To: All Members of the Pennines Township Committee

Dear Councillor

PENNINES TOWNSHIP COMMITTEE

You are requested to attend the meeting of the Pennines Township Committee to be held in St James' CE Primary School, Crossfield Road, Wardle, OL12 9JW on 21st May 2013 commencing at 6.15 pm.

The agenda and supporting papers are attached.

If you require advice on any agenda item involving a possible Declaration of Interest which could affect your right to speak and/or vote, please contact staff in the Governance and Committee Services Team at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting.

Yours Faithfully

Linda Fisher  
Service Director

Pennines Township Committee Membership 2013/14
Councillor Allen Brett  
Councillor Martin Burke  
Councillor Robert Clegg  
Councillor Janet Darnbrough  
Councillor Ashley Dearnley  
Councillor John Hartley  
Councillor Aftab Hussain  
Councillor Andy Kelly  
Councillor Stephanie Mills  
Councillor Amna Mir  
Councillor Martin Rodgers  
Councillor Ann Stott JP
Apologies for Absence

1. Appointment of Chair

2. Declarations of Interest

Members are requested to indicate at this stage any items on the agenda in which they intend to declare an interest. Members are reminded that, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 and the Council’s adopted Code of Conduct, they must declare the nature of any personal or discloseable pecuniary interest required of them and, in the case of any discloseable pecuniary interest, withdraw from the meeting during consideration of the item, unless permitted otherwise within the Code of Conduct.

3. Open Forum (6.20-6.50pm)

Half an hour has been set aside for members of the public to raise any issues relevant to the business of the Committee and the Township.

4. Marshalling Community Events
   - Item at the request of Councillor Brett

5. Minutes
   - To consider the minutes of the Pennines Township Committee meeting held on 5th March 2013.

6. Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub-Committee
   - To note the minutes of the Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub-Committee held on 27th March 2013.

7. Pennines Township Planning Sub-Committee
   - To consider the minutes of the Pennines Township Planning Sub-Committee held on 14th February, 13th March and 18th April 2013.

8. Neighbourhood Planning - Designation of the Proposed Littleborough Neighbourhood Area

9. Review of Pennines Township Area Forums

10. Review of Pennines Township Service Groups

11. Pennines Township Committee - Sub-Committee and Delegation Arrangements

12. Appointment of Sub-Committees, Working Groups and Other Bodies 2013/14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Pennines Township Funds 2013/14</td>
<td>46 - 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>St.Andrew's CE (Dearnley) Consultation on Proposed Change in Age Range to establish a Nursery Class and significant enlargement</td>
<td>63 - 84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>School Governors Appointments</td>
<td>85 - 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Clean &amp; Green - Update</td>
<td>89 - 95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRESENT: Councillor Aftab Hussain (Chair); Councillors Brett, Burke, Robert Clegg, Darnbrough, Dearnley, Hartley, Mills, Mir, Rodgers and Stott

OFFICERS: M. Taylor and G. Beverley (Operational Services), S. Banu (Planning & Regulation Service), P. Cooke (Customers & Communities), P. Gregory, N. Afzal, T. Knight and M. Garraway (Corporate Services)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: J. Taylor and K. Finnigan (Link4Life); 15 members of public.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor Kelly

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
72 Councillor Stott declared a personal interest in agenda item 7, Neighbourhood Planning – Application for a Neighbourhood Area by Littleborough Civic Trust. Councillor Stott declared previous conversations with members of the Civic Trust regarding this issue.

PRESENTATION - LIBRARY STRATEGY CONSULTATION
73 The Service Director – Corporate Services consulted the Township Committee in relation to the Library Strategy Review, the presentation forming part of the first consultation of the strategic review of Library Services across the Borough.

Consultation has been wide-ranging taking into account statutory requirements. Hard copies of the documents are available in all public libraries across the Borough and on the Council’s website. A young person’s survey and a shorter version are available for children which is also accessible online, copies provided to all secondary schools and in hard copy at all libraries. Officers are attending a programme of meetings with specific groups including older people’s forums, disabled people’s focus groups and friends of libraries groups.

The purpose of the consultation is to determine what customers and non-users require from the library service.

DECADED – That the presentation be noted.

OPEN FORUM
74 The following issues were raised in the Committee’s Open Forum session: -
   a) Memorial Park – Skate Park
Mrs I. Davidson of Friends of Memorial Park addressed the Committee updating on the progress for the development of a skate park feature.

   b) Signalisation of Elizabethan Way/Sir Isaac Newton Way
Mr R. Davis referring to agenda item 7, S106 contribution to signalisation of Elizabethan Way/Sir Isaac Newton Way, sought an explanation of how the scheme would work in practice as this was unclear from the computer generated model. Referring to paragraphs 3.8-3.10 of the submitted report Mr Davis highlighted a previous decision by the Committee that the area should be considered as an entirety and requested confirmation that this had been taken into account. Service Director – Operational Services undertook to respond in writing to Mr Davis questions.
c) Illegal Highways Lines and Signs
Mr B. Cropper addressed the Township Committee in relation to the legality of highways signs and lines around the Borough and if the Council had received value for money in works recently undertaken. Further to previous representations in relation to the matter and recommendations from the Township Committee that the Service Director with responsibility for Highways meet with Mr Cropper directly, the Township Committee requested the Head of Property & Highways Client Services contact Mr Cropper and provide a timeline for resolution to the matter.

d) Section 38 cycle lane from Stubley Mill Road to Railway Street, Littleborough
Mr B. Cropper informed the Committee that the cycle lane had been constituted incorrectly with the surface applied being of the wrong material. Mr Cropper had previously made representations on this matter to relevant Authorities and sought confirmation that as the cycle lane had been recently adopted by the Council the matter would be rectified.

e) Former Akzo Nobel site
Mr B. Cropper referring to the meeting of the Pennines Township Planning Sub-Committee held on 1st August 2012, requested the Township Committee instruct the Service Director – Corporate Services to obtain a copy of the film recorded by the BBC at the meeting. Mr Cropper informed the Township Committee he had met with the Chief Planning Officer to discuss the Akzo Nobel site on 11th February 2013.

DECIDED – That the Service Director – Corporate Service be instructed to obtain a copy of the BBC’s recording of the meeting of the Pennines Township Planning Sub-Committee meeting held on 1st August 2012.

MINUTES
75 Further to minute 64 (c) of the meeting held on 8th January 2013, Members of the Township Committee detailed existing and additional cases of cars being advertised for sale on the public highways within the Township. The Service Director – Operational Services informed the Township Committee cases should be reported to the Contact Centre which would result in an Officer visiting the site.

Further to minute 69 of the meeting held on 8th January 2013, the Chair advised Ward Councillors had met to consider the proposed prohibition of driving at Merryman Hall, Smallbridge.

DECIDED – That the minutes of the meeting held on 8th January 2013 be approved as a correct record.

PENNINES TOWNSHIP DELEGATED AND FUNDING SUB-COMMITTEE
76 DECIDED – That the minutes of the meeting of the Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub-Committee held on 6th February 2013, be noted.

PENNINES TOWNSHIP PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
77 Further to the meeting of the Pennines Township Planning Sub-Committee held on 18th January 2013, Members referred to discussion of the Sub-Committee in relation to the number of applications received at the meeting and the nature of those applications. Members expressed concerns over the impact on Council resources of holding Sub-Committee meetings for the consideration of such applications where a single application, recommended for approval by Planning Officers, is for consultation of the Sub-Committee prior to decision by the Licensing & Regulatory Committee.
DECIDED – That (1) the minutes of the Pennines Township Planning Sub-Committee meetings held on 18th December 2012 and 16th January 2013, be approved as a correct record; (2) This Committee recommends the dissolution of existing Township Planning Sub-Committee arrangements and for all planning related matters to be determined by the Licensing and Regulatory Committee.

NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANNING - APPLICATION FOR A NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA BY LITTLEBOROUGH CIVIC TRUST

78 The Service Director – Planning and Regulation Service introduced a report informing Members of the receipt of an expression of interest by Littleborough Civic Trust for the preparation of a neighbourhood development plan for the Littleborough area; in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 and regulation 5 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Members were requested to approve the proposed area boundary, as detailed within the submitted report, for the purposes of public consultation.

Alternatives considered: The Council has a duty to consider and support the preparation of neighbourhood development plans by a neighbourhood forum.

DECIDED – That the Application for a Neighbourhood Area by Littleborough Civic Trust Littleborough be approved for the purposes of public consultation.

S106 CONTRIBUTION TO SIGNALISATION OF ELIZABETHAN WAY/SIR ISAAC NEWTON WAY ROUNDABOUT

79 The Service Director – Operational Services introduced a report seeking approval for the signalisation of the roundabout situated at Elizabethan Way/Sir Isaac Newton Way, using Section 106 contribution funds specified for highway improvements within the Milnrow and Newhey Ward.

Alternatives considered: Members considered alternatives schemes to ease traffic congestion around this junction, as detailed within the submitted report.

Members of the Township Committee, in noting the recommended full time hours of operation for the proposed signals, sought clarification on how part time operational hours during busy periods would affect the proposed scheme and traffic congestion. Members noted the reported costs associated with alternative schemes.

DECIDED – That the report be deferred to a future meeting of the Committee pending further information relating to alternative options for the operational hours of the signalisation of the roundabout and alternative schemes.

STREET SERVICES CLEAN AND GREEN

80 The Township Committee considered a report of the Service Director – Operational Services seeking Township funding for the retention of Cleaner Green Team for 2013/2014. The reason for the recommendation being the ending of funding from the Priority Investment Fund which Pennines Township approved match funding against, resulting in the introduction of a specific Clean and Green Team for the Township from August 2012.

The Service Director reported though that funding from the Priority Investment Fund would not be available in 2013/2014 and the Committee was asked to determine
whether they could continue to support this additional resource through Township Funds only.

Alternatives Considered: Members were provided with options for the continuation of the service over varying periods within the submitted report, or to manage the service using existing resource provision where possible.

In discussing the options for retention of the Cleaner Green Team in Pennines Township Members questioned why the team would not have a permanent base in the Pennines Township. Members sought assurances that updates would be provided to Members at Township Committee meetings and requested up to date information relating to which schemes had been completed from previously allocated funds. Members questioned who received funds from the sponsoring of roundabouts within the Township the Service Director – Operational Services informed the Committee these funds are currently consumed into Highways Service budgets and would confirm details directly to Members.

**DECIDED – That the sum of £36,450 from the Pennines Township Revenue Funds 2013/14, be approved for the retention of the Pennines Cleaner Green Team for a period of twenty four weeks.**

**COMMUNITY CENTRE FUNDING AGREEMENT 2013/2014**

81  The Township Committee considered a report of the Service Director – Corporate Services that advised Members of progress towards the establishment of funding agreements between funded Community Centres and the Council for financial year 2013/2014.

The Service Director reported that as the Community Centre budget is devolved to Township Committees, the recommendations in the report outlined the funding agreement process for 2013/2014, which requested quarterly progress reports from the funded community centres, which will enable the Township Committee to monitor the use of the budget.

The Service Director reported that in 2011 following a full evaluation to provide detailed information on the performance of funded Community Centres; Members had agreed as part of a savings proposal to reduce funding to Community Centres by 15% or 23% in 2012/13. During 2012/13 performance has been monitored and a 2013/14 funding agreement developed in partnership with the Community Base Network (representatives from Community Centres).

Alternatives considered: The lack of a formal agreement will not allow members to effectively monitor the Community Centre’s budget and the performance of individual Community Centre’s.

**DECIDED – That the report be noted.**

**GREATER MANCHESTER JOINT MINERALS DEVELOPMENT PLAN DOCUMENT**

82  The Township Committee considered a report of the Service Director – Planning and Regulation which informed Members of the current situation with regard to the Joint Minerals Development Plan Document for Greater Manchester (JMDPD), and which was seeking a resolution from the Council, at its meeting on 17th April 2013, that the JMDPD shall have effect in the Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Area with effect from 26 April 2013. In addition, the Council would be asked to resolve to approve the changes to the existing proposals map for the allocation of Areas of Search and Mineral Safeguarding Areas.
DECIDED – That the report be noted.

SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY VACANCIES - AUTHORITY GOVERNORS

83 The Township Committee considered a report of the Service Director - Support for Learning that sought nominations to a number of School Governing Body vacancies, at schools in Pennines Township.

DECIDED – That Councillor Ashley Dearnley be the nominated appointment to serve on the Governing Body at St. Andrews CE Primary School.
PRESENTE: Councillor Aftab Hussain (Chair); Councillors Robert Clegg, Dearnley, Hartley, Kelly, Mills and Mir

OFFICERS: K. Moore and M. Garraway (Corporate Services)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillors Darnbrough and Stott; 1 member of public.

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE: Councillor Brett

ADDITIONAL ITEM OF BUSINESS
16 In accordance with Council Procedure rules the Chair indicated there would be an additional late item of business on the grounds of urgency, an application for Pennines Township Revenue Funds 2012/13 for £4,000 from Milnrow Brass Band. The grounds for urgency being the requirement for the band to confirm funding prior to being able to confirm their place to compete in a national competition.

WITHDRAWAL OF ITEM OF BUSINESS
17 In accordance with Council Procedure rules the Chair indicated applications PTC/11/12 for a link bridge from Butterworth Hall to New Street and PTC/12/12 for a public footpath from Milnrow to Hollingworth Lake; for Pennines Township Capital Funds 2012/13 be deferred pending further information on each scheme.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
18 There were no declarations of interest.

MINUTES
19 The minutes of the meeting of the Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub-Committee held on 6th February 2013 be approved as a correct record.

PENNINES TOWNSHIP FUNDS 2012/13
20 The Deputy Chief Executive (Corporate) introduced a report seeking Members agreement to the allocation of Pennines Township Funds to funding streams in 2012/13 and to consider applications for funds by submitted groups and projects.

The recommendations contained within the report were presented as management of the Pennines Township Fund is delegated to the Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub Committee. Pennines Township Funds are allocated to projects/schemes that benefit the Township’s community and environment, and realise the Township priorities. The report enabled the Sub-Committee to monitor and review the use of the Pennines Township Funds to ensure continued efficient and effective use of Township Funds.

Alternatives: Members were asked to support or decline proposed schemes within the submitted report.

The Head of Townships informed the Sub-Committee that the Township Capital Funds for 2013/14 were to be reduced by twenty five percent due to expected underspends by other Townships from the 2012/13 Capital Funds. The Chair informed the Sub-Committee he had previously received assurances that there would
be no reduction in Township Funds in preparation for the 2013/14 Budget. Members of the Sub-Committee sought information as to the mechanisms used for the reduction of the Capital Budget.

**DECIDED** – That (1) the Deputy Chief Executive write to the Director for Finance expressing the concern of Pennines Township Members of the reduction in Township Capital Funds for 2013/14, and to request the reinstatement of those Funds for 2013/14;

(2) the expenditure, commitments and balances of Pennines Township Revenue and Capital funds as detailed in the appendices 1 and 2 be noted;

(3) the decisions made under delegated authority as detailed in appendix 3 be noted;

(4) applications for assistance from the Pennines Township Revenue Fund, as detailed in Appendix 4 of the submitted report, be determined as follows:

a) PF/26/12, £563 be approved for the purchase of equipment for volunteers in Wardle Village;

b) PF/27/12, £650 be approved for Wardle Road Garden supplies;

c) PF/28/12, £300 be approved for Milnrow Library Garden supplies;

d) PF/30/12, £500 be approved for Victoria Garlick for the purchase of swimming equipment;

e) £4,000 be approved for Milnrow Brass Band to assist in competing in a national competition.

(5) applications for assistance from the Pennines Township Capital Fund, as detailed in Appendix 4 of the submitted report, be determined as follows:

a) PTC/08/12, request for £40,250 for drainage improvements on Kiln Lane be deferred to a future meeting of the Pennines Township Committee or delegated Sub-Committee, providing information relating to alternative options available, legal and financial implications of the scheme;

b) PTC/09/12, a request for £26,500 be deferred to a future meeting of the Sub-Committee pending full breakdown of the associated costs of the scheme;

c) PTC/10/12, £575 for play equipment at Haugh Park be approved.
PENNINES TOWNSHIP PLANNING SUB COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING
Thursday, 14 February 2013

PRESENT: Councillor Clegg (in the Chair); Councillors Brett, Darnbrough, Hartley, Kelly, Mir, Martin Rodgers and Stott.

