

Planning Application Comment

From: DoNotReply@tameside.gov.uk  
Sent: 22 July 2018 19:15  
To: Planning Mail  
Subject: Planning Application Comment

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\* AUTOMATICALLY GENERATED ONLINE FORM EMAIL \*\*  
\*\* Do NOT send any correspondence to this address! \*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Planning Application Comment  
Allocated Request Number: 22481161  
Service Id: 440  
Dated: 22/07/2018 19:15:22

Planning Application Number: 18/00119/FUL Date Of Application: 12/02/2018  
Proposal: Construction of 5 No. detached houses and associated works  
Site: Land South of  
Grove Street  
Ashton-under-Lyne  
Tameside

Comments From:

Comments On The Proposal...  
Comments on Planning Application 18/00119/FUL  
re: Land South of Grove Street Ashton-under-Lyne

A) Traffic issues

1) Prevention of traffic short-cut between Newmarket Road and Richmond Street. Currently Sat-Nav's appear to indicate a route between Lindisfarne road and Grove Street and it is not unusual to see cars attempting to drive across the grass towards Grove street from Lindisfarne Road. Some cars get stuck on the grass and need to be towed-off the grass. Currently motor-cycles often use this shortcut between Grove Street and Lindisfarne Road or also drive on the public footpath to Croxdale Close. There is no doubt that if there is no barrier at the end of the new extended Grove Street and turning circle, cars will also attempt to drive over the kerb and attempt to get to Lindisfarne Road or Marsden Close or Croxdale Close.

2) Grove Street

My knowledge of using Grove Street is as a pedestrian and I am often surprised how many vehicles are parked on the road and pavements for such a short street. I often wonder if some drivers park on Grove street when they are visiting Grovewood Close and/or Lindisfarne Road and/or parking here to walk their dogs. I assume that some visitors visiting houses on Newmarket Road also park on Grove Street. There may be a congestion issue with two-way traffic using the extended Grove Street. This needs examining further.

3) Between Grovewood Close and Grove Street My knowledge of Grovewood Close is as a pedestrian. Grovewood Close is a narrow road with no pavement. I am told by people living on Grovewood Close

#### Planning Application Comment

who use cars that the junction with Grove Street is awkward to negotiate when several cars are trying to get in and out of Grovewood Close. The problem appears to be multifactorial: the narrowness of the entrance to Grovewood Close, vehicles parked on Grove Street limiting the road to one-way and limited visibility caused by parked vehicles and overgrowth of bushes. This needs examining further during access design.

4) Between Grove Street and Newmarket Road Newmarket Road is much busier than in the past and the vehicles appear to drive at a greater speed at this end of Newmarket Road. It is often difficult to turn onto Newmarket Road especially when turning right onto Newmarket Road. There are daily queues on Newmarket Road going towards Oldham Road with a tail-back reaching the Grove Street junction. Hence making turning right into Newmarket Road even more difficult as the traffic coming from Oldham Road is usually driving at speed. This needs examining further.

5) Pedestrian crossing of Newmarket road There is no pedestrian crossing on Newmarket Road. Pedestrians have to run the gauntlet of looking for fast moving vehicles. It is surprising that access to Daisy Nook Country Park, which Tameside Council and officers' state is easily accessible within walking distance for adults and children in this part of Ashton, has no safe pedestrian crossing point. However locally used amenity green space accessible by footpaths is surplus to requirements! Although pedestrian crossing of Newmarket Road may not be considered to be relevant to the current planning application it should be addressed somewhere, maybe in the related application to TMBC highways department?

#### B) Open space statements

1) Wipflow Open Space Assessment Date: 30 January 2018 This document was not available in March.

Why not?

This Wipflow document mainly regurgitates both National and Local TMBC policy document statements and advice they have received. The major document referenced is the "Tameside District Council PPG17 OPEN SPACE STUDY Final Assessment Report" Dated: August 2010. The queries with the Wipflow document are:

#### 1. Section Conclusion 5.2

This section states:

"The site is unallocated the UDP but we have been advised the site falls under the UDP policy OL4 which allows for development on Protected Open Space where it can be demonstrated, by means of a suitable supply and demand study that the retention of a site is not necessary and the site has no special significance to the interests of sport and recreation." Where is the "a suitable supply and demand study"? I could not find such a study when I have looked on the TMBC web site. Also local councilors last year did not appear to know of any studies.

#### 2. Section Conclusion 5.4

This section states:

"It is also a material consideration that the site is now within private ownership and therefore its use as public open greenspace is limited. whilst under the ownership of

Planning Application Comment

the local authority, the land was available as public open land, however, this is now no longer the case as the site is not owned by the local authority. We have however, left a proportion of the site which will remain as Public Open Space."

The owners show good will to the local community in their statement "We have however, left a proportion of the site which will remain as Public Open Space.". However, there is an ongoing issue to how this "Public space" owned by a private individual or company (not sure which) will be maintained and by who? At the moment this area is overgrown and not maintained. What is the way forward on this issue?

2) General comments on open space

a) The Wiplov Open Space Assessment makes many references to the "Tameside District Council PPG17 OPEN SPACE STUDY Final Assessment Report" (Dated: August 2010) and the judgments made by TMBC on surplus open space.

I am sad to say the PPG17 document appears to have questions to the validity of the methodology, questionable adequacy of surveys to get local views and ways that value judgments weightings have been determined. A low priority appears to have been given to small areas of green space in residential areas close to where people live. I am surprised these basic problems in the study were not highlighted although in some area they were hinted at. Many scientific journal articles on studies clearly point-out deficiencies that were known in a study.

b) TMBC appears to intend to increase cramming of houses into residential areas. Estates which were originally designed to have green spaces of presumably appropriate sizes and approved by the council authorities at that time are now judged to have excessive amount of green space. TMBC without any clarity of adequate local consultations and/or surveys appear to have judged designed-in green spaces in residential areas, that are big enough for one or more houses, are now deemed to be of no local value and surplus to requirements. I have tried searching TMBC website on many occasions over past years to find-out what decisions/judgments on specific issues. It is very difficult to find out information. Last year I asked local councilors but they did not appear know much more information. There should be improved clarity in the way decisions/judgments are made and logical accessible routes to view the information.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\* AUTOMATICALLY GENERATED ONLINE FORM EMAIL \*\*  
\*\* Do NOT send any correspondence to this address! \*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

<<-Server:[public.tameside.gov.uk] Path:[/plan/f422planapp.asp]->>