Cabinet, 14 October 2026, Public Questions

Submitted in advance

	Questioner/ Respondent	Question
1	**Peter Liggins (attending)**	During online public consultation sessions for the proposed Prestwich redevelopment, the Council Leader told residents that if parking at the new travel hub couldn't be free then the Council would look into a system where shoppers who parked to use local businesses could have parking charges refunded. Does the Council Leader recall making these statements & will the Council publish details of what efforts were made to achieve these commitments? **Please add any background information that may assist with your question:** Assurances were made by the Council Leader during online public consultations on the Prestwich redevelopment that parking at the proposed multi story car park would either be free or if not free then a system would be in place whereby shoppers supporting local businesses would have any parking charges refunded.
	Councillor O'Brien	• The public consultations that have been referred to took place in February and September 2023 so three years on, there has been changes in context and costs including the undertaking of previous survey work to try and determine expected usage and length of stay in the new Travel Hub. The survey work was based on monitoring the pattern of usage of the two existing surface car parks. • Since the public consultations (more than 3 years ago), and leading up to the Cabinet report, there has been a number of parking charges scenarios modelled (over the last few months) to determine a best fit and balance of a suitable tariff structure for expected users of the Travel Hub and predictions whilst ensuring enough income to cover the c£300k operating costs of APCOA managing the new facility. • In the context of the Leader's comment about a validating option reducing income too significantly, I will need to revert to Muse for previous analysis or rationale. However, noting again significant time

		has passed, I will commit to re-exploring with APCOA. Since appointing them, they have advised that they have multiple options for applying a discount linked to supporting the local businesses. For example, QR codes or a physical validation tablet are the most common methods. These can be explored with both the existing businesses and new businesses; the latter once the new retail units are built and occupied. Comment 1: It should be free for 1-2 hours to encourage people to use the Prestwich village shops and restaurants/ cafes during the day! RESPONSE: The Council are not in a position to subsidise the car park. Our revenue budget is under strain due to the pressure of significant demand pressure for social care services. The car park will cost several hundred thousand pounds a year to run. Analysis shows that most people will use the car park for 1-2 hours. If free parking was provided for this period there was a risk that the cost of operating the building would not be recovered and would be an additional pressure on stretched budgets. The Council acquired funding from the GMCA to build the building itself and this hasn't been a cost to the Council's budget. Comment 2 (from the Facebook comments) covers Rob's response (and in addition to my e-mail below) on some kind of parking validation, but I'm still prepared to re-explore with APCOA to see if it may work but notwithstanding it would need to work in the context of still meeting operating costs. Comment 2: When asked repeatedly about parking charges during several public consultations, Councillors & the Council Leader repeatedly assured us that either free parking or some kind of parking validation would be brought in. So that local businesses were supported & people continued to pop into the village for items rather than driving to Tesco or Lidl where they can park for free. It seems either we all misheard or they misspoke. RESPONSE: The Council was keen to entertain an element of free parking in the design but unfortunately, significant challenges in our revenue budget due to social care

		demand meant that we are unable to subsidise the running costs of the building. If we made a decision to subsidise the running cost of the building, we would have had to cut services elsewhere.
2	**Andy W Morris (not attending)**	Paragraph 46 of the Cabinet report "Anti-Social Behaviour Policy 2027-2030 (Renewal)" states that the draft policy "was shared with tenant engagement groups through Housing Services as part of the consultation process", and that "No amendments to the policy content were proposed through this engagement". I am a member of the Housing Services ASB Tenant Review Group. This is certainly not correct, as the group was not provided with the draft Anti-Social Behaviour Policy 2027-2030, only the current one. The minutes of our 4th August meeting record tenants proposing numerous changes, including timescales, the long list of exclusions, and clarification on gardens and fly-tipping. We also proposed a lot more suggestions besides these. None of these changes are in the new policy. We also asked for a separate housing ASB policy, as having two policies in one makes it too lengthy. It is not among the alternative options in the report. Paragraph 46 says the easy-read version is a response to tenant feedback. At our 4th August meeting, it was the Housing Services Strategy & Policy Manager who first raised a tenant-friendly version. What tenants asked for was a separate housing ASB policy. The ASB policy has been on the forward plan as a key decision since 21st July 2026, yet it was not on the agenda of the Housing Advisory Board on 28th July or 10th September 2026. The Board's terms of reference, supported in June 2026, say its role is to give "early advice on key housing policies prior to Cabinet consideration". This policy should have gone to the Board first. The report says an Equality Impact Assessment has been undertaken, but it is not attached. In early 2025 the Council's Hate Crime Policy Officer told me the ASB policy "is slightly incorrect and needs to be tinkered with as it is up to a victim if they want a hate crime to be raised or not". Housing Services repeated those

