

**SPEAKERS PANEL  
(PLANNING)**

**16 November 2022**

**Commenced: 10:00am**

**Terminated: 12:40pm**

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

**Apologies:** Councillor Pearce

**29. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Subject Matter</b>	<b>Type of Interest</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
<b>Councillor Ricci</b>	<b>Agenda Item 7(i) Planning application: 22/00940/FUL – 3 Downing Close, Ashton- under-Lyne, OL7 9LX</b>	<b>Prejudicial</b>	<b>Applicant is known to the Member.</b>
<b>Councillor Dickinson</b>	<b>Agenda Item 7(j) Planning application: 21/01459/FUL – Amenity area adjacent to 25 Grosvenor Street, Stalybridge</b>	<b>Prejudicial</b>	<b>Pre-determined views against the proposals</b>

*During consideration of the above items, Councillors Ricci and Dickinson, left the meeting and played no part in the discussion and decision making process thereon.*

**30. MINUTES**

The minutes of the proceedings of the meeting held on 19 October 2022, having been circulated, were approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**31. OBJECTIONS TO THE TAMESIDE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL (ALDWYN PARK ROAD AND SIDE STREETS, AUDENSHAW) (PROHIBITION OF WAITING) ORDER 2022**

Consideration was given to a report of the Assistant Director, Operations and Neighbourhoods outlining the objections received to the proposed waiting restrictions on Aldwyn Park Road, Audenshaw and the associated side streets.

It was explained that the Council had received correspondence from both residents and Members expressing concern regarding the visibility at the junctions along Aldwyn Park Road in Audenshaw. Consequently, a scheme was advertised in July 2022 advertising proposed restrictions at the critical locations on Aldwyn Park Road and the side streets of Dorset Avenue, Madison Avenue, Ruskin Avenue, Shirley Avenue and Porlock Avenue.

The proposed waiting restrictions were outlined as follows:

Alydwyn Park Road, north side	-	from a point 20 metres west of its junction with Porlock Avenue to a point 13 metres east of that junction
Alydwyn Park Road, north side	-	from a point 10 metres west of its junction with Dorset Avenue to a point 10 metres east of that junction
Alydwyn Park Road, north side	-	from a point 10 metres west of its junction with Madison Avenue to a point 13 metres east of that junction
Alydwyn Park Road, north side	-	from a point 10 metres west of its junction with Shirley Avenue to a point 10 metres east of that junction
Alydwyn Park Road, both sides	-	from its junction with Lumb Lane for a distance of 10 metres in a westerly direction
Alydwyn Park Road, south side	-	from a point 10 metres east of its junction with Ruskin Avenue to a point 10 metres west of that junction
Dorset Avenue, both sides	-	from its junction with Aldwyn Park Road for a distance of 10 metres in a northerly direction
Madison Avenue, both sides	-	from its junction with Aldwyn Park Road for a distance of 10 metres in a northerly direction
Porlock Avenue, both sides	-	from its junction with Aldwyn Park Road for a distance of 10 metres in a northerly direction
Ruskin Avenue, both sides	-	from its junction with Aldwyn Park Road for a distance of 10 metres in a southerly direction
Shirley Avenue, both sides	-	from its junction with Aldwyn Park Road for a distance of 10 metres in a northerly direction

Members were informed that during the consultation period, seven objections and three letters of support were received from residents. The objections mainly highlighted a concern for a lack of parking spaces on the street and a fear of disputes being caused between the neighbours. In addition, one resident raised concern regarding parking their vehicle on another street due to robberies in the area.

Letters of support were received from residents living on Madison Avenue, Porlock Avenue and Ruskin Avenue.

Addressing the concerns raised, the Highways Manager accepted that parking within the area would be reduced, but it was not deemed that the proposals were unnecessarily restrictive. It was highlighted that the proposed waiting restrictions reflected the guidance not to stop or park within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction as stipulated in the Highway Code 2022.

#### **RESOLVED**

**That authority be given for the necessary action to be taken in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to make the following order: THE TAMESIDE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL (ALDWYN PARK ROAD AND SIDE STREETS, AUDENSHAW) (PROHIBITION OF WAITING) ORDER 2022 as outlined above and detailed within the submitted report.**

#### **32. TAMESIDE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH (ST ALBANS AVENUE, ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE) (PROHIBITON OF WAITING) ORDER 2022**

Consideration was given to a report of the Assistant Director, Operations and Neighbourhoods outlining the objections received to the proposed waiting restrictions within the St Albans Avenue area, Ashton-under-Lyne.

