|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Mossley Town Council** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **12 July 2023 at 8.00pm** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  |  | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Present:**  Councillor Frank Travis (Chair) (In the Chair); Councillors Dean Aylett, Stephen Homer, Idu Miah, Mary Mitchell and Pat Mullin. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Approximately 50 members of the public were present at the meeting. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2418** | **Apologies for Absence**  Apologies for absence from the meeting were submitted on behalf of Councillors Hamza Aslam, Amelia Bayliss and Sally Davies. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2419** | **Declarations of Interest**  Councillors and officers were invited to declare any interests they had in any of the items on the agenda for the meeting.  No declarations were made. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2420** | **Public Engagement**  Members of the public were invited to address the meeting.  Police  The Clerk reported that the Police had been invited to attend the meeting to deliver an update on Policing matters in the Town but were unable to attend for operational reasons. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | Planning issues  In view of the significant number of residents present at the meeting, members considered the following planning application at this point during the meeting:  Outline application for proposed residential development (with means of access to be considered, all other matters reserved) at land to west of Huddersfield Road (between Hey Farm Estate and Mossley Hollins High School), Mossley (18/00159/OUT)  The Clerk had reminded members that the application had originally been considered by the Town Council in April 2018.  Whilst the Town Council had not adopted a formal view on the application, Town Councillors were extremely impressed at the work which had gone into producing a comprehensive and informative document (prepared by residents of the Hey Farm Estate) and had encouraged Tameside MBC to fully consider the information included within the report prior to making a recommendation on the application. The Town Council presumed that document has been fully considered.  The application was being reconsidered by the Town Council at this meeting following a further consultation from Tameside MBC.  The meeting was attended by approximately 50 residents who strongly voiced their concerns about the development.  After considering the application and listening to the concerns of local resident, the Town Council agreed that the application should be refused. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | RESOLVED: | | | That the Clerk in consultation with the Chair be authorised to submit to Tameside MBC, an objection to planning application 18/00159/OUT based on the views now expressed at this meeting. | | | | | | | | |
|  | (Note: For ease of reference, the objections agreed with the Chair and submitted to Tameside MBC are appended to these minutes.) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2421** | **Public Engagement (continued)**  Application for Financial Assistance - Friends of Egmont St (FOES) – Application for a ‘large’ grant (£1570) to assist with funding for the 2023 Harvest Festival.  Lesley Arnold-Rigby, Chair of FOES attended the meeting to respond to questions from members.  **(**Note: The application was considered at a later point during the meeting). | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2422** | **Brunswick Dam Project – Update**  Liam Charles and Rob Ollerenshaw attended the meeting and delivered an update on progress made on the project to bring Brunswick Dam into and amenity feature for the community.  The consent of the land owner had now been obtained to carry out improvement works.  A formalised and constituted group was now required to assist with applications for grant aid.  Members reaffirmed their support for the project and a member advised on assistance available in setting up financial arrangements for the project. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2423** | **Minutes**  The Minutes of the Meeting of the Town Council held on Wednesday 7 June 2023 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2424** | **Financial Update to 30 June 2023**  The Clerk submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) showing the financial position as at 30 June 2023 and listing all bills paid since the last meeting as follows: | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | M/CR Candle Makers (grant) | | | | | | | | | | | £300.00 |
|  | Mossley Methodist Church | | | | | | | | | | | £40.00 |
|  | Zoom | | | | | | | | | | | £15.59 |
