**Minutes of:** **CABINET**

**Date of Meeting:** 4 November 2026

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

**Also in attendance:** Councillors S Arif, C Birchmore, J Rydeheard and D Vernon

**Public Attendance:** No members of the public were present at the meeting.

**Apologies for Absence:** None

---

## CA.98 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies received.

## CA.99 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

## CA.100 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

There were two public questions submitted in advance of the meeting, neither member of the public was present, in line with the constitution, written responses will be provided to both residents.

No further members of the public attended the meeting.

## CA.101 MEMBER QUESTION TIME

Councillor Staples Jones asked a question about the car parking consultation and mitigations that might be coming down the line such as enforcement or resident permits.

Responding Councillor L Smith commented that a full parking review has been commissioned that will look at parking sufficiency across the borough. This will look at where displacement may be and what can be done to support residents in each township. Councillor L Smith encouraged as many people as possible to complete the parking consultation to ensure their views are captured.

## CA.102 MINUTES

**It was agreed:**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2026 be approved as a correct record.

## CA.103 CALL-IN - OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED DISPOSAL OF PUBLIC OPEN SPACE - LAND ON THE NORTH SIDE OF MILTON ROAD, RADCLIFFE, BURY

The Leader reminded members that this item had been discussed and agreed at Cabinet on 14 October 2026 and subsequently called in by Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Leader suggested cabinet members take a short recess to review the additional report and objections that had been circulated to members.

Councillor Thorpe introduced the report which provides details of the objections received to the proposed disposal of Public Open Space (POS) of land on the North Side of Milton Road, Radcliffe, Bury. Councillor Thorpe highlighted that 28 objections from residents had not been include in the original report and therefore the decision amended by Cabinet on 16 October 2026 was flawed. The updated report contains the objections that had been missed and some additional objections received up to the last Cabinet meeting as recommended by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor O'Brien welcomed a position had been reached where the importance of shared space and community involvement is a more realistic option.

Councillor Rydeheard thanked officers for their work in reviewing and producing the updated reports and members who attended Overview and Scrutiny. Members of Overview and Scrutiny members had a wide ranging discussion, covered a lot of issues and agreed some proportionate recommendations for cabinet to consider.

Councillor Birchmore reminded members that the objections are coming from residents who live in the area who have concerns about the decisions being made by the council and expressed her concerns that the system let residents down.

Councillor O'Brien responded that if residents take the time to express their views, their voice should be heard during decision making and confirmed it was an error not to have the objections included in the original report.

Councillor Walmsley welcomed the scrutiny meeting and that the meeting showed how good scrutiny in Bury is. Discussions are under way to review how we can ensure these issues don't happen again.

Councillor O'Brien reminded members that the recommendations from Overview and Scrutiny Committee have been provided for Cabinet to consider and shape the decision to be taken.

The Monitoring Officer confirmed that the options are to confirm the original decision, amend the original decision or ask for further information. Members need to have regard to the recommendations from Overview and Scrutiny Committee when considering the decision

<u>Recommendations from Overview and Scrutiny</u>
Councillor O'Brien confirmed that Cabinet would accept the recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee being:

1. Cabinet to consider the 28 objections which were submitted prior to the consultation closure date of 24th September 2026, which were not provided in the original report to Cabinet.
2. That feedback from the event on the 29th September, alongside all other representations received up to 14th October 2026 (that being the date of the meeting of Cabinet in which the previous version of the report was considered), be considered by Cabinet in addition to the feedback received within the consultation period.

3. That a review is carried out to ensure that all consultation responses are dealt with appropriately to prevent a repetition of these issues and ensuring that responses are more appropriately and informatively grouped and presented to decision makers.
4. That, in addition to meeting statutory requirements for consultation in accordance with Sections 123(2A) and 127(3) of the Local Government Act 1972, the council carries out additional appropriate and localised consultation with the relevant communities affected for future development on this report and for future projects.
5. That pages 45-47 of the Overview and Scrutiny agenda pack, the full scrutiny report of Roger Frith dated 30th October 2026, prepared for the call-in meeting be provided to Cabinet for acknowledgement and consideration.