OFFICERS: R. Butler (Planning and Regulation Service), D. Baker (Operational Services) and P. Thompson (Corporate Services).

Also in Attendance: Councillor Mills and 21 members of the public.

Apologies for Absence: None.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
38 There were no declarations of interests.

ERECT ETION OF 15 METRE WIND TURBINE - MOORFIELD KENNELS, HIGHER WHITE SLACK FARM, HUDDERSFIELD ROAD, NEWHEY
39 The Service Director – Planning and Regulation Service reported on planning application 12/56060/FUL for the erection of a 15 metre (17.8 metres to the tip of the blade) high wind turbine at Moorfield Kennels, Higher White Slack Farm, Huddersfield Road, Newhey, Rochdale.

The Sub-Committee considered the views of Mr L. MacDonald, the agent acting on behalf of the applicant, who addressed the Sub-Committee in relation to the application.

DECIDED - That the planning application be referred to the Licensing and Regulatory Committee for determination and that Committee be advised that this Sub-Committee would be minded to grant planning permission.

CONSTRUCTION OF A CAR PARK PROVIDING 10 SPACES AT ST. JOHN’S CHURCH, HALIFAX ROAD, ROCHDALE
40 The Service Director – Planning and Regulation Service advised that planning applications 12/56132/FUL and 12/56281/LBC, in respect of the proposed provision of a car-park, with 10 spaces, at St. John’s Halifax Road, Rochdale had been withdrawn, prior to the meeting, at the request of the applicant.

INSTALLATION OF A CONTROL KIOSK - LAND TO THE WEST OF SMITHY BRIDGE ROAD, ROCHDALE
41 The Service Director – Planning and Regulation reported on planning application no. 12/56282/FUL, for the installation of a new control kiosk, pressure balancing column and additional outfall structure, proposed bank strengthening measures and the formation of new temporary and permanent vehicular access points to Smithy Bridge Road also involving the temporary diversion of the public right of way across the site on land to the west of Smithy Bridge Road, Rochdale.

The Sub-Committee considered the views of a representative of the United Utilities, the applicants, who addressed members in relation to the application.

The Sub-Committee considered the views of objectors to the application who addressed the Sub-Committee in relation thereto.
DECIDED – That (1) the planning application be approved subject to the conditions detailed in the submitted report and that at the conclusion of the scheduled works the diverted footpath be returned to its current position.

(2) that any future planning applications from United Utilities in respect of this location be considered at a meeting of Pennines Township Committee.

INSTALLATION OF A SINGLE WIND TURBINE - 1 NEAR HEY HEAD FARM, CALDERBROOK ROAD, LITTLEBOROUGH

The Service Director – Planning and Regulation reported on planning application no. 12/56235/FUL for the proposed installation of a single micro scale wind turbine (14.97 metres to hub, 5.6 metres diameter blades) at No. 1 Near Hey Head Farm, Calderbrook Road, Littleborough.

The Sub-Committee considered the views of Mr. L. MacDonald, the agent acting on behalf of the applicant, who addressed the Sub-Committee in relation to the application.

The Sub-Committee considered the views of Mr. McGregor, an objector to the application, who addressed the Sub-Committee in relation thereto.

DECIDED - That the planning application be referred to the Licensing and Regulatory Committee for determination and that Committee be advised that this Sub-Committee would be minded to grant planning permission.

INSTALLATION OF A SINGLE WIND TURBINE - 2 NEAR HEY HEAD FARM, CALDERBROOK ROAD, LITTLEBOROUGH

The Service Director – Planning and Regulation reported on planning application no. 12/56238/FUL for the proposed installation of a single micro scale wind turbine (14.97 metres to hub, 5.6 metres diameter blades) at No. 2 Near Hey Head Farm, Calderbrook Road, Littleborough.

The Sub-Committee considered the views of Mr. L. MacDonald, the agent acting on behalf of the applicant, who addressed the Sub-Committee in relation to the application.

The Sub-Committee considered the views of Mr. McGregor, an objector to the application, who addressed the Sub-Committee in relation thereto.

DECIDED - That the planning application be referred to the Licensing and Regulatory Committee for determination and that Committee be advised that this Sub-Committee would be minded to grant planning permission.

INSTALLATION OF A SINGLE WIND TURBINE - 3 NEAR HEY HEAD FARM, CALDERBROOK ROAD, LITTLEBOROUGH

The Service Director – Planning and Regulation reported on planning application no. 12/56239/FUL for the proposed installation of a single micro scale wind turbine (14.97 metres to hub, 5.6 metres diameter blades) at No. 3 Near Hey Head Farm, Calderbrook Road, Littleborough.

The Sub-Committee considered the views of Mr. L. MacDonald, the agent acting on behalf of the applicant, who addressed the Sub-Committee in relation to the application.
The Sub-Committee considered the views of Mr. McGregor, an objector to the application, who addressed the Sub-Committee in relation thereto.

**DECIDED** - That the planning application be referred to the Licensing and Regulatory Committee for determination and that Committee be advised that this Sub-Committee would be minded to grant planning permission.

**INSTALLATION OF A WIND TURBINE - FAR HEY HEAD FARM, CALDERBROOK ROAD, LITTLEBOROUGH**

45 The Service Director – Planning and Regulation reported on planning application no. 12/56249/FUL for the proposed installation of a single micro scale wind turbine (14.97 metres to hub, 5.6 metres diameter blades) at Far Hey Head Farm, Calderbrook Road, Littleborough.

The Sub-Committee considered the views of Mr. L. MacDonald, the agent acting on behalf of the applicant, who addressed the Sub-Committee in relation to the application.

The Sub-Committee considered the views of Mr. McGregor, an objector to the application, who addressed the Sub-Committee in relation thereto.

**DECIDED** - That the planning application be referred to the Licensing and Regulatory Committee for determination and that Committee be advised that this Sub-Committee would be minded to grant planning permission.

**CHANGE OF USE AND RELOCATION OF RESIDENTIAL PARKING AREA - CHANNING CHILD CARE, RAILWAY STREET, NEWHEY, ROCHDALE**

46 The Service Director – Planning and Regulation reported on planning application no. 12/56344/FUL for: the change of use of a ground floor flat to nursery accommodation; the change of use of the existing residential parking area to a children’s play area; and the relocation of a residential parking area to the north of premises at Channings Child Care, Railway Street, Newhey, Rochdale.

The Sub-Committee considered the views of Mr. Law, the agent acting on behalf of the applicant, who addressed the Sub-Committee in relation to the application.

The Sub-Committee considered the views of Mrs. D. Clark, an objector to the application, who addressed the Sub-Committee in relation thereto.

**DECIDED** - That planning permission be refused on the grounds that: the development adds to an existing car parking problem at this location, and if the application was to be approved it would create an unreasonable nuisance to local residents and highway safety.
PRESENT: Councillor Clegg (in the Chair); Councillors Brett, Darnbrough, Hartley, Mir, Martin Rodgers and Stott.

OFFICERS: R. Butler (Planning and Regulation Services), J. Gillighan (Operational Services) and P. Thompson (Corporate Services)

Also in Attendance: Eight members of the public.

Apologies for Absence: Councillor Kelly.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
47 In accordance with the Council’s Code of Conduct, Councillors Brett and Martin Rodgers each declared a personal and prejudicial interest in planning application number 12/56225/FUL (minute 48 below refers). The two Councillors left the meeting room for the consideration of, and determination of this planning application.

INSTALLATION OF A BAFFLE UNIT - MILNROW MOTOR COMPANY, LADYHOUSE WORKS, NEWHEY ROAD, MILNROW
48 The Service Director – Planning and Regulation reported on planning application no. 12/56225/FUL, for the proposed installation of a baffle unit and a replacement spray booth extraction flue including an acoustic enclosure (part retrospective).

The Sub-Committee considered the views of Mr. S. Hatchell who addressed the Sub-Committee on behalf of the objectors to the planning application.

The Sub-Committee also considered the views of Mr. M. Percy who addressed the Sub-Committee on behalf of the applicant.

DECIDED - That planning permission be refused.

ERECTION OF THREE STORY DWELLINGS - RIVERSIDE COURT, MADENS SQUARE, LITTLEBOROUGH
49 The Service Director – Planning and Regulation reported on planning application no. 12/56394/FUL, proposing the erection of three, three storey dwellings at Riverside Centre, Madens Square, Littleborough.

The Sub-Committee considered the views of Mr. M. Percy who addressed the meeting on behalf of the applicant.

DECIDED – that planning permission be granted, subject to the usual development control conditions and the additional conditions that:
(1) the developers make a suitable Open Space Contribution;
(2) the ground floor garage space be not converted into a residential area.

ERECTION OF A DETACHED BAR/SEATING SHELTER - WATERSIDE INN, INGHAMS LANE, LITTLEBOROUGH
50 The Service Director – Planning and Regulation reported on planning application no. 12/56401/FUL, proposing the erection of a detached bar/seating shelter, near to the side (north) elevation and the construction of a covered smoking
shelter to the north elevation (retrospective), at the Waterside Inn, Inghams Lane, Littleborough.

The Sub-Committee considered the views of Mr. M. Percy who addressed the meeting on behalf of the applicant.

DECIDED – that planning permission be granted, subject to the conditions detailed in the submitted report and the additional condition that: ‘the use of either structure, (other than for use as smoking shelters), is restricted to between noon and 23.30 hours’.
PRESENT:  Councillor Clegg (in the Chair); Councillors Brett, Martin Burke, Darnbrough, Hartley, Kelly, Mir and Stott.

Officers: R. Butler (Planning and Regulatory Service), J. Gillighan (Operational Services) and P. Thompson (Corporate Services)

Also in Attendance: Three members of the public.

Apologies for Absence: Councillor Martin Rodgers

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
51 In accordance with the Code of Conduct for Councillors and Voting Co-operative Members and the Code of Conduct for Members and Officers Dealing with Planning Matters, Councillor Clegg resigned from the Sub-Committee during consideration of submitted planning application 13/00133/FUL for the change of use of land and for the erection of fencing to create external dog-runs in association with the existing kennels and cattery business at Springbank Kennels, Birch Lane, Wardle, Rochdale in order to address the Sub-Committee in support of the application, and Councillor Clegg took no part in the determination of this planning application.

Councillor Brett in the Chair.

CHANGE OF USE - SPRINGBANK KENNELS, BIRCH HILL LANE, WARDLE
52 The Service Director – Planning and Regulation reported on planning application no. 13/00133/FUL, proposing a change of use of land and the erection of fencing to create external dog-runs in association with an existing kennels and cattery business (retrospective) at Springbank Kennels, Birch Hill Lane, Wardle, Rochdale.

The Service Director also advised the Sub-Committee of a revision to the published report in relation to this planning application; namely that the if the Sub-Committee was minded to grant planning permission the application should be referred on to the Licensing and Regulatory Committee in accordance with the Council’s Scheme of Delegation.

The Sub-Committee considered the views of Mr. M. Percy who addressed the Sub-Committee on behalf of the applicant.

The Sub-Committee also considered the views of Wardle and West Littlebrough Ward Member, Councillor Clegg, who addressed the Sub-Committee in support of the application.

The Sub-Committee also considered a letter of objection to this planning application, from residents of the nearest residential property to the application site, No. 1 Woodend, which was read out by Councillor Darnbrough.

DECIDED – That the Licensing and Regulatory Committee be informed that this Sub-Committee is minded to support the submitted planning application.
APPLICATION FOR WORKS TO TREES WITHIN A CONSERVATION AREA - CLEGG HALL ROAD, LITTLEBOROUGH

53 The Service Director – Planning and Regulation reported on application no. 13/00205/WTCA, proposing works to trees within a Conservation Area, namely to fell three Sycamore trees (T2, T3 and T10 on the submitted plan) and for various works to 12 Sycamore trees, seven Ash trees, two Lime trees and one Beech tree (T1 and T4 – T24 on the submitted plan), at Clegg Hall House, Clegg Hall Road, Littleborough.

DECIDED - That authorisation of the felling of three Sycamore trees (T2, T3 and T10 on the plan attached to the report) and for various works to 12 Sycamore trees, seven Ash trees, two Lime trees and one Beech tree (T1, T4 – T9 and T11 – 24 on the plan attached to the report) be approved.

PLANNING APPEALS

54 The Sub-Committee was notified that the planning appeal in respect of 8 Brookway, Littleborough (12/56018/HOUS) for a two storey side extension to a dwelling (resubmission of application no. D54672) had been allowed by the Planning Inspectorate.

DECIDED – That the report be noted.
## Agenda Item 8

**Subject:** Neighbourhood Planning – Designation of the proposed Littleborough Neighbourhood Area  
**Status:** For Decision

### Report to:

Pennines Township

### Date:

21 May 2013

### Report of:

Director of Economy and Environment – Mark Widdup

**Author:** Sohida Banu  
**Email:** Sohida.banu@rochdale.gov.uk  
**Tel:** 01706 924364

### Comments from Statutory Officers:

- Section 151 Officer
- Monitoring Officer

### Key Decision:

Yes

### Forward Plan

- General Exception
- Special Urgency

## 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To inform Members of the comments received following consultation on the proposed area boundary for the prospective Littleborough neighbourhood plan.

1.2 To seek Member approval for the designation of the Littleborough neighbourhood area boundary to support future preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

2.1 Township Committee approves the neighbourhood area proposed by Littleborough Civic Trust for designation, having regard to the representation made.

2.2 if approved, the boundary designation should be publicised on the Council’s website as soon as possible including a statement containing the name of the designated neighbourhood area, a map of the designated area and the name of the body who applied for the designation.

## MAIN TEXT INCLUDING ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED/ CONSULTATION CARRIED OUT
Alternatives considered

3.1 The Council is not obliged to accept the neighbourhood plan area being put forward in this case. However, if Members decided to refuse the designation of an area, the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations require that the Council publishes a statement of the reasons for making that decision. In the event of such a decision, it is therefore important that the Township Committee sets out clear reasons why the decision has been made.

3.2 Section 61G (5) of the Localism Act 2011 also requires that if the Council decides to refuse the application because it considers that the specified area is not an appropriate area to be designated as a neighbourhood area, the Council must exercise their power of designation so as to secure that some or all of the specified area forms part of one or more areas designated (or to be designated) as neighbourhood areas. The effect of this provision is therefore that if members decided to refuse the application then the Council would need to have alternative proposals for the boundaries of the neighbourhood area(s) and must use its powers to designate them.

3.3 Such a decision would also be likely to delay the production of the Neighbourhood Plan and the ability for members of the local community to come together to create a neighbourhood forum.

Consultation undertaken

3.4 The Council has undertaken public consultation to publicise the boundary for the proposed Littleborough neighbourhood area application for a period of six weeks between 20 March and 30 April 2013. The consultation undertaken by the Council was sufficient to cover the duties imposed under the Localism Act and The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

Background

3.5 The Localism Act 2011 introduced new processes for communities to get involved in planning for their areas through the preparation of neighbourhood development plans and neighbourhood development orders. The powers came into force on 1 April 2012 with the publication of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. This has provided local communities through parish councils or neighbourhood forums, the opportunity to shape and encourage delivery of new development in their area.

3.6 A neighbourhood development plan sets out planning policies in relation to the development and use of land in a particular neighbourhood area specified by the plan. It can cover a range of issues from design statements to master planning. Neighbourhood Development Plans can be used to bring forward sustainable development and growth within the area specified within the Plan. They will not be able to prevent development in an area - they can only include proposals for an equal (or greater) amount of growth that is set out in the local authority's Local Plan.

