

**Minutes of:** CABINET

**Date of Meeting:** 10 September 2025

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

**Also in attendance:** Councillors S Arif, R Bernstein, M Rahimov and M Smith

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

**Apologies for Absence:** Councillor J Rydeheard

---

**CA.24 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor Jack Rydeheard, and Councillor Shabaz Arif was attending as his substitute.

**CA.25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Alan Quinn declared an interest by virtue of him being a Board Member of City of Trees.

**CA.26 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

A written question regarding street trees had been received by a member of the public, Paul Brierley, who was unable to attend and as such Members agreed that a written response to his question would be sent.

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

This question is for Lynne Ridsdale. Given that the Council has recently had a strike against them from the ICO for breaching the Freedom of Information Act from my May Subject Access Request, and we are currently 19 days overdue on my second Subject Access Request, I just wanted to check – is it you who is personally responsible for this breach and do you intend to do anything about it?

Jacqui Dennis, Director of Law and Governance responded that an extension has been applied to the most recent SAR and the deadline response date is 22 September. That extension is to allow officers to make sure they're collating all the information that has been requested and we will respond within that timescale.

In response to a request for clarification, Ms Dennis responded that as senior officer for this area, she has responsibility and it was her understanding that the extension was applied and the new date was 22 September.

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

Mrs Ridsdale another question for you. I note that Liverpool Council recently received an ICO enforcement notice after three strikes. Bury is now heading towards multiple

strikes of its own. What concrete steps are you putting in place to ensure that this Council complies with the Freedom of Information Act going forward?

Lynne Ridsdale, Chief Executive, gave assurances that the Council works closely with the ICO, and takes information governance seriously. She apologised for the frustration felt with timescales; the Council processes a lot of data and you have raised a number of complex issues which we are trying to deal with properly and completely. Over the last few years and in partnership with the ICO we've implemented more structure around information governance. We have a range of officer leads that pick this up, we have a data protection officer, we have Jacqui Dennis as SIRO (Senior Information Risk Owner), we have established internal boards with frameworks that work across information governance, and we've stepped that up significantly over the last couple of years including recent changes where we've built in additional governance which is now being reviewed to ensure real-time visibility of our performance. So we are across it, we do our very best, and we will ensure that we get back to Mr Jacobs by 22 September.

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

Who was the actual ultimate signatory from the Council who signed the Pinfold Lane Library off and when was the title deed signed?

Lynne Ridsdale advised that specifics for that were not to hand but would be emailed to Ms Partridge within 5 working days.

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

Dear Mr O'Brien, against a backdrop of spiralling debt at Bury Council, how can residents have confidence in this Council's handling of multimillion pound land disposals when it can't even handle the basic public duties on data access?

The Leader responded that the Council's debt is not spiralling, it is part of an organised programme of investment in the borough. All of those decisions have been made openly and transparently on a variety of different occasions at both Cabinet and Council, Budget Council in particular, and all of which is under the scrutiny of our external auditors and national bodies. There are no issues around our debt management. Debt has increased, as seen in many Councils, but that has been planned and is deliberately so in order to invest in our areas, grow them, and ensure they are thriving. Where we do have challenges around responding to FOIs or SARs that is, as outlined tonight, part of our improvement efforts to ensure that is done within the timescales and to everybody's satisfaction. Ultimately though, this Council has had lots of scrutiny over the last few years as we seek to drive improvement aspirations forward and I'm pleased to say that on many occasions the Local Government Association, who have done peer reviews, and others who have looked in on those efforts (not least tonight we will hear about Ofsted's view of our Children's Services) we are seeing those improvements. So I hope that residents will have confidence that, whilst there are always ways in which we could do better, that we make mistakes, and we're not perfect, they can be assured that things are improving here at the Council.

A written question regarding debt had been received by Councillor Donald Berry, who was unable to attend and as such Members agreed that a written response to his question would be sent.