|  | PAYE (May 2023) | | | | | | | | | | | £116.60 |
|  | SLCC | | | | | | | | | | | £139.00 |
|  | M Iveson (Salary and Expenses (June) | | | | | | | | | | | £476.22 |
|  | Total | | | | | | | | | | | £1087.41 |
|  | The Clerk advised members that an update had been sought from Tameside MBC about progress on the skatepark project at Mossley Park to which the Town Council had agreed to award £5,000. This amount had been carried forward in the budget in recent years as an ‘earmarked’ reserve.  Tameside MBC had indicated that tenders had now been invited to carry out the works with the cost being met by Friends of Mossley park, The Co-operative Bank and Mossley Town Council.  It was envisaged that the works would be carried out in the late Summer. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | RESOLVED: | | | | | (1) | | | | That the report be noted. | | |
|  |  | | | | | (2) | | | | That the Clerk be authorised to settle upon receipt, the invoice from Tameside MBC for the Town Council’s £5,000 contribution to the scheme. | | |
| **2425** | **Neighbourhood Plan Update**  The Chair advised that arrangements were being made for a meeting between interested parties including the dedicated officer from Tameside MBC who would assist the Town Council. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | RESOLVED: | | | | | That the report be noted. | | | | | | |
| **2426** | **Egmont St Pavilion – Update**  The Chair informed members on the outcome of the public consultation event which had taken place on Thursday 29 June 2023.  The responses from members of the public were overwhelmingly positive. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | RESOLVED: | | | | | That the report be noted. | | | | | | |
| **2427** | **Mossley Walking and Cycling Strategy – Update**  There were no issues to report. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2428** | **Provision of Cycle Racks**  The Chair reported that a site meeting with officers from Tameside MBC had taken place earlier during the day to consider the siting of racks in both ‘Top’ and ‘Bottom’ Mossley.  Consideration was being given to relocating the existing cycle racks at the Bus Station adjacent to the Market Ground in ‘Top’ Mossley, to a location in the vicinity of the Co-op. The estimated cost of carrying out this work was being provided by Tameside MBC.  A site in proximity to the health centre in ‘Bottom’ Mossley appeared to be appropriate. Once again, costs were being provided by Tameside MBC.  Consideration may be given to providing racks at other locations if demand for such a facility could be demonstrated. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | RESOLVED: | | | | That the report be noted. | | | | | | | |
| **2429** | **Mossley Park Bowling Green (See minute 2291 of 19 October 2022)**  The Clerk reported on a response received from Tameside MBC following the Council’s request at the last meeting for an update.  Railings had been erected following a visual and tactile inspection of the cliff face by a specialist contractor in September 2022. The railings would provide an increased ‘buffer’ zone for any future rock falls and provide an additional barrier to capture any rolling debris that may breach the current palisade fence.  It was recommended that the bowling green be closed until further mitigation was put in place to reduce the risk to the bowlers and Council staff maintaining the green. The timing of this was unfortunate as it prevented the final game of the season from going ahead.  The long-term solution recommended was to provide a large scale civil engineering project to retain the cliff face but the cost for this would be prohibitive.  The green was now at a playable standard but would require some more scarifying and further treatment this season. Some maintenance was planned around the green itself over the next few weeks. Tameside MBC were currently sourcing funding for additional shelters to replace the one lost on the far side of the green. The process of renovating the toilet block was underway and once costs had been confirmed, work would commence as soon as possible. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | RESOLVED: | | That the report be noted. | | | | | | | | | |
| **2430** | **Partnership Working – Collaboration on Projects and Funding.**  The Chair invited members to consider allocating an amount from the unallocated resources budget to assist with collaborative partnership working in the town.  The Town Council was, for obvious reasons not in a position to fund every proposal for which application was made, but was in a position to work with others to drive an orchestrated and funded programme. The suggested £5,000 would be used as match funding for bids. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | RESOLVED: | | That a sum of £5,000 be allocated from the ‘unallocated’ budget to assist with match funding for collaborative working on projects in the town. | | | | | | | | | |
