

Public Document Pack



Meeting of: Rochdale North Township Committee
Date: Wednesday, 13th November, 2019
Time: 6.00 pm.
Venue: Hollingworth (Room 108ABC), First Floor,
Number One Riverside, Smith Street,
Rochdale, OL16 1XU

This agenda gives notice of items to be considered in private as required by Regulations 5 (4) and (5) of The Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012.

Item No.	AGENDA	Page No
1	Apologies To receive any apologies for absence.	
2	Declarations of Interest Members are required to declare any disclosable pecuniary, personal or personal and prejudicial interests they may have and the nature of those interests relating to items on this agenda and/or indicate if S106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 applies to them.	
3	Urgent Items of Business To determine whether there are any additional items of business which, by reason of special circumstances, the Chair decides should be considered at the meeting as a matter of urgency.	
4	Minutes of meeting Tuesday, 10 September 2019 of Rochdale North Township Committee To consider the minutes of the meeting of Rochdale North Township Committee, held 10 th September 2019	3 - 6
5	Blurred Lines A film about criminal exploitation and sexual exploitation of children by young people of Oulder Hill school.	

6 Greater Manchester Police - Update

7 Open Forum

Up to 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.

8 Section 106 Formal Sport and Local Open Space

7 - 26

To update the Committee on the progress made in updating procedures to allocate Section 106 Formal Sport and Local Open Space contributions

Rochdale North Township Committee Members

Councillor Ali Ahmed

Councillor Sultan Ali

Councillor James Gartside

Councillor Michael Holly

Councillor Shaun O'Neill

Councillor Shah Wazir

Councillor Iftikhar Ahmed

Councillor Wendy Cocks

Councillor Kieran Heakin

Councillor Rachel Massey

Councillor Faisal Rana

Councillor Peter Winkler

For more information about this meeting, please contact:

Peter Thompson

Governance and Committee Services

Floor 2, Number One Riverside,

Smith Street, Rochdale, OL16 1XU

Telephone: 01706 924715

e-mail: peter.thompson@rochdale.gov.uk

Agenda Item 4

ROCHDALE NORTH TOWNSHIP COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF MEETING Tuesday, 10th September 2019

PRESENT: Councillor O'Neill (in the Chair); Councillors Ali Ahmed, Iftikhar Ahmed, Cocks, Heakin, Holly, Massey, Rana, Wazir and Winkler.

OFFICERS: V. White, J. Simpson (Neighbourhoods Directorate), I Trickett (Economy Directorate) and P. Thompson (Resources Directorate).

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Four members of the public.

APOLOGIES

8. Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sultan Ali and Gartside.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

9. There were no declarations of interests.

OPEN FORUM

10. The following matters were raised in the Committee's Open Forum session:

a) College Bank Flats, Rochdale

The Township Committee were addressed by Mr. R. Parker and Mr. M. Slater regarding proposals by Rochdale Boroughwide Housing (RBH) to demolish four of the seven high rise accommodation blocks at College Bank, Rochdale, commonly known as the 'seven sisters' and with regard to the consultation exercise that RBH had carried out in relation to this matter.

It had been anticipated that the Committee would be receiving a report from the Director of Neighbourhoods regarding the outcome of a consultation exercise relating to the draft Supplementary Planning Document, details of which were reported to the former Rochdale Township Committee at its meeting held on 23rd January 2019.

Members of the Committee again expressed their concerns at the consultation exercise that RBH had undertaken (further to minute 3(b) of the Committee's meeting held 11th June 2019) and member's support for the work of the residents who were opposed to the course of action being proposed by RBH was noted.

Resolved:

1. The Chair, Councillor O'Neill, on behalf of the Committee be authorised to make enquiries regarding the current position of the draft Supplementary Planning Document.
2. The Committee expresses its support for the work of the residents who were opposed to the course of action being proposed by RBH.
3. The Committee requests that the Cabinet member with responsibility for the Planning, Development and Housing Portfolio be requested to take up the concerns of the residents with RBH.

b) Syke Common, Healey

The Township Committee received a series of questions from Mr. R. Lord and Mr. N. Dixon regarding activities being progressed to repair and improve the paths around Syke Pond, some sections of which continue to collapse into the pond. The Committee received answers to Mr. Lord and Mr. Dixon's questions, from the Council's Environmental Management Service and noted that a full report on this

matter would be submitted to the next meeting of the Healey Ward's Area Forum on 18th October 2019.

c) Greater Manchester Police

Members of the Township Committee expressed their disappointment that representatives of Greater Manchester Police were not in attendance at the meeting to update on initiatives they were undertaking in both the Rochdale North Township and in Rochdale town centre.

Resolved:

That the Township and Communities Manager be requested to write to greater Manchester Police requesting that, wherever possible, they attend future meetings of Rochdale North Township Committee to update on police and community initiatives.

MINUTES

11. The Committee considered the minutes of the previous meeting held 11th June 2019. It was noted that at the last meeting, Councillor Cocks had been appointed as the Township's Older Person's Champion and not Councillor Massey (minute 7 refers). Further to minute 6 (resolution 6) the monetary figure of £5,000 should replace £5,00 quoted in that minute.