The following question was asked by Councillor Miriam Rahimov:

I wanted to ask a question about the development consent order that national highways submitted and has gone through. For many years Besses Councillors have campaigned to improve the Haweswater tunnel under the M60 and make it fit for purpose. We've managed to get the Secretary of State to support our call for National Highways to do something about it. Good news is now that work has been approved and is going to go ahead, can I ask has our hard work paid off and will something actually finally be done about the tunnel?

Responding, the Leader thanked the Councillor for her question and for the campaigning from herself and her Ward colleagues. There was a broad consensus that J18 and Simister Island improvements were an opportunity to look at wider parts of the infrastructure that will make it easier, safer and convenient for our residents, particularly those in Besses but also connections through to other parts including Prestwich. I want to provide a 'hot off the press' update – as you will know we as a Council have lobbied for this and made representations at examination stage, along with a letter of support from myself. I can now advise that the improvements will be required and included as part of that approval. A really good success story for the area around the tunnel. In the decision letter, paragraphs 111-112 deal with this and I'm more than happy to share that. It's something to celebrate and hopefully when the work is carried out residents will be happy with the improvements.

Councillor Rahimov thanked officers for their work in achieving this alongside Councillors.

## **CA.28 MINUTES**

### **It was agreed:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 9 July 2025 be approved as a correct record.

## **CA.29 2025/26 CORPORATE PLAN - QUARTER ONE UPDATE**

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member, Finance and Transformation presented a report providing a quarter one update on progress against the Corporate Plan. This demonstrated delivery and was subject to continued refinement to best monitoring impact. In response to Member questions, it was noted that Team Bury objectives reflected the work of all partners in Bury while this report focussed on the Council's efforts. Delivery was demonstrated from the Council but impact was not necessarily linear or guaranteed and would require a longer timeframe, combined efforts from all partners, and the right monitoring metrics.

### **Decision:**

Cabinet noted the update on progress against the Corporate Plan 2025/26.

**Reasons for the decision:**

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

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

Not applicable.

**CA.30 2025-26 Q1 FINANCE POSITION**

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member, Finance and Transformation presented a report providing the 2025/26 forecast revenue outturn (including an overspend of £4.148m), forecast savings position, forecast capital outturn position, forecast Collection Fund position and forecast for the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) position as at 30 June 2025, and the Prudential Indicators as at quarter 1. In response to Member questions, it was noted that the Council had demonstrated a strong track record over the last 12-18 months of achieving the target savings and internal frameworks were in place to provide assurance of savings moving forwards.

With regards to the non-service specific underspend, this related to treasury management with a higher than budgeted income and lower than budgeted capital financing costs resulting from the slippage in the capital programme. In response to a question regarding borrowing, it was noted that the treasury function looked at where best value could be achieved, evaluating opportunities to restructure financing where interest rates were changing and aligning with the medium term financial strategy as set in February. With regards to which Approved in Principle schemes were yet to be incorporated into the In-Progress Programme, this information was not to hand and would be circulated after the meeting. Members also discussed the underachievement of savings owing to delayed implementation of restructures, and noted that these transformations were now being monitored through internal assurance boards and HR processes were being reviewed. Finally, in relation to highways budgets, it was noted that this was broader than just resurfacing, and these budgets were usually fully spent by the end of the year.

**Decision:**

Cabinet:

1. Noted the 2025/26 forecast revenue outturn position as at 30 June 25 of a £4.148m overspend (1.74%) against a net budget of £238.257m;
2. Noted the 2025/26 forecast savings position as at 30 June 2025 of a forecast underachievement of £0.441m (-3.9%) against an agreed target of £11.344m;
3. Approved the in-year updates to the capital programme, revising the capital delivery programme for 2025/26 to £132.095m which will form the basis for future in-year monitoring and reporting of performance;
4. Noted the 2025/26 forecast Collection Fund Position as at 30 June 2025 of a surplus of £1.627m of which £1.563m relates to Bury's share; and
5. Noted the Prudential Indicators as at quarter 1.

**Reasons for the decision:**

To update members on the Council's budgetary position and actions taken or being taken to ensure budgetary targets are achieved. This report is in accordance with the Council's financial procedure regulations.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

Not applicable.

