

Minutes of: CABINET

Date of Meeting: 28 June 2017

Present: Councillor R Shori (in the Chair)
Councillors K S Briggs, E O'Brien, J Kelly and A Simpson

Public Attendance: 34 members of the public were present at the meeting.

**Apology for
Absence:** Councillor A Quinn

CA.31 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor R Shori declared a personal interest that his partner is employed by the Council.

Councillor A Simpson declared a personal interest in respect of minute number CA.43 for the reason that she is a governor of Parrenthorn High School.

CA.32 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

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

The Chair invited questions from the members of the public present that did not relate to items to be considered at the meeting.

No questions were received.

CA.33 MINUTES

Delegated decision:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 12 April 2017 be approved and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

CA.34 LIBRARY REVIEW - OUTCOME OF THIRD PUBLIC SURVEY ON PROPOSED OPTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Cabinet Member (Children and Families) submitted a report presenting:

- The summarised outcomes of the public consultation on the Library Review relating to the 2 proposed options:
 - Option 1** - Retain Bury, Ramsbottom and Prestwich Libraries plus a service-wide team.
 - Option 2** - Retain Bury, Ramsbottom, Prestwich and Radcliffe Libraries plus a smaller service-wide team.
- An overview of additional work carried out since the last report to Cabinet, and;
- A recommendation for option choice and next steps.

The Chair invited questions from members of the public present.

- Can an assurance be given that the Council will support the Friends of Tottington Library to keep their local library open?

The Council will listen to proposals of the Friends of Tottington Library and will support them where it is cost neutral to the Council.

- Tottington Library has the highest number of young readers in the Borough and the Council's proposal to close the library will discriminate against them. How has the Council included young readers in its consultation?

The Council undertook its consultation across all areas including children at school. The libraries at Tottington and Unsworth were well used by younger readers with the support of family members and the Library Service would continue to work with families in the future.

- Can the Council reconsider the proposal to close Bury libraries? There will be an impact on the lives of residents if their library is closed. There will also be implications for older people commuting and disabled people who will not be able to travel into Bury or find a disabled parking space close to the library. Safety is an issue for these people. Unemployed people also rely on libraries and may not be able to afford the cost of travel to get access.

The Council is not in a financial position to be able to keep all the libraries in the Borough open and must take decisions to provide a sustainable, high quality library service for Bury residents.

- Why has Option 3 not been mentioned in the report regarding a possible reduction in the size of libraries? The more libraries there are the more efficient the access to facilities will be for residents. Community groups and clubs could be lost if the closures happen. The volunteers mentioned in the report are not coming forward as expected.

Option 3 was considered in the previous stage of the review process but was it not financially viable. Also, the arrangements for the libraries involved would not have provided a level of service and quality appropriate for the whole of the Borough. Work with the community will still continue including luncheon clubs and work to reduce social isolation. Unfortunately the Council still has to make further financial savings on services and cannot afford to maintain the service in its current form.

- What sort of resources will be made available for library volunteers to promote a community library service? Can the Council commit resources to maintain a community asset?

The Council welcomes the support of community groups and will offer advice and help to identify and access funding but is unable to provide direct financial resources.

- When the Council refers to 'cost neutral' can details be provided because it is important for a group that is interested in taking on an asset to know the costs involved in order to produce a costed business plan.

The Council is not able to provide specific details on every asset at this stage of the process.

- Why has the Council not built up funds from Council Tax for use to maintain library buildings?

The Council has to meet a number of service demands and prioritises its resources accordingly.

- The Council promised that the Seedfield Library was safe for twenty years after receiving lottery funding and now after eight years the service is going to be lost.

A twenty year period was given at the time however the present financial situation in which the Council if finds itself means that this position cannot be sustained. The Council will continue to work for and support the local community. The lottery funding provided was a capital grant and the Council provided the staffing resources for the library.

- The library in Tottington is the only community asset available to hold meetings and clubs. The local churches have been approached but are not able to help. There is no bus service to the other closest areas with a library.
- Can Councillors take a knock like the people of the borough are experiencing through cuts to services and use the money saved to help fund a library service?