Members noted the recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 3 November 2026.

Decision(s)
Cabinet

- Reconsidered the decision made on the 14th October in light of the recommendations from Overview & Scrutiny and following consideration of the additional information set out in the report.
- Confirmed the original decision made by at the Cabinet meeting on 14 October 2026

Reasons for decision(s)

- The Council constitution requires that the decision is reconsidered as set out above.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- There are no alternative options as the Council is required to comply with it's constitution

## CA.104 CALL-IN - NEW ASH GROVE ADDITIONAL PROVISION ACADEMY

Councillor Walmsley introduced the report and reminded members that the decision to call this item in was because it was subject to the call in of the previous item therefore although the decision was sound the decision needs to be reviewed in light of the previous cabinet discussion.

There were no recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny meeting held on 3 November 2026.

There were no comments or questions from members

Decision(s)

- Approved the use of the Milton Road site (see appended site plan in Stage 3 Report) for the proposed new Ash Grove Alternative Provision (AP) Academy.
- Approved the current designs to be submitted for full Planning Approval.

- Approved the funding strategy detailed below for a budget of £17m and delegate spending authority to the Executive Director of Place in conjunction with Director of Law and Governance to oversee implementation of relevant contracts.
- Approved the Procurement strategy approach for the engagement of a suitable contractor/consultant team.

Reasons for decision(s)

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

## CA.105 APPROVAL TO UNDERTAKE PUBLIC CONSULTATION TO INFORM THE DEVELOPMENT OF A LOCAL SUPPORTED HOUSING STRATEGY FOR BURY

Councillor A Arif introduced the report seeking approval to undertake a six-week public consultation and engagement programme to inform the development of a Local Supported Housing Strategy and accompanying five-year delivery plan for Bury.

Councillor Birchmore commented that this has clear aims objectives and proposed outcomes with stakeholders identified. A range of methodologies is included to maximise the reach of the consultation. Should there be a designated council lead to the consultation, how much are we paying for this work and how will the data be analysed?

Councillor A Arif responding confirmed there is no financial implication arising from this report. The delegated authority is for the Director Housing to ensure the consultation processes. The consultation has been designed to ensure as many residents as possible can participate.

Councillor Birchmore asked for clarification on how the council would ensure that the data is analysed properly to ensure all voices come through

Councillor A Arif confirmed she would pass this to Arc 4.

Councillor Rydeheard queried the agreement for Arc 4 to conduct this consultation and how there would be no further costs. Councillor Rydeheard also queried how the stakeholders were identified and what priority rating was given to each one.

Councillor A Arif confirmed that there were no further financial implications an any further work would be brought back to cabinet for approval.

Councillor O'Brien confirmed that the detailed information will be pulled out and sent to Councillor Rydeheard.

Councillor Rydeheard queried the priority rating for each stakeholder and what methodology was used to decide which stakeholders should and shouldn't be consulted with.

Councillor Arif confirmed this was a targeted consultation around current and future supported housing need, identifying gaps in provision, improving outcomes for residents and informing future planning, commissioning, and investment decisions across the supported housing sector.

Decision(s)
Cabinet:

- Approved the commencement of a six-week public consultation and engagement programme to support the co-production and development of a Local Supported Housing Strategy for Bury.
- Delegated authority to the Director of Housing to make any non-material amendments to the consultation and engagement programme, if required.
- Noted that following consultation and development of the Strategy, the proposed Local Supported Housing Strategy and five-year delivery plan will be presented to Cabinet for approval and adoption.

