

HEYWOOD TOWNSHIP COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING

Monday 31st July 2017

PRESENT: Councillor Rush (Chair); Councillors Beswick, Dutton, Susan Emmott, Malcolm, McCarthy, Robinson and Wardle

OFFICERS: A. Fallon (Director of Public Health and Wellbeing), M. Robinson and B. Hirst (Economy Directorate) S. Hay and A. Storey (Neighbourhoods Directorate), T. Buckley and A. James (Resources Directorate)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: 10 members of the public

APOLOGIES

11 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor O'Rourke.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

12 There were no declarations of interest.

URGENT ITEMS OF BUSINESS

13 There were no urgent items of business.

ITEMS FOR EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

14 There were no private items of business.

OPEN FORUM

15 The following matters were raised as part of the Open Forum:-

- a. Pilsworth Road Rising Bollard

The Township and Engagement Officer referred to a question submitted by Mr Challinor with regard to the rising bollard on Pilsworth Road. A reply from the Ward Councillors would be sent to Mr Challinor in due course.

- b. Graffiti

A local resident referred to instances of graffiti around the Township, a number of which had the same details or names and asked whether the Council was doing anything about this matter. The Committee were informed that graffiti was cleared when it was reported and that this issue would be forwarded to the police for further consideration.

MINUTES - HEYWOOD TOWNSHIP COMMITTEE

16 The Minutes of the meeting of the Heywood Township Committee held on 26th June 2017 were considered.

In regard to Minute 8(3b) the Township Committee agreed that Councillor Rush be appointed to the East Lancashire Railway Trust Board.

Decision:

1. That the Minutes of the meeting of the Heywood Township Committee held on 26th June 2017 be approved and signed as a correct record;
2. That the appointment of Councillor Rush to the East Lancashire Railway Trust Board be approved.

MINUTES - HEYWOOD TOWNSHIP DELEGATED SUB-COMMITTEE

17 The Minutes of the meeting of the Heywood Township Delegated Sub-Committee held on 5th July 2017 were considered.

In regard to the application from Sandon House, the Chair informed the Committee that an update from the builders relating to the cladding was awaited.

In regard to the application for Keep Clear signs at Waterfold Lane, the Chair was requested to look into the timescales for completion of the project.

Decision:

1. That the Minutes of the meeting of the Heywood Township delegated Sub-Committee held on 5th July 2017 be noted.

OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER - PILSWORTH ROAD / REGENT STREET, HEYWOOD

18 The Township Committee considered the report of the Director of Neighbourhoods which informed the Committee that a request was received from Heywood Township for the Council to investigate reports of indiscriminate parking around the junction of Pilsworth Road and Regent Street.

It had been reported that a local hairdressers and a school were the main generators of on-street parking. Investigations found that indiscriminate parking did occur in the area, where there was a high number of child pedestrian movements and where a school crossing patrol operated.

New parking restrictions were drafted and approved by Heywood Township.

The restrictions were formally promoted and during the consultation period the Authority received one letter of objection to the proposal. The objector reported that the restrictions would reduce the number of available on-street parking spaces for customers visiting her business.

The report outlined the reasons for the proposal, the objections received and a response to the objection. It was reported that a serious injury accident had since occurred at the location.

Alternatives Considered:

The Committee could consider recommending that the proposal be abandoned.

Should Committee decide not to introduce the restrictions proposed then the issues with parked vehicles, which were reported to Heywood Township, would not be addressed.

The Committee considered representations from two local residents both objecting to the proposals as advertised and who addressed the meeting outlining their concerns. One objector was a local business owner who presented a petition from her customers objecting to the proposals. The second objector also presented a petition of objectors to the proposals and stated that it had been proposed by a previous Government Minister that the community had a right to challenge what they saw as unfair 'yellow lines' in their local area. The Committee considered the representations made and the petitions presented and agreed to request that the Head of Legal look into the right to challenge prior to implementing the decision of the Committee.

Decision:

1. That the Traffic Regulation Order, Borough of Rochdale ((Civil Enforcement of Traffic Contraventions) (Various Streets) (Heywood Township) Order 2008) (Amendment) (No.43) Order be implemented as advertised subject to confirmation from the Head of Legal Services that the matters raised by one of the objectors as detailed above relating to community right to challenge does not affect the Order proceeding.

