

Minutes of: CABINET

Date of Meeting: 14 October 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 C Birchmore, J Rydeheard and D Vernon

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

Apologies for Absence: Councillor S Arif

CA.72 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor S Arif

CA.73 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

CA.74 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Two questions were submitted in advance of the meeting by members of the public, Peter Liggins 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.

Fin McCaul asked whether Cabinet will defer approval of the proposed Prestwich Travel Hub parking charges until the Council has properly assessed the impact on access to essential NHS healthcare, the financial burden on existing businesses and their employees, and the consequences for Prestwich's daytime economy?

Responding, Councillor Morris advised that considerable work has gone to get to this point to make a recommendation to cabinet which includes the tariff structure.

Modelling has been done and we have started by looking at what the car park is used for and when, and how a tariff structure can balance the outcomes required. We also need to consider how to generate income for the council.

There are already parking charges in Bury Town Centre, and it was important to ensure parity across the borough, and have concluded free parking after 6pm and a flat rate on a Sunday are positive ways forward to support residents in Prestwich.

There is also an option for season tickets as part of the suggested tariff structure. Modelling for free parking during the day didn't make financial sense and the Council are not in a position to subsidise the car park.

Councillor Morris offered to visit local businesses and discuss any further issues if required.

CA.75 MEMBER QUESTION TIME

There were no Member questions submitted in advance.

Councillor Mike Smith highlighted an opportunity that could deliver in environmental and community benefits at land adjoining Outwood Country Park that was originally live for public auction but following discussions with the company, agreement principle has been secured for the land to be transferred to the council for a nominal sum of £1.00.

Councillor Smith asked whether cabinet would explore the financial, ecological and legal implications of acquiring the land; expedite the land and keep Friends of Outwood and Cllr Smith involved as the proposal develops.

Councillor O'Brien thanked Councillor Smith for bringing this opportunity to the Cabinet's attention and agreed this is a positive opportunity but there is a need to review risks and liabilities.

Councillor Thorpe added that the council need to ensure there are no liabilities as there has been a request for the purchasers of this site to indemnify the sellers of any historical and ongoing issues associated with the land. Councillor Thorpe committed to tasking officers to look into the opportunity and to meeting with Councillor Smith on a regular basis and keeping him updated.

Councillor Simpson questioned the agreement in place at Milltown Road that has been in place since 10 October 2023 where the land had been handed over to the community for an initial period of three years. In February 2026 there was works carried out on the site for which there was no communication or consideration given to the residents who have been maintaining the site.

Substantial works has taken place on the meadow by residents including the purchase of bulbs and wildflower seeds.

Councillor Simpson asked if the cabinet decide to take the green space away from the community, how does it intend to compensate the hundreds of hours and funding spent maintaining the area over the last few years.

Councillors O'Brien apologised to Councillor Simpson and the community for the lack of communication leading up to the initial work.

Councillor Thorpe added that we are aware of the agreement and that although it is not a legally binding agreement, it is important that the council operates in good faith. We would be willing to work in collaboration with the local residents.

The Monitoring Officer confirmed she would look at the compensation issue but as there is no formal legal agreement the initial advice would be that it is not the case that compensation would flow from that.

CA.76 MINUTES

It was agreed:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2026 be approved as a correct record.

CA.77 ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR POLICY 2027-2030 (RENEWAL)

This item has been deferred and will now be considered in December 2026.

CA.78 REVIEW AND AMENDMENTS TO BURY COUNCIL'S HOUSING ALLOCATIONS POLICY

Councillor A Arif introduced the report seeking Cabinet approval for two minor amendments to the Council's Housing Allocations Policy following its annual review. The changes are intended to strengthen homelessness prevention and provide appropriate operational flexibility while maintaining the overall principles and priorities of the existing allocations scheme.

Councillor Rydeheard asked a question around forecasting and whether there are any additional costs associated with the policy?

Sian Grant, Director of Housing confirmed that it is really rare that a case doesn't fit within the criteria and that this only occurs when we have complex cases.

Councillor Vernon queried 'retiring service attendants' and whether this would relate to someone who was made redundant rather than retiring.

Councillor A Arif confirmed that there is only one tied tenancy and that the occupant is not affected by redundancy.

Decision(s)

Cabinet:

- Approved the amendments to the Allocations policy.

Reasons for decision(s)

- The council has properties it lets to employees such as caretakers or park wardens as part of their employment contract. When these employees retire they lose their service tenancy and are at risk of becoming homeless. In order to prevent them becoming homeless and to ensure they enjoy a planned rehousing move it is recommended that the Allocations Policy is amended to allow for a direct let to a council tenancy at the point of retirement.
- The policy should reserve discretion to the Director of Housing make direct lets in such circumstances she considers necessary subject to the law and aims of the policy. Such lettings should be very few in number and will not affect overall compliance with the law.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- Do nothing and not amend the Allocations Policy. This option has been rejected as it would leave long standing employees at risk of homelessness and will avoid the Director of Housing having to seek cabinet approval for individual direct lettings under the policy.

CA.79 NORTHERN GATEWAY WESTERN ACCESS SCHEME: STAGE 3 CONTRACT SUM, EXTERNAL PROFESSIONAL TEAM CONTRACT EXTENSION, AND ACCEPTANCE OF INVESTMENT ZONE GRANT FUNDING.

Councillor O'Brien introduced the report seeking Cabinet approval of the Bentley Project Management sum of £423k, to cover the remaining Stage 2B period, and subsequent Stage 3 works, concluding the scheme's Pre-Construction Period and highlighting that this is an important development site for both Bury and wider area.

Councillor Rydeheard queried the provisional maximum and whether any allowances have been made of if this would be exceeded and whether there is any room for manoeuvre.

Councillor O'Brien confirmed that we are not forecasting to exceed it. If we do go over for any reason, would need to return to cabinet to make an additional decision.

Councillor Vernon queried paragraph 16 around Councils commercial risk and the included break clause and mechanisms. If costs do spiral out of control are the developers liable as much as Bury Council.

Councillor O'Brien advised that at this stage we can have a lot more certainty around the budget, however projects do get delayed and costs increase. We are attempting to pre-empt this and can be reasonably assured that this is a robust estimate and provide assurance that there are checks and balances in the approach.