Resolved:

That subject to the above two amendments the minutes of the meeting of Rochdale North Township Committee, held 11th June 2019, be approved as a correct record.

ROCHDALE NORTH TOWNSHIP ACTION AND RESOURCES DELEGATED SUB-COMMITTEE

12. Resolved:

That the minutes of the meeting of Rochdale North Township Action and Resources Delegated Sub-Committee, held 4th July 2019 be noted.

PERMANENT DIVERSION OF DEFINITIVE FOOTPATH HEYFP117

13. The Township Committee considered a report of the Director of Neighbourhoods which advised that land which has been used to form part of a right of way (footpath) in the Norden area of Rochdale, labelled as HeyFp117 and RocAFp10 on Council records, was now unstable following a landslide in the area. The footpath ran on a ledge some 20 – 30 feet high and was considered a high risk for continued use by the general public.

To ensure public safety it was proposed to divert part of HeyFp117 and part of RocAFp10 footpaths to land located further away from the ledge. The Council was able to do this by proceeding with a Map Modification Order under section 119 Highways Act 1980 and following this with a legal event order to change the routes on the definitive map and statement.

The relevant landowner (United Utilities) were contacted and has written to the Council to approve a diversion of the footpaths onto neighbouring land in their ownership. The location of the diverted route is currently being used by members of the public and is notably safer.

The associated costs for officer's time and advertising costs will be borne by the Council. The diversion is required to protect public safety.

Alternatives considered:

It was reported that there were no other suitable alternatives. It was not possible to build the land back up as it was a natural landslide, the land was now unstable and any works carried out in the area could cause further land fall.

Resolved:

That the Council proceed with a Definitive Map Modification Order to divert the footpaths to an alternative location agreed by the landowner (United Utilities), to remove the risks to the general public, and, to show the new location of part of HeyFp117 and part of RocAFp10 a on the definitive map and statement by completing a legal event order.

Reasons for the decision:

Under Section 130 of the Highways Act 1980, the Council has a duty to assert and protect the rights of the general public to the use and enjoyment of any right of way. Should a right of way be out of repair, difficult to use or there is a risk to the general public in their right to the use of a footpath, bridleway or restricted byway, the Council has a duty to take the appropriate action to ensure the legitimate users are not put in any potential danger.

The conditions described in the report represent one of the circumstances the Council has to take action and the only reasonable precaution was to divert the sections of footpaths onto land that is easy to use and stable. The general public were already using an alternative route on neighbouring land, as the Council applied a temporary closure to prohibit use along footpaths HeyFp117/RocAFp10. The landowner, United Utilities, allowed access over a permissive route that they have now agreed can be recorded on Council records as a legal definitive footpath.
Eligible for Call-in: Yes.

ROCHDALE NORTH TOWNSHIP FUNDS - DELEGATION ARRANGEMENTS

14. The Director of Neighbourhoods presented a report which advised Members that at its first meeting on 11th June 2019, the Township Committee had considered a report reviewing its Township Funds for 2018/19, agreed terms and conditions for funds in 2019/20, and considered its delegation arrangements for 2019/20.

The Committee had authorised the delegation to the Townships and Communities Manager, in consultation with the Chair, Vice Chair and Opposition Spokesperson of Rochdale North Township Action and Resources Delegated Sub Committee. The Committee also resolved to reduce the limit of delegation from £5,000 as per the recommendation in the report to the Committee, to a limit of £3,000.

The Townships and Communities Manager reported that in agreeing a limit of £3,000 for delegated decisions, the Committee may be open to challenge if it was found that Rochdale North Township had, without justification, departed from the consistency of decision making which may be deemed as lacking in fairness. It was noted that all of the Borough's other four Townships had agreed to delegate decisions up to £5,000.

Alternatives considered:

The Committee has delegated authority to determine whether or not to approve the allocation of funds to funding streams and adopt terms and conditions associated therewith.

Resolved:

The Committee, in the light of legal advice received, rejected the recommendation to increase the limit of delegation from £3,000 to £5,000, which would have put it the

delegated funding limit at the same level as the Borough's other four Township Committees.

(N.B. in accordance with Council Procedure Rules, Councillor Holly requested that his vote against the Committee's resolution in this regard be noted).

Reasons for the decision:

The management of the Township Funds is a function that is delegated from the Township Committee to the respective Township Devolved Sub-Committee. The Township Funds are allocated to projects that benefit the Borough's communities and environment, and which realise the Township priorities.

Eligible for Call-in: Yes.

Agenda Item 8

Report to Pennines Township Committee



Date of Meeting	6 th November 2019
Portfolio	Cabinet Member for Housing, Planning and Development
Report Author	Nick Barton
Public/Private Document	Public

Section 106 Formal Sport and Local Open Space

Executive Summary

- 1.1 This report updates Elected Members on the progress made in updating procedures to allocate Section 106 Formal Sport and Local Open Space contributions following an audit report, which was produced in October 2018.
- 1.2 This report provides information on the current balance of unallocated Section 106 Formal Sport and Local Open Space contributions, on a Ward, Township and borough wide basis.

