Minutes of: **CABINET**

Date of Meeting: 9 September 2026

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

Also in attendance: Councillors Birchmore, Rydeheard and Vernon

Public Attendance: 3 members of the public were present at the meeting.

Apologies for Absence: Councillor S Walmsley and Councillor S Arif

---

CA.49 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Walmsley and Councillor S Arif

CA.50 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

CA.51 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Two questions were submitted in advance of the meeting by members of the public, Greg Hermanns and Andy W Morris. Neither member of the public was present at the meeting, so in accordance with council procedures written responses will be sent to them by Democratic Services.

Three members of the public were present at the meeting and asked the following questions:

Danielle Davies asked about drainage at the Simister Bowlee site and how the Council would ensure nothing runs into United Utilities drainage and also does not affect public septic tanks to make sure no damage and costs are left to individual residences.

Responding, the Leader advised that the introduction of a sustainable drainage system as part of any development of the Simister Bowlee site will be the responsibility of the developers to work in conjunction with the Council and United Utilities. We will likely monitor this though oversight around carrying out of works including planning enforcement powers and influencing planning applications.

James Tierney asked whether the Council can identify a single document currently available to residents that demonstrates, in one place, that the necessary highways, emergency access, drainage, sewerage, school and healthcare capacity will be delivered before the development creates the demand for them — and if such a document doesn't exist, why are members being asked to support the development before that evidence exists?

Responding, the Leader advised that the single document is the development frameworks which brings together all of the necessary policies in infrastructure requirements including drainage, schools, and health care. It is still a high level document and any planning applications would contain more specific information. Some of the infrastructure will be required before any development takes place, some will happen concurrently and there will be some elements that may be completed at the end of the process.

Amanda Foster asked that no planning application for the Simister Bowlee (JPA1.2) allocation will be validated or determined until an independent, up-to-date, and cumulative flood risk and drainage assessment has been carried out? The current evidence base traces back to a desktop study from August 2017, which was simply reissued as a further desktop exercise in September 2020 by consultants acting for the site promoter — not prepared independently — and which states in its own conclusion that further detailed investigation would be needed at the planning application stage. That evidence has never been independently verified since, and it also fails to account for the Rochdale AFC Bowlee Playing Fields application (PL/2026/0738), on land within the same catchment already identified as having longstanding drainage issues, which proposes converting grass to hard 3G surfacing and adding buildings and car parking — increasing runoff into ground already known to be constrained. Given this, what independent, cumulative verification will the Council require — covering both JPA1.2 and the Bowlee Playing Fields scheme together — before any application is accepted as validated?

Responding, the Leader advised that any planning application for JPA1.2 will need to provide sufficient and up to date evidence on flood risk and drainage, which will have to be properly assessed. As part of the process, the council will make a determination by consulting other relevant bodes including the Environment agency. The Council cannot give the requested commitment tonight, but it will ensure that flood risk and drainage are appropriately and robustly considered as part of the planning process.

CA.52 MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions.

CA.53 MINUTES

It was agreed:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 8 July 2026 be approved as a correct record.

CA.54 NORTHERN GATEWAY MAYORAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION UPDATE

Councillor O'Brien introduced the report which provides an update on progress with the Northern Gateway Mayoral Development Corporation (MDC). Creation of the MDC was approved by Cabinet in July 2025, where it was noted that a further report would be presented outlining the MDC operational arrangements, costs, and cost sharing approach. This report sets out these arrangements and seeks their approval. It also seeks authorisation and associated delegation for the preparation and completion of contractual arrangements to provide for these arrangements.

Councillor Rydeheard complimented the negotiation of the loan and asked for clarity around trigger points for repayments and the anticipated date the receipts will come over the low value.

Councillor O'Brien confirmed it was a piece of work currently being processed and will form future spending arrangements. Committed to sharing minutes of meetings with all members at the appropriate time.

Councillor Rydeheard queried the potential for legal issues and potential liability for those issues and whether work is ongoing to make sure we're not over exposed to the legal risk.

The Monitoring Officer assured members that there were safeguards in place. The Monitoring Officer for GMCA is the Monitoring Officer for the MDC but we play a part in understanding what is coming forward and ensure that Bury's interests are taken into account.

Councillor Vernon echoed what Councillor Rydeheard had said and asked about business rates.

Councillor O'Brien advised that we have confidence in the site, but aware that it will require a lot of upfront work to get to a position where it is generating those business rates. Can be assured that the risk to Bury is low but need to be

Councillor Rydeheard queried what the exchange for the loan was and whether we continue to hold a stake or get receipts from it?

Councillor O'Brien confirmed we don't have a share in the site itself but trying to, through the corporation, deliver the site and will benefit from it at a later stage. If we are in a position where we can pay it off, will be left with running costs we have committed to paying.