The Boundary Commission is to be contacted and enquiries made regarding a change to the electoral cycle and numbers of Councillors. If this is taken forward the money saved would not be ring-fenced specifically for libraries provision but would be directed to other areas such as emergency and priority spending and increases in costs.

- If a community group can demonstrate that it could successfully maintain a building would the Council consider a community asset transfer?

The Council would consider the transfer of a community asset if this could be successfully demonstrated.

- Once the library buildings are no longer providing a library services will groups still be able to use the space for community related activities?

There will be transitional arrangement plans which will need to be developed but this would take place after a decision to close a library facility.

- The three month period for setting up a community group to take on a building and negotiate an operating framework with the Council is a relatively short

period. Can the Council set up meetings on a weekly basis to take negotiations forward?

Where there are plans produced that demonstrate a community group could take on the running of a building it will be supported by Council and meetings will be arranged accordingly.

Written questions were also submitted as follows:

- Who are the members of the Service-Wide team and how can they be contacted?

The service wide-team is not yet established. We will not be embarking upon a staff consultation until the decision is taken at Cabinet to approve one of the two options. The service wide team will be implemented after this consultation.

- What has this team done so far to promote this possible new option across all libraries users and residents in their neighbourhoods?

During March 2017 a presentation updating communities about the Library Review was given at all Township Forums. Time was also allowed for questions and discussion. The presentation covered: The outcome of the first public consultation; impact of the Council budget; phase two consultation (including discussions with community groups) and next steps.

All groups currently or recently using libraries have been given the opportunity to have an informal discussion with senior library staff in order to help them plan for the future of their group. A mapping exercise has been carried out so we understand every group that currently meets in the existing libraries.

- What has been done to identify and provide adequate support to volunteers and further community groups who would be willing to develop such community led projects?

Several groups have expressed an interest in developing a model to run library buildings which are proposed to close at the end of the review either as libraries or as other community provision. Discussions with these groups will be ongoing over the coming months. It should be noted that any library service provided by these groups will be outside the Council's statutory library offer and must be cost neutral to the library service and the Council.

- When are you going to make available to the public, community groups, library users and volunteers detailed information about what the Council intends to do with each buildings, fittings, equipment and books likely to be closed due to the review of the Library service?

Until a decision is made at cabinet we are not in a position to look at potential building usage post library review. In the Cabinet report (January 2017) appendix 5 lists an Asset Management view of opportunities to achieve savings, giving early indications of possible future usage. The next Cabinet report will also update on this item on June 28th. Following a Cabinet decision there will be a full transition

plan implemented to change the structures of the library service to the new chosen model.

Delegated decision:

That approval be given to Option 2, as presented in the report submitted, to retain Bury, Ramsbottom, Prestwich and Radcliffe Libraries and a smaller Service-Wide Team.

Reasons for the decision:

The Council is reviewing its services in order to deliver significant savings over the next four years. The Council also has a legal duty to provide Bury residents with a comprehensive and efficient library service.

Other option considered and rejected:

To retain Bury, Ramsbottom and Prestwich Libraries plus a service wide team.

CA.35

PROPOSED CLOSURE OF RIBBLE DRIVE NURSERY

The Cabinet Member (Children and Families) submitted a report following a request from the Governing Body of Ribble Drive Primary School for the Local Authority to publish and consult on a statutory proposal to remove its nursery provision. This would change the age range of the school from 3-11years to 4-11years.

The proposal for the closure of the nursery provision at the school was published on 18 April 2017 and this set out arrangements for those affected by the proposal to make their views known. The closing date for comments was 16 May 2017. The school also carried out an informal consultation prior to the publication of the proposal.

The Chair invited questions from members of the public present.

