

Minutes of: CABINET

Date of Meeting: 9 July 2025

Present: Councillor E O'Brien (in the Chair)
Councillors S Thorpe, T Tariq, S Walmsley, A Quinn, R Gold
and C Morris

Also in attendance: Councillors R Bernstein, M Smith, J Rydeheard and
C Birchmore

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

Apologies for Absence: Councillor L Smith and Councillor C Cummins

CA.1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Lucy Smith, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, and Councillor Clare Cummins, Cabinet Member for Housing Services, Lynne Ridsdale, Chief Executive, Jeanette Richards, Executive Director Children and Young People.

CA.2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

CA.3 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Eleven members of the public attended and asked questions of the Cabinet.

The following question was asked by a member of the public, Jess Wiseman:

Can the Council confirm that the £480,000 disposal price for the Pinfold Lane Library approved by the Cabinet in February 2025 was based on the joint NHS Council valuation completed in December 2024, as reference in the Cabinet minutes and Part A report?

Responding, Councillor O'Brien reported that he wasn't in the position to confirm a sale price, as this was confidential due to commercial confidentiality. The questioner was right to suggest there have been previous figures of the value for that site, which is the usual guiding price for any deal that we would make. Although not in a position to confirm anything tonight he was hopeful that in the near future we should be able to provide the details. Once the NHS have finalised the deal within their own structures that should then allow us to be clear about the price paid for the site and hoped that will clarify how it relates to previous assessments of the value of the site.

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

Can the Council confirm the nature of the potential breach of section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 that was identified in or around April 2025. I'm not asking for legal advice, just a summary of the issue that was raised.

Responding, Councillor O'Brien reported that the starting position is that the Council's legal advice does not state that there was a breach. This is helpful in clarifying any speculation around it – people may have opinions otherwise, but that is not what our external, independent legal opinion concluded. Ask our Director of Law and Governance to confirm how things are considered internally in the Council and how it informs our thinking.

Jacqui Dennis advised that in considering section 123, the Council may dispose of land held by ourselves in any manner we wish, however in doing so we should not dispose of land for a consideration less than that that can be reasonably obtained. So in terms of how the Council made its decision, it obtained a joint valuation with the NHS, that was considered. Cabinet received a report in February where members agreed to transact with the NHS to sell the land. In terms of the consideration, reliance was placed on an independent valuation, and it was on this basis the Council undertook to enter in to this sale.

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

Since Cabinet gave consent to dispose of the site at £480,000, has the proposed sale price changed and, if so, on whose authority, and was that change reported back to the Cabinet or benchmarked against any other offers?

Responding, Councillor O'Brien reiterated that he was not in a position tonight to confirm any sale price. I am confident and hopeful we can in the near future. At that point I would hope to assume Members and members of the public that this deal has been negotiated and completed on a sound legal basis, with a sound independent valuation of the site.

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

Given that a formal public offer of £450,000 was made after Cabinet approval but before completion, and the early expressions of interest were on record, why was the offer not tested or retained as a fallback?

Responding, Councillor O'Brien reported that fundamentally after the Cabinet has made a decision we are still in the process of completing and seeing that decision through. We've effectively done what we need to as part of that deal, it's now sitting with the NHS and their decision making processes. These are different from ours and also take time. Ultimately once we've made that decision it's only right that we allow that process to be completed, and I have given assurances at the last Cabinet meeting that if that deal does not complete for any reason we would welcome and be open to exploring other offers. I think it's important to note that, as Roger Frith confirmed at the last meeting, prior to that Cabinet decision in February no other offers had come in and we were making a decision in February on the basis of that offer from the NHS as the sole offer.

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

Since legal completion of the Pinfold Lane library deal still hasn't taken place, is there a specific reason for the delay and has any part of the deal materially changed in the interim?

Responding, Councillor O'Brien reported that the deal has not changed, it is simply the pace of the bureaucracy within the NHS. Nothing more to it than the NHS's decision making process which is currently underway. The NHS is made up of smaller components within one organisation which has resulted in the extra time needed for the deal to be finalised. I am confident we will get to that point but equally confident that if we don't then we will come back to the table looking for offers and engage with those who are interested in the site.

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

If the terms of the Pinfold Lane deal have changed in price, timing or valuation basis, will the new deal be brought back to Cabinet for renewed consent as required under proper governance procedure?

Responding, Councillor O'Brien reported that yes, if there were substantive changes to it, we would have to bring it back for renewal of the decision. That's not the case at the moment, we're confident it won't change, but yes on principle if substantial changes are made to the deal we would bring that back.

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

In April 2023 I first expressed interest in the Pinfold Lane library site and followed up more than a dozen times. Every request was ignored and I received contradictory explanations from Mr Frith about the nature of the sale. Then in February this year Cabinet approved a disposal that internal emails now suggest did not comply with Section 123 of the Local Government Act. I requested a pause; that was denied externally, but from the outside it appears that the deal has been paused internally and possibly revalued. The original price agreed was around £480,000, factoring in £15,000 costs for demolition so effectively £465,000. Now we're seeing references in the press to a £500-600,000 valuation yet this revised deal has not been remarketed and not tested against other bidders and no legal advice or valuation has been published. My question is this: how can the Council claim it is meeting its legal duty to achieve best consideration when it appears to be preparing to push through a materially different deal, again, on a one to one basis, again, without competition, and again, behind closed doors?