Recommendation

- 2.1 Elected Members note the procedures in place to allocate Section 106 Formal Sport and Open Space contributions, both in relation to historic agreements, signed prior to April 2015 and agreements following the change in Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) legislation in April 2015.
- 2.2 Elected Members note the unallocated Section 106 Formal Sport and Local Open Space contributions and the restrictions upon them, for their Ward and Township.

Reason for Recommendation

- 3.1 Section 106 Planning Obligations regarding Formal Sport and Local Open Space attract significant resources to improve local sports and general recreation facilities for the benefit of the residents of our communities. The Council is obliged to ensure that these resources are spent efficiently and in accordance with local policy and Government guidance.
- 3.2 Following an audit of the Section 106 process in October 2018, additional procedures have been developed to ensure the efficient allocation and spend of historic and new Section 106 contributions in accordance with local policy and Government guidance.

Key Points for Consideration

- 4.1 In October 2018, the Council's Internal Audit team produced a report on Section 106 Planning Obligations. The key objective of the audit was to ensure that Section 106 arrangements are managed appropriately.
- 4.2 The audit provided an assurance opinion that Section 106 arrangements were adequately managed, stating that "the control systems in operation are generally sound. However, opportunities exist to improve the management of some risks".
- 4.3 The audit report made two recommendations, firstly establishing a Section 106 Officer Steering Group and secondly to review existing unallocated section 106 contributions.
- 4.4 A breakdown of all unallocated Formal Sport and Local Open Space by Ward and Township is attached to this report (Appendix 1). The council currently holds £551,078 in unallocated Formal Sport contributions and £798,027 of Local Open Space contributions.
- 4.5 In accordance with the recommendations of the audit report, an officer steering group has been created and is chaired by the Assistant Director for Place (Neighbourhoods).
- 4.6 This group has reviewed processes for the delivery of Section 106 contributions which fall in to two categories:
 - Those relating to pre April 2015 agreements, where Elected Member approval (Cabinet for Formal Sport and the relevant Township for Local Open Space) for the allocation of existing contributions is required; and
 - Those relating to post April 2015 agreements, where Elected Member approval for new allocations is required as part of the planning process.
- 4.7 Members should note that Section 106 allocations for formal sport should be prioritised to support the priorities in the Council's Play Pitch Strategy, this strategy takes a hierarchical approach, prioritising Township hub sites, followed by key education sites, followed by single sport representation and larger multi-pitch sites and finally small club sites.
- 4.8 Members should also note that Section 106 allocations for play provision should be informed by the Council's forthcoming Play Strategy, subject to Cabinet approval; and associated Township Action Plans, subject to Township approvals.
- 4.9 Members should also note that Section 106 allows for the provision of 20 years maintenance of both local open space and formal sport; and the future maintenance of any new or improved provision must be considered when Section 106 contributions are allocated.
- 4.10 Planning officers are currently progressing an SPD which if adopted by Cabinet will allow future allocations of Section 106 to be used for indoor sports, these being prioritised through the Council's Built Facilities Strategy.

4.11 Appendix 2 provides an update on allocated projects, currently in progress, on an individual Township basis and sets out the priorities that are being followed; aligned to existing and emerging policy.

4.12 **Alternatives Considered**

The Council is required to spend Section 106 Formal Sport and Local Open Space contributions in accordance with legal agreements and local and national planning policy. Not following the recommendations of the audit report, risks a loss of efficiency in delivery of Section 106 projects and the associated benefits to residents and potentially contributions being returned to developers unspent.

Costs and Budget Summary

5.1 A breakdown of all unallocated Formal Sport and Local Open Space by Ward and Township is attached to this report. The council currently holds £505,742 in unallocated Formal Sport contributions and £806,342 of Local Open Space contributions.

Risk and Policy Implications

6.1 Contributions from Section 106 agreements, must be spent within the parameters of each of those legally binding documents. Where the money is not spent within the appropriate parameters, then this risks legal challenge, which would present significant financial and reputational as well as legal risk to the Council.

6.2 Where there are any queries or where there is any uncertainty on spending contributions obtained through Section 106 planning obligations, this should be raised and advice should be sought from Legal Services and where appropriate the Section 151 Officer, as any misspending may obviously impact on that function.

Consultation

7.1 This report is to inform Elected Members of the progress in meeting the recommendations of the audit report and current unallocated Section 106 Formal Sport and Local Open Space contributions held by the Council.

7.2 Further reports will be presented to appropriate committees to seek authority to allocate Section 106 Formal Sport and Local Open Space contributions, following consultation with Ward Councillors and Portfolio Holders.