Decision(s)

Cabinet:

- a. Delegated final acceptance of Balfour Beatty Civil Engineering Ltd Stage 3 contract sum, up to a provisional maximum of £3,129,915, covering the finalisation of the Detailed Design/ Full Business Case stage work packages (Stage 3), to the Director of Law and Democratic Services in consultation with the Executive Director of Place and Director of Finance and the Leader.
- b. Approved the Bentley Project Management (UK) Limited contract sum of £423,000 covering the remaining Pre-Construction Stages of the scheme (finalisation of Stage 2b Outline Business Case/ Preliminary Design stage, and Stage 3 Full Business Case/ Detailed Design stage).
- c. Accepted the remaining £8.5 million of Investment Zone capital grant funding allocated to the Western Access scheme, for inclusion in the Council's Capital Programme.

Reasons for decision(s)

- The Western Access scheme (Pilsworth Road Corridor Improvements) is a cross-boundary scheme with Rochdale Council, and will provide the necessary off-site, highway and transportation infrastructure required to access the early development phases of the Northern Gateway Investment Zone (IZ) site (JPA 1.1 allocation). The construction of the Western Access scheme will create the potential capacity to unlock up to 600,000 sqm of employment generating uses and support the creation of high quality, employment floor space,

including space within the advanced manufacturing and foundational sectors.

- The completion of on-going Stage 2b activities to finalise the Outline Business Case (OBC) for the Western Access scheme will result in a preferred option for the scheme being identified and associated Preliminary Designs and an updated scheme budget estimate being prepared. Importantly, the OBC will also provide the robust strategic, economic, commercial and financial cases for the scheme. This in turn will provide the firm foundation for the development of the subsequent Stage 3 Full Business Case (FBC), which will confirm detailed designs and costings.
- Investment Zone (IZ) year one revenue grant funding was allocated to the Western Access scheme from 1st April 2024. Following Cabinet's approval of the Grant Funding Agreement (GFA) in November 2024, the Year One grant (£800,000) has already been released. In September 2025, the GMCA and Council also signed a Deed of Variation to the original GFA that released the Year 2 revenue grant (£500,000) and an advanced payment of the Year 3 revenue grant (£200,000). The GFA covering the remaining £8.5M balance of IZ capital grant has also now been agreed between the Council and GMCA and provides sufficient budget to cover the remaining costs associated with the finalisation of the Western Access scheme Stage 2B activities (OBC/ Preliminary Designs) and the subsequent Stage 3 activities (FBC / Detailed Design) in line with the project cash flow. These costs include the Balfour Beatty Civil Engineering Ltd Stage 3 contract sum and the associated Bentley Project Management (UK) Limited contract sum covering their professional services during the remainder of Stage 2b and Stage 3.
- There continues to be an urgent need to swiftly and flexibly progress the development of the Western Access scheme to meet the challenging grant funding milestone deadlines which are attached to the release of the IZ grant. These GFA milestones include the finalisation of the Western Access scheme's preliminary designs by early 2027, and production of the scheme detailed/ technical designs and costings during 2028. The approval of the Balfour Beatty Stage 3 provisional maximum, contract sum and external professional team (Bentley Project Management (UK) Limited) costs covering the remainder of Stage 2b and Stage 3, will help maintain scheme continuity and progress in line with GFA milestones and overall scheme programme. The continuation of these activities and services by the main contractor and the external professional team in line with their existing procurements and associated respective contracts, will also ensure the continued provision of the necessary resources and technical skills which the Council does not possess internally, to deliver these time critical remaining stages of the scheme's pre-construction phase.
- The IZ funding has been allocated from 1st April 2024, with a revised spend output of summer 2030 in line with the Grant Funding

Agreement scheme construction completion milestone, there is a need to move projects forward swiftly and flexibly to respond to these funding opportunities. The remaining balance of £8.5 million capital grant has now been made available to Bury Council and is required to be accepted for inclusion in the Council's capital programme.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- Delaying the approval of the Balfour Beatty Stage 3 provisional maximum, Contract Sum will in turn delay the finalisation of the Western Access scheme Full Business Case (FBC), and production of associated detailed/ technical designs and costings. Consequently, this will delay the start of the construction delivery (Stage 4), which under the grant funding requirements should commence by autumn 2028 and be completed by summer 2030. Noncompliance with funding requirements and associated GFA milestones would present a significant risk to the receipt of Investment Zone grant funding.
- That the recommendations are not approved, and the Bentley Project Management (UK) Limited contract sum covering the finalisation of Stage 2b and Stage 3 is not approved. This would jeopardise the delivery of the Western Access scheme OBC, Preliminary Designs, FBC and Detailed Designs, which would impact on the delivery of the early phases of the Northern Gateway site development. The delivery of the Western Access scheme is critical to providing the necessary highway capacity and associated sustainable transportation improvements required to unlock the initial phases of Northern Gateway for a national-scale employment opportunity.
- Continuing with the existing contractual arrangements provides best value and maintains programme certainty. Re-procurement at this stage would result in significant delay, increased mobilisation costs, duplication of design and business case activities, loss of scheme knowledge and a substantial risk to achievement of Investment Zone funding milestones.
- That the recommendations are not approved, and the remaining £8.5 million Investment Zone revenue grant funding is not fully utilised, with the funding being reallocated elsewhere in Greater Manchester. This presents a high risk to the delivery of the Places for Everyone joint development plan and specifically, the delivery of the Western Access scheme and the Northern Gateway Investment Zone (JPA1.1 allocation).
- Delaying the delivery of the Western Access scheme would erode confidence in the Council's ability to deliver a key strategic priority for both Bury Council and its strategic partners, including Rochdale Borough Council, Greater Manchester Combined Authority, Transport for Greater Manchester and National Highways. Delaying the delivery of the Western Access scheme would undermine supporting the delivery of a number of major, corporate strategies and Team Bury initiatives including the Council's 'Let's Do It' Vision and Strategy,

Northern Gateway Strategic Development Vision, Atom Valley MDZ Vision and emergent Mayoral Development Corporation, Northern Gateway Development Framework (supplementary planning document), Bury's Economic Strategy, the emergent Greater Manchester Transport Strategy, amongst others.

CA.80 NEW PERSONA SHAREHOLDER AGREEMENT - PART A

Councillor Tariq introduced the report seeking Cabinet approval to adopt a new Shareholder Agreement between Bury Council and Persona Group Ltd. and highlighted that the proposed new agreement has been developed collaboratively between the Council and Persona, with legal input. It clarifies governance, strengthens the relationship between the parties, supports service improvement and growth, and sets out arrangements for any future surpluses.