Reasons for decision(s)

- National guidance emphasises that Local Supported Housing Strategies should be evidence led and developed in partnership with organisations who commission, refer into, deliver and regulate supported housing, alongside people with lived experience of supported housing services.
- Undertaking a structured programme of consultation and engagement will strengthen the evidence base and ensure that local priorities are informed by both quantitative analysis and qualitative insight.
- Meaningful engagement with residents and stakeholders, will help the Council better understand experiences of supported housing, identify unmet and emerging needs, understand barriers to accessing accommodation and support, and identify opportunities to improve pathways, outcomes and service quality where required. The consultation findings will directly inform the strategic priorities, actions and outcome measures contained within the Local Supported Housing Strategy and five-year delivery plan.

Alternative option considered and rejected

- Develop the Local Supported Housing Strategy using existing evidence only, without a dedicated phase of public and lived experience consultation.
- This option has been rejected as it would not fully reflect the principles of coproduction set out within national guidance and may limit the Council's understanding of how supported housing services are experienced by residents and stakeholders. Quantitative evidence alone cannot adequately capture resident experiences, barriers to access, service quality issues, move-on challenges, aspirations for independent living or the outcomes achieved through supported housing.
- Failure to undertake meaningful engagement could result in missed opportunities to identify hidden demand, unmet need, service gaps, and

practical improvements that could strengthen future service planning and commissioning.
- A dedicated consultation and engagement programme is therefore considered essential to ensuring that the Strategy is robust, inclusive, evidence based and responsive to local needs.

## CA.106 FAMILY SAFEGUARDING PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT

Councillor Walmsley introduced the report seeking approval to renew our Family Safeguarding Partnership agreement for 12 months. The funding provided through the partnership agreement is essential to ensure we maintain fidelity to the model of practice, which lays the foundation for the Families First Partnership Programme. As we progress with implementation of the reforms, this may present alternative opportunities and funding sources for further continuation of the model.

Councillor Rydeheard queried the cost of the agreement to extend the contract for a further 12 months. Jeanette Richards, Executive Director Children and Young People confirmed it was exactly the same.

Councillor Thorpe suggested this was an investment rather than a cost given the significant savings this initiative is making in terms of children not going in to care.

Councillor Birchmore stated that this was a much more positive way of keeping families together.

Councillor S Arif queried whether the family first partnership was making a difference and how this could be demonstrated

Councillor Walmsley confirmed that we have had a 7% decrease in the number of children with protection plans which demonstrates the success of the model.

Jeanette Richards, Executive Director Children and Young People confirmed we are tracking the impact of the model of practice with 46 fewer children coming into public care which is directly linked to the impact of the model. We are also tracking the sustainability of positive outcomes measuring rereferral back to children's services. These outcomes are holding over time which further shows the positive impact of the model.

Decision(s)
Cabinet
- Approved that a new Family Safeguarding partnership agreement is drawn up between Bury Council and our safeguarding partners, specifically GM Integrated Care Board, Pennine Care NHS Foundation Trust, Probation Service, Early Break and Greater Manchester Police.
- Agreed to continued partnership funding for a further 12 months at a cost of £490,618, funded from Supporting Families reserves.

Reasons for decision(s)
- Since its implementation in 2023, the Family Safeguarding model of practice has supported children and families across Bury through multi-agency teams delivering support and intervention. These teams include social workers and child and family practitioners employed directly by Bury Council, as well as partner roles including mental health practitioners, drug and alcohol recovery workers, domestic abuse offers, domestic abuse practitioners and a clinical

psychologist who are employed by our partners in NHS, Early Break and Probation.

