

CABINET MEMBER FOR ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Venue:	Bailey House, Rawmarsh Road, Rotherham	Date:	Monday, 20 September 2004
		Time:	9.00 a.m.

A G E N D A

1. To determine if the following matters are to be considered under the categories suggested, in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972.
2. To determine any item which the Chairman is of the opinion should be considered later in the agenda as a matter of urgency.
3. Minutes of a meeting of the Unitary Development Plan Review Members' Steering Group held on 16th July, 2004 (Pages 1 - 4)
 - **to receive the minutes and note the proposed re-constitution of the Steering Group.**
4. Draft South Yorkshire Rail Strategy 2004 (Pages 5 - 11)
Head of Planning and Transportation Service to report.
 - **to inform Members about the consultation draft of the South Yorkshire Rail Strategy.**
5. Public Consultation: Traffic Management Act 2004 - Network Management Duty (Pages 12 - 19)
Street Works & Co-ordination Engineer to report.
 - **to approve the proposed response to the consultation.**
6. The Rotherham Borough Council (Brampton en le Morthen) (Environmental Improvements) Compulsory Purchase Order 2004 (Pages 20 - 22)
Head of Legal and Democratic Services to report.
 - **to consider the making of the Order by Thurcroft Parish Council in order to facilitate an environmental improvement scheme for which grant funding is available.**

(Plan not available electronically)
7. Economic and Development Services Beacon Applications (Pages 23 - 24)
 - Corporate Property Manager to Report
to note the information in the report
8. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC
The following items are likely to be considered in the absence of the press and public as being exempt under the paragraphs, indicated below, of Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972:-

9. Restructuring of Economic and Development Services Finance Team (Pages 25 - 27)
Executive Director to report.
 - **to report on the restructuring of the Finance Team.**
(Exempt under Paragraph 1 of the Act – report relates to staffing)
(Appendix 1 – First Phase Plan and Appendix A – Action Plan are not available electronically)

10. Landscaping - Manvers Residuals (Phase 3) and Templeborough Enterprise Park
Project Officer to report.
 - **to seek approval for the implementation of landscape schemes and applications to Yorkshire Forward for grant funding.**
(Exempt under Paragraph 7 of the Act – financial affairs of an organisation other than the Local Authority)
(Report not available electronically)

11. Single Regeneration Budget IV, New York Riverside, Project 3.5 - Proposed Boundary Wall and Entrance Gates, New Life Christian Centre, Canklow Road, Rotherham (Pages 28 - 32)
Project Officer to report.
 - **to seek approval for grant expenditure under the terms of the project.**
(Exempt under Paragraph 5 of the Act – financial assistance provided by the Local Authority)

**UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN REVIEW MEMBERS' STEERING GROUP
FRIDAY, 16TH JULY, 2004**

Present:- Councillor G. Smith (in the Chair); Councillors Hall, Walker and Robinson.

together with:-

Alan Mitchell, Forward Planning Manager
Andy Duncan, Strategic Planner

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from:-

Councillor Pickering, Vice-Chair, Planning Board
Phil Turnidge, Senior Planner

2. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING HELD ON 21ST MAY, 2004

Agreed: That the minutes of the previous meeting held on 21st May, 2004 be approved as a correct record.

3. MATTERS ARISING

There were no matters arising from the previous meeting.

4. FUTURE ROLE OF THE STEERING GROUP

Reference was made to the challenging timescales, the need to ensure Member ownership and to have as efficient process as possible.

Consideration was given to the proposal that this Group should have greater delegation, and to bring in other Cabinet Members and officers as required.

It was pointed out that the new LDF would be a significant document and would be a spatial strategy to co-ordinate regeneration and other strategies in Rotherham.

Consideration was given to a suggested Scheme of Delegation for a renamed group – the Rotherham LDF Steering Group.

It was reported that the Head of Planning and Transportation Service was happy that the suggestions be tabled for debate. However, these had yet to be discussed with the Executive Director, Economic and Development Services.

The involvement of Area Assemblies was discussed.

The Chairman expressed concern that this was a long list of proposed delegated powers and referred to the possibility of Call-in of some of the issues and the resulting delay. He added that there were on-going discussions about revising the delegation to the Regeneration and Property Boards.