Decision(s)
Cabinet:

- Noted and approved the MDC operational arrangements, costs, and cost sharing approach as set out at Appendix 2.
- Authorised and delegated to the Executive Director for Place and Director of Legal and Democratic Services the negotiation, preparation, and completion of the necessary contractual arrangements to provide for the MDC operational arrangements, costs, and cost sharing as set out at Appendix 2.
- Noted and approved the GMCA's offer to contribute additional grant funding of up to £300,000 per year to in-part fund the MDC for a period of three years from 2026/27 to 2028/29.
- Authorised and delegated to the Executive Director for Place and Director of Legal and Democratic Services the negotiation, preparation, and completion of the necessary contract(s) in relation to the GMCA's additional grant funding to provide for the MDC
- Noted the GMCA's offer of an interest free loan of up to £877,000 to support Bury Council making its contribution towards MDC costs and authorise the Council's Finance Team to undertake the necessary assessments under the Council's Treasury Management Strategy and associated Prudential Indicators to determine its merits and the necessary approval process required before entering into such a loan, pursuant to the Constitution of this Council.

Reasons for decision(s):

- In March 2025, Cabinet endorsed the creation of an MDC as the preferred delivery vehicle for the Northern Gateway and most appropriate route to achieve the Strategic Development Vision for Northern Gateway, endorsed by Cabinet in November 2024.
- As set out in the report to Cabinet in July 2025, Rochdale Council will host the MDC with Bury Council to act as the partner authority for an initial period of 2 years with reviews every 5 years thereafter, with the operational resource costs of the MDC shared equally between the Councils.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

- A core principle of the MDC from the outset has been that both Bury and Rochdale Councils will contribute equally to its costs, therefore no alternative split of costs has been considered.
- Alternative operational arrangements, including Bury Council being the initial host authority, were considered as the MDC proposal was developed. Rochdale Council was considered to have the operational capacity to be the initial host authority.
- The review cycle for hosting arrangements was proposed to be 5 years throughout the lifetime of the MDC. This was reduced to 2 years for the first review as this was considered a suitable period for the MDC to stabilise, and a point at which the respective circumstances of the Councils, with respect to operational capacity to support the MDC, may have changed.

CA.55 REDEVELOPMENT OF THE ELMS, WHITEFIELD

Councillor Morris introduced the report seeking Cabinet approval to procure a multidisciplinary design team to undertake a detailed site appraisal, scheme design, planning assessment and viability testing. The proposed scheme would comprise approximately 16 one-bedroom social rent apartments, specifically designed to enable older residents to live independently for longer while addressing an identified local housing need at the Elms in Whitefield. The Elms is a vacant Council owned brownfield site on Elms Close, Whitefield.

Cabinet have previously approved the disposal of the site to a strategic delivery partner/member of the Council's Registered Provider Partnership Framework for the development of an independent living scheme for people aged 55 and over, as direct delivery by the Council was not considered financially viable at that time. Since then, updated feasibility work and cost assessments have identified a potential opportunity for the Council to deliver the scheme directly. This change is primarily due to increased Homes England grant funding and the availability of retained Right to Buy receipts and affordable housing commuted sums.

Councillor Rydeheard queried the housing stock, will this count towards the number of properties the Council can allocate to?

Councillor Morris advised that this is a development of 16 properties which will be removed from the target but as it is a small site it won't make a huge difference to the number of properties required.

The Leader confirmed that this won't be a game changer in terms of the sites required for Places for Everyone but shows our commitment to using brownfield sites first.

Councillor Rydeheard highlighted the cost range of the contract that has been set and queried what procurement process has been followed and whether the contact is for a start to finish service.

Councillor Morris confirmed that the contract hasn't been awarded this report is to seek approval for a budget in that range to prepare for a contract. There will be a procurement process likely to be using a framework for this.

Councillor Birchmore confirmed her support for this item, citing the use of brownfield sites and building our own properties.

Decision(s):
Cabinet:

- Approved the principle of progressing proposals for the redevelopment of The Elms through a direct delivery approach, as set out within this report.
- Authorised the procurement of a multidisciplinary design team, via a compliant public sector framework to undertake the detailed appraisal, design development, planning and viability work required to assess the feasibility and deliverability of the proposed scheme.
- Delegated authority to the Executive Director of Place and Executive Director of Finance to oversee delivery of this stage of the project, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth.
- Noted that if the proposed scheme proves to be viable, deliverable and capable of securing planning consent, a further report and funding strategy will be presented to Cabinet seeking approval to progress to the next phase of development.
- Agreed that, should direct delivery prove to be unviable, the site may be disposed of to a strategic delivery partner/member of the Council's Registered Provider Partnership Framework, in accordance with Cabinet's previous decision of 13 March 2024. Any such disposal will be subject to compliance with the requirements of Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972.