The Highways Manager advised Members that Holden Clough Community Primary School was situated on St Albans Avenue, Ashton-under-Lyne to the north east of a densely populated residential housing estate. Over recent years the school had developed, expanding from a single form entry to a two-form entry. This had inevitably led to an increase in both pedestrian and vehicular traffic that had exacerbated traffic around the school.

It was explained that at the school's main entrance there were existing 'school keep clear' road markings that were to be retained. In February 2020, approval had also been given to implement 'no waiting at any time' restrictions on St Albans Avenue and around its junctions with Whalley Grove and Stainmore Avenue. These restrictions were introduced to address problem parking around the school's main entrance and were to be retained as part of the outlined proposals.

Since the latter restrictions were introduced, the Panel were informed that dangerous and obstructive parking was now occurring around the school's newly formed pedestrian entrance that was sited on the eastern boundary of the school. Predominantly at school opening and closing times, vehicles had been witnessed parking at or near the bend opposite the pedestrian entrance and double parking too close to the junctions of Exeter Drive and Westminster Close. Traffic flow had therefore been impeded and this had led to conflict between pedestrians and drivers.

In addition, St Albans Avenue was served by the 231 bus service that ran throughout the school peak period, calling at stops that were less than 200m from the school's pedestrian entrance. Members were informed that due to vehicles parking at or near the bend, buses travelling in opposite directions were frequently at an impasse, resulting in further congestion and delays to the bus service.

Numerous complaints were received from local residents, the school's headteacher, parents/carers of children attending the school, ward Members and the local Member of Parliament requesting a scheme to address the issues of road safety and congestion. A scheme was advertised in May 2022.

During the statutory consultation period no objections were received to the proposed 'No Stopping Monday-Friday 8am-5pm in school entrance area' on St Albans Avenue (west side) and four objections were received to the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions and one request was made for an amendment to the scheme.

Communication was also received from Transport for Greater Manchester's (TfGM) bus services directorate, which sought assurance that that existing bus stop clearway heading westbound, approximately outside No.71 St Albans Avenue was to be retained. It was confirmed to Members that the existing clearway was to be retained.

The Highways Manager outlined that the main issue of contention among the objectors related to the assertion that the congestion around St Albans Avenue and the adjacent side roads was only an issue at school opening and closing times and that the proposed order for 'No Waiting at Anytime' restrictions was excessive. The objectors argued that the restrictions only be in operation Monday-Friday, 8am-5pm.

Two objectors suggested that the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions on St David's Close "from its junction with St Albans Avenue for a distance of 15 metres" were unnecessary and excessive. One objector expressed concern that further waiting restrictions around the school would displace the problem, creating problems elsewhere on the housing estate. A further two objectors suggested that there could be a pick up/drop off facility within the school grounds to reduce congestion around the school.

Support for the proposals was received from the resident of No.77 St Albans Avenue, who also requested an extension of the waiting restrictions to cover the full extent of their property, in order to stop parking and facilitate access to their driveway.

Addressing the concerns raised, the Highways Manager acknowledged that the obstruction to through traffic occurred predominantly at school opening and closing times. However, any vehicle parking at any other time either too close to the bends or too close to the junction, on the lengths of road covered by the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions, would either obstruct the highway or block driveways. Therefore reducing the time span of the proposed restrictions would imply that it was acceptable to park here at other times throughout the day and therefore was not recommended.

In relation to the parking concerns raised, the Panel were advised that parking at a junction could cause a major hazard as it reduced visibility for both motorists and pedestrians who might be crossing the road. Rule 243 of the Highway Code stated that drivers must not park within 10 metres of a junction. Although 15 metres was optimum, in this instance Highways considered that the proposed restrictions could be reduced from 15 metres to 10 metres in length, on both sides of St David's Close.

To satisfy concerns around the blocking of private driveways, affected residents would be offered 'H-markings' to discourage drivers from parking over driveways.

Any amendments to parking changes within the school grounds was the responsibility of the school and outside the remit of the Council in terms of this scheme.

