

EXECUTIVE

24 JULY 2023

PRESENT

Leader of the Council (Councillor Tom Ross), in the Chair.

Councillor C. Hynes	Deputy Leader of the Council and Executive Member for Leisure, Arts, Culture & Heritage
Councillor S. Adshead	Executive Member for Highways, Environmental & Traded Services / Labour Group Secretary
Councillor J. Harding	Executive Member for Finance, Change & Governance
Councillor E. Patel	Executive Member for Economy and Regeneration
Councillor J. Slater	Executive Member for Health and Care
Councillor R. Thompson	Executive Member for Communities and Safety
Councillor A.J. Williams	Executive Member for Climate Change

Also present

Councillors Evans, Butt, Jerrome, Ennis, and M. Taylor.

In attendance

Sara Todd	Chief Executive
Sara Saleh	Deputy Chief Executive & Corporate Director of Strategy and Resources
Richard Roe	Corporate Director of Place
Nathan Atkinson	Corporate Director of Adults and Wellbeing
Jill McGregor	Corporate Director of Children's Services
Graeme Bentley	Director of Finance and Systems
Emma Malpas	Head of Legal & Governance and Deputy Monitoring Officer
Alexander Murray	Governance Officer

APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors K.G. Carter and J.A. Wright

13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations were made.

14. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held 19 June 2023 be agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Leader.

15. QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC

The Deputy Monitoring Officer informed the Committee that many questions had been received. In the interests of time the Deputy Monitoring Officer had summarised each question but assured the committee that the full versions of the questions and answers would be recorded in the minutes and the questioners would receive the full responses in writing.

Eleanor Horner submitted the following requests for clarification and questions.

I would like to ask some points of clarification on the report on the Mayor's Challenge Fund at Agenda Item 8.

At paragraph 3.4 the report refers to "several non-MCF funded schemes" including BEE Network Crossings at Gorsey Lane and Dunham Road. The paragraph further states that the Gorsey Lane project has "ATF4 funding approved, currently at tender stage with works expected to start by Autumn 2023". There is no other reference to ATF4 in the report, only Active Travel Fund Tranches 1 and 2.

When the Gorsey Lane/Dunham Road scheme was approved by the Executive on 12 October 2022, the report to that meeting stated that this was an MCF-funded project. As I brought the original petition to Council in 2019 and as MCF-funded projects are being reprioritised, I would appreciate clarification and assurance of the status of this scheme.

1. Are the Gorsey Lane and/or the Dunham Road schemes referred to in paragraph 3.4 the same as the scheme that was approved on 12 October 2022?
2. Have there been any significant design amendments to the scheme as set out in the report that was approved in October?
3. Please confirm that the scheme that was approved in October is fully funded and proceeding to delivery in Autumn 2023 and not being delayed in the reprioritisation of MCF-funded schemes."

The Executive Member for Climate Change provided the following response to the requests for clarification.

Trafford Council did not directly make any ATF4 bids. The GMCA via TfGM made ATF4 bid submissions. As part of ATF4 TfGM proposed several bids, that met the "shovel-ready" criteria which included additional Bee Network crossings.

Yes is it the scheme approved by the Executive on 12 October 2022. The Gorsey Lane/Dunham Road scheme is funded through the Mayors Challenge Fund however the lead agent is TfGM not Trafford council.

In response to the three questions the Executive Member for Climate Change gave the following answers.

1. Yes, the Gorsey Lane and/or the Dunham Road schemes referred to in paragraph 3.4 the same as the scheme that was approved on 12 October 2022.

Executive (24.7.23)

2. There have been no significant changes to the scheme as set out in the report that was approved in October. The designs have been refined, in terms of technical aspects, i.e. Road Safety Audits, drainage, LTN 1/20, trees placements.
3. Yes. The MCF funding sits with TfGM. They are expecting to go to the TfGM contractor framework and appoint a contractor by the end of August 2023. With works to start thereafter.

The Following question was submitted by Mr Andrew Gould

I read with dismay the Urmston Active Neighbourhood section of the MCF agenda item for this meeting.

As you will be aware it contains plans for blocking roads to motorised traffic on the Canterbury Rd estate (Route D). This will mean that many residents will only be able to reach their homes by the junctions of Canterbury Rd with Croftsbank Rd or Lostock Rd. These junctions are busy at peak times and will cause major issues for residents accessing the estate. There is also the matter of queueing traffic on Canterbury Rd right next to the children's playground if it becomes one of the only exit points.

