

**SPEAKERS PANEL
(PLANNING)**

21 March 2018

Commenced: 10.00am

Terminated: 11.00am

Present: Councillor McNally (Chair)
Councillors Kinsey, D Lane, P Fitzpatrick, Ricci, Sweeton, Ward, Wild and Dickinson

Apologies for absence: Councillors Glover, S Quinn and F Travis

32. MINUTES

The Minutes of the proceedings of the meeting held on 14 February 2018 having been circulated, were taken as read and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

33. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Member	Subject Matter	Type of Interest	Nature of Interest
Councillor P Fitzpatrick	Agenda Item 4 - Objections to Proposed Limited Waiting Restrictions in the area of King Street, Hyde.	Prejudicial	Committee Member – Grafton Centre
Councillor Kinsey	Agenda Item 4 - Objections to Proposed Limited Waiting Restrictions in the area of King Street, Hyde.	Prejudicial	Committee Member – Grafton Centre
Councillor Dickinson	Agenda Item 6(b) – Planning Application: 17/00774/FUL – Slateacre Road, Hyde	Personal	Friend of Councillor R Welsh, who raised objections to the scheme.

Having declared a prejudicial interest, as above, Councillors P Fitzpatrick and Kinsey left the meeting during consideration of the Item below and paid no part in the discussion or decision making thereon.

34. OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED LIMITED WAITING RESTRICTIONS IN THE AREA OF KING STREET, HYDE

Consideration was given to a report of the Director of Operations and Neighbourhoods, which explained that a scheme had been designed which proposed to introduce 2 hours limited waiting no return within 4 hours, restrictions within the area of King Street, Tanner Street and Clarendon Street, Hyde.

By way of background information, it was explained that the Grafton Street area of Hyde was home to the Grafton Centre, an Indian Restaurant, Car Sales Centres, Technology Company and a Pay and Display car park. The area was separated from the town centre by the M67, but connected by footbridges to the bus station. The carriageways surrounding the car park were covered by double yellow lines and a loading ban which prevented parking, including parking by disabled badge holders. There were three short sections of highway that were not covered by waiting restrictions, one each on King Street, Tanner Street and Clarendon Street, that could accommodate a total of approximately 16 vehicles. From observations, it appeared that all day parking did take place.

It was further explained that the Grafton Centre catered for many elderly and disabled clients and it was understood that many users would not be capable of parking further afield and walking the distance to the centre. An element of short term parking would make the centre more appealing and possibly more well used, and disabled users may park within this area free of any time restraints. In addition, the restriction could also assist other local businesses for parking for their customers.

The proposals were advertised in the Tameside Reporter newspaper and on street furniture in the affected area in line with the Council's obligations and illustrated in an appendix to the report.

As a result of the advertised scheme; seven objections were received from local businesses.

Two objections were received from a local firm in the vicinity of the proposed restrictions, one of whom indicated they wrote as a representative of that firm and canvassed all employees for their feedback.

They explained that their own car park overflowed by approximately ten vehicles each day whose staff/visitors had to find alternative parking. They further indicated that the proposed two hours limited waiting was not long enough for their clients as most meetings lasted more than half a day.

They further raised concerns for the Grafton Centre and the elderly that used the centre and were sure that many were there for longer than two hours and had lunch at the centre.

They further indicated that proposed restrictions were likely to have a significant negative impact on the running of their business. They made alternative recommendations as follows:

- (i) The introduction of on-street paid parking but with no time limit, to operate at same rate of the existing Grafton Street Pay & Display Car Park;
- (ii) Recommended widening existing carriageway to accommodate perpendicular parking rather than the existing parallel parking both on King Street and Clarendon Street, therefore increasing availability of on street parking within that area by 10 vehicles.

An objector representing the local firm attended the meeting and expressed concerns as above.

Members were informed that the further five objections had been received from a business operating on the opposite side of the M67 Motorway. One objector claimed the existing arrangements did not affect the existing day to day operations of the local businesses and all objected to loss of available free non-restricted day time parking within the town centre or surrounding areas, and one objector pertained to the loss of parking within the top storey of the town centre multi-storey car park and loss of parking due to waiting restrictions being introduced within surrounding streets.

The response of the Director of Operations and Neighbourhoods to all objections raised as above, was detailed in the report.