Reasons for decision(s)
The decisions will:

- Act as a trailblazer project for further social housing delivery and signal Bury's commitment to the GM target of 50,000 new homes by 2039.
- Support delivery of the Council's Housing Strategy, wider regeneration priorities and Government objectives to increase the supply of social rented accommodation.
- Facilitate the Councils brownfield first approach to housing delivery by bringing a long-term vacant site back into use.
- Deliver much needed affordable housing for older residents (including those with long-term conditions), helping them maintain their independence and reduce the need for more costly interventions.
- Address identified demographic pressures, promote independent living, support health and wellbeing, and provide housing options better suited to the needs of an ageing population. • Increase the supply of accessible and adaptable homes to meet the changing needs of an ageing population.
- Reduce ongoing costs associated with securing and maintaining a vacant site.
- Deliver wider social, environmental and economic benefits, including additional Council Tax revenue.
- Enable the Council to retain ownership of the completed development, increase its housing stock and create a long-term income stream for the HRA (Housing Revenue Account) to help sustain housing services.
- The procurement of a multidisciplinary design team gives the Council the opportunity to undertake robust due diligence before committing to construction expenditure, and will provide greater certainty regarding deliverability, planning considerations, costs and funding requirements. It should be noted that no commitment to construction or project delivery beyond the feasibility and planning stage is being sought through this report.

Alternative options considered and rejected:
Alternative Option Rejected – Disposal to a Registered Provider/Strategic Delivery Partner:

- Dispose of the site to a strategic delivery partner/member of the Council's Registered Provider Partnership Framework, consistent with the original approach.
- Whilst this option would facilitate redevelopment of the site, it would forgo the opportunity for the Council to expand its housing stock, generate a long-term rental income stream and retain control over the design, quality and management of the scheme. Additionally, the anticipated capital receipt from disposal for affordable housing purposes is expected to be minimal.

Other Options Considered and Rejected: Do Nothing/Retain the Site:

- This option has been rejected due to increasing demand for housing for older people in the borough. Demographic projections indicate that demand for this type of accommodation will continue to rise over the coming years. Leaving the site undeveloped would fail to address identified housing needs. The proposed scheme will create additional housing capacity and help address gaps in provision.
- This is a brownfield site located in an area of high demand for social housing. A feasibility assessment identified an independent living scheme for older people as the most appropriate use of the site, reflecting both identified local housing need and the Council's strategic priorities. The site is particularly well suited to this form of development due to its proximity to existing older persons' accommodation and its location within a well-established and supportive community.
- Retaining the site would provide no strategic, social or financial benefit to the Council. The site would continue to incur maintenance and security costs whilst remaining a dormant asset.

Disposal to a Private Developer:

- This option has been discounted as the proposed social rented independent living scheme is unlikely to be delivered through the private development market. In addition, the Council would lose the opportunity to increase its social housing stock and secure long-term rental income.

Sell the Site Without a Defined End Use

- This option has been rejected because it would remove Council influence over the future use of the site and could result in development that does not align with local housing priorities. The site presents a strong opportunity to provide specialist accommodation for older people and contribute to wider strategic objectives.

CA.56 DISPOSAL OF PYRAMID PARK AND Q-PARK - PART A

Councillor Morris introduced the report which is seeking approval to accelerate delivery and bring forward high-quality, mixed typology housing at Pyramid Park and Q-Park, two key town centre, brownfield sites, both within council ownership. Councillor Morris highlighted the opportunity we have within Bury Town Centre to deliver almost 200 homes with mixed tenures.

Cllr Birchmore queried what the percentage of social housing will be and what information we have about the ecology of the site.

Cllr Morris confirmed that the current proposals are looking at extra care and supported living schemes. There is a recognition that there is an ecological value to the site. Some on site

provision to enhance the ecology will be required and part of the detailed proposals that will be submitted.

Robert Summerfield, Director of Regeneration and Project Delivery, confirmed the scheme tendered is planning compliant, so we will expect the minimum of social housing but hope they will be able to exceed it.

In terms of biodiversity net gain, we will achieve 10% biodiversity net gain across the site, with the majority of the net gain on site where possible. If we are unable to achieve net gain on the site we will seek to find alternative solutions to provide the biodiversity required. It is a statutory requirement to achieve this and this has been part of the tender process.

Councillor Vernon queried how much control we have over land once we hand it over to the developer and what powers do we have to ensure they comply with what we have asked them to do.

Councillor Morris advised we have a contract that states what we want the developer to deliver around intergenerational living and different types of homes.

Robert Summerfield, Director of Regeneration and Project Delivery, confirmed the key guiding factor is the housing strategy which has formed the quality element of the bidding process. The site will be disposed subject to planning, and we have consulted with planners all the way through to ensure the site is compliant. Confident that what will be delivered is what is needed in the Town Centre, a multifaceted scheme which can also contribute to other council services. We will hold them to account as part of development agreement.

