

**Minutes of:** CABINET

**Date of Meeting:** 30 June 2026

**Present:** Councillor E O'Brien (in the Chair)  
Councillors A Arif, R Gold, G McGill, C Morris, L Smith, T Tariq,  
S Thorpe and S Walmsley

**Also in attendance:** Councillors S Arif, C Birchmore, J Rydeheard and D Vernon

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

---

**CA.10 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies received.

**CA.11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**CA.12 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

The following question was asked by a member of the public, Amanda Foster:

In the meeting we had with Cris Logue (Assistant Director of Strategy, Planning & Development) a few days ago I asked about Brownfield sites in relation to Simister Bowlee. He told me that 80% of the Brownfield sites were allocated, but I did some research and according to the latest Bury SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) – which only goes up to 2024 – it's stated at 44%. Can you clarify where you got the 80% from? Can you evidence it? Is this since 2024?

Responding, Councillor Eamonn O'Brien reported that at their meeting last night, Overview and Scrutiny Committee had a comprehensive discussion regarding Brownfield sites, with the vast majority of developments from the last few decades being built on Brownfield land. Councillor O'Brien advised that the 44% reflected the Brownfield allocation for strategic sites in the Places for Everyone Plan, whilst the 80% reflected the figure for completions.

The following question was asked by a member of the public, Daniel Jacobs:

Last year at Cabinet you stated you had many meetings about Section 123 discussions and the library disposal. I then went on to do a Freedom of Information Request and it came back that there was no information held for any meetings or minutes. Subsequently in a Subject Access Request I found information that you and Councillor Rubenstein were WhatsApping about my personal data and a Key Decision. I haven't received that information and I wanted to understand why Key Decisions were being discussed through informal channels.

Responding, Councillor Eamonn O'Brien responded that Key Decisions weren't being discussed on WhatsApp. The WhatsApp you refer to from Councillor Rubenstein says, 'I've received an email, it relates to the library site' and I said in response that the

Council had produced a response and I would share it with him. That was the end of the correspondence. It was not a discussion around the 123, nor around the Key Decision; it was a colleague asking for some advice, bringing something to my attention, and I don't see this as contrary to how we make decisions at the Council. With regards to the meetings about the library site, we have numerous discussions in a variety of forums which aren't necessarily minuted, but when we make decisions in public there is a record, it's fully transparent, and this is the standard we're held to.

The following question was asked by a member of the public, Angus Park:

At Cabinet last year Mr Frith (Assistant Director of Corporate Assets & Facilities Management) said one-to-one deals were done mostly for small patches of land and garden transfers and very occasionally for a commercial deal. Why then has almost every major disposal bypassed open marketing since 2021? It's totally at odds with what has been said at previous Cabinet meetings. Can you explain please?

Responding, Councillor Eamonn O'Brien responded that he did not agree with the characterisation and that the last 5 years the vast majority of sites have been open to the public, several through auction sites, and several gone on open market. It's true to say that the vast majority of one-to-one sales are of a smaller nature, but of the sites I'm recalling from memory they go out through a rigorous public process. Paul Lakin (Executive Director of Place) added that the Council used multiple ways to dispose of sites including active marketing for larger sites, for others it's more appropriate to go to auction where anyone can turn up and bid, but for small parcels of land this wouldn't be appropriate. The method depends on the size and scale of the site as seen in the Accelerated Land Disposal Programme.

The following question was asked by a member of the public, Rebecca Partridge:

The Council has used an Accelerated Land Disposal Programme and from what I can see several major property disposals have bypassed open marketing. Each one may have been justified as an exception because of specific or urgent circumstances, but when open marketing is bypassed repeatedly, the public is entitled to presume that the exception has effectively become the rule. This pattern also appears wider than just the land disposal programme; the £20m Millgate Shopping Centre acquisition and the £100m Prestwich Town Centre regeneration deal also appear to have gone ahead without going to open marketing or competitive process. My question is: across these major property decisions, what mechanism has replaced open marketing or competition to make sure the Council is still achieving best value for the public?