Discussion ensued with regard to the above and consideration was given to the information provided, including the objections raised and responses given and it was:

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 (KING STREET, TANNER STREET AND CLARENDON STREET, HYDE) (PROHIBITION OF WAITING) ORDER 2018** as follows:

Advertised Proposed Schedule:

Limited Waiting 2 hours no return within 4 hours	
King Street (east side)	From its junction with Grafton Street in a southerly direction to a point 5 metres north of its cul-de-sac end.
Tanner Street (west side)	From its junction with Grafton Street in a southerly direction to a point 5 metres north of its cul-de-sac end.
Clarendon Street (east side)	From a point 5 metres north of its cul-de-sac end (situated to the north of the M67 eastbound off slip road) for a distance of 17 metres in a northerly direction.

35. APPEAL DECISION NOTICES

Application reference/Address of Property.	Description	Appeal Decision
Appeal APP/G4240Z/17/3188389 - Hyde Road, Denton. M34 3EH	Ref: 292 Proposed replacement of existing 1 no. 48 sheet advertising display with 1 no illuminated 48 sheet digital LED advertisement.	Appeal dismissed.

36. 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	17/10163/REM Taylor Wimpey Ltd, Manchester
Proposed Development:	Application for the approval of reserved matters (landscaping, layout scale and appearance) relating to the residential phase of development approved under outline planning permission 15/00986/OUT. Approval was sought for 79 dwellings. Former Clarendon College Sixth Form Centre, Clarendon Road, Hyde. SK14 2LJ
Speaker(s)/Late Representations:	James Berggren of How Planning, spoke in support of the application.

<p>Additional Comments/Information</p>	<p>The Development Manager, Planning, circulated the following additional information at the meeting in respect of this application:</p> <p>Condition 3 in the report relating to car parking, made reference to a retail unit – this is a typo as the scheme is purely residential.</p> <p>Condition 9 related to the provision of bin storage. Since the drafting of the report, a plan had been provided showing the location of screened bin storage for each of the plots. This condition can therefore be amended to require the screened storage to be provided for each dwelling. In accordance with the approved details shown on drawing no. 01 Rev. H, prior to the first occupation of that dwelling and be retained as such thereafter.</p> <p>Since publication of the agenda, 1 resident had contacted the planning department seeking clarification on how sources of contamination such as asbestos would be dealt with during the construction phase of the development and also querying the hours during which construction work could take place.</p> <p>Condition 6 of the outline planning permission required the submission and approval of an investigation into potential sources of contamination on the site and any necessary remediation measures prior to the commencement of development and Condition 12 was a standard condition which limited the hours of construction to between 07.30 and 18.00 Mondays to Fridays and 08:00 to 13:00 Saturdays only.</p> <p>Members sought an explanation in respect of outline permission on the site, which had given approval for 96 units and the scheme before them, which sought approval for only 79 dwellings. This was in light of an application submitted to the last meeting of the Panel (meeting of 14 February 2018, Minute 30 refers) which had officer recommendation for refusal as the number of dwellings had fallen significantly short of the number approved at outline planning stage.</p> <p>The Development Manager, Planning, explained that the scheme referred to had a particular designation under policy E2 and it was considered that the extent of the deficit wasn't justified given the policy requirement and the significance of the site. In the case of the scheme under consideration today, however, it was felt that the lower density scheme had resulted in a higher quality design.</p>
<p>Decision:</p>	<p>Approve subject to the conditions as detailed in the report, including amendments to conditions as detailed in the additional information above.</p>

<p>Name and Application No:</p>	<p>17/00774/FUL Spring and Company, Stockport</p>
<p>Proposed Development:</p>	<p>Demolition of 10 and 12 Slateacre Road and construction of 10 dwellings, with associated access and infrastructure. Land on the south western side of and including 10 and 12</p>

	Slateacre Road, Hyde.
Speaker(s)/Late Representations:	Michelle Ashley – spoke in objection to the application. Jason Dugdale (Agent) – spoke in support of the application.
Additional Comments/Information	<p>The Development Manager, Planning, circulated the following additional information at the meeting in respect of this application:</p> <p>Since the publication of the report, 3 letters of representation had been received expressing concern regarding the impact of the proposed development on the badger setts within the site, flood risk and parking. Each of these issues were dealt with in the report and there were no objections from the relevant consultees.</p> <p>In relation to ecology, the following information supplemented Section 14 of the report:</p> <p>A brief Mitigation Strategy had been put forward in Section 5 of the Badger Sett Monitoring report prepared by Urban Green in November 2017. This strategy involved the managed exclusion of Badgers from their sett and the subsequent closure of the sett.</p> <p>It did not include the provision of any alternative terrestrial habitats and it did not include provision for the construction of a new artificial sett. Where Badgers were excluded without the provision of alternative setts it needed to be demonstrated that the Badger population had a territory wider than the site affected by the works, had alternative places within this territory to relocate to and had alternative terrestrial habitat available for feeding within the territory.</p> <p>In this case, the Monitoring report had demonstrated that the Badger territory was wider than the application site and that there were alternative locations within this territory for sett construction and for feeding.</p> <p>Section 12 of the report dealt with highway safety impacts of the proposal in detail and officers therefore had nothing to add in that regard.</p> <p>Section 13 of the report dealt with the flood risk impact of the proposal in detail and officers therefore had nothing to add in that regard.</p> <p>It was noted that Councillor R Welsh had objected to the application and the concerns she raised were detailed in the report. It was further noted that due to a breakdown in communication, Councillor Welsh had not received timely notification of the meeting and therefore, had not been able to make arrangements to attend to voice her objections in person.</p>
Decision:	Approve subject to the conditions as set out in the report and: The completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the following contribution: Green Space - £12,867.16 to be used to upgrade the path