Cllr Birchmore queried whether it will come off the quota for required housing in the borough.

Leader confirmed that these are some of the more obvious sites that are available in Bury and will make a contribution to the total housing numbers required across the borough.

Decision(s):
Cabinet:

- Approved the plans for disposal of the sites at Pyramid Park and Q-Park, to Watson Construction Ltd (Company number 08621624) as the Development Partner.
- Delegated the award of all contractual documents for example a Development Agreement (if applicable),lease agreements, licence and other ancillary contracts) that relate to the appointment of Watson Construction Ltd (Company number 08621624), to the Executive Director of Place and Executive Director of Finance, and the council Leader and Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth.
- Delegated the disposal of Pyramid Park and Q-Park, including commercial terms (including Best Value Consideration if applicable) and eventual capital receipt, to the Executive Director of Place and Executive Director of Finance, and the council Leader and Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Growth.

Reasons for decision(s)

- The disposal of the Pyramid Park site to a developer, and the delivery of new housing, is required by the 31st March 2027 and 31st March 2029, respectively, as per the agreed BLRF2 grant funding milestones.
- The appointment of Watson, who have a strong track record of delivery of mixed tenure residential led developments across Greater Manchester, will enable the realisation of much needed new, sustainable homes and

accommodation, across a range of tenures and typologies, at Pyramid Park and Q-Park, and in line with the council's brownfield first approach to housing.
- The disposal of Pyramid Park and Q-Park will generate a capital receipt for the council, and will also reduce the revenue costs of holding, maintaining and securing these long-term vacant, town centre opportunity sites, which in their Page 70 current state, are detrimental to the street scene and regularly attract antisocial behaviour.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- Do nothing:
    - If no action is taken to bring forward the Pyramid Park and Q-Park sites for residential, the comprehensive regeneration of this strategic town centre area, in line with the council's vision and masterplan, will not take place and the sites will remain vacant and likely subject to further anti-social behaviour and physical deterioration. The opportunity cost of not facilitating development at these sites will be a significant setback to the council's wider town centre regeneration ambitions. Furthermore, by failing to realise the development of Pyramid Park in the short-term, it is highly likely that the BLRF2 Grant Funding Agreement (GFA) delivery milestones, namely the requirement to have completed disposal by 31st March 2027 and have delivered the new homes by 31st March 2029, would become unachievable. This risks a full grant claw back of the £1.73 million brownfield funding provided by One Public Estate (OPE) and would also jeopardise the anticipated capital receipt that would be yielded from the disposal of the sites. If this BLRF2 grant clawback was to materialise, Pyramid Park would continue to remain a significantly unviable and potentially void site for years, if not decades, as it cannot be brought forward without public sector intervention to address technical site constraints and abnormals.
    - Failure to realise development at Pyramid Park and Q-Park would also erode confidence in the council's ability to bring forward these two key strategic, brownfield priority sites, which is critical in supporting the delivery of a number of major corporate strategies including the Bury Housing Strategy, the Bury Economic Strategy, and the Bury Town Centre Masterplan. The proposed future residential scheme across both sites holds potential in delivering a significant element of the identified housing shortfall and would help a range of cohorts to live independently in a sustainable location, thus improving outcomes, and complementing wider town centre regeneration activity. These beneficial outcomes would be forfeited by not facilitating development at the sites.
    - It would also affect the forthcoming redevelopment of Bury Interchange, which will see the construction of a new pedestrian footbridge, spanning the tram lines across from Pyramid Park to Townside at Knowsley Place. This is because the ongoing, grant-funded, remediation scheme at Pyramid Park (planning ref: 70903) has several interlinked planning conditions with the Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) interchange southern access works (ref: 71834). The realisation of the wider economic, social and environmental benefits that the future residential scheme would bring, including the generation of new council tax revenue, would also be put at risk. Page 71 19.
- Dispose of the sites on the open market:

- Although this route is likely to ensure the swift disposal of both sites, generate a capital receipt, and free the council of any liabilities tied to the ownership of both plots, the council would be placed in a precarious position as it requires the prospective developer to be able to bring forward housing delivery at Pyramid Park as per the BLRF2 GFA milestones, as outlined earlier. There would be a material risk that the prospective developer, appointed through this open market sale route, could 'land-bank' and not undertake any meaningful development, or realise a residential scheme in line with the council's wider regeneration and strategic vision, with no guarantee to the council on delivery or quality of the scheme.
- Moreover, if the current procurement process, which commenced in April 2026, was to be terminated at this stage and a new open market disposal process initiated, it again would increase the likelihood of the Pyramid Park GFA milestones becoming unachievable due to the sheer amount of time it would take, thereby risking the full grant claw back. Further internal staff resource would also be required, and additional fees would be incurred through the council's external consultant team, needed to support the new procurement, marketing and sale process.