3.7 Littleborough Civic Trust made an application to designate the proposed area boundary in February 2013. This was the first stage in the process of preparing a Neighbourhood Development Plan. The area chosen was based on the historical Littleborough Urban District Council (UDC) boundary. It was felt that this boundary reflected the community in Littleborough. Wardle, Milnrow and other parts of the Pennines Township were not included because they were
considered too large an area and would involve a number of communities rather than just one.

3.8 The application by Littleborough Civic Trust for the designation of the proposed area as the neighbourhood area for a prospective Littleborough Neighbourhood Development Plan consisted of two letters of intent and a map (see appendix 2).

3.9 Members approved the area application at the Pennines Township Committee on the 5 March 2013 for a statutory six weeks public consultation in order to get comments on the proposed area boundary from residents, business and other interested parties in the proposed Littleborough area.

Public consultation on the proposed Littleborough neighbourhood area

3.10 Consultation on the Proposed Littleborough neighbourhood area ran from Wednesday 20 March to Friday 30 April 2013 and was publicised in accordance with regulation 6 of the Neighbourhood and Planning (General) Regulations 2012. In addition, there was a press release in the Rochdale Observer on 9 March 2013 setting out details of the plan process and how to get involved. Also, a copy of the area application was sent to all the libraries in the Pennines Township.

3.11 Littleborough Civic Trust during the process sent a letter and leaflet with information about the consultation to a number of business premises in proposed Littleborough area. They have also been raising awareness of the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan and have been gaining support for the creation of a neighbourhood forum. This includes some informal meeting with residents and businesses within the proposed neighbourhood area.

Responses to the Consultation

3.12 At the close of the consultation, the Council had received responses from twenty six local residents on the boundary of the proposed Neighbourhood Area in Littleborough. A summary of consultation responses to the Littleborough neighbourhood area application can be found in Appendix 1 at the end of the report.

3.13 The consultation paper asked two questions in relation to the proposed Neighbourhood Area. This was whether the proposed boundary of the Littleborough Neighbourhood Area that will comprise the neighbourhood development plan was appropriate. If not, then how could the boundary be altered and the reasons for any alteration in that case.

3.14 There were twenty two comments from local residents expressing support for the boundary of the proposed Neighbourhood Area.

3.15 There were two comments from local residents objecting to the suggested plan the boundary. Their concern was that the neighbourhood area should reflect the local authority boundaries and relate directly to the electoral areas i.e. wards.

3.16 There was one comment that did not make clear whether it supported or objected to the boundary, however it did raise similar concerns about the neighbourhood area being reflective of the electoral boundaries. Finally,
Decision making

3.17 The issue is whether or not the specified area is an ‘appropriate area to be designated as a Neighbourhood Area’.

3.18 This is the first neighbourhood area application made to the Council and so, in determining this application, there are no conflicts with other neighbourhood areas designated under section 61G(4)(b) of the Act.

3.19 The reasons explaining why this specified area is considered appropriate are set out in the application for designation itself and the application for designation has been publicised in accordance with Regulation 6 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012.

3.20 There were twenty two comments from local residents expressing support for the boundary of the proposed Neighbourhood Area. However, there were three people who expressed their concern about the neighbourhood area and how it should reflect the local authority boundaries and relate directly to the electoral areas represented for those areas.

3.21 A neighbourhood area can be based on an administrative boundary such as an electoral ward, but this is not necessary, particularly, if it does not coincide with what is considered as a neighbourhood by local people.

3.22 The proposed Neighbourhood area accords with the former Littleborough Urban District Council boundary – which was subsequently taken as a boundary for the development of the Littleborough Town Design Statement. Given general support for the area following consultation, and as the proposed area follows that previously utilised by the Council for an adopted planning document, it is considered that the designation of the boundary as publicised is reasonable and should be supported in this case.

3.23 If the application is approved, then Regulation 7(1) of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 requires the designation to be publicised. If the application is refused, reasons must be given under section 61G(9) of the 1990 Act and Regulation 7(2) of the Regulations requires the decision to be publicised. However, in this instance, the Council will exercise their power of designation so as to secure that some or all of the specified area forms part of one or more areas designated (or to be designated) as neighbourhood areas.

Next steps – application for a Neighbourhood Forum and preparing a Neighbourhood Plan

3.24 If it is deemed appropriate to designate the proposed area boundary as the neighbourhood area for a prospective Littleborough Neighbourhood
Development Plan, then the process of designating Littleborough Civic Trust, or any other body which may come together, as the neighbourhood forum may begin. (Stage 2). A separate report will be prepared for this and a decision will be sought by Members once a relevant forum application is submitted. Only a properly designated neighbourhood forum which meets the conditions prescribed within statute and regulations may prepare a neighbourhood development plan for a designated neighbourhood area.

3.25 The neighbourhood development plan will set out a vision for the designated neighbourhood area and include planning policies for the use and development of land at a local rather than strategic level. For example it could plan for growth and cover where new shops, offices or homes should be developed and what green spaces should be protected. The plan should be compatible with national policies and any Council policies in the Local Plan. It should be focused on guiding development rather than stopping it and crucially cannot propose less development within the plan area than may be proposed within the Council’s development plan. If adopted it will become a statutory plan and can then be used in making decisions on planning applications.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 There are no specific financial implications arising from the recommendations within this report or for the Council’s involvement in the process at this stage. Going forward, the costs to the Council will depend on the nature and scale of help and support provided and the ability of community groups to contribute financially to the process or obtain further funding to support the plan preparation. Anecdotally, information from pilot neighbourhood areas indicate the costs of plan preparation area considerable and much falls on the local community to commit or secure resources for the project. The duty to support does not require the Council to give financial assistance to a designated neighbourhood forum unless it chooses to do so. Currently, the Government has suggested funds will be made available to authorities to cover the costs of the independent check and referendum but no details are yet available. It is not possible to provide an authoritative estimate of the total costs involved in preparing a plan.

4.2 It is expected that further reports will be presented to Members setting out any financial implications to the Council, in the event that a neighbourhood plan for the area is progressed.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 It is considered that the request received from the Littleborough Civic Trust is valid and meets the legal requirements of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Further reports would need to be presented to Members for decision on the proposed area forum for a prospective Littleborough Neighbourhood Development Plan.

6. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 Much of the work associated with plan preparation is to be undertaken by the local community rather than the Council. However, it is clear that this process will require some staff input from Planning, Legal, Township and other services. Work specifically to support the designation and consultation of the proposed
area boundary and area forum respectively can be met from within existing staffing resources.

7. CORPORATE AND TOWNSHIP PRIORITIES

7.1 Any neighbourhood development plan must take into account and reflect the priorities and policies in other local plan guidance and strategies for the Council, including the emerging Core Strategy and other corporate strategies of the Council. In preparing a neighbourhood development plan consideration must be given to current Township priorities at the time of preparation. This will clearly be critical to the Council’s acceptance of any neighbourhood development plan for the Littleborough area.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS

8.1 All the issues raised and the recommendation(s) in this report involve risk considerations as set out below:

- Local communities will be required to show that they are able to accommodate requirements for growth and development in their areas in accordance with the Local Plan. If they simply seek to prevent development, current Guidance indicates the Plan will not succeed at an independent examination.
- Resourcing neighbourhood planning forums and neighbourhood planning areas is likely to be an issue faced by communities and authorities. It is noted that much of the work and resource will fall to be undertaken by the designated neighbourhood forum itself.
- Based on national feedback elsewhere, the preparation of neighbourhood development plans appears to be a lengthy and resource intensive process. Further reports setting out any resource or risk implications would need to be presented to Township for Members consideration.

9. EQUALITIES IMPACTS

9.1 Workforce Equality Impacts Assessment

There are no workforce equality issues arising from this report at this stage of the process.
9.2 Equality/Community Impact Assessments

There are no equality/community issues arising from this report at this stage of the process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Place of Inspection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of consultation responses to the Littleborough neighbourhood area application</td>
<td>Members’ Group Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Map of the area application</td>
<td>Members’ Group Rooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter of intent</td>
<td>Members’ Group Rooms</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1 - Summary of consultation responses to the Littleborough neighbourhood area application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Do you consider that the proposed boundary of the area that will comprise the Neighbourhood Development Plan is appropriate?</th>
<th>If not, how would you suggest the boundary is altered and why?</th>
<th>Interest in area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Iain Spencer Gerrard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 N Eves</td>
<td>Yes, that is Littleborough.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 D Taylor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident and business owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Susan Taylor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 J Smith</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 A J Smith</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 John F Kay</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Helen Mavis Evans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Scott Warburton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident and business owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Iain Bowden</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Rachel E Cropper</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Barry Cropper</td>
<td>Yes, I could not agree more that the historical boundaries of the former UDC are wholly appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident, Vice Chairman FOHL, member of Littleborough Historical and Archaeological Society, attend Canalside Development Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Elizabeth Cropper</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 John Kershaw</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident, Business owner and Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Peter Ernest Evans</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Darlene Greenwood</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident and Member of the Hollingworth Lake Rowing Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 June Gordon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Maurice Gordon</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Michael Millen</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Roger H Davis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident, Member of Littleborough Canalside Development Group and Friends of Hollingworth Lake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Cynthia Davis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident, Member of Littleborough Canalside Development Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 P Johnson</td>
<td>I live on a new housing estate and I do not understand the suggested boundary. I think it is better to stick to election boundaries because people understand these.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 M L Edwards</td>
<td>No, I consider that if the new Forum is to speak on Planning matters it should relate to current Local Authority boundaries. As above, I consider that the boundaries should relate to Local Authority boundaries and also relate directly to the democratically elected councillors for those areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Bernice Clifton</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>I believe that the proposed boundary should match existing local authority and electoral boundaries. Another set of boundaries will be confusing to residents and impair efficient consultation with electoral representatives. Previous Urban District Council boundaries are nearly 40 years out of date with many present administrations and organisations of services, facilities, local government, transport etc.</td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 James Stanton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 United Utilities</td>
<td>No specific comments to make at this stage, but please see covering letter (available on request). However, they would like to be included in the drafting of the Neighbourhood Area Plan and any Neighbourhood Development Orders or Community Right to Build Orders.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Business owner, Landowner, Work in the area, Utility infrastructure provider</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Mr Robinson,

NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM FOR LITTLEBOROUGH

Our Chairman, Dan Taylor and I would like to thank you for the meeting held last Thursday in your office when the above was discussed.

At the meeting it was agreed that the setting up of a neighbourhood forum would first require a plan showing the area proposed to be covered by the forum. The area of the old Littleborough Urban District was suggested by us and you were happy to take this on board as a start of the process. You offered to provide a suitable plan of the area with the old boundary marked on it.

It was proposed by you that this map, along with a statement of intent by us, would be taken to the next Pennines Committee meeting for its approval. This letter can be taken as a statement of intent in that, in collaboration with you, we wish to begin the process of creating a neighbourhood forum for Littleborough with the purpose of that forum then developing a neighbourhood plan.

A third requirement, not discussed at the meeting, but subsequently pointed out to us by Sohida Banu, is that the person or body proposing to set up a neighbourhood forum should be a ‘qualifying’ body i.e. capable of initiating the process and carrying it through to the point where the new forum can assume responsibility for itself.
Littleborough Civic Trust has now been active for 40 years. It was responsible for the research and surveys which led to the publication of a report on 'A Country Park and a Regional Park' and which led directly to the setting up of the Hollingworth Lake Country Park. It has been involved with the 'saving' of the old coach house of the Falcon Inn, Littleborough and the renovation of it to become the tourism information centre and arts centre for Littleborough now known as the Coach House Heritage Centre. In addition to many other beneficial events we wrote and published 'The Story of Littleborough' with the profits going to six local charities or societies. In conjunction with the Countryside Agency and with a grant from them totalling £25,000 we involved all the people of Littleborough in a project which researched on a large scale the history, present situation and future needs of the town. The results of this work were finally published as the Littleborough Town Design Statement which was accepted in its entirety by Rochdale Council with relevant parts becoming a Statutory Planning Document which is attached to the Unitary Development Plan and will be attached to the forthcoming Local Development Plan.

We hope that this clearly shows the collective capabilities of the Trust, as a group proposing a forum, are sufficient to carry out the necessary work involved in this enterprise. I would emphasise that Littleborough Civic Trust is not putting itself forward entirely as the neighbourhood forum other than that someone from the Trust would probably wish to be a part of it.

Yours sincerely,

Iain S Gerrard (Secretary)
31 January 2013

Mr Mark Robinson
Chief Planning Officer
PO Box 32
Telegraph House
Bailie Street
Rochdale
Lancashire
OL16 1JH

Dear Mr Robinson,

NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM FOR LITTLEBOROUGH

It has been suggested that we give a reasoned argument for the choice of the old boundary of Littleborough to delineate the area of interest for a forum.

We initially chose it because it was the same boundary which defines our own area of interest. However we feel it is a good choice, independent of that reason, because it indicates the historical boundary of a community, that of Littleborough town. We have not included Wardle or Milnrow or other parts of the Pennines Township because we feel this would be far too large an area and would involve a number of communities rather than just one.

It has also been suggested that the present council boundaries might be considered more appropriate by some. We would argue against this as these areas were designed to give councillors an approximately equal number of constituents for which they would have responsibility and had nothing to do with communities as such; indeed Littleborough has been bisected by one such boundary in a manner which bears no relationship to any historical boundaries.

We understand from advice available from Locality that if there was a parish council in existence it could be considered as suitable to become a neighbourhood forum. Littleborough never had a parish council as such but did have a council when it was a designated urban district. The Urban District was in existence for at least 75 years and clearly represented a long-standing community and this is the area we felt was suitable in this case.

Yours sincerely,

lain S Gerrard (Secretary)
1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The report briefly describes Pennines Township Area Forums and the work undertaken during 2012/13 and priorities for 2013/14. The report recommends that the purpose and function of forums in the Townships is reviewed during 2013/14.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Committee notes the work undertaken by the 2 Area Forums during 2012/13 in Appendix A.

2.2 Committee considers and agrees the main priority for the work of the Forums during 2013/14 stated in paragraph 3.3.

2.3 Committee agrees to review the purpose and function of Area Forums in Pennines Township during 2013/14.

3. MAIN TEXT INCLUDING ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED/CONSULTATION CARRIED OUT

3.1 The Area Forums established by Pennines Township Committee require arranging, organising. this includes:

- Smallbridge and Firgrove Area Forum.
- Milnrow and Newhey Area Forum.

Both Forums meet quarterly and the minutes from the meetings are notes by Pennines Township Committee.

3.2 The role of the Township Management Officer is to coordinate and progress actions agreed at the meetings, the number of these can range from 5 to 20 actions per meeting.

3.3 It is important to continually review the Area Forums. During 2013/14 the main priorities for the work of the forums are:

- To involve local people in determining and reviewing priorities for the Township Plan.
- To agree and work to an Action plan for each of the forums during 2013/14
- To look at the purpose and function of forums in Pennines Township and any opportunities for working with communities in the remaining 2 wards (Littleborough Lakeside and Wardle and West Littleborough).

Improvements specific to each forum are identified in Appendix A
4 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

4.1 Members may wish to consider the alternative of having no forum meetings during 2013/14. This would reduce the work of the Township office; however the forums do have a role in involving local people in decision making; monitoring and developing projects and facilitating devolution.

5 CONSULTATION PROPOSED/ UNDERTAKEN

5.1 The development and improvement of the Area Forums in Pennines is based on continual dialogue, consultation and agreement with ward members and local people about the main issues in their areas. The forums and provide an opportunity to raise issues with Pennines councillors in the 2 wards (Smallbridge and Firgrove and Milnrow and Newhey).

6. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 There is a cost associated with holding forums on the Township; it is the cost of room hire. The estimated cost of room hire for 2 forums held 4 times a year is £340. A budget has been identified to cover these costs.

7. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

8. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The report describes work which will be undertaken by existing staff.

9. CORPORATE AND TOWNSHIP PRIORITIES

9.1 The report addresses the objectives of the Pennines Township Plan by ensuring a mechanism by which we can continue to work with communities and elected members to ensure that their priorities are reflected within the Plan.