		words in its letter to me of 3rd March 2025 and promised the policy would be reviewed and that I would be updated. I was not, and the hate crime wording in the new policy is exactly the same, again not consulted with tenants about before this. Page 5 shows tenant satisfaction with the Council's handling of antisocial behaviour rising from 50.31% in Quarter 1 2024/25 to 54.55% in Quarter 1 2026/27, with 2025/26 missed out. The report calls customer feedback "highly positive" without saying how many tenants were surveyed. There are also numerous other issues with the new draft ASB policy, which I am happy to supply in addition to this question. This is not the first time something incorrect has been presented to Cabinet. There is no transparency when tenants are not shown what is being said about them, and are not told which of their feedback has been used or why it has not. Given this, will Cabinet defer item 6 until the Housing Advisory Board and the ASB Tenant Review Group have seen the draft policy, correct paragraph 46 on the public record, and agree that in future any report stating what tenants said is shown to those tenants before it goes to Cabinet?
	Councillor Gold	Thank you for your question. The Council values the contribution of tenants and residents who take the time to review policies and provide feedback, and I would like to acknowledge the commitment shown by members of the Housing Services ASB Tenant Review Group in this process. The Anti-Social Behaviour Policy is a corporate policy that applies across a range of tenures and service areas, including both housing-related and wider community ASB matters. As part of the policy review, Housing Services engaged with tenant representatives and a number of comments and observations were received regarding areas such as accessibility, response timescales, exclusions, and the clarity of information available to tenants. Feedback was also provided regarding the desirability of a separate Housing ASB Policy and the need

		for supporting guidance that is easier for residents to navigate. Having reviewed the concerns raised, the Council accepts that the wording within paragraph 46 of the Cabinet report does not fully reflect the discussion that took place with tenant representatives. Whilst colleagues were of the view that the feedback received did not necessitate substantive amendments to the core policy itself, comments were received from tenants and those comments should have been more clearly reflected within the report. In particular, the report could have better explained the feedback received and how that feedback influenced the proposal to develop supporting tenant-friendly guidance and an easy-read version of the policy. The Council also recognises the point made regarding the feedback loop. Whilst engagement took place, the final draft policy and report were not subsequently shared back with the Tenant Review Group to demonstrate how their comments had been considered. It is accepted that this has led to a perception that feedback was not fully reflected or responded to, and there is merit in ensuring greater transparency in future policy consultation and engagement exercises. In light of the issues raised, and following discussions between Public Protection and Housing Services officers, a decision has been taken to defer consideration of the policy until December. This will provide an opportunity to clarify and, where necessary, amend the wording within the Cabinet report regarding tenant engagement. Close the feedback loop with the ASB Tenant Review Group by setting out the comments received and how those comments have been considered. Present the revised policy and supporting report to the next Housing Advisory Board in December for discussion prior to Cabinet consideration. In relation to the Equality Impact Assessment, this has been completed and is available as a supporting document. The satisfaction data referenced within the report is drawn from tenant perception surveys, with the corresponding response numbers available to support the percentage figures presented.

		Regarding the request for a separate Housing ASB Policy, this was considered through the engagement process. The Council's position remains that a single corporate ASB policy provides a consistent framework across services and tenures. However, the Council recognises the need to ensure that tenants can readily understand how the policy applies to housing-related cases and therefore remains committed to producing supporting guidance and accessible information specifically for tenants. The Council welcomes constructive challenge from tenants and residents. The concerns raised have highlighted an opportunity to strengthen communication and reporting arrangements, and the decision to defer the item will ensure that Cabinet is able to consider the policy following further engagement and clarification with tenants and the Housing Advisory Board.
3.	**Fin McCaul (attending)**	Will Cabinet 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?
	Councillor Morris	The Council has created the travel hub as the first phase of a c£100m regeneration of Prestwich Town Centre. The consolidation of the parking was required to enable this. The regeneration is being carried out to enhance and sustain the economy and community of Prestwich in the long term and will greatly enhance opportunities for business. The consolidation of parking necessitated the construction of a travel hub building for which there is a cost to operate, much higher than the previous surface level provision. Without the Travel Hub, the council would not have been able to deliver the wider regeneration initiative. The Council is not in a financial position to subsidise the operation of the travel hub and as such, parking charges are necessary. Parking charges being introduced are similar to those in Bury Town Centre and we have attempted to ensure there is parity between Council charged facilities in the borough. The charging framework will be reviewed in 6 months which will enable us to accurately understand the impacts

		discussed. It is challenging to do this in advance of introducing the charges as we can only consider data from other, similar sites which is not specific to the conditions in Prestwich.