Consideration was given to the suggestion that 1 to 9 in the list be reserved for Cabinet and Council, and 10 to 24 be delegated to the Rotherham LDF Steering Group.

Agreed: (1) That the Area Assembly Chairs be asked to be flexible regarding presentations to and consultations on the new LDF.

(2) That, subject to the above discussion points, a report be submitted to the Cabinet, asking for recommendation to the Council, of the proposed scheme of delegation.

5. SCOPE OF THE FIRST LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

It was reported that there had been discussion with Government Office and they had suggested that the initial LDF submission should comprise a core strategy, core policies (particularly housing) and a statement of community involvement.

Concern was expressed that this would mean that the new document would not be comprehensive, and that other topics would have to continue to be dependent on the present policies with the existing UDP.

From the planning point of view it was thought that the first document would also need to include:-

- Core Strategy and Supporting Strategic policies
- the Economy
- Plan, monitor and management of Housing Land
- Transportation policies and proposals
- Town Centre Action Plan
- Proposals map,
- Statement of Community Involvement
- Annual monitoring report.

It was pointed out that sustainability would be at the core and it was recognised that within the timescale this would be ambitious.

Agreed: That the initial submission includes the elements listed above.

6. THE NORTHERN WAY GROWTH STRATEGY

Consideration was given to a Briefing Paper – The Northern Way Growth Strategy.

The aim was to develop a package of measures to boost the economy of the North of England which was seen by the Government as under-performing. The development of the strategy was being lead by the three northern RDA's.

The key themes identified were:-

- prospering city regions
- World class universities – knowledge economy
- More entrepreneurs – stronger industries
- A better skilled workforce – fewer out of work
- Better road, rail, air and sea transport
- Many more quality homes
- Selling the North
- More self-reliant – more private investment (Smart delivery)

The work would relate to the Regional Spatial Strategy and that would be significant to the LDF and may mean higher targets e.g. growth, infrastructure etc., than previously anticipated.

Those present commented on:-

- reference to the implication that Rotherham might have to roll out its green belt to support Sheffield
- relocation of civil service jobs
- pockets of deprivation

It was reported that the RDA's were committed to present a full report on the Northern Way to the ODPM by late July 2004.

Agreed: That summary of the Strategy and its implications be presented to a future meeting of the Steering Group.

7. LEGISLATIVE POSITION - UPDATE

It was reported that the new Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act had received royal assent in May but that there was a gradual process of introducing the measures contained within the Act.

It was reported that parts relevant to planning commenced in September which was later than anticipated. The revised Planning Policy Statements and protocols were awaited.

The target date for adoption of the new plan was March 2007. Working from September 2004 this gave a timescale of 2½ years though the Government had previously been referring to a 3 year timescale. However it appeared that the Government was talking about three years. The Government Planning Minister had stated that it was Government's intention to reform the planning obligations. Clarification about this was needed.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There were no other items of business.

9. DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING

Agreed: That the next meeting of this group (renamed the Rotherham LDF Steering Group) be held on FRIDAY, 24TH SEPTEMBER, 2004 at 10.00 a.m. at the Town Hall.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Economic and Development Services
2.	Date:	20/9/2004
3.	Title:	Draft South Yorkshire Rail Strategy 2004
4.	Programme Area:	Economic and Development Services, Planning and Transportation Services.

5. Summary

To inform members about the consultation draft of the South Yorkshire Rail Strategy (SYRS).

6. Recommendations

That Cabinet Member approves the draft SYRS and recommends that the comments in the report are forwarded to the SYPTE.

7. Proposals and Details

The SYRS attempts to focus the disparate stakeholders and issues relating to the current and future development of the rail network in South Yorkshire. The key objectives of the SYRS are to:

- Improve reliability and performance of the existing rail network.
- Improve services through investment in rolling stock and passenger facilities.
- Improve integration with other travel modes.
- Improve the cost effectiveness of rail investment.
- Improve rail access to communities and new economic development areas.

The SYRS promotes both short/medium and medium/longer term priorities to improve the rail network and services in Rotherham and South Yorkshire. A summary of the priorities across South Yorkshire is attached at Appendix A. A copy of the full draft SYRS will be available at the meeting. The priorities relating directly to Rotherham will significantly improve rail travel and are fully supported. These are discussed in more detail below.