There were no comments or questions

Decision(s)

Cabinet

- Approved to adopt the new Persona Shareholder Agreement

Reasons for decision(s)

- To explore the potential for providing Persona with greater flexibility in decision making to facilitate growth in high quality service delivery by a local company which provides giving a strengths-based approach to care and support of older residents and those living with learning disabilities.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- Do nothing – Persona will be unable to respond fully to the department of health and adult care commissioning intentions and potentially miss out on growth opportunities

CA.81 EXTENSION OF LEASE FOR ST MONICA'S - PART A

Councillor Walmsley introduced the report seeking Cabinet approval for the grant of a new lease for the premises occupied by the Elms Bank College Hub, located within the former St Monica's Sixth Form buildings in Prestwich. The facility is currently leased by Oak Learning Partnership (OLP) from Salford Roman Catholic Diocesan Trustees (StoC) and provides specialist post-16 educational provision for young people with Special Educational Needs (SEN).

Councillor O'Brien highlighted that this is a welcome opportunity to continue working with the Trust.

There were no comments or questions

Decision(s)

Cabinet:

- a. Approved the current heads of terms for the grant of the new lease and associated indemnity agreement
- b. Delegated any minor variations to the final heads of terms or Indemnity Agreement to the Assistant Director of Corporate Assets and Facilities Management.

- c. Delegated the signing of the lease, Indemnity Agreement and any associated documents to Councils Monitoring Officer.

Reasons for decision(s)

- The grant of the new lease secures the operation of the Elms Bank College Hub without major capital expenditure for in the medium term.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- Not to agree to the agreement to the new lease
 - In this scenario the OLP would have to vacate the existing buildings in August 2027.
 - The Council would need to secure a suitable site and spend several million pounds on modular accommodation to ensure provision could continue past August 2027.
 - Without alternative provision OLP would in effect need to close the provision.
 - As such, this option has been discounted.

CA.82 OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED DISPOSAL OF PUBLIC OPEN SPACE - LAND ON THE NORTH SIDE OF MILTON ROAD, RADCLIFFE, BURY

The Leader advised that two members of the public, Jacqueline Daley and Elaina Daley, wished to raise questions concerning the proposed disposal. As they had been unable to attend the earlier public question session, the Leader permitted them to put their questions before Cabinet considered the report.

Elaina Daley referred to the number of bungalows in the vicinity and the needs of older and vulnerable residents. She asked how residents would be protected from any anti-social behaviour associated with a future use of the site. Jacqueline Daley asked how residents would be supported in relation to pupils travelling to and from any future educational provision.

Councillor Thorpe clarified that the item before Cabinet concerned only the proposed disposal of the land. He stated that pupils attending alternative provision should not be stereotyped and that specialist staff would support pupils if the proposed educational development progressed.

Councillor Walmsley similarly cautioned against stigma associated with alternative provision. She advised that the Council had not received complaints about its two existing alternative provision sites and that any future anti-social behaviour concerns would be addressed through the appropriate police and community safety arrangements. She also noted that any development would remain subject to the relevant planning and other approval processes.

The Leader confirmed that further decisions would be required before any development could take place. He undertook to maintain communication and provide opportunities for residents to engage as the proposals developed.

Councillor Thorpe introduced the report, which asked Cabinet to consider the objections received following the statutory advertisement of the proposed disposal of public open space on the north side of Milton Road, Radcliffe, and to determine whether the disposal should proceed.

Councillor Birchmore expressed concern that the report included the formal objections but did not reproduce the comments made at the separate engagement event held on 29 September 2026. She asked why there was no detailed report of attendance and feedback from that event; why the event appeared to focus on the proposed alternative provision rather than the disposal; why Cabinet Members had not attended; whether Cabinet Members had read the section 123 material; and how many had visited the site.

Councillor Thorpe responded that the attendance of education officers had enabled residents to obtain information about the possible future use of the site. He confirmed that he had not attended the event or previously visited the site, but was familiar with the location and had read the section 123 report. The Leader confirmed that he had visited the site on a number of occasions and acknowledged that discussion of the disposal and the proposed educational development, which was the next item on the agenda, could overlap.

The Monitoring Officer clarified that the statutory process under section 123(2A) of the Local Government Act 1972 was distinct from the later engagement event. She advised that the statutory advertisement had run from 27 August to 3 September 2026 and that the report set out the objections received during that period. The event held on 29 September 2026 was a separate pre-consultation engagement exercise concerning issues that could arise if the proposal progressed. A summary of the feedback from that event had been made available to Members.

Councillor Birchmore stated that attendees had signed in and attributed their comments, but that those comments had not been reproduced verbatim. She considered that the summary did not provide residents with sufficient assurance that their views had been heard. The Leader confirmed that the summary and the objections received during the statutory period had been provided and that the views and comments had been taken into account.

Councillor Birchmore referred to a question raised at the Council meeting on 16 September 2026 about the timing and transparency of the engagement event. She also referred to subsequent project reports dated 30 September and 5 October 2026 and asked what evidence demonstrated that the statutory objections had been individually assessed, how they had influenced the recommendations, and that Cabinet remained open-minded and had not predetermined the matter.

Councillor Thorpe responded that no decision had been made before Cabinet's consideration of the report. He advised that preparatory work had been undertaken in parallel to make effective use of time and resources, but that this did not determine the outcome of the disposal decision. He stated that the report enabled Cabinet to consider the objections before deciding whether the land should be made available for disposal. He also referred to the need to improve facilities for vulnerable children currently educated in sub-optimal accommodation.

Councillor Rydeheard referred to residents' concerns about the pace of the process and the number of representations relating to the loss of green space. He asked how those concerns had been taken into account and what consideration had been given to residents' access to alternative open space.

Councillor Thorpe stated that the Council should progress its objectives promptly where possible. He acknowledged concerns that other nearby areas of public open space might be less accessible because of distance or safety and stated that Cabinet was required to balance the loss of public open space against the need to provide suitable facilities for children in the borough.

Councillor L Smith advised that work was under way to review the borough's parks and open spaces, including their public health, biodiversity and community value, to support appropriate provision and maintenance across the borough. Following a further question from Councillor Rydeheard about the effect of losing this particular area of land, Councillor Thorpe undertook to provide further detail. Cabinet noted that the decision before it concerned the proposed disposal of public open space. It did not itself grant planning permission or finally approve the proposed educational development, which was considered separately under the following agenda item and remained subject to the relevant statutory and approval processes.

Decision(s)

Cabinet:

1. considered the objections received in response to the statutory advertisement of the proposed disposal of the public open space shown edged red on the plan at Appendix 1, together with the officer analysis and the additional information made available following the engagement event held on 29 September 2026; and
2. having taken those matters into account, resolved to proceed with the proposed disposal of the land.

