybridge. The Panel were informed that an application had been received from a local resident to make a Public Path Diversion Order under section 119 of the Highways Act 1980.

Members were advised that Footpath Stalybridge 95 started at Mottram Old Road, Stalybridge and ran in a generally easterly direction along a private access track, before passing through the garden area of 'The Barn' at Sidebottom Fold. The footpath then continued east through an agricultural field before terminating at its junction with Bridleway Stalybridge 68. At present, the alignment of the footpath ran for a distance of 900 metres.

The Sustainable Transport Officer outlined the proposed diverted alignment of the footpath. Footpath Stalybridge 95 would enter Sidebottom Fold but instead of passing through the garden area of the 'The Barn', it would instead turn to the north following the alignment of Footpath Stalybridge 88 for approximately 50 metres before entering the agricultural field and then turning back to the south to re-join Footpath 95 on the east side of Sidebottom Fold. The proposed alignment of the footpath would run for a distance of approximately 989 metres.

It was explained that the newly created section of footpath would run on a natural surface throughout with a width of 2.5 metres. A short slope on the proposed diverted alignment of the footpath would

introduce a small number of additional steps. Access to and from the agricultural fields would be granted by means of a British Standards compliant gate.

Panel Members heard that an order could not be confirmed unless the Council considered that the diversion would not make the path substantially less convenient to the public. Following an informal consultation with the ward Members for Stalybridge South, they stated that they had no objections to the proposed diversion, based on the proviso that the cost for any physical works involved in the diverted route were covered by the applicant.

Comments from the Peak and Northern Footpath Society did not raise any objections to the proposed diversion but requested that the width of the path be increased from 2 metres to 2.5 metres where it ran along the boundary of the field at the back of the gardens of the adjacent houses. Members were informed that the applicant had agreed the diversion route would be 2.5 metres in width. The Ramblers also responded to the consultation stating that the proposed diversion should be rejected but provided no further comment clarifying the reason for their objection.

The Director of Operations and Neighbourhoods noted that whilst the diversion alignment was of advantage the applicant/landowner, it was not substantially less convenient to the public and only added 89 metres to the length of the current footpath. Furthermore, the Director acknowledged that whilst the proposed alignment included slightly more steps, the continuation of the route through the field was a strenuous walk and the diversion would not therefore have a significant impact on the public enjoyment of the path. It was therefore:

RESOLVED

That the Borough Solicitor be authorised to make and advertise a public path diversion order as outlined in the submitted report or, should there be any objections to the order, submit it to the Secretary of State for confirmation.

23. 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:	21/00609/FUL Mr Mark Robinson
Proposed Development:	Replacement roof covering and partial cladding of walls. Unit 1, Cowhill Lane Industrial Estate, Cowhill Lane, Ashton-under-Lyne
Speaker(s)/Late Representations	Councillor Fairfoull, ward Member, and Mark Stimpson, on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Panel in support of the application.
Decision:	Officer recommendation was to refuse. Members noted the concerns of officers in relation to the cladding, as detailed in the report, but considered that the economic benefits in ensuring that the building was fit for purpose and continued as an employment site to meet local needs outweighed the concerns relating to the appearance of the materials to be used for part of the front elevation.

As such, Members considered that the development did not conflict with the provisions of policies C1 and E6 of the Tameside Unitary Development Plan and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and met the objectives of Section 2, paragraph 8 of the NPPF.
Members therefore resolved to grant planning permission subject to standard conditions regarding time and materials. In addition, as the cladding would overhang part of the adopted highway, a note/informative would be attached advising the applicant of their responsibilities in this regard.

Name and Application No:	21/00858/FUL One Manchester	
Proposed Development:	To vary condition 6 (specifying approved plans) of planning permission ref. 14/00098/FUL to allow for the introduction of substations and generator and reduction in car parking spaces	
	Fell View (Formerly Oakglade House), 2 Booth Street, Ashton-under-Lyne	
Decision:	That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as detailed within the submitted report.	

Name and Application No:	21/00904/FUL Johnnie Johnson Housing
Proposed Development:	To vary condition 1 (specifying approved plans so as to accommodate the construction of a small retaining wall at the rear of the site) of planning permission ref. 19/00614/FUL – Demolition of existing fire damaged care home to allow for the redevelopment of the site to form a new build block of 16, two bed self-contained apartments. (Former) Charlotte House Residential Home, Albert Road, Hyde
Speaker(s)/Late Representations	The planning officer advised that condition 14 was no longer required and had therefore been discharged by the Local Planning Authority.
Decision:	That planning permission be granted subject to the conditions (with the omission of condition 14) as detailed within submitted reported.

24. APPEAL DECISIONS

Application Reference/Address o Property	Description	Appeal/Cost Decision
APP/G4240/D/21/3274238	Proposed demolition of an existing detached garage and	Appeal dismissed.

10 Reid Close, Denton, M34 7QH	construction of single storey side and rear extension.	
APP/G4240/W/21/3275422 Brookfields, Mossley, OL5 0LG	Proposed residential development of 21No. family homes and associated works – amended plan to create temporary construction access from Stamford Road.	Appeal dismissed.
APP/G4240/W/21/3275422 Brookfields, Mossley, OL5 0LG	Application is made by Clement Court Properties Ltd for a full award of costs against Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council.	Award of costs refused.
APP/G4240/D/21/3277059 35 Marlborough Road, Hyde, SK14 5HY	Proposed first floor extension to side above existing garage and utility room.	Appeal dismissed.
APP/G4240/D/21/3276323 27 North End Road, Stalybridge, SK15 3AZ	Proposed double storey front extension, double storey side extension and rear dormer with loft conversion.	Appeal dismissed.

25. URGENT ITEMS

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

CHAIR