Short to Medium Term Priorities

- The SYPTE will progress discussions with train operators to determine the cost and feasibility of a shuttle service between Doncaster and Robin Hood Doncaster Sheffield Airport (RHDSA). Whilst airport bound rail passengers from Rotherham Central, Swinton or Meadowhall Station would need to interchange at Doncaster, much improved connectivity between Rotherham and RHDSA would be achieved.
- The SYPTE will investigate funding opportunities and establish a business case for the delivery of station improvements and platform extensions at Rotherham Central Station. Currently the station platforms can only accommodate four-car rolling stock - typically local trains. Platform extensions will allow longer trains including inter-urban services to access the station subject to capacity constraints being resolved at Holmes Curve (see below). Initial contact has already been made by the SYPTE and the Council has set up a project group to drive the matter forward via the Renaissance Towns Initiative.

A number of welcome improvements for passengers using Rotherham Central Station are identified. These include a heated waiting room and a help point. Members should note that Appendix 3 of the SYRS suggested that Rotherham Interchange already has a heated waiting room and provides free car parking for 100 vehicles. In fact, there is no heated waiting room and the majority of the 60 space car parking provision is controlled by Pay and Display regulations. The SYPTE have since corrected these anomalies.

Medium to Long Term Priorities

- The capacity constraints and low train running speeds on the single track approach to Rotherham Station (Holmes Curve) are acknowledged by the SYRS. The reinstatement of the former Blackburn curve to the west of the Sheffield /

Rotherham Boundary is supported to improve capacity and to allow the routing of inter-urban services through the station. This is particularly welcome bearing in mind the role Rotherham Central Station has to play in supporting the Rotherham Renaissance Towns project and the Council's broader transport objectives.

- Capacity constraints are also identified to the north of Sheffield Station. These constraints limit scope to expand rail service provision and create delays which have a 'knock on' effect for services elsewhere on the network. Additional capacity will improve train punctuality on the whole network, including those accessing Rotherham from the east.
- A direct heavy rail link between Barnsley and Doncaster is proposed although engineering difficulties associated with the re-instatement of the line make the project a very long term aspiration. Nevertheless, a direct link would enable the diversion of some existing Barnsley to Sheffield rail services via Swinton and Rotherham Central thereby improving Rotherham's connectivity with the rail network.

8. Finance

Financial estimates are included in Appendix A. Although there are no direct financial implications arising from this report at this stage, funding would be from a variety of sources via the DfT, SYPTE and SYPTA.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The Strategic Rail Authority (SRA) has now been restructured with greater roles for the DfT and Network Rail resulting in greater public control of rail network. However, during the transitional period, dialogue will be required between the SYPTE/PTA and DfT to ensure that commitments made by the SRA are honoured.

First Keolis operate the new Trans-Pennine rail franchise and SercoNed Rail will take over the Northern Rail franchise from Arriva in Autumn 2004. Again, dialogue will be required to ensure that, subject to the limitations of the existing rail network, both operators provide a high quality rail service which integrates with the objectives of the Local Transport Plan.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The improvement of public transport provision through reliable, high quality rail services is essential to foster sustainable and inclusive regeneration in Rotherham. Improvements to the rail network will also make a positive contribution to the targets and objectives contained in the Local Transport Plan (LTP) and in turn, these influence the LTP Annual Performance Review - a key indicator in our Corporate Performance Assessment.

The Rotherham Town Team recognised the economic importance of rail and have identified a pivotal transportation role for Rotherham Central Station in the Rotherham Renaissance Towns project.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

- South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 2001-6
- Annual Progress Report 2003/4
- Draft South Yorkshire Rail Strategy