Reasons for decision(s)

- Cabinet considered the objections relating to the loss of public open space and the matters raised concerning accessibility, amenity and the availability of alternative open space. Having balanced those matters against the reasons for making the land available for the proposed educational development, Cabinet concluded that the disposal should proceed. The decision concerned the proposed disposal of the land and did not determine any subsequent planning application.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- Not to proceed with the proposed disposal. This option was rejected after Cabinet had considered the statutory objections, the officer analysis and had balanced the identified loss of public open space against the reasons for making the site available for the proposed educational development.

CA.83 NEW ASH GROVE ADDITIONAL PROVISION ACADEMY

Councillor Walmsley introduced the report seeking to progress the delivery of a new permanent facility for the Ash Grove Alternative Provision (AP) Academy on the proposed Milton Road site in Radcliffe. The proposal represents a significant investment in the borough's education infrastructure and forms a key element of the Council's commitment to improving outcomes for some of Bury's most vulnerable children and young people.

The Council has a statutory responsibility to ensure that appropriate educational provision is available for children who are unable to access mainstream education. In December 2024, the

Council entered into a legal agreement with Oak Learning Partnership (OLP) to provide a permanent, single-site location for Ash Grove Alternative Provision Academy by September 2028. The proposed development will replace the current temporary arrangements across multiple sites, creating a modern, purpose-built facility capable of accommodating up to 136 pupils in an inclusive, supportive, and adaptable learning environment.

The development will support the delivery of the Council's Alternative Provision Strategy; address identified gaps in local educational provision and ensure compliance with statutory and contractual obligations. Importantly, it will provide a long-term, sustainable solution that improves educational opportunities, strengthens support for vulnerable learners, and reduces the Council's reliance on temporary accommodation and external provision arrangements.

The Council has a statutory duty under Section 19 of the Education Act 1996 to provide suitable education for children who cannot attend mainstream school due to exclusion, illness, or other reasons. Alternative Provision (AP) is therefore not discretionary; it is a legal requirement. Bury currently lacks a permanent site for its main AP. Following relocation from the former Spring Lane site, provision operates from temporary accommodation across two locations, creating operational inefficiencies, and limiting the development of a coherent local Alternative Provision offer for our children.

Councillor Birchmore queried why the cost per pupil is so much higher than star academy and whether we know how many permanent exclusions there were last year?

Councillor Walmsley confirmed that alternative provision costs more per pupil than general population schooling. She also confirmed there were 66 permanent exclusions last year.

Ben Dunne, Director, Education & Skills added that permanent exclusions across Bury are far too high compared to our Greater Manchester neighbours. The vast majority of our suspensions and permanent exclusions sit in secondary schools. This is also a national issue. An alternative provision academy that provides a genuine inclusion hub, outreach support, short term intervention places and provides a centre for excellence all hinge around a provision setting that can focus on those things. This is an opportunity to intervene earlier and support schools earlier so they don't find themselves in a situation where they have to permanently exclude children.

As we haven't had these options in Bury before, we have had to rely on expensive independent specialist placements, out of borough provision, high transport costs, crisis interventions, and high numbers of youngsters going into youth justice.

Alternative provision can be a turning point for young people. Perception that the new alternative provision is for a new group of youngsters who will come into the borough is not the case. There is already a group of children in provisions that aren't fit for purpose.

Councillor Birchmore commented that we need to address the fact we have a high number of exclusions.

Councillor Walmsley agreed with Councillor Birchmore's comments. There are ongoing discussions with head teachers, Multi Academy Trusts and there is a lot of work going on behind the scenes to reduce the number of suspensions and permanent exclusions.

Councillor Rydeheard acknowledged that not all schools are as big as others in the borough and therefore some schools will be able to do more than others. Councillor Rydeheard also queried youth justice and that as these children are already in Bury, is there a potential for savings on youth justice strategy and about the loans and whether these can be consolidated.

Councillor Walmsley advised that lots of these issues refer to secondary schools but right about capacity in schools. There will be savings in youth justice if this is done right, there are also potential savings in health, mental health, youth crime, policing, and all public services.

Councillor Thorpe advised that there is currently no provision in the budget due to the number of hurdles required to be completed to be able to get this moving and a live project. Hoping we can get some grant funding from the DfE and work is ongoing to look at that. May also be able to use already committed capital that we don't move forward with to mitigate impact.

Decision(s)

Cabinet:

- Approved the use of the Milton Road site (see appended site plan in Stage 3 Report) for the proposed new Ash Grove Alternative Provision (AP) Academy.
- Approved the current designs to be submitted for full Planning Approval.
- Approved the funding strategy detailed below for a budget of £17m and delegate spending authority to the Executive Director of Place in conjunction with Director of Law and Governance to oversee implementation of relevant contracts.
- Approved the Procurement strategy approach for the engagement of a suitable contractor/consultant team.

Reasons for decision(s)

- To ensure the Council complies with an academisation legal agreement entered into with the Oak Learning Partnership Trust by providing a permanent school facility by September 2028.
- Any delays in the proposed programme contained in the Stage 3 report could result in failure to deliver.
- It is possible that legal action may be taken if the Council does not meet its contracted legal obligations. OLP could also take actions to withdraw six-day provision and renegotiate any remaining placement costs. Ultimately, it would further compromise the lives of some of Bury's most vulnerable young people having had their previous Radcliffe sites relocated to the current temporary locations of New Kershaw and Whittaker Street.
- The additional cost in having to extend the rental agreements for the temporary modular buildings at Whittaker Street and New Kershaw to accommodate the Students at OLP Ash Grove beyond the agreed current two years could be at least £150,000.00 per annum.

CA.84 PROPOSED CREATION OF AN END-TO-END GREATER MANCHESTER FOSTERING HUB

Councillor Walmsley introduced the report seeking approval for Bury Council to join the expanded Greater Manchester End-to-End Fostering Hub, hosted by Rochdale Borough Council, which would manage fostering recruitment, assessment and approval functions on behalf of all ten Greater Manchester authorities and is a corner stone of the GM Regional Care Cooperative, leading on the commissioning and sufficiency of homes for children in care.

Councillor Walmsley highlighted that Bury, like other councils across Greater Manchester, faces increasing challenges in recruiting and retaining foster carers. This has contributed to greater reliance on costly residential placements and external provision. The proposed model

aims to increase the number of approved foster carers through a more consistent, specialist and regional approach.

Councillor Rydeheard commented that it is a positive thing to retain kinship element.

