

**Minutes of:**               **THE CABINET**

**Date of Meeting:**       19 September 2012

**Present:**                   Councillor M Connolly (in the Chair);  
Councillors G Campbell, I Gartside, A Isherwood, J  
Lewis, N Parnell, T Pickstone, J Smith, R Shori and S  
Walmsley

**Also in attendance:** -

**Apologies:**               -

**Public attendance:**   11 members of the public were in attendance

---

#### **CA.345   DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Connolly declared two personal interests, the first related to any matters likely to impact on the fact that his partner is employed by Adult Care Services. The second related to Minute number CA.230 Manchester Airport Group Strategic Review, for the reason that Councillor Connolly is a Council appointed member of the Manchester Airport Group PLC (Shareholders Committee).

#### **CA.346   PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

A period of thirty minutes was allocated for members of the public present at the meeting to ask questions about the work or performance of the Council or Council services.

Questioner: Mr Walker

Question: Can the Council introduce a 20 mph zone on Nuttall Lane, Ramsbottom. Local Residents have major concerns regarding the volume and speed of traffic using Nuttall Lane. Vehicles regularly break the 30 mph limit. The road is dangerous for children going to St Andrew's Primary School on Nuttall Lane. A petition is in circulation and has over 200 names so far.

Questioner: Representative of Emmanuel CE School, Holcombe and the Holcombe Society

Question: Can the Council introduce a 20 mph zone at each end of Holcombe Village to ensure drivers keep to 20 mph or less when driving through the village. A speed reduction measure had been introduced at the centre of the village which does reduce vehicle speed. However, vehicles are speeding when they enter and leave the village. Vehicle speeds have been measured at 88 mph on the road outside the Emmanuel School and 60 mph at the edge of the village. 280 vehicles have been caught on speed cameras speeding within the village.

Response: The Council recognises the seriousness of speeding vehicles as a Borough-wide issue. Under the proposed scheme to be considered by Cabinet areas will be assessed and then prioritised according to the level of the problem to show the major 'hotspots'. The Council has collated statistics on

areas and local residents will be consulted. Township Forums will provide an opportunity for residents to present evidence or information and provide their local knowledge and opinion on proposals relating to their area. Residents can also contact their local Councillors to pass on their views. Resources for the programme will come from the Council and other partner organisations for the three year period of the scheme.

**CA.347 MINUTES**

**Delegated decision:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 August 2012 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

**CA.348 20 MPH SPEED LIMITS WITHIN RESIDENTIAL AREAS**

A report was submitted by the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Regeneration regarding the promotion of a three-year programme of Environmental Traffic Calming Schemes designed to reduce the legal speed limit to 20 mph on streets within selected residential estates and areas located throughout the Borough.

**Delegated decisions:**

1. That a strategy for the implementation of 20 mph zones and speed limits is adopted as described in the report submitted in order to improve road safety in residential areas.
2. That the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Regeneration be authorised to agree details of the strategy including approval for individual schemes identified through the prioritisation process.
3. That approval be given to the inclusion of the scheme in the Capital Programme 2012/2013 to 2014/2015 to be funded from capital receipts (2012/2013).

**Reason for the decision:**

Research into improving road safety and public health has shown that the widespread introduction of 20 mph zones will deliver benefits.

**Other option considered and rejected:**

To reject or amend the recommendations.

**CA.349 AMENDMENT TO THE REPOSSESSION PREVENTION FUND FOR NEIGHBOURHOODS AND REGENERATION**

A report was submitted by the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Regeneration seeking approval to amend the Repossession Prevention Fund Policy and Procedure so that interest free loans can be offered to households (at risk of repossession and eviction) who can demonstrate their ability to repay a loan, following a full financial assessment with a money advisor.

Communities and Local Government (CLG) recommend the use of loans where practical, in order that funding can be recycled to assist households at risk of repossession and eviction in the future.

The current procedure operates on a grant only basis which prevents recycling.