Responding, Councillor O'Brien reported that we have always done this deal as transparently as possible: the information that we've shared has come through Cabinet reports, it's formed part of our thinking and vision around the Whitefield Town Plan. Clearly there are some bits of information at this stage that we're not able to share in the public domain. That does make this harder to give you confidence in our approach of transparency on this, but I hope in the near future to give you that reassurance. The deal, at the moment, has not been paused or revalued or materially changed. It is simply going through a slow bureaucratic process from the NHS. We have also been reassured that the legal basis for what we have done so far has been sound. There were differences of opinion, that is clear from the email correspondence, which I don't think is a bad thing as it shows people are taking things seriously and we don't just

follow the pack. The key consideration as a result of that difference of opinion was do we have an external independent view on the deal, and that is what we have got. That says we are not in breach of Section 123. Fundamentally we have made a decision that is legal, as transparent as we can be at this point, and crucially we are delivering on what we said we would to the residents of Whitefield; a new health centre, GP practices, away from a building that has for a long period of time been in poor condition and not serving residents as well as it could be. We have tried to do the best for the residents of Whitefield as a whole in keeping with the Whitefield Town Plan, and I'm confident we will get something of a high quality for those residents at the end of this. I appreciate there is other interest in the site, I appreciate you may be personally disappointed in the decision, but we have a duty to the wider set of residents. I remain confident that we have done the right thing in the right way.

In response to further discussion with the public, the Leader advised that we do not have a system that the highest bidder always wins. The size of the bid is only one factor that we have to consider. We are trying to get the best value and the best outcome for residents. We have to weigh up those considerations against things like the value, and what we've tried to do in this instance is ensure we have the right balance between value of the land, and benefit to the people of Whitefield. I am satisfied that we have got good value and a good outcome for residents.

Ultimately if you're asking for a legal view about what we're doing, all I can do is take the legal advice that we've been given, which is that what we have done is in accordance with the law. I am confident on that front that we have done what we need to do in keeping with the law. The secondary element of what you're saying is if there is a higher bid then we should take that bid. And what I'm saying is the size of the bid is one factor – a very important part, clearly, but it is only one factor in what we consider around these types of decisions. There are some decisions which have no strategic value to the Council where the size of the bid is probably a much bigger consideration, but this is a slightly different case. So I appreciate what you're saying, but the decision has been made. We're going to see that deal through with the NHS. Should that change, I repeat myself again, we will be happy to consider the bids – yours and any others – for the site, in the proper process.

CA.4 MEMBER QUESTION TIME

The following question was submitted in advance of the meeting by Councillor Birchmore:

In relation to the Northern Gateway Mayoral Development Corporation: Public Consultation Analysis Report it states that there were 85 respondents in total to the consultation. Does the Council think that was a sufficient number of responses to make a decision relating to such a significant plan and what explanation does the Council have as to why so few residents responded?

Responding, Councillor O'Brien reported that it was a low number but low in relation to the scale of the Northern Gateway but not what we were specifically consulting on – the governance and setting up of the Mayoral Development Corporation. Governance is important but probably not something people engage with the most.

We want to ensure there is engagement and interest in the site, but we are satisfied that the content and number of respondents does not undermine what we're trying to do, which is ensure we have the best possible delivery of the site in the interests of the local area using the tools and support and resources the Mayor and Combined Authority can offer.

A further supplementary question was submitted:

Looking at the actual responses –

Do you agree with the creation of the Mayoral Development it's 24% yes and 70% no.

To what extent do you agree 50% strongly disagreed

Also, regarding naming didn't seem popular – will this impact the decisions to be made?

Councillor O'Brien reported that it's always useful to get feedback, even if in low numbers. I appreciate some people will object to this purely because they disagree with the principle of how the land was released, and you have to take into account the underlying reasons for the feedback. The feedback I've read through and listened to, other than the in-principle objections, nothing is fundamental in how we proceed next. There will always be debates about specifics and they probably mirror internal debates we are having – the name, the scale, what to deliver when and how, etc. Ultimately why we need a structure where we can engage with those issues and have a democratic influence on it. We can't dictate what happens on the site but how we can influence not just work within the site but wider public issues – transport links, future skills need, environmental impacts, and the sustainability of the site moving forwards. This governance will allow us to instil a sense of public accountability and thinking in the decision making rather than being a private sector project.

Councillor Quinn advised that in light of progress being made elsewhere with industry development, we need to fill the site with skilled, high tech jobs with good career progression as quickly as possible. The Leader agreed, and stated that the Mayoral Development Corporation will help us achieve this.