- These roles are required to continue to ensure continued fidelity to the Family Safeguarding model of practice. The number of practitioners in each role is based on a needs analysis that was completed alongside as part of the original implementation and planning which was supported by the Centre for Family Safeguarding Practice.
- When looking at the impact of Family Safeguarding since its implementation, data is now beginning to show improved outcomes for children and families in Bury, which are being sustained across 6, 12 and 18-month periods following referral. This is resulting in lower levels of escalation through the system and lower numbers of children and young people entering the care of the local authority. Alongside the statistics, feedback from families shows the value of this model of practice and the benefits of offering a multi-agency approach to support, help and protection, addressing the needs of the family in a holistic, strengths-based way.
- This is particularly pertinent as we move into implementing the national Families First Partnership Programme of reforms to social care, expanding our use of Family Safeguarding to create a seamless offer of support for families. The FFP model is designed so that family help is delivered by professionals (not all of whom are social qualified) and taking a whole family approach, working to address the issues facing the adults in the family and so is a good fit for the Family Safeguarding model.

<u>Alternative options considered and rejected</u>

- Option 1 - Discontinue funding to partners  This would result in a loss of the multi-agency practitioners within the service and mean that Bury is no longer a Family Safeguarding authority. This was a key strand of the Council's Improvement Plan following the inadequate Ofsted inspection of 2021, and supported by the DfE under sector led improvement partner (SLIP) arrangements. This option risks losing the benefits achieved through the multi-disciplinary approach, resulting in poorer outcomes for children and families. This may also result in increased demand on statutory intervention including children subject to child protection plans and children entering care. This is inconsistent with the council's objective to offer the right level of support for children and families at the right time, in the most cost effective way. It would also remove the basis on which the Families First Programme implementation has been founded, which assumes a Family Safeguarding model of practice in its locality structures.
- Option 2 - Reduce funding levels Reducing funding would result in fewer practitioners available to support families. The number of practitioners in place was originally set by the Centre for Family Safeguarding who designed the model and considered the number of children open to social care at different levels of intervention.  Reducing the number of practitioners would mean we no longer have fidelity with the Family Safeguarding model. The model of practice is based on families being able to access the support directly, without having to go on multiple pathways and referral routes.

**CA.107 CLOSURE OF SIX TOWN HOUSING LTD - APPRAISAL OF STOCK OPTIONS & RECOMMENDATION FOR TRANSFER OF STHS FREEHOLD OWNED STOCK TO THE HRA - PART A**

Councillor A Arif introduced the report seeking Cabinet approval in principle to transfer the majority of the housing stock owned by Six Town Housing Ltd (STH) into the Council's Housing Revenue Account (HRA) as part of the closure of STH. The transfer would exclude Sherbourne House.

Councillor Vernon queried what assurances are there, that transferring Six Town Housing will not create additional financial pressures for existing Council tenants.

Councillor A Arif confirmed that members could be assured that there would be no additional financial pressures.

Councillor Rydeheard questioned whether any projections or assessments have been completed and whether the request for exceptional financial support includes this.

Councillor O'Brien confirmed that the HRA would not require exceptional financial support. Bringing Six Town Housing in house has no implication on any discussion around exceptional financial support.

Councillor A Arif clarified that cabinet are only being asked to approve in principle and that a further detailed paper would be brought back to cabinet at a future meeting.

Councillor Thorpe reminded members that Exception Financial Support isn't asking for a grant or a loan, it's asking for more flexibility to enable us to balance our books, ideally by capital receipts being used more flexible.

Councillor Birchmore queried whether there was a break clause in the lease at Sherbourne House or whether it was fixed term agreement.

Stephen Tonge, Solicitor & Deputy Monitoring Officer confirmed that the lease runs until 2031 with no break clause available. If it gets to a point where making decisions on Sherborne House, we would have a responsibility to rehouse the residents living there.

Councillor A Arif confirmed that the preferred option for Sherbourne House would be to find an alternative registered provider.

Councillor S Arif queried what would happen if a suitable alternative provider could not be found.

Councillor A Arif confirmed that housing service and adult social care would work together to secure alternative supported accommodation for the residents.

Councillor Birchmore queried the funding by Homes England and whether we could guarantee transferring that from Six Town Housing to Bury Council.

Councillor A Arif agreed to provide a response to Councillor Birchmore outside the meeting.

