TO: All Members of Council

Dear Member/Colleague

Council

You are invited to attend a meeting of the Council which will be held as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Wednesday, 14 September 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Bury Town Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>7.00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing</td>
<td>If Opposition Members and Co-opted Members require briefing on any particular item on the Agenda, the appropriate Director/Senior Officer originating the related report should be contacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGENDA

The Agenda for the meeting is attached.

Reports are enclosed only for those attending the meeting and for those without access to the Council’s Intranet or Website.
The Agenda and Reports are available on the Council's Intranet for Councillors and Officers and also on the Council’s Website at www.bury.gov.uk – click on Agendas, Minutes and Forward Plan.

Copies of printed reports can also be obtained on request by contacting the Democratic Services Officer named above.

Yours sincerely

M. Owen

Chief Executive
AGENDA

1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members of the Council are requested to declare any interests which they have in any items or issues before the Council for determination.

2 MINUTES (Pages 1 - 10)

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the last Meeting of the Council held on 13 July 2016 (Copy attached)

3 MAYORAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

To receive communications from the Mayor and any announcements by the Leader of the Council or the Chief Executive on matters of interest to the Council.

4 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

To answer questions from members of the public, notice of which has been given, on any matter relevant to the Council or its services to the community. Up to 30 minutes will be set aside for this purpose. If time permits, further questions will be invited from members of the public present.

5 RECOMMENDATIONS OF CABINET AND COUNCIL COMMITTEES

6 LEADER' STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME (Pages 11 - 70)

To receive a Statement from the Leader of the Council on the work of the Cabinet and to answer written questions from Members of the Council to the Leader and Cabinet Members on any matter in relation to which the Council has powers or duties which affect the Borough, provided the necessary written notice has been given.

Verbal questions on the work of the Cabinet since the last Council meeting will be allowed subject to a limit of one question per Councillor.

7 JOINT AUTHORITIES - REPORT BY THE COUNCIL'S REPRESENTATIVE AND QUESTIONS (Pages 71 - 74)

(A) A report from the Council’s representative on the work of Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority, Councillor Quinn
(B) Questions (if any) on the work of the Joint Authorities to be asked by Members of the Council for which the necessary notice has been given in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.2

8 NOTICES OF MOTION

The following Notices of Motion have been received:-

(i) Smoking
This Council recognises that tobacco related disease remains the single greatest cause of preventable deaths in England, killing 80,000 people every year, more people each year than obesity, alcohol, road accidents and illegal drug use put together. It is also the single biggest preventable cause of cancer. Tackling tobacco would play a significant part in reducing health inequalities. Thousands of children also suffer harm as a result of smoking.

In the borough of Bury, 19.5 per cent of people smoke. Each year, in Bury, smoking costs an estimated £54.5M. Rates of smoking related deaths and lung cancer in Bury are worse than the UK average.

This Council resolves to commit to signing the Local Government Declaration on Tobacco Control. This is a declaration which commits Bury Council to tackle the harm smoking causes our communities by committing the Council to:

- Reduce smoking prevalence and health inequalities
- Develop tobacco control plans with partners and local communities
- Participate in local and regional networks
- Support Government action at national level
- Protect tobacco control work from the commercial and vested interests of the tobacco industry
- Monitor progress of our plans
- Join the Smokefree Action Coalition

Signing the declaration will send out a clear signal to the people of Bury that we remain ambitious in our efforts to reduce the harm caused by tobacco. We have been working with partners at Cancer Research UK and the Bury Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to boost local action on the issue; later this month the CCG are looking to support us by signing the sister pledge, the NHS Statement of Support for Tobacco Control. These commitments underpin the work already underway to tackle smoking within the borough, including:

- Multi-agency work to continue to reduce smoking in pregnancy
- Utilizing the Healthy Workplace Charter & Working Well Bury scheme to address smoking in targeted populations e.g. Routine & Manual Workers
- Joint work with Bury CCG to systematically target populations, using GP registers
- Link with the Healthy Schools program to deliver focused educational work to break the intergenerational cycle of tobacco use and stop young people from starting a tobacco habit.
- Amplify national campaigns locally e.g. National No Smoking Day & Stoptober
- Continue to undertake work with the Trading Standards team to tackle the accessibility of tobacco products for young people, particularly in relation to illegal and illicit tobacco and underage sales.

This council therefore agrees to commit to the Local Government Declaration on Tobacco Control in order to protect successive generations of young people from the harm done by tobacco, save lives and reduce health inequalities.


(ii) Green Belt

Council notes:

1 The Green Belt process, introduced from 1955, as a planning policy to protect countryside around the countries largest urban areas.

2 The aims of Green Belt (as stated in the 2012 National Policy Planning Framework) are:
   • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
   • To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another
   • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
   • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns
   • To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land

3 And the stated opportunities and benefits being:
   • Providing opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population
   • Providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas
   • The retention of attractive landscapes and the enhancement of landscapes, near to where people live
   • Improvement of damaged and derelict land around towns
   • The securing of nature conservation interests
   • The retention of land in agricultural, forestry and related uses.

4 That significant parts of Bury (60%) have been designated as Green Belt land which makes a very significant positive contribution to the
character of the area, as well as providing opportunities for leisure and recreation.

5 That Green Belt also plays an important part in providing a rural barrier between the different towns and village communities that make up Bury.

6 The Greater Manchester Spatial Framework is currently being developed by Greater Manchester Councils to identify land for homes and jobs to 2035, including a stated aim to enhance and protect the quality of the natural environment, conserve wildlife and tackle low carbon and flood risk issues, so that we can accommodate growth sustainably.

7 That the GMSF process includes a strategic review of Green Belt land, the first strategic review for over 30 years.

8 The significant amount of ‘brownfield land’ available in Greater Manchester (2721 hectares in the most recent National Land Use Database), the highest amount in the North West.

This Council supports

1 Green Belt as an important Planning Policy which should be retained around our major urban areas going forwards

2 The aims, opportunities and benefits of Green Belt as stated in the National Policy Planning Framework remain valid and valid for Bury.

3 The stated aims of the GMSF to ensure that both appropriate and affordable housing, and provision for jobs and job creation are provided going forwards, and the aims for this growth to be sustainable.

4 The use of brownfield land for housing and jobs as a first priority.

This Council therefore resolves

1 To take what steps we can as an Authority, without prejudicing or pre-determining any future planning application or consultation, to encourage developers to use existing sites and extant planning applications

2 To ask our representatives to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority to continue to make a strong case for retaining a strong green belt across Greater Manchester.

In the names of Councillors M D’Albert, T Pickstone and S Wright.

(iii) Pay Increases
“This Council thoroughly deplores the recent excessive pay increases, proposed by a recent Personnel Committee report by the Labour controlled Manchester City Council to some of their already highly paid senior Council officials.

We also note that this is in stark contrast to majority of the hard working staff at Manchester City Council who have received the LGA nationally agreed 1% pay increase.

This Council resolves not to follow the example set by the Manchester City Council in giving such an excessive pay increases to our Bury Council senior managerial staff, some of whom are on six figure salaries”

In the names of Councillors I Bevan, R Caserta, J Daly, I Gartside, D Gunther, M Hankey, J Harris, R Hodkinson, K Hussain, G Keeley, O Kersh, S Nuttall, I Schofield, D Silbiger, R Walker, and Y Wright

9 SCRUTINY REVIEW REPORTS AND SPECIFIC ITEMS "CALLED IN" BY SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

10 QUESTIONS ON THE WORK OF OUTSIDE BODIES OR PARTNERSHIPS

Questions on the work of Outside Bodies or partnerships on which the Council is represented to be asked by Members of the Council (if any).

11 DELEGATED DECISIONS OF THE COUNCIL COMMITTEES

Questions on the delegated decisions made by the Regulatory Committees and Scrutiny Committees contained in the Digest of Decision 2 published since the last ordinary meeting of the Council, providing four clear working days’ notices has been given of the question.

Members are asked to bring to the meeting their copy of Digest 2
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Minutes of: AN ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

Date of Meeting: 13 July 2016


Apologies from: Councillors R Cathcart, J Daly, E Fitzgerald, S Nuttall and N Parnell

Public attendance: 56 members of the public attended the meeting

C.128 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

1. Councillor Connolly declared a personal interest in any item which related to staffing as his partner is an employee of the Local Authority Trading Company, Persona.

2. Councillor Jones declared a personal interest in any item which related to staffing as his wife is an employee of Bury Council.

3. Councillor Bevan declared a personal interest in any item which related to staffing as his wife is an employee within a Bury School.

4. Councillor Mallon declared a personal interest in any item which related to staffing as his wife is an employee within a Bury High School.

5. Councillor S Wright declared a personal interest in any item which related to staffing as his wife is an employee within a Bury School.

6. Councillor Quinn declared a personal interest in respect of item 8, Notices of Motion (EU Referendum) as his daughter is employed at the EU Parliament.

7. Councillor Shori declared a personal interest in any item which related to staffing as his partner is an employee of Bury Council.

8. Councillor Kelly declared a personal interest in Leader’s Question Time (Q21) as an employee of the Care Quality Commission.
C.129 MINUTES

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Meeting of Council held on 18 May 2016 be signed by the Mayor as a true and correct record.

C.130 MAYORAL COMMUNICATIONS

The Mayor thanked all those who attended the Mayoral Sunday Church Service.

C.131 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The Mayor reported the receipt of three written questions as set out below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Questioner</th>
<th>Answered By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Fracking</td>
<td>Ms K Leach</td>
<td>Councillor Shori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Fracking</td>
<td>Mr P Jenkins</td>
<td>Councillor Shori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Missing No Through Sign, Ebury Street</td>
<td>Mr S Wheeler</td>
<td>Councillor Shori</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On inviting questions from members of the public present, the following issues were raised:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Questioner</th>
<th>Answered By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Six Town Housing Performance</td>
<td>Mr V Hagan</td>
<td>Councillor Shori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Fracking</td>
<td>Ms J Ross</td>
<td>Councillor Shori</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Lack of grass cutting at Gypsy Brook</td>
<td>Ms K Delaney</td>
<td>Councillor Shori</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.132 RECOMMENDATIONS OF CABINET AND COUNCIL COMMITTEES

There were no recommendations of Cabinet or Council Committees.