Responding, Councillor Eamonn O'Brien responded that the Millgate and Prestwich the Council were purchasing the sites, so would not be responsible for marketing. When we have gone out to tender works, this has been part of well-established competitive, open processes. As in the previous answer, we use a variety of ways to dispose of sites, all of which can be analysed and checked. The Accelerated Land Disposal Programme for example was an open public display and demonstration of land we were looking to dispose of, came through open reports to Cabinet and Scrutiny, and it received a lot of public interest. If we're approached on the back of one of those sales, I regard that as an open way of going about it. Unless there are specific examples you want to give, I want to give reassurance that when we dispose of sites we have legal duties put on us and we have to follow those processes. Every avenue

we've been tested on we've been found to be acting in accordance with the law, openly and transparently, and will continue to work in that way.

**CA.13 MEMBER QUESTION TIME**

There were no Member questions.

**CA.14 MINUTES**

**It was agreed:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> April 2026 be approved as a correct record.

**CA.15 URGENT BUSINESS**

The Leader advised that Councillor Sandra Walmsley had been appointed as Cabinet Member for Children and Young People under Executive powers and welcomed her back to the Cabinet.

Jacqui Dennis, Monitoring Officer, detailed the subsequent Committee appointments that were associated with this appointment, which would be outlined in a report coming to Council in July along with other Committee changes since May.

Cabinet **noted** the update and welcomed Councillor Walmsley.

**CA.16 BURY LOCAL PLAN (REGULATION 19)**

The Leader presented a report regarding the Bury Local Plan, a long-term framework to manage future growth and development in the Borough from 2022 to 2043, setting out locally specific planning policies used to determine and shape future planning applications and development proposals. Members noted this had been updated as a result of representations received during the public consultation period and would go out for further consultation before a final version would seek Council approval.

It was noted that this report was discussed in detail at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting the previous evening, and recommendations had been noted.

**Decision:**

Cabinet:

1. Approved the Publication Bury Local Plan, Policies Map and supporting background documents and invite representations over for an eight-week period commencing no earlier than 10 July 2026; and
2. Delegated power to the Executive Director of Place to make minor non-material editorial amendments to the Publication Local Plan before the invitation to make representations commences.

**Reasons for the decision:**

To ensure that stakeholders have a further opportunity to have their say on the emerging Bury Local Plan.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

To not approve the Publication Local Plan, Policies Map and supporting background documents. This would prevent stakeholders commenting on the Publication Local Plan and would result in the future adoption of the document being contrary to planning regulations and legal requirements.

**CA.17-19 SIMISTER BOWLEE, WALSHAW, AND ELTON RESERVOIR DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORKS**

The Leader presented three reports regarding the results of the consultations on Development Framework Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) for Simister Bowlee, Walshaw, and Elton Reservoir, and seeking approval for the final SPDs to be adopted. It was noted that these reports were discussed in detail at the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting the previous evening, and recommendations had been noted.

In response to Members' questions, it was noted that:

- Any planning application would wait until a site-wide ecology strategy for Walshaw was in place; this, as for all evidence, would need to be in place either before or alongside applications.
- The Infrastructure, Phasing and Delivery Strategy for Elton Reservoir was a live document primarily used by Planning Department but could be shared with Members when significant updates and changes are made.
- Phasing of developments was ensured through close working with developers so milestones were met and community infrastructure projects delivered alongside. The SPDs would ensure comprehensive evidence and strategies were in place before planning applications came in to ensure the Council could attach relevant and specific conditions and permissions to ensure delivery of the whole site was achieved.
- It was noted that these decisions tonight were not about allocating land or the principle of whether development could take place, as those decisions had been taken in previous years; these decisions were about governing applications when they came forward.
- It was noted that these plans would enable other land to be protected and allowed the Council the strongest democratic power to push back on undesirable developments and ensure that the best possible suite of infrastructure was delivered alongside developments.
- The Conservative Group noted their concerns about the principle of plans.
- A comprehensive discussion was held at Overview and Scrutiny regarding the Elton Metrolink station, and it was noted further discussions would take place with TfGM.