CA.5 MINUTES

It was agreed:

That the minutes of the meeting held on 11th June 2025 be approved as a correct record.

CA.6 MILLWOOD PRIMARY SPECIAL SCHOOL - PART A

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategic Growth presented a report providing a full explanation of the latest position, details of the programme and seeking approval of a costed bid from the contractors for the construction of the new wing; roofing remedial and other outstanding defects scheme. The contractors have completed the Pre-Construction Services Agreement (PCSA) for the detailed design up to RIBA Stage 4 and Cabinet approval is needed to ensure a start on site can be made on 4 August 2025 to meet the tight project deadlines.

In response to Member questions, Rachael Stirk, Head of Service CYP, advised that completion date was anticipated for September 2026, subject to no delays to the programme. The Leader added that, in the meantime, the Council would support the school to manage the works.

Decision:

Cabinet:

1. Approved the costed bid from the contractor together with the costs of the professional & consultant fees/ additional surveys/client FFE costs for the construction of the new wing; roofing remedial works and other outstanding defects scheme. All costs are to be covered by Children's Services capital funding; and
2. Authorised the Director of Law and Democratic Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People to finalise the terms of the Design and Build Contract to be entered into with the contractor.

Reasons for the decision:

Cabinet approval to appoint a contractor is needed at the July 2025 Cabinet meeting to ensure a timely start on site to achieve the tight deadlines for the 4th wing extension and completion of the roofing remedial/outstanding defects work.

Development of additional capacity at Millwood Primary Special School, as set out in the Project Safety Valve agreement between the Council and the Department for Education, is a key element of the specialist place sufficiency strategy. Taken together, the Agreement and strategy set out the business case for the development of new provision and expansion of existing specialist provision to meet increasing demand within Bury and reduce the reliance on placements in Independent Non-Maintained Special Schools (INMSS). The extension scheme at Millwood Primary Special School is a priority within this strategy.

Urgent completion of the roofing remedial works/other outstanding defects is required. This has already been delayed due to the previous contractors going into Administration.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

Do nothing. If we don't proceed with the extension this would mean pupils being sent to out of borough provisions which would be at a large cost to the council.

We must address the roofing remedial works/other defects as a priority as the original contractors only re-roofed approximately half of the school roofs. The roof is deteriorating and needs to be replaced as soon as practically possible. Whilst it is possible to re-procure the scheme, this would result in significant delay to delivery of the project with no certainty that costs will be reduced. The option to re-procure will remain, to be pursued in the event that the costed bid is rejected. In that event all the work carried out to date will be utilised to form an integral part of the tender documents to be issued.

CA.7

REFRESHED RESIDENTIAL AND NURSING HOME CONTRACT AND CONTRACT MANAGEMENT PROCESS

Councillor Tamoor Tariq, Cabinet Member for Adult Care, Health and Public Service Reform, presented a report which sought approval to the contract arrangements for the provision of older adult residential and nursing care services in Bury. In borough, the annual value of services contracted through the current arrangements is £33,384,000, supporting over 700 people. The current residential and nursing care contract is over 10 years old, and the Council have issued numerous contract variations over this time. Legislation pertaining to the contract has changed over the years and now seemed an ideal opportunity to revisit the current contract, incorporate all the previous variations and bring the legislative elements up to date. The new contract will be a 10-year contract, consisting of seven years plus three years, and is designed to give the Council and Providers more certainty in planning going forward.

In response to Members' questions, it was noted that the 7+3 year timescale was in line with standard contract monitoring by the Council including regular check-ins, KPIs monitoring, and performance assessments as well as regular collaboration to understand and mitigate challenges. Councillor Tariq advised that it would be about supporting provider and working with providers to improve, should there be issues, before removing the contract. The break clause after 7 years was also standard, for either party to step away should they need to.

Decision:

Cabinet:

1. Approved the award of new contracts to the providers listed in Appendix 1 for the provision of residential and nursing care services. Such contracts to be for a maximum period of 10 years (7 plus 3 years) from 1st September 2025;
2. Acknowledged the implementation of the new Quality Assurance Framework and the Contract Management Framework;
3. Delegated to the Director of Adult Social care in consultation with Director of Legal and Democratic Services the finalisation and issue of the new contracts; and
4. Delegated authority to make residential placements in care homes until August 31st, 2035 (7 plus 3-year contract) to the Director of Adult Social Care.

Reasons for the decision:

Streamlining Process – the proposed recommendations will enable placements to be made at pace, avoiding unnecessary delays to resident's care whilst also minimising administration.

Making it easier to do business with the Council – the change would avoid unnecessary delays and enable payments for these services to be made more quickly. This is important when the current residential market demand exceeds supply in many areas.

Adhering to both statutory duties and contract rules – the proposed change allows the Council to deliver the duty to offer choice and control over where someone prefers to live.

A stronger contractual agreement between the Council and care homes. The change enables the Council to issue new contracts to all currently commissioned providers and make new individual placement arrangements

for new residents being admitted into a care home. The new terms and conditions will offer greater clarity as to the outcomes the Council expects from the providers.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

Option 1 - Do nothing and continue with existing arrangements.