The Grand parent of a child currently attending Ribble Drive Nursery addressed Cabinet making the following points:

- The minutes of the Governors meetings had agreed to an increase in numbers in the nursery until 2018.
- The notice posted on the proposal was not correct and had to be replaced.
- The recommendation of the Governors is based on an inaccurate report.
- The cost of the nursery provision is £75,000 per annum. It is proposed that the teaching assistants in the nursery will be made redundant but it appears that the nursery teacher will remain as an employee of Ribble Drive PS.
- The school has not consulted with the families affected by this proposal. Who has checked the accuracy of the consultation process?
- Parents were invited to place their children in the nursery in January 2017.
- There is a moral issue in the manner the school has invited children and then leaves nine children to find a new nursery.

Delegated decisions:

1. That consideration of the proposal to close Ribble Drive Nursery be deferred until the next meeting of Cabinet (26 July 2017).
2. That the report to the next Cabinet meeting include details on the consultation process undertaken by the Governors of Ribble Drive Primary
3. School including the contact made with parents of children currently attending Ribble Drive Nursery and the responses received.

Reason for the decision:

To ensure that the consultation process has been conducted in a fair, thorough and transparent manner before a decision is taken on the recommendation to close the nursery.

Other options considered and rejected:

To approve or reject the proposal to closure the nursery provision at Ribble Drive Primary School.

CA.36 REVENUE AND HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT OUTTURN 2016/2017

The Cabinet Member (Finance and Housing) submitted a report providing details of:

- The revenue outturn figures in respect of the last financial year (2016/2017);
- Major variances between the revised estimate and the outturn;
- The level of school balances;
- HRA outturn for the year;
- The minimum level of balances in the light of risk assessments

Delegated decisions:

1. That the final outturn for 2016/2017 and explanations for major variances (Appendix A, B and C) be noted.
2. That the recommendations of the Interim Executive Director for the minimum level of balances in light of the review of the corporate risk assessments and departmental risk assessments (Section 4) be endorsed.
3. The final revenue outturn and HRA outturn for 2016/17 be noted along with explanations for major variances.
4. The level of the General Fund balances be noted.
5. That it noted that the minimum level of the General Fund balance calculated at £4.250m for 2017/18 is subject to regular review as part of the budget monitoring process.

Reason for the decision:

The presentation of an annual report on the Revenue and HRA Outturn is a requirement of the Council's Financial Regulations, as part of Council's Financial Procedure Rules.

Other options considered and rejected:

To reject the recommendations.

CA.37 CAPITAL OUTTURN REPORT 2016/2017

The Cabinet Member (Finance and Housing) submitted a report providing Members with details of:

- The capital outturn figures in respect of the last financial year 2016/17;
- Major variances between the Revised Estimate and the Outturn;
- The financing of the Capital Programme in 2016/17;
- Re-profile of budgets/allocations and slippage of funding into 2017/18;
- Details of the capital receipts realised during the year.

Delegated decision:

1. That the final Capital Outturn for 2016/2017, including the explanations for major variances as detailed in the report and Appendix A be noted.
2. That the financing of the Capital Programme in 2016/17, as detailed in Paragraph 3.5 of the report submitted, be noted.
3. That approval be given to the re-profiled/slippage requests and associated funding into 2017/2018, as detailed in Appendix B of the report submitted.
4. That the level of Capital Receipts realised in year and the proposed use of the sites disposed of during the year as detailed in Appendix C be noted.

Reason for the decision:

The presentation of an annual report on the Capital Outturn is a requirement of the Council's Financial Regulations, as part of the Council's Financial Procedure Rules.

Other option considered and rejected:

To reject or amend the recommendations.

CA.38 TREASURY MANAGEMENT OUTTURN REPORT 2016/2017

The Cabinet Member (Member for Finance and Housing) submitted a report reviewing the Council's Treasury Management activities during 2016/2017.

Delegated decision:

That the Treasury Management Annual report 2015/2016 be noted.

Reason for the decision:

The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) Code of Practice on Treasury Management requires that the Council receives an annual review report of the previous year by 30 September.

Other option considered and rejected:

To amend or reject the recommendations.

