

**SPEAKERS PANEL  
(PLANNING)**

**21 October 2020**

**Present:** Councillor McNally (Chair)  
Councillors: Choksi, Dickinson, Glover, Jones, Lewis, Naylor,  
Owen, Ricci, Ward and Wild

**Apologies:** Councillor Gosling

**25. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the proceedings of the meeting held on 23 September 2020, having been circulated, were approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**26. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest declared by Members.

**27. OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED TAMESIDE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH  
(ROUGHTOWN ROAD, MOSSLEY) (ONE WAY TRAFFIC) ORDER 2020**

Consideration was given to a report of the Assistant Director, Operations and Neighbourhoods, outlining the objections received to the proposed one way traffic order.

It was explained that Roughtown Road was a steep, historic track road which led from Carrhill Road to Manchester Road, Mossley. The road was currently two way, with a number of 90-degree bends and a carriageway width of approximately five metres. The road had no designated footway and pedestrians had to walk in the carriageway. In total, 70 properties were served directly by the road.

Residents of Roughtown Road and Higher Newtons had approached the Council on a number of occasions regarding the volume and speed of traffic using the route. In 2019, an officer from the Council met with one resident who lived in the vicinity and was directly affected by heavy use of the highway, regularly having to open the gates to their property to enable vehicles to pass each other.

Following complaints from residents the Council advertised a scheme for 28 days in April 2020 that proposed the introduction of a one way system on Roughtown Road from a point 19 metres south of its junction with High Street to its junction with Manchester Road. The scheme was designed to promote road safety by prohibiting the flow of traffic in one direction.

Members were informed there were eight formal objections (one outside of the 28-day objection period), six representations in favour, including the MP for Stalybridge and Hyde, and a petition containing nine signatures also in favour of the scheme.

Six of the objections raised concerns that the proposals were in the 'wrong direction'. The proposals advertised the scheme to be downhill which would result in there being three routes downhill from 'Top Mossley' to 'Bottom Mossley' and only one for traffic travelling in the other direction, raising the possibility of traffic delays and congestion if another road was closed for any reason. One objector suggested that traffic calming be implemented to prevent the speeding traffic and another raised concern regarding the right turn from Roughtown Road onto Manchester Road, due to the geometry of the junction and the high retaining walls. A further two objections were received from Mossley Fire Station informing the Council that the restrictions in the proposed direction would mean 'on call' fire fighters would struggle to meet the time constraints set by the fire station.

In response, the Head of Engineering Services explained the reasons that the Council had designed the proposed scheme in the direction that it had been advertised:

- There was nowhere for vehicles to safely turn if traffic was prohibited downhill and would result in the length of Roughtown Road from Manchester Road to Carrhill Road needing to be one way, leading to a significant impact on all the residents along Roughtown Road;
- The left turn from Manchester Road into Roughtown Road was only possible by using the lane for oncoming traffic (southbound lane) on Manchester Road to ensure the turn was met safely, and whilst there was an advisory sign requesting drivers not to attempt this manoeuvre, it was appreciated that some drivers would continue to make this turn unless restrictions were imposed; and
- Many of the complaints related to 'rat running' traffic and it was explained that if the road was made one way uphill, it would make the road more attractive to traffic 'cutting through' as there would not be the risk of opposing traffic.

The Officer further explained that traffic calming measures would not prevent the potential for other hazards such as collisions at the bends and speed cushions had the potential to cause a further hazard in freezing weather conditions and were not appropriate for steep gradients. Addressing concerns that using the recommended arterial route along Stamford Road would cause delays, it was highlighted that two vehicles meeting on Roughtown Road already caused delays as well as other safety issues. Whilst it was accepted there would be times when Stamford Road would need to be closed, sufficient warning of any closure would be provided and local diversions would be put in place.

Representations in favour of the scheme, submitted by local residents, were also summarised for the Panel. Residents were continually concerned regarding the safety of pedestrians, cyclists and occasional horse riders that used the road, especially during the hours of darkness as the road was not lit by street lighting. Disruption to the lives of local residents had also been caused by abuse from motorists, road rage incidents, and damage to drystone walls and street furniture. The direction of the proposed restrictions was also deemed the most appropriate by those in favour as large vehicles would not be able to travel uphill due to the geometry of the carriageway. In addition, there was a concern that introducing a one way system uphill would attract a considerable volume of traffic that would not normally use the road due to the risk of meeting oncoming traffic.