Decision(s)

Cabinet:

- Endorsed the proposal for the transition from the current Greater Manchester Fostering Recruitment Hub model to an end-to-end regional fostering hub model hosted by Rochdale Council.
- Noted the national policy context, including the Government's ambition to create 10,000 additional fostering placements and the associated Department for Education funding opportunities available to participating authorities.
- Noted and agreed the delegation of agreement by the Director of Children's Services (in consultation with other authorities and the portfolio holder for Children's Services and the S151 officer) of the proposed funding formula and resource contributions for fiscal years 2026/27 and 2027/28.
- Noted and agreed the proposed HR recommendation on 2-year secondment opportunities for the staff in scope. Secondment is subject to staff in scope consenting.
- Delegated authority to the Director of Children's Services, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Children's Services and Education and the Monitoring Officer, to implement those arrangements and approve any operational matters necessary for their delivery.

Reasons for decision(s)

- Securing sufficient fostering households remains a significant challenge for Bury and across Greater Manchester and beyond. By the end of 2024/25, the number of Greater Manchester children in mainstream fostering placements was 7% lower than six years earlier, with a sharper 10% reduction in in-house mainstream placements. Over the same period, mainstream residential placements across all provider types increased by 41%. The resulting increased reliance on residential care continues to create significant financial pressure across all Greater Manchester Local Authority budgets. The latest published outturn figures for local authority revenue expenditure suggest that Greater Manchester collectively spent at least £920m on children's social care across 2024/25, including £530m purely on children in care, chiefly their homes.
- In 2025/2026 the Greater Manchester Fostering Hub received 86 enquiries from carers interested in fostering for Bury and this led to 27 initial visits. The 27 initial visits led to 14 applications and assessments commencing and at the end of the year 3 approvals had been made, a further 2 assessments were ongoing. This shows that the Hub received a reasonable number of enquiries (86) and 43% (27) of these enquiries led to a home visit. 52% (14) of home visits to prospective foster carers led to an application and assessment but only 21% (3) led to approvals in year. This is an in-year enquiry to approval rate of 3.4%.
- The Foster for Greater Manchester Hub is already demonstrating measurable improvement at the front end of the recruitment pathway in all aspects within its scope . Since launch, 99.8% of initial enquiries have been responded to within one working day, more than a quarter of initial enquiries have converted to an initial visit, and conversion from initial visit to application has increased by 10 percentage points, reaching its highest level in three years. The first-year

review also found that 51% of initial visits converted to application, compared with 41% in the 12 months prior to May 2024, while initial enquiry to initial visit conversion improved by seven percentage points.

- The introduction of foster carer ambassadors has strengthened applicant engagement, with application rates 36% higher for households supported by an ambassador. More recent performance data also shows a strengthening pipeline, with households in assessment increasing by 30% compared with the previous year and 11 household approvals recorded in May 2026. However, approvals remain below the DfE baseline, with 106 household approvals against a baseline of 116, and there remains significant variation in application-to-approval conversion across local authorities, ranging from 11.1% to 51.7%. This variation in performance supports the case for moving to an end-to-end model, which would allow Greater Manchester to build on improved early-stage performance, while creating greater consistency, grip and accountability across assessment and approval.
- Further details on the activity required to deliver against the DfE minimum expectations of a regionalised fostering hub are provided below.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- The first alternative would be to disband the existing hub and revert to the 10 Greater Manchester LA's undertaking all fostering recruitment work. The declining number of fostering households and placements over several years and improvement in conversion rates in the initial stages of the process since the inception of the hub, would evidence this is not a workable option. Furthermore, scoping exercises regarding staff currently undertaking recruitment activity within each LA, would suggest that it is, in some LA's, under resourced and not prioritised in terms of staffing allocation to the task. In addition, this would not be consistent with the Governments expectations.
- The second alternative is to continue with the Hub as is, undertaking enquiry to application, the hub has evidenced improvement in consistency and conversion rates from enquiry to application. This has not resulted in a significant improvement in approval rates, following the application being handed over to the respective LA for assessment. This option does not therefore provide improved sufficiency capacity, increased placement choice for children or budgetary benefits from reducing dependency on residential care and is therefore not recommended.

CA.85 FAMILIES FIRST PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMME - PART A

Councillor Walmsley introduced the report seeking Cabinet approval for Bury's proposed implementation approach to the national Families First Partnership Programme (FFPP). The reforms aim to shift children's services towards earlier intervention, prevention, stronger multi-agency safeguarding, and greater involvement of families in decision-making.

Councillor Rydeheard queried the grant funding and whether we have anticipated the possibility that the funding may get cut and our response in the event that it does.

Councillor Walmsley confirmed that it has been taken into consideration and that safeguards would need to be put in place to ensure the service can continue.

Decision (s)
Cabinet

- a. Approved the implementation of the Families First Partnership Programme operating model as set out in this report.
- b. Approved the use of Families First Partnership Programme grant funding to support implementation of the model and associated service transformation arrangements.
- c. Approved commencement of formal consultation with affected staff and trade unions regarding the proposed organisational and staffing changes arising from implementation of the Programme.
- d. Delegated authority to the Executive Director of Children and Young People, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People and the Monitoring Officer, to take such actions as are necessary to implement the approved model and associated operational arrangements.
- e. Noted that implementation of the Programme will contribute to compliance with relevant statutory duties and the reforms introduced by the Children's Wellbeing and Schools Act 2026.

Reasons for decision(s)

- Implementation of the Families First Partnership Programme is part of the national children's social care reform programme and provides Bury with an opportunity to strengthen our Family Safeguarding model of practice, while also delivering services in line with relevant statutory guidance, including Working Together to Safeguard Children, and the Families First Partnership Programme delivery expectations
- Families First is a significant system reform programme that will improve outcomes for children and families through earlier intervention, strengthened multi-agency safeguarding and greater family involvement in decision-making. Approval will enable the Council and its partners to comply with national policy expectations, secure the benefits of government investment, establish robust governance and accountability arrangements, and support the delivery of a sustainable, integrated model of family support across Bury

Alternative options considered and rejected

The Families First Partnership Programme is a national reform programme supported by programme guidance, grant conditions and elements of the Children's Wellbeing and Schools Act 2026, which seeks to reform how services to children and families are delivered by local authority children's services and partner agencies

CA.86 10-YEAR OCCUPATIONAL LEASE - 6B & 6C BRIDGE TRADING ESTATE

Councillor Tariq introduced the report seeking to approve a new 10-year lease for Units 6B and 6C at Bridge Trading Estate, which are used by Bury Adult Care Equipment Services. These premises provide the operational base for the storage, management and distribution of essential equipment, aids and adaptations that help residents remain safe and independent at home. The service also supports hospital discharge and helps avoid unnecessary admissions. The previous lease has ended following notice served by the landlord, and terms have now been agreed for a new lease running from May 2025 to May 2035. The proposed rent is higher than the current rent, but reflects current market conditions and avoids the significant cost, disruption and service risk associated with relocation.