**Simister Bowlee Development Framework Decision:**

Subject to approval by Rochdale, Cabinet:

1. Noted the responses to the public consultation and proposed post consultation revisions set out in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 to this report;
2. Approved the revised SPD as the final version to be adopted and published; and
3. Delegated authority to the Executive Director (Place) to make any minor, non-material editorial amendments to the SPD ahead of its final publication.

**Walshaw Development Framework Decision:**

Cabinet:

1. Noted the responses to the public consultation and proposed post consultation revisions set out in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 to this report;
2. Approved the revised SPD as the final version to be adopted and published; and
3. Delegated authority to the Executive Director (Place) to make any minor, non-material editorial amendments to the SPD ahead of its final publication.

**Elton Reservoir Development Framework Decision:**

Cabinet:

1. Noted the responses to the public consultation and proposed post consultation revisions set out in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2 to this report;
2. Approved the revised SPD as the final version to be adopted and published;
3. Delegated authority to the Executive Director (Place) to make any minor, non-material editorial amendments to the SPD ahead of its final publication.

**Reasons for the decisions:**

The adoption of the documents will establish frameworks against which future planning applications on the sites will be considered, set out high level design and development principles for the sites and approaches to the delivery and phasing of infrastructure on and off sites.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

No other options were considered/were applicable.

**CA.20 ADOPTION OF SPD13 - HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION**

The Leader presented a report which detailed the outcomes of the draft Houses in Multiple Occupation Supplementary Planning Document (SPD13) consultation and sought approval for the final SPD to be formally adopted. It was noted that this had received cross-party support through a motion at Cabinet. Members discussed the difficulty in registering smaller HMOs built through permitted development rights, noting the Council's small team, and requesting public to let officers or Councillors know of any HMOs in their area.

**Decision:**

Cabinet:

1. Noted the responses to the public consultation and the proposed post-consultation revisions;
2. Approved the revised SPD13 – Houses in Multiple Occupation as the final version to be adopted and published;
3. Delegated authority to the Executive Director (Place) to make any minor, non-material editorial amendments to the SPD; and
4. Approved the revocation of the existing SPD13 – Conversion of Buildings to Houses in Multiple Occupation.

**Reasons for the decision:**

- SPD13 provides additional detail and guidance on the implementation of existing Development Plan policies that are used to determine proposals for

Houses in Multiple Occupation. It provides guidance on some of the key issues to be considered in determining planning applications for Houses in Multiple Occupation, setting out comprehensive guidance on location requirements and design considerations for new HMOs.

- The adoption of the document and revocation of the previous SPD13 would ensure that all relevant planning applications are considered against up-to-date policy guidance.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

To not adopt the revised SPD13 – Houses in Multiple Occupation.

**CA.21 ADOPTION OF SPD19 - HOT FOOD TAKEAWAY**

The Leader presented a report regarding the outcome of the draft Hot Food Takeaway Supplementary Planning Document (SPD19) consultation and seeking approval for the final SPD to be formally adopted. The Cabinet Member for Adult Care, Health and Public Service Reform noted his particular thanks to the Public Health team for their contribution, and the meaningful contribution impact this would have on residents.

**Decision:**

Cabinet:

1. Noted the responses to the public consultation and the proposed post-consultation revisions;
2. Approved draft SPD19 –Hot Food Takeaways as the final version to be adopted and published; and
3. Delegated authority to the Executive Director (Place), to make any minor non-material editorial amendments to the SPD ahead of its final publication.