Contact Name : Paul Gibson, ext. 2904, paul.gibson@rotherham.gov.uk

APPENDIX A

South Yorkshire Rail Strategy 2004**Short to medium Term Priorities**

Short Term Priorities	Timescale	Indicative Cost	Funding Sources	Delivery Partners / Key Stakeholders
<u>Service Improvement</u>				
Improved punctuality and reliability of local services	Throughout the franchise period starting Oct 2004	Within the franchise replacement programme	Franchise replacement	Northern Franchisee / SYPTE / Network Rail / DfT
Implementation of a regular fast Sheffield / Barnsley / Leeds service	2004 / 05	£120,000 for Capital cost Revenue cost with franchise until 2007	SYPTE / Metro / Yorkshire Forward Franchise Replacement	SYPTE / Metro / Network Rail / TOC / SRA
Progress discussions / investigations into opportunities to deliver shuttle train access to Robin Hood Doncaster Sheffield airport	2004 / 05 – 2006 / 07	Being developed – initial estimates £0.5m – £0.75m p.a depending on service frequency	SYPTE / Peel Holdings / Doncaster MBC	SYPTE / DMBC / TOC / Network Rail
Securing investment to improve the standard and capacity of rolling stock	Throughout the franchise period starting 2004	To be discussed with franchise when franchise in operation	Franchise replacement / LTP / Other services	DfT / Northern Franchisee / SYPTE
<u>Better Passenger Facilities</u>				
Improvements to the standard of services / facilities provision at local rail stations	2005 – 2010	£1.6 million	SYPTE / developer contributions / TOCs	SYPTE / TOCs
Maximising the benefits of significant investment in the main urban centre stations	2004 / 05 – 2006 / 07	-	SYPTE and SY Local Authorities	SYPTE and SY Local Authorities
Investigate opportunities to deliver improvements to Rotherham Central Station	2007 / 08	Being defined	DfT / SYPTE / Rotherham MBC / Other Agencies	SYPTE / RMBC / Northern Franchisee

Evaluating the case for limited investment in new rail stations and bringing forward the case to secure investment if there is a sound business and broader policy case in comparison with the cost.	2005 – 2010	Typically £2m plus per station	DfT / developer contributions	SYPTE / DfT / TOCs
Improving ticketing and information provision	Ongoing	-	SYPTE	SYPTE / Northern Franchisee
<u>Lobbying and Working with parties to Secure Strategy Delivery</u>				
Ensure structures and funding assist deliver of the South Yorkshire Rail Strategy	2004 / 05	-	-	SYPTE / DfT / PTEG/PTA SIG
Capacity improvements at Dore junction	Not programmed	£10million previous indicative cost	DfT/Network Rail	DfT / SYPTE / TOCs / Network Rail
Influencing ECML and Doncaster St development	Ongoing	-	-	SYPTE/DMBC
Exploration of opportunities for improvements to services through the promotion of Huddersfield to Barnsley via Penistone line as a Community Rail Partnership project	2005 / 06	Being developed	DfT / SYPTE / Metro / Countryside Agency / Kirklees MC and Barnsley MBC	SYPTE / Metro / Penistone Line Partnership
Developing the case for more significant strategic investment in the longer term	Ongoing	-	DfT / SRA / Network Rail	SYPTE / PTEG / RAYH / SY Local Authorities / TOCs

Medium to Long Term Priorities

Medium / Longer Term Vision	Indicative Cost	Funding Source	Delivery Partners / Key Stakeholders
Addressing capacity constraints at Sheffield Station and North of Sheffield	£200 million +	DfT / SYPTE / TOCs	SYPTE / DfT / Sheffield CC
Accessing Doncaster from Barnsley and the Dearne Valley	£100 million + costs at Doncaster / ECML station and approach	DfT / SYPTE / TOCs	DfT / SYPTE / Barnsley MBC / Doncaster MBC and Rotherham MBC
Improved access to Robin Hood Doncaster Sheffield Airport	£0.5m - £0.75m (dependent upon frequency of service provided) plus capital costs	SYPTE / DfT / developer contributions / TOCs	DfT / SYPTE / RAYH / Peel Holdings / Doncaster MBC
Improved access to and from Rotherham	£10 million	DfT / SYPTE / TOCs	SYPTE / Rotherham MBC / DfT
Creating links from Stocksbridge and Oughtibridge to Sheffield	£75m	DfT / SYPTE / TOCs	SYPTE / Sheffield CC / DfT

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet Member and Advisors meeting (delegated powers)
2.	Date:	20 September 2004
3.	Title:	Public consultation – Traffic Management Act 2004 Network Management duty
4.	Programme Area:	Economic & Development Services

5. Summary

The government is carrying out extensive consultation on part 2 of the Traffic Management Bill 2004 – Network Management, in particular the duty guidance document. The views of this Council are therefore being sought as part of this process. The closing date for consultations is 30 September 2004. The main aim of the network management duties is to minimise disruption.