C.133 LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(a) Written question (Notice given)

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Shori, made a statement on the work undertaken by him since the date of the last Council meeting.

The Leader and the relevant Cabinet Members answered questions raised by Councillors on the following issues:
Due to the lack of time to answer questions 19 to 37 inclusive, the Leader gave an undertaking that copies of those questions and responses will be circulated to all Councillors. The Leader also gave an undertaking to make these available on the Council Web Site.

(b) Oral questions on Leader’s Speech and the work of the Cabinet since the last Council meeting (without Notice)
C.134 JOINT AUTHORITIES – REPORTS BY THE COUNCIL’S REPRESENTATIVE AND QUESTIONS

(a) Councillor Shori, the Council’s representative on the Greater Manchester Police and Crime Panel gave a verbal report on the work of the Authority to all Members of the Council.

(b) The following questions had been received in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Questioner</th>
<th>Answered by</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Metrolink Delays</td>
<td>Councillor D’Albert</td>
<td>Councillor Bayley (Representative on Transport for Greater Manchester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Assumptions Around Fare Increases</td>
<td>Councillor Pickstone</td>
<td>Councillor Bayley (Representative on Transport for Greater Manchester)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Impact of EU Referendum on Pension Fund</td>
<td>Councillor S Wright</td>
<td>Councillor Grimshaw (Representative on GM Pension Fund Advisory Board)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Future of Recycling Following EU Referendum</td>
<td>Councillor Mallon</td>
<td>Councillor Quinn (Representative on Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.135 NOTICES OF MOTION

Three Notices of Motion had been received and set out in the Summons.

(i) Fracking

A motion had been received and set out in the summons in the names of:

Councillors P Adams, N Bayley, J Black, S Briggs, R Cathcart, M Connolly, A Cummings, E FitzGerald, J Grimshaw, S Haroon, T Holt, M James, D
It was moved by Councillor Shori and seconded by Councillor Quinn that:-

This Council acknowledges the growing public concern that unconventional gas extraction entails significant risks to the environment and to the health and wellbeing of neighbouring communities. These include, but are not limited to, earth tremors, potential air pollution, pollution of water resources and increased industrialisation of the countryside. There appears to be insufficient regulation and scrutiny of current unconventional gas extraction operations in the UK and as a consequence these operations risk irreversibly polluting fragile water courses, established nature and tourism activities.

Council further recognises that fracking may have a detrimental effect on house prices, as well as building insurance within the vicinity of fracking wells. Additionally, an investigation by Greenpeace found that many fracking licenses have been issued to companies linked to offshore tax havens, raising questions about the purported economic benefits of shale gas extraction and any potential tax benefits to the Treasury.

There is also concern that exploration and extraction of fossil fuels by unconventional means can undermine investment in a safe and secure renewable energy future. The Conservative Government have been diverting incentives and investment away from renewable energy sources, while at the same time encouraging and supporting non-renewables such as fracking.

It is the duty of the Council to protect the health and wellbeing of residents and the integrity of our natural environment and to play its part in supporting sustainable energy for future generations. Bury Council has already demonstrated a commitment to providing clean, green energy and in accordance with this commitment:

i) Council will not allow any exploratory drilling, fracking or coal-bed extraction on land it owns or controls.

(ii) Whilst this Council is unable to introduce planning policies seeking a presumption against fracking because of national planning policy introduced by Central Government, the Council will nevertheless ensure in accordance with the law that there is a rigorous criteria for assessing planning applications for the exploration or extraction of gas, including the practice commonly known as fracking. Planning applications will be assessed against appropriate planning policies and relevant material planning considerations to ensure that any such application is considered in appropriate detail. Council will oppose strongly any attempt to weaken or override its powers as a planning authority when considering any applications for fracking.

(iii) Council agrees to consult with local communities on any planning applications related to fracking received for their area.

(iv) Council aims to take steps within its statutory powers to work to harness the abundant sustainable and renewable energy resources available locally such as wind and river weirs, and aims to work towards becoming fossil-free by 2025.
Furthermore, in line with the Paris Agreement 2015, we call on the Secretary of State for Energy & Climate Change to reconsider the Government’s reversal of the scrapping of clean energy subsidies, to reintroduce rules on zero-carbon housing and tax incentives on ‘green’ cars and to reinstate the energy efficiency budget, increasing investment in renewables in a bid to reduce our carbon emissions.

**It was moved by Councillor Gartside and seconded by Councillor Bevan as an amendment to:**

**RETAIN:** This Council acknowledges the growing public concern that unconventional gas extraction [*Proportedly*] entails significant risks to the environment and to the health and wellbeing of neighbouring communities. These include, but are not limited to, earth tremors, potential air pollution, pollution of water resources and increased industrialisation of the countryside. There appears to be insufficient regulation and scrutiny of current unconventional gas extraction operations in the UK and as a consequence these operations risk irreversibly polluting fragile water courses, established nature and tourism activities.

Council further recognises that fracking may have a detrimental effect on house prices, as well as building insurance within the vicinity of fracking wells.

**DELETE:** Additionally, an investigation by Greenpeace found that many fracking licenses have been issued to companies linked to offshore tax havens, raising questions about the purported economic benefits of shale gas extraction and any potential tax benefits to the Treasury.

There is also concern that exploration and extraction of fossil fuels by unconventional means can undermine investment in a safe and secure renewable energy future. The Conservative Government have been diverting incentives and investment away from renewable energy sources, while at the same time encouraging and supporting non-renewables such as fracking.

**RETAIN:** It is the duty of the Council to protect the health and wellbeing of residents and the integrity of our natural environment and to play its part in supporting sustainable energy for future generations. Bury Council has already demonstrated a commitment to providing clean, green energy and in accordance with this commitment:

1) Council will not allow any exploratory drilling, fracking or coal-bed extraction on land it owns or controls. **ADD:** until all the aforementioned safety concerns have been satisfactorily addressed.

(ii) Whilst this Council is unable to introduce planning policies seeking a presumption against fracking because of national planning policy introduced by Central Government, the Council will nevertheless ensure in accordance with the law that there is a rigorous criteria for assessing planning applications for the exploration or extraction of gas, including the practice commonly known as fracking. Planning applications will be assessed against appropriate planning policies and relevant material planning considerations to ensure that any such application is considered in appropriate detail. Council will oppose strongly any attempt to weaken or override its powers as a planning authority when considering any applications for fracking.
(iii) Council agrees to consult with local communities on any planning applications related to fracking received for their area.

DELETE (iv) Council aims to take steps within its statutory powers to work to harness the abundant sustainable and renewable energy resources available locally such as wind and river weirs and aims to work towards becoming fossil-free by 2025.

REPLACE WITH (iv) Council aims to take steps within its statutory powers to work to harness the abundant sustainable and renewable energy resources available locally such as river weirs.

DELETE:- Furthermore, in line with the Paris Agreement 2015, we call on the Secretary of State for Energy & Climate Change to reconsider the Government’s reversal of the scrapping of clean energy subsidies, to reintroduce rules on zero-carbon housing and tax incentives on ‘green’ cars and to reinstate the energy efficiency budget, increasing investment in renewables in a bid to reduce our carbon emissions.

REPLACE WITH:- Furthermore, in line with the Paris Agreement 2015, we welcome the Government’s continued tax incentives on ‘Green Cars’ and investment in renewables in a bid to reduce our carbon emissions. We also welcome the Government’s scrapping of clean energy subsidies for on-shore Wind Turbines and note that taxpayer funded subsidies should only be a short-term measure whilst long term reductions in renewable’s technology prices is a more effective business model in helping to achieve a ‘Green Economy’.

The amendment was put to the vote and with 14 voting for, 32 against with the Mayor abstaining was declared lost.

Prior to the vote on the motion, in excess of eight Councillors requested that voting be recorded to show how each Member cast their vote, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.5.

The result of the vote was as follows:-

For the motion:


Against the motion:

Abstaining from the motion:

Councillors I Bevan, R Caserta, I Gartside, D Gunther, M Hankey, J Harris, R Hodkinson, K Hussain, G Keeley, O Kersh, I Schofield, D Silbiger, R Walker, Y Wright and the Worshipful the Mayor

The Mayor declared the motion carried.

(ii) EU Referendum
A motion had been received and set out in the Summons in the names of:

Councillors I Bevan, R Caserta, J Daly, I Gartside, D Gunther, M Hankey, J Harris, R Hodkinson, K Hussain, G Keeley, O Kersh, I Schofield, D Silbiger, S Nuttall, R Walker, and Y Wright

It was moved by Councillor Kersh and seconded by Councillor Gartside that:-

This Council notes the views of the people in our Borough, who by a clear and decisive majority expressed their wish to leave the European Union institution at the national referendum held on the 23rd June 2016.

This Council will therefore respect the views of all of the Bury electorate who participated in the referendum and gave their views. However, this Council will resolve to work together on a cross party basis with the Government to make the transition to life outside the EU institution as smooth as possible.

We also need to ensure that we keep a strong and positive relationship with our European neighbours and in particular with the towns of Angouleme, Schorndorf and Tulle who are our European twinning partners.

It was moved by Councillor Lewis and seconded by Councillor Pickstone as an amendment as follows:-

Delete last line of Conservative motion and insert -

However, the decision to leave the EU is likely to have serious consequences, many of them unknown as yet. For Bury the immediate consequences locally, and actions needed, are threefold –

1. This council is aware that there may be serious consequences for local businesses trading within Europe. We are very concerned about the effect on local employment, the impact on both trade and tourism and we are already aware of contracts that have been cancelled or put on hold. We will work to support the local economy where we can, with a commitment to examine ways to further support local businesses where possible as events unfold.