It was explained that the scheme had been designed to allow for some parking along the straight section of St Albans Avenue (west side) opposite the main entrance to the school. The waiting restrictions, as advertised, did cover the entrance to the driveway of No.77 to deter parking over the driveway itself. Whilst the Council appreciated that standing traffic was forced to wait/give way to oncoming traffic, this would hinder access/egress to the driveway of No.77 if entering from the bottom of the estate (although not if entering from the top), an extension of the waiting restrictions would only serve to move this problem further down the road and further reduce the available on street parking.

An extension of the waiting restrictions along the whole of the straight section of St Albans Avenue (west side) to join up with the existing waiting restrictions on the left hand bend was considered within the context of this scheme. However, the removal of parked cars could potentially lead to an increase in vehicle speeds along the straight section which would not improve road safety outside the school.

It was therefore recommended that original proposals be amended to the following:

<b>No Waiting at Any Time restrictions on:</b>	
St Albans Avenue (east side)	from a point 10 metres north-east of its junction with Westminster Avenue to a point 32 metres north-west of its junction with St David's Close.
Westminster Avenue (both sides)	from its junction with St Albans Avenue for a distance of 15 metres in a south-easterly direction.
Exeter Drive (both sides)	from its junction with St Albans Avenue for a distance of 15 metres in an easterly direction.
St David's Close (both sides)	From its junction with St Albans Avenue for a distance of 10 metres in a southerly direction.

## **RESOLVED**

**That authority be given for the necessary action to be taken in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to make the following order: THE TAMESIDE METROPOLITAN**

**BOROUGH (ST ALBANS AVENUE AREA, ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE) (PROHIBITION OF WAITING) ORDER 2022 as detailed above and at 7.2 in the submitted report.**

**33. OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED TAMESIDE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL BUS STOP CLEARWAY (24 HOUR) CHEETHAM HILL ROAD, DUKINFIELD 2022**

Consideration was given to a report of the Assistant Director, Operations and Neighbourhoods outlining objections received to the proposed bus stop clearway on Cheetham Hill Road, Dukinfield.

Members were informed that bus stop EH0328 was located on the west side of Cheetham Hill Road approximately outside property No. 310. The bus stop was served by services 221, 346, 389 and school service 127. There were up to five buses per hour for services 221, 346 and 389 and one morning 127 school service. In September 2021, the bus stop was upgraded to include a raised platform and a bus stop clearway. With the exception of buses, vehicles must not stop or park within a bus stop clearway. However, it was explained that following a complaint from a resident, it was transpired that residents had not been consulted prior to the clearway being installed and was subsequently removed.

Following the removal, it was advised that the Council wrote to TfGM to establish the necessity of a clearway at this location. TfGM responded that they would like to see the clearway reinstated to ensure the full benefit of the raised platform at the recently upgraded stop. The Highways Manager highlighted that if vehicles other than buses continued to park in the vicinity, passengers using the stop would have to alight and disembark from the bus whilst it was stopped in a live lane of traffic. This was an unsafe practice as passengers could not access the footway without going between parked vehicles and causing congestion on an already busy road. A statement from TfGM in support of the reinstatement of the bus stop clearway was read to Members.

It was highlighted that buses pulling up against the kerb had become more important given that increased provision of fully accessible buses, in accordance with the Public Service Vehicles Accessibility Regulations (PSVAR). The benefits of these low-floor and 'kneeling' buses were considerably reduced if the bus could not get to the kerb.

Following the statutory 28-day consultation period, correspondence was received from two objectors. Both objectors contended that bus stop EH0328 was located too close to the signal controlled junction at Yew Tree Lane and that when buses were stopped it caused the traffic to back up over the pedestrian crossing, especially when two buses were in situ at the same time. They advised that congestion was particularly problematic at school pick up/drop off times given the close proximity to the schools within the area. The objectors suggested that the bus stop could either be moved to a different location or removed completely.

The Highways Manager provided a summary of further objections:

- Concern that emergency service vehicles may be unable to get through if buses were stopped;
- That the bus stop clearway was too long and an eyesore;
- Issues relating to anti-social behaviour and littering at the bus stop;
- Residents unable to park on the road outside their property;
- Residents with disabilities needing to park outside their property;
- Resident unable to reverse onto their driveway off Cheetham Hill Road; and
- Concern that the introduction of the clearway would reduce the value of their property.