6. Recommendations

(1) That the response to the consultation, which is attached as appendix “A” to this report, is forwarded to the Department of Transport.

7. Proposals and Details

Part 2 of the Bill places a network management duty (as may be reasonably practical) on all local traffic authorities to keep traffic (both vehicular and pedestrian) flowing, taking account of their other duties and responsibilities, and to co-operate with other authorities to the same end.

As part of the arrangements for delivering the network management duty, the Bill requires that all traffic authorities appoint a "Traffic Manager". The Council will need to exercise all of those functions that have an impact on traffic flows in a more holistic way, but the precise duties and responsibilities of the Traffic Manager will be for the Council to decide.

The Act defines the Council's duty as including anything that would contribute to the more efficient use of the highway network, or anything that would avoid, eliminate or reduce disruption. This is not limited to the actions of the Council's traffic group or its road works highway maintenance units. For instance its grass cutting and wheelie bin collection operations should be co-ordinated so as not to cause disruption during peak hours.

However, if it can be demonstrated that the Council is failing with regard to its network management duties, then the Bill provides for the Secretary of State to appoint a traffic director who would take control of the traffic management duties for the Council.

The Council already has a range of powers and duties under which we manage activities taking place on the network. In particular the Council has roles as:- Highway authority, under the Highways Act 1980; Street authority, under the New Roads and Street Works Act 1991; Traffic authority, under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The Council already carries out a range of activities utilising powers contained within these Acts, and all contribute to the overall management of the network, including:

- Co-ordination of utility and council works on the highway.
- Co-ordination of other planned activities which could reduce the capacity of highways – includes such things as scaffolding/hoarding associated with developments, builders skips, street fairs and so on.
- Allocating road space between different classes of highway users, for example bus lanes, cycle lanes, pedestrian zones etc.
- Co-ordination of traffic signals for efficient use of the highway network.
- Making sure the highway network is kept up to date. Traffic signals and road markings adjusted regularly to reflect changes in traffic patterns.
- Network monitoring and taking action to clear away incidents which may disrupt the network. This often involves working closely with the police.

The Bill will provide additional power to enhance these existing duties, the overall aim being to raise the standards of network management across all authorities throughout England. The consultation relates to the draft Network Management Duty Guidance, which the Council must have regard

to when exercising their network management duties. The guidance document is set out in a series of numbered paragraphs and suggested comments are set out in appendix “A”, which is attached to this report. Copies of the draft duty guidance document will be available prior to the meeting.

8. Finance

The Government’s view is that the Bill’s provisions overall be cost neutral. We could take the view that improved internal organisation or communication would be sufficient to fulfil the added duties. However, it may not be possible to easily separate and quantify the costs of the new duties contained within the new post of Traffic Manager. Other sections of the Bill, for instance part 3 which relates to permit schemes, may contain some offsetting revenues. The application of permit schemes is optional, and although more appropriate in larger cities, we will consider permit schemes in the town centre and on strategic routes such as Quality Bus Corridors (QBC’s).

The overriding themes throughout the network management duties are communication, co-ordination and pro-active monitoring. It is felt that to effectively monitor and deal with incidents / works on the ground we may require additional resources, to ensure that the monitoring function is sufficient to ensure compliance with programmes etc. At this early stage these requirements would be difficult to quantify, and will depend on the scope of duties which we decide to attach to the post of Traffic Manager.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The overriding risk would be that the Secretary of State could intervene and take control of the network management function. There is a risk that the “offsetting revenues” (section 3 of the bill etc) are not appropriate for Rotherham as a whole and can only be applied in a small core area – the Town Centre for instance, and QBC’s. This would not probably “offset” the additional costs incurred in any additional monitoring duties, which would apply to the whole of Rotherham.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

- (1) Regeneration.
Reducing delays, using existing powers and additional powers contained within the bill, will aid movement of vehicles throughout the highway network in Rotherham.
- (2) Equality issues. There would be no equalities issues associated with the implementation of this bill.
- (3) Sustainability.
Economy and work. By helping to minimise delays people are able to travel to and arrive at work on time. Local businesses are able to receive raw materials on time and are thereafter able to deliver finished goods on time to their local customers.