2. We have already seen an alarming rise in the number of hate incidents across the country. The sad and unnecessary death of Jo Cox MP being the most stark and devastating of crimes, and this council wishes to record its sadness and anger at this outrageous crime.

   In Bury we have a good track record on community cohesion, and we will continue to work hard with our local communities to ensure that good community relations are maintained and enhanced. We will also liaise with other agencies to try and ensure that community safety and protection is paramount, so that all residents, irrespective of nationality or race feel safe.

3. The impact on council income of the referendum outcome through any resulting emergency budget, the effect on the local economy, the potential rise in interest rates and the effect on both council and staff pension scheme investments, will need to be watched closely. Any further reduction in income will once again affect the services we are able to offer residents. Furthermore, the stated government desire to make councils self-sustaining by 2020 may prove even more difficult to achieve in a potentially worsening economic climate.
Additionally, we also need to ensure that we keep a strong and positive relationship with our European neighbours and in particular with the towns of Angouleme, Schorndorf and Tulle who are our European twinning partners.

This council pledges to do all it can, with the resources available, to support our residents, communities, and businesses through the difficult process of exiting the European Union.

**On being put, with 32 voting for, 12 against, with 3 abstentions, including the Mayor, the Mayor declared the amendment carried.**

**On being put, with 32 voting for, 12 against, with 3 abstentions, including the Mayor, the Mayor declared the substantive motion carried.**

(iii) **Hate Crime and Tolerance**

A motion had been received and set out in the summons in the names of:

**Councillors M D’Albert, T Pickstone and S Wright**

It was moved by Councillor Pickstone and seconded by Councillor Tariq that:-

This Council notes with concern the increase in hate crime (57% increase by 27 June 2016) following the outcome of the EU Referendum.

Council restates that we are proud to live in a diverse and tolerant society. Racism, xenophobia and hate crimes have no place in our country.

Council condemns racism, xenophobia and hate crimes unequivocally. We will not allow hate to become acceptable.

Council reassures all people living in Bury that they are valued members of our community.

Council resolves to work to ensure local bodies and programmes as needed to fight and prevent racism and xenophobia.

**On being put, with no-one voting against the Mayor declared the motion carried.**

The Mayor called upon the Leader to move the Closure Motion in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9

**RESOLVED:**

That the whole of the remaining business before Council be approved.
NOTE: The meeting started at 7.00 pm and ended at 10.25 pm

NOTE: - There were no scrutiny review reports or specific items called in by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- There were no questions on the work of Outside Bodies or Questions on the Delegated Decisions of the Council.

The following report was duly approved following the Closure Motion:

Quarterly Report on Special Urgency Decisions
Turning now to the work of the Cabinet since the last Council meeting...

Mr Mayor there have been two meetings of the Cabinet and these focused on issues surrounding the Council’s resources and assets.

In July we considered the 2015/16 revenue and capital outturns and also the Treasury Management Annual report.

Our revenue spending was £61,000 below budget and our capital spending was within £13,000 of budget.

The very clear conclusion that can be drawn from these reports is that the Council and its officers have done an outstanding job managing our finances.
And that isn’t just for last year.

No, despite Cllr Daly’s comments in the Bury Times, under Labour control this Council has a proud record of sound financial management. We have consistently stayed within budget as far back as 2008/09, when the Council last reported an overspend...and that was when the Tories were in control!

And at the same time that we have delivered this excellent financial management we have also produced some superb outcomes for the people of this borough. Many of our services are amongst the best in the country and we do this whilst also delivering outstanding value for money...and don’t just take my word for that.

Our external auditors, KPMG, issue an annual VFM statement and the latest one says “we are satisfied that, in all significant respects, Bury Council has put in place proper arrangements to secure economy, efficiency and effectiveness in its use of resources”.

Of course Mr Mayor we are acutely aware that at the Cabinet’s most recent meeting we discussed the month 3 monitoring report for the current year and noted that the report contained a forecast overspending of £6.4m.

The reason for this position is set out in the report but basically it results from the complexity of implementing several of the cuts options used to support the budget; it reflects additional demands for key Council services and it reflects reductions in income resulting from the difficult economic situation the country as a whole faces.

However, it is very important that Council understands that we have not yet overspent and that swift action is being taken to address the situation.

We are also in the fortunate position that our finance team has constructed a balance sheet position that recognised the need to provide sufficient reserves to meet unexpected demand and other budget shortfalls.
We are even more fortunate that previous Tory budget amendments weren’t passed by this Council because if they had been then our reserves would have been massively depleted and the situation would be much, much worse. So much for Tory prudence (joke).

Whilst the causes behind the forecast are issues that we know we need to address, the whole position is made worse by the fact that this year’s budget was set against a backdrop of yet another £12m cuts on top of the £52m we have already had to cut since the opposition came to power in 2010.

Mr Mayor, Bury is one of the poorest funded metropolitan Councils in the country and the sad fact is that the Unfair Deal for Bury is now hitting home, and hitting home hard.

Every man, woman and child in this borough is short changed by the Government to the tune of £32 compared to other similar areas.
If we received the same funding as neighbouring Rochdale then we would have an additional £28 million to spend on local services. If we received the same as neighbouring Blackburn then we would have £34 million.

These are game changing figures Mr Mayor, especially at a time when the Council is facing a further £32m of cuts over the next three years.

And sadly Mr Mayor, the Government’s betrayal of Bury isn’t just limited to Council services. The NHS in this country is now at a critical point in its fight for survival with experts predicting that the flagship 7 day a week NHS is little more than a pipe dream and our very own CCG is facing its own funding shortfall, amounting to £11m a year, and is having to take its own difficult decisions to bridge the gap.

For a number of years we have been warning the Government that their blinkered and politically motivated decimation of our local funding would leave many services unsustainable and that is exactly what is happening.
And again, don’t just take my word for it. The Parliamentary Public Accounts Committee looked into the financial sustainability of Councils and said “Councils with the greatest spending needs – the most deprived authorities – have been receiving the largest reductions. Further cuts could not just undermine the entire viability of most optional services, but might threaten some statutory services in these areas.”

“Looking to the future, if funding reductions were to continue we question whether DCLG would be in a position to provide assurance that all local authorities could maintain the full range of their statutory services.”

“The Department cannot at present satisfy us that it understands whether it is feasible and practical for local authorities to deliver the service transformation necessary to maintain financial sustainability. Nor does it understand what the effects on service users would be.”
To be fair to the Government, they did respond. They introduced a Transition Grant...but only for their mates in the leafy south! That well-known ‘Deprived’ borough, Richmond-upon-Thames, got £30.47 per person from the Grant...and everyone in Bury got 14p!

Mr Mayor there are three simple reasons why we are where we are. Firstly the Government’s austerity agenda, secondly a funding formula that rewards failure and thirdly the ever increasing, and un-funded, demands that are being placed on our services.

And let no-one in this room be under any illusion...public services in this country, and in Bury, are at a tipping point.

Unless the Government takes action then services that people need and value simply won’t be there.
Mr Mayor, I can assure Council that in Bury we won’t go down without a fight. We will be brave, we will be bold and we will be radical. I just hope that the Government follows our lead because if they don’t then anything we do may not be enough.

On a more positive note, the Cabinet also received reports showing how we are investing in our most important asset...our staff. We approved improvements to the Bury Behaviours model and we noted the progress made on implementing the People Strategy.

Finally we considered reports setting out plans to invest in a new Extra Care scheme at Haworth Close, an extension to Butterstile School, and a Highways Asset Management Plan for the Borough.

Even in these incredibly difficult times this Labour Group recognises that we must continue to exploit invest to save opportunities and make radical changes to services so that they have the best chance of surviving Theresa May’s ‘return to the 50s’ agenda.
Suggested answer to written Question 1 submitted by Councillor R Walker

Q. Does the Leader share my disappointment that Manchester City Council chose to commission a recent report on a plan for a Single Hospital Service for the whole of Manchester without consulting adjoining Boroughs which would be affected by the proposals, including in our case the removal of North Manchester Hospital from Pennine Acute Hospitals footprint?

A. Following the CQC inspection of Pennine Acute Hospital Trust, an Improvement Board has been established to review all recommendations made by CQC. The aim is to ensure that services and workforce are appropriately targeted with the aim to improve in all areas identified by CQC.

Interim arrangements and review of all Pennine Acute Services will require oversight, strong leadership and a commitment to safeguard patients.

Strategic decisions about hospital configuration are being considered, but have not been finalised at this point.
Suggested answer to written Question 2 submitted by Councillor Pickstone

Q. Given recent reports of continuing increases in obesity, including amongst children, could the Leader inform members on how Bury compares on this issue with the regional and national figures, and what work the authority is doing under its public health function to tackle the issue.

A. Given recent reports of continuing increases in obesity, including amongst children, could the Leader inform members on how Bury compares on this issue with the regional and national figures, and what work the authority is doing under its public health function to tackle the issue.