<u>Decision(s)</u>
Cabinet

- Noted that STH Board have approved in principle the transfer of its housing stock to the Council subject to tenant consultation and full legal, financial, taxation, valuation and governance due diligence.
- Approved in principle the acquisition by the Council of the housing properties currently held by STH, but excluding the lease of Sherbourne House, subject to

the completion of STH's consultation with its tenants and full legal, financial, taxation, valuation and governance due diligence.

- Approved in principle that, subject to completion of the matters referred to in recommendation (b) and confirmation of a lawful and financially prudent transfer mechanism, the properties be held by the Council for housing purposes pursuant to Part II of the Housing Act 1985 and accounted for within the Housing Revenue Account where appropriate.
- Delegated authority to the Director of Housing, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, the Monitoring Officer and the Section 151 Officer, to develop and negotiate the detailed terms of the proposed transaction and to undertake all necessary due diligence.
- Noted that a further report will be brought to Cabinet seeking approval of the final transaction structure, financial implications, valuation arrangements, funding arrangements and any associated governance decisions including reporting on the outcomes from STH's consultation with affected tenants.
- If STH is unable to find an RP to take on the lease of Sherbourne House, approve that the Council's Housing Service and Adult Social Care Service shall work to rehouse the tenants of Sherborne House into alternative Specialised Supported Housing pursuant to the Council Local Housing Authority obligations.
- Noted that if STH is unable to find an RP to take on the lease of Sherbourne House then a further report will be brought to Cabinet regarding options for the Sherborne House lease upon its current tenants being rehoused (which is likely to include assignment to the Council but with change of use, prospects of securing an assignment to a third party or surrendering the lease with associated costs).

Alternative options considered and rejected

- The option to "do nothing" is not an option as Cabinet has already decided to close STH due to the regulatory risks identified in previous cabinet reports including that a disproportionate amount of resource is required to ensure that STH remains compliant with the Regulator for Social Housing's regulatory standards.

## CA.108 GM JOINT MINERALS AND WASTE PLAN UPDATE

Councillor O'Brien introduced the report which provides an update to Cabinet on the production of the Greater Manchester Joint Minerals and Waste Plan and seeks to secure appropriate delegation to progress the plan in a timely manner

Councillor Vernon queried how Bury councillors and residents have a meaningful opportunity to influence the plan particularly around identification of sites.

Councillor O'Brien responding confirmed that a reduced timescale would not mean that there is less opportunity for elected members or members of the public to shape this plan. Councillor O'Brien committed to a briefing session for elected members on this topic.

Councillor Rydeheard requested clarification queried what a map of proposed minerals and waste plan policies

Councillor O'Brien confirmed his understanding was that the policies map is a physical description of where the mineral and waste is going to be.

Councillor S Arif requested confirmation that any proposed mineral or waste site in Bury will be subject to proper local consultation before a decision is made.

Councillor O'Brien confirmed that despite having a shorter timeframe to carry out this work, it will not compromise the engagement and decision making processes.

Decision(s)
Cabinet:

- Approved the decisions set out in the table at Appendix A.
- Approved the delegations to AGMA set out in the table at Appendix A and
- Approved delegated authority, to the extent not already captured by existing delegations or delegated to AGMA, to Executive Director of Place to take any executive decisions necessary for the Authority to progress through the plan making stages including those identified in the table at Appendix A.

Reasons for decision(s)

- The new plan making legislative framework requires certain decisions, such as ones in relation to the timetable to be made at speed. In addition, having agreed to produce a joint plan some of the required steps must be completed simultaneously by all of the authorities. The proposed delegations will enable the plan to be progressed in a timely fashion and in line with regulations. Not having appropriate delegations in place could result in difficulties in producing the plan to the 30-month timeline required by legislation.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- No alternative options considered.