Option 2 - Run a tender exercise for every care home placement.

Detailed reasons for rejection are set out on the report.

CA.8 BRADLEY FOLD TRADING ESTATE

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategic Growth presented a report setting out proposals for the redevelopment of Bradley Fold Trading Estate. Many parts of the estate are in a dilapidated condition and although this poses a risk to the Council, it also presents a regeneration opportunity. Investment in the estate will maximise the sites' potential as a modern industrial hub but needed the right design and project management support to achieve. This report set out proposed action to mitigate the current risks and identify the potential for the site.

In response to Members' questions, it was noted that legal consistency would be needed between Bradley Fold and Bury Market leases, but they were different sites and presented different challenges and opportunities so deals would not necessarily be the same. Conversations with all tenants would take place regarding future proposals and which parts of the site need intervention sooner to give tenants as much time as possible to move. With regards to insurance, it was noted that currently the Council was self-insuring, and this would be part of the conversations to be held imminently with tenants to work with them individually.

Decision:

Cabinet:

1. Approved the first stages of the Bradley Fold redevelopment as set out in the report;
2. Approved £1,417,000 being added to the capital programme, funded from prudential borrowing. A full breakdown is shown in part B.
 - includes approval for the expenditure in relation to compensation costs associated with the service of S.25 notices on all units that do not have insurance cover
 - includes approval for the expenditure of £400,000 associated with the upgrading and relocating the electricity substation and transformer.
3. Noted that where appropriate and subject to relevant risk mitigation, tenants may be placed onto short term contracted out leases to allow continuation of business and income generation whilst Phase 1 is completed;
4. Approved the tender of demolition contractor/s for demolition of units as they become vacant; and
5. Approved the tender of a design team and project manager to progress 'Phase 1' to RIBA Stage 3 and update master plan for the whole estate. Note that subsequent will brought to Cabinet at the appropriate time.

Reasons for the decision:

Redevelopment of the estate will maximise the sites' potential by providing high quality industrial units which will drive inward investment, employment opportunities and maximise revenue potential for the Council. Termination of existing agreements will reduce & mitigate risk of holding buildings that are in a poor state of repair and do not have 3rd party insurance cover. If tenants are granted short term leases at the discretion of the Head of Land and Property, they will be on the basis that the tenant accepts the building is not insured or may not be rebuilt / repaired if cost of works exceeds the value of the premises or repair work is not viable. Where units are self-contained, and tenants can obtain their own insurance, longer term 'Full Repairing and Insuring' leases can be granted on the basis that they undertake agreed improvement works.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

Do nothing and continue to lease units at nominal rents. Whilst this would maintain the existing income, due to the condition of the units and high cost of dealing with all compliance issues this is not economically or financially feasible in the long term. The site earmarked for Phase 1 has been cleared for over 10 years; by continuing to do nothing there is an opportunity lost to improve the estate and maximise income, jobs and business rates. If the Council do not replace and relocate the transformer it risks losing power to the estate.

CA.9 GREATER MANCHESTER JOINT MINERALS AND WASTE PLAN

Councillor Alan Quinn, Cabinet Member for Environment, Climate Change and Operations, presented a report on the statutory Greater Manchester Joint Minerals and Waste Plan (GMJMWP) and next steps in the decision-making process. In response to Members' questions, it was noted that this Plan would not make it more difficult to introduce a garden waste tax as that would still be for individual Councils to decide, but that Bury was not currently considering this option.

Decision:

Subject to Council approving, in principle, to the making of a joint development plan document with the other 9 Greater Manchester Councils (Bolton, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Stockport, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan), to cover planning for minerals and waste across Greater Manchester, Cabinet:

1. Delegated to AGMA Executive Board the formulating and preparing of the joint development plan document to cover planning for minerals and waste across Greater Manchester insofar as such matters are executive functions.
2. Noted that the following are the sole responsibility of the Council:
 - a. Responsibility for giving of instructions to the Executive to reconsider the draft plan submitted by the Executive for the authority's consideration.
 - b. The amendment of the draft joint development plan document submitted by the Executive for the Council's consideration.
 - c. The approval of the joint development plan document for the purposes of submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination.
 - d. The adoption of the joint development plan document.

Reasons for the decision:

The existing Greater Manchester Minerals and Waste Plans require updating in full because they are out of date having been adopted over a decade ago. Planning for

both minerals and waste at the same time, and jointly across Greater Manchester, represents an efficient way to deliver updates to the planning policy framework. There are resource efficiencies (economy of scale) at each stage of plan preparation and will mean that up-to-date minerals and waste policies will be in place at the earliest possible time scale.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

- To produce two separate joint plans, one for waste and one for Minerals. This approach would require more resources than a single, joint plan due to duplication of work and could result in delay.
- To produce a joint Waste Plan and incorporate minerals policies into each authority's Local Plan. Some authorities are already advanced in preparing a Local Plan and therefore cannot incorporate minerals within their plan timetable. Therefore, some GM authorities would continue to have outdated minerals policies, contrary to national policy.
- Do not update the current plans – 'do nothing' scenario. This approach would be contrary to national policy and legislation and risks unplanned proposals coming forward.