Background Papers	Place of Inspection
--------------------------	----------------------------

<p>8. Provision of Recreational Open Space in New Housing Supplementary Planning Document</p>	<p>Planning and Development, Floor 3, Number One Riverside or online at: http://rochdale.gov.uk/pdf/2017-02-21-recreation-open-space-spd-updated-v2.pdf</p>
---	--

For Further Information Contact:

Nick Barton

Tel: 01706924847,
nick.barton@rochdale.gov.uk

TOWNSHIP	TOTAL (£)	WARD	AMOUNT
HEYWOOD	£ 174,224.87	NORTH HEYWOOD (1)	£ 54,970.00
			£ 830.00
			£ 4,980.00
			£ 830.00
		WEST HEYWOOD	£ 108,713.87
			£ 1,660.00
			£ 415.00
			£ 1,826.00
MIDDLETON	£ 172,530.91	HOPWOOD HALL	£ 41,500.00
			£ 6,640.00
		EAST MIDDLETON	£ 20,916.00
			£ 2,071.68
			£ 5,822.00
		NORTH MIDDLETON	£ -
		SOUTH MIDDLETON	£ 93,500.00
		WEST MIDDLETON	£ 2,081.23
			£ 22,857.14
			£ 85,714.29

PENNINES	£ 220,003.93		£ 105,000.00
		LITTLEBOROUGH LAKESIDE	£ 913.00
			£ 1,369.50
			£ 3,735.00
			£ 415.00
		MILNROW AND NEWHEY	£ -
		SMALLBRIDGE AND FIRFROVE	£ -
		WARDLE AND WEST LITTLEBOROUGH	£ -
ROCHDALE NORTH	£ 148,064.64	CENTRAL ROCHDALE	£ 148,064.64
		HEALEY	£ -
		NORDEN	£ -
		SPOTLAND AND FALINGE	£ -
ROCHDALE SOUTH	£ 91,517.71	BALDERSTONE AND KIRKHOLT	£ -
		BAMFORD	£ 26,271.90
		CASTLETON	£ 415.00
		KINGSWAY	£ 7,904.76
			£ 54,925.07
		MILKSTONE AND DEEPLISH (2)	£ 2,000.98

£ 806,342.06

- (1) Heywood elected members have identified supporting cycle track surfacing at Springfield Park as a pr
(2) Ward members have identified supporting improvements to Stoneyfield Park as a priority.

DEVELOPMENT
Land at Manchester Street (Burns Mill)
Market Street
85 and 85a Rochdale Road East
Gregg Street
Persimmon Homes Sutherland Road
84-86 Bury Street, Heywood
Land at Heys Lane
Heywood Farm, Birtle
Alderman Kay, Tintern Road
Manchester Road
Old David's Inn, Mount Road
204 Grimshaw Lane
Alkrington Moss Primary School
Sovereign Gate, Heywood Old Road
Helvellyn Drive
Wiggett Homes, Hare Hill Road
LIDL Stockton Street

BDW Trading Ltd, Stansfield Mill
Branch Road Farm
Schofield Hall Barn, Rakewood Road
Riverside Centre, Madens Square
104 Todmorden Road
Keepmoat, Dean Street
McCarthy & Stone, Norden Road
Partington Street
Moss Terrace / Billberry Street
David Wilson Homes, Kingsway
Boundary Street

riority at an estimated cost of £12,000.

RESTRICTIONS
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision and/or improvement of open space sport/recreational facilities in Middleton.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Children' Play Area in the vicinity of the development.
Provision of a pedestrian crossing with the remainder being used to improve connectivity within Littleborough Centre.

Towards improvement to the Stansfield Estate Play Area, towards improvements to the public footpath leading to Shop Wood (allocated and complete) and the provision of outdoor sports in Littleborough.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
To be applied by the Council towards the provision of recreational open space.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.
Enhancement or improvement of public realm, open space, footpaths and/or cycleways within the vicinity of Kingsway Business Park.
Towards the provision/improvement of recreational open space within the vicinity of the development including design and supervision.

Pennines Township EM Service s106 Township Update

Allocated and part spent s106 funding

EM Services are part way through a number of s106 funded projects in Pennines Township.

Table 1: Position statement existing allocated s106 plan for spend

Scheme	£ allocated	£remaining	Plan for spend
Stansfield Estate Play area	20,000	20,000	Allocated to RBH play site but RBH are looking to close the play area. Not sufficient to pay for new RBC play area inspection / maintenance costs so not possible to spend. Ideal would be new development to add to this to enable a new RBC play areas
Milnrow Memorial Park	5,810	5,122	Budget has been spent on Milnrow Play, EM in process of drawing the money down
Wardle sports pitches	44,332	1,311	Remainder to be drawn down asap part of ongoing project

Unallocated s106

The s106 Steering Group will use the following EM Service strategic documents to inform s106 priorities:

1. Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy (PPOS): Currently being reviewed and updated. The refreshed version will include consideration around bowling greens and tennis courts in parks as well as the formal sports pitches for football, cricket, rugby that were already included in the original strategy.