There is no mention of what the problem is that this scheme is trying to solve. There is a vague mention of satisfying the Walking and Riding policy but I'm at a loss to see how. If this is a drive for 'low traffic' this only is an issue for the entire estate with school traffic. Urging parents not to drive to school has had limited effect and reducing the ways of getting on to the estate is unlikely to change behaviour drastically.

There is some 'rat running' at the east end and some traffic using the side streets to get to Canterbury Rd shops. The 'rat running' appears to be people leaving the motorway and heading towards East Urmston / West Stretford. I still believe this will happen, but they would now be likely to head down Canterbury Rd as an alternative impacting local traffic, extending the busy period and causing yet more queueing by the children's play area.

I am against plans for this scheme continuing for the reasons mentioned above.

This scheme is substantially the same as one discussed at length and consulted on during the E.A.T.F. consultation in 2020. The outcome of the consultation was that 74% of residents rejected the scheme. This was reported as part of decision M/11.9.20/EAQCC(1) and the plans for the Canterbury Rd. Estate recommended for no further action. It is disgraceful that in the intervening years more public money has been spent in development.

In the same report it was concluded that "there is no clear way forward for an alternative layout that would be accepted by residents and businesses". Will the portion of Route D around Canterbury Rd now be excluded from Urmston Active Neighbourhood permanently – No more talk of trials or further wasteful consultations?

The Response below was provided by the Executive Member for Climate Change.

Executive (24.7.23)

The decision mentioned to M/11.9.20/EAQCC(1) refers to Emergency Active Travel Fund (EATF) Tranche 1 Modal Filters Projects and not the wider Urmston Active Neighbourhood scheme. These Modal Filters Projects formed part range of isolated proposals developed following announcement of Emergency Active Travel Funding that was made available for Trafford as part of an allocation by the Department of Transport (DfT).

Trafford first consulted a range of stakeholders on proposals to introduce more active travel measures for the wider Urmston Active Neighbourhood scheme in 2020 as part of a Mayoral Challenge Fund (MCF) application. This consultation was met with a high degree interest with over 3,400 comments received and over 600 individuals attending drop-in sessions where Neighbourhood Map via Trafford Council's Commonplace website.

These comments are still available online at: <https://urmstonactivenighbourhoodmap.commonplace.is/comments/5e66061e23b526001128130c>

This consultation identified safety, car driving, parking, traffic congestion around schools and dangerous rat-runs through residential areas as some of the key issues for the stakeholders

Resident feedback has been a key part of the development of the plans being taken forward. This has factored in how people move around their neighbourhood and risks they encounter each day.

Conceptual designs for Urmston Area Active Neighbourhood and were presented to Trafford Council, Ward Councillors and TfGM in 2022. The overall designs were split the scheme into several phases beginning with interventions along eight potential minor or major routes that cover the whole of Urmston.

Phase 1 comprising Route C: Flixton West and Route D: Davyhulme Park, including the Canterbury Rd estate have been identified for further engagement and consultation planned for in Autumn 2023. In addition to consultation, the intention is to include an option of trials post the consultation.

Both routes propose active travel measures include modal filters (barriers to stop cars at specific points) along with new cycle ways, pedestrian paths and controlled crossings of busy roads or other physical barriers that divide communities. These will be incorporated into the wider Bee Network for sustainable travel in the Greater Manchester area.

The aim is that all the residents of Urmston will take this opportunity to lead and make their voices heard on this ambitious initiative, changing the way they view and interact with their neighbourhood through the inclusion of more environmentally friendly community spaces, safer walking and cycling routes connecting schools and communities and ultimately prioritising the movement of people and cyclists over vehicles.

Executive (24.7.23)

The following questions were sent by Kevin Smith on behalf of Friends of John Lee Park.

Note prior information, review was provided to the meeting on the 18th. The issues raised were not fully answered to our satisfaction. For completeness our input on specific items on the Report reviewed are copied below.

1. USAGE

What utilisation rate (% of hours available to book) is expected for the pilot. What proportion of these are expected to be charged? These are bookings separate to any outreach programme.

Any realistic assessment of income net income must be based on an achievable usage and charges.

We've not seen that.

2. OUTREACH

Why have we not seen a full description of a typical outreach programme – How many hours per court per week. Charges to users. Fees to the operator / coaches. Who the courses are for (Age/other).

Without this key change to court use it is not possible to judge the benefits of the proposed options.

We cannot judge.