CA.57 ANNUAL COMPLAINTS PERFORMANCE AND LEARNING REPORT 2025/26 AND SELF-ASSESSMENT AGAINST THE HOUSING OMBUDSMAN COMPLAINT HANDLING CODE

Councillor A Arif introduced the report to approve the annual complaints performance and service improvement report for scrutiny as required by The Housing Ombudsman Service (HOS) Complaint Handling Code highlighting that complaint volumes increased significantly during 2025/26 (188 Stage 1 complaints compared with 62 the previous year), reflecting improved accessibility and a stronger culture of encouraging residents to raise concerns.

Councillor Rydeheard raised concerns around the poor customer service aspect and queried what the additional training was and how processes have been streamlined.

Sian Grant, Director of Housing, confirmed that a number of training sessions had been held with teams including how to respond to complaints, how to investigate complaints, and keeping records. We have also completed dip samples of responses to ensure we are addressing the complaints effectively.

Councillor Rydeheard queried whether there was an issue with record keeping. The Director of Housing confirmed there were historical issues with the housing system and training has been provided to support staff with keeping records up to date. Also ongoing work looking at upgrading the housing management system to make it more user friendly.

The Leader also advised that we have also done some work to look at what is a complaint and what should be classed as a service issue.

Councillor Rydeheard queried why a decision hadn't been taken to upgrade or change the housing system beforehand and was advised that once the housing service was brought back in house, upgrades and modifications have been made,

Councillor Birchmore queried the number of people who stated the council were not easy to deal with in terms of complaint handling and whether any reasons why were identified.

Sian Grant, Director of Housing confirmed that more research was completed. There wasn't a particular cohort that found us easy/difficult to deal with. On review, we found that if a complaint was not upheld they were less likely to be satisfied with the service.

Councillor A Arif confirmed that work is ongoing to improve tenant engagement with the aim of more tenants voices being heard.

Decision(s):
Cabinet

- Noted and approved the Annual Complaints Performance and Learning Report 2025/26 for publication and submission to the HOS.
- Approved the self-assessment against the Complaints Handling Code for submission to the HOS and publication.
- Noted the learning, service improvements and actions identified to further strengthen complaint handling performance and compliance with the Complaints Handling Code.

Reasons for the decision(s)

- The HOS Complaints Handling Code requires landlords to undertake an annual self-assessment of compliance and publish both the assessment and an annual complaints performance and learning report. Consideration by Cabinet demonstrates appropriate oversight, transparency and accountability, whilst supporting the Council's commitment to learning from complaints, improving services and delivering positive outcomes for tenants and leaseholders.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- The publication of an annual self-assessment and complaints performance and learning report is a requirement of the HOS Complaints Handling Code. Failure to do so would reduce transparency and could result in noncompliance with the Complaints Handling Code and HOS expectations.

CA.58 HRA CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME 2026.2027 MAJOR REFURBISHMENT WORKS - HEATING AND HOT WATER

Councillor A Arif introduced the report which sought approval for the Housing Revenue Account ("HRA") Capital Works Programme for 2026/27 and a budget of £2,015,000 for Major Refurbishment Works - Heating and Hot Water. This programme would replace aging boiler in council homes ensuring tenants have reliable heating and hot water, reducing the likelihood of breakdowns and improving energy efficiency.

Cllr Birchmore queried whether they were hydrogen compatible boilers we were replacing them with. Sian Grant, Director of Housing committed to return to Councillor Birchmore on whether they could be converted to hydrogen.

Decision (s)
Cabinet:

- Given the tight timescales associated with the return and evaluation of tenders, Cabinet is requested to:
    - Delegated authority to award the contract(s) for the Gas Boiler Replacement Programme to the Director of Housing.
    - Delegated authority for the finalisation and sealing of the contract(s) to the Director of Law and Democratic Services, in consultation with the Director of Housing.

This delegation will enable the timely award of the contract(s) and support the delivery of the approved 2026/27 HRA Capital Works Programme.

Reasons for decision(s)
Property data indicates that the existing gas boilers are approaching renewal and upgrade. The investment helps to ensure timely replacement and upgrade of heating and hot water provision for our tenants. Whilst helping to ensure DHS standards are met, which includes property state of repair and provision of thermal comfort.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- Do nothing: The gas boiler replacements are necessary to help achieve legislative requirements around DHS. Also to ensure our tenants have access to energy efficient heating and hot water provision.
- 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).

CA.59 CONTRACT AWARDS IN RESPECT OF THE HRA CAPITAL INVESTMENT PROGRAMME 2026/27 AND CARBON REDUCTION - SUSTAINABILITY IMPROVEMENT MEASURES

Councillor A Arif introduced the report seeking Cabinet approval for contractor appointments and contract extensions to deliver the Council's 2026/27 housing retrofit and carbon reduction programme, funded through the approved HRA Capital Programme budget of £5.6 million.