**CA.31 2024/25 TREASURY OUTTURN REPORT**

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategic Growth presented a report outlining the financial position and providing an update on the Treasury Management function throughout 2024/25. In response to Member questions regarding the flexibility of investment periods, it was noted this depended on the terms of the investment vehicle and the required liquidity of assets.

**Decision:**

Cabinet noted and approved for onward submission to Council on 17 September 2025, the:

- Treasury Management 2024/25 Outturn Report.
- 2024/25 Prudential and Treasury Indicators.

**Reasons for the decision:**

It is a requirement of the CIPFA Code that the Council receives an annual Treasury Management Outturn Report. It should be noted that the Council met all its Prudential Indicators relating to Treasury Management in financial year 2024/25.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

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

**CA.32 OFSTED STANDARD INSPECTION OF CHILDREN'S SERVICES IN BURY**

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Children and Young People presented a report summarising the result of the recent Ofsted inspection of Children's Services and the resulting change in the type and frequency of future inspections. The Ofsted outcome was a move from the previous overall judgement in November 2021 of 'inadequate' to a new judgement that services 'require improvement to be good'. Members noted that the report praised the progress made and graded the leadership provided by the council and within Children's Services as 'good'.

Councillors extended their thanks to officers for their work, in particular senior officers Lynne Ridsdale and Jeanette Richards, as well as the cross-party support of the Children's Improvement Board, Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee and Members more widely. Councillor Smith was also thanked for her passion and leadership as Cabinet Member. In response to Member questions, Councillor Smith advised that the outcome would hopefully give staff confidence to know we were on the right track and the validation to keep going. It was noted that the action plan would come before Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee at their next meeting, and was underpinned by service plans. Quarterly meetings with the DfE would continue along with a yearly inspection programme.

**Decision:**

Cabinet noted the outcome of the recent Ofsted inspection of Children's Services and the time-horizon for future engagement.

**Reasons for the decision:**

N/A

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

N/A

**CA.33 ADULT SOCIAL CARE PERFORMANCE QUARTER ONE REPORT 2025/26**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Care, Health and Public Service Reform presented a report outlining the delivery of the Adult Social Care Strategic Plan, preparation for the new CQC Assessment site visit on the week commencing the 6<sup>th</sup> October, and reporting on the department's performance framework for Quarter 1. In response to Member questions, it was noted that 12 officers were coming through the workforce over a 2-year period and would contribute to the wider department. With regards to overdue reviews, this was cyclical in nature and in line with other authorities. Delays were reducing, owing to investment in the reviewing team, but work was ongoing in this area to make further improvements.

**Decision:**

Cabinet noted the report.

**Reasons for the decision:**

N/A

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

N/A

**CA.34 RE-TENDER OF SUPPORTED LIVING CARE SERVICES FOR PEOPLE WITH LEARNING DISABILITIES AND/OR AUTISM**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Care, Health and Public Service Reform presented a report which sought permission to start the process to procure a new Supported Living contract in Bury, ultimately replacing existing contracts. In response to Member questions, it was noted that the law mandated that Councils give choice of provision which resulted in a number of out of borough placements. With regards to the large number of private care providers, this reflected the need for a diverse and vibrant market to ensure service quality was not dependent on a small number of providers. Members also discussed the long timescale and the plans to co-produce the service specification in parallel with public consultation, noting that this enabled feedback to be received, converted into an easy to read format, and taken back for public review. This meant the service specification could be produced incrementally, necessitating a long timescale which was reflected in the report.

**Decision:**

Cabinet agreed that:

1. The Commissioning Team follow the timeline outlined and complete consultation, engagement, and co-production of a service specification;
2. The tender for Supported Living be put to the market, as per procurement rules and support; and
3. Cabinet receive the results of the invitation to tender and award the contract between July-November 2026.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The re-procurement and timeline will afford commissioners the opportunity to complete comprehensive engagement with key stakeholders on a new model for Supported Living. We will run workshops with partners and professionals to understand what works well currently and whether there are opportunities to do things differently, and we will engage with residents and families, not only people who use the service, but also the Bury People First (our co-production network). Commissioners will co-produce a new service specification and model with key stakeholders.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

The option to “do nothing” and not follow the process and timeline will mean missed opportunities for the change, improvement, and innovation which supports the delivery of a new Supported Living model, which makes sure that people are given the best possible opportunity to progress and achieve independence.