In Bury 67.1% of adults are overweight or obese. This almost matches similar authorities to Bury (statistical neighbours) but is greater than the England figure of 64.6%. For children, around 20.75 of 4-5 year olds have excess weight and the trend is very slightly worsening. This is below the national figure of 21.9% and comparable authorities (22.6%). Excess weight in 10-11 year olds stands at 32.9%, with the trend recently improving. This figure is lower than similar authorities (34.1%) and England (33.2%).
Current work within the Council under its public health function to tackle obesity includes:

- Commissioning the Health Visiting Service and the School Health Service to deliver the national Healthy Child Programme which incorporates healthy weight.
- Commissioning of the National Childhood Measurement Programme for Bury
- Bury Lifestyle Service provides advice and support around weight management, physical activity and nutrition
- BEATS - a GP Exercise Referral Scheme for those with a chronic condition including where obesity is a factor
- Golden Apple Award – an accredited healthy eating scheme currently operating in all children’s centres, 62 nurseries and with some childminders
- Roll out of a Healthier Catering Award which accredits relevant businesses and schools for healthy catering
- Implementation of Bury’s Breastfeeding Strategy
- School Food Policy

Work currently in development by Public Health working variously across the Council and with partners includes:

- A Health Supplementary Planning Document to support regulation of obesogenic environment, and particularly, check the proliferation of unhealthy take-aways
- A Bury Healthy Schools Programme which will incorporate healthy eating and physical activity
- Development of an Active Travel Plan for Bury to promote walking and cycling as part of daily routines
- Further implementation of the Physical Activity and Sport Strategy
- Development of a Food and Health Strategy
- Review of obesity pathways for children and adults to inform future commissioning intentions
ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 3 submitted by Councillor Fitzgerald

Q. Now the libraries consultation has closed, could the Leader tell us how many responses we got and what the next steps will be?

A. 3,536 surveys have been received with an additional 500 telephone interviews being completed.

The consultation has shown clear support for the 6 principles on which to base the future of the Library Service. These principles, along with the present and future needs of the people of Bury will be used to develop financially realistic options for the Library Service. The second public consultation will begin in November of this year.
BURY COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING – 14 SEPTEMBER 2016

NOTE FOR: COUNCILLOR SHORI
LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET
QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been
circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the
Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should
not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 4 submitted by
Councillor Preston

Q. Does the Leader agree that the launch of the Bury Commission
on Life Chances highlights the importance Bury Council places
on ensuring each and every one of its citizens receives the best
start in life?

A. Yes - The Commission has been set up to conduct an
audit of Life Chances in Bury and make
recommendations to improve them. The principal
objective is to consider how the local authority, partners
and stakeholders can work together to better align
education, skills and employment. There are a broad set
of key questions the commission is focusing on, one of
those is specifically focused on “How could better early
years provision help life chances?”
Suggested answer to written Question 5 submitted by Councillor Gartside

Q. Can the Leader please confirm if the potential 9% hike of the waste disposal levy in 2017 has been accounted for in Bury Council’s Medium Term Financial Strategy?

A. Yes it has, along with the 24% reduction in funding to 2020, unfunded new burdens such as the Apprenticeship Levy (£500k), and the removal of specific grants, e.g. Education Services Grant (£2.8 million) and the Housing Benefit Admin Grant (£1.0 million).

All of this on top of the “un”fair deal Bury is getting, whereby if it was funded at the national average per head, the Council would have additional resources totalling £9 million; or £18 million if funded at the average for GM authorities.

Waste disposal is a significant cost for the Council and we are working closely with the Waste Disposal Authority to examine ways of reducing costs.

In terms of Bury’s own waste disposal costs, it is worth noting that had we not embarked upon our 3 weekly collection initiative, then the cost for 2016/17 would have been £2.1 million higher than it is now.
BURY COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING – 14 SEPTEMBER 2016

NOTE FOR: COUNCILLOR WALMSLEY
CABINET MEMBER FOR STRATEGIC HOUSING AND SUPPORT SERVICES

ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 6 submitted by Councillor Sarah Southworth

Q. What has been the outcome of the investment made by the Council in provision of fibre broadband across Bury and how has this supported our local business community?

A. Access to fast and reliable internet speeds is a key driver to business growth and economic productivity.

Bury Council’s investment in the Get Digital Faster Programme is part of the wider broadband plans across Bury and the city region.

The focus is on increasing access (defined as speed and coverage) by investing in superfast broadband infrastructure (mostly fibre enabled cabinets) across the borough.

It is a Greater Manchester programme working alongside our neighbours in Bolton, Bury, Oldham, Rochdale, Stockport, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan. *(Salford and Manchester were excluded from the programme due to State Aid constraints.)*

Bury like the other districts made a substantial contribution to this programme which leveraged funding
from Europe through ERDF (European Development Fund) and central government. This programme brings faster broadband speeds to those areas that fall outside of a commercial roll out programmes.

We know that access to faster broadband speeds is crucial for Greater Manchester to be able to compete on the world stage. Bury businesses must be at the centre for any opportunities to grow locally, nationally and internationally.

Our investment has resulted in faster broadband speeds available to 99% of premises across the borough. Bury’s take up rates are one of the highest across Greater Manchester.

To maximise our investment it is crucial that we ensure as many of our businesses and residents are aware that they can ask for access to faster speeds.

To further stimulate interest this Council invested in a scheme to bring Connection Grants to Bury. This grant was aimed at small businesses, charities and social enterprises to enable them to cover the infrastructure costs to upgrade to faster broadband connection.

The Connection Voucher Scheme has provided grants of up to £3,000 and was on a first come first served basis.

I am pleased to confirm that between the 1st April 2015 and 27 September 2015 a total of 220 vouchers have been issued to eligible Bury businesses. That equates up to £660,000 investment locally, from an initial contribution of £6,000 from Bury Council to cover the costs of administrating the scheme.

At the onset of this programme a report was commissioned to measure the economic impact across the city region.

This report estimates £80 million Gross Value Added for the Greater Manchester Economy.
The additional estimated growth in GVA in Bury is estimated at £3.8 million. I look forward to sharing a full evaluation of the economic impact at the conclusion of this programme.

Supporting our local economy is our overarching ambition and we will of course continue to support those businesses and residents across our borough that don’t currently enjoy the benefits of faster speeds.
Suggested answer to written Question 7 submitted by Councillor Skillen

Q. Last year’s Boxing Day floods affected 450 homes around the Borough. So far over 200 homeowners have applied for grants of up to £5k to make their homes more flood resilient. What is the Council doing to help the owners who have not yet applied to receive this assistance?

A. Since the severe floods on Boxing Day last year we have been successfully managing the process of awarding Flood Resilience Grants. Over 600 homes and businesses across the borough were affected by the Storm Eva floods and so far we have processed over 200 grant applications and are currently assisting a further 110 owners of affected properties with their applications.

We would like to help as many residents as possible so the closing date for applications has been now extended to 30th September 2016 with the building work to be completed by 31st March 2017. In addition to public meetings and letters sent to all of the affected residents we have entered into a partnership with a company called Caribou. Caribou are a company specialising in providing advice to residents and carrying out necessary improvements such as fitting flood doors. This company has been recommended by the government and has a proven track record, most recently working with the owners of flooded properties in Rochdale.
ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 8 submitted by Councillor Harris

Q. Over 200 new homes are under construction opposite the junction at Watling Street and Bury and Bolton Road. At present, heavy duty vehicles attempting to access and egress the site are creating traffic chaos along Bury and Bolton Road. Would the Council acknowledge that traffic will increase dramatically at this junction when the properties on the Tudor Grange Estate are occupied and put forward plans to introduce permanent traffic lights to assuage the problem?

A. This development has been the subject of consideration and resolution by the Council’s Planning Control Committee. This involved the consideration of detailed traffic and highways impact in the consideration of such applications. The Council therefore has nothing further to add and must let the planning and development process take its lawful course.
Suggested answer to written Question 9 submitted by Councillor D’Albert

Q. In the light of the success of Team GB at the Olympic Games, could the Leader inform members on how Bury compares with other areas both regionally and nationally for sports participation. What is the authority doing to encourage sport participation in the Borough?

A. The Bury Sport And Physical Activity Service (SAPAS) helps to increase the participation of the Borough of Bury through increasing the awareness and number of opportunities in Bury for people to become more active more often whether they live, work or study in Bury. For example, SAPAS provides a very successful Exercise Referral Scheme called BEATS for people with a recurring illness or medical condition who would benefit from a personal exercise programme. It is a partnership between NHS Bury and Bury Leisure. Doctors, practice nurses and specialist health professionals within Bury refer suitable patients to join the BEATS programme. There is also a number of different physical activity programmes to help get the people of Bury more active including Bridging The Gap which works with local partners to provide suitable and enjoyable activities for our disabled residents. Programmes such as Sportivate,
Satellite Clubs and Doorstep Clubs help to get our younger population (11+) more active, trying to increase the variety and the number of opportunities young people can access. Our ‘Walk with Me’ programme provides a number of weekly volunteer led walks that people can enjoy no matter what their ability, and Wheels For All based at Clarence Park provides adapted bikes for everyone to enjoy each week.

“I Will if You Will” (IWIYW) is a programme, led by Bury Council with the support of Sport England and other partners, to encourage more women to be more active, more often. The project was originally conceived to address the gender gap that exists between males and females, with almost 2 million fewer women than men taking part in sport and physical activity regularly. The programme set out to encourage behavioural change amongst women and girls in Bury, with a view to monitoring the throughput, frequency and retention of participants and generating learning on what works. The programme has been in Bury since 2013. Working with a range of partners in Bury, IWIYW has developed the market offer, and reached out to women and girls via a range of channels to support and encourage them to be more active. The result of the programme to date can be seen in the position Active People Survey results in respect of women and girls participation.

The Sport England ‘Active Peoples Survey’ for 12 months to April 2016 showed that 32.6% of females took part in sport each week for at least 30 minutes compared with 31.7% females nationally and 41.8% of males took part in 30 minutes of sport once per week compared with 40.7% nationally. Therefore Bury is above the national average for both females and males. Bury is also above average when compared with our statistical neighbours for sport participation.
Suggested answer to written Question 10 submitted by Councillor Kerrison

Q. Could the Leader provide an update on the Bury Light Night evening and could he tell us what is planned for this year’s event and inform us how it will be advertised?

A. The review of last year’s event established that Bury Light Night has grown to such an extent that its scale has become beyond the capacity of the town centre to accommodate it. It has grown from an estimated audience of 10,000 people in 2012 to more than 30,000 last year. While the event was delivered safely there were concerns that public safety could be threatened by any further growth. It would be possible to address this with an increased budget – making the event a bigger spectacle, but this would only delay the inevitable point that the town centre isn’t big enough for such crowds; and this option would be unrealistic in the current financial position.