Councillor Birchmore queried the battery storage and whether it is in the roof space. Sian Grant, Director of Housing confirmed this was not the case as it would be a fire risk.

Decision(s):
Cabinet:

- Approved 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 £2,520,090.72 (inclusive of VAT).
- A contract award to Next Energy Solutions Ltd (Company number 10147744), in respect of the Estates comprising of Programme B and as outlined at 2.1, for an initial term of 8 months (proposed commencement date of 25th September 2026 and the option to extend for a further two years taken as 12-month increments from 1st April 2027, at the Council's sole discretion. The total estimated contract value for the initial term is £2,608,261.32 (inclusive of VAT). The total estimated future contract values in the event the options to extend are utilised by the Council are as follows:
    - First 12-month extension: £3,912,391.98 (inclusive of VAT)
    - Second 12-month extension: £3,912,391.98 (inclusive of VAT)

- The estimated future contract values for the extension periods represent annualised values calculated on a pro rata basis from the initial term figure.

Reasons for decision(s)

- The primary reason for requesting the contract extension with A.Connolly and contract award to Next Energy 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 A.Connolly 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.60 A BED EVERY NIGHT ("ABEN")

Councillor A Arif introduced the report seeking permission for the Council to extend the current A Bed Every Night ("ABEN") contract between the Council and Adullam Homes Housing Association Limited (company number IP20853R) ("Adullam Homes") for a further period of 12 months, whilst the service re-procure the ABEN provision to reduce the number of individuals rough sleeping within the borough. The ABEN provision provides safe off the street accommodation, as well as the opportunity for individuals to develop independent living skills and break the cycle of homelessness.

Councillor Rydeheard queried whether the extension is pro rate to the normal rate and the Director of Housing committed to responding outside of the meeting.

Councillor Vernon queried what we are doing with those individuals who are sleeping rough but have not engaged with us and was advised that there are some individuals who do not need to go into this scheme due to finding other options.

Councillor Arif clarified that we provide the support around their needs and offer them all services that are available including working with other services and providers to support individuals to get off the streets.

Councillor Birchmore queried the programme that was rolled out for winter last year, including churches and whether this was funded as part of this or separately? The Director of Housing confirmed that funding is separate to this scheme.

Decision(s)

Cabinet:

- Authorised Bury Metropolitan Borough Council to extend current ABEN contract with Adullam Homes Housing Association Limited (company number IP20853R) for a 12-month period, commencing on 01st April 2026, and for the total estimated contract value of £335,732 inclusive of VAT
- Authorised Bury Metropolitan Borough Council to initiate a tender exercise via The Chest to procure a provider for the delivery of ABEN provision, in line with the requirements set out in the grant agreement with the Greater Manchester Combined Authority. This contract having an initial two-year term (proposed commencement date of1st April 2027) and a total estimated contract value of £708,799 including VAT, with the option to extend for a further 2 years (in 12month increments) at the sole discretion of the Council and with a total estimated Page 179 contract value of £1,380.263 inclusive of VAT in the event that the full two year extension is utilised.
- Authorised the delegation for the approval of the award of a new contract to the Director of Housing, following the conclusion of a compliant tender exercise via The Chest.

Reasons for decision(s)

- There has been a significant increase in the number of individuals experiencing homelessness. This cohort includes multiple disadvantage, individuals leaving custody, who often face additional barriers to securing and maintaining stable accommodation.
- Rough sleeping has increased locally, due to numerous factors which include:
    - Increase in the number of people with complex needs (mental health, substance misuse and offending behaviours)
    - Expensive local housing market contributing to lack of access to the private rented sector and finite support of social housing.
    - Increased asylum and refugee presentations due to government policy and leave to remain cases.
    - Cost of living has increased which resulting in more households struggling to sustain their tenancies.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- Do nothing: These properties will deliver emergency accommodation, helping to reduce rough sleeping and minimise the length of time individuals spend on the streets. 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. This would present a risk of reputational damage and a failure to meet our corporate responsibilities.
- ABEN is a Greater Manchester Mayoral initiative that has been delivered by the local authority since 2019. The programme continues to build on its success year on year and remains a key resource in reducing rough sleeping and breaking cycles of homelessness. 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 ABEN is most effectively delivered by an external provider.

CA.61 CARE AT HOME - REQUEST TO DELEGATE THE AUTHORITY TO CONTRACT AWARDS

Cllr Tariq introduced the report highlighting that the Care at Home service supports the vulnerable people of Bury with their assessed needs under the Care Act 2014. This includes support with personal care, moving and handling, nutrition and hydration, and medication. The Council spend on Care at Home in 2025/26 was c.£12.426m, the service supports approximately 700 people each day and delivers circa 10,000 hours of home care each week.

Councillor Rydeheard questioned what protections are in place to protect against any significant in estimated costs due to it being an activity based contract.