CA.10 NEIGHBOURHOOD SUPPORT HOUSING SERVICES - YOUNG PEOPLE'S ACCOMMODATION & SUPPORT TENDER

Councillor Tamoor Tariq, Cabinet Member for Adult Care, Health and Public Service Reform presented a report regarding the commissioning Neighbourhood Support Housing Services to reduce and prevent homelessness and sustain future tenancies. Members voiced their support for the service, and noted financial details would be provided under Part B.

Decision:

Cabinet:

1. Agreed to the procurement of the following lots under Neighbourhood Support Housing Services:

Lot 1 – Young People's Accommodation and Support Service (including care leavers) for age 18 to 25; to include 40 units of accommodation comprising of self-contained units in a block(s) with shared communal space for social, educational and recreational opportunities based on the Foyer Model. (25 units immediately increasing to 40 by April 2026) with 6 to 9 months outreach support for those leaving the service and young people living independently in the community.

Lot 2 – Ofsted Registered Young Families Accommodation and Support Service (including care leavers) for age 16 to 25; to include 20 units of mixed accommodation, (12 units immediately increasing to 20 by April 2026) with 6 to 9 months specialist family outreach support for those leaving the service and young families living independently in the community.

Lot 3 – Ofsted Registered Accommodation and Support Service (including care leavers) for age 16 to 18; to include 9 units of mixed accommodation available from

commencement of contract. With 6 to 9 months outreach support for those leaving the service.

2. Agreed to a further 4-month extension for current contractual arrangements to 1st February 2026, to be funded from the adult social care budget. This is to allow sufficient time for procurement and mobilisation of service provision.

Reasons for the decision:

Joint funding arrangements are proposed to improve outcomes for young people, young parents and their children to enhance their quality of life, whilst also achieving value for money and potential cost savings to Children's Services by reducing the use of unregulated, out of borough placements, and spot purchase arrangements.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

The current contract for young people's accommodation and support services end on 30th September 2025. Procurement rules only allow for a further extension to contractual arrangements, if we can demonstrate a clear intention to procure. If new services are not commissioned, we will have unmet housing and support need, therefore, this provides an opportunity to review the current service provision, support modelling and funding arrangements.

CA.11 GREATER MANCHESTER LOCAL NATURE RECOVERY STRATEGY

Councillor Alan Quinn, Cabinet Member for Environment, Climate Change and Operations presented a report which explained the mandatory requirement to establish a Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS); set out the findings from the public consultation on the draft version; and summarised the content of the final version.

In response to Members' questions, it was noted that the 2014 Anti-Social Behaviour Act allowed for fines to be placed on those knowingly allowing invasive species to spread, but that this was a complex problem which transcends borough borders. It was also noted that no sites had been removed but that the map was much larger than core areas highlighted, which showed the potential for the future.

Decision:

Cabinet agreed that they are content for the Local Nature Recovery Strategy to be published and authorise the Executive Director of Place to confirm the same in writing to the GMCA and the Mayor as the responsible authority for the GM Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

Reasons for the decision:

The Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, as amended by the Environment Act 2021, requires responsible authorities to develop Local Nature Recovery Strategies to identify opportunities and priorities for nature recovery, develop an action plan and map areas where funding and efforts to work together to help nature should be targeted. The GM Local Nature Recovery Strategy will fulfil this obligation. As a supporting authority, Bury Council is obliged to support the production of the LNRS.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

Not to agree with or raise an objection to the final GM Local Nature Recovery Strategy. This option has been rejected because, whilst Bury is not the 'responsible authority', legislation requires that responsible authorities involve all 'supporting authorities' (such as Bury Council) in the preparation process so that key users are able to shape content. Bury has been involved in the preparation of the strategy, the strategy is considered to be justified and there are no valid reasons to object. Additionally, Bury Council still has a key role to play in delivering the Local Nature Recovery Strategy and it will inform the roll out of Biodiversity Net Gain and provide important evidence to inform the emerging Local Plan.

CA.12 CORPORATE CORE SENIOR STRUCTURE

Councillor Richard Gold, Cabinet Member for Customer Service, Communications and Corporate Affairs, presented a report setting out the actions resulting from a series of staffing changes within the Corporate Core during 2024/25, and seeking approval for a Voluntary Exit application and the creation of two new Chief Officer Posts. In response to Members' questions, it was noted that Councillor Gold had received assurance from officers regarding the model and the job offer, and the posts would be filled with the best people we could find.