1.1 In relation to the PPOS, the following have been highlighted as a priority for investment / improvement in the Pennines Township:

- a. Littleborough Sports Centre multi-sports hub for Pennines Township as number one priority
- b. Multi-team sites at Rakewood and Hollingworth academy as the second priority
- c. Individual team sites as third priority
- d. Following the above, any bowls / tennis project yet to be identified as part of the strategy refresh

2. Play Area Strategy (PAS): This new strategy is currently being designed and is expected to be presented to Members early in the New Year. This will inform on the current provision quantity / quality / location for each site whether Council or RBH play area and identify exactly what investment is required over a 5 year period to ensure play area provision across the Borough meets requirements, expected standards and is innovative and attractive to users.

2.1 In relation to the PAS, the following areas have been highlighted as a priority for investment / improvement in the Pennines Township:

- a. Main Town Park (Hare Hill Park) relatively major refurbishment required
- b. Ensuring play areas are accessible and inclusive for all people regardless of disabilities of children or accompanying adults
- c. Programme of remedial works various sites already identified as required to ensure safety standard, Stonie Heys identified as a specific priority
- d. If RBH to decide to close a play area on their land and if this leaves under-provision of play facilities in an area, assess and provide Members with information and recommendations they will need to make any decisions on funding a RBC transfer of the site or for providing alternative play area provision as appropriate

3. Individual site Green Flag management plans developed in partnership with various stakeholders that set out individual projects deemed desirable for that site based on input from users, EM Service staff, Members, Friends group, Green Flag judges comments etc.

Unallocated s106

The Main s106 report includes as an appendix a list of all unallocated s106 for Pennines Township. Individual scheme proposals using the above documents will be brought to Cabinet (Formal Sports) and Township (play / open space improvements) for Member consideration and s106 funding allocation in due course.

New s106 will include as per the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), a 20 year inspection and maintenance budget allocation to be negotiated by Planning as part of the legal Planning processes around s106.

For existing unallocated s106 as part of the table above, it should be understood that for any spend which delivers over and above the current level of provision, the £value in column 3 will have to be allocated to both capital expenditure to deliver the new provision and to revenue expenditure to inspect and maintain that new provision. If the funding was allocated purely to capital costs it would create a provision that there is no budget to inspect or maintain and therefore a liability.

Standard industry practice is to allocate the same £value capital costs to revenue costs, so a play area that costs £50,000 to supply and install will require £50,000 revenue budget to inspect and maintain for 20 years. For example we have a 6 weekly detailed technical inspection of all the equipment fixtures and fittings and safety surfacing by trained Council staff and an annual independent inspection by an external company.

The requirement for additional revenue budget provision to inspect and maintain facilities that deliver over and above existing provision is expected to be confirmed in the PAS and is part of the refresh of Planning Policy.

If a specific project is expected to deviate from the standard revenue costing practice because it is simpler and therefore less costly to inspect and maintain this will be defined to Members and a lower revenue contribution would be sought.

If there are specific circumstances whereby a scheme is not creating additional provision over and above existing facilities then EM Service would not request revenue costs, for example if Township agreed to decommission a remnant play area in an area of over-provision in one part of the Township then this could balance new provision elsewhere in the Township.

Rochdale South Township EM Service s106 Township Update

Allocated and part spent s106 funding

EM Services are part way through a number of s106 funded projects in Rochdale South Township.

Table 1: Position statement existing allocated s106 plan for spend

Scheme	£ allocated	£remaining	Plan for spend
Robinsons Common	244,000	64,805	Ongoing project MUGA etc money to continue to be drawn down. If any spare possible for Play Area project see below.
Sparth community centre canopy	8,500	8,500	No deliverable, to be returned to Members to make decision alternative spend.
Broad Lane Right of Way (Wainhomes)	27,133	27,133	Quotes being obtained, project will be delivered.
Rochdale Memorial Gardens revamp	28,478	1,072	Remainder will be spent this financial year, a few small jobs to finish off.
Balderstone Sports project	748,063	731,086	Ongoing project.

Unallocated s106

The s106 Steering Group will use the following EM Service strategic documents to inform s106 priorities:

1. Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy (PPOS): Currently being reviewed and updated. The refreshed version will include consideration around bowling greens and tennis courts in parks as well as the formal sports pitches for football, cricket, rugby that were already included in the original strategy.
 - 1.1 In relation to the PPOS, the following have been highlighted as a priority for investment / improvement in the Rochdale South Township:
 - e. Firgrove Sports Centre multi-sports hub for Rochdale South Township as number one priority
 - f. Multi-team sites at Mayfield Rugby, Rochdale Rugby, Kingsway School and Top O'th Lane as the second priority
 - g. Individual team sites as third priority
 - h. Following the above, any bowls / tennis project yet to be identified as part of the strategy refresh
2. Play Area Strategy (PAS): This new strategy is currently being designed and is expected to be presented to Members early in the New Year. This will inform on the current provision quantity / quality / location for each site whether Council or RBH play area and identify exactly what investment is required over a 5 year period to ensure play area provision across the Borough meets requirements, expected standards and is innovative and attractive to users.
 - 2.1 In relation to the PAS, the following areas have been highlighted as a priority for investment / improvement in the Rochdale South Township:
 - e. Main Town Park (Springfield Park) relatively major refurbishment required
 - f. Ensuring play areas are accessible and inclusive for all people regardless of disabilities of children or accompanying adults
 - g. Programme of remedial works various sites already identified as required to ensure safety standard, Balderstone Park identified as a specific priority
 - h. If RBH to decide to close a play area on their land and if this leaves under-provision of play facilities in an area, assess and provide Members with information

and recommendations they will need to make any decisions on funding a RBC transfer of the site or for providing alternative play area provision as appropriate

3. Individual site Green Flag management plans developed in partnership with various stakeholders that set out individual projects deemed desirable for that site based on input from users, EM Service staff, Members, Friends group, Green Flag judges comments etc.