**CA.35 IMPLEMENTATION OF LIVE WELL IN BURY**

The Cabinet Member for Adult Care, Health and Public Service Reform presented a report regarding the implementation of the GM Mayoral Live Well Programme in Bury and an opportunity to implement a Live Well Centre in Whitefield. In response to Member questions, it was noted that Whitefield had been chosen owing to the general lack of voluntary sector, town centre or leisure provision, as well as the level of inequality in the area and subsequent impact on life chances. With regards to cost, it was noted that GM Live Well transition funding of £676k would be split 50:50 with the VCSE, with the Council's half funding the refurbishment and backlog of maintenance on the site. An additional £100,000 had been identified in the Council's MTFS to address operational capacity and building management, which would ultimately be taken over by the voluntary sector groups working out of the building.

**Decision:**

Cabinet:

1. Noted the principles of the GM Live Well programme and recognise the solid foundation for it to land in Bury given the work on integrated team working in 5 neighbourhoods and in strengths-based working and community capacity recognition;
2. Supported in principle the deployment of the Ark building in Whitefield as the Live Well ‘flagship’ live well centre in the borough by March 2026 as the first phase of delivering the GM live well commitment of a live well centre in every neighbourhood by 2030;
3. Noted that GM Live Well transition funding of £676k is to be split 50:50 with the VCSE and to approve the £338k transfer to Bury Voluntary and Community Faith Alliance (Bury VCFA) to convene the VCFSE component of the scheme

including in the first instance increasing community capacity and resilience in order to for instance take on building operation;

4. Agreed a call on the council component of the funding will be backlog maintenance and initial refurbishment to bring the building back into use; and
5. Noted a potential requirement for the Council to underwrite building management function for up to 3 years, up to £100k per annum, until the community capacity is in a position to take on the operation of the building, based on evidence and assurance of financial viability.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The recommendations would allow Bury to be fully compliant with the terms of the GMCA/NHS GM grant allocation to deliver an exemplar Live Well centre in the borough, as a first phase of the Live Well commitment to have a Live Well centre in every neighbourhood and would be a major manifestation of LET'S Do It! principles in Whitefield.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

The alternative option considered was to use the Live Well funding to provide a broad level of support in each of the 5 neighbourhoods. This is rejected because it will not deliver a substantial Live Well centre as required by the terms of the grant. It is also noted that there are live programmes in each of the 4 other neighbourhoods that have potential to deliver a Live Well centre – for example in the Radcliffe hub and in the Prestwich development. There is a unique opportunity in Whitefield to bring a currently disused council building back to life.

**CA.36 GINNEL BETWEEN MALTON AVENUE/SAWLEY AVENUE, WHITEFIELD. PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER (ALLEY-GATES) - PART A**

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategic Growth presented a report outlining an application for an Alley Gating Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) for the Ginnel between Malton Avenue/Sawley Avenue, Whitefield owing to criminal activity and anti-social behaviour.

**Decision:**

Cabinet approved the Alley Gating Public Spaces Protection Order annexed to the report.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The reason for the recommendation regarding the closure of this ginnel is due to several incidents of serious violent crime that have occurred in the ginnel. The most serious incident being the loss of a life due to an individual being stabbed with a knife. There are multiple reports of Anti-Social behaviour, drug use, and a general fear of using the area from the local residents.

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

The alternative options that were considered but rejected were:

- Civil Injunction - A Civil Injunction is an order that could be considered to deal with a certain individual that is causing harassment, alarm, or distress. This is a highly effective tool in most instances and if applied to this situation it could be useful to remove a prolific offender. However, this would only apply to the



individual in question, meaning that other people causing the issues raised within this report would be able to continue and the same work would have to be repeated for each individual.