Adrian Crook, Director of Community Commissioning confirmed that there are internal governance monitoring boards which take place monthly. These are responsible for monitoring the spend against the contract.

Decision(s)
Cabinet

- Delegated the authority to contract awards to the Director of Adult Social Services and Community Commissioning and the Executive Director of Health and Adult Care.
- Delegated finalisation and sealing of the contracts to the Director of Law and Democratic Services in consultation with the Director of Adult Social Services and Community Commissioning and the Executive Director of Health and Adult Care.

Reasons for decision(s)

- The Council has a legal duty to follow Procurement Law and fair purchasing processes and must complete a re-tender process to ensure compliance with the legislation (Procurement Act 2023). Additional benefits include a new contract and service specification with updated quality requirements enabling us to ensure high standards for the customers, clearer key performance indicators for robust contract monitoring, and a broader scope for innovation.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- Alternative options are not applicable due to Procurement Law and the requirement to complete a re-tender exercise (Procurement Act 2023). Should the Council decide to do nothing, we would risk being non-compliant with the legislation.

CA.62 AWARD OF EVCI GM CONTRACT TO INSTALL EV CHARGEPOINTS THROUGHOUT BURY

ouncillor L Smith introduced the report requesting to take part in the ECVI structure concession contract to put in electric charging infrastructure across the borough.

Councillor Rydeheard commented that the report was scrutinised at O&S and thanked Councillor L Smith for attending.

Councillor Birchmore queried whether there is sufficient power if everyone had an electric car and that tariffs could be higher overnight than during the day and whether there is any way we can get them to address that?

Councillor Smith responding advised that the agreement is at market rate which could be different at different times of the day and night.

Ben Thomson, Assistant Director (Public Protection) confirmed we are in active discussions with the supplier to provide a discounted rate and assured member we are looking to secure a competitive rate which is tied in to the concessionary contract.

Decision(s):
Cabinet:

- Agreed TfGM on behalf of Bury Metropolitan Borough Council can proceed to award the contract to the Preferred Supplier identified within Part B of this report.

Reasons for decision(s):

- A competitive and transparent procurement process was undertaken in line with all legislative requirements governing local authority procurement. Following evaluation of all submissions against the agreed criteria, the Preferred Supplier identified within Part B of this report emerged as the highest-scoring bidder and Page 214 offered the best overall value to the Council. Their appointment is therefore proposed.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

- No alternative procurement routes were considered appropriate due to the contract value and scope. A competitive tendering process was required to meet internal contract procedures and all relevant procurement legislation.

CA.63 APPROVAL OF ACCEPTING THE DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT GRANT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE 15112 BURY TO BOLTON ACTIVE TRAVEL CORRIDOR SCHEME (SPENFOLD LANE BRIDLEWAY) WITH APPROVAL TO AWARD THE DELIVERY CONTRACT

Councillor L Smith introduced the report seeking formal approval to accept a grant supplied by the Department for Transport ("DfT") and administered by Walk Wheel Cycle Trust (Company number 01797726) ("WWCT") to deliver the 15112 Bury to Bolton Active Travel Corridor Scheme.

Councillor Vernon supported the recommendation and queried whether any money for the extension would go towards maintaining and improving the existing parts of the greenway.

Councillor Rydeheard queried whether there was any provision within the funding to improve current infrastructure.

Councillor L Smith confirmed that this is about the area being in a better state to maintain in the first place.

Decision(s):
Cabinet:

- Approved Bury Metropolitan Borough Council entering into the SubGrant agreement with Walk Wheel Cycle Trust (Company number 01797726) and subsequently the Department for Transport for the delivery of the 15112 Bury to Bolton Active Travel Corridor Scheme.
- Authorised Legal to finalise and seal all the necessary contract documents to access the funding.

Reasons for decision(s):

- The Sub Grant Agreement is required to enable the Council to accept and draw down the approved DfT funding for delivery of the schemes.
- Failure to enter into the above agreement in a timely manner may jeopardise project delivery, risking funding withdrawal and impacting the Council's reputation with the Department for Transport.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

- Not proceeding with the schemes: This option was rejected as it would result in the loss of DfT funding and missed opportunities to improve local active travel infrastructure.

CA.64 CORPORATE PLAN QUARTER 1 2026-27 PERFORMANCE & DELIVERY

Councillor Thorpe introduced the report providing an overview of progress during Quarter One (April to June 2026). The Council has made a positive start to delivery of the 2026-27 Corporate Plan, of the Council's 31 objectives, 18 are on track, 12 are progressing with mitigating actions in place and one objective has been identified as a potential delivery risk.

Councillor Rydeheard questioned Objective 19, accelerating team working maturity in each of our 5 neighbourhoods which is rated amber and queried the reason behind this and how we are focussing on these.