9.2 The Vision and Blueprint for Rochdale Council 2014/15 retains Township Committees and will devolve a range of services to Township direction, managed through annual Township Plans which are reviewed on a quarterly basis.

10. RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The key risk for 2013/14 is the pressure on staff resources it is suggested that the purpose and function of Area Forum in Pennines Township are reviewed during 2013/14.

11 EQUALITIES IMPACTS

11.1 Workforce Equality Impacts Assessment

There are no (significant) workforce equality issues arising from this report.

11.2 Equality/Community Impact Assessments

There are no (significant) equality/community issues arising from this report.
**1. Statistical Information**

1.1 The number of Forums in 2012/13 was 2.
1.2 The number of meetings per Forum during 2012/13 was 4.
1.3 The number of attendees per meeting during 2012/13 ranged from 3 to 29 people per meeting.
1.4 The total number of issues raised and followed up at each meeting during 2012/13 ranged from 2 – 17.
1.5 The most common issues raised across all forums during 2012/13 were: Anti-social behaviour, Traffic/parking issues and Environmental Issues (e.g. dog fouling, weeds, Litter/Fly-tipping).

**2. Qualitative Information**

### 2.1 Milnrow and Newhey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of Forum</th>
<th>Public meeting attended mainly by individual members of the local community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency and time for meetings</td>
<td>Four times per year. 7pm onwards Thursday evenings, held at Newhey Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGM</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Officers</td>
<td>Chair (informal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Involvement</td>
<td>Guiding facilitator, sending out minutes/invitations, taking and writing up minutes, following up queries and complaints, organising presentations from agencies, publicity, arranging venues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Positive points
- Good councillor involvement.
- Attendees keen to participate.
- Mechanism for consulting local residents.

#### Difficulties
- Dominated by traffic and environmental issues, some requiring long term solutions.
- Little consultation and communication with Metro.
- Questions submitted on day so don’t always have the answer.
- Weather dependant.

#### Progress in past year
- Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub-Committee approved funding for the restoration of Milnrow Clock.
- Community led speed watch scheme rolled out in Milnrow.

#### What more can be done to improve the Forum
- Officer participation from Highways.
- Increase Community Engagement work.

#### Main issues
- Metro, HGV using Klin Lane/Wildhouse Lane, Traffic in surrounding areas, Residents Parking Scheme, Repairing of Milnrow Clock, Litter, Dog Fouling, Community Speed Watch, CCTV

#### What support is needed?
- Attendance by Highways Officers

#### Key Aims
- Encourage Chair to tighten up agenda
- Continue to publicise to encourage ward-wide representation
### 2.2 Smallbridge and Firgrove

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure of Forum</th>
<th>Public meeting attended mainly by individual members of the local community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency and time for meetings</td>
<td>Four times per year. 6.30pm onwards Thursday evenings, alternating venues between Smallbridge &amp; Firgrove</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitution</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGM</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Officers</td>
<td>Chair (Informal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Involvement</td>
<td>Guiding facilitator, sending out minutes/invitations, taking and writing up minutes, following up queries and complaints, organising presentations from agencies, publicity, arranging venues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Positive points
- Friends of Community and Leisure Association and the Smallbridge Tenants and Residents Association utilise the meeting to let people know what is going on in the area.
- Good councillor involvement. Attendees keen to participate.
- Regular Police Attendance.
- Mechanism for consulting local residents.
- Residents have asked for the number of meetings to be increased.

#### Difficulties
- Questions submitted on day so don’t always have the answer.
- Similar issues are raised at each forum.
- Dominated by issues in areas where there are limited resources and funding e.g. Environmental Management Services.
- Attendance levels vary depending on the weather.

#### Progress in past year
- ‘Grot spot’ areas identified by forum. On EM list to be tackled.
- Forum identified traffic issues in the ward. GMP have identified areas and are monitoring closely
- Members of the forum took part in an Environmental Project on Stevenson Square.

#### What more can be done to improve the Forum
- Increase Community Engagement work. Move the forum to a more central location for Smallbridge and Firgrove areas.

#### Main issues
- PACT Meetings, litter/fly-tipping, Dog Fouling, Traffic in surrounding areas, Cutting of grass/weeds, Shop Leases at Stevenson Square, ASB, Highways issues such as, replacing of railings and the painting of lines.

#### What support is needed?
- Attendance by Highways Officers

#### Key Aims
- Continue to publicise to encourage ward-wide representation
- Encourage questions to be submitted in advance.
- Identify regular Chair
- Establish new venue following consultation with Members of the forum
## 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 The report reviews the work of the Pennines Township Service Groups during 2012/13 and includes a recommendation for a new ways of working for 2013/2014.

## 2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Committee notes the Service Group work undertaken during 2012/13 (Table 1).

2.2 Committee considers and agrees to a proposal to combine the People and Place Service Group with the incorporation of a Pennines Township informal scrutiny function as outlined in paragraph 3.5.

## 3. MAIN TEXT

3.1 Pennines Township has three service groups (People, Place & Highways); four elected members are appointed to each. The purpose of the Service Group meetings is for Council Services to inform and seek instruction on current and future activity.

3.2 Service Directors or service representatives are invited to provide a 15-30 minute briefing. Table 1 highlight the topics and issues raised over 2012/13.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>People Service Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Service</td>
<td>- Usage of libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Integration of customer services into libraries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Book Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- School Holiday provision e.g. summer reading club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Youth sessions in Smallbridge Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Saving proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Community activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Service</td>
<td>- Increase Youth Club Provision e.g. Littleborough Youth Club and Firgrove Pavilion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Detached work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Residential projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Safe4Summer campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Delivery of services through the Youth Bus Partnership working with the Library Service and Sports services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link4Life</td>
<td>- Usage of sport facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Lady Alice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sunsport- sport and leisure activities for young disabled people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Arts and heritage provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Apprenticeship academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety</td>
<td>- CCTV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Crime Statistics for the Township</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Saving proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- ASB, criminal damage, vehicle crime, robberies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Perceptions of crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place Service Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Services</td>
<td>- Funding for Street Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Weeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Monitoring of ‘Grot Spot’ areas submitted by members and the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Waste Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Green Flag Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Regulations</td>
<td>- Railway Arches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Akzo Nobel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Flooding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Section 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Planning applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Neighbourhood planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Housing</td>
<td>- Dean Street Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Flood protection for properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Empty Properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stock Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>- Information boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Pennines Tourism and Business Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Manchester Countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highways Service Group</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highways</td>
<td>- HIP Programme for 2013/15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Highways Capital programme 2013/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Residents Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Road Markings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- General updates on specific highway schemes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 20mph School Zones</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 In each calendar year, there are four meetings per service group. In 2012/13 due to attendance, one Place Service Group meeting was cancelled. Two Highways meeting were also cancelled however were replaced by two meetings specifically to discuss the HIP Programme for 2013/15 and Highways Capital Programme 2013/14. The People and Place Service Group meetings scheduled for March were combined.

3.4 As part of this review members are asked to consider:
- The number of meetings per year, currently it is 12 meeting
- The involvement of members – membership is 4 members per group
- The effectiveness of the groups in progressing issues and receiving updates.

3.5 Improvements can be made by:
- Combining the People and Place Service Groups with the introduction of an informal overview and scrutiny function.
- Arranging meetings as required to meet the need to disseminate information and seek instruction arises.
- Inviting all Pennines Township councillors to the service group meetings

3.6 These improvements will:
- Reduce the number of meetings per year
- Include all councillors
- Enable the groups to receive a wider range of service updates
- The introduction of an informal overview and scrutiny function means that members can ensure that local service delivery is monitored effectively.
- Enable members to explore the potential for increasing devolution to the Township Committee
- Lead to more effective dissemination of information to members.
- Enable services to hold informal discussions with all members on potential schemes before being presented to the Pennines Township Committee for decision.

4  Alternatives considered

4.1 The alternative of no service group meetings is considered to be detrimental to the Township Committee engaging with services and ensuring local service delivery. The improvements suggested will provide a more effective way of working in partnership with Council services and partners.

5  Consultation proposed/undertaken

5.1 The Service Group meetings are based on consultation and agreement with the elected members.

6.  FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 There are no direct financial implications to this report.

7.  LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

8.  PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 The report describes work which will be undertaken by existing staff.

9.  CORPORATE AND TOWNSHIP PRIORITIES
9.1 The report highlights activities undertaken to meet Township priorities under the scrutiny of elected members.

9.2 The Vision and Blueprint for Rochdale Council 2014/15 retains Township Committees and will devolve a range of services to Township direction, managed through annual Township Plans which are reviewed on a quarterly basis.

10. RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS

10.1 There are no specific risk issues for members to consider arising from this report.

11 EQUALITIES IMPACTS

11.1 Workforce Equality Impacts Assessment

There are no (significant) workforce equality issues arising from this report.

11.2 Equality/Community Impact Assessments

There are no (significant) equality/community issues arising from this report.
1. PURPOSE OF REPORT
The recommendations are presented to enable the Committee to confirm its delegated decision making arrangements for the 2013/14 Municipal Year.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS
2.1 The Committee confirm the Sub-Committee structure of the Pennines Township Committee, comprising the Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub-Committee and the Pennines Township Planning Sub-Committee.

2.2 The Committee approves the delegation arrangements to the Pennines Township Delegated & Funding Sub-Committee, as contained within the Scheme of Delegation to Township Committees and detailed in Appendix 1 to this report.

2.3 The delegation arrangements to the Pennines Township Planning Sub-Committee, as contained within the Development Control Scheme of the Council’s Constitution, be noted.

3. ALTERNATIVES AND RISKS CONSIDERED
3.1 Township Committee, if so minded, could resolve to maintain arrangements as confirmed by the Township Committee on 24th May 2011, or adopt alternative Sub-Committee arrangements, in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation to Township Committees of the Council’s Constitution.

3.2 To not approve delegation arrangements could delay decisions being made by Township Committee and Sub-Committees.

4. BACKGROUND
4.1 Pennines Township Delegated Sub-Committee - the Sub-Committee currently exercises formal powers as detailed at Appendix 1, derived from the Scheme of Delegation as a Committee for dealing with ‘urgent’ issues on behalf of the Township Committee and for making grant approvals and decisions on devolved budgets and Township Funds.
4.2 Pennines Township Planning Sub-Committee - the Sub-Committee works to a
degulation scheme contained within the Council's Development Control Scheme, and powers
are directly delegated by Council to the Sub-Committee.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
There are no direct financial implications to this report.

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS
The Committee is being asked to confirm its delegation arrangements to ensure that decisions
are made in accordance with relevant and statutory procedural requirements.

7. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS
There are no personnel implications to this report.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT
There no specific risks associated with this report

9. EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS
None

BACK GROUND PAPERS
There are no background papers to this report.
APPENDIX 1

PENNINES TOWNSHIP DELEGATED & FUNDING SUB-COMMITTEE

TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. To receive and consider the minutes arising from meetings of the Ward/Area Forms and other Township Working Parties and related bodies, referring matter of concern to the Township Committee.

2. To exercise the following delegated powers as provided in the Scheme of Delegation to Township Committees
   A. Determination of objections/representations in respect of the Appointment of Hackney Carriage Stands
   B. Urgent designation of a Conservation Area
   C. To deal with urgent matters within the remit of the Pennines Township Committee

3. To exercise under delegated powers the following powers of the Pennines Township Committee (as contained within the Scheme of Delegation to Township Committees)
   A. Confirmation of Traffic Regulation Orders which are the subject of objection by persons directly affected by the proposal (i.e. in occupation of premises in the immediate vicinity of the proposal)
   B. Closures or diversions of highways, including footpaths and bridleways, deemed to be contentious by the Director of Highways and Engineering
   C. Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, S.9)
   D. Traffic regulation for special areas, for example, Country Park (Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, S.22)
   E. Pedestrian crossings, for example, pelican and zebra crossings (Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, S.23)
   F. Street playgrounds (Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, S.29)
   G. Byelaws for street playgrounds (Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, S.31)
   H. Installation of road humps which are the subject of significant objections by people directly affected (as determined by the Director of Highways and Engineering)
      (i) The private street works code
      (ii) General
      (iii) The advance payment code
   J. Power to determine applications to make Orders under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to add footpaths to the Definitive Map
   K. Power to make Footpath Creation Orders under the Highways Act 1980 S.26
   L. Reclassification of roads used as public paths under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981
   M. Power to designate public footpaths as cycle tracks under the Cycle Tracks Act 1984
   N. Consideration of any other matter that may be referred to the Township relating to the regulation of highways, footpaths, bridleways etc.
4. To have full responsibility for all aspects of devolution (including any related delegated budgets and Township Funds) and the implementation and development of the Township Plan.

5. To receive reports from 'devolved' and 'influenced' Services detailing their response to the Township priorities in the Township Plan and the development of their respective Service Plans to reflect those priorities.

6. To monitor budgets delegated to the Township level (including Township Funds), to ensure that all requirements and restrictions placed on any devolved funding are met or are capable of being met before any decisions are made.

7. To consider and comment on quarterly monitoring reports on devolved funding with a subsequent report to Pennines Township Committee.

8. To consider and determine all applications/ proposals to the Township Funds, ensuring that all requirements and restrictions placed on any devolved funding are met, or capable of being met, before any decisions are made.
1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To consider the appointments, for the 2013/14 Municipal Year of the Chair and Vice Chair of the Township Sub-Committees; the appointment of Members to Pennines Township’s Sub-Committees; and the appointment to various Working Groups and Other Bodies.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 The Township Committee determine the appointment of the Vice Chair of the Township Committee;

2.2 The Township Committee consider the composition and appointments of Members to the Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub-Committee and the Pennines Township Planning Sub-Committee;

2.3 The Township Committee considers the appointment of Chair and Vice Chair of the above mentioned Sub-Committees;

2.4 The Township Committee appoint Members to the Township Working Groups/Forums;

2.5 The Township Committee appoint Members various “Other Bodies” as detailed in paragraph.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1 At the Council meeting held on 18th May 2011 Council resolved that the allowances of the Chairs of Planning Sub-Committees be merged with those of Vice-Chairs of Township Committees.

3.2 Members are asked to make appointments of Chair, Vice-Chair, Members and Substitutes to Township Sub-Committees. In relation to the appointment of Substitute Members, the Committee are asked to note that the number of substitute Members appointed by a Political Group to any Committee or Sub-Committee should not exceed the number of ordinary seats held by that Group on that Committee or Sub-Committee, or three Substitute Members in total.
(a) **Pennines Township Delegated & Funding Sub-Committee**  
The Sub-Committee exercises either delegated powers or acts on any matter within the Committee’s Terms of Reference on which it is essential to take a decision. Members are requested to determine the composition of the Sub-Committee, the 2012/13 membership comprised eight Members and four substitute Members as follows: -  
Councillor Hussain (Chair)  
Councillor Clegg (Vice-Chair)  
Councillor Brett  
Councillor Dearnley  
Councillor Hartley  
Councillor Kelly  
Councillor Mills  
Councillor Mir  
*Substitute Members*: Councillors Martin Burke, Darnbrough, Stott and Martin Rodgers.  

Members are also requested to formally appoint the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Sub-Committee.

(b) **Pennines Township Planning Sub-Committee**  
In 2012/13 eight Members (on the basis of 2 Members per Ward) and three substitute Members were appointed to the Pennines Township Planning Sub-Committee as follows: -  
Councillor Clegg (Chair)  
Councillor Brett (Vice Chair)  
Councillor Darnbrough  
Councillor Kelly  
Councillor Mir  
Councillor Stott  
Councillor Hartley  
Councillor Rodgers  
*Substitute Members*: Councillors Mills, Martin Burke, Dearnley and Hussain.  

Members are requested to formally appoint the Sub-Committee and a Chair and Vice-Chair and considered the composition of the Sub-Committee.

### 3.2 Working Groups:  
Members are requested to consider appointments to the following Working Groups/meetings.

(a) **Ward Area Forum Meetings**  
The three Ward Members attend, as available, their respective Ward Forums.