Decision:

Cabinet:

1. Agreed to the deletion of the post of Director of People & Inclusion following the post-holder's resignation;
2. Agreed to deletion of the post of Head of Human Resources;
3. Approved the Voluntary Early Retirement of the Head of HR, support payment of the Voluntary Early Retirement and capital costs associated and commend this proposal to Council for their agreement;
4. Thanked the Head of Human Resources for his contribution to the Council during his time with the authority;
5. Agreed to the creation of two new Chief Officer posts: Assistant Director People & Inclusion and Head of Communications; and
6. Delegated authority to the Executive Director (Strategy & Transformation) and Monitoring Officer to consider responses received from the consultation and produce a final version of the structure for implementation.

Reasons for the decision:

The proposals in this report make a budget saving with support the Council's financial position in 2025/26 and will create a permanent leadership structure within two important areas of the Corporate Core.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

None.

CA.13 EXTENSION OF COUNCIL CONTRACT FOR DELIVERY OF PARKING ENFORCEMENT

Councillor Alan Quinn, Cabinet Member for Environment, Climate Change and Operations, presented a report which sought approval to extend the existing Contracts for the delivery of Parking Enforcement and IT Back Office Services.

Decision:

Cabinet approved the extension of the existing Parking Enforcement and associated IT Contract for twelve months until 31st August 2026.

Reasons for the decision:

The extension is required to allow for a new Parking Enforcement and IT back office specification and Tender process to be arranged and completed.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

No other option is available in the light of the operational requirement.

CA.14 2024-2025 FINANCIAL OUTTURN REPORT

Councillor Sean Thorpe, Cabinet Member for Finance and Transformation, presented a report which provided an update on the council's final outturn position across the General Fund revenue and capital budgets, Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and DSG (Dedicated Schools Grant).

The 2024/25 General Fund outturn position is an overspend of £4.365m, representing 1.94% of the net revenue budget. This compares to the last report to Cabinet at Quarter 3 which forecast an overspend of £2.660m. The increase was largely due to an increase in Adult Social Care, including additional demand and complexity of cases, as well as issues arising from data quality, and had been funded from budget stabilisation reserves which were now no longer sufficient to support the forecast funding gap past 2026/27. Members also noted that 93.88% of the approved savings as set out in the 24/25 budget had been delivered, collection of Business Rates and Council Tax arrears had improved as had the collection rate for in year debt.

The outturn position on the capital programme was slippage of £19.360m against the £79.174m approved delivery programme, the HRA showed improvement with an underspend of £0.201m, and the DSG showed an overspend due to increased demand in the high needs block, a trend being seen nationally.

Councillor Thorpe provided further detail on the data quality issue which had been identified as part of the year-end reconciliation process and effectively led to expenditure being netted off and understated by c.£4m. Members noted this issue was not widespread across the Council, the error had since been rectified and further staff training was in place.

In response to Members' questions regarding whether the data quality issue has fully resolved, it was noted that the next update would be the Quarter1 report in September, but that the most significant date to know would be the refresh of the MTFS in November.

Decision:

Cabinet:

1. Noted the 2024/25 revenue outturn position of a £4.365m overspend (1.94%) against a net budget of £224.480m;

2. Noted the General Fund and Earmarked Reserves balance at 31 March 2025 of £63.684m;
3. Noted the overall 2024/25 capital programme outturn position of £59.814m, (76%) compared to the overall 2024/25 capital programme budget of £79.174m;
4. Approved the in-year capital slippage of £19.360m being initially transferred into 2025/26 to enable an in-year review of the deliverability of the capital programme to be undertaken and the programme re-profiled accordingly;
5. Noted the 2024/25 outturn position for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA); and
6. Noted the 2024/25 outturn position for the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG).

Reasons for the decision:

To note the final financial outturn position for 2024/25 subject to external audit.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

None.

CA.15 CAR PARKING FEES

Councillor Alan Quinn, Cabinet Member for Environment, Climate Change and Operations, presented a report regarding proposed changes to the charges for Resident Parking Permits. He advised that the last increase in charges was approximately four years ago and these current changes reflected the growing pressures and costs on that service. In response to Members' questions, it was noted that residents' comments and suggestions were always considered wherever we could be better or fairer while in balance with the financial outlook and ensuring the service was covering its costs. With regards to specific family circumstances, Councillor Quinn gave assurances that discretion would always be used on a case by case basis for those in need.

Decision:

Cabinet considered the feedback from the consultation and approved the recommendation for the changes to resident parking permits.

Reasons for the decision:

The Council is under significant financial pressure and the changes proposed brings the organisation in line with other areas within Greater Manchester. Should this not be approved then the projected savings will have to be recovered from other areas.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

N/A.

CA.16 HOUSING MAJOR WORKS PROGRAMME 2025/26

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategic Growth presented a report seeking formal approval of a number of contract awards, contract extensions and a budget approval which form part of the Housing Major Works Programme. In response to Members' questions regarding an omission in the February 2025 HRA Capital Budget of £750,000.00 it was noted that this had arisen as a result of errors in collating stock

condition data which would be safeguarded against in the future through the stock condition survey carried out.