Buildings, planning and land use. By minimising traffic delays (both vehicular & pedestrian) the town centre environment would be enhanced and this may encourage growth.

Transport. Any reduction of delays on the highway network will aid the movement of public transport and make it more reliable.

Pollution. The proposals should help to reduce both noise and air pollution by helping to reduce queuing vehicular traffic.

(4) Health implications.

Any reduction in air pollution can only have a beneficial effect on air quality.

(7) The Council's five political priorities.

(7b) Regeneration.

(i) Ensuring a safe well management efficient highway network is maintained will help to improve the image of Rotherham addressing the negative views both within and outside the Council.

(10) Performance indicators.

(i) The draft document outlines the need to enforce / sanction / monitor / review through a series of new performance indicators, which will be developed in conjunction with local authorities and others. The Secretary of States powers of intervention could be triggered through these performance indicators and other measures.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

The Highways Act 1980.

New Roads and Street Works Act 1991.

Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Network Management Duty Guidance – Draft document.

Contact Name : Graham Weaver – Network Regulation Engineer
extension 2930 - email: graham.weaver@rotherham.gov.uk

Appendix A
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

Network Management Duty Guidance – Consultation Document
Comments.

Paragraph No	Comments
The network management duty.	
11	We welcome the specific inclusion of pedestrians in the term “traffic”, and the inclusion of highway users such as cyclists.
12	We also welcome the recognition that the network management duty should not override the Council’s other duties, of road safety for instance, but it should compliment these existing duties. In addition, the bill should recognise issues within the Council’s Local Transport Plan.
13	The need to maintain a consistent co-ordinated approach across local authority boundaries is understood.
Strategic Approach	
21-23	The Act needs to be firmly embedded in Council culture and statutory documents such as in the Local Transport Plan,. The DfT should amend current draft guidance for preparing local transport plans to include advice on integrating the Act into the LTP process.
The traffic manager requirement	
18-20	The need to appoint a traffic manager as the key to good co-ordination is accepted.
Scope of the duty.	
24-31	This Council will need to put measures in place to gather large quantities of information on works and events. We will also need to have contingency plans for unforeseen incidents. There is also a requirement to consult widely on initiatives This will involve setting up or amending new systems in a relatively short time period. It is therefore felt that there will be a significant start up cost to this process. Planning Applications or LTP projects may affect congestion, and consideration of the network management duty should be embedded in the planning process
Managing other issues.	
32-37	There is clearly a need for the Council to obtain best value for its expenditure, and have regard to its other statutory duties. The Act clearly is meant to supplement these powers and duties, and not detract from them. The Act therefore does not prejudice any of the Councils other statutory duties or its core aims.
Monitoring and evaluation.	
38-43	There is clearly a need to closely monitor the effectiveness of the procedures and policies formulated by the Council. Although there are a small number of relevant related

	<p>performance measures in the LTP etc, there will be a need to develop more to provide adequate information. It is suggested that these performance measures should be nationally agreed with clearly defined parameters, so that direct comparisons can be made. This approach will also aid in highlighting best practice amongst all LTA's. It would be useful if the DfT provided more detailed information about the scope and detail of monitoring data it expects local authorities to collect. DfT should examine indicators that take vehicle occupancy into account. For example, the savings associated with a 1 minute improvement in journey time of a full bus over 1 km is about 40 times greater than the saving for a single occupancy vehicle over the same distance. There is a risk of perverse outcomes if Traffic Managers seek to move traffic at the expense of pedestrians wishing to cross the road, i.e., a drift towards vehicular measures at the expense of pedestrians. Therefore, the DfT should promote journey time monitoring for pedestrians and recommend a suitable target.</p>
Broad principles of network management.	
44-45	No comments
46	<p>With regard to regular "events" it is agreed that planning, co-ordination and managing these events can be carried out. However there is some concern about large events carried out on private land which may have a knock on effect on the network, e.g. pop concert that attracts hundreds of vehicles. The concern is the way these events will be communicated to the traffic manager.</p>
47-49	<p>We would agree with the need for authorities to formulate a structured approach to the allocation of road space based on a road hierarchy. However the time scale to develop the approach, including consultations is very tight, and we believe that there will again be a significant start up cost.</p>
50-51	<p>A whole authority approach is seen as significant in terms of delivering a efficient free flowing highway network.</p>
52-57	<p>We already work closely with the police and Passenger Transport Executive. We again feel that given the short time scale the public consultation process may not allow early implementation of the policies to fulfil the network management duties.</p>
58-61	<p>We already licence skips and scaffolding, and closely manage and monitor utilities work. It is agreed that a approach to achieve parity with our works, should be sought through this Act.</p>
62-64	<p>We already share information on road closures and temporary traffic signals. We will consider how best to develop this further to include all information. However the type of process to deliver this would be complex and its delivery is unclear.</p>
Issues for particular circumstances.	