(b) **Township Services Groups**  
To appoint to each of three Township Services Groups, the Groups to consider devolved and influenced services as listed in the table below, grouped in line with the Township priorities: –

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Groupings</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Highways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Devolved Libraries</td>
<td>Environmental Management</td>
<td>Highways &amp; Engineering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 In 2011/2012 the membership of the Township Service Groups comprised four Members (appointed on the basis of one Member per ward) as follows:

(a) Service Group 1 (People) - Councillors Mir, Darnbrough, Stott and Martin Rodgers.
(b) Service Group 2 (Place) - Councillors Clegg, Kelly, Hussain and Mills.
(c) Service Group 3 (Highways) - Councillor Martin Burke, Hartley, Dearnley and Brett.

At the meeting of the Township Committee held 25th May 2010, the Committee decided that substitute members of each of the above Service Groups could be drawn from any other Pennines Township Member.

3.5 **Other Bodies**

Members are requested to consider appointments to the following bodies:

(a) Ellenroad Trust Limited
The Pennines Township Committee is requested to appoint four Trustees to the Ellenroad Trust Limited. Councillors Brett, Kelly, Martin Rodgers and Stott were appointed in 2012/13.

(b) MoorEnd Development Trust
The Township Committee is requested to appoint a representative to the Trust's Committee of Management in compliance with the MoorEnd Development Trust's Memorandum and Articles of Association, and in 2012/2013 Councillor Brett was appointed.

(c) Township Older Person’s Champion
The Township Committee is requested to appoint one Member to serve as the Township Older Persons Champion. In 2012/13 this was Councillor Darnbrough.

(d) Visit Rochdale Borough Group
The Township Committee is asked to appoint one Member to the Visit Rochdale Borough Group, and in 2012/13 Councillor Kelly was appointed.

4. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 There are no financial implications to this report.

5. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 The appointment of Sub-Committees is required to enable the undertaking of delegated Council functions and the Constitution of the Council requires the Township Committee to appoint Chairs and Vice Chairs of Sub-Committees.

6. **PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 There are no personnel implications to this report.
7. **RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS**
   7.1 Not applicable.

8. **EQUALITIES IMPACTS**
   8.1 None

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**
There are no background papers to this report.
1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 A review of revenue and capital expenditure during 2012/13 and provide options for the allocation of funds in 2013/14.

1.2 Members to approve Pennines Township Funds terms and conditions, and agree delegation arrangements concerning funding decisions.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Members note the expenditure, commitments and balances for Pennines Township revenue and capital funds at financial year end 2012/13 (Appendix 1 and 2).

2.2 Members note the findings of the review of Township Funds 2012/13 (Appendix 3) and feedback received to date on projects funded during 2012/13 (Appendix 3a).

2.3 Members approve the allocation of Pennines Township Funds to funding streams in 2013/14 as detailed in Appendix 4.

2.4 Members approve the terms and conditions for Pennines Township revenue and capital funds for 2013/14 (Appendix 5).

2.5 Members agree to the delegation arrangements for Pennines Township Funds 2013/14 as detailed in 3.5 of this report.

2.6 Members agree any unspent funds be reallocated to a central revenue or capital funding stream as appropriate before year end to enable Members to spend/commit all Pennines Township Funds during 2013/14 financial year.

2.7 Reasons for recommendation
Management of the Pennines Township Fund is delegated to the Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub Committee.

Pennines Township Funds are allocated to projects/schemes that benefit the Township’s community and environment, and realise the Township priorities.

To enable Committee to monitor and review the use of the Pennines Township Funds to ensure continued efficient and effective use of Township Funds.

3. PENNINES TOWNSHIP FUNDS

3.1 Members note expenditure, commitments and balances for Pennines Township revenue and capital funds 2012/13 (Appendix 1 and 2). The final outturn for financial year 2012/13 as agreed with Accountancy will be reported to the next scheduled funding committee.

3.2 A review of Pennines Township revenue and capital funds has been undertaken (Appendix 3). Evaluation of projects provides useful information to the Township Office relating to identifying the effectiveness of the application process and management of grants; whether projects deliver value for money; applicants achieve their objectives and evidence their successes, and ensure the completed projects funded complied with the terms and conditions of the fund. In 2012/13 grants awarded and projects funded made a difference to the local community with improvements to local facilities, increased social interaction and delivery of solutions to address local needs. Members are asked to note the variety of projects funded during 2012/13 from feedback received to date (Appendix 3a).

3.3 Township Officers have analysed the findings from the review of Township Funds 2012/13 and recommend that Members approve the allocation of Township Funds to funding streams in 2013/14 as detailed in Appendix 4.

3.4 Terms and conditions for Pennines Township revenue and capital funds have been updated. Members are asked to approve the terms and conditions for 2013/14 (Appendix 5).

3.5 Members are asked to agree to the delegation arrangements for Pennines Township Funds 2013/14 as follows:

   a) Head of Townships, in consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of Pennines Township, may decide on all projects for less than £5,000.

   b) Township Office will refer proposals for funding of £5,000 and above to the next Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub Committee for decision.

   c) Delegated decisions will be reported for information to each Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub Committee to ensure all Members are aware of the projects that have been approved.
3.6 **Alternatives considered**

In considering the report, Members will decide whether or not to approve the allocation of funds to funding streams as appropriate.

3.7 **Consultation proposed/undertaken**

Committee receives regular monitoring reports about the use of the funds. Any proposal for funding requires support from at least one Member. All proposals will continue to be consulted on as appropriate with Members, residents and other stakeholders.

4. **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

4.1 Committee will receive regular reports to enable Members to monitor the use of the Pennines Township Funds to ensure best use of available resources.

4.2 Township funds are monitored on a monthly basis and financial monitoring reports will be presented to future Committees on a regular basis.

5. **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

5.1 There are no legal implications arising from this report.

6. **PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 There are no personnel implications arising from this report.

7. **CORPORATE AND TOWNSHIP PRIORITIES**

7.1 The purpose of the Township Funds is to enable Township Committees to meet their respective Township Plan priorities and deliver actions to meet those priorities. This report asks Members to consider how Township Funds 2013/14 are allocated in order to do this.

7.2 The Vision and Blueprint for Rochdale Council 2014/15 retains Township Committees and will devolve a range of services to Township direction, managed through annual Township Plans which are reviewed on a quarterly basis.

8. **RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS**

8.1 There are no specific risk issues for Members to consider arising from this report.

9. **EQUALITIES IMPACTS**

9.1 **Workforce Equality Impacts Assessment**

There are no workforce equality issues arising from this report.
9.2 **Equality/Community Impact Assessments**

There are no significant equality/community issues arising from this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Place of Inspection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pennines Township Revenue Funds Summary 2012/13</td>
<td>Appendix 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennines Township Capital Funds Summary 2012/13</td>
<td>Appendix 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennines Township Year End Revenue &amp; Capital Funds Review 2012/13</td>
<td>Appendix 3 and Appendix 3a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennines Township Funds 2013/14 - Proposed Allocation to Funding Streams</td>
<td>Appendix 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms and conditions 2013/14</td>
<td>Appendix 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PENNINES TOWNSHIP FUNDS REPORT 2012/13

## OVERALL SUMMARY - REVENUE 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>% Actual Spend</th>
<th>% Actual + Committed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget b/f (2011/12)</td>
<td>57,100</td>
<td>74.16%</td>
<td>93.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Budget 2012/13</td>
<td>80,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income from other funds/services</td>
<td>6,782</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Available 2011/12</td>
<td>144,382</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgets transferred to services/Actuals</td>
<td>107,070</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments</td>
<td>28,463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Actual + Commitments</td>
<td>135,533</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Remaining 2012/13</td>
<td>8,849</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Forecast Outturn** 144,382

**Potential under/overspend 2012/13** 8,849

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grants/Contributions</th>
<th>Balance b/f 2011/12 £</th>
<th>Base Budget 2012/13 £</th>
<th>Income/ Adjustments</th>
<th>Revised Budget 2012/13 £</th>
<th>Actuals to Period £</th>
<th>Committed to Period £</th>
<th>Virements within Township Funds £</th>
<th>Virements to Services £</th>
<th>Total to Period £</th>
<th>Budget remaining 2012/13 £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Township Priority Projects Fund</td>
<td>51,500</td>
<td>65,500</td>
<td>6,782</td>
<td>123,782</td>
<td>16,592</td>
<td>25,114</td>
<td>(972)</td>
<td>74,200</td>
<td>114,934</td>
<td>8,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennines in Bloom Fund</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>3,899</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Contracts Fund</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,700</td>
<td>2,728</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>972</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleborough Lakeside Ward Fund</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>2,387</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milnrow &amp; Newhey Ward Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smallbridge &amp; Figgrove Ward Fund</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>2,650</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardle &amp; West Littleborough Ward Fund</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57,100</td>
<td>80,500</td>
<td>6,782</td>
<td>144,382</td>
<td>30,705</td>
<td>28,463</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76,365</td>
<td>135,533</td>
<td>8,849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

Income/Adjustments - £6,782 reimbursement from Highways schemes reconciliation (prior to 2012/13)
## OVERALL SUMMARY - CAPITAL 2012/13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>£</th>
<th>% Actual</th>
<th>% Actual + Committed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget b/f (2011/12)</td>
<td>39,100.00</td>
<td>24.08%</td>
<td>90.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Budget 2012/13</td>
<td>78,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer from other funds/services 2012/13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Available 2012/13</td>
<td>117,100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgets transferred to other services/Actuals</td>
<td>28,199.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitments</td>
<td>78,075.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Actual + Commitments</td>
<td>106,274.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget Remaining 2012/13</td>
<td>10,825.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Forecast Outturn** 117,100.00

**Potential under/(over)spend 2012/13** 10,825.50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Fund Schemes</th>
<th>Balance b/f 2011/12</th>
<th>Budget 2012/13</th>
<th>Actual to Period</th>
<th>Committed to Period</th>
<th>Total to Period</th>
<th>Budget remaining 2012/13</th>
<th>Forecast 2012/13</th>
<th>Difference £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PTC11/01 Calder Avenue Flooding Grant</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC03/12 Stonie Heyes Play Area</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,387.00</td>
<td>18,387.00</td>
<td>18,387.00</td>
<td>18,387.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,387.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC05/12 Fencing for Milnrow Precinct</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,067.50</td>
<td>3,067.50</td>
<td>3,067.50</td>
<td>3,067.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,067.50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC01/12 Albert Royds Street Widening</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC04/12 Puffin Crossing on Church Street</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,000.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC06/12 Lakebank Pedestrian Guard Rail</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,080.00</td>
<td>5,080.00</td>
<td>5,080.00</td>
<td>5,080.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,080.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC07/12 Newhey Village CCTV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,665.00</td>
<td>1,665.00</td>
<td>1,665.00</td>
<td>1,665.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,665.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC10/12 Haugh Park Play Equipment</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>575.00</td>
<td>575.00</td>
<td>575.00</td>
<td>575.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>575.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unallocated/retained funds 2012/13</td>
<td>- 10,825.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10,825.50</td>
<td>10,825.50</td>
<td>10,825.50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>7,500.00</td>
<td>109,600.00</td>
<td>28,199.50</td>
<td>78,075.00</td>
<td>106,274.50</td>
<td>10,825.50</td>
<td>117,100.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Available funds 2012/13** 10,825.50
## PENNINES TOWNSHIP YEAR END REVENUE & CAPITAL FUNDS REVIEW 2012/13

### REVENUE FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Township Priority Projects Fund</strong></td>
<td>£65,500</td>
<td><strong>Base Budget</strong>&lt;br&gt; <strong>b/f 2011/12</strong>&lt;br&gt; £51,500&lt;br&gt; £6,782 Highways reconciliation&lt;br&gt; The Township Priority Projects Fund provides a budget to resource larger projects to address local issues/demands to benefit the local community and environment across Pennines Township. This fund was used to support 25 projects (£104,816.95) during 2012/13 consisting of 8 community projects (£39,831) and 17 highways/environmental projects (£64,985.95). At year end other Pennines Township revenue funding streams were transferred into this budget to maximise expenditure of Township funds in 2012/13. Uncommitted funds total 7.14% of the Township Priority Projects Fund at year end. Evaluation information relating to some of the successful projects is detailed in Appendix 3a of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pennines in Bloom Fund</strong></td>
<td>£3,900</td>
<td><strong>Base Budget</strong>&lt;br&gt; The Pennines in Bloom Fund was established to enable Pennines Township to resource activities such as planting schemes, promotional materials and prizes for school competitions that resulted in Pennines Township being awarded a North West in Bloom Silver Gilt award in 2012/13. Pennines in Bloom Steering Group continue to promote and work with local groups and the community across the Township to attain and maintain high environmental standards for our public spaces. This newly constituted group have spent/committed the funds and started identifying/developing environmental projects in preparation for entering the North West in Bloom competition 2013.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maintenance Contracts Fund</strong></td>
<td>£3,000</td>
<td><strong>Base Budget</strong>&lt;br&gt; <strong>b/f 2011/12</strong>&lt;br&gt; £700&lt;br&gt; Uncommitted funds of £972 were transferred into the Township Priority Projects Fund prior to year end for allocation. The Maintenance Contracts Fund was established to fund the maintenance of all civic flags/flagpoles across the Township and annual community event road closures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ward Fund</strong></td>
<td>£12,000</td>
<td><strong>Base Budget</strong>&lt;br&gt; <strong>b/f 2011/12</strong>&lt;br&gt; £1,000&lt;br&gt; Each Pennines Township Ward received £3,000 to allocate to smaller projects that would enable activities to take place to respond to local issues/demands for the benefit of the local community and environment. This fund has been useful in providing a budget for dealing with issues that necessitated a quick response with Ward Councillors identifying projects and approval being sought from the Pennines Township Chair and Vice Chair. This fund was used to support 15 projects (£12,136.79) during 2012/13 consisting of 8 community projects (£6,740.80) and 7 highways/environmental projects (£5,395.99). Evaluation information relating to some of the successful projects is detailed in Appendix 3a of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Fund</td>
<td>£78,000</td>
<td>The Capital Fund has been used to deliver a range of projects/schemes that benefit the Township’s community and environment, and realise the Township priorities in 2012/13. Projects/schemes were submitted from Councillors, Council Officers and the community via Area Forums. This fund was used to support 8 projects (£106,275) during 2012/13 consisting of 3 community projects (£20,627) and 5 highways/environmental projects (£85,648). Uncommitted funds total £10,826 at year end to be carried forward into 2013/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Budget</td>
<td>£39,100</td>
<td>b/f 2011/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pennines Township funds are making a difference to the local community. Examples of successful applications in 2012/13 illustrate the type of projects that have been awarded funding.

**Morris Dancing Championships**

‘...the girls are focused on this healthy sport which keeps them off the streets and gives them an incentive in life’

Deborah Davies
Trainer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Recipient</th>
<th>St Ann’s Morris Troupe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Greater Manchester Morris Dancing Association Annual Championships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund</td>
<td>Ward Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded</td>
<td>£700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

St Ann’s Morris Troupe applied for Ward funding to enable the troupe to attend the Greater Manchester Morris Dancing Association Annual Championships in October 2012. Morris dancing is enjoyed by children and adults with St Ann’s Morris Troupe regular participants in local carnivals. Tinies Team were given a special recognition award while the Babies and Seniors Teams each achieved third place in their categories at the championships.
A local resident and a team of volunteers wanted to improve the area around the electric substation in the heart of Wardle Village as rubbish and overgrowth had made it an eyesore. Funds received enabled the group to purchase top soil and turf as well as the hire of heavy duty tools to clear the site in preparation for turf. Further work was carried out by the group in the centre of the village around the old church to bring the habitat under control. Paths were cleared of weeds, grass mowed and hedges trimmed. The group continues to meet on a fortnightly basis to carry out litter picks, weed eradication and general clean ups around Wardle, and they have received a very good response from the local community. Empowerment of the local people to make a difference to their green spaces and where they live will ensure the environment is safeguarded for the future.