## CA.109 APPROVAL TO TENDER AND DELEGATE APPROVAL TO AWARD THE CONTRACT FOR VARIOUS EXTERNALLY FUNDED HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS

Councillor Smith introduced the report seeking Cabinet approval to commence procurement activities and delegate authority to award delivery contracts for a programme of externally funded highways, active travel and public realm improvement schemes across the borough.

Councillor Birchmore queried who was funding this work, the Metrolink ramp that had been raised at a planning meeting, and the widening of the existing ramp at Water Street.

Councillor L Smith responding confirmed that these issues would be reviewed to ensure the plan reflects what has been agreed. This is grant funded money that is coming through for these schemes so permission is being sought to start moving forwards.

Councillor S Arif queried who would be responsible for ongoing maintenance and whether the council will face any additional costs.

Councillor Smith confirmed Bury Council would be responsible for maintenance. There won't be much additional costs but maintenance costs should be less than currently.

Decision(s)
Cabinet:

- Approved the issuing of the tender documents and completion of all procurement related activities for the following schemes to enable the progression of the various Final Business Cases. B
    - Bury Town Centre Streets for All (Phase 1)
    - Radcliffe Town Centre Streets for All (Phase 1)
    - Ramsbottom Town Centre Streets for All (Phase 1)
    - Radcliffe Metrolink Active Access Ramp Scheme
    - Parkhills Junction Improvements
    - Hinds Lane & Elton Bridge Development
    - Hollins Brow – Bus Pinch Points Improvements
- Delegated to the Director of Law & Governance authority to enter into relevant legal arrangements in accordance with the constitution in consultation with the Executive Director of Place, the Director of Finance and the Cabinet member for Environment, Climate Change & Operations.

Reasons for decision(s)

- To secure and deliver approximately £15 Million of external funding investment into Bury, providing improved accessibility, safety, connectivity and improvements to existing infrastructure across the borough.
- To fulfil the council's obligations set out in the signed development agreements made between Bury Council and Transport for Greater Manchester to progress the schemes.
- Delays in submitting and implementing the finalise business cases would risk funding withdrawal and impact the council's reputation with TfGM and the department for Transport. Potentially risking future funding allocations.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- Not proceeding with the schemes: This option was rejected as it would result in the loss of external funding and missed opportunities to improve accessibility, safety, connectivity and existing infrastructure within the Borough.

## CA.110 PARKING STRATEGY AND DISTRICT CAR PARKING

Councillor L Smith introduced the report seeking Cabinet approval to undertake consultation on two key elements of an emerging borough wide Parking Strategy; the potential introduction of parking charges at 22 Council-owned car parks across district centres and the implementation of moving traffic enforcement powers already available to the Council under the Traffic Management Act 2004.

Councillor Rydeheard queried what external research has been done on similar schemes and how will those views be taken into account

Councillor L Smtih confirmed that this consultation is on the back of a review of the parking across the borough and will allow us to review parking for the different economies that operate in Bury.

Councillor O'Brien highlighted that there is a balance we need to meet between dealing with budget pressures and protecting the interests of towns.

Councillor Rydeheard highlighted that ten of the 22 proposed charges are in Radcliffe and that this seems to be disproportionate and queried what assessment of impact the new Hub in Radcliffe will have on this

Councillor L Smith reminded members that Radcliffe is changing and has had lots of development recently. We also need to ensure we have enough parking in the right places to make things work.

Councillor Birchmore queried free parking for a specific period of time, how the council will consult, what the methodology, outcomes and aims were, and the income from parking charges.

Councillor L Smith confirmed that the income is ringfenced for highways and road safety. Free parking option is not off the table and is part of the consultation. Trying to gather as much data as possible to help make these decisions.

Councillor S Arif queried what assurance can be given to disabled residents and those who rely on their cars and whether they would be affected by these proposal.

Councillor L Smith reminded members that the consultation is open to everyone to provide their feedback.