Decision:

Cabinet:

1. Approved contract award to Emmanuel Whittaker Ltd for renewal of kitchen & bathrooms to be carried out to Council properties on the Huntley/Massey Estates in Bury for 1 year for the value of £1,153,828.15;
2. Approved the expenditure of £750,000 for additional kitchens and bathrooms to various Council properties across the rest of the Borough;
3. Approved the following contracts for energy efficiency and/or renewable energy works to Council properties on three estates:
 - Chesham Estate (completes existing scheme) to A. Connolly. Value: £1,443,506.87
 - Freetown & Stanley Close to Eco Approach. Value: £1,980,743.50
 - Hollinhurst to Live Manage Facilitate. Value £1,646,189.85
4. Approved a contract extension to existing EPC Contract with GGI, to extend work across 3 estates in Prestwich, Tottington & Whitefield, value £1,000,000.00.

Reasons for the decision:

The procurement approach on the tenders and contract extensions included in this report has been developed in conjunction with Bury Council's Procurement Team. Overall, our tender evaluations for the Huntley Massey Kitchen and Bathroom programme and the Energy Efficiency Works Programme are scored on the basis of 60% Price, 30% Quality (site delivery, tenant engagement, health & safety etc.) and 10% Social Value.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

- Do nothing: Maintaining homes to at least the Decent Homes Standard is a regulatory requirement and the Council would quickly become non-compliant with the Home Standard part of the Regulatory Requirements if these works were not brought forward
- Deliver Inhouse: These are major contracts and we lack the capacity in the in house contractor there is also significant specialist energy works included in the contracts.
- Open Tender: This option was considered and is possible. However, this would involve a significantly extended procurement process in both time and cost. The use of the Procure Plus framework which specialises in social housing investment works adds benefits in ensuring all tenderers meet capability, expertise and compliance requirements and the mini competition allows the tender to be tailored to the Councils specific requirements. Using the framework offers clear benefits over the open tender route. Similarly exercising a 12 month contract extension on the same rates as the original contract allow us to bring forward investment quick without further drawn out tendering processes.

Councillor Quinn highlighted the Integrated Water Management item.

It was agreed:

That the minutes of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority meeting held on 30th May 2025 be noted.

CA.18 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.19 MILLWOOD PRIMARY SPECIAL SCHOOL-REQUEST FOR APPROVAL TO APPOINT CONTRACTOR - PART B

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategic Growth presented the Part B report which contained the full financial details.

Decision:

Cabinet:

1. Approved the costed bid from the contractor together with the costs of the professional & consultant fees/ additional surveys/client FFE costs for the construction of the new wing; roofing remedial works and other outstanding defects scheme. All costs are to be covered by Children's Services capital funding; and
2. Authorised the Director of Law and Democratic Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People to finalise the terms of the Design and Build Contract to be entered into with the contractor.

Reasons for the decision:

As set out for the Part A report.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

As set out for the Part A report.

CA.20 BRADLEY FOLD TRADING ESTATE - PART B

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategic Growth presented the Part B report which contained full financial details.

Decision:

Cabinet:

1. Approved the first stages of the Bradley Fold redevelopment as set out in the report;
2. Approved £1,417,000 being added to the capital programme, funded from prudential borrowing. A full breakdown is shown in part B.

- includes approval for the expenditure in relation to compensation costs associated with the service of S.25 notices on all units that do not have insurance cover
 - includes approval for the expenditure of £400,000 associated with the upgrading and relocating the electricity substation and transformer.
3. Noted that where appropriate and subject to relevant risk mitigation, tenants may be placed onto short term contracted out leases to allow continuation of business and income generation whilst Phase 1 is completed;
 4. Approved the tender of demolition contractor/s for demolition of units as they become vacant; and
 5. Approved the tender of a design team and project manager to progress 'Phase 1' to RIBA Stage 3 and update master plan for the whole estate. Note that subsequent will brought to Cabinet at the appropriate time.

Reasons for the decision:

As set out for the Part A report.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

As set out for the Part A report.

CA.21 HOUSING MAJOR WORKS PROGRAMME 2025/26 - PART B

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategic Growth presented the Part B report which contained the full financial details

Decision:

Cabinet:

1. Approved contract award to Emmanuel Whittaker Ltd for renewal of kitchen & bathrooms to be carried out to Council properties on the Huntley/Massey Estates in Bury for 1 year for the value of £1,153,828.15;
2. Approved the expenditure of £750,000 for additional kitchens and bathrooms to various Council properties across the rest of the Borough;
3. Approved the following contracts for energy efficiency and/or renewable energy works to Council properties on three estates:
 - Chesham Estate (completes existing scheme) to A. Connolly. Value: £1,443,506.87
 - Freetown & Stanley Close to Eco Approach. Value: £1,980,743.50
 - Hollinhurst to Live Manage Facilitate. Value £1,646,189.85
4. Approved a contract extension to existing EPC Contract with GGI, to extend work across 3 estates in Prestwich, Tottington & Whitefield, value £1,000,000.00.

Reasons for the decision:

As set out for the Part A report.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

As set out for the Part A report.