Unallocated s106

The main s106 report includes as an appendix a list of all unallocated s106 for Rochdale South Township. Individual scheme proposals using the above documents will be brought to Cabinet (Formal Sports) and Township (play / open space improvements) for Member consideration and s106 funding allocation in due course.

New s106 will include as per the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), a 20 year inspection and maintenance budget allocation to be negotiated by Planning as part of the legal Planning processes around s106.

For existing unallocated s106 as part of the table above, it should be understood that for any spend which delivers over and above the current level of provision, the £value in column 3 will have to be allocated to both capital expenditure to deliver the new provision and to revenue expenditure to inspect and maintain that new provision. If the funding was allocated purely to capital costs it would create a provision that there is no budget to inspect or maintain and therefore a liability.

Standard industry practice is to allocate the same £value capital costs to revenue costs, so a play area that costs £50,000 to supply and install will require £50,000 revenue budget to inspect and maintain for 20 years. For example we have a 6 weekly detailed technical inspection of all the equipment fixtures and fittings and safety surfacing by trained Council staff and an annual independent inspection by an external company.

The requirement for additional revenue budget provision to inspect and maintain facilities that deliver over and above existing provision is expected to be confirmed in the PAS and is part of the refresh of Planning Policy.

If a specific project is expected to deviate from the standard revenue costing practice because it is simpler and therefore less costly to inspect and maintain this will be defined to Members and a lower revenue contribution would be sought.

If there are specific circumstances whereby a scheme is not creating additional provision over and above existing facilities then EM Service would not request revenue costs, for example if Township agreed to decommission a remnant play area in an area of over-provision in one part of the Township then this could balance new provision elsewhere in the Township.

Rochdale North Township EM Service s106 Township Update

Allocated and part spent s106 funding

EM Services are part way through a number of s106 funded projects in Rochdale North Township.

Table 1: Position statement existing allocated s106 plan for spend

Scheme	£ allocated	£remaining	Plan for spend
Syke Pond	36,536	36,536	Structural survey done and Paul Harris / QS team putting out to tender, to be spent this financial year

Unallocated s106

The s106 Steering Group will use the following EM Service strategic documents to inform s106 priorities:

1. Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy (PPOS): Currently being reviewed and updated. The refreshed version will include consideration around bowling greens and tennis courts in parks as well as the formal sports pitches for football, cricket, rugby that were already included in the original strategy.

1.1 In relation to the PPOS, the following have been highlighted as a priority for investment / improvement in the Rochdale North Township:

- i. Firgrove Sports Centre multi-sports hub for Rochdale North Township as number one priority
- j. Multi-team sites at Oulder Hill, Norden Community School and Rochdale Cricket and lacrosse club as the second priority
- k. Individual team sites as third priority
- l. Following the above, any bowls / tennis project yet to be identified as part of the strategy refresh

2. Play Area Strategy (PAS): This new strategy is currently being designed and is expected to be presented to Members early in the New Year. This will inform on the current provision quantity / quality / location for each site whether Council or RBH play area and identify exactly what investment is required over a 5 year period to ensure play area provision across the Borough meets requirements, expected standards and is innovative and attractive to users.

2.1 In relation to the PAS, the following areas have been highlighted as a priority for investment / improvement in the Rochdale North Township:

- a. Moderate Investment at multiple partially under-provisioned sites:

- Falinge
- Norden
- Heybrook
- Denehurst

Unlike some other Townships there is no one major investment required site but rather a number of smaller / medium size projects

- i. Ensuring play areas are accessible and inclusive for all people regardless of disabilities of children or accompanying adults
- j. Programme of remedial works various sites already identified as required to ensure safety standard
- k. If RBH to decide to close a play area on their land and if this leaves under-provision of play facilities in area assess and provide Members with information

and recommendations they will need to make any decisions on funding a RBC transfer of the site or for providing alternative play area provision as appropriate

3. Individual site Green Flag management plans developed in partnership with various stakeholders that set out individual projects deemed desirable for that site based on input from users, EM Service staff, Members, Friends group, Green Flag judges comments etc.

Unallocated s106

The main s106 report includes as an appendix a list of all unallocated s106 for Rochdale North Township. Individual scheme proposals using the above documents will be brought to Cabinet (Formal Sports) and Township (play / open space improvements) for Member consideration and s106 funding allocation in due course.