Cllr Rydeheard asked a question on the market conditions and what assessments or considerations have taken place as to whether the market conditions are at a premium to what they otherwise would have been under market conditions as they are.

Roger Frith, Assistant Director of Corporate Assets & Facilities Management confirmed that the rent is reasonable at the moment for units that size.

Councillor Birchmore queried what the items were that are stored at this facility.

Councillor Tariq confirmed the equipment stored at the facility included hoists, specialist and stair lifts.

Decision(s)

Cabinet

- Approved a 10-year lease of 6b & 6c Bridge Trading Estate, on the terms set out in this report, to enable Adult Care Equipment Services to remain in occupation

Reasons for decision(s)

- Adult Care Equipment Services provides an essential service and requires secure, uninterrupted occupation of suitable premises to maintain continuity of service.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- Vacation of the unit - This would create a direct risk to the continuity of Adult Care Equipment Services. The unit is already configured for the storage, management and distribution of equipment, aids and adaptations, and loss of occupation would disrupt an essential operational service that supports residents to remain safe and independent at home. Vacation would mean either:
 - Finding alternative premises - This option has been rejected because there are no readily available alternative premises currently identified that would provide an equivalent operational base. Moving the service would require the Council to source suitable accommodation, negotiate terms, undertake any necessary fit-out works, relocate equipment and manage transition arrangements. This would create additional cost, operational risk and potential service disruption. It may also give rise to reinstatement liabilities at the existing premises.
 - Close the equipment store - This option has been rejected because the store support the provision of equipment to residents with care and support needs. Closure would therefore undermine the Council's ability to maintain continuity of an essential Adult Care service.

CA.87

HIGHWAYS CAPITAL PROGRAMME - HIGHWAY MAINTENANCE FUNDING 2026/27

Councillor Smith introduced the report seeking to support the maintenance and improvement of Bury's highway assets for 2026/27.

Councillor Birchmore queried the resurfacing scheme for 26/27 on the website it states 'to be confirmed', when will the council determine which roads will be resurfaced?

Councillor Smith confirmed that historically had stated all the roads that were planned to be completed but due to various reasons this does have to change. Details will be updated as we purchase the blocks and works are confirmed.

Councillor Rydeheard queried whether the factors contained in the draft budget have been taken into account as to feasibility for the delivery timescale and what impacts that could have on delaying some of the proposals set out.

Councillor Smith confirmed that a proposed change in structure of the highways team is being consulted on. Vacancies are being held in line with this.

Decision(s)

Cabinet

- Approved the Highways Capital Investment Programme and associated funding allocation set out in Table 2.
- Approved the proposed asset management and prioritisation approach used to determine investment priorities across the highway network, as detailed in Appendix 1.
- Approved the proposed works on culverts and structures detailed Appendix 2.
- Noted the previously approved road safety programme detail in Appendix 3.
- Delegated authority to Executive Director of Place, in consultation with Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Smith Cabinet Member for Environment, Climate Change and Operations to approve amendments to the programme of work and prioritisation method where required, to respond to changing asset condition, emerging risks, funding opportunities and delivery considerations.

Reasons for Decision(s)

- The Council, as the Highway Authority for Bury, has a statutory duty to maintain the public highway and associated infrastructure, including structures deemed to be publicly maintainable. The proposed programme provides a balanced and risk-based approach to managing the borough's highway assets, ensuring investment is targeted towards those interventions that deliver the greatest benefit in terms of safety, asset condition, network resilience and long-term value for money.
- The programme has been developed using asset management principles to prioritise investment based on condition, risk and network need, helping to manage deterioration across the network, protect previous investment and reduce future maintenance liabilities. It supports the Council's wider priorities for economic growth, connectivity, thriving communities and resilient public infrastructure.
- Approval of the programme will also enable the Council to utilise external funding allocations within the conditions and delivery timescales attached to those funding streams, including the Mayor's Pothole Fund, CRSTS and Integrated Transport Block funding. Failure to commit funding through an approved programme risks delaying delivery, affecting spend profiles and reducing the Council's ability to maximise the benefits of available investment within the required funding periods.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

- Alternative investment approaches have been considered. However, the recommended programme represents the most effective use of available funding based on asset condition, risk, deliverability and strategic need. The proposed approach ensures investment is prioritised transparently and consistently in accordance with the Council's Highway Asset Management Plan and the requirements of external funding providers.

CA.88 LIVE WELL IMPLEMENTATION IN THE BOROUGH

Councillor Tariq introduced the report seeking approval to accept and allocate £676,000 of Greater Manchester Live Well under the terms of a grant agreement with GMCA funding for both Year 2 and Year 3 of the programme.

The Live Well programme is a Greater Manchester initiative designed to reduce health, social and economic inequalities through neighbourhood-based support, stronger community networks, and integrated public services.

Councillor Smith welcomed the paper and thanked the team for the transformation in Besses.

Councillor Birchmore highlighted that pride in place funding is not money for the council nor should it be treated as a replacement for council funding.

Councillor Tariq clarified that there is no intent on our behalf to present this as a replacement.

Decision(s)

Cabinet

1. Noted the good progress of Live Well year 1 funding to establish the Whitefield Live Well centre in Besses and note the VCFA utilisation of half of the grant award to support the Live Well centre and invest in community capacity in Whitefield and beyond.
2. Approved entering into a further grant agreement to secure the £676,000 from GMCA for Years 2 and 3 and the allocation of £338,000 to Bury VCFA in each year, subject to appropriate grant funding arrangements.
3. Noted the priorities for VCFA investment in Year 2 and approve the proposals for spend for the Year 2 Council element of the grant funding.
4. Agreed a framework for prioritisation of Live Well investment across the borough for year 3.

Reasons for decision(s)

- Approval of the recommendations secures £676,000 from the GM Live Well Fund for year 2 and year 3 and provides for investment in the Bury VCFA of half of that in each year - £338,000 – to continue the implementation of Live Well in the borough following the year 1 pilot in Whitefield. The GM Live Well programme does not require match funding and is completely aligned with the principles of the LETS Do It Strategy.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- The alternative option to obtaining the grant funding is to not receive it which is a missed opportunity to deliver a key aspect of the council Lets Do It strategy, with no benefit.
- It will be noted it is a condition of the grant that 50% of the funding received should be spent with the local voluntary and community sector. There is an alternative that would see the Council administer multiple grants to local voluntary and community sector colleagues rather than inviting the VCFA to lead that, but it would require additional administrative and management resource in the council to do that and VCFA have well established and mature grant management processes and knowledge of the voluntary and community sector in the borough. This alternative is therefore rejected.