Reasons for the Decision:

A request was received from Heywood Township for the Council to investigate reports of indiscriminate parking at the junction of Regent Street and Pilsworth Road, Heywood. It was reported that the demand for parking in the area was generated by a local hairdressers and a school.

Both roads were un-classified. However, Pilsworth Road facilitated the movement of a large number of vehicles as it provided one of only two main routes into and out of Heywood to the south. Regent Street connected with Pilsworth Road and provides access to Woodland Primary School and other residential streets to the west of Pilsworth Road. The primary school was located on the south side of Regent Street and the hair dressers located on the west side of Pilsworth Road, near to the junction of Regent Street. There was a school crossing patrol which operated directly outside the hair dressers on Pilsworth Road.

Site inspections had found vehicles parked in the vicinity of the junction and the patrol crossing point. This affected visibility at the junction and at the crossing, for both motorists and pedestrians. The junction provided the main

vehicular access point to and from the school and parked vehicles interfered with the free movement of traffic during busy periods. There were also a high number of child pedestrian movements at the junction due to its proximity to the school and the crossing patrol facility.

There were currently parking restrictions in place along the south side of Regent Street and on the west side of Agincourt Street, in the vicinity of the school. However, the restrictions did not extend further east along Regent Street to the junction of Pilsworth Road, where the complaints originated and the order had been advertised to address the issues that had been reported.

OBJECTIONS TO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER - BRADSHAW STREET AND VALE STREET, HEYWOOD

19 The Township Committee considered the report of the Director of Neighbourhoods which advised that on 26th June, the Committee had considered a report on objections received to a proposed Traffic Regulation Order on Bradshaw Street and Vale Street, Heywood. The minutes from the meeting were appended to the report.

An alternative was put forward at the meeting by objectors to the proposal. Officers had concerns over the amendment and subsequently met with the three ward members on site to discuss the proposals. At that meeting a further amendment was proposed.

The concerns that were raised were that the proposal did not take into account the position of the carriageway signal detector, or an area opposite one of the industrial accesses, which was required to be kept free of parked vehicles so that the swept path of HGV's was not obstructed.

The ward Councillors agreed to a compromise between the original proposal and the amended proposal. Although this resulted in a section of highway being un-restricted on both sides, where double parking may potentially occur, the councillors agreed to monitor the situation if and when the scheme was introduced. The enclosed plans appended to the report showed the restrictions removed from the scheme and the revised design proposed to be re-advertised.

Alternatives Considered:

Should the Committee decide not to introduce the restrictions proposed, then the issues with parked vehicles which were reported to the Township would not be addressed.

Decision:

1. That the Traffic Regulation Order, Borough of Rochdale ((Civil Enforcement of Traffic Contraventions) (Various Streets) (Heywood Township) Order 2008) (Amendment) (No.42) be approved subject to an amendment as detailed in Appendix B to the submitted report.

Reasons for the Decision:

Bradshaw Street and Vale Street are located to the south of Rochdale Road East on the east side of Heywood town centre. Bradshaw Street provides access to a supermarket, Business Park and several storage / business premises. It is not a through route for vehicular traffic and terminates at a point approximately 150 metres south west of Rochdale Road East.

Vale Street is a short cul-de-sac providing access to two business premises. It connects with Bradshaw Street at its southern end.

It was reported that vehicles park at various locations on both Bradshaw Street and Vale Street at weekends and during the evenings. The vehicles were reportedly associated with regular events held by a local business located within the business park. There were several coach companies which were accessed directly from Bradshaw Street and Vale Street. The parked vehicles restricted access and egress for coaches. The coach companies often operated at weekends and evenings but were prevented from doing so by the obstructive parking.

There were existing parking restrictions in the vicinity of the superstore and near to the junction of Rochdale Road East, at the northern end of Bradshaw Street. However, there were currently no parking restrictions in the vicinity of the various access points, which reportedly become obstructed.

It was proposed to introduce prohibition of waiting restrictions to address the issues that had been raised. The proposed restrictions at the southern end of Bradshaw Street and Vale Street would assist in removing parked vehicles in the vicinity of the businesses, which would improve access and egress for coaches. The restrictions on the North West side of Bradshaw Street near to Rochdale Road East would prevent vehicles parking near to the signal stop line, enabling motorists to queue unhindered.