The Panel considered the views of, Carl Gannon, a local resident who had witnessed the dangers of two way traffic on the road first hand. It was explained that it was a narrow road with no footway that was used mostly downhill by pedestrians, cyclists and some horse riders. There was hope that if the proposals were approved they could avert an accident particularly near the very narrow junction with Manchester Road as vehicles attempted to turn uphill. The objector also highlighted the disruptive traffic jams that had been caused by vehicles meeting head on whilst travelling on the narrow road as well as motorists using the road as a rat-run, especially in an uphill direction. Residents also believed that it was quicker and safer for drivers to use Manchester Road and Stamford Road rather than attempting to use Roughtown Road as a shortcut.

#### **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 (ROUGHTOWN ROAD, MOSSLEY) (ONE WAY TRAFFIC) ORDER 2020 as detailed within the submitted report.**

#### **28. OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED TAMESIDE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH (VARIOUS STREETS, MOSSLEY) (PROHIBITION OF WAITING) ORDER 2020**

Consideration was given to a report of the Assistant Director, Operations and Neighbourhoods, outlining objections received to the proposed No Waiting At Any Time restrictions.

It was explained that following requests from local residents, councillors and the fire service together with onsite observations made by officers of the Engineering Services Department the Council proposed the implementation of new No Waiting At Any Time Restrictions in the area known as 'Top Mossley' and within Mossley town centre. The proposed waiting restrictions had been designed to enhance the flow of traffic and improve site line visibility at various junctions within the area.

A scheme of proposals were advertised in June 2020 and 12 objections were received during the statutory consultation period. Eight of the twelve objectors voiced concerns that residents who currently parked their vehicles where the new waiting restrictions were proposed would be displaced into other areas where parking was already at a premium. Four of the objectors were of the opinion that this displacement of parking would lead to an increase in congestion that would not only affect the accessibility for emergency service vehicles but could impede refuse collection wagons and lead to tensions within the local community. Concerns were raised that these parking issues would be further compounded given that planning permission had been given for new housing developments within Mossley town centre that did not have off street parking facilities.

Further parking concerns were also highlighted, particularly from those residents who would not have the amenity to park outside their own properties if the new waiting restrictions were imposed. Six objectors expressed concerns in terms of accessibility for disabled residents or those with young children. There were fears from one objector that being unable to park outside their property would devalue their home whilst another claimed not to have received notice of the proposals.

Three objectors who resided on Lees Road contended that parked vehicles outside properties 9-23 Lees Road acted as a barrier between pedestrians on the footway and a busy road prone to speeding traffic. It was therefore suggested that the cars themselves acted as a traffic calming measure given that vehicles were forced to slow down and give way to opposing traffic. An additional three objectors questioned why the restrictions on Greaves Street, Lees Road and Quick Edge Road were necessary given that vehicles parked responsibly in these locations and that visibility at these junctions was generally good.

Members were informed that a number of the objectors did not object to the scheme entirely but had requested reductions of certain elements of the No Waiting At Any Time restrictions and some also suggested that residents only parking be considered as an alternative.

The Panel considered the views of, Anne Bates, a local resident, who explained that there were no issues crossing Quick Edge Road because of parked cars, one of the roads subject to the proposed restrictions. It was highlighted that Lees Road was of particular concern given the volume and speed of traffic using the road but that parking was not an issue in the vicinity. There were particular concerns that residents would have nowhere to park and those with mobility issues would be especially disadvantaged if the proposals were implemented. Pollution caused by the volume of traffic in the area was of primary concern, not parked vehicles, and it was requested that the Council take action to tackle this problem.

The Head of Engineering Services explained that the various elements of this scheme had been designed to increase the site line visibility of junctions within the Top Mossley area. Parking at a junction could cause a major hazard as it reduced visibility for both motorists and pedestrians wishing to cross the road. The Highway Code made clear that drivers were not to park within 10 metres of a junction to allow motorists emerging from or turning into a junction a clear view of the road they were joining. It was also highlighted that there was no legal entitlement for a resident to park on the highway outside their property. Whilst blue badger holders were entitled to some concessions, such as parking on double yellow lines for up to three hours, providing it was safe to do so, they were not allowed to park within 15 metres of a junction.

Suggestions that the proposed restrictions be reduced were not deemed appropriate given the nature of the roads in question and the submission that motor vehicles could be used as a traffic calming measure were also deemed to be inappropriate given that motor vehicles were transient.