| **2431** | **Dates for Christmas 2023 Events in Mossley**  The Town Council was invited to consider any arrangements for the Christmas 2023 events in Mossley as follows:  Friday 24 November 2023 - Micklehurst  Saturday 25 November 2023 – Mossley  The Chair informed members that discussions would take place with Comtec, the organisation that had assisted with last year’s Christmas and other events in the town, on a project for the Christmas 2023 event. The budget for the 2023 event had been reduced to £7,000.  It was confirmed that a Christmas market was to take place at the methodist Church on Saturday 25 November 2023. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | RESOLVED: | | | | | | | That the report be noted. | | | | |
| **2432** | **Planning Issues**  The Council considered the following planning applications: | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | (i) | Rear ground floor extension on stilts, clad in grey and black UPVC cladding board with sliding folding glazed doors and Balcony at 19 Market Street Mossley (23/00559/FUL) | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | (ii) | Separation of existing dwelling to form additional dwelling at Rock House 229 Stockport Road Mossley (23/00560/FUL) | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | (iii) | Dormer loft conversion at 87 Andrew Street Mossley (23/00526/CPUD) | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | (iv) | Discharge of conditions 3 (Materials), 5 (Site Investigation), 6 (Ground Investigation Scheme), 8 (Construction Environment Management Plan), 10 (Road Works And Traffic Management Measures), 13 (Hard And Soft Landscaping), 15 (Surface Water Drainage Scheme), 17 (Tree Protection) Of Planning Permission 19/00985/FUL at Land In Front Of Hopkins Buildings Off Tame Valley Close Mossley (23/00058/PLCOND) | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | (v) | Proposed two storey rear extension at 8 Daisy Hill Road Mossley (23/00436/FUL) | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | (vi) | Full discharge of Condition 2 (Materials) of planning reference 21/00320/REM on land formerly Prospect House Stockport Road Mossley (23/00071/PLCOND) | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | (vii) | Variation of Condition 1 (drawings) to incorporate changes to the design and layout to planning permission 21/00320/REM at land to the rear of 75-99 Stockport Road Mossley (23/00613/FUL). | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | The outline application for proposed residential development (with means of access to be considered, all other matters reserved) at land to west of Huddersfield Road (between Hey Farm Estate and Mossley Hollins High School), Mossley (18/00159/OUT), had been considered earlier during the meeting under the ‘Public Engagement’ item. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | RESOLVED: | | | | | | | That remaining applications be noted. | | | | |
| **2433** | **Chair’s Report**  The Chair reported that he had been approached by The Vale, requesting a contribution towards the cost of providing an external box in which a defibrillator donated by Micklehurst Primary School could be installed. The cost of the external box was £550. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | RESOLVED: | | | (1) | | | | | That a grant of £250 be awarded to The Vale to assist with the provision and installation of an external box in which to place a defibrillator at the The Vale’s premises. | | | |
|  |  | | | (2) | | | | | That in view of the direct benefit to the area, part of the area or to some or all its inhabitants, the expenditure be met from Section 137 funding. | | | |
| **2434** | **Updates and reports from Town Team and Other Agencies**  The Town had been visited and assessed by ‘Britain in Bloom’ judges earlier during the day.  A community volunteering event was to take place at Emmaus on Saturday 21 October 2023. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2435** | **Correspondence**  There were no additional items of correspondence to report. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **2436** | **Application for Financial Assistance**  Friends of Egmont St (FOES) – Application for a ‘large’ grant (£1570) to assist with funding for the 2023 Harvest Festival. | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | RESOLVED: | | | | | | (1) | | | | That a grant of £1,000 be awarded to ‘Friends of Egmont St’ to assist with the 2023 Harvest Festival. | |
|  |  | | | | | | (2) | | | | That in view of the direct benefit to the area, part of the area or to some or all its inhabitants, the expenditure be met from Section 137 funding. | |
|  | The meeting closed at 10.20pm. | | | | | | | | | | | |