CA.22 NEIGHBOURHOOD SUPPORT HOUSING SERVICES - YOUNG PEOPLE'S ACCOMMODATION & SUPPORT TENDER - PART B

Councillor Tamoor Tariq, Cabinet Member for Adult Care, Health and Public Service Reform verbally presented the Part B report with full financial details.

Decision:

Cabinet:

1. Agreed to the procurement of the following lots under Neighbourhood Support Housing Services:

Lot 1 – Young People’s Accommodation and Support Service (including care leavers) for age 18 to 25; to include 40 units of accommodation comprising of self-contained units in a block(s) with shared communal space for social, educational and recreational opportunities based on the Foyer Model. (25 units immediately increasing to 40 by April 2026) with 6 to 9 months outreach support for those leaving the service and young people living independently in the community.

Lot 2 – Ofsted Registered Young Families Accommodation and Support Service (including care leavers) for age 16 to 25; to include 20 units of mixed accommodation, (12 units immediately increasing to 20 by April 2026) with 6 to 9 months specialist family outreach support for those leaving the service and young families living independently in the community.

Lot 3 – Ofsted Registered Accommodation and Support Service (including care leavers) for age 16 to 18; to include 9 units of mixed accommodation available from commencement of contract. With 6 to 9 months outreach support for those leaving the service.

2. Agreed to a further 4-month extension for current contractual arrangements to 1st February 2026, to be funded from the adult social care budget. This is to allow sufficient time for procurement and mobilisation of service provision.

Reasons for the decision:

As set out for the Part A report.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

As set out for the Part A report.

CA.23 NORTHERN GATEWAY MDC

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategic Growth presented a report providing the governance details of the Atom Valley Northern Gateway Mayoral Development Corporation (MDC) which will provide a single, focussed body for engagement with Government and key stakeholders. This report set out how the MDC will work, the governance arrangements and operational details. The Leader noted that the current proposals were subject to change, however this was the first stage approach, setting out the principles behind the scheme, and ensuring Bury has a voice in the process.

In response to Members’ questions, it was noted that the make up of the board and voting rights were subject to change as legally it was for the MDC to decide, so it was up to Rochdale and Bury to lay down a marker to ensure adequate political

representation. With regards to the consultation, it was noted that this report sets out our response to the feedback and that we still think this is right way forward.

With regards to the Chair, the timescale depended on the availability and response from the people interested. The Leader advised a range of names were being considered and an appointment would be made as soon as reasonably possible. In the meantime, we have infrastructure of the Mayoral Development Zone in the background to move the project forwards.

With regards to checks and balances for use of powers, it was noted that the constitution set out every power available to the MDC but not necessarily powers that were planning to be used. Such powers over public rights of way have a higher threshold of checks and balances, and the constitution set out that any such power would be done with consent of the Secretary of State. The Leader undertook to provide an overview of safeguards outside the meeting.

Decision:

Cabinet:

1. Noted the outcome of the 'Atom Valley Northern Gateway MDC' consultation, as detailed within the Consultation Report (Appendix A);
2. Supported designation of the 'Atom Valley Northern Gateway' Mayoral development area by the Greater Manchester Mayor (the Mayor) and the Mayor notifying the Secretary of State (SoS) of that designation;
3. Approved the draft governance and operational arrangements, including objectives, as set out in the draft constitution (Appendix B);
4. Delegated Northern Gateway Strategic Board to finalise the draft governance and operational arrangements for the proposed MDC and note the approval of the constitution sits with the MDC;
5. Agreed Rochdale Council will be the MDC host Authority and Bury Council will be the partner Authority, subject to 2-year initial review then regularly on 5-year basis thereafter;
6. Noted that corresponding recommendations are to be presented to Rochdale Council, and that, if endorsed a further report will be presented to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) and GM Mayor to seek endorsement of these proposals. Accordingly, establishment of the Atom Valley Northern Gateway MDC is contingent on these respective decisions; and
7. Noted that following endorsement by GMCA, the Mayor and the SoS a further report will be presented to Cabinet seeking formal approval to implement, including financial appraisal to provide further details on costings.

Reasons for the decision:

A Delivery Vehicle Options Appraisal (DVOA) was commissioned by Bury and Rochdale Councils and GMCA from Deloitte which concluded the delivery vehicle with the greatest ability to support the effective delivery of Northern Gateway is an MDC. This stems from the MDC's capacity to maintain local accountability and explore potential enhanced powers, alongside a series of additional benefits.

Alternative options considered and rejected:

That the 'Atom Valley Northern Gateway MDC' is not endorsed and would therefore not proceed to implementation. Alternative delivery mechanisms would need to be

revisited, however as outlined in the March cabinet report, the MDC was the option that presented the best balance of considerations of flexibility, governance, private sector engagement and risk share, with other options comparing unfavourably in terms of the criteria, fit for the needs of Northern Gateway, and, in the case of some options, reliance on pending legislation creating threats to delivery timelines based on an untested model with no best practice basis.

COUNCILLOR E O'BRIEN
Chair

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