Decision(s)
Cabinet:

- Noted the principles for a borough wide parking strategy set out in section 8.
- Approved statutory consultation on proposals to introduce parking charges at the 22 Council car parks listed in Appendix 1, using the existing Bury Town Centre tariff structure set out in Appendix 2 as the baseline for consultation, with a minimum 21 day objection period in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
- Delegated authority to the Executive Director of Place and the Director of Law and Governance and Director of Finance in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Climate Change and Operations, to agree the proposed tariffs, operating hours, concessions and payment arrangements, prepare the draft off street parking places order and carry out the statutory consultation.
- Approved a public consultation of at least six weeks on the proposed approach to implementing the Council's existing civil enforcement powers for moving traffic contraventions under Part 6 of the Traffic Management Act 2004.
- Delegated authority to the Executive Director of Place, the Director of Law and Governance and the Director of Finance in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Environment, Climate Change and Operations, to agree the moving traffic consultation materials and consultation arrangements.
- Required a further report to Cabinet before any parking order is made, parking charges are introduced or moving traffic enforcement begins. The report will set out the consultation responses, final proposals, financial implications, operational arrangements and proposed mitigation. 2.7 Note that the evidence and themes arising from the consultations will inform the emerging borough parking strategy.

Reasons for decision(s)

- An independent review of 39 Council owned off-street car parks identified a case for the introduction of charges at 22 locations, particularly where high occupancy and long stays reduce the availability of spaces. The Bury Town

Centre tariff structure provides an established and understood baseline which can be tested through consultation. The statutory parking order process requires publication and consultation on the detailed proposals, with a minimum 21 day period for objections and representations. This will allow residents, businesses and other users to comment before Cabinet makes a final decision.

- The Traffic Management Act 2004 places a network management duty on local traffic authorities. Proportionate civil enforcement of moving traffic restrictions can support that duty by improving compliance and traffic flow, reducing congestion and delay, improving bus journey reliability and creating safer conditions for pedestrians, cyclists and people using mobility aids. Better network performance may also help reduce avoidable vehicle emissions and allow the police to focus on other priorities. A minimum six week consultation will allow residents, businesses, road users and other stakeholders to comment on the proposed approach before Cabinet decides whether and how to proceed.

Alternative options considered and rejected

- Introducing district parking charges or moving traffic enforcement without consultation was rejected. Both proposals require public engagement, further evidence and a subsequent Cabinet decision.
- Maintaining the current arrangements was rejected because it would leave identified parking pressures unresolved and would not use the Council's existing moving traffic powers to address evidenced road safety and network management issues.

## CA.111 UPDATE ON AMENDMENTS TO ANNUAL APPOINTMENTS

Councillor Thorpe introduced the report highlighting changes made to the annual appointments since the Annual Meeting of Councill on 20 May 2026.

There were no comments or questions from members.

Decision(s)
Cabinet

- notes the appointments and amendments to appointments made since the Annual Meeting of Council as set out in the report.

Reasons for decision(s)

- To update Cabinet on amendments to appointments to:
    - Regulatory Committees, Overview and Scrutiny Committees and other bodies
    - Outside bodies

Alternative options considered and rejected
N/A

## CA.112 URGENT BUSINESS

There was no urgent business.

## CA.113 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.114 CLOSURE OF SIX TOWN HOUSING LTD - APPRAISAL OF STOCK OPTIONS & RECOMMENDATION FOR TRANSFER OF STHS FREEHOLD OWNED STOCK TO THE HRA - PART B

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

Decision(s)
Cabinet

- Note the update on STH viability concerns including the STH Board making a self-referral to the RSH in relation to its liquidity risk.
- Note the revised guidance from CT that considering the liquidity risk facing STH it is unlikely that options 1 and 2 as are now practical and timely options.

Reasons for recommendation(s)
Refer to Part A of the report

Alternative options considered and rejected
Refer to Part A of the report

**COUNCILLOR E O'BRIEN**
**Chair**

**(Note: The meeting started at Time Not Specified and ended at Time Not Specified)**