Grant Recipient: Wardle Society  
Project: Wardle Environmental Project  
Fund: Ward Fund  
Awarded: £1,500

‘...positive comments from residents in terms of our project is wonderful’

Ian Tait  
Group Co-ordinator
Pennines in Bloom aims to promote natural beauty in our community by encouraging and supporting improvements in the areas of Littleborough, Milnrow, Newhey, Firgrove, Smallbridge and Wardle. A group consisting of representatives from across Pennines Township are working towards sustainable, long term environmental improvements that will benefit the local community and nurture understanding, appreciation and respect of our green spaces.

Community groups, schools, local businesses and the general public were given the opportunity to showcase their horticultural pride that exists in Pennines through their entry into the North West in Bloom competition in 2012. A judging route was agreed that encompassed the many green activities taking place in Pennines Township from allotments to planters and community led environmental projects.

Funds were awarded to the Pennines in Bloom Group who co-ordinated and developed projects with the aim of working towards sustainable, long term environmental improvements. Links with Friends of groups, businesses and schools were nurtured to pool knowledge and experience for the benefit of Pennines Township. Also Pennines in Bloom is an opportunity for the community to come together building stronger networks between people who live across Pennines Township.

The North West in Bloom awards reward horticultural excellence, community involvement, environmental friendliness and sustainability. Pennines Township were awarded the North West in Bloom Silver Gilt award.
‘Although wet and windy the community joined together to create a green space to be proud of’

Katie Moore
Pennines Township Office

Grant Recipient: Pennines Township Office
Project: Stevenson Square Community Project
Fund: Township Priority Projects Fund
Awarded: £639.95

In response to the Pennines Township Plan Projects, officers from Township teamed up with Rochdale Boroughwide Housing to deliver an environmental improvement event in Smallbridge. The event was designed to encourage local people to come together and create a community garden on Stevenson Square promoting community ownership and improving the appearance of a public open space. Activities on the day included weeding and planting spring bulbs, trees and hardy plants which would bloom all year round. The volunteers on the day transformed the space into an attractive sustainable community garden that has made the area brighter.
Hare Hill Park Landscaping/Planting Project

Grant Recipient: Friends of Hare Hill Park  
Project: Hare Hill Park Landscaping/planting Project  
Fund: Township Priority Projects Fund  
Awarded: £1,443

Friends of Hare Hill Park arranged significant amount of work at the main entrance of the park to remove overgrown shrubs and re-design the area with the aim of encouraging increased use of this beautiful Victorian park. The grassed area makes the park feel a more safe and inviting place to visit by improving sight-lines and overall visibility. This green space is well used and highly valued by the local community with the park often a focal place for a variety of recreational events in the town. Hare Hill Park featured on the Pennines in Bloom competition route in 2012 and these works demonstrated to the judges the continued commitment to improving Pennines Township green spaces.

‘...really impressed with the improvements that have been made’

Pennines in Bloom Group

Before – Overgrown entrance of Park  
After – Park entrance cleared/turfed
APPENDIX 4

PENNINES TOWNSHIP FUNDING STREAMS 2013/14

TOTAL REVENUE FUNDS 2013/14 = £127,580 (BASE BUDGET = 81,500 + B/F 2012/13 = £46,080)
TOTAL CAPITAL FUNDS 2013/14 = £147,101 (BASE BUDGET = £58,200 + B/F 2012/13 = £88,901)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>b/f 2012/13</th>
<th>Base Budget</th>
<th>Total Budget 2013/14</th>
<th>Committed</th>
<th>Budget Available 2013/14</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Revenue Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township Priority Projects</td>
<td>£33,963</td>
<td>£66,500</td>
<td>£100,463</td>
<td>£61,564</td>
<td>£38,899</td>
<td>Fund to resource larger revenue projects that meet the Township priorities. Base budget of £66,500 with retained budget of £61,564 (see committed column) for projects approved pre 2013/14 including Street Services Clean &amp; Green Provision 2013/14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events Fund</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£8,768</td>
<td>£8,768</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£8,768</td>
<td>Fund received from the Council’s Feelgood activities budget for Pennines Township to allocate to events during 2013/14 for the benefit of the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance Fund</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£3,000</td>
<td>Fund will finance all civic flags/flagpoles maintenance and cover the cost of annual community event road closures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Revenue Fund</td>
<td>£3,349</td>
<td>£12,000</td>
<td>£15,349</td>
<td>£3,349</td>
<td>£12,000</td>
<td>Fund to resource smaller revenue projects that address local issues/demands for the benefit of the local community and environment. Base budget of £12,000 will provide each Pennines Township Ward with £3,000 to allocate to revenue projects within their Ward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capital Fund</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Capital Fund</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£8,000</td>
<td>£8,000</td>
<td>£0</td>
<td>£8,000</td>
<td>Fund to resource smaller capital projects that address local issues/demands for the benefit of the local community and environment. Base budget of £8,000 will provide each Pennines Township Ward with £2,000 to allocate to capital projects within their Ward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Fund</td>
<td>£88,901</td>
<td>£50,200</td>
<td>£139,101</td>
<td>£78,075</td>
<td>£61,026</td>
<td>Fund to resource larger capital projects that meet the Township priorities. Base budget of £50,200 with retained budget of £78,075 (see committed column) for projects approved pre 2013/14.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Purpose of the fund

Pennines Township’s vision is to create sustainable urban and semi-rural communities in our Township where people feel safe and have a sense of community and belonging. We want the local community to have access to appropriate housing, employment, leisure and community facilities, and proper social and family support.

Pennines Township funds can be used to offer support to projects and organisations that are of direct benefit to the community and environment of Pennines.

Applications are assessed against how well they meet the Pennines Township’s priorities which are:

- To support the creation of local jobs by developing tourism opportunities/business development.
- Improving our services for children and young people.
- To enhance the quality of life and community safety for local people by seeking improvements to the environment.
- Improving leisure and recreation opportunities and promoting healthy lifestyles.

2. What can be funded

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. What can be funded</th>
<th>3. What cannot be funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Projects aiming to meet Township Plan priorities.</td>
<td>a) Projects that would normally be funded through mainstream budgets, that duplicates or replaces existing services or that the Council or other body has a statutory obligation to provide.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Projects for which there is no other identifiable budget and are within the powers of the Council.</td>
<td>b) Projects benefiting individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Projects that supplement or enhance current Council service provision.</td>
<td>c) Improvements to private land, unless there is a demonstrable wider community benefit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Projects to improve landscapes or public areas, eg providing additional seating, paving or railings, etc.</td>
<td>d) Promoting religious or political causes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Restoration and/or landscaping of property as part of a heritage scheme.</td>
<td>e) Campaigning or carrying out activities to influence a Council decision in the exercise of its statutory functions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Projects that can clearly demonstrate benefit to the local community such as providing bollards, fencing, lights, CCTV, etc.</td>
<td>f) Support for the general work of charities including fundraising events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Projects that can be delivered with no additional revenue costs.</td>
<td>g) Hiring or renting venues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Equipment hire or purchase such as IT equipment, sports equipment, arts and crafts materials, etc.</td>
<td>h) Wages or expenses for permanent, contract or regular members of staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Publicity materials that recognise the contribution made by the Township.</td>
<td>i) General running costs e.g. utility bills, maintenance and repair of assets, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Specialist trainers/assessors to deliver qualifications/courses/activities.</td>
<td>j) Parties/day trips out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>k) Purchase of alcohol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>l) Continuing schemes or projects that are already up and running or purchasing items before funding is awarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m) Purchasing or hiring of vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n) Purchasing insurance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Terms and conditions

a) The expenditure must be within the powers of the Council.

b) The project must benefit the Township community and meet at least one of the Township Plan priorities.

c) All grants to community groups must be spent/claimed within 6 months of approval. Any extension to this period must be made in writing and is subject to the Chair and Vice Chair of Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub Committee’s discretion.

d) Grants can only be made to non-profit making formally constituted groups with their own group bank account.

e) The grant must be used for the purposes for which it was approved. Any requests for change of use must be made in writing and is subject to the Chair and Vice Chair of Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub Committee’s discretion.

f) VAT on purchases relating to the project must only be included in the amount requested if it cannot be claimed back from HM Revenue and Customs.

g) Applicants are responsible for ensuring that all necessary permissions (such as planning permission), regulations (such as health and safety) and insurance relating to their scheme/event are in place.

h) Groups applying for a project to work with children, young people or vulnerable adults must have policies and procedures in place that explain how these people will be protected and remain safe.

i) If public liability insurance is required for a community project, it is the responsibility of the group to ensure adequate insurance is in place.

j) The Council does not accept any liability for damage, loss or future maintenance of any projects funded by Township Funds.

k) The Council reserves the right to withhold or reclaim the grant monies if the terms and conditions are not adhered to.

l) The Council’s approval must be sought for the disposal or transfer of any items acquired with the grant.

m) Successful applicants must complete and return a Project Evaluation Form giving details of how the grant was used and accompanied by invoices/receipts. Failure to return the Project Evaluation Form and invoices/receipts will result in restrictions being imposed on the applicant relating to future requests for funding, and the local funding network will be informed.

n) The Council reserves the right to add specific conditions relating to payment of the grant, the purpose of the grant and/or the activities to be funded.

5. Decision Making Process

a) All projects must be submitted on an application form.

b) Application forms are checked by officers to see if the project meets the terms and conditions of the fund.

c) Projects not meeting the terms and conditions or incomplete application forms will be referred back to the applicant within 10 working days with a written explanation. At this point applicants may be requested to supply additional information.

d) Applicants will be advised of decisions in writing within 15 working days of the Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub Committee meeting.

e) There is no appeals process.
6. Commissioning Process

a) All parties to do everything within their power to ensure the completion of the project to the specification and achieve the desired outcome within the specified timescale and costs.

b) Any variations in costs or outcomes by either party should be negotiated and agreed between the provider and the Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub Committee prior to incurring any additional costs.

c) Where the Township wish to vary the specification – the service provider will identify the implications of the change, ie time extensions, impact on outcomes, etc and additional costs, and agree the variations with the Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub Committee.

d) Where the service provider may wish to vary the specification – the service provider should submit the variations to the Head of Townships with justification prior to incurring additional costs for consideration by the Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub Committee. The Committee may decide not to accept the variations in which case the project continues to the original specification or if the Committee accepts the variations, to agree the funding of any additional costs from the Township Funds.

e) The service provider will receive sufficient budget transferred from the Township Fund to cover the cost of the project on the Head of Townships receiving evidence of the start of the project as agreed. Stage payments may be agreed.

f) The service provider agrees to provide regular monitoring reports on the project in terms of achieving the outcomes, performance against targets and finance, and post project evaluation reports.

g) Where a service provider does not satisfy the performance targets for the project, the Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub Committee may, after consultation with the service provider, withhold funds (or withdraw funds previously transferred to a Council Service).

h) Any unapproved additional costs incurred by the service provider must be borne by the service provider unless agreed otherwise with the Pennines Township Delegated and Funding Sub Committee.

i) Service providers external to the Council will be required to submit invoices for payment.
1. PURPOSE OF REPORT
1.1 The Executive Member for Children Schools and Families approved going out to consultation on these proposals (ICM CSF 2-13 on 17th April 2013). The purpose of this report is to invite the views of the Pennines Township Committee and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the proposals to change the age range of St.Andrew’s CE (Dearnley) to 3-11 with the establishment of a Nursery Class and for a significant enlargement to admit up to 45 children in each new year group from 1st September 2014. This is part of the public consultation process. These views are sought before Cabinet considers whether or not to publish statutory proposals.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS
2.1 **Pennines Township Committee** is asked to consider this report and to identify any views on the proposals to change the age range of the school with the addition of a nursery class with effect from 1st September 2014 and to significantly enlarge the school to admit a further 15 children in each new admission year from September 2014.

2.2 **Overview and Scrutiny Committee** is asked to consider this report and to identify any views on the proposals to change the age range of the school with the addition of a nursery class with effect from 1st September 2014, and to significantly enlarge the school to admit a further 15 children in each new admission year from September 2014.

3. PROPOSAL TO ENLARGE THE SCHOOL AND ADD A NURSERY CLASS
3.1 **Background**: Cabinet on 18th March considered the need for additional Reception Class places across the Borough, and this included additional Reception Class places at St.Andrew’s CE (Dearnley). The need for extra places is because of the increase in birth-led demographic demand in the area, which would also have implications for nursery provision. To accommodate the extra children additional accommodation will
need to be provided at the school. The school admitted extra children in September 2012, when provision was made for up to 15 extra Reception Class children.

3.2 **Increasing the Capacity of the School:** In order to admit an additional half form of entry (15 extra children in each new year group) from 2014, additional accommodation will be needed. To accommodate the 45 children in each new year group from 2014 to 2016 and possibly beyond, the school will need 11 classrooms. Statutory proposals for a significant enlargement are required because additional permanent accommodation will be provided at the school and the additional numbers are planned for at least each of 3 years from 2014-2016. Taken together with the space already provided at St. Andrew's for additional pupils in 2012, this constitutes a significant enlargement of the school. The DfE provide statutory guidance on this in the document “Expanding a Maintained Mainstream School by Enlargement or Adding a Sixth Form” – see background documents.

3.3 The proposal to increase the intake of the school is set out in **Appendix Four** to this report. It follows the report to Cabinet on 18th March, which identified the need for additional Reception Class places in Pennines Township. This sets out the demographic and other data that has been taken into account in determining the need for additional school places. **Appendix Five** has maps showing the distribution of births, for admission to schools in the Pennines Township.

3.4 Should the demographic demand for additional places continue beyond September 2017, the school would be in a position to do so. If, however, demographic demand for reception class places reduces, then the Local Authority could consider reducing the intake at the school, after consultation, nearer the time.

3.5 **Provision of a Nursery Class:** The Governing Body has written to the Local Authority asking that consideration be given to establishing a Nursery Class at the school – letter attached as **Appendix ONE**. The recent feasibility study undertaken for the enlargement of the school has included consideration of the provision of space for a Nursery Class. Provision of a 26 full-time-equivalent (fte) Nursery Class will add to the overall early years capacity within the area. The school puts forward a case for the establishment of a Nursery Class with particular emphasis on parental demand, supporting the economic well-being of families in an area of increasing deprivation, and improved outcomes for children.

3.6 The need for additional Nursery places in the area is addressed in the proposals set out at **Appendix Four**. This takes account of the Rochdale Childcare Sufficiency Assessment, a copy of which is available on the Rochdale Council website.

3.7 **Consultation:** The statutory process for the consultation arrangement is set out below:
3.8 Where a Prescribed Alteration to a school is proposed, the Admission Authority for the school must undertake consultation on such proposals prior to the publication of Statutory Notices. A change in the age range of a school is such a prescribed alteration. Statutory Guidance on the consultation process must be followed. The timeline for the Consultation and Decision process for these proposals is attached at Appendix Two.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
4.1 The revenue funding for the Nursery Class, if approved, would be through the Early Years Single Funding Formula. Revenue funding for the increased mainstreamed capacity will be through the school funding formula which is Dedicated Schools Grant monies. Capital costs associated with the establishment of a Nursery Class and the enlargement of the premises would be met through Basic Need Capital Grant.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS
5.1 The Local Authority is responsible for consultation and the publication of any statutory proposals in respect of a Voluntary Controlled School. The Local Authority is also responsible for determining those proposals. The Local Authority has a statutory duty to secure sufficient school places in their area. Local Authorities and other admission bodies have a duty to comply with infant class size limits. Admission Authorities have a duty to comply with any preference expressed by a parent for a school place except where to do so would prejudice the provision of efficient education and the efficient use of resources. The enlargement of St.Andrew’s CE will enable the Local Authority to discharge those duties for this part of the Borough.

5.2 There are no other legal implications arising from this report.

6. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS
6.1 The governing body of the school would be responsible for the selection and appointment of staff required from within the school budgets. There are no other personnel implications for the Local Authority.