Chair

**Outline application for proposed residential development (with means of access to be considered, all other matters reserved) at land to west of Huddersfield Road (between Hey Farm Estate and Mossley Hollins High School), Mossley (18/00159/OUT)**

The Town Council considered this application for a second time at the meeting on 12 July 2023 following consultation by Tameside MBC on revisions made to the original application.

The Town Council has issued a comprehensive objection to the proposal which is set out below for information.

This application was originally considered by the Town Council in April 2018.

Whilst the Town Council did not adopt a formal view on the application, Town Councillors were extremely impressed at the work which has gone into producing a comprehensive and informative document (prepared by residents of the Hey Farm Estate) and encouraged Tameside MBC to fully consider the information included within the report prior to making a recommendation on the application.

The Town Council presumes that document has been fully considered.

The application was reconsidered by the Town Council following a further consultation at the meeting on 12 July 2023.

The meeting was attended by approximately 50 residents who strongly voiced their concerns about the development.

After considering the application and listening to the concerns of local resident, the Town Council agreed that the application should be refused for the following reasons.

1. Although the land which is subject to the application is allocated for residential use, that zoning is historic. The Tameside Local Plan is by no means finalised and the residential allocation is not yet confirmed. Indeed the plan has not yet been put out to consultation stage and to grant permission for the development on the basis of a draft plan would be wrong and irreversible.
2. The Environmental and Ecological Survey documents accompanying the application is suspect in that it appears to be generic in nature and not tailored to the land which is subject to the application.
3. It has always been the assumption that ‘brownfield’ sites will be developed rather than develop current green space. Looking at not only at the brownfield land available locally in Mossley, (sites off Egmont St, the former Mossley Hollins School site etc), but even within the relatively short radius to include north Stalybridge there are brownfield sites which are still in the planning process; for example, the substantial former Hartshead Power Station site.
4. The proposed development will result in overdevelopment and pays little or no regard to additional infrastructure required to accommodate such a significant increase in the local population. Developers’ financial contributions which are to provide some mitigation and enhancement in the fields of highway, greenspace and environment and education, will be unable to satisfactorily compensate and alleviate issues which will arise from this development.
5. The proposed development is speculative and does not include an element of affordable housing for which there is a need in the Town.
6. The proposed development does not incorporate play facilities for the significant numbers of children likely to occupy the number of family designed dwellings proposed.
7. The nature of the land gives cause for concern with regard to flooding and drainage in the longer term and will exacerbate existing flooding and environmental issues in the locality particularly being located so close to the Tame Valley. The land takes run off from the hills to the east and there is real cause for concern that the ground conditions cannot support development without compromising and degrading what is already regarded as an area of significant “risk” related to those ground conditions and hydrology.
8. The number of traffic movements associated with a development of this size must have a significant and detrimental effect on the existing local highway.

network particularly at rush hour periods. The location of the proposed development in a semi-rural location with undulating topography does not lend itself to alternative and sustainable forms of transport.

The development needs to be seen in the context of other potential developments on the same main road link. This cannot be regarded in isolation, although residents are very concerned about local impact, with other proposals at the Hartshead Power Station site (over 300 dwellings in all) would generate a massive increase in traffic along Huddersfield Road, even if primary movements at key times may not all be along this route. The impact of this is not simply on our own community, but on those who share our valley.

1. The significant number and type of dwellings proposed must have a detrimental effect on the Town’s infrastructure which is already under significant pressure. The ability of education and health services to accommodate this level of development is questionable in the least.

The Town Council would like to see the comments and rationale for coping with this possible influx from the providers of these services.

Given the strides forward in the standards of society from the latter part of the 19th Century to now, through housing, planning, education, public health and environmental protection legislation, this level of development not only undermines the principles of this great body of work, it will mean that resources, be they financial or otherwise, allocated to these areas, will be spread much more thinly. This is effectively a backward step.

Although it may well be argued that the resolution of deficiencies in, say, healthcare, is a role for government and may be rectified over time, the increased demand for services, which are currently going backwards, should not be tolerated. This is not just about joined up thinking and supply of resources at this time, it’s very basic common sense.

1. The rich bio-diversity prevalent in the area will be lost for current and future

generations.

1. A strategy to deal with the increasing number of applications for residential development on a large scale such as this and small infill sites is required to avoid the loss of open greenspace in the Town. The Town Council has agreed to formulate a Neighbourhood Plan for the Town in the hope to address this but the plan will take time to formulate. This will have to sit within the new local plan, yet to go to consultation for some time.
2. The Council does not refute the general arguments for increasing the housing supply, or addressing any imbalance in types available under any tenure. Indeed, some development of social and affordable units would be welcomed as a priority, but certainly not at this scale.
3. The conclusion we have come to is that applications for all but the most modest and socially desirable properties should be deemed to be premature, pending the development of existing brownfield sites and the rational reconsideration of these factors through the development plan process.

We should not allow detrimental development to be delivered on our doorstep largely because of a lack of development planning to direct it. That is a basic principle of the Town and Country Planning Acts, which we seem to be abandoning to developer led planning.

.