Following the review, Officers returned to first principles to assess what Light Night was establish to achieve. The approach which we have agreed addresses a number of Light Night’s vulnerabilities and offers a sustainable future for a major Bury event contributing to the local economy. One the simple question of a single night, we are moving to a 2 night event, which will open up more opportunities for day-time participation of schools and
community groups and also make it easier for town centre retailers and restaurants to get involved as previously many of them were not able to open for the night time activities. More fundamentally, it has been recognised that the purpose of Light Night was to establish a unique visitor experience. When it started Light Nights around the region were rare; that has changed over time so it is not unique, it just part of a calendar of such events. So we have come up with the concept of Transition, where Bury will actively promote and celebrate its uniqueness to maintain a sense that Bury is always the cultural leader in the region. So Light Night will be replaced with a new 2 night concept which focus on Sound – the Bury Sounds Festival. We have chosen sound art, which includes music, radio, performance, poetry and lots of other arts which use sound. Sound is a big artform across Europe but less so in the UK and certainly not in the region. The specific advantage of choosing an under-represented artform is that we anticipate it will open up new sources of funding. We plan to give the Sounds Festival a 3 year run which is a sufficient timescale to approach funders with a development plan to lever in external support; and we aim to make the event self-financing over the development period. After 3 year a new Transition will be considered, thus establishing itself as constantly reinvented.

Because it took a little longer than usual to work through this process, our timescales are very tight for this year, so to the public it may well look like a hybrid Light & Sound Festival, which may not be a bad thing to have a transition to transition (joke). On the question of marketing, there is a marketing plan, a new brand identity will be launched shortly and we will be promoting the event with the mixture of printed materials, social media, contacts to press, radio and other media.
ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 11 submitted by Councillor Cathcart

Q. Would the Leader join me in thanking the funders and volunteers involved in the Radcliffe Tower Project and the opening of the Radcliffe Manor Heritage Trail?

A. I’m sure he would as he, Cllr Preston and the Mayor were present last Friday at the opening tour. The event was organised to thank representatives of the Heritage Lottery Fund for their £266,000 contribution and to celebrate completion of a project to turn the Scheduled Ancient Monument site from a compound for a landfill site to an extension to Close Park. The project worked to a tight budget so the time and enthusiasm of volunteer researchers, archaeologists and Rangers was central to its success.
ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 12 submitted by Councillor Hankey

Q. Can the Leader advise us on the current progress on the GM Regional Strategy and can he assure us that this Chamber will have the opportunity to express its’ views on the final document before Bury Council gives agreement to it?

A. Work on the preparation the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework is currently ongoing with a view to commencing an eight week period of public consultation on a draft plan in mid-October. The GMSF will form part of the statutory development plan for each of the constituent GM districts and, as such, will require the endorsement of each Council at key stages. Council approval will be required prior to the plan being submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination into its soundness and legal compliance and also prior to the plan being formally adopted. So yes, there will be opportunities for views to be expressed on the document.
ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 13 submitted by Councillor Susan Southworth

Q. Would the Leader agree with the conclusions and recommendations of the Health Select Committee Report on Public Health post 2013, in particular that cuts to the Public Health Grant are a false economy?

A. The Health Select committee, chaired by Conservative MP Sarah Woolastion, published its report on Public Health post 2013 on 1st September 2016. The committee examined the state of public health post the 2013 reforms which brought public health back into councils. Overall the report concludes that the transfer of public health has been positive and that local authorities are able to demonstrate many examples of excellent practice. Indeed here in Bury, we are doing many innovative things such as our fantastic work on addressing health related barriers to employment, our work to ensure every child gets the best start in life and our work with the NHS to prevent & manage diabetes and other common long term conditions. However, the report also highlights the challenges facing local authorities in particular the cuts to the public health grant which the report has quite rightly described as a false economy. In Bury the cuts equate to £1.1m this year with a further series of cuts over the next 3
years of almost another £1m. This puts all the good work we’re doing at significant risk. The Select Committee states, and I agree, that the cuts will not only add to the future costs of health and social care but risk widening health inequalities. Obviously this is something which is particularly important to us in Bury and core to our Team Bury strategies. In her first speech as Prime Minister, Theresa May put reducing health inequalities first on her list of ‘burning injustices’ that need to be tackled. There is also a growing mismatch between spending on public health and the significance attached to prevention in the NHS 5 Year Forward View. Cutting the public health grant does just not stack up.

As if the cuts were not enough, the committee also expressed concerns at the on-going workforce issues within Public Health, especially the specialist workforce and the importance of addressing these issues rapidly to prevent further depletion and the loss of vital knowledge, skills and experience required to ensure effective delivery of public health outcomes. Local public health teams also face significant problems not being able to access the right level of data and information they need to do their jobs effectively. This is true in Bury and whilst the team have been working hard to address this working with colleagues across Greater Manchester, it is an issue that can only be resolved nationally and needs to be done urgently.

So to conclude, I very much support the conclusions of the Health Select Committee. I hope the government takes notice and reverses these irrational cuts and ensures we have all the tools we need to improve the health of the people of Bury and reduce health inequalities.
Suggested answer to written Question 14 submitted by Councillor Haroon

Q. Would the Leader join me in celebrating our success in halving teenage pregnancy in Bury over the last 10 years?

A. The teenage pregnancy rate in Bury has fallen from 49.4 per 1000 girls in 2005, to 23 per 1000 girls in 2015 (Source ONS;). This exceeds the goal of the original national Teenage Pregnancy Strategy which was to halve Teenage Pregnancy rates, and brings the under-18 and under-16 conception rates to the lowest level since records began in 1969. The achievement in addressing such a complex health and social issue affecting the lives of young people and their children is certainly something to celebrate.

The dramatic decrease in Teenage Pregnancy rates is undoubtedly the result of improvements to sex and relationships education in schools and greater access to contraceptive services, which has given more young people the tools they need to have happy, healthy relationships and prevent unplanned pregnancy.

Teenage Pregnancy is dropping in Bury in line with the England trend. However the proportion of under 18 conceptions leading to abortions and under 18 abortion rates in Bury had increased last year, unlike the England trend.
It is important to note teenage pregnancy disproportionately affects looked after children, young offenders, those with poor educational attainment or who are disengaged from school, young people with mental health problems and those with low self-esteem. Therefore, it is vital to keep a focus on teenage pregnancy to sustain the progress made and further narrow inequalities.

In Bury the LA have recently tendered a new sexual health service (in partnership with Rochdale and Oldham) which includes the development of an online virtual hub, this means young people have ready access to a wide range of information, advice and guidance as well as the ability to book appointments online, and an out of hours telephone advice service.

Finally, the continued effort to reduce the number of teenage parents is essential as it is pivotal to wider efforts to reduce social exclusion, health inequalities, and child poverty.
ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME
(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 15 submitted by Councillor Hodkinson

Q. Can the leader tell me why the Council did not resurface the top end of Bridge Street during the recent 5 week road closure? Surely this was a missed opportunity to do the job properly?

A. Information from condition surveys and highway safety inspections feed into the process of assessing all roads within Bury for inclusion within a forward programme of works. The condition of the top section of Bridge Street, Ramsbottom (Crow Lane to Bolton Street) was assessed as being in sufficiently sound repair and, as such, it did not warrant consideration for inclusion in the rolling 5 year capital highway maintenance programme.

Inspections prior to the works commencing indicated that most of the surface was structurally sound and with the addition of patch repairs, this was seen as a more efficient use of resources. Patching works to the carriageway were around 20-25% of the estimated cost of resurfacing. The Council does not have the necessary funds to undertake resurfacing works to roads that are not in need of such interventions when there other roads within the Borough that are in much more need.

In addition, surfacing over the new trenches excavated as part of the gas main renewal works on Bridge Street before they have been exposed to passing traffic and had sufficient time to compact always presents the risk that deformations/defects may appear in the new surfacing due to settlement.
Suggested answer to written Question 16 submitted by Councillor S Wright

Q. Could the Leader inform members work the authority is doing to tackle the illegal employment of staff at wages less than the national minimum/‘living’ wage? In particular how does this work address staffing in the restaurant trade where pay can sometimes be ‘made up’ by ‘tips’

A. As a leading employer in Bury we set a good example in terms of employing staff. As an absolute minimum we pay the national living wage and we would always encourage other employers within Bury to follow our lead.

When procuring services, we stipulate that employers should:

- a) not unlawfully discriminate on the basis of age, race, religion, gender, sexual orientation or disability;
- b) abide by good health and safety practice based on its responsibilities under any applicable health and safety at work legislation;
- c) pay its staff at least the minimum wage in line with the National Minimum Wage Act 1998 and comply with all relevant employment legislation

All suppliers are required to complete a Suitability Assessment to ensure compliance with employment and other legislation.
NOTE FOR: COUNCILLOR HOLT
FIRST DEPUTY AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HEALTH AND WELLBEING

ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 17 submitted by Councillor Sarah Southworth.

Q. Would the Leader agree that the recently published National Obesity Plan represents a missed opportunity to make a radical difference to the health and wellbeing of our children?

A. The new National Childhood Obesity Plan has rightly received considerable criticism from a range of professional bodies and interest groups as being a missed opportunity to tackle the current obesity crisis. Nationally, one in five 10 year-olds are obese and in Bury 33% of our 10-11 yr olds are overweight or obese. Obesity is linked to numerous chronic conditions and costs the economy an estimated £27 billion p.a. A public health issue of this magnitude needs a cross-department and cross-society strategy - The National Childhood Obesity Plan is far from that.

The Plan’s principle proposals for action are:
1. A sugar tax.