CA.89 DRAFT 2027/28 BUDGET

Councillor Thorpe introduced the report highlighting that the 2026/27 Final Budget Report presented to Budget Council on 25 February 2026 set out the Council's budget requirement for the 2026/27 financial year and provided details on the Council's reserves position. This report presents an updated budget position for 2027/28, comprising a refreshed budget assumptions and funding movements and a draft revenue savings.

Councillor Thorpe confirmed that the proposed review of the youth service and participation has now been removed from the consultation.

Councillor Rydeheard confirmed there were lots of pre submitted questions from members and a useful discussion was held at Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Rydeheard queried the 75k saving in waste collection and highlighted he is dealing with missed bins in his ward and asked what more detail can be provided and clarity that this proposal won't impact residents any further.

Councillor Thorpe advised the savings are being achieved you the rationalisation of the service to make it more efficient.

Councillor Smith confirmed we are not proposing to remove any waste collection rounds but acknowledged that there are problems in certain areas that need to be reviewed.

Councillor Rydeheard advised members had discussed the garden waste charge at Overview and Scrutiny and the possibility this could lead to a net loss and queried whether there were any plans to try to forecast what that is likely to be and whether we could map the impact this could have?

Councillor Thorpe advised that at Overview and Scrutiny they discussed the potential impacts of implementing this policy which could have a detrimental impact on delivering this policy. There is a plausibility that it doesn't work however, work to date shows that we would be able to deliver this effectively as have several other councils in Greater Manchester.

Councillor L Smith advised that there is some risks but we are going to be mitigating them really well. As part of the improvement programme, there will be a waste strategy and this policy would sit within this.

Councillor Vernon queried the response he received when he asked a question about the green waste levy several years ago and what has changed since then.

Councillor Thorpe highlighted that circumstances change over time and that this is being included within a wider waste strategy to help meet our 2035 targets.

Councillor O'Brien advised that there is a lot more genuine uncertainty on the impact this would have several years ago. Lots of authorities across the country do this already and Stockport and Trafford have now since implemented it. We can now say with greater certainty what impacts implementing this policy will have. The financial position is very challenging so proposals that we may not have considered in the past need to be looked at now.

Councillor Birchmoer felt there was some information around costings that was missing from the proposals and would like this information to be brought back to Overview and Scrutiny to enable them to review the proposals properly.

Councillor Thorpe responded that these proposals have been brought forward earlier than normally happens and so the detail is being worked on and will be presented with the final budget proposals.

Councillor Rydeheard highlighted that other authorities deal with garden waste in different ways and whether we were planning on consulting on the method of implementation.

Councillor L Smith confirmed that the consultation would include the method for implementing this policy.

Decision(s)

Cabinet

1. Approved the updated Medium-Term Financial Strategy to 2029/30, including the underlying assumptions regarding resources and spending requirements.
2. Approved the Draft 2027/28 Revenue Budget and Medium-Term Financial Strategy position as set out within this report, including the forecast remaining budget gap of £9.585m for 2027/28 and cumulative gap of £17.508m by 2029/30, as the basis for consultation and further budget development.
3. Approved the total budget assumptions of £29.945m in 2027/28.
4. Approved the new saving proposals totalling £17.451m over the period 2027/28 to 2029/30, including £10.747m in 2027/28, £2.686m of which are subject to the outcome of the public budget consultation of which £1.070m relates to 2027/28.
5. Noted the total savings programme of £27.251m over the period of 2027/28 to 2029/30, including £17.560m in 2027/28.
6. Approved public consultation on the draft budget assumptions and new savings requiring a policy decision between 19th October to 30th November 2026.
7. Noted that the outcomes of the budget consultation will be reported back to Members and used to inform the final budget setting proposals and referred to Overview & Scrutiny Committee for their consideration.
8. Noted the draft proposal to increase Council Tax by 4.99% in 2027/28 and the remaining years of the MTFS 2028/30 (comprising 2.99% general increase and 2.0% adult social care precept) in line with the current referendum limits.
9. Noted the progress to date in relation to the voluntary exit scheme.
10. Noted the workforce savings, which is primarily the product of funding optimisation, vacancy deletion and organisational redesign and does not represent a change in policy. The intention is to bring forward further proposals to increase the overall workforce-related contributions (including the progression of the voluntary exit scheme).
11. Noted the recurring savings and exit costs resulting from workforce reductions will be included in the Final Budget Report and reported to Cabinet and Council in February 2027.
12. Approved the use of flexible capital receipts or capitalisation direction in the form of borrowing to fund eligible severance and transformation costs arising from the delivery of the budget strategy and associated workforce proposals in accordance with the statutory guidance issued by MHCLG with the final allocation to be determined by the Director of Finance.
13. Approved the assumptions relating to sales, fees and charges included with the draft budget and note that detailed schedules will be presented as part of the Final Budget Report.
14. Noted the forecast reserves balance for 2027/28 and limited capacity of reserves to support future budget gaps.

15. Noted the Section 151 Officer's assessment of the Council's financial position and the reasons why exploration of Exceptional Financial Support is considered necessary;
16. Authorised the Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Chief Executive, Monitoring Officer and the Cabinet Member for Finance and Corporate Services to explore Exceptional Financial Support with MHCLG, conduct negotiations, provide financial assurance and finalise and submit the application to cover any remaining funding gap in advance of final budget setting.

Reasons for decision(s)

- The Council has a legal requirement annually to set a balanced budget and Council Tax and where necessary undertake consultation with the public, businesses, stakeholders and internally with staff and through Overview & Scrutiny Committee.
- To update members on the Council's budgetary position and set out the work plan to reduce the forecast budget gap ahead of Budget Council on 24th February 2027.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- The current assumption within the MTFS is for an on-going 4.99% annual Council Tax increase (2.99% general precept and 2% adult social care precept) which is built into the core spending power assumptions within the 2026/27 to 2028/29 Local Government Finance Settlement.
- An alternative option could be made to increase its 'relevant basic amount of council tax' above the levels that will be set out in the Local Government Finance Settlement, but this would require holding a local referendum and a majority vote.
- A 1% increase or decrease in Council Tax is equivalent to c£1.311m of additional funding.

CA.90 PRESTWICH VILLAGE REGENERATION PROJECT: PHASE 1A (TRAVEL HUB) - OPERATIONS STRATEGY

Councillor Morris introduced the report seeking approval for the strategy, charging and tariff structure to enable the Travel Hub to be open and fully operational within the required timeline.

Councillor Rydeheard queried whether there was a mechanism in place to the council to hold APCOA to account if anything does go wrong?