65-74	All relate to London – no comments
75-76	Close liaison with the Highways Agency is already carried out in Rotherham on an informal basis. However we are not aware of any detailed local operational agreement.
Good practice advice on techniques and approach.	
77-82	The use of road hierarchies with differing priorities is seen as a significant step in the right direction. However the time scale to develop the approach, including consultations is very tight, and we believe that there will again be a significant start up cost in terms of considerable staff time.
83-87	Data collection is seen as playing a key role. Although we do have a good coverage of CCTV and automatic traffic detectors, on key highway routes, the need to integrate this information is also seen as significant. We are not aware of significant levels of I.T software available to carry out this task.
88-90	No Comments
91-97	We already have electronic systems in place which record planned street works and road works. We are currently looking at a map based system as an extension of this data system. We agree these systems are key to the role. However we are also aware that I.T software to enable these aims, and other sections of the Act, is complex and requires development time. It would appear that this development period, following on from the requirements of the Bill, has been very short. This may lead to software being used which has not been bench tested and it is possible, therefore, that the software may fail. This may detract from the positive impact of the Bill.
98-100	The Council already has in place a “special events” policy and procedure.
101-112	No comments.
113-118	We agree that managing and enforcing parking and traffic regulations does also play a key role in the network management function. We are currently close to completing a review of current Traffic Regulation Orders, and we are in the process of making an applications to the Secretary of State for powers under Section 6 of this Act.
119-127	Accommodation of essential servicing traffic will require detailed consultation with various bodies, as outlined. However the time scale to develop the approach, including consultations is very tight, and we believe that there will again be a significant start up cost in terms of considerable staff time.
128-129	We currently provide some information and we fully intend to develop this service to the potential audience.
General Comments	
A	There seems to be very little, in the way of additional powers, to ensure that the information required to co-ordinate is provided on time. “Best endeavours” is not

	adequate to provide this vital information.
B	There could have been greater incentives offered to carry out street works and road works quickly. The onus seems to be on the Traffic Manager to ensure this happens rather than on the work promoter.
C	Monitoring the works/events “on the ground” is seen as a crucial and integral part of the duties. It is felt that to adequately carry out this function will require considerable resource input. It is therefore honestly felt that the permit scheme etc may not offset these costs and the costs are not therefore neutral, as suggested.

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet Member for Economic and Development Services
2.	Date:	20th September, 2004
3.	Title:	The Rotherham Borough Council (Brampton-en-le-Morthen) (Environmental Improvements) Compulsory Purchase Order 2004
4.	Programme Area:	Resources

5. Summary

The Council has been asked by make the Order by Thurcroft Parish Council in order to facilitate an environmental improvement scheme for which grant funding is available.

6. Recommendations

1. That pursuant to Section 125 of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended), the Council make “The Rotherham Borough Council (Brampton-en-le-Morthen) (Environmental Improvements) Compulsory Purchase Order 2004” on behalf of the Thurcroft Parish Council for the purpose of an environmental improvement scheme on land in Brampton Road, Brampton-en-le-Morthen, Rotherham.
 2. That the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to affix the Common Seal of the Council to the Order and Order Map.
 3. That the Order be submitted to the First Secretary of State for confirmation.
-

7. Proposals and Details

Thurcroft Parish Council has asked the Borough Council to purchase on its behalf an area of land at Brampton Road, Brampton-en-le-Morthen. A plan of the site is attached to this report. The intention is for a local voluntary body to apply for a grant from the Countryside Agency, known as a Jubilee Garden Doorstep Grant. The voluntary body will improve and maintain the land under the auspices of the Parish Council who will hold title to the land and be the accountable body for the grant.