Responding to the objections from local residents, the Highways Manager confirmed that the bus stop was approximately 50 metres from its junction with Yew Tree Lane, which was well within the parameters of bus stop design guidance. The bus stop had been in its current position for 13 years and neither the Council nor TfGM were aware of any issues with the location of the stop or its proximity to the signalised junction. It was explained that if the stop was removed completely, this would result in the distance between the next and previous stop being over 450 metres which was

above TfGM's recommended guidance. TfGM did not move or remove bus stops unless on road safety grounds.

Concerning emergency service vehicles, Cheetham Hill Road was not dissimilar to a number of other roads within the borough and therefore it was assumed that in an emergency, motorists, including the bus driver would move to allow an emergency services vehicle through, provided that it was safe to do so. Regardless, the ability of the bus stop to pull up parallel to the kerb with a clearway would improve space on the road.

Any concerns related to anti-social behaviour at the bus stop should be reported to the police in the first instance and the school if they were pupils. It was likely that the bin was removed whilst the bus stop upgrade was undertaken and the Council's Operations and Greenspace team were arranging for the bin to be replaced.

The Highways Manager explained that whilst the Council was not unsympathetic to the resident's situation regarding on-street parking, there was no legal entitlement for residents to park on the public highway outside or near to their property. The proposed restrictions would help to enhance the flow of traffic and residents would be able to park on the road opposite their property at weekends and outside of the restricted hours Monday to Friday. In addition, the implementation of the bus stop clearway would not prevent the resident from completing the necessary manoeuvre to reverse onto their driveway.

Individuals with a blue badge could apply for an advisory disabled parking bay, and whilst this could not be placed directly outside the resident's property, it could be sited within close proximity where there were no parking restrictions.

Members were informed that there was no evidence that the implementation of a bus stop clearway would affect property prices within the vicinity of restrictions nor that car insurance premiums would be affected if the vehicle was still being parked on the public highway within the same postcode area and it was therefore:

#### **RESOLVED**

**That authority be given to implement the 24 hour bus stop clearway on Cheetham Hill Road (west side), from a point 45 metres north of its junction with Yew Tree Lane for a distance of 23 metres in a northerly direction.**

#### **34. 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:-**

<b>Name and Application No:</b>	<b>20/01255/OUT Mr Mark Andrew &amp; Mr Frank Williams</b>
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	<b>Outline planning application for the erection of 8 houses (landscaping reserved). Land at Woodend View, Mossley, OL5 0SN</b>
<b>Speaker(s)/Late Representations</b>	<b>Councillor T Sharif and Nick Gittings addressed the Panel objecting to the application. Frank Williams, the applicant, addressed the Panel in relation to the application.</b>

<b>Decision:</b>	<b>That planning permission be refused.</b>
------------------	---

  

<b>Name and Application No:</b>	<b>21/01379/FUL Mr Andrew Rhodes</b>
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	<b>Proposed development of 6no. detached dwellings. Hanover Memorial Gardens, Hanover Street, Mossley</b>
<b>Speaker(s)/Late Representations</b>	<b>Cllr S Homer and Paul Waters addressed the Panel objecting to the application.</b>
<b>Decision:</b>	<b>That planning permission be refused.</b>

  

<b>Name and Application No:</b>	<b>22/00262/FUL Mr Wilcox</b>
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	<b>Construction of 9no. 3 bed dwellings including ancillary works/excavation. Land on Stamford Road, Mossley</b>
<b>Speaker(s)/Late Representations</b>	<b>The Head of Planning advised that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant and therefore no vote was taken by Members of the Panel.</b>

  

<b>Name and Application No:</b>	<b>20/00268/FUL Mr Patrick Hand</b>
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	<b>Proposed residential development of 2 bungalows and associated works. Land adjacent to 24 Stablefold, Mossley, OL5 0DJ</b>
<b>Speaker(s)/Late Representations</b>	<b>Councillor T Sharif and Steve Kiy addressed the Panel objecting to the application.</b>
<b>Decision:</b>	<b>That planning permission be refused.</b>

  

<b>Name and Application No:</b>	<b>22/00280/FUL Real Estate Aventor Ltd</b>
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	<b>Change of use of building to 20no. apartments, including roof extension to first floor section, and insertion of new windows and replacement of doors with windows. James Howe Mill, Turner Lane, Ashton-under-Lyne, OL6 8LS</b>
<b>Speaker(s)/Late Representations:</b>	<b>The case officer advised Members that a further seven representations had been received since publication of the agenda. All of these additional representations objected to the proposals.</b>

	<p>It was also confirmed that the parking area, shaded in blue in the submitted report, had shared access and was not in the control of the applicant.</p> <p>Darren Arrowsmith addressed the Panel objecting to the application.</p> <p>Sheila Wright, on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Panel in relation to the application.</p>
<b>Decision:</b>	That planning permission be refused.