7. CORPORATE PRIORITIES
7.1 The proposal is consistent with the Corporate priorities under “Aiming High” and the Children’s Plan, in particular under “Building Success & Independence”- (1.1)- improving children’s readiness for school.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS
8.1 All the issues raised and the recommendation(s) in this report involve risk considerations as set out below:

- Overall it is important to ensure that there are sufficient school places (a statutory duty) without increasing potential surplus capacity;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th>Representation</th>
<th>Decision</th>
<th>Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not prescribed (minimum of 6 weeks recommended; school holidays should be taken into consideration and avoided where possible)</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>Must be 6 weeks (this is prescribed in legislation and cannot be shortened or lengthened to take into account school holidays)</td>
<td>LA must decide the proposals within 2 months. No prescribed timescale for the schools adjudicator</td>
<td>No prescribed timescale – but must be as specified in the published notice, subject to any modifications agreed by the Decision Maker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Increasing an admission number does not by itself guarantee additional pupils in a school, and there are financial implications for a school budget if sufficient extra pupils do not take up places;
• The number of extra places proposed is the minimum required, it does not allow any significant margin if there are more pupils than expected, nor does it take account of potential extra pupils moving into an area as a result of housing developments; and
• The effect of additional nursery places at the school might affect other providers of the 3 and 4 year old free entitlement in the area.

9. EQUALITIES IMPACTS
9.1 Workforce Equality Impacts Assessment
There are no workforce equality issues arising from this report.

9.2 Equality/Community Impact Assessments
The Equality Impact Assessment is attached as Appendix Six

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanding a Maintained Mainstream School by Enlargement or Adding a Sixth Form- A Guide for Local Authorities and Governing Bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making Changes to a Maintained Mainstream School (Other than Expansion, Foundation, Discontinuance &amp; Establishment Proposals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale Childcare Sufficiency Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Extra Reception Class Places September 2014-2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHS 23-04-13
With reference to the Feasibility Study for St Andrew’s CE Primary School, which is currently under review, we would like to make the following points:

- Since becoming Head Teacher of St Andrew’s I am frequently asked by prospective parents who come to view our school whether nursery and before/after school provision is available. This issue has also been recorded on our parent questionnaires (reference Parent Surveys 2010 and 2012 – available on request). This is a facility which is clearly in demand and would be appreciated by our families. It would also free up private day care places to accommodate increasing numbers required for nursery provision for the under three age range.

- As an area of increasing deprivation (Raise on line 2013) nursery provision would support the economic well being of our families. Currently the nursery provision is located in more affluent areas. With reference to the 2012 DFE Performance Tables Free School Meals information, which is an indicator of deprivation, St Andrew’s has 20.9% FSM (for 2013 this has increased to 35% with the inclusion of FSM6) whereas Smitly Bridge Primary School, our nearest neighbour has 7.5%, Littleborough Primary has 12.3% and St James’ CE Wardle has 16.4%.

- Nursery provision would enhance our sense of identity in being a Church of England school, with children experiencing continuity in the rich Christian ethos we promote. It would support our contribution to the local community with children understanding, valuing and benefiting from that sense of community, and in time enabling them to give back and make a positive contribution to the community.

- This current year we have worked closely with the Local Authority and Manchester Diocese to accommodate Rochdale children. We have acknowledged that our school is here for the benefit of Rochdale children, not determined by keeping a 1st place focus which can and usually does support results at key stage 2. We have welcomed the extra children, and prevented previous uncertainty (and sometimes hostility) with the vast majority of parents happy, thereby supporting harmony in the local community.

We are constantly striving for a better future for our children and for our town, and hope these points support your decision when considering the issues at hand.

Yours sincerely

Chair of Governors – Mr Gary Walczak

Head Teacher – Mrs Judith Rainford

---

**APPENDIX TWO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W/C</th>
<th>WHAT</th>
<th>Consultation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8th April</td>
<td><strong>Easter Holiday - Delegated Decision report</strong></td>
<td>Cllr Martin delegated decision to consult +Cllr A Hussein</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th April</td>
<td>Cllr Martin delegated decision to consult +Cllr A Hussein</td>
<td>- Start consultation- letters out to parents etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- fri 19thApril Letters/Docs out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd April</td>
<td>Consultation- 6 weeks excluding school holidays</td>
<td>- Letter to parents etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th April</td>
<td>open drop-in session?</td>
<td>- consultation paper,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th May</td>
<td></td>
<td>- fuller information on case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th May</td>
<td></td>
<td>- website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th May</td>
<td>Pennines Township Committee 21/05/13</td>
<td>- Equality Impact Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27th May</td>
<td>Half Term 30/05/13- Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd June</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Closing date Friday 17/6 midnight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10th June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24th June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st July</td>
<td>Cabinet 1/7 - decision to publish or not if so-</td>
<td>- Saturday 6/7 publish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statutory 6 weeks representation period-</td>
<td>- letter to parents etc out on Friday 5/7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inc School Holidays. Copies of Notice to DfE Finalise Prescribed</td>
<td>- consultation paper, fuller information on case</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>information Prepare Notice, Book advert in paper-</td>
<td>- all papers to website</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rochdale Observer Post Notice on Gates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th July</td>
<td>Pennines Township Committee 09/07/13</td>
<td>- equality impact assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th July</td>
<td>Open drop-in session tbc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22nd July</td>
<td>Term ends Tues 23/7/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25/7/13- Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29th July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th Aug.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Aug.</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Closing date Friday 16/8 midnight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th Aug.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26th Aug.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Sept.</td>
<td>Term starts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Sept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th Sept.</td>
<td>Cabinet 16/09/13 for determination Notify DfE/OSA, School, statutory</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>objectors etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23rd Sept.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19th April 2013

To: Parents, Pupils, Staff of St Andrew’s CE School, Headteachers and Governing Bodies of Pennines Township Schools, Secretaries of Recognised Trades Unions, neighbouring Local Authorities, Diocesan Authorities, MP for Rochdale, Pennines Township Councillors, Private and Voluntary Early Years Providers, St.Andrew’s PCC.

Dear Sir/Madam,

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF A NURSERY CLASS and SIGNIFICANT ENLARGEMENT AT St. ANDREW’S CE SCHOOL, DEARNLEY.

The reason for this letter is to tell you that the Local Authority is considering setting up a Nursery Class at St.Andrew’s CE Dearnley following a request by the Governing Body. The governing body of St.Andrew's CE has asked the Local Authority to consider setting up a Nursery Class at the school. In recent years a number of parents have asked whether the school could provide a nursery class. This part of the borough is an area of increasing deprivation, and the establishment of a nursery class will help improve outcomes for children in the school. The Local Authority also wants to expand the school to provide a total of 45 places in each new Reception year group from 1st September 2014 because of the increase in the number of children in the Township.

What is being proposed?
The proposals are: to set up a new nursery class for 26 full-time equivalent children; and to increase the intake at the school to 45 children in each new Reception Year from September 2014. This is a change in the age range of the school from 4-11 to 3-11, and also a significant enlargement of the school.

What would happen and when?

The Local Authority also wants to increase the intake at the school to 45 in each new year group from September 2014 because of the increase in the number of children in the Township.
The new nursery class would have 26 places available for each of the morning and afternoon sessions. The Admissions criteria will be the standard Local Authority criteria for admission to a nursery class. The nursery would be staffed by a Teacher and a Teaching Assistant.

Continued overleaf…

CONSULTATION REPLY SLIP- PLEASE SEE OVERLEAF

........... Continued…..

The 15 extra places for Reception intakes would be in accordance with the admission policy of the school. The school will have two classes in Reception year group, and then three classes of up to 30 children in Key Stage 1 (Year 1 & 2), with a similar organisation as children progress in to Key Stage 2. To provide the Nursery Class and extra school places, additional teaching and other accommodation will be needed at the school. A feasibility has been undertaken, and capital funding will be provided through Rochdale Local Authority.

Further information & Consultation
The full consultation paper and the report to the Executive Member for Children Schools and Families are available on the Local Authority Website at http://consultations.rochdale.gov.uk/research/standrews/.
There is a 6 week consultation period starting on 19th April 2013. This ends at midnight on 17th June 2013.

Who takes the decision?
After the close of the consultation, Cabinet will consider all responses received. It will decide whether to publish statutory proposals to open a nursery class and increase the size of the school. If Cabinet decides to publish proposals, at the end of a further 6 week representation period the Local Authority will then make the final decision in accordance with Statutory Guidance and Regulations.

How can I make my views known?
You can make your views known by completing the reply slip below, or by writing to the Local Authority by letter or e-mail at the address below. If you want to ask questions about the proposals, a meeting has been arranged as follows-

| Open Drop-in for Parents & carers & interested parties | Starts 3.00pm until 5.00pm on Thursday 2nd May 2013 | School hall |

The closing date for comments is midnight on 17th June 2013
Comments should be sent to dawn.jennings@rochdale.gov.uk, or in writing to Dawn Jennings School Support Officer, Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council, Schools Service, Number One Riverside, Smith Street ROCHDALE OL16 1XU
Yours Faithfully

Sandra Bowness
Service Director
Support for Learning

The new nursery class would have 26 places available for each of the morning and afternoon sessions. The Admissions criteria will be the standard Local Authority criteria for admission to a nursery class. The nursery would be staffed by a Teacher and a Teaching Assistant.
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I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL TO ADD A NURSERY CLASS TO THE SCHOOL

YES
NO

I SUPPORT THE PROPOSAL TO INCREASE THE INTAKE OF THE SCHOOL TO 45

YES
NO

COMMENTS:

NAME-

SCHOOL:-

CONNECTION TO THE

Please return this slip to the school office- St.Andrew's CE, Dearnley, or to Dawn Jennings, Schools Service, Number One Riverside, Smith Street ROCHELDALE OL16 1XU

INTRODUCTION

1. The Proposals are to increase the capacity of the school to admit 45 children in each new successive year group from September 2014 and to change the age range of the school to 3-11 to include a Nursery Class.

WHAT IS THE CURRENT AGE RANGE AND SIZE OF THE SCHOOL?

2. The current age range of the school is 4-11, and the Admission Number is 30, with a capacity of 210 places. The school currently has 208 children on roll.

WHAT IS PROPOSED?

3. The proposed age range of the school will be 3-11, and the proposed admission number for each new successive year group will be 45, with a capacity of 315 places. The Nursery Class would have a capacity of 26 Full-time Equivalent (FTE) places.

4. The proposals are put forward by Rochdale Local Authority and if approved would be implemented from 1st September 2014. All relevant information and documentation can be found on the Council website at http://consultations.rochdale.gov.uk/research/standrews/

HOW WILL THE NURSERY CLASS BE ORGANISED?
5. The Nursery class would have 26 FTE places, and would be a separate unit within the Foundation Stage. The main features would be:

- Staffing- 1 Teacher/ 1 Teaching Assistant
- Daily sessions: 8:45 – 11:45 am; 12:30 – 3:30 pm.
- Children would be entitled to 15 hours provision, which would be either morning or afternoon sessions.
- The Curriculum will be the Early Years Foundation Stage which is currently followed in Reception. Nursery children would work alongside Reception children with opportunities for joint work wherever possible.
- Admission Criteria are the standard local authority admission criteria for admission to a nursery class, a copy of which is on the consultation website. Please note that admission to the Nursery Class does not give priority for admission to the school.
- Only children aged 3 who will become four in that academic year will be admitted.
- Children will be a full part of the school and would therefore wear school uniform.
- There will be no before or after school care offered.

WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF A NURSERY CLASS?

6. The benefits to the school and children of the Nursery Class will be:

- To facilitate better transition for the children. The school currently takes from a number of different settings which does not allow for efficient transfer of information and can lead to social and emotional difficulties when settling in to their new school. This year’s cohort came from 13 different nurseries/childcare providers.
- Early identification of vulnerable groups. This will mean that the needs of new children can be identified as early as possible.
- Consistent baseline data. This will improve standards and outcomes for children because time saved on transition logistics will be spent on providing for their needs.
- There will be continuity of provision which will reflect the ethos and culture of the school.
- Current parents have expressed as desire for a nursery on the premises (ref. parent surveys 2010 and 2011).
- Developing strong and effective parental links from the earliest possible opportunity.
- Standards throughout school will be raised because older children will have opportunities to interact with younger children.
- Provision for Reception pupils would be enhanced, e.g. outdoor provision.
- Creation of links with other providers that are facilitating the new two year old entitlement.
- Ease of access for families who already know and trust the school.
- Opportunities for existing staff to enhance CPD.

ARE MORE NURSERY PLACES JUSTIFIED?

7. The Local Authority’s Childcare Sufficiency Assessment indicates that, overall, in Wardle and West Littleborough Ward there are currently just enough places to meet the free entitlement for 3-4 year olds, and the take up of entitlement places is high. It should be noted that the adjacent Smallbridge and Firgrove Ward has a shortage of places for 3-4 year olds, and a low take up rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WARD</th>
<th>No. of Eligible 3-4 Year Olds</th>
<th>Places</th>
<th>Coverage %</th>
<th>No. taking free entitlement</th>
<th>% taking free entitlement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wardle &amp; West</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>102%</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>110%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Factors that support an increase in the number of places are that the child population is growing, and the extension of the free 15 hours entitlement to 2 year olds will mean that more places will be needed in the future. The recommendation in the Childcare Sufficiency Assessment for both wards is to increase the number of providers offering free entitlement. The expansion of the school provides a cost-effective and timely opportunity to make more places available in the Township.

WHY ARE MORE MAINSTREAM SCHOOL PLACES NEEDED?

9. The demographic trend for Pennines Township suggests that there are enough places in the Township as a whole for both 2013 and 2014, but more places will be needed in 2015 and 2016. The geography of the Township is such that the pattern of demand varies across the different localities. A more detailed analysis of birth distribution and current pattern of preferences suggests a need for extra places to address both demographic and an element of preference demand. The graph below shows how many Reception Class places there are now and how many children are expected across the Township as a whole.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>2016/17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected pupils</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reception places</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Places Needed</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table below sets out the birth, place availability and preference situation across the Township in September 2012, together with the position for 2013. For 2014 and 2015 it shows the birth and place availability. That level of detail will not be available until September 2013 but birth data at Ward level indicates an increase in demand for 2016 compared to 2015 in Littleborough Lakeside (up by 21 births) and Smallbridge and Firgrove (up by 12 births). However births in Wardle and West Littleborough are down by 8 births and Smallbridge and Milnrow and Newhey by 16 births). The overall position remains that across the township an extra form of entry will be needed to match demographic demand in 2016.
11. Cabinet has agreed that, subject to feasibility, 15 additional places should be provided at St. Andrew’s to meet the increased local demographic demand for additional school places.

HOW WILL THE PROPOSALS BE FUNDED?
12. The expansion of the school would be through new build, in addition to the additional accommodation already provided this year. The capital funding for the expansion would be met by the Local Authority through Basic Need Capital Grant. Revenue funding for the Nursery Class would be through the Early Years Single Funding Formula, and revenue funding for additional reception pupils in the school will be through the Fair Funding Formula.

WHAT CONSULTATION WILL BE UNDERTAKEN?
13. Consultation on these proposals will be in accordance with statutory guidance. The consultation documents are available on the School Website. The following groups of people and individuals will be consulted:
* Parents and Carers of children at St. Andrew’s CE School, Dearnley
* Staff at the school
* St. Andrew’s Parochial Church Council
* Headteachers & Governing Bodies of all Pennines Primary and Secondary Schools
* Early Years Providers in Pennines Township
* Secretaries of Recognised Trades Unions
* Pennines Township Councillors
* MP for Rochdale
* Manchester Church of England Diocese
* Salford Roman Catholic Diocese
* neighbouring Local Authorities

HOW CAN I MAKE MY VIEWS KNOWN TO THE GOVERNING BODY?
14. An open drop-in session has been arranged for interested parties, to be held on 3.00-5.00 on Thursday 2nd May, at the school. The consultation will take place between 19th April 2013 and midnight on 17th June 2013. Responses to the consultation should be sent to Dawn Jennings, by e-mail at dawn.jennings@rochdale.gov.uk or by post to Dawn Jennings, School Support Officer, Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council, Schools Service, Number One Riverside, Smith Street ROCHDALE OL16 1XU.