- Community Protection Notice (CPN) - A Community Protection Notice was designed and implemented in 2014 to help assist with such issues that cause harassment, alarm, and distress within the community. This option was a viable option at the beginning of this, however, as with the Civil Injunction this is an action that can only be used towards an individual and not to tackle a collective problem.
- Acceptable Behaviour Contract (ABC) - An ABC is a low-level intervention that will still be used alongside the PSPO if these recommendations are approved. This is a non-enforceable contract between Bury Council and an individual which is voluntarily agreed. It is a way of an individual working with the Council to avoid any further actions being taken. Due to the nature of the issues, it was felt that this tool was low level, and they are needed more serious intervention re. a PSPO.

### **CA.37 ANNUAL COMPLAINTS PERFORMANCE AND SERVICE IMPROVEMENT REPORT 2024/25 AND SELF ASSESSMENT**

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services presented a report presenting the self-assessment against the Housing Ombudsman's Complaint Handling Code and the Annual Complaints Performance and Service Improvement Report for approval. This included a summary of areas of complaints, Ombudsman rulings, and the resulting changes and training.

In response to Member questions, it was noted that staff training, new complaint handlers, and improvements to ongoing monitoring were now in place. All comments and outcomes from Ombudsman rulings were implemented, with complaints being seen as opportunities to learn and improve the service. With regards to repairs, a review was underway on how these were carried out to ensure jobs are completed first time, including training provided to the Asset Management team regarding tenant profiles.

#### **Decision:**

Cabinet:

1. Approved the annual self assessment against the Complaint Handling Code; and
2. Approved the Annual Complaints Performance and Service Improvement Report.

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

It is a requirement of the Housing Ombudsman Complaint Handling Code that we carry out a self-assessment against the code and produce an annual report on our complaints' performance and service improvement. As part of the code it is a requirement that both are approved by the governing body of the landlord and then submitted to the Housing Ombudsman along with the governing body's response to the report.

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

None.

## **CA.38 HOUSING MAJOR WORKS PROGRAMME 2025/26 - PART A**

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services presented a report which sought formal approval of several contract awards with contract extensions for window and door fittings which form part of the Housing Major Works Programme. In response to Member questions, it was noted Procure Plus was the recommended framework and the use of local suppliers secured additional social value for communities as part of contract delivery.

### **Decision:**

Cabinet:

1. Approved contract award to WRPS Ltd for fitting of windows and doors and associated works to be carried out to Council properties on several estates in the south of the Borough for one year for the value of £535,485.78. Dependent upon performance and at current pricing, there is the option to extend the above contract for a further 12 months, at no more than 50% of the original contract value;
2. Approved contract award to A Connolly Ltd for fitting of windows and doors and associated works to be carried out to Council properties on several estates in the south of the Borough for one year for the value of £662,432.70. Dependent upon performance and at current pricing, there is the option to extend the above contract for a further 12 months, at no more than 50% of the original contract value;
3. Approved a supply agreement award to Nova Ltd for supply of replacement windows and doors to be fitted by WRPS Ltd, recommendation 2.1 above to a value of £401,383.09; and
4. Approved a supply agreement award to Nova Ltd for supply of replacement Windows and Doors to be fitted by Connolly Ltd recommendation 2.2 above, to a value of £424,010.00.

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

A key regulatory requirement for Housing is to ensure all Bury Council homes are maintained, as a minimum, to the Decent Home Standard. A key expectation of the Regulator for Social Housing is that all our homes are of good quality, well maintained and safe homes for tenants and comply with the Decent Homes Standard.

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

- Do nothing: These works will enhance the physical appearance, energy efficiency and security of council homes across the Borough and will be welcomed and valued by residents. 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 by the in-house contractor.

- Open Tender: This option was considered and is a possibility. However, this would involve a significantly extended procurement process in both time and cost.