<b>Name and Application No:</b>	<p>22/00565/FUL</p> <p>Mr and Mrs Ward</p>
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	<p>Demolition of existing stables/structures and erection of 1 residential dwelling.</p> <p>Whitehall Cottage, Luzley Road, Ashton-under-Lyne, OL6 9AJ</p>
<b>Speaker(s)/Late Representations:</b>	<p>The Head of Planning advised that since publication of the agenda, correspondence had been received from an individual questioning the accuracy of the dimensions provided.</p> <p>The officer confirmed that Planning was satisfied with the accuracy of the dimensions following consultation with the applicant and design agency.</p> <p>Colin Heywood addressed the Panel objecting to the application.</p> <p>Endaf Roberts, on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Panel in relation to the application.</p>
<b>Decision:</b>	That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions as detailed within the submitted report.

<b>Name and Application No:</b>	<p>22/00723/FUL</p> <p>Mr Francis Cheetham-Roberts</p>
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	<p>Change of use of land to accommodate 4 yurts to be used for rental glamping holiday purposes, refurbishment of derelict building to washing facility, use of existing car park and toilet facility and associated works.</p> <p>Top Shippon, Home Farm, Hill End Lane, Mottram, SK14 6JP</p>
<b>Speaker(s)/Late Representations:</b>	Francis Cheetham-Roberts, the applicant, addressed the Panel in relation to the application.
<b>Decision:</b>	That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions as detailed within the submitted report.

<b>Name and Application No:</b>	<p>22/00836/FUL</p> <p>Mr &amp; Mrs Dawson</p>
---------------------------------	--



<b>Proposed Development:</b>	<b>First floor side extension. 28 Angel Close, Dukinfield, SK16 4XA</b>
<b>Speaker(s)/Late Representations</b>	<b>Stephen Pond addressed the Panel objecting to the application. Veronica Dawson, the applicant, addressed the Panel in relation to the application.</b>
<b>Decision:</b>	<b>That planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions as detailed within the submitted report.</b>

<b>Name and Application No:</b>	<b>22/00940/FUL Mr Frank Tinnirello</b>
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	<b>Two-storey extension at rear. 3 Downing Close, Ashton-under-Lyne, OL7 9LX</b>
<b>Speaker(s)/Late Representations</b>	<b>The Head of Planning summarised written objections to the application from Councillor Choksi, including issues relating to a previous planning control matter. Charlie Schofield addressed the Panel objecting to the application. Sohail Musa, on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Panel in relation to the application.</b>
<b>Decision:</b>	<b>Members resolved to defer the application to allow further investigation work to be carried out in relation to the proposed use of the dwelling and proposed extension.</b>

<b>Name and Application No:</b>	<b>21/01459/FUL Evans UK Property Ltd</b>
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	<b>Erection of four storey building for use as a residential institution (Use Class C2), with access and associated infrastructure. Amenity area adjacent to 25 Grosvenor Street, Stalybridge</b>
<b>Speaker(s)/Late Representations</b>	<b>Councillor Dickinson addressed the Panel objecting to the application. Matthew Dixon, on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Panel in relation to the application.</b>
<b>Decision:</b>	<b>Following deferment at the meeting of Speakers Panel (Planning) on 14 September 2022, Members resolved to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions as detailed within the submitted report.</b>

### 35. APPEAL DECISIONS

Application Reference/Address of Property	Description	Appeal/Cost Decision
<b>APP/G4240/W/22/3298511</b> Land at end of Foundry Street, Foundry Street, Dukinfield, SK16 5PH	Proposed installation of a 17.5m monopole supporting 6 no antenna, 1 no dish, together with the installation of 2 no equipment cabinets and ancillary development thereto.	<b>Appeal allowed.</b>
<b>APP/G4240/W/22/3298608</b> 1 Bowland Road, Denton, M34 2GD	Proposed erection of a detached dwelling.	<b>Appeal dismissed.</b>

**36. URGENT ITEMS**

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

**37. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

**RESOLVED**

That the next meeting of the Panel would take place on 21 December 2022.

**CHAIR**