**Reasons for the decision:**

- SPD19 provides additional detail and guidance on the implementation of existing Development Plan policies that are used to determine proposals for Hot Food Takeaways. It provides supporting information and guidance on how the Local Planning Authority will assess planning applications for hot food takeaways where planning permission is required.
- The adoption of the document and revocation of the previous SPD19 would ensure that all relevant planning applications are considered against up-to-date policy guidance.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

To not adopt the revised SPD19 – Hot Food Takeaways.

**CA.22 BURY ART MUSEUM APPOINTMENT OF CONTRACTOR**

The Cabinet Member for Culture, Economy and Skills presented a report which sought approval to appoint a contractor for work to the Bury Art Museum roof. In response to Members' questions, it was noted that there were no restrictions on the number of tenders that could be received, but the specialist nature of the work resulted in a small number of companies submitting a bid. Funding for the work was made up through grant funding and Bury Council funding allocations from the previous year. Full

assurance was given through the Council's internal processes regarding the costs of borrowing.

Questions were raised about the named contractor being recommended for appointment, and it was agreed that this report be deferred until clarification could be made.

**Decision:**

Cabinet deferred the decision to the next meeting.

**Reasons for the decision:**

To ensure the correct contractor was being appointed.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

N/A

**CA.23**

**APPROVAL TO UNDERTAKE PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON A DRAFT HOUSING STRATEGY FOR BURY**

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services presented a report regarding the development of a new Housing Strategy, which will replace the existing 2021 – 2025 version. This report sought Cabinet approval to commence a 12-week public consultation on the draft strategy, after which the final version would come back to Cabinet for approval.

In response to Members' questions, it was noted that feedback on the management of previous consultations would be welcomed. Members were advised that arc4, the organisation responsible for collating the evidence used to inform the strategy, had been operating for many years. It was further noted that representations received during the consultation process would be taken into account in the final version of the strategy, which would be presented to Cabinet for approval. Prior to this, the strategy could be considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee should it wish to do so.

**Decision:**

Cabinet:

1. Noted the work to date on developing the draft Housing Strategy which was attached at Appendix 1;
2. Approved that formal public consultation for a period of twelve weeks should be undertaken to gather views and opinions on the draft Housing Strategy, ensuring that these are duly considered before a final version is prepared for Cabinet approval;
3. Delegated authority to the Director of Housing to make any non-material amendments to the draft strategy, prior to consultation if required; and
4. Noted that following consultation, a final proposed Housing Strategy and delivery plan will be submitted to Cabinet for approval and adoption. The accompanying report will summarise the outcome of the public consultation.

**Reasons for the decision:**

- Public consultation on a housing strategy constitutes a formal decision under the Council's governance arrangements and must therefore be authorised by

the Cabinet. This ensures compliance with the principles of good governance, openness, and accountability.

- To ensure that the draft Housing Strategy is subject to meaningful engagement while proposals remain at a formative stage, in accordance with the Gunning Principles.
- Consulting residents and stakeholders, including those with protected characteristics, enables the Council to gather valuable feedback, local intelligence, practical expertise, potential equality impacts/mitigation, and fosters shared commitment to implementation.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

Retain the existing Housing Strategy to deliver Bury's housing priorities and guide inclusive growth and investment in the borough - This option has been rejected because the existing Housing Strategy is now outdated due to changes in national policy, service delivery arrangements and the findings of a statutory review of housing needs undertaken in November 2025.

**CA.24 OPTIONS FOR CLOSURE OF SIX TOWN HOUSING LTD**

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services presented a report regarding the next stage of activities to achieve the orderly closing down of the Six Town Housing Limited (STH LTD) business operation to progress to the final closure of STH as an entity owned by Bury Council, a process begun in September 2025. The Cabinet Member gave assurances to tenants that they would be able to stay in their homes and any decision would be made with their best interests as priority.

In response to Members' questions, it was noted that, if properties were transferred to another provider, they would be governed by the same regulator and held to the same standards. Any repairs would be carried out by the Council up to the day of transfer, with Bury continuing to provide support to ensure a smooth transition. It was also noted that staff members affected was small, with no staff requiring TUPE arrangements.