WHAT HAPPENS AFTER THAT?
15. After the close of the consultation period, the Local Authority will consider all responses received, and decide whether or not to publish statutory proposals. If the decision is
taken to publish statutory proposals, there would be a further statutory representation period of 6 weeks, after which Rochdale Local Authority would consider the proposals and any responses received. The Local Authority would then decide whether or not to approve the published proposals.

Chris Swift
School Organisation & Development Manager
19th April 2013

Birth Distribution data for Pennines Township          APPENDIX FIVE
Births 2010-11 for Admission September 2015

The table below sets out the birth, place availability and preference situation across the township in September 2012, together with the position for 2013. For 2014 and 2015 it shows...
the birth and place availability. That level of detail will not be available until September 2013 but birth data at Ward level indicates an increase in demand for 2016 compared to 2015 in Littleborough Lakeside (up by 21 births) and Smallbridge and Firgrove (up by 12 births). However births in Wardle and West Littleborough are down by 8 births and Smallbridge and Milnrow and Newhey by 16 births). The overall position remains that across the township an extra form of entry will be needed to match demographic demand in 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>September 2012</th>
<th>September 2013</th>
<th>September 2014</th>
<th>September 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Littleborough</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wardle</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithy Bridge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milnrow</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newhey</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equality Impact Assessment Draft

Appendix Six
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1. State which function you are assessing and identify who should be involved in the equality impact analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Service Area Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrew’s CE Primary School, Dearnley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What function, policy, procedure or practice is being assessed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishment of a Nursery Class and Significant enlargement of the school from 1st September 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who is responsible for it? Council or Other Organisation/Partnership?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rochdale Local Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the aims and objectives of the function, policy, procedure or practice?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. To change the age range of the school to establish a Nursery Class, and 2. Enlarge the school to admit up to and extra 15 children in each successive year group from 1st September 2014.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who are the key stakeholders?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Andrew’s CE Primary School- Parents, staff, pupils, governors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lead Officer for this analysis (i.e. service manager who will co-ordinate the EIA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Swift</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others consulted and involved in the analysis (i.e. colleagues/peers/key internal and external stakeholders)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first stage in the development of the proposal is to undertake public consultation as prescribed by regulations. This consultation will include parents of children at the school and the staff, other schools, Early Years and Childcare providers, the Local Authority, Diocesan Authorities, Secretaries of recognised Trades Unions, elected members and the local MP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Identify the scope of the equality impact assessment
Please provide a summary of:

- What is to be included in this impact assessment/what issues will you consider? i.e. are all aspects of the policy/service to be covered or is it confined to a limited area? Please explain. This is likely to reflect the relevance to equality of different aspects.
- Does this service/policy have link to other service areas, or other Equality Impact Assessments?

1. This EIA covers only the change in age range at the school to add a Nursery Class, and to enlarge the school to admit more children in new successive year groups from 2014.

2. There are no links to other service areas

3. State the data that you have considered for this assessment and any gaps in data identified. What action will be taken to close any data gaps?
1. The increase in births in the area will lead to an increase in demand for both nursery and school places. In November 2012 consultation was undertaken on the need for Extra Reception Class places in Pennines Township. The overall position for the Township is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Reception Admission Places</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Pupil Numbers</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra Places Needed</td>
<td>-7</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The Township comprises different community areas, with different birth and demographic characteristics, so more detailed analysis of birth data by lower level super output area provided an evidence base for changes in demographic demand at a more localized level and taken with patterns of parental preference suggests the localities where additional school places might be provided. On that basis Cabinet on 28th January 2013 agreed to putting 15 extra admission places at St. Andrew’s CE primary school to meet the expected local shortfall in places.

3. The Governing Body of the school has written to the Local Authority requesting consideration of the establishment of a Nursery Class. In considering this request the local authority has taken account of the early years and childcare sufficiency assessment for the Ward, and on the basis of current provision and places for 3-5 year olds, additional places will help meet the increased number of children. There are currently 168 children eligible for the Free Entitlement to nursery places, and 172 places in the Ward: 102% coverage.

4. The school is in an area of increasing deprivation—evidenced by the increase in eligibility for free school meals from 20.9% in 2012 to 35% in 2013, much higher than other schools in the area.

5. It is important that sufficient places are provided overall for both Nursery and Reception places, without providing too many (because that could adversely affect other schools and providers viability if too many places are provided).

6. School places should be provided so that all children can access a school place within a reasonable distance from their home.

7. The provision of a Nursery Class at the school will enhance the continuity of children’s education in the Foundation Stage.

8. An increase in the annual intake to 45 will mean that additional accommodation is required at the school to ensure that each class need not exceed 30 children.

4. Assess the impact the policy/service has on equality will reference to different groups or communities. To do this, consider the questions on page 5 of the guidance, which relate to unequal outcomes or disadvantage; access barriers; unmet needs; encouraging participation; fostering good relations. The Equality Impact Assessment Checklist may also be helpful at this stage.

Race Equality
The proposed changes do not have an adverse impact on race equality considerations.

Disabled People
The proposed changes do not have an adverse impact on disabled people.

Carers
The proposed changes do not have an adverse impact on carers.

Gender
The proposed changes do not have an adverse impact based on gender considerations.

Older and Younger People
The proposed changes will increase the number of school and Nursery places available, and so will increase the scope to meet parental preference, and access to a nearby school.

People who are Socio-Economically Disadvantaged
The proposed changes will have a positive impact on children who are socio-economically disadvantaged. The school is serving an area of increasing deprivation, evidenced by the increase in eligibility for free school meals from 20.9% in 2012 to 35% in 2013, much higher than other schools in the area. The establishment of a Nursery class will support the economic well-being of these families.

Religion or Belief
The proposed changes do not have an adverse impact on religion or belief considerations. The proposed additional places are in a voluntary controlled Church of England school. The school promotes a Christian ethos, and the additional places will increase parental preference for families seeking a faith based education.

Sexual Orientation
The proposed changes do not have an adverse impact on sexual orientation considerations.

Gender Reassignment
The proposed changes do not have an adverse impact on gender reassignment considerations.

Pregnant Women or Those on Maternity Leave
The proposed changes do not have an adverse impact on pregnant women or those on maternity leave. Provision of additional Nursery Class places may improve accessibility to local provision for mothers with nursery age children.

Marriage or Civil Partnership
The proposed changes do not have an adverse impact on marriage or civil partnership considerations.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

What are the main conclusions from this analysis?
The establishment of a nursery class would be an advantage to the school and the community, and to people from socio-economically disadvantaged groups.
What are your recommendations?

Equality objectives and targets to address the unequal impact/unmet needs/barriers/low participation

*The proposals do not have adverse equality impacts.*

Suggested actions to meet those targets

*No specific actions are required.*

6. Consult your stakeholders on the main findings and conclusions of the equality impact analysis and ask for their comments. State your consultation and inclusion methodology.

**The Consultation and Inclusion Methodology Used**

Consultation on the proposal will need to comply with statutory guidance. The consultees will comprise the following: Parents, Pupils, Staff, of St.Andrew’s CE School, all schools and early years providers in Pennines Township, St Andrew’s PCC Manchester Diocesan Board of Education, Local MP, Councillors in Pennines Township, secretaries of recognised trades unions, neighbouring local authorities. The consultation papers will be published on the Council Website.

Outcomes from the first consultation will be considered by Overview and Scrutiny Committee and Cabinet and a decision taken whether to proceed to the next stage- that is the publication of statutory proposals.

7. Produce an impact analysis action plan for 2013/14. Details of this should be included in your service delivery plan.

8. Equality Impact Analysis sign off

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chris Swift</td>
<td>School Organisation &amp; Development Manager</td>
<td>3rd May 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Equality Impact Assessment Action Plan 2013/14**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Target Date for Completion</th>
<th>Resource Implications</th>
<th>Lead Officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Consultation on proposals (starts 19-04-13)</td>
<td>Consultees and interested parties able to express their views about the proposals.</td>
<td>Consultation ends 17-06-13</td>
<td>Preparation, distribution &amp; dissemination of consultation documents</td>
<td>Chris Swift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of outcomes of consultation, and decisions on whether to publish statutory proposals.</td>
<td>Report to Cabinet with recommendation on whether to proceed with the proposals.</td>
<td>Cabinet 01-07-13</td>
<td>Preparation of Report for Cabinet</td>
<td>Chris Swift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further public Consultation on proposals 08-06-13</td>
<td>Consultees and interested parties able to object to proposals.</td>
<td>Representation period ends 16-08-13</td>
<td>Preparation, distribution &amp; dissemination of consultation documents, cost of publication of Notice in local press</td>
<td>Chris Swift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination of proposals</td>
<td>Cabinet considers representations and determines proposals</td>
<td>Cabinet 16-09-13</td>
<td>Preparation of Report for Cabinet</td>
<td>Chris Swift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Proposals (if approved).</td>
<td>Additional accommodation provided at the school, additional teaching groups established for Nursery Class and Reception Class.</td>
<td>1st September 2014</td>
<td>Capital resources through approved Capital programme. Revenue funding for Nursery class through the Early Years Single Funding Formula, and for the Reception Class through the Fair Funding Formula.</td>
<td>Chris Swift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject: SCHOOL GOVERNING BODY VACANCIES – AUTHORITY GOVERNORS

Status: For Publication

Report to: Pennines Township Committee

Date: Tuesday 21st May 2013

Report of: Service Director - Support for Learning

Author: Paul Hyde - Assistant Governor Support Officer

Email: paul.hyde@rochdale.gov.uk

Tel: 925175

Cabinet Member: Councillor D Martin - Portfolio Holder for Children, Schools & Families

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 This report outlines current Authority Governor Vacancies within maintained schools in the Township area and requests that Township Committee makes the appropriate appointments or nominations for appointments by the Governing Body as indicated within the attached appendices.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 That Township Committee appoints or nominates for appointment by the Governing Body, Authority Governors to serve on the School Governing Bodies with current and forthcoming vacancies (as outlined in the attached appendices).

MAIN TEXT INCLUDING ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED/ CONSULTATION CARRIED OUT

3.1 Members are asked to consider the School Governing Body vacancies highlighted within this report and in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation and Regulations either make appointment or nominate appointees.

3.2 The ‘Scheme of Delegation to Township Committees’ section R (School Governing Body Vacancies) delegates the function of appointing nominees to School Governing Body vacancies or nominating to the Governing Body for appointment in accordance with the agreed formula to the appropriate Township Committee.

3.3 The agreed formula was revised by Members following a decision of Council on 14 July 2000 which stated that ‘new reports dealing with Authority Governor vacancies will contain no reference to which political group should make the nomination to fill the vacancy and no reference to which political group made previous nominations’. Members agreed that Governors will be chosen on the basis of the contribution, which they can bring to the school in terms of skills and experience.

3.4 The School Governance (Constitution) Regulations have the effect of disqualifying Governors who have been removed for non-attendance from re-appointment as a Governor at the same school during the 12 months immediately following the disqualification.

3.5 Members are asked to consider the nominations received from schools (as listed in the Appendices) where schools have been able to offer a nomination.
3.6 Members are asked to note that the School Governance (Constitution) Regulations 2012 change the mechanism for filling LA governor vacancies at schools which have reconstituted i.e. made any changes to their Instrument of Government since September 2012. The regulations require that authority governors meet the eligibility criteria, if any, specified by the governing body; are nominated by the local authority and appointed by the governing body.

3.7 Details of Authority vacancies where members are able to fill by appointment are attached at Appendix A and where schools fall within the requirements of the 2012 Regulations i.e. in that members are able to make nominations for appointment only, are listed in Appendix B.

Alternatives considered
3.8 There are no alternative methods of filling Authority Governor Vacancies within the current Township and Officer schemes of delegation and legislative provision.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS
4.1 There are no financial implications for members to consider arising from this report.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS
5.1 There are no legal implications for members to consider arising from this report other than the School Governance (Constitution) Regulations 2007 and 2012.

6. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS
6.1 There are no specific personnel implications for members to consider arising from this report.
7. CORPORATE PRIORITIES
This report contributes to and supports the Local Authority’s role in school improvement through the development of effective governing bodies to promote high standards in all schools.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS
8.1 There are no specific risk issues for members to consider arising from this report.

9. EQUALITIES IMPACTS
9.1 Workforce Equality Impacts Assessment
There are no workforce equality issues arising from this report.

9.2 Equality/Community Impact Assessments
There are no significant equality/community issues arising from this report. The Council however are committed to a policy of equal opportunities and in making their recommendations, the Committee are asked to recognise that there is an under representation of disadvantaged groups on governing bodies. Black and minority ethnic groups are under-represented on governing bodies particularly in the Rochdale Township. Similarly disabled persons are generally under-represented on governing bodies.

There are no background papers
# APPENDIX A

## FOR APPOINTMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>WARD</th>
<th>NO. OF AUTHORITY</th>
<th>VACANCY CAUSED BY</th>
<th>WISHES TO CONTINUE AS GOVERNOR</th>
<th>NOMINATION FROM SCHOOL / GENERAL APPLICANT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamer Community Primary School</td>
<td>Smallbridge and Firgrove</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Removal of Mrs C Akram on 15/04/2013 Removal of Mrs B Kerslake on 15/04/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Littleborough Community Primary School</td>
<td>Littleborough Lakeside</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resignation of Mrs S Cunningham on 22/04/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Cllr J Hartley – this nomination is supported by the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smithy Bridge Primary School</td>
<td>Littleborough Lakeside</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Removal of Cllr S Mills on 08/11/2012</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Mary’s RCP School Littleborough</td>
<td>Wardle &amp; West Littleborough</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Resignation of Cllr A Dearnley on 04/01/2013</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Mr I Bowden – this nomination is supported by the school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To update Members as to the progress and current status of the Township Clean and Green Team as requested at previous Township meetings.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Members are asked to note the progress report (Background Papers) on work carried out by the Cleaner Greener Teams that are temporarily funded by the Pennines Township.

2.2 Members are also asked to note that the funding for these teams will no longer be available after the 13th September 2013.

MAIN TEXT OF THE REPORT

3.1 In March, Township Members agreed to fund the Cleaner Greener Team for a further period of 24 weeks.

3.2 In addition to reacting to member requests the teams constantly assist the mainstream Street Services resource in dealing with ad-hoc work and requests for service; this does make up the majority of the teams work in the Middleton Township. In addition, the teams prioritise gateway work to improve the appearance of the Township.

3.4 Attached is a worksheet detailing the tasks carried out to-date in relation to the township Cleaner, Greener team for Members’ further information.

3.5 To nominate schemes or request action form the teams, Members are further encouraged to contact the service via the township officers or by emailing environmental.management@rochdale.gov.uk or by ringing 0845 226 1800.

3.6 A Report will be presented to Township in July regarding options for possible further deployment of these teams beyond 13th September 2013.
4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 None

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 None

6. PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 None

7. CORPORATE AND TOWNSHIP PRIORITIES

The activities undertaken by the Clean & Green Teams contribute directly to the Quality of Place aspirations and commitments in the Council’s Blueprint. They also contribute to the priorities of an increased healthy lifestyle and well-being, high quality open spaces, and places where people want to live and stay.

8. RISK ASSESSMENT IMPLICATIONS

8.1 These activities are helping to mitigate the risk across the Borough of a decline in the Street Scene.

9. EQUALITIES IMPACTS

9.1 Workforce Equality Impacts Assessment

There are no (significant) workforce equality issues arising from this report.

9.2 Equality/Community Impact Assessments

There are no (significant) equality/community issues arising from this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Document</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennines Township Work Spreadsheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennines Township Work Photos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date Reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/06/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/08/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31/08/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/08/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/08/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/10/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/06/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/06/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/08/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/12/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/03/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/03/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14/03/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/03/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/06/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/06/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22/06/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/07/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie Moore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Brett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Brett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strim back and clear the pathway to the rear of 59 Whitegate Litteborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Programmed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Programmed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>