This previously announced measure from the budget is welcome. It will not, however, deliver the progress needed without being part of a wider programme to improve children’s nutrition. It is also likely to be open to legal challenge, and delay, by the industry who will likely cite that many large brands already have low/no sugar ranges which make up 50% of the market. It is also questionable how much of any money raised will
actually be spent on physical activity and healthy eating initiatives in schools

2. **Reformulation programme to reduce sugar in food and drink.**

This is also welcome but leaves “hidden sugars” in other products and misses a crucial opportunity to reduce fat and salt content. And, due to technical practicalities it is also likely to be slow in its introduction. Moreover, it is only a voluntary scheme with no mandated targets or sanctions and is, therefore, destined to fail.

3. **Supporting physical activity in schools for an hour per day.**

This measure is linked to a welcome new healthy schools rating scheme. However, this is also on a voluntary basis and physical activity on its own will not tackle obesity; it requires dietary action too.

The biggest failure of the plan is that it omits a raft of evidence-based recommendations from the Health Select Committee to tackling obesity:
- Controlling price promotions on unhealthy food and drink
- Regulating the marketing and advertising of unhealthy food and drink
- Effective labelling of single portions of products with added sugar to show sugar content in teaspoons.
- Better provision of education and information about diet
- Stronger powers for local authorities to control the wider environment e.g. planning powers to halt the proliferation of unhealthy take-aways.

Some regard obesity as the’ new smoking’. Reductions in tobacco-related harm benefitted from brave and bold political action to take on a fearless tobacco industry and progress a range of population-level measures. That political will to drive similar approaches is not evident in The National Childhood Obesity Plan. As such, the Plan represents a missed opportunity to make a radical difference to the health and wellbeing of our children.
Suggested answer to written Question 18 submitted by Councillor Cathcart

Q. In light of the high level of childhood hospital admissions for asthma in Bury, could the Leader tell me what is being done to address this and what more could be done?

A. I share your concerns, in Bury in the financial year 2013/2014 we had 171 emergency admissions for children (under 18s) with asthma. Our rate of admissions (400 per 100,00) is 46% higher than the national admission rate (219 per 100,00). The council with partners are taking this area very seriously and working hard to address this.

GP’s in Bury are now working to the Greater Manchester standards to improve support and management of children with asthma. This includes having more regular appointments with children to monitor their condition and to support them to self-care and manage their symptoms more effectively.

Exposure to cigarette smoke is associated with hospital admissions in asthmatics. Bury council coordinate a task group which is working towards supporting mums to quit smoking during pregnancy and to support them and family members to stay quit following bringing the baby home to ensure a smoke free home.
Air quality is also an important factor and can contribute to asthmatic episodes. To make a significant impact on improving air quality steps need to be taken on a wider geographical footprint. As such Bury is working with Greater Manchester towards the GM Low Emissions Strategy and Plan along, the Transport Strategy and the spatial planning strategy. These strategies and plans will work to promote a range of steps to improve air quality such as

- Reducing emissions from HGVs
- Reducing emissions from buses
- Promoting walking, cycling and the use of public transport

In addition to these Greater Manchester approaches, Bury council is taking a range of steps locally to increase active and greener travel. These include;

The opening of the Cycle hub at Bury Interchange which was opened in late 2012,
The improvement of cycle parking facilities at our Metrolink stations,
The extension of the park and ride car parks at Whitefield and Radcliffe Metrolink stations,
The installation of 7 electric car charging points,
The development of a local active travel group to promote walking and cycling as part of daily activity,

There is also ongoing Work towards a 3 year programme to introduce 20mph zones or speed limits within a majority of residential areas in Bury.
Suggested answer to written Question 19 submitted by Councillor Daly

**Q.** What does the Leader think about the possibility of up 12,000 new homes being built in our Borough as a result of the GM Spatial Framework being adopted in due course?

**A.** The GMSF has to be prepared within the context of national planning policy set out by the Government. The Government has set a target to build 1 million new homes nationally by 2020 and is putting considerable pressure on local authorities to deliver this. National planning policy states that authorities ‘should plan to substantially increase the amount of housing’ and to ensure that the ‘full objectively assessed needs are met in their local plans’.

In determining local needs, national guidance states that the Government’s own figures on household projections should form the starting point for identifying housing needs and that these should be adjusted to reflect local market signals. The latest CLG household projections indicate that around 190,000 new households are expected to form in GM over the next 20 years. Taking account of local market signals, the objectively assessed housing needs for GM is around 226,500. For Bury, the objectively assessed housing need is just over 12,000.
Clearly, Local authorities are under considerable pressure from the Government to ensure that enough land is identified for housing through their development plans. This is clearly evident in the Government’s threat to impose financial penalties for those local authorities who do not have up to date local plans, such as the removal of New Homes Bonus monies. They have even threatened to ‘designate’ such local authorities, effectively putting them in ‘special measures’. This would mean that the Government would intervene and impose local plans on authorities – presumably also having to apply their own national policy to meet the objectively assessed needs for housing and employment.

In Bury, we have already experienced difficulties in recent years in trying to take forward a local plan that did not meet housing or employment needs and the Government’s own appointed planning Inspector made it clear that we should withdraw the latest plan and concentrate on the GMSF, allowing the ten authorities to consider the key strategic planning issues collectively. This is what we are now doing.

However, it is important to note, that if we are to meet the identified needs in Greater Manchester and in Bury, that we will continue to prioritise the release of brownfield land and encourages the re-use of existing properties and buildings. Districts are working hard to deliver these brownfield sites to help aid urban regeneration and minimise the amount of greenfield land needed to meet the Government’s targets. However, even if all these brownfield sites come forward, they would only provide about a third of the housing that the Government considers is needed in the Borough.
ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 20 submitted by Councillor James.

Q. Of Greater Manchester’s population of 10 million trees, 10% are Ash trees. With Chalara or Ash Die Back now confirmed in Bury, will the Leader take this very serious situation and put it on the agenda at the next AGMA meeting and work with organisations such as Manchester City of Trees to combat this outbreak?

A. We understand from the City of Trees team that this disease is now present in the northern half of Greater Manchester and is expected to spread further. It seems that some ash trees have some tolerance of the disease so not all will need to be felled. Trees in a dangerous condition in public places will be given priority by the Council’s tree gang. Whilst chalara could have a significant financial implication, it is not yet clear that this will be the case. We will therefore continue to work closely with other GM districts and City of Trees in case some sort of collective response is needed.
Suggested answer to written Question 21 submitted by Councillor Kelly.

Q. Would the Leader, on behalf of this town of Bury, congratulate the members of Team GB who came from our area and contributed to the outstanding medal haul of 67 medals, including 27 golds?

A. The Leader would certainly like to congratulate the whole of Team GB and in particular those Olympians who have made Bury very proud of their achievements and their efforts in Rio this year. Cyclist Adam Yates, swimmer James Guy and boxer Muhammed Ali, who all have Bury connections went on to represent their country and Bury with pride, with determination and after years of dedication to achieve their Olympic Dreams. I would like to congratulate each and every one of them, and in particular James aged 20 who achieved a Silver medals in the men’s 4x200m freestyle relay team and the men’s 4x100m medley relay team.
Suggested answer to written Question 22 submitted by Councillor d’Albert.

Q. Could the Leader inform members of how many households claim single person discount for Council Tax in each township forum area?

A. 31,553 currently claim Single Person Discount as follows;
   Bury (12,034)
   Prestwich (5,036)
   Radcliffe (6,680)
   Ramsbottom (2,394)
   Tottington (1,555)
   Whitefield (3,854)
Suggested answer to written Question 23 submitted by Councillor R Walker

Q. Could the Leader undertake to review the policy of many Council vehicles, including those operating for Six Town Housing, being taken home at night and weekends by employees to be parked in the highway? Could such a review consider the long term loss of amenity for neighbouring residents and any implications for security and insurance by not using a Council depot?

A. Vehicles are allowed to be taken home with the Head of each user Department making the decision based on the following criteria:-

Service efficiency – where it is more operationally productive and efficient for the driver to start work from home rather than lose time travelling from their base to the first job and vice versa, also with reduced mileage comes a fuel cost saving.

Security – numerous years ago many of the vehicles that where left in locked parks depots where often subjected to theft of the vehicle or vandalism often three to four vehicles could be reported on a Monday morning so it made sense to allow those drivers to take them home. If all vehicles had to be parked within Bradley Fold Depot there would be insufficient space to accommodate them.

Six Town Housing’s policy of allowing trades staff to take their vehicles home at night is a financial decision.
based on productivity. We estimate that there would be approximately one hour of travel time lost per day if staff had to go to Bradley Fold to pick up their vehicle, as the start of their working day would be classed as from when they leave home. Rather than at present where they travel to their first job in their own time and their start time is classed as when they arrive at said property.

The cost saving of STH operating in this way is roughly £538,000 (based on 90 staff who work a 5 day week 46 weeks of the year at a cost of £26 per hour).
Suggested answer to written Question 24 submitted by Councillor O’Brien

Q. Would the Leader like to congratulate the people of Bury for recycling 64% of their domestic refuse in June?

A. Household recycling in Bury hit a record high of 64% in the month of June and this is the first time that the 60% goal has been surpassed - the previous best was 59.6% in July 2015.

In the main, this is due to residents putting more food waste into their brown recycling bins rather than their grey bins. This followed an intensive food waste recycling campaign earlier this year. Some 2,211 tonnes of biowaste (food and garden mixed waste) were collected in June, the first time that the 2,000 tonne barrier has been breached in a single calendar month.

This is tremendous achievement by the people of Bury, many of whom are doing everything they can to recycle. While this is a one-off monthly figure, and will not represent the yearly average, it is a significant milestone. It shows that we are heading in the right direction and we all need to keep up the momentum. More and more people are putting the right stuff in the right bin. This is vital, especially when money is scarce. Every penny that we save through recycling is a penny less that we have to cut from other frontline services.
ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 25 submitted by Councillor Mallon

Q. In 2010 David Cameron promised to “cut the deficit not the NHS”. As we have A & E Departments closing, Walk In Centres and a shortage of doctors and nurses, does the Leader believe that we can trust Tories over the NHS?