## **CA.39 SIX TOWN HOUSING RECOMMENDATION - PART A**

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services presented a report providing a review of the options regarding the future of Six Town Housing Limited (STH) as an entity owned by Bury Council. Members noted that the recommendation was to close down STH, owing to the commercial and regulatory risks associated with the option to invest. This process would take at least 18 months with a £500k budget from STH reserves and the Housing Revenue Account balance. Members noted that the first step will be to procure advisors for the project management legal and financial due diligence, and any financial decisions such as the options for the assets will be brought back to cabinet for decision and be subject to tenant consultation.

With regards to the regularisation of contracts, the matter was considered prior to the insourcing of management of the housing stock and all matters relating to the contracts will be resolved prior to the dissolution of STH. In response to Member questions, it was noted that all details such as recharging would be worked through as part of the close down process, with reports coming to Cabinet for decision as required.

### **Decision:**

Cabinet approved the “Close Option”, the first step being to procure advisors to provide project management, due diligence, legal and financial advice.

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

- The Invest Option entails participating in a specialist accommodation sector which is highly and increasingly regulated, and external providers are more suited to deliver this for Bury. The Council is already able to make use of opportunities to build social and affordable housing without STH via partnerships and potentially via the HRA in the future.
- Whilst STH could fund roles to support its growth under the Invest Option, Bury Housing Services would be responsible for ensuring both the Council (as a social housing provider) and STH each complied with the Regulator of Social Housing’s regulatory framework (since the Council is STH’s sole managing agent).
- After considering the options and mindful of the challenges facing the Council’s own delivery of council housing (and upon consulting with the Council’s senior housing officers and its professional advisors), the Director of Housing takes the view that the commercial and regulatory risks associated with the Invest Option are both too high and difficult to fully quantify when weighed against the potential advantages of that option.

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

- Retain Six Town Housing “as is” – The current governance arrangements constitute a regulatory risk as per the Campbell Tickell Report and STH is not realistically a viable proposition based on its current size and remit.

- Invest and grow Six Town Housing – grow Six Town housing to become a specialist housing provider.

#### **CA.40 SIMISTER ISLAND DEVELOPMENT CONSENT ORDER**

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategic Growth presented a report requesting delegated authority in order to respond to all consultations and engagement as part of the Simister Island Development Consent Order. Members noted the opportunity for improving biodiversity, and the importance that Bury participates fully in the process.

##### **Decision:**

Cabinet delegated authority to the Executive Director (Growth) to respond to all consultations and engagement as part of the Simister Island Development Consent Order.

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

Without delegated authority it is unlikely that the Council will be able to effectively engage with the DCO process. If responses are not submitted in accordance with the timescales, they cannot be taken into account. Without the requested delegation in place, this could result in a recommendation made to the Secretary of State on the Requirements which does not fully take account of impacts upon Bury.

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

- Option 2 – Not to delegate authority. This is not recommended as it is unlikely that the Council would be able to effectively engage with the DCO process.
- Option 3 – Not to participate in the DCO process. This is not recommended as this could result in a recommendation made to the Secretary of State on the Requirements which does not fully take account of impacts upon Bury.

#### **CA.41 APPROVAL TO DIRECT AWARD CONTRACT FOR THE DELIVERY OF FISHPOOL PHASE 2 AND PIMHOLE BEE ACTIVE TRAVEL SCHEMES**

The Cabinet Member for Environment, Climate Change and Operations presented a report which sought formal approval to directly award a contract for the delivery of the Fishpool Phase 2 and Pimhole Bee Active Travel Schemes, under the Greater Manchester Highways Alliance Framework (Lot 7), and funded through the Mayor's Cycling and Walking Challenge Fund (MCF) and administered by Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM).

In response to Member questions, it was noted that 'quiet streets' saw deliberate and physical interventions to prevent cut-through motor traffic while maintaining full access for pedestrians, cyclists, emergency services, and local car parking. They were only introduced where there was legitimate safety concerns and as part of wider schemes taking a neighbourhood approach, rather than isolated infrastructure changes. With regards to public consultation, it was noted that the scheme had started consultation in 2022 and community briefings had been undertaken earlier this year, resulting in a comprehensive assessment. Not all residents would be happy with the proposals but serious consideration had been given. The Leader encouraged Councillors to share continuing concerns, but no significant changes to designs could now be considered.