**Decision:**

Cabinet:

1. Noted the findings of the initial assessment and notes that further detailed analysis will be available after the soft market test;
2. Confirmed that the timely and orderly closure of STH LTD to reduce regulatory and operational risk remains the overriding priority; and
3. Approved a phase of soft market testing to assess market interest in options 1 and 2 with a further report to be brought back to Cabinet in September setting out the findings and a preferred option.

**Reasons for the decision:**

Five potential options for the future of the STH LTD and its housing stock portfolio have been identified, but further work, including a soft market testing exercise and full impact assessment on the HRA is required before a preferred option can be confirmed.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

The option to “do nothing” is not appropriate since Cabinet has resolved to close down the STH LTD entity to remove the risk to Bury Council.

**CA.25 CONTRACT AWARDS IN RESPECT OF THE HRA CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME 2026/27 AND CARBON REDUCTION - SUSTAINABILITY IMPROVEMENT MEASURES**

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services presented a report seeking approval of contract awards for Carbon reduction schemes as part of the approved Housing Revenue Account (“HRA”) Capital Works Programme for 2026/27. The measures aim to provide improved thermal comfort and ventilation, while reducing carbon emissions, energy consumption and bills for Bury residents. In response to Members’ questions it was agreed that detail regarding any pro rata cost increase from the extension and a breakdown of social value cost-benefit would be provided to Members outside the meeting.

**Decision:**

Cabinet agreed:

1. An extension of the existing contract between the Council and A.Connolly Limited (Company number 03860866) in respect of Bent Hill estate, Prestwich, Sedgley Ward – 140 properties, which forms part of Programme A, for a further term of 12 months commencing on 8th September 2026 and a total estimated contract value of £2,100,075.60; and
2. A contract award to NextEnergy Capital Limited (Company number 05975233), in respect of the estates mentioned below which comprise of Programme B, for an initial term of 1 year (proposed commencement date of 31st July 2026) and the option to extend for a further 12 months. The total estimated contract value for the initial term is £2,173,551:
  - a. Goshen Estate Redvales Ward - 95 properties
  - b. Knowles St Estate Redbank Ward - 6 properties
  - c. Sumner Avenue Estate- Radcliffe North and Ainsworth Ward- 24 properties
  - d. Decent Home standard - Thermal Comfort fails for 70 properties throughout the borough. These are located within the Redvales, Ramsbottom, Besses, North Manor, and Bury East areas.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The primary reason for requesting approvals for the programmes from both A.Connolly's and NextEnergy is to ensure continuation of the Bury Council Housing retrofit programme, which is aimed at helping to achieve Energy Performance Certificate (“EPC”) C by 2030 along with aims to reduce energy consumption and carbon emissions. Retrofit surveys are underway in preparation for Social Housing/Warm Homes Fund (Wave 3) grant application which is essential to support HRA capital investment.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

- Do nothing: The Energy schemes are necessary to help achieve legislative requirements of EPC C by 2030 and Net Zero ambitions in line with GMHP by 2038.

- Deliver Inhouse: Due to the specialist scope of work within these contracts there is both a lack of suitable skills and capacity for the in-house contractor (Repairs Direct).
- Re-tender: This option was considered for AConnolly's relating to the Bent Hill scheme and would be possible; however, this would involve a significantly extended procurement process in both time and cost.

## **CA.26 PROCUREMENT FOR GAS COMPLIANCE, REPAIRS AND MAINTENANCE FRAMEWORK**

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services presented a report regarding the re-procurement of the Council's Gas Compliance, Repairs and Maintenance service to ensure the continued safe servicing, repair and maintenance of heating and hot water systems within the Council's housing stock. In response to Members' questions, it was noted that performance would be monitored through monthly meetings with the provider to review Key Performance Indicators, and that tenants should raise any issues over the phone; as these were gas repairs, the Council response was normally within 24 hours. It was noted that detail regarding the costs of the three-month extension of the existing contract would be provided to Members outside the meeting.