A. Thank you for your question Councillor Mallon. Without wishing to overstate it I believe that under this Government our NHS has been stretched to breaking point. Indeed this is not just my view but the view of NHS providers who point to a chronically understaffed NHS and widespread breaches of performance targets.

Put simply, without a funding boost from Government, the cash crisis in the NHS means that it cannot cope with demand for services and maintain standards of care.

Sadly, it doesn’t look as though the bus with £350m a week for the NHS is going to arrive anytime soon!!!
Suggested answer to written Question 26 submitted by Councillor Gartside.

Q. Can the leader please give a full update of what progress has been made with United Utilities in securing more investment for upgrading our Borough’s inadequate sewer systems, much of which date back to Victorian times?

A. Although the Council have regular co-ordination meetings with United Utilities, where they update us on progress on anything related to our Borough, we do not have a direct influence on their programme of capital works other than by highlighting any specific, urgent needs.

United Utilities are just embarking on a new Asset Management Plan which is a 5 year investment strategy based on priorities agreed by Ofwat. Any major investment not already in the programme would be to address urgent problems with a needs based prioritisation. There is nothing planned for upgrading of the existing network.
Suggested answer to written Question 27 submitted by Councillor Preston.

Q. Does the Leader agree that the impending Bury 10K run (Sept 18th) will showcase Bury’s impressive town centre and the route to Radcliffe?

A. The first ever “Asda Foundation Bury 10K” is being organised by Jane Tomlinson’s “Run For All”, a not-for-profit company, in partnership with the Council’s “I Will If You Will” initiative.

Over a thousand runners will hit the streets on Sunday 18th September 2016. The event promotes the Council’s Health & Wellbeing agenda and provides a fantastic showcase of the Borough.

Starting and finishing close to The Rock retail and leisure venue, the inaugural event is expected to bring a major cash boost for local charities.

Inevitably, there will be a number of road closures and parking restrictions, and full details are available on our website.
ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 28 submitted by Councillor Bayley.

Q. Can the Leader give an update on the Working Well programme and its particular success in Bury?

A. The Greater Manchester Working Well Pilot commenced in March 2014. This flagship programme was conceived and designed at a local level to assist long term unemployed residents with health related barriers into employment.

Like all the other districts across Greater Manchester, Bury invested into this programme because we believe that work is good for people, good for families, and good for communities and brings greater benefits to the economy.

This programme gets to the heart of why unemployed residents find it so difficult to comprehend the benefits of working. Every person that moves onto the programme is assigned a Key Worker. It’s the Key Workers job to systematically remove the barriers that can weigh a person down, debt, bereavement, ill health, housing issues For some or our residents that list can go on and on.
Some have never worked. Can you imagine that? We know that entrenched worklessness is detrimental to a person’s health and well being.

In Bury I am happy to report we have 4 dedicated Key Workers who have delivered some fantastic results. To date the pilot has moved 20 individuals into employment. This number will continue to rise with ongoing support with remaining customers. To date Bury’s job outcome targets have been exceeded. I am aware that the Mayor recently hosted a celebratory tea party for a number of individuals who have secured employment. One of whom had not worked for over 20 years.

In March this year the programme was expanded to cover a much wider cohort of benefit claimants including those moving in and out of employment and on low incomes. The expansion brings with it complimentary services such as access to mental health Talking Therapies Service and dedicated skills for employment support. To date 13 unemployed resident have secured employment.

In addition I am proud to announce that Bury was selected as one of 4 districts to trial referrals from GPs. Based at the Radcliffe Health centre we have brought 24 services together to deliver wrap around support to patients visiting the centre. For those who want to receive employment support they are referred to Working Well. In Bury we have 200 referrals assigned to this pilot and we intend to use each and every one of them for the benefit of Radcliffe residents. Since March there have been 123 referrals into the pilot. Not all of these will be appropriate for Working Well but none the less will still receive the support they need. This pilot will act as an early test and measure approach for our wider Neighbourhood working plans and the future commissioning of a Greater Manchester Employment and Health Programme.

It’s fitting that these two agendas are now firmly brought together as I think we can all agree that good employment is good for our communities’ health and wellbeing.
Suggested answer to written Question 29 submitted by Councillor S Wright

Q. Could the Leader give members an update on the Streetsafe scheme? When will schemes which have been consulted on and agreed be implemented?

A. We are now in year 3 of this initiative, and it is appropriate that we take stock of the programme and consider future action.

It is proposed that any schemes requiring physical measures which have already been passed to Operational Services will go ahead.

It is further proposed that no new 20mph zones requiring physical measures will be commenced.

Schemes will require signage / road markings will continue to be considered for implementation.

Overall progress with the scheme will continue to be monitored in the light of funding constraints, and other highway network priorities.
Suggested answer to written Question 30 submitted by Councillor J Walker.

Q. Could the Leader clarify whether the Council is continuing to invest in apprenticeship opportunities in the current economic climate?

A. The Council is as committed as ever to its apprenticeship scheme; we currently employ around 50 apprentices and have recently recruited 12 new apprentices to various teams across the Council. (two of which are Looked after Children) Despite the current economic climate the apprenticeship scheme is as important as ever in providing employment opportunities for young people in the borough whilst also helping us to maintain a skilled workforce that is fit for the future.

In October last year Bury Council was named by the Telegraph as one of the top 50 apprentice employers in the UK, whilst being recognised as offering ‘outstanding opportunities’ for apprentices – this is something which we’re very proud of and we’re keen to continue with and build upon this success. With the forthcoming apprenticeship levy and associated recruitment target we are looking at ways to further develop our apprenticeship programme.
Suggested answer to written Question 31 submitted by Councillor Jones.

Q. Earlier this year, a decision was taken to jointly re-purpose the Members room in a joint collaborative effort between the council, elected members and the trade Unions to provide more facilities for learning. Has that decision proved to be beneficial?

A. Since the room became available it has been in almost constant use for a very wide range of learning activities. That includes many tutor-led courses for employees and managers, 121 and team coaching sessions for a wide range of employees and creativity sessions for teams trying to find new ways to work. It has proven to be a really popular, flexible space for learning and feedback from trainers and learners alike has been very positive.
ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 32 submitted by Councillor Cummings

Q. Does the Leader agree that the proposed changes to Salary Sacrifice schemes outlined by HMRC will hit many hard working staff and are nothing more than a token attempt to reform taxation compared to the widespread corporate abuse of our Tax system by global companies?

A. 583 staff currently utilise the salary sacrifice option for a range of schemes, e.g. Child Care Vouchers, Car Leases (which are not subsidised !), Staff Car Parking, and Gym Memberships.

These are valuable services which make childcare, getting to work, and maintaining a healthy lifestyle possible.

Without this scheme, many of these facilities would beyond the reach of our staff; in some case making the practicality of working impossible.

This compares to the wholesale abuse of the tax system by major global companies.

We would ask that HMRC refocus their efforts and dedicate resources to addressing tax avoidance that takes place on a global scale, rather than targeting hard working staff on “Pay as You Earn” schemes
ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 33 submitted by Councillor Skillen

Q. Please can you provide an update on Neighbourhood Working?

A. The Neighbourhood Working Programme is progressing in line with the timescales and milestones outlined in the Programme Plan. All the enabling work streams are now fully established and being delivered through the two Trailblazer Townships. This includes:
- Community Engagement events planned for September and October.
- A review of the Township Forum arrangements to facilitate co-production of Neighbourhood Plans.
- Completion of asset mapping work and the progression of voluntary schemes to promote community resilience and wellbeing.
- The development of an electronic version of the Quality of Life conversation wheel, linked to the Bury Directory to promote self help and early intervention.
- The development of a single outcomes framework to inform the implementation of the OBA process to monitor progress and inform cost benefit analysis.
- Models, pathways and supporting processes for community based multiagency hubs. Bury East is initially located in Castle Buildings and will go live on 19 September. Radcliffe base is located at Radcliffe Primary Care Centre with plans to go live at the end of October.
A system leadership workshop has been held with the Neighbourhood Working Mobilisation Team and produced proposals for the approach to the leadership and governance of Phase 2 of the programme. This involves the co-ordination of all change programmes witching each of the Trailblazer Townships and plans for roll out of the programme across the remaining Townships by December. The proposals will be submitted to Team Bury for approval in October.
Suggested answer to written Question 34 submitted by Councillor Adams.

Q. Please can the Cabinet Member for Communities outline how the Council can work with partners to raise awareness of hate crime throughout the year, in addition to supporting the Greater Manchester Hate Crime awareness week in February?

A. I agree that if we are to tackle hate crime in all its ugly forms, we need to continue to raise awareness throughout the whole year. I believe this requires a dedicated Hate Crime Communications Plan that is implemented throughout the year. I have asked officers to develop this Plan. This Plan will be used to raise awareness across Bury of what a hate crime is as well as the support available to those who may have been a victim of a hate incident or crime. We will use it to engage schools, faith groups, local authority staff and communities of interest. The Plan utilises a range of approaches including the use of social media.
ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 35 submitted by Councillor Grimshaw:

Q. Please can the Cabinet Member for Strategic Housing and Support Services outline what the Council is doing to help promote/increase affordable homeownership across the Borough?

A. The Council administer a very successful Affordable Housing Scheme to allow residents of the borough better access to affordable home ownership. The scheme is currently offering 2, 3 and 4 bedroom houses, flats and bungalows for sale on select new developments in Whitefield, Radcliffe, Prestwich, Bury and Tottington. Qualifying applicants can buy one of the new homes with a 25% discount off the full market value. For example, a property with a full market value of £100,000 will be offered to qualifying applicants for £75,000. A number of these homes are also available to buy on a shared ownership basis, which allows applicants to buy an initial stake of between 25% and 75% of the new property and pay rent on the remaining share, which is owned by a registered provider. Additional shares can be purchased in the future and the applicant may eventually own their home outright. In addition, a number of 1, 2 and 3 bedroom apartments are available to rent at 80% of the full rental value, making them more affordable for residents. Please note, this is not Council housing, the majority of these affordable homes are provided through section 106 planning agreements.
Suggested answer to written Question 36 submitted by Councillor Pickstone.