CA.39 FUTURE OF SECTION 48 AGMA GRANTS SCHEME

The Leader and Cabinet Member (Economic Growth and Human Resources) submitted a report seeking consideration to be given to the closure of the current Section 48 AGMA Grants Scheme, with a view to its replacement by a new scheme under the Greater Manchester Combined Authority.

Delegated decisions:

1. That in giving initial consideration to the case for closure of the Section 48 AGMA Grants programme, authority be given for a consultation on closure of the scheme to be undertaken by AGMA to inform a final decision on closure to be taken at a later date.
2. That support be given to the development of a new funding programme for culture, under the GMCA, as a potential replacement for the Section 48 Scheme.
3. That it be noted that it is intended to run the consultation for a new Combined Authority programme for culture at the same time as the consultation on closure of the Section 48 scheme.

Reason for the decision:

AGMA Leaders have suggested that they would like to review options for the development of a new programme for culture under the GMCA and to align the new programme with the closure of the Section 48 Scheme.

Other option considered and rejected:

To reject the recommendations.

CA.40 CORPORATE PERFORMANCE 2016/2017 QUARTER 4

The Leader and Cabinet Member (Economic Growth and Human Resources) submitted a report providing an update on corporate performance in line with the Single Outcomes Framework for Team Bury.

The report detailed a series of indicators and performance measures under each outcome, with the most recent data provided for each of these.

Delegated decision:

That the report be noted.

Reason for the decision:

A robust performance management framework is essential if the Council is to measure the effectiveness and value for money of the services it delivers.

Other option considered and rejected:

To reject the recommendation.

CA.41 BURY WHOLE SYSTEM TRANSFORMATION: DEVELOPMENT OF ONE COMMISSIONING ORGANISATION

The Leader and Cabinet Member (Economic Growth and Human Resources) submitted a report outlining the programme structure for the development of a One Commissioning Organisation in Bury by April 2018 in line with the Bury Locality Plan and the Greater Manchester Transformation fund bid.

Delegated decisions:

1. That the report be noted.

2. That the planning framework for Whole System Transformation and the planned approach to the development of One Commissioning Organisation in Bury be endorsed.

Reason for the decision:

Failure to move the integration agenda forward represents a major organisational risk and jeopardises provision of services to residents.

Other option considered and rejected:

To reject the recommendations.

CA.42 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

Delegated decision:

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

CA.43 PARRENTHORN HIGH SCHOOL EXTENSION AND REMODELLING WORK TO SUPPORT AN INCREASE IN PUPIL NUMBERS AT THE SCHOOL - CAPITAL PROJECT STAGE 2 APPROVAL

The Cabinet member (Finance and Housing) and the Cabinet Member (Children and Families) submitted a report setting out in financial terms, the details of a project at Parrenthorn High School and involved expenditure exceeding £250,000.

The project is contained within the Council's agreed capital programme for 2017/18 and 2018/19 and includes the proposed funding arrangements.

Delegated decision:

That approval be given to the financial details set out in the report submitted.

Reason for the decision:

Modelling of future demand for high school places indicates that the most appropriate school in which to create additional capacity is Parrenthorn High School.

Other option considered and rejected:

To reject the recommendation

CA.44 ELMS BANK SPECIALIST ARTS COLLEGE - PHASED SCHEME OF REBUILD AND REFURBISHMENT - CAPITAL PROJECT STAGE 2 APPROVAL

The Cabinet member (Finance and Housing) and the Cabinet Member (Children and Families) submitted a report setting out in financial terms the details of a project at Elms Bank Specialist Arts College to provide a phased scheme of rebuild and refurbishment. The proposed would be funded from the 2017/18, 2018/19, 2019/20 Capital Programme, (schools capital maintenance grant) which involves expenditure exceeding £250,000.

The report gave details of the financial profile of the project identifying the costs to be incurred and the funding to support it.

Delegated decision:

That approval be given to the financial details as set out in the report submitted.

Reason for the decision:

The proposed scheme will increase the capacity of the school help meet the needs of its 185 pupils.

Other option considered and rejected:

To reject the recommendations.

COUNCILLOR
Chair

(Note: The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 7.55)