### **Decision:**

Cabinet approved the re-procurement of Gas Compliance, Repairs and Maintenance services for the Council.

### **Reasons for the decision:**

To maintain compliance with The Gas Safety (Installation and Use) Regulations 1998 and statutory obligations of the Procurement Act 2023 and ensures principles of fairness, transparency, value for money, and accountability. Bury Council is currently in contract with 'Sureserve Compliance North West' until 31 December 2026, and who are currently delivering the Gas Compliance, Repairs and Maintenance for the Council. This contract is due to end on 31st December 2026, and whilst the contract does not provide a contractual right to extend, it is proposed that it be extended by a further period of 3 months to 31st March 2027.

### **Alternative options considered and rejected:**

All five procurement options listed in the report are being considered.

## **CA.27 COMMUNITY ACCOMMODATION SERVICE TIER 3**

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services presented a report regarding the re-procurement of the Community Accommodation Service Tier 3 (CAS3), a service supporting individuals leaving prison custody, providing supported accommodation and independent living skills, helping to break cycles of homelessness and reoffending.

In response to Members' questions it was noted that the Council worked with Prevention to carry out a full risk assessment for individuals coming out of prison to identify the best placements and ensure they had the safest place based on their individual circumstances. Members were advised that homeless properties wouldn't normally be advertised owing to safeguarding concerns, but any properties requiring a

planning class change would have the appropriate planning records and permissions. It was noted that a proportional breakdown of contributing factors in the rise in homelessness would be provided to Members outside the meeting.

**Decision:**

Cabinet:

1. Authorised Bury Council to initiate a tender exercise via The Chest to identify a provider to deliver the Community Accommodation Service Tier 3, in line with the requirements set out in the grant agreement with the Greater Manchester Combined Authority, with an initial term of 14 months of total estimated contract value (for the initial term) of £430,596, and option to extend for a further 6 months; and
2. Authorised the Director of Housing to approve the award of the new contract without the need for further approval from Cabinet.

**Reasons for the decision:**

There has been a significant increase in the number of individuals experiencing homelessness. This cohort includes individuals leaving prison custody, who often face additional barriers to securing and maintaining stable accommodation. The Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (“MHCLG”) has recently set out outcome measures for local authorities as part of its updated strategy, including an ambitious objective to ensure that no individual leaves an institution into homelessness.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

- These properties will deliver emergency accommodation preventing individuals leaving custody homeless and rough sleeping. If this option is not pursued, the council will be unlikely to achieve a reduction in rough sleeping, which conflicts with our local, regional, and national homelessness strategies. We would also fail in delivering this joint commissioned programme. This would present a risk of reputational damage and a failure to meet our corporate responsibilities.
- CAS3 is joint commissioned programme between the GMCA and MoJ and has been delivered by the local authorities since 2022. The programme continues to build on its success year on year and remains a key resource in preventing, breaking cycles of homelessness and reducing re-offending. Due to current capacity constraints within the service, the ongoing challenges in securing suitable accommodation to support delivery, and its status as an externally grant-funded programme with a fixed cost envelope CAS3 is most effectively delivered by an external provider.

**CA.28 LOCAL AUTHORITY HOUSING FUND ROUND 4 (LAFH R4)**

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services presented a report regarding delivery of the Local Authority Housing Fund Round 4 (LAHF R4), which provides capital funding to increase the supply of high-quality temporary accommodation to reduce reliance on Bed and Breakfast (B&B) placements for homeless families, and support accommodation for households under the Afghan Resettlement Programme providing long-term affordable assets for the Council. Members voiced their support in the invest-to-save approach, reducing pressures on Council budgets while providing benefits to residents. In response to Members’ questions it was noted that a breakdown of waiting lists would be provided to Members outside the meeting.