Appreciation was given to the disruptive nature of roadworks, but these changes were not intended to make traffic worse, they sought to improve safety long term for cyclists and pedestrians, ensuring roads were not used as inappropriate cut-throughs.

**Decision:**

Cabinet:

1. Approved the direct award of a contract to George Cox & Sons Ltd for the delivery of the Fishpool Phase 2 and Pimhole Bee Active Travel Schemes, in accordance with the terms of the Greater Manchester Highways Alliance Framework; and
2. Authorised Legal to finalise and seal the necessary contract documents to secure the appointment.

**Reasons for the decision:**

The direct award is permitted under the framework agreement, reducing procurement timescales and ensuring delivery within funding deadlines. George Cox & Sons Ltd has been identified as the highest-ranked contractor for Lot 7, specialising in civil works, ensuring quality and value for money. Delays in awarding the contract may risk funding withdraw and impact the council's reputation with TfGM and the Department for Transport (DfT).

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

- Separate procurement for each scheme: This option was rejected as it would duplicate efforts, extend timescales, and increase administrative costs.
- Not proceeding with the schemes: This option was rejected as it would result in the loss of MCF funding and missed opportunities to improve active travel infrastructure.

**CA.42 APPOINTMENTS UPDATE**

The Cabinet Member for Customer Service, Communications and Corporate Affairs presented a report which set out amendments to appointments made by Council as a result of political proportionality changes.

**Decision:**

Cabinet noted the amendments to the Annual Appointment Report appointments made since the Annual Meeting of Council as set out in the Appendices.

**Reasons for the decision:**

N/A

**Alternative options considered and rejected:**

N/A

**CA.43 MINUTES OF ASSOCIATION OF GREATER MANCHESTER AUTHORITIES / GREATER MANCHESTER COMBINED AUTHORITY**

**It was agreed:**

That the minutes of the AGMA Executive Board Greater Manchester Combined Authority meetings held on 27 June 2025 be noted.

**CA.44 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.45 GINNEL BETWEEN MALTON AVENUE/SAWLEY AVENUE, WHITEFIELD. PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER (ALLEY-GATES) - PART B**

The Leader and Cabinet Member for Strategic Growth presented the Part B appendix.

**Decision:**

Cabinet approved the Alley Gating Public Spaces Protection Order annexed to the report.

**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.46 HOUSING MAJOR WORKS PROGRAMME 2025/26 - PART B**

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services presented the Part B report containing the full financial information.

**Decision:**

Cabinet:

1. Approved contract award to WRPS Ltd for fitting of windows and doors and associated works to be carried out to Council properties on several estates in the south of the Borough for one year for the value of £535,485.78. Dependent upon performance and at current pricing, there is the option to extend the above contract for a further 12 months, at no more than 50% of the original contract value;
2. Approved contract award to A Connolly Ltd for fitting of windows and doors and associated works to be carried out to Council properties on several estates in the south of the Borough for one year for the value of £662,432.70 Dependent upon performance and at current pricing, there is the option to extend the above contract for a further 12 months, at no more than 50% of the original contract value;
3. Approved a supply agreement award to Nova Ltd for supply of replacement windows and doors to be fitted by WRPS Ltd, recommendation 2.1 above to a value of £401,383.09; and

4. Approved a supply agreement award to Nova Ltd for supply of replacement Windows and Doors to be fitted by Connolly Ltd recommendation 2.2 above, to a value of £424,010.00.

**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.47 SIX TOWN HOUSING RECOMMENDATION - PART B**

The Cabinet Member for Housing Services presented the Part B appendix, noting that Members' queries could be answered once the process was underway.

**Decision:**

Cabinet approved the "Close Option", the first step being to procure advisors to provide project management, due diligence, legal and financial advice.

**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.

**COUNCILLOR E O'BRIEN**

**Chair**

**(Note: The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 8.21 pm)**