At the meeting of the Township Committee in June, following representations made by objectors, an amended scheme had been approved. Following the meeting, further discussions had taken place and a further scheme was now proposed for implementation.

LAND AT GEORGE STREET, HEYWOOD

20 The Township Committee considered the report of the Director of Economy which related to an area of land running from Bridge Street North to public open space at George Street/Bank Top Street. The land encompassed the site of a former scrapyard and factory that had lain unused for at least the last 15 years.

The proposal was for a local well established company to acquire the land to expand their business which has been based in Heywood for 36 years and has gone from strength to strength. The current facility had been out-grown and to continue to grow the business an additional major site was required.

The company would retain their existing facility and planned to build a new showroom and workshop facility on the new site which would create 10 new jobs. Much of the land would be used as display areas and would not be built upon. The nature of the company's business was such that they attracted people to Heywood from outside the region.

The proposal would be in accordance with an agreed Development Brief for the area which proposed the release of this land for employment purposes.

Alternatives Considered:

Due to known historic contamination issues, the land was not considered ideal for housing development as remediation costs were likely to be high. The use of the land for residential development was unlikely to be viable and therefore a Development Brief prepared by the Council for the wider area concluded it was considered that it would ideally suit a commercial surface use as per this proposal.

The land could be retained, but there was currently no maintenance budget and so the land may remain in an unkempt state close to the town centre and adjacent to newly developed housing and manicured public open space. In addition, the contamination represented a liability for the Council.

Decision:

1. That Cabinet be informed that the Township Committee supports the land at George Street (running from Bridge Street North to the public open space at George Street/Bank Top Street) being declared surplus to the Council's requirements and being released for disposal to the local business as detailed within the submitted report.

Reasons for Decision:

The land was acquired by compulsory acquisition in 2001 and has had a number of issues in the past due to former land uses and subsequent trespass and pollution issues.

The sale of the land to a local company would prevent the company from leaving the Borough and would keep the existing employment within the Township. New jobs would be created in the Township and the development would secure substantial inward investment in Heywood and would bring economic use to a current unkempt and problematical area.

TOWNSHIP PLANNING PANELS

21 The Township Committee considered a report of the Director of Economy which set out proposals for collating the Township Committee's views on forthcoming and submitted planning applications, as well as seeking determination of how Township Committee Members are consulted in relation to the allocation of S106 funds.

Alternatives considered:

The Township Committees could determine a structure to provide their views on planning applications suitable for Township Members. In relation to S106 funds, Members could have maintained the existing consultation with the Officers delegated to determine the allocation of funds.

Decision:

1. That matters relating to S106 funds which reside within the Township are to be considered by the Heywood Township Delegated Sub-Committee.
2. That Township Members will continue to use existing processes as appropriate for submitting views on forthcoming and submitted planning applications.

Reason for decision:

Seeking views of elected Members in relation to planning applications and S106 funds provides the benefit of understanding the local environment to inform Planning decisions which impact within the Township.

BUDGET 2018/19 TO 2020/21 GUIDELINES, TIMETABLE AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT

22 The Township Committee considered a report of the Chief Finance Officer which consulted Members on the budget guidelines, timetable and method of public engagement to be used in preparing the detailed 2018/19 budget and provisional budgets for 2019/20 and 2019/21.

Alternatives considered:

None.

Decision:

1. That the report be noted.

Reason for decision:

Consultation on the Budget 2018/19 to 2020/21 is part of the budget setting process.

UPDATE ON HIGHWAYS GULLEY CLEANING PROGRAMME

23 The Township Committee received an update on the highways gully cleaning programme for the Heywood Township.

Alternatives considered:

The update was presented for information.

In considering the gulley cleaning programme, Members of the Committee requested that they be given further information in regard to why areas with known flooding issues were not showing on this years' replacement/repair programme and the rationale behind how the programme was devised and prioritised.

Decision:

1. That the update on the highways gulley cleaning programme be noted;
2. That the Head of Highways be requested to provide Members with details of why areas with known issues were not showing on this years' replacement/repair programme and the rationale behind how the programme was devised and prioritised.

Reasons for the decision:

The update on the highways gulley cleaning programme was provided at the request of Members of the Committee.