**Decision:**

**Cabinet:**

1. Approved the use of £701,000 from the total £1,176,000 combined grant allocation and match funding from the General Fund Capital Programme of £1,051,500 for 2026/27 delivery, to enable the acquisition of eight properties; and
2. Noted that, based on current interest rates of circa 6.44% for 30-year PWLB money, the estimated interest cost of borrowing will be just below £0.068m per annum or £0.204m over the first three years. This will support the reduction of reliance on unsuitable and high cost temporary accommodation over the longer term. (The Council used this approach for the delivery on the previous round of funding under LAFH R3).

**Reasons for the decision:**

Approval is needed for the 60% General Fund Capital Programme match funding required under the LAHF R4 agreement to support the purchase of eight properties. Rents will be set at affordable rent levels. This approach supports long-term sustainability reflecting an invest-to-save model, reducing reliance on expensive Bed and Breakfast placements. Estimated reductions are approximately £0.170m over the first three full years. This compares favourably to the debt interest costs of £0.204m over the same three-year period for borrowing from PWLB to fund the match contribution. In addition, the properties will be let at Affordable Rent, which over an extended period estimated at 37 years will recover the initial principal costs incurred to purchase them. The proposal aligns with LAHF R4 grant conditions enabling the Council to meet its statutory housing duties while easing financial pressure.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

Do nothing: These properties will provide long-term, financially sustainable temporary accommodation for the borough, with the council contributing only 60% of the acquisition cost. If this option is not pursued, the council may need to continue relying on expensive bed and breakfast placements, which would not support a cost-effective, invest-to-save approach.

**CA.29 IMPLEMENTATION OF RENTERS RIGHTS ACT 2025**

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services presented a report regarding the implementation of the Renters' Rights Act 2025 legislation, bringing in changes to the private rented sector and strengthening the role of local authorities as regulators while offering greater protection for renters. In response to Members' questions, it was noted that implementation commenced in May 2026, with subsequent phases continuing beyond 2026. The timescales presented challenges for all authorities, particularly in the context of workforce capacity shortages. However, measures had been put in place to strengthen resilience, including the development of apprenticeship programmes.

Members discussed the Phase 2 rollout of the national private rented sector landlord database and agreed that it had the potential to deliver benefits for both landlords and tenants. It was noted that arrangements for sharing the database had yet to be confirmed; however, further information would be circulated once details became available.

**Decision:**

**Cabinet:**

1. Noted the implementation of the Renters' Rights Act on 1st May 2026;
2. Approved the amendments to the existing enforcement policy and adopt the Justice for Tenant's Civil Penalty Policy;
3. Delegated authority to the Assistant Director of Public Protection and Resilience, in consultation with the Director of Law and Governance, to implement any further policies required or make further amendments to existing policies;
4. Supported investment in staffing and digital systems to deliver Private Rented Sector regulation; and
5. Noted the alignment with Corporate Plan priorities and the Housing Strategy.

**Reasons for the decision:**

To ensure the Council can fully meet its statutory duties under section 107 of the Renters' Rights Act 2025. The recommendations provide a clear, consistent and legally robust framework for enforcement decision-making, reducing the risk of legal challenge and associated reputational risk. Making minor amendments to the existing Enforcement Policy will enable timely and effective implementation, building on a policy that is already considered robust. Adopting the Act-specific Civil Penalty Policy will further ensure consistency, transparency and proportionality in the application of penalties under the new legislative framework, while aligning the council's approach with national best practice and mitigating the risk of challenge arising from local deviation.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

- Not to implement policy changes
- To adopt both the JfT/ACEHO Civil Penalty Policy and Enforcement Policies to replace the existing local policies.

**CA.30**

**MINUTES OF ASSOCIATION OF GREATER MANCHESTER AUTHORITIES / GREATER MANCHESTER COMBINED AUTHORITY**

**It was agreed:**

That the minutes of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority meetings held on 13 February and 27 March 2026 be noted.

**COUNCILLOR E O'BRIEN**  
**Chair**

**(Note: The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 8.00 pm)**