The Parish Council can under Section 125 of the Public Health Act 1875 purchase land for the purpose of being used as public walks or pleasure grounds. Under Section 125 of the Local Government Act 1972, if a Parish Council is unable to acquire land by agreement for any purpose for which they are authorised to acquire land, they may represent the case to the Borough Council who may make a Compulsory Purchase Order. The Parish Council is unable to acquire the land by agreement as the land owner is unknown. The Parish Council has, in fact, maintained the land for sometime and tried last year unsuccessfully to register a possessory title with the Land Registry. It is understood that the land may have been under the control of the former South Yorkshire County Council, and prior to that the former West Riding County Council. It might, therefore, have been expected to transfer to the Borough Council upon abolition of the SYCC but there is no record of it in the Borough Council's Terrier. The Council is, therefore, asked to make a Compulsory Purchase Order.

If the Council is satisfied that suitable land for the purpose cannot be acquired on reasonable terms by agreement, they may make a Compulsory Purchase Order and submit it to the Secretary of State for confirmation.

The Council may recover from the Parish Council the expenses incurred by them in connection with the acquisition of the land.

If the Order is confirmed, the Council will carry it into effect but the land when acquired will be conveyed to the Parish Council.

8. Finance

It is proposed that the Council should recover from the Parish Council the expenses incurred in connection with the acquisition of the land. These will include legal and surveyor's fees. The Parish Council will be required to pay the valuation of the land into a holding account, on the assumption that the owner of the land is not identified during the order procedure, in case the owner should subsequently appear. If the owner of the land is not identified, compensation will be assessed by the Lands Tribunal. The Council's estimate is that the value of the land should not exceed £5,000.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Without the Compulsory Purchase Order, the Parish Council will be unable to acquire title to the land, which is a condition of the grant funding. The grant would, therefore, be lost.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The purchase, laying out and maintenance of this land is in accordance with the Council's objectives.

The proposal is supported by the local community and the development will be undertaken by a community group.

The site when developed and improved will be a valuable local amenity for residents of Brampton-en-le-Morthen.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Consultation has taken place with Roy Liversidge, the Valuation Manager and Alan West, the Clerk to Thurcroft Parish Council.

Contact Name : Tim Mumford, Head of Legal and Democratic Services, ext. 3500, email: tim.mumford@rotherham.gov.uk

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Delegated Powers
2.	Date:	20th September 2004
3.	Title:	Economic and Development Services Beacon Applications. All Wards
4.	Programme Area:	Economic and Development Services

5. Summary

The Council has submitted applications to the Beacon Council Scheme 2004, round six, for:

- Asset Management
- Supporting New Businesses
- Integrated Children's Services

The first 2 are Economic and Development Services led.

6. Recommendations

That Members note the contents of the report.

7. Proposals and Details

The applications were submitted on 9th September 2004.

A shortlist of candidates will be announced in November 2004.

Assessment visits to shortlisted authorities will take place between the end of November 2004 and January 2005.

Shortlisted authorities will give presentations on their application in January/February 2005.

Successful applicants will be announced in April 2005.

Successful applicants will hold Beacon status from April 2005 to June 2006.

Once selected, Beacons have a duty to promote their good practice, knowledge and expertise for the benefit of service-specific authorities. They will work with the IDeA, Government departments, other national and regional organisations and specific best value authorities.

8. Finance

Successful Beacons will receive a payment as a reward for their achievement and to support the cost of dissemination. A total of £3 million has been set aside for this purpose. The Government expects to share most of this equally among the successful applicants, while allowing some extra resources for joint applications.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

The Beacon payment is unlikely to cover the total costs incurred by Economic and Development Services; the difference will have to be met from within Economic and Development Services budgets. However, the benefits of being awarded Beacon Status far outweighs this.

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

Being awarded Beacon Status would impact on all Council policies and improve total performance in addition to theme specific performance.

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Beacon Council Scheme, Applications Brochure 2004 and Theme Guides.

Contact Name : Arnold Murray, Corporate Property Manager, Extn 2103,
arnold.murray@rotherham.gov.uk

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 1 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

By virtue of paragraph(s) 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted