

**Minutes of: BURY WEST TOWNSHIP FORUM**

**Date of Meeting:** 24 September 2014

**Present:** Councillor (in the Chair)  
Councillors Kerrison, S Nuttall, S Southworth, R Walker and J Walton

**Also in attendance:** Phil Jones – Brandlesholme Residents Association

**Public Attendance:** 53 members of the public were present at the meeting.

**Apologies for Absence:** Councillor J Frith

---

**306 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest made at the meeting

**307 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 14TH JULY 2014.**

**It was agreed.**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Bury West Township Forum held on 14 July 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

**308 POLICE UPDATE**

Christine Maksymowski explained that the Police representative had been invited to attend and had accepted the invitation subject to their availability on the day. No representative was available to attend this meeting.

**It was agreed:**

A police update would be given at the next meeting of the Bury West Township Forum due to be held on the 19 November at Bolton Road Methodist Church.

**309 CHANGES TO WASTE MANAGEMENT COLLECTION SERVICE**

Councillor Susan Southworth, Deputy Cabinet Member, Sustainable Borough attended the meeting. She was accompanied by Glenn Stuart, Head of Waste Management and Talat Afzal, Recycling and Waste Awareness Officer. Councillor Southworth reported that she was at the meeting to explain the changes to the ways that bins would be collected across the borough and why the changes were necessary.

It was explained that the Council had to find savings of £16m for the 2015/2016 financial year and many options were being considered. The recycling figures had risen from 27% in 2011 to 47% currently but it was hoped that by encouraging

more residents to recycle their waste more efficiently the percentage could be raised to 60% or more. This would then help to achieve a saving of over £1m and also help the borough to become greener.

The Council was paid £25 per tonne for green bin waste (paper and card) and £25 per tonne for blue bin waste (glass, plastics and metal) it also raised income by producing compost from the brown bin waste (garden and food waste).

The new collection rounds would commence in the second week of October and all residents would see a change to their current service.

Brown bins would be emptied every two weeks, blue and green bins would be emptied every three weeks as would the grey bin. The days on which the bins were emptied would also change for some residents.

It was explained that all of the information relating to the days on which the bins would be emptied was currently being delivered to every household in the borough along with information on what to put in each bin.

Currently a lot of what was put into the grey bins could be recycled but wasn't being. Councillor Southworth explained what materials should go in which bins.

If residents were unsure how they could recycle more, or were concerned about waste such as nappies and other similar products they could ask for a waste audit to be carried out. This would involve a member of the waste management team visiting them to talk through their needs and advise on the scheme.

It was also explained that extra blue and green bins could be requested and would be provided free of charge. Extra grey bins were also available but would incur a £30 administration and delivery charge and the householder would be assessed for need before one was supplied.

If a household had downsized to one of the smaller capacity bins they could request going back to a larger size grey bin and this would be free.

It was asked that all residents tried to recycle as much as possible before requesting a change of bin or extra bin as they may find that by following the scheme, they wouldn't actually require one.

Councillor Southworth also explained that all of the information was available on the Council website and the new collection day information was also available on line. There would also soon be the option to receive e-mail reminders of collections and residents would be able to sign up this shortly.

Councillor Tony Isherwood, Cabinet Member, Environment was also in attendance to assist with answering questions.

Those present were given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments and the following points were raised:

- Mr Worth a local resident explained that he had attended the Bury East Township Forum and had asked a number of questions. He felt that the questions had not been answered satisfactorily so was asking them again:
- Mr Worth questioned the figures quoted in relation to the cost for removing waste and stated that he didn't think this figure was correct. He had been involved in waste management for a number of years and knew that he could receive this service at less cost.

Glenn Stuart reported that the figures quoted were correct. The contract covered most of Greater Manchester and involved a complex pricing mechanism.

- A member of the public stated that she was currently finding it difficult with the grey bin being emptied every two weeks and asked how she would manage with collections every three weeks. Would she be able to receive an extra grey bin.

It was explained that each request would be evaluated by a waste audit. They would be visited by a member of the waste management team who would explain the scheme and advise on whether an extra grey bin could be supplied.

- A member of the public asked whether all residents had been informed of the changes.

It was reported that all addresses would receive information packs containing a new calendar. Information packs had already been sent to every address explaining the changes and there had been a number of events held across the borough as well as press releases.

- It was stated that the new scheme had just been thrust on the residents with no consultation. The rationale behind this was questioned.

Councillor Isherwood explained that the Council were in a situation where a large amount of savings had to be found due to the cuts that had been made nationally. The change to the waste collections would add to these savings.

There would also be a number of Council service changes being reviewed in the near future which will have to be consulted on.

- A member of the public asked whether Bury would be the only Council with this scheme.

Councillor Southworth explained that there were already a number of councils carrying out 3 weekly residual waste collections in Scotland and in Falkirk the scheme had been extended. It was believed that schemes of this type would be rolled out across many other councils in the future.

- It was asked whether the plastics that were not currently recycled would be in the future.

Councillor Southworth explained that the plastics that were not recyclable in the current scheme were the lowest grade plastics possible and therefore not worth anything in recycling terms. The supermarkets should be encouraged to cut down on their packaging as should the producers.

- A member of the public explained that he would prefer to get rid of the brown bin and use a composter in his garden. It was asked whether this could be done. Could the brown bin be taken away and replaced with a free composter.

Councillor Isherwood explained that there were compost bins available to residents at a reduced rate and this was definitely something that the council could consider.

**It was agreed:**

That Councillors Southworth and Isherwood and Glenn Stuart and Talat Afzal be thanked for their attendance.

**310 HEALTHIER TOGETHER**

Dr Kiran Patel, Chair at Bury CCG and Catherine Jackson, Nurse Clinician at the CCG attended the meeting to explain the current Healthier Together consultation and to ask those present for their comments and feedback on the proposals.

It was explained that the way in which healthcare was provided across Greater Manchester was undergoing change. The three areas that were affected were:-

- GP services
- Health and Social Care
- Specialist Surgery (Abdomen and Bowel)

Dr Patel explained that there was currently a scheme running in Radcliffe where GPs were offering their patients appointments 7 days a week and this was due to be rolled out across Bury from December.

Work was taking place looking at how services between health and social care could be integrated and some schemes were already in place that were bridging the gaps in these areas. This ongoing work was bringing together lots of different organisations to provide joined up services across health and social care and bring more community based services to people outside of a hospital based setting.

The current consultation was asking all Greater Manchester residents to look at the different options for specialist hospital services (relating to abdomen and bowel surgery) across the conurbation and give feedback on them.

Dr Patel explained that there were 12 hospitals across Greater Manchester all providing different levels of care in relation to specialist surgery. Following a lot of work with clinicians working in these hospitals, the eight Healthier Together options had been proposed.

It was explained that there were currently hospitals providing specialisms in areas such as stroke and heart surgery and these would not change. All hospitals that currently had an Accident and Emergency department would continue to have one. The changes being consulted on would effect a very small number of patients but would improve the service they received and help save lives.

The options were set out as there being seven or eight local general hospitals and four or five specialist hospitals.

Two hospitals would not be affected by the consultation: Trafford General and Rochdale Infirmary. Three hospitals had already been designated as Specialist: Manchester Royal Infirmary, Salford Royal Hospital and Royal Oldham Hospital. Three had already been designated as Local General Hospitals: Fairfield General Hospital, Tameside General Hospital and North Manchester General Hospital. This leaves four hospitals to consider: Royal Albert Edward Infirmary (Wigan), Royal Bolton Hospital; Wythenshawe Hospital and Stepping Hill Hospital.

Fairfield General Hospital would remain a local general hospital.

The consultation was asking for views on which of the eight options set out was preferred.

Those present were given the opportunity to ask questions and make comments and the following points were raised:

- A member of the public explained that he had experienced extremely poor organisation in the Pennine Acute hospitals. He had been invited to attend an appointment at one hospital only to be asked to attend an alternative site upon arrival as no one was available to treat him.

Dr Patel explained that situations like that would hopefully lessen due to the reorganisation. Out -patient services would be provided closer to home in clinics at GP surgeries.

- A member of the public referred to news reports that had highlighted issues of concern: particularly diluted services and the fact that Wigan residents were quite isolated in relation to the other areas.

Dr Patel explained that the current services were not meeting the required standards and were more diluted than if any of the proposed options were implemented.

Dr Patel also stated that it was recognised that Wigan could be considered out of the way as it was the most westerly location within Greater Manchester and the nearest specialist site already confirmed was Salford Royal. There was a possibility of Royal Albert Edward in Wigan, Royal Bolton and Wythenshawe being confirmed as another site and this would be decided following the consultation. He did however state that all specialist hospitals met transport standards for all residents affected.

- A member of the public asked whether NWAS service were concerned about some of the specialist hospitals being located in Manchester City Centre and how this may affect their transfer times.

Dr Patel explained that NWAS had been involved in the consultation and the proposals since the start of the process and they were more than happy with the location of the confirmed specialist sites. The paramedics were used to accessing city centre locations as hospitals were already located there.

**It was agreed:**

That Dr Patel and Catherine Jackson be thanked for their attendance.

**311 MILE LANE UPDATE**

Further to Minute BWTF.115 of the previous meeting of the Township Forum, Councillor Walker provided members of the Bury West Township Forum with a verbal update informing those present of the situation at Mile Lane shops.

Councillor Walker explained that he had contacted a number of people with regards to the various issues and he could now report the following issues:-

He confirmed that the shops would not be demolished and the flats located above the shops were in the process of being refurbished.

The butcher shop was due to re-open and a new lease had been confirmed. The newsagent and the Post Office would be closing as the newsagent would be relocating to another site. The Post Office had refused an application for the Post Office facilities to relocate with the newsagents.

The land at the side of the site was privately owned and, as there were no hazards on the site and it was just overgrown there was no requirement for the owner to tidy it up. The owner had stated that he would not be adverse to a community clean up of the site or community payback project.

Those present were given the opportunity to ask questions and the following points were raised:

- The Council used to cut back and tidy the land and had stopped.

It was explained that the Council had to review the work it carried out and would now only undertake jobs that it was obliged to.

- It was asked whether the Co-op would be able to sell newspapers.

It was reported that the Co-op would be approached with this request if nobody opened a new newsagent shop .

- It was asked whether the Post Office would be approached about the possibility of allowing somebody else to provide the service on Mile Lane.

It was suggested that the Post Office should be invited to attend a special meeting of the Township Forum to discuss the options available.

**It was agreed:**

1. The Township Co-ordinator would liaise with the Post Office and invite them to a special meeting of the Township Forum.
2. That options for clearing the land at the side of the site be explored.

**312 HIGHWAYS SUB GROUP UPDATE**

Councillor Walker gave a verbal update on the work that had been carried out by the Highways Sub Group.

Those in attendance suggested that the bend on Mile Lane should be reviewed as this was a blind bend and dangerous.

**313 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The Chair, Councillor S. Nuttall, invited questions, comments and representations from members of the public present at the meeting. Questions were asked and comments made on the issues detailed below. The Township Forum Co-ordinator undertook to obtain a reply to matters which could not be dealt with at the meeting.

In response to a question from a member of the public Councillor Southworth reported that Wood Street was currently in the process of being resurfaced.

A member of the public asked if the double yellow lines which had been painted on the road outside Greenhill Primary School would be removed.

It was reported that the lines would remain on the site and were only enforceable for half an hour in the morning and half an hour in the evening.

**314 DRAFT TOWNSHIP FORUM PLAN**

Christine Maksymowski, Township Co-ordinator, presented the updated Township Plan which had been discussed at the last meeting.

**It was agreed:**

That the Township Plan be accepted

**315 COMMUNITY FUNDING REPORT**

The Township Co-ordinator reported that funding was still available in Elton and Church Wards.

**It was agreed:**

The report be noted.

**316 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

**It was agreed:**

The next meeting of the Township Forum will be held on 19 November 2014 at Bolton Road Methodist Church.

**COUNCILLOR  
Chair**

**(Note: The meeting started at Time Not Specified and ended at Time Not Specified)**