Panel Members were advised that in line with statutory processes, public notices for this scheme were advertised in the local press and on street from 25 June 2020. In addition, properties adjacent to the proposed restrictions had received a hand delivered notice. Whilst the individual claimed not to have received notice of the proposals, the fact that they had submitted an objection suggested that the statutory process and the extent of the letter drop had been successful in its purpose.

Overall, the Council, following numerous requests from different sources concerning reduced visibility at various junctions in Top Mossley, had deemed that the restrictions were necessary. However, the proposals had been designed to ensure that motorists were able to park in Top Mossley and within the town centre but in locations where it was safe to do so. The suggestion by some objectors for a controlled parking scheme would not address the over demand for available on street parking or reserve parking spaces directly outside individual houses.

**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 (VARIOUS STREETS, MOSSLEY) (PROHIBITION OF WAITING) ORDER 2020 as detailed within the submitted report, subject to the amendment of the No Waiting At Any Time Restrictions on Lees Road (east side) from its junction with Greaves Street being reduced from 15 metres to 10 metres.**

**29. 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>20/00461/FUL Mr Andy Wood</b>
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	<b>Full planning application for the construction 1no. Self-Storage Facility (Use Class B8) with ancillary B1 uses. Land adjacent to Rayner Lane, Ashton-Under-Lyne, OL7 0PG</b>
<b>Speaker(s)/Late Representations</b>	<b>Nicole Roe, on behalf of 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>19/00374/FUL Jigsaw Homes</b>
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	<b>Full planning application for the development of land surrounding Cavendish Mill to create 50 no. dwellings, with associated landscaping, public space and access roads. Land adjacent to Cavendish Mill, Cavendish Street, Ashton-under-Lyne</b>

<b>Decision:</b>	That planning permission be granted subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement and the conditions as detailed within the submitted report.
------------------	--

<b>Name and Application No:</b>	18/00487/OUT Willsgrove Developments Limited
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	Outline planning application for the development of land for residential (C3), including the provision of public open space and the means of access (details of the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the development are reserved). Land at Manchester Road, Ashton Hill Lane, Fitzroy Street and Williamson Lane, Droylsden (Former Robertson's Jam Factory site, Williamson Lane, Droylsden)
<b>Decision:</b>	That planning permission be granted subject to the amended Section 106 Agreement and the conditions as detailed within the submitted report.

<b>Name and Application No:</b>	20/00645/FUL Richmond Fellowship
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	Demolition of existing buildings and construction of a supported housing scheme (use class C3) (19 X 1 bed units) and associated landscaping and access. Land at Rutland Street, Ashton-under-Lyne
<b>Decision:</b>	That Planning permission be granted subject to the prior completion of a Section 106 Agreement and the conditions as detailed within the submitted report.

<b>Name and Application No:</b>	20/00540/FUL Cashino Gaming Ltd
<b>Proposed Development:</b>	Full planning permission for the change of use from A2 use to an adult gaming centre (sui generis), installation of a new shopfront and advertisement consent for new signage. 17 Queens Walk, Droylsden Shopping Centre, Droylsden
<b>Speaker(s)/Late Representations</b>	Henry Hodgson, on behalf of 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.

### 30. APPEAL / COST DECISIONS

Application Reference/Address of Property	Description	Appeal Decision
APP/G4240/X/20/325226 23 Napier Street, Hyde, SK14 5PZ	Refusal to grant a certificate of lawful use or development (LDC).	Appeal dismissed
APP/G4240/W/20/3253962 43 The Mudd, Littlemoor Road, Mottram, Hyde, SK14 6JN	Proposed double garage.	Appeal dismissed
APP/G4240/D/20/3254002 37 Radnor Avenue, Denton, Manchester, M34 2QT	Proposed erection of 1.9m high timber fence (retrospective).	Appeal dismissed
APP/G4240/C/20/3249746 Godley Green Cottage, Godley Green, Hyde, SK14 3BE	<p>A) Appeal by the applicant against the Council for the full award of costs against an enforcement notice alleging the carrying out of building operations at the Property without the required planning permission.</p> <p>B) Appeal by the Council against the applicant for a partial award of costs against an enforcement notice alleging the carrying out of building operations at the Property without the required Planning permission.</p>	Application A and Application B for the award of costs are refused
APP/G4240/W/20/3246235 Land adjacent to 19 Greaves Street, Mossley	Proposed residential development comprising of a terrace of six one-bed bungalows with gardens to rear.	Appeal dismissed

CHAIR