**Delegated decision:**

That approval be given to adopt the amended policy and procedure to allow for the provision of small loans where feasible, under Section 2 of the Local Government Act 2000.

**Reason for the decision:**

This decision provides the Council with an opportunity to recycle scarce resources and maximise support.

**Other option considered and rejected:**

To reject the recommendation.

**CA.350 TOWNSHIP PLANS**

A report was submitted by the Cabinet Member for Community Development that outlined the priorities agreed for each Township Plan. The report also outlined the process followed to develop the plans and the performance management framework in place for ensuring each plan is effectively monitored and implemented.

The projects outlined in each Locality Plan will be delivered within the Council's existing budgetary framework and do not require additional financial commitment from the Council.

**Delegated decisions:**

That the Township Plans for each of the six Township Forums be noted and supported, subject to confirmation that Prestwich Township Forum approved a Township Plan.

**Reasons for the decision:**

Township Plans provide an essential focus to the work of the Township Forums and capture local priority outcomes which will guide the work of each Township Forum.

**Other option considered and rejected:**

To reject the recommendation.

**CA.351 THIRD SECTOR COMMISSIONING FRAMEWORK 2013/2014, 2014/2015 AND 2015/2016**

A report was submitted by the Cabinet Member for Community Development setting out the proposed management arrangements, assessment criteria and implementation timetable for the Council's Third Sector Commissioning Framework for 2013/2014, 2014/2015 and 2015/2016.

It was reported that the Small Grants Panel will now meet on 28 November 2012 and report its recommendations to Cabinet at the meeting scheduled to take place on the same day.

**Delegated decision:**

That approval be given to the priority criteria, as set in paragraph 2.3 of the report submitted, as the basis for a Third Sector Commissioning Panel to assess applications and make recommendations to Cabinet.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The fund is currently managed by Forever Manchester under a contract with the Council. This decision will bring monitoring and performance elements of the programme 'in house' and help secure outcomes of the Bury Council Corporate Plan.

**Other option considered and rejected:**

To reject the recommendation.

**CA.352 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

**Delegated decision:**

That in accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item of business as it involves the likely disclosure of information as detailed in the conditions of category 3.

**CA.353 RATIONALISATION OF OPERATIONAL DEPOTS**

**E**

A report was submitted by the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Regeneration providing details of an 'Invest to Save' business case for relocation of Highways Services from Fernhill Depot to Bradley Fold Depot, together with the relocation of the existing smaller Grounds Maintenance depot from Fernhill to Bury Cemetery Depot.

**Delegated decision:**

That approval be given to the proposed relocation of Highways Operations and part of grounds Maintenance to realise the anticipated efficiency saving.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The Council has to consider all options to generate efficiencies towards meeting savings targets. There are also operational benefits to locating services at fewer sites.

**Other option considered and rejected:**

To reject the recommendation.

(Note: Councillor Gartside abstained on this matter)

**CA.354 MANCHESTER AIRPORT GROUP STRATEGIC REVIEW**

**E**

The Leader of the Council submitted a report informing Members of the progress of the implementation of Manchester Airport Group's (MAG) proposed Strategy for growth and requests Cabinet to note the progress of proposed changes to the governance arrangements to accommodate the Strategy.

**Delegated decisions:**

1. That the progress in implementing the Strategy by the then Executive on 21 March 2012 be noted.
2. That approval be given to the Manchester Airport Group Board's recommendation for the selection of a preferred investor.
3. That approval be given to the appointment of KPMG to act as financial advisor to the ten local authority shareholders in relation to the restructuring of MAG and the implementation of the Strategy.
4. That a further report be submitted to Cabinet before the Strategy is implemented.

**Reasons for the decisions:**

The decisions are in order to secure financial growth in the Airport Group. The Strategy's aim is to deliver maximum value, growth and profitability in the interests of all existing shareholders.

**Other option considered and rejected:**

To reject the recommendations.

**COUNCILLOR M CONNOLLY**  
**Chair**

(Note: The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 7.15pm)