Q. Could the Leader inform members on the amount paid out by the authority, and the amount spent on legal costs, for compensation claims as a result of poor road and pavement surfaces, for the last five financial years?

A. Figures are as follows;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Payments</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>£441,573.64</td>
<td>£396,616.43</td>
<td>£838,190.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>£577,212.15</td>
<td>£791,360.97</td>
<td>£1,368,573.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>£664,451.41</td>
<td>£654,036.47</td>
<td>£1,318,487.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>£752,664.92</td>
<td>£546,808.30</td>
<td>£1,299,473.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/04/2016 – 09/09/2016</td>
<td>£226,425.19</td>
<td>£161,587.82</td>
<td>£388,013.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 37 submitted by Councillor Bayley.

Q What is the Council doing to help increase opportunity for affordable home ownership in Prestwich?

A The same answer above applies to all areas of the borough, including Prestwich. More specifically to Prestwich, there are currently some affordable properties being developed through Planning Policy, including 24 (2, 3 and 4 bedroom) affordable units being developed by Redrow Homes behind Tesco’s.
ITEM (6) – LEADER’S STATEMENT AND CABINET QUESTION TIME

(Note: A printed version of the question has been circulated around the Council Chamber at the back of the Order of Proceedings and therefore the question should not be read out.)

Suggested answer to written Question 38 submitted by Councillor Kelly

Q. What initiatives have we delivered over the summer period that have engaged families?

A. One of the initiatives that we have run is Bury’d Treasure which is a project that is being delivered by the IWIYW team and has been funded by numerous partners including 15 primary schools within Bury. The aim was to get families active over the summer and help them discover the natural beauty within the town. The project consists of a pirate themed treasure hunt for families across 7 parks/trails in Bury. These are located in:

- Kirklees trail
- Prestwich clough
- Outwood trail
- Philips Park
- Nuttall Park
- Peel Tower
- Clarence Park
The routes are between 1.3 and 7.7 km, three are wheelchair, bicycle and buggy accessible and all have been risk assessed. As of 6th September, 285 families (we have averaged that there are 3 people per family = 855 individuals that took part). The families have undertaken 569 walks over the summer holidays. The most popular route is Clarence Park. A mid project survey was well received with 100% of respondents saying they would undertake the Bury’d Treasure next year. The survey also revealed that families were discovering new walks and parks, that it was a great initiative, it gave them quality family time and that it was free. All of the 115 respondents reported a positive experience.
Briefing note for Councillor Quinn

GMWDA Update

Last Authority meeting Jen Hollamby
if applicable

A Special meeting of the Authority took place on 15th July 2016. Members considered a report on the European Referendum - Impact on Authority Plans, which provided Members with some potential impacts and sought agreement to refocus the Authority’s planned lobbying strategy. A report on the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) Proposed Expansion of Functions, that explained that a decision had been taken by the GMCA to start a process of consultation on widening its range of functions from 1st April 2017, which would include the roles and responsibilities currently performed by the Authority. Members also received an update about the Recycling & Waste Management Contract (the Contract) Savings, which included a presentation provided by the Authority’s Advisers who were in attendance at the meeting, which highlighted delivery options, commercial, technical and financial issues. Further reports on the subject would be considered again at the Authority’s next meeting on 9th September 2016.

Contract Update

Contract performance is set out below for 2015/16 and 2016/17. The main focus of the Contract is defect rectification with the construction contractor Costain continuing to rectify tanks associated with the anaerobic digestion plant. Options for delivery of Contract savings are being developed and will be considered further by the Authority at the 9th September 2016 meeting.

Targets

2015/16

Contract performance monitoring figures for the year end position 2015/16, shows that nearly 50kt more Contract waste was delivered than in 2014/15. However, the landfill avoidance increased by almost 130kt on the previous year, giving the overall Contract diversion rate of 79.31% against the 74.99% target. This was substantively achieved with the diversion of material to the Runcorn Thermal Power Station (TPS) facility, as refuse derived fuel (RDF) through our ‘shredding’ initiative.

Recycling performance, however, remained behind target with an overall Contract rate of 40.85% against a target of 47.93%. Whilst District recycling tonnages are ahead of the target, Contractor rates are at less than half their target due to facility under performance (particularly with Mechanical & Biological Treatment facilities (MBT) grit and compost-like product not being recycled).

2016/17

During quarter 1 of 2016/17, waste growth continued to increase with 4% more waste received than in quarter 1 last year. Fortunately, landfill avoidance levels also improved. Overall diversion of Greater Manchester’s waste was over 88% against the budgeted 83.2% target. Recycling rates improved, with growth for both District and Contractor, reaching a combined level of 44%, although this is still behind the annual target of 48.32%.

Communications Update

To encourage residents to recycle all they can, behavioural change campaigns for 2016/17 continue to be delivered by Recycle for Greater Manchester (R4GM) in partnership with Bury Council. During May to July 2016 a Right Stuff Right Bin (RSRB) campaign was delivered to over 4,700 households in Prestwich, Tottington and Radcliffe. The aim of the campaign was to reduce contamination and increase recycling by 3%.
The campaign targeted contamination of recycling bins and encouraged residents to think about what items can and cannot be recycled through the use of a red, amber and green tagging system. **Green** = Recycling right, thank you, **Amber** = Warning, some items in the wrong bin and **Red** = Wrong stuff, wrong bin.

The campaign was supported by door-step engagement to offer advice to residents on correct recycling and to facilitate the ordering of missing recycling bins. Education assemblies and classroom sessions were also delivered to schools in the round areas reaching over 700 pupils. Overall, the campaign has been successful in reducing contamination with fewer red tags and more green tags issued towards the end of the campaign. Tonnages are being monitored year on year and early indications show an increase in recycling in the commingled waste stream of 8.5% (March to August 2016).

It is proposed that a further Right Stuff Right Bin (RSRB) campaign targeting flats in Radcliffe and Ramsbottom will be delivered early next year (January to March 2017). The campaign will be adapted from the RSRB household tagging system and instead will look to apply red, amber ad green stickers to communal bins. This activity will be supported by doorstep engagement to give advice and guidance on recycling in flats and to deliver hessian recycling bags were needed.

The Authority is currently working on a long-term communications strategy (to 2020) focused on achieving improvements and greater efficiencies in household recycling, re-use and waste prevention. The strategy includes a new jointly funded £200k partnership with the Waste & Resources Action Programme (WRAP) to deliver a two-year programme of support to help improve recycling rates and tackle waste prevention.
ITEM 7 – JOINT AUTHORITY QUESTIONS

Police

Cllr D’Albert

1. Could the Council’s representative on the Greater Manchester Police and Crime Panel inform members on the figures for the use of ‘tasers’ by Police in Greater Manchester in the current year and previous three years, including figures for multiple us of taser on the same person?

The total aggregated figures for the last three years across Greater Manchester are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Year (2016) (January to June 2016)

521

Further details, including comparative data with other local authority areas are available on the Home Office website.

It is important to note that officers have deployed ‘Taser’ in many different types of incidents within the figures. These can range from violent domestic incidents, robberies, life threatening situations and incidents where an officer faced some form of weapon.

It is also important to note that the figures include the total number of Taser ‘uses’ (within multiple categories defined by the Home Office) as opposed to the actual number of Taser ‘incidents’ where the Taser is actually ‘fired’. In the majority of cases the mere threat of its use can be enough to bring violent or potentially violent situations to a safe and peaceful resolution.
2. Could the Council’s representative on the Greater Manchester Police and Crime Panel give a brief outline to members of the ‘SHIELD’ self defence training which has been given to officers? What is the cost of this programme? **Cllr S Wright**

A. **GMP do not train a ‘SHIELD’ self defence system, nor have knowledge of it. They do use the ‘SPEAR’ self-defence system.**

- Each year every operational police officer across the UK must accredit in the ‘use of force’ in order to be authorised to continue to use their baton, handcuffs and incapacitant spray.
- This course is known nationally as Personal Safety Training (PST). The content of PST is tightly governed by the College of Policing, the Home Office and the Self Defence And Restraint working group.
- There is a national manual with a catalogue of approved techniques; SPEAR forms part of the manual. This year, for the first time, GMP has based all PST courses around the SPEAR principles.
- The SPEAR system itself is very basic; it has been designed as a self-defence tool and can be used by individuals in a whole range of situations where they are attacked.
- For GMP it links very nicely with their ‘take a step back’ approach; officers are encouraged not to rush into confrontation but rather assess the situation at distance which gives them time to make good decisions.
- The SPEAR system provides a solution for those situations where officers were unable to ‘take a step back’ because they were ambushed. The system harnesses the individuals natural instinct to flinch, and turns that open handed posture into an effective defence. There are no kicks or strikes, officers are taught to use open hands and all the techniques are purely defensive. Once officers are free from the initial attack they are taught to access their batons, cuffs and/or spray.

Moving on to the cost of the programme.....

There is always a cost to delivering PST, perhaps 6,000 officers per year attend a two-day training event which involves payment of salary whilst they attend.

There is a full time training team consisting of a Sergeant and 10 instructors at a cost of about £385,000 (11 x £35,000). GMP also pay for the cost of venue hire for delivery of PST.

The SPEAR programme itself comes at a much smaller cost; GMP paid for one instructor to attend a SPEAR instructor’s course and this cost £1,200. That officer then trained other instructors and the training was rolled out across GMP.

In forces across the UK where there has been an adoption of the SPEAR principles there has been a massive decrease in assaults to officers resulting in serious injuries, by as much as one third. Feedback for the SPEAR training is almost all positive and officers report that they feel far more confident working alone with the new skill-set.