New s106 will include as per the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), a 20 year inspection and maintenance budget allocation to be negotiated by Planning as part of the legal Planning processes around s106.

For existing unallocated s106 as part of the table above, it should be understood that for any spend which delivers over and above the current level of provision, the £value in column 3 will have to be allocated to both capital expenditure to deliver the new provision and to revenue expenditure to inspect and maintain that new provision. If the funding was allocated purely to capital costs it would create a provision that there is no budget to inspect or maintain and therefore a liability.

Standard industry practice is to allocate the same £value capital costs to revenue costs, so a play area that costs £50,000 to supply and install will require £50,000 revenue budget to inspect and maintain for 20 years. For example we have a 6 weekly detailed technical inspection of all the equipment fixtures and fittings and safety surfacing by trained Council staff and an annual independent inspection by an external company.

The requirement for additional revenue budget provision to inspect and maintain facilities that deliver over and above existing provision is expected to be confirmed in the PAS and is part of the refresh of Planning Policy.

If a specific project is expected to deviate from the standard revenue costing practice because it is simpler and therefore less costly to inspect and maintain this will be defined to Members and a lower revenue contribution would be sought.

If there are specific circumstances whereby a scheme is not creating additional provision over and above existing facilities then EM Service would not request revenue costs, for example if Township agreed to decommission a remnant play area in an area of over-provision in one part of the Township then this could balance new provision elsewhere in the Township.

Middleton Township EM Service s106 Township Update

Allocated and part spent s106 funding

EM Services are part way through a number of s106 funded projects in Middleton Township.

Table 1: Position statement existing allocated s106 plan for spend:

Scheme	£ allocated	£remaining	Plan for spend
Middleton Town Centre Conservation project	30,000	£8,507	Project implementation sits outside EM with Council Conservation Officer Jessica Scott. We are expecting spend this financial year
Pine St play area	26,226	10,398	Works identified and programmed in at King George V to upgrade play area to spend monies this financial year
Cleweth Rd Changing rooms	116,000	116,000	Project undeliverable, to be taken back to Members to consider alternative allocation
Bowlee	186,463	118,819	Some spend still due on drainage but suggested to Members to retain remainder to add to expected additional s106 to enable large item spend e.g. 4G pitch

Unallocated s106

The s106 Steering Group will use the following EM Service strategic documents to inform s106 priorities:

1. Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy (PPOS): Currently being reviewed and updated. The refreshed version will include consideration around bowling greens and tennis courts in parks as well as the formal sports pitches for football, cricket, rugby that were already included in the original strategy.
 - 1.1 In relation to the PPOS, the following have been highlighted as a priority for investment / improvement in the Middleton Township:
 - m. Bowlee multi-sports hub for Middleton Township as number one priority
 - n. Multi-team sites at Limefield Park, Hopwood Hall and Middleton Cricket Club as the second priority
 - o. Individual team sites as third priority
 - p. Following the above, any bowls / tennis project yet to be identified as part of the strategy refresh
2. Play Area Strategy (PAS): This new strategy is currently being designed and is expected to be presented to Members early in the New Year. This will inform on the current provision quantity / quality / location for each site whether Council or RBH play area and identify exactly what investment is required over a 5 year period to ensure play area provision across the Borough meets requirements, expected standards and is innovative and attractive to users.
 - 2.1 In relation to the PAS, the following areas have been highlighted as a priority for investment / improvement in the Middleton Township:
 - a. Moderate investment at multiple partially under-provisioned sites including:
 - King George
 - Hollins
 - Brassey St
 - Bowlee

Unlike some other Townships there is no one major investment required site but rather lots of smaller / medium size projects

- l. Ensuring play areas are accessible and inclusive for all people regardless of disabilities of children or accompanying adults
 - m. Programme of remedial works various sites already identified as required to ensure safety standard
 - n. If RBH to decide to close a play area on their land and if this leaves under-provision of play facilities in an area, assess and provide Members with information and recommendations they will need to make any decisions on funding a RBC transfer of the site or for providing alternative play area provision as appropriate
3. Individual site Green Flag management plans developed in partnership with various stakeholders that set out individual projects deemed desirable for that site based on input from users, EM Service staff, Members, Friends group, Green Flag judges comments etc.

Unallocated s106

The Main s106 report includes as an appendix a list of all unallocated s106 for Middleton Township. Individual scheme proposals using the above documents will be brought to Cabinet (Formal Sports) and Township (play / open space improvements) for Member consideration and s106 funding allocation in due course.

New s106 will include as per the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), a 20 year inspection and maintenance budget allocation to be negotiated by Planning as part of the legal Planning processes around s106.

For existing unallocated s106 as part of the table above, it should be understood that for any spend which delivers over and above the current level of provision, the £value in column 3 will have to be allocated to both capital expenditure to deliver the new provision and to revenue expenditure to inspect and maintain that new provision. If the funding was allocated purely to capital costs it would create a provision that there is no budget to inspect or maintain and therefore a liability.