	<p>across Hacking Knife Meadow, Werneth Low.</p> <p>It was also agreed that an additional clause be included in the Section 106 Agreement for the requirement of a Management Company to deal with site maintenance.</p>
--	--

Name and Application No:	<p>17/00943/REM</p> <p>Bellway Homes Ltd (Manchester Division)</p>
Proposed Development:	<p>Application for the approval of reserved matters (landscaping, layout, scale and appearance) relating to the residential phase of development approved under outline planning permission 13/01045/OUT. Approval was sought for 78 dwellings.</p> <p>Former Frank Hoyle Transport Ltd, Broadway, Hyde. SK14 4QQ</p>
Speaker(s)/Late Representations:	<p>Anna Relph – Planning Consultant – spoke in support of the application.</p>
Additional Comments/Information:	<p>The Development Manager, Planning, circulated the following additional information at the meeting in respect of this application:</p> <p>The reference to the means of enclosure of balconies at 11.5 of the report is a typo and not relevant to this scheme. No balconies were being included and therefore this comment should be ignored.</p> <p>Condition 3 relating to car parking made reference to a retail unit – this is a typo as the scheme was purely residential.</p> <p>The applicant had requested that the trigger points for Conditions 3 (parking provision) and 4 (boundary treatments) be amended to require the provision for each dwelling to be provided prior to the occupation of that specific dwelling as opposed to any of the plots within the development. Officers had no objection to this revision.</p> <p>Since publication of the report, the applicant had requested that Conditions 5 (requiring compliance with the submitted landscaping scheme) and 6 (implementation of that scheme) be merged. Officers had no objection to this and so the revised condition would read:</p> <p>‘The approved landscaping scheme (dwg. no. LDS426-01F) shall be implemented before the first occupation of any part of the development or in accordance a programme agreed previously with the local planning authority. Any newly planted trees or plants forming part of the approved scheme which, within a period of 5 years from the completion of the planting, are removed, damaged, destroyed or die shall be replaced in the next appropriate planting season with others of similar size and species’</p> <p>Conditions 9 & 10 in the report refer to obscure glazing of certain openings to preserve the residential amenity of the future occupiers of the development. Since the drafting of the report, the final amended plans had been submitted and as a result, Condition 10 as not now necessary and Condition 9</p>

	<p>should read:</p> <p>‘All ensuite and bathroom windows identified on the floor plans and elevations to all of the dwellings hereby approved shall be permanently fitted with obscure glazing to meet the requirements of Pilkington Level 3 as a minimum. The development shall be retained as such at all times thereafter’.</p> <p>Condition 11 of the report related to the provision of bin storage. Since the drafting of the report, a plan had been provided showing the location of screened bin storage for each of the plots. This condition could therefore be amended to require the screened storage to be provided for each dwelling, in accordance with the approve details shown on Drg no. BHM107/BT01 Rev E, prior to the first occupation of that dwelling and be retained as such thereafter.</p> <p>An additional condition was required to ensure compliance with the Noise Impact Assessment submitted with the planning application. The following wording had been agreed with the applicant:</p> <p>‘The development herby approved shall be carried out in full accordance with the Noise Impact Assessment re AC104327-1R6 produced by REC dated 28 February 2018, including the detailed mitigation strategy outlining noise mitigation measures on a plot by plot basis. The development shall only be carried out full in accordance with the approved details.</p> <p>Reason: To safeguard the amenity of future occupants of the development’.</p>
<p>Decision:</p>	<p>Approve subject to conditions as set out in the report including amendments to conditions as detailed in the additional information above.</p>

37. URGENT ITEMS

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

CHAIR