3. EXAMPLES

Where is this programme working. What are the numbers. What is the outreach, utilisation, charging structure.

Any pilot should be informed by best- and worst-case examples of implementation elsewhere and the learnings to date.

We've seen no detailed examples.

As John Leigh Park is not part of the pilot the Friends expect no further suggestions for change to their court use over the 2-year period of the pilot.

We do expect normal court maintenance to continue.

The Executive Member for Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage provided the following response.

I'd like to thank the friends of John Leigh Park for their questions. They've raised 3 areas of concern where they feel the meeting with Council officers on 18th July to discuss the pilot proposals did not fully cover. I understand that John Leigh Park does not wish to be in the pilot scheme and this is reflected in the proposal, however the Friends of Parks group suggest that further explanation would benefit those parks who have opted to be involved in the local pilot.

Usage

Many of the issues raised here regarding usage levels and income will be developed as we work over the next two years with local communities to shape

Executive (24.7.23)

the local programmes and collect data on usage and income generated for each pilot scheme. Understanding these factors and determining what works for our communities are important elements of the pilot, which is why there haven't yet been a detailed breakdown of income, usage and charges.

However, current booking data has been considered and referenced in the report as it shows Trafford residents and tennis players are willing and able to use the booking system.

We have been working closely with the Lawn Tennis Association, the national governing body and they are very supportive of the local pilots to test all elements of the approach and consider how the outreach programmes can best reflect the varying community needs in each locality.

The LTA have advised that a park court typically needs a collective maintenance and sinking fund of £1,500 per annum. The revenue model developed for the Pilot responds to this with a flexible model that can balance free bookable access, coaching and outreach and paid for slots.

Demand data, supports the pilot and suggests there is considerable latent demand for Tennis in the borough. The demand data covers all of Trafford and covers all ages within a 0-20 min drive time to courts.

We will continue to draw on the LTAs expertise and the learning gained as they roll out this national programme across Greater Manchester and wider.

Outreach

Providers will be asked to tender for the local provision and will be expected to connect and collaborate with local schools and clubs to ensure a pathway and provide a range of sessions across all age groups abilities and at varying times and costs to meet community needs while generating required income levels.

Examples

As this is a national scheme it is early days in the roll out programme, however working closely with Manchester City Council and Bury Council we have been able to draw on the learning from case studies. both report usage levels of 50-60% per week.

Manchester City Council has a scheme with over 19,000 users and have demonstrated that sites with access gates have more bookings, than those that do not and that these have increased on a monthly basis from April 2023. They have also engaged a provider across a range of Parks who deliver junior, adult and family sessions at all levels with varying charging packages in place. This is delivered alongside a rolling programme of court upgrades, including installing lockable gates and introducing charges for court hire.

We will continue to work with the LTA, and colleagues within GM and beyond to learn from their experiences- good and bad. We look forward to bringing that learning back to share with Friends of Parks and feed into the Trafford pilots.

Executive (24.7.23)

The final question below was received from Mr Andrew Gould

Park Friend's Groups across Trafford have been engaged with the Tennis Improvement Program for some time.

Most parks have deep misgivings about plans to charge a fee to access any part of a public park. During the One Trafford / Parks Meeting in February 2023 not one group supported the councils plans for Tennis. Running a trial isn't going to change that. In two years, no matter how successful the pilot, Friends groups are likely to be of the same view then because it's fundamental to free access principals.

These plans have now been shared with the wider community and a consultation run. The result was overwhelmingly of the view that Trafford should not be considering limiting access to Tennis courts to those that were able to pay.

The idea of charging has been rejected by 80% of those who responded to the consultation. What level of disapproval would it take for Council Officers to recommend something more acceptable?"

The Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage provided the following response to Mr. Gould's question.

I'd like to thank Mr Gould for his correspondence, the points he has raised and his specific question in relation to the consultation. The Friends of Parks Groups across Trafford have been involved in the project for some time. Their opinions on each site and local insight have been invaluable, and we will continue to work with the Friends of Parks groups as we progress with the pilots in each community.

We have also worked with the Lawn Tennis Association in bringing together the level of investment required to improve park courts across the borough. As detailed in the report, the level of funding required of £587,242 to bring our courts up to an acceptable standard and ongoing maintenance of £46,500k per annum is, unfortunately not one that the Council could meet given the current level of budget pressures.

This proposal provides a significant opportunity to work closely with local residents, alongside tennis's national governing body to learn from their experiences and that of other authorities and communities as we pilot the approach together.