Standard industry practice is to allocate the same £value capital costs to revenue costs, so a play area that costs £50,000 to supply and install will require £50,000 revenue budget to inspect and maintain for 20 years. For example we have a 6 weekly detailed technical inspection of all the equipment fixtures and fittings and safety surfacing by trained Council staff and an annual independent inspection by an external company.

The requirement for additional revenue budget provision to inspect and maintain facilities that deliver over and above existing provision is expected to be confirmed in the PAS and is part of the refresh of Planning Policy.

If a specific project is expected to deviate from the standard revenue costing practice because it is simpler and therefore less costly to inspect and maintain this will be defined to Members and a lower revenue contribution would be sought.

If there are specific circumstances whereby a scheme is not creating additional provision over and above existing facilities then EM Service would not request revenue costs, for example if Township agreed to decommission a remnant play area in an area of over-provision in one part of the Township then this could balance new provision elsewhere in the Township.

Heywood Township EM Service s106 Township Update

Allocated and part spent s106 funding

EM Services are part way through a number of s106 funded projects in Heywood Township.

Table 1: Position statement existing allocated s106 plan for spend:

Scheme	£ value allocated	£ value remaining	Plan for spend
Hopwood Park drainage, ponds & paths	11,155	6,368	Initial project complete. Members are requested to approve alternate spend on improving drainage & matting under the Hopwood Park zipwire which is frequently too muddy to use
Queen's Park Multi-use Games Area	89,000	610	Retention for unexpected early repairs. Assess March 2020 to see if any remedial works after winter weathering

Unallocated s106

The s106 Steering Group will use the following EM Service strategic documents to inform s106 priorities:

1. Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy (PPOS): Currently being reviewed and updated. The refreshed version will include consideration around bowling greens and tennis courts in parks as well as the formal sports pitches for football, cricket, rugby that were already included in the original strategy.

1.1 In relation to the PPOS, the following have been highlighted as a priority for investment / improvement in the Heywood Township:

- a. Heywood Sports Village (L4L) main sports hub for the Township as number one priority
- b. Multi-team site at Sutherland Road as the second priority
- c. Individual team sites as third priority 3
- d. Following the above, any bowls / tennis project yet to be identified as part of the strategy refresh

2. Play Area Strategy (PAS): This new strategy is currently being designed and is expected to be presented to Members early in the New Year. This will inform on the current provision quantity / quality / location for each site whether Council or RBH play area and identify exactly what investment is required over a 5 year period to ensure play area provision across the Borough meets requirements, expected standards and is innovative and attractive to users.

2.1 In relation to the PAS, the following areas have been highlighted as a priority for investment / improvement in the Heywood Township:

- a. Main Town Park (Queen's) major refurbishment required
- b. Investment at under-provisioned Darnhill site
- c. Ensuring play areas are accessible and inclusive for all people regardless of disabilities of children or accompanying adults
- d. Programme of remedial works various sites already identified as required to ensure safety standard
- e. If RBH to decide to close a play area on their land and if this leaves under-provision of play facilities in an area, assess and provide Members with information

- and recommendations they will need to make any decisions on funding a RBC transfer of the site or for providing alternative play area provision as appropriate
- f. Upgrading poor quality youth provision (skate facility at Hopwood Park is very poor compared to provision in other Townships)

3. Individual site Green Flag management plans developed in partnership with various stakeholders that set out individual projects deemed desirable for that site based on input from users, EM Service staff, Members, Friends group, Green Flag judges' comments etc.

Unallocated s106

The main s106 report includes as an appendix a list of all unallocated s106 for Heywood Township. Individual scheme proposals using the above documents will be brought to Cabinet (Formal Sports) and Township (play / open space improvements) for Member consideration and s106 funding allocation in due course.

New s106 will include as per the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), a 20 year inspection and maintenance budget allocation to be negotiated by Planning as part of the legal Planning processes around s106.

For existing unallocated s106 as part of the table above, it should be understood that for any spend which delivers over and above the current level of provision, the £value in column 3 will have to be allocated to both capital expenditure to deliver the new provision and to revenue expenditure to inspect and maintain that new provision. If the funding was allocated purely to capital costs it would create a provision that there is no budget to inspect or maintain and therefore a liability.

Standard industry practice is to allocate the same £value capital costs to revenue costs, so a play area that costs £50,000 to supply and install will require £50,000 revenue budget to inspect and maintain for 20 years. For example we have a 6 weekly detailed technical inspection of all the equipment fixtures and fittings and safety surfacing by trained Council staff and an annual independent inspection by an external company.

The requirement for additional revenue budget provision to inspect and maintain facilities that deliver over and above existing provision is expected to be confirmed in the PAS and is part of the refresh of Planning Policy.

If a specific project is expected to deviate from the standard revenue costing practice because it is simpler and therefore less costly to inspect and maintain this will be defined to Members and a lower revenue contribution would be sought.

If there are specific circumstances whereby a scheme is not creating additional provision over and above existing facilities then EM Service would not request revenue costs, for example if Township agreed to decommission a remnant play area in an area of over-provision in one part of the Township then this could balance new provision elsewhere in the Township.