Will Blandamer, Executive Director (Health and Care) advised that we are making good progress on the model of neighbourhood working, further establishment of public services teams, implementation of the live well centre and connection to a range of reform programmes for children. Confidence was expressed in the work we have done, noting the challenge to be able to describe it in detail. Classed as amber within this report as we need to be able to describe a more consistent operating model of neighbourhood working that brings all this together.

Adrian Crook, Director of Community Commissioning further commented that we didn't quite meet the Q1 milestones as children's and adults teams weren't moved into the Live Well centre within the expected timeframe.

Decision(s):

Cabinet:

- Noted the Quarter One position on progress against the Corporate Plan 2026-27.

Reasons for decision(s)

- To enable transparency and robust monitoring of performance and delivery of the Corporate Plan.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- Not applicable.

CA.65 FINANCE Q1

Councillor Thorpe introduced the report providing an update to Cabinet on the council's forecast Quarter 1 position across the General Fund revenue and capital budgets, Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and DSG (Dedicated Schools Grant).

Councillor Rydeheard thanked Councillor Thorpe for attending Overview & Scrutiny Committee to go through this report with scrutiny members.

Councillor Birchmore highlighted the housing revenue account and confirmed her interest that some of the maintenance would be moved in house.

Decision(s)
Cabinet

- Noted the 2026/27 forecast revenue Quarter 1 position of a £5.691m overspend (2.26%) against a net budget of £252.135m.
- Noted the forecast reduction in General Fund and Earmarked Reserves of £12.047m (27.31%) and forecast closing balance at 31 March 2027 of £32.059m.
- Noted the total forecast delivery of savings in 2026/27 of £18.534m (88.85%) against a target of £20.860m, including unachieved savings carried forward from 2025/26. This results in a forecast shortfall of £2.326m (11.15%).
- Noted a net increase of £22.228m to the 2026/27 Capital Programme, comprising of £17.336m of slippage from 2025/26 and £7.311m of additional schemes in 2026/27, offset by £2.419m rephased into 2027/28.
- Approved and recommend to Council the in-year capital programme addition requiring £0.350m of additional prudential borrowing.
- Approved and recommend to Council an additional £0.210m of prudential borrowing within the Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme for 2026/27.
- Noted the 2026/27 forecast Quarter 1 position for the Collection Fund.
- Note the 2026/27 forecast Quarter 1 position for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA).
- Noted the 2026/27 forecast Quarter 1 position for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).
- Noted the Quarter 1 Prudential Indicator position

Reasons for decision(s)
To note the forecast Quarter 1 finance position for 2026/27.

Alternative options considered and rejected
N/A

CA.66 2025/26 TREASURY OUTTURN REPORT

Councillor Thorpe introduced the report outlining the financial position and provides an update on the following aspects of the Treasury Management function throughout 2025/26.

There were no questions from members present.

Decision(s)
Cabinet

- Noted and approved for onward submission to Council on 16th September 2026, the:
    - Treasury Management 2025/26 Outturn Report.
    - 2025/26 Prudential and Treasury Indicators.

Reasons for decision(s)

It is a requirement of the CIPFA Code that the Council receives an annual Treasury Management Outturn Report. It should be noted that the Council met all its Prudential Indicators relating to Treasury Management in financial year 2025/26.

Alternative options considered and rejected
Regular reporting to members on the Council's Treasury Management arrangements, controls and performance forms a key element of its overall governance and financial administration. Given this, no alternative options were considered when preparing this report.

CA.67 MINUTES OF ASSOCIATION OF GREATER MANCHESTER AUTHORITIES / GREATER MANCHESTER COMBINED AUTHORITY

It was agreed:

That the minutes of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority meeting held on 26 June 2026 be noted.

CA.68 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

CA.69 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

Decision:
That the press and public be excluded from the meeting under Section 100 (A)(4), Schedule 12(A) of the Local Government Act 1972, for the reason that the following business involves the disclosure of exempt information as detailed against the item.

CA.70 DISPOSAL OF PYRAMID PARK AND Q-PARK - PART B

Councillor Morris presented the Part B report which included the full financial details.

Decision(s)
1. As set out in Part A.

Reasons for decision(s)
2. As set out in Part A.

Alternative options considered and rejected
3. As set out in Part A.

CA.71 AWARD OF EVCI GM CONTRACT TO INSTALL EV CHARGEPOINTS THROUGHOUT BURY PART B

Councillor L Smith presented the Part B report which included the full financial details.

Decision(s)
Cabinet:
- Note the contents of this Part B report.
- Agree that TfGM be authorised to proceed with contract award to Believ Limited following completion of all required governance approvals and procurement procedures.
- Approve the inclusion of Bury Council within the Greater Manchester LEVI concession contract arrangements as outlined in Part A and this report.

Reasons for the decision:
As for Part A.

Alternative options considered and rejected:
As for Part A.

COUNCILLOR E O'BRIEN
Chair