In relation to Mr Gould's question on consultation and charging.

We acknowledge that not all elements of the scheme were fully supported through the boroughwide public consultation process – particularly on charging. Equally, some elements of the scheme were supported and the levels of support for each element varied from location to location, as did the level of charging that people thought acceptable. Therefore, the idea is to work out a fair and accessible structure that will not prevent anyone from being able to play tennis. How we do that is exactly what we hope to test in our local pilots.

We accept that the boroughwide public consultation process was somewhat limited in its reach. By piloting the approach in local communities, we are seeking to engage families, young people, local schools, and clubs to gauge their opinions – taking a focused community, place-based approach. These local voices were not captured in the broader boroughwide consultation process to date.

At the end of the pilot, we will carefully consider the learning and available options to determine the best offer for all our residents.

**16. MATTERS FROM COUNCIL OR OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES
(IF ANY)**

Councillor Acton informed the Committee that the Scrutiny Committee had met for the first time and had agreed a work programme for the year. Councillor Acton highlighted a number of key items the Committee were going to look at including Access to Council Services and Damp and Mould within social Housing. Councillor Acton concluded his update by stating that the task and finish group on Events at Old Trafford and Reducing Car Dependency would be continuing within the new municipal year.

The Leader thanked Councillor Acton for his update and welcomed the Committee's input on access to Council services and Damp and Mould in Social Housing. The Leader stated that he and the rest of the Executive looked forward to working closely with the Committee over the Course of the year.

Councillor Butt informed the Committee that the Health Scrutiny Committee were having their first meeting later that week and that the agenda covered a number of items carried forward from the previous year and that the Committee had identified a number of topics of importance to residents to review over the coming year.

The Leader thanked Councillor Butt for his update.

17. CULTURE STRATEGY

The Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage introduced the report on the Councils culture strategy. The Committee were informed that Trafford was a talent belt for culture and the arts across Greater Manchester with 25% of creative professionals living within the borough. The Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage stated that this often went unrecognised at a GM level with Trafford often being seen as an audience for Manchester's cultural offerings rather than the workforce and core element of the creative industry. The Executive Member drew the Committee's attention to the fact that Trafford was underrepresented in terms of external funding for culture and the arts.

The report detailed the positive impact the strategy would have for residents across the borough and how it would help to stimulate the borough's economy. The strategy looked to build upon the area's rich heritage in sport and the arts. As part of the development of the strategy a culture summit had been held and the Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage spoke of the great

Executive (24.7.23)

energy among those who attended the summit with regards to what could be achieved within the area. The Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage concluded her introduction by drawing the Committee's attention to the recommendations of the report along with the resources required to achieve them.

The Leader welcomed the report and spoke of his own passion for culture and the creative sector within Trafford. The Leader recognised the rich cultural position the Council had with the imperial war museum, Sale Festival, one of the largest collections of puppets in the country, a thriving music service, and being home to multiple international music venues. The Leader spoke of how the strategy would look to build upon that strong foundation and address any gaps within the boroughs cultural landscape.

Councillor Williams spoke about the excellent framing of culture in the report in the way that it included wider elements of culture such as the sporting and food and beverage offers within the area. The Executive Member gave credit to the consultants who had been involved in the creation of a very robust report which provided a much-needed recognition of the cultural value in the borough and the role the Council had in developing the cultural offer within Trafford.

Councillor Evans noted the level of funding for the role on page 22 of the report. Councillor Evans stated that £400 a day was a lot of money and he felt it would be better served by having a full-time role. Councillor Evans then drew the Committee's attention to Page 23 point 5.4 of the report which stated that future funding requirements would be met from external sources. Councillor Evans asked how certain of the funding was the Council, whether future meant after one two or three years, did the continuation of the strategy reliant upon that external funding. The Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage responded to Councillor Evans that the role was the result of a lot of research and looking at other areas where culture had thrived. While the role looked expensive the wage offered reflected the market rate for an individual with the right skills. By appointing such an individual, they would help to secure external funding through their role, which would continue to pay for the role and the delivery of the strategy.

Councillor Jerrome noted that there was a large amount of jargon within the report and felt that there was a lack of concrete outcomes listed within the strategy which could lead to a loss of the S106 funding that was being put into the strategy. The Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage responded that the strategy would be organic and continually changing in line with contributions coming from residents from all over the borough and the Executive Member encouraged all Council Members to get involved and input into the strategy utilising their local knowledge and expertise to ensure the strategy was a success. The Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage agreed with Councillor Jerrome around the amount of jargon within the body of the report and felt that it reduced the accessibility of the document. The Corporate Director of Strategy and Resources noted the points raised about jargon in the Strategy and assured members that an easy read version had been developed and would be shared.