Councillor Morris confirmed that the car park would be operated using ANPR and barriers so the likelihood of incorrect fines being issued were minimal.

Councillor Birchmore queried whether any funds in terms of parking have to be ringfenced?

Councillor O'Brien confirmed that the council cannot use it for income generation. Any income is ringfenced around the wider service.

Neil Kisson, Director of Finance confirmed that we will have ringfence and statutory car park account that will have full transparency on how it has been collected and utilised.

Councillor Rydeheard queried whether there was an agreement in place for this particular car park that the payment of charges goes to the land owner and payment of fines go to the operator?

Councillor Morris confirmed that we pay a cost to APCOA each year and any income received will go towards paying that.

Decision(s)

Cabinet:

- Acknowledged APCOA Parking (UK) Limited (Company number 02572947) as the appointed third-party operator for the Travel Hub.
- Approved the operations strategy to facilitate the opening of the Travel Hub.
- Approved the introduction of parking charges and other charges in the new Prestwich Travel Hub and subsequent agreement to the implementation of a tariff structure as set out in Section 8 of this report.

Reasons for recommendation(s)

- To successfully facilitate the Travel Hub opening to the public (once APCOA is fully mobilised) now construction of the building is practically complete and is within the Council's ownership.
- To enable the Travel Hub to have an operations strategy including a charging and parking tariff structure in place to generate income and cover APCOA's operational costs for managing the facility. Opening the Travel Hub without implementing charging would mean that the Council would need to subsidise the facility by approximately £300,000 per annum.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- Not agreeing to the operations strategy but this would prevent the Travel Hub from opening.
- Not introducing a charges and parking tariff structure but this would prevent the Council from generating income to be able to cover the costs of a third-party operator managing the Travel Hub.
- Various parking tariff options have been considered and financially modelled, but the recommended option is in keeping (as much as possible) with the current parking tariffs within Bury Town Centre (noting the differences between the operation of a surface-level car park and a building) and overall, represents best value for money, including meeting the annual operating costs of APCOA.

CA.91 PARKING AND BUS LANE ENFORCEMENT SERVICES

Councillor L Smith introduced the report seeking Cabinet approval for interim and longer-term contractual arrangements that will maintain parking and moving traffic enforcement services and support an integrated, resilient and value-for-money service.

There were no comments or questions.

Decision(s)

Cabinet

- Noted that the previous enforcement services contract with Marston (Holdings) Limited (Company number 04305487) expired on 31 August 2026 and that services have continued to be provided by the incumbent supplier.

- Approved the use of a compliant procurement framework to award a short call-off contract for value of £600,000 to Marston (Holdings) Limited (Company number 04305487) for the continued provision of enforcement services pending procurement of a long-term solution. This short-term contract to commence following approval and expiring on 31st March 2027
- Authorised the Executive Director (Place), in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Climate Change and Operations and Director of Law and Democratic Services, to finalise and enter into the framework call-off contract and ancillary documentation.
- Approved commencement of a procurement exercise for a replacement long-term enforcement services contract for a value of £5,000,000.
- Authorised the Executive Director (Place), in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Climate Change and Operations and Director of Law and Democratic Services, to undertake all steps necessary to conduct the procurement process.
- Authorised the Executive Director (Place), in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Climate Change and Operations and Director of Law and Democratic Services, to award and enter into the replacement contract following completion of the procurement process, subject to approved budget and procurement parameters.
- Delegated authority to approve lawful contract modifications, mobilisation arrangements and ancillary contractual documentation required in connection with the framework call-off contract or replacement contract

Reasons for decision(s)

- The Council is required to maintain effective parking and moving traffic enforcement services to support its statutory traffic management responsibilities. The proposed short term framework call off arrangement will provide service continuity whilst a longer term procurement is undertaken. The longer term procurement will enable the Council to develop a more integrated enforcement service, improving operational efficiency, accountability and value for money. The recommendations provide an appropriate governance framework to support both the immediate service requirements and the future delivery of enforcement services.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- Alternative delivery and procurement options were considered as part of the review of future enforcement arrangements. The recommended approach was considered to provide the most appropriate balance of service continuity, operational effectiveness, value for money and future flexibility. Other options were not progressed as they were not considered to deliver the Council's requirements as effectively as the proposed approach.

CA.92 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 10 July 2026 be noted.

CA.93 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

CA.94 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.95 NEW SHAREHOLDER AGREEMENT WITH PERSONA PART B - OCTOBER CABINET 2026

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

Decision(s)

Cabinet:

1. Adopted the new Persona Shareholder Agreement

Reasons for recommendation(s)

2. To explore the potential for providing Persona with greater flexibility in decision making to facilitate growth in high quality service delivery by a local company which provides giving a strengths-based approach to care and support of older residents and those living with learning disabilities.

Alternative options considered and rejected

3. Do nothing – Persona will be unable to respond fully to the department of health and adult care commissioning intentions and potentially miss out on growth opportunities

CA.96 EXTENSION OF LEASE FOR ST MONICA'S - PART B

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

Decision(s)

1. Cabinet
 - a. Approved the current heads of terms for the grant of the new lease.
 - b. Delegated any minor variations to the final heads of terms to the Assistant Director of Corporate Assets and Facilities Management.
 - c. Delegated the signing of the lease and any associated documents to Councils Monitoring Officer.

Reasons for recommendation(s)

2. The grant of the new lease secures the operation of the Elms Bank College Hub without major capital expenditure for in the medium term.

CA.97 FAMILIES FIRST PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMME - PART B

Councillor Walmsley introduced the Part B report which included the full financial details.

Decision(s)

1. Cabinet:

- a. Approved the implementation of the Families First Partnership Programme operating model as set out in the Part A: Families First Partnership Programme report.
- b. Approved the use of Families First Partnership Programme grant funding to support implementation of the model and associated service transformation arrangements.
- c. Approved commencement of formal consultation with affected staff and trade unions regarding the proposed organisational and staffing changes arising from implementation of the Programme as set out in the Part A Families First Programme report, and noting the additional detail provided in this report.
- d. Delegated authority to the Executive Director of Children and Young People, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People and the Monitoring Officer, to take such actions as are necessary to implement the approved model and associated operational arrangements.
- e. Noted that implementation of the Programme will contribute to compliance with relevant statutory duties and the reforms introduced by the Children's Wellbeing and Schools Act 2026.

Reasons for decision(s)

- 2. Refer to report - Part A Families First Partnership Programme.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- 3. Refer to report - Part A Families First Partnership Programme.

COUNCILLOR E O'BRIEN

Chair

(Note: The meeting started at 6.00pm and ended at 8.35pm)