The Leader noted that CTC, who supported the creation of the strategy, were leaders in the field. The Leader expressed his confidence felt that the funding

Executive (24.7.23)

provided through delivery of the strategy would be key in unlocking the untapped creative and economic potential of the assets and abilities of the area and its residents.

Councillor Butt welcomed the report and noted how Trafford “Punched above its weight” in terms of the cultural assets the borough had. Councillor Butt drew the Committees attention to the works of groups listed in the strategy such as the third age which worked with those with disabilities and spoke of the value of their work. Asked another question at the end responded by Sara Saleh.

Councillor Ennis welcomed the report and asked for assurances around the night-time economy and education. In response the Corporate Director of Resources and Strategy recognised the need to provide assurance and stated that working was ongoing with members deliver that assurance.

RESOLVED:

1. That the report be noted.
2. That the Trafford Cultural Strategy be adopted and approved
3. That the implementation plan and the associated commitment of resources be approved.

18. TENNIS INVESTMENT PROJECT

The Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage introduced the report and gave a short overview of its contents. The Executive Member informed the Committee that the Friends of Davyhulme Park were not in support of the project and did not want to be part of the pilot scheme, although this had not been known until after the report was published.

The report detailed the current standard of tennis courts within Trafford, the costs of improving and maintaining the courts, and outlined the concern that the courts would deteriorate further if the Council’s approach did not change. The proposal within the report was that the Lawn Tennis Association had funding available that could be used to improve the courts and then gates would be installed, which the Council could use to charge a fee for use of the courts that would pay to maintain the courts and for coaching etc... While 80% of respondents to the consultation were against charging for access to the courts the majority did welcome the ideas of introducing coaching and of having gates on the courts to protect them.

The Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage concluded the introduction by stating the recommendations of the report which included approval to run a pilot programme across the borough. The Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage Informed the Committee that if the Council decided to proceed with the proposals following completion of the pilot scheme, then additional capital funding would be required, which had not yet been secured although the Council was still in conversations with the LTA. The Committee were informed of the proposed charges for the courts of £3.00 per hour for 10 hours a day from May – September.

Executive (24.7.23)

The Executive Member for Economy and Regeneration welcomed the report and supported the recommendations as a way to introduce a sustainable model which would guarantee that Trafford were able to maintain the assets in good condition and encourage tennis across the borough.

The Executive Member for Highways, Environmental, and Traded Services noted the negative feedback from the consultation and welcomed the decision to run a pilot scheme in order to test proposals before rolling out the programme. The Executive Member for Highways, Environmental, and Traded Services also noted that in areas where similar schemes had already been rolled out they had seen a notable increase in the use of tennis courts.

Councillor Thompson thanked the officers for all research done and the presentations they had provided to the Executive to the Friends of Parks groups.

Councillor Ennis noted that the Council had received positive feedback from three of the four sites for the pilot and asked which one had not. The Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage stated that no response had been received from Pickering lodge. The Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage assured the Committee that the Council would continue to try to engage with the Friends of Pickering Lodge and it was hope that they would be happy to take part in the Pilot Scheme.

Councillor Evans asked if the Executive were confident that the scheme would generate the required income. The Corporate Director of Place responded to Councillor Evans that Bury and Manchester had achieved 50% usage which, if replicated within Trafford, would break even. The Council expected that the courts would attract a wide range of users including those people who were retired, young people in summer holidays, and others who were not working during the daytime. The Corporate Director of Place spoke about the benefits of the route that the Council were going down with the LTA putting a pound in for each pound the Council put in which maximised the funding used by the Council for the project. The Corporate Director stated that it was hoped that if the pilot was a success the LTA would invest more to roll the project out further.

Councillor Evans noted that the Council were spending nearly all the funding on upgrading the sites for the pilot and asked what would happen if it failed or if the Council wanted to roll the programme out further. The Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage agreed with Councillor Evans points that there was the possibility that the programme could fail to meet the projected income. However, even if that happened, the Council would still have improved the condition of the courts. It was hoped that additional funding would be available from the LTA at the conclusion of the pilot, but it was not a certainty.

Councillor Evans asked what the point was in having a consultation given that 80% of those consulted with did not want it and yet the Council was proceeding any way. The Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage responded that the 80% were those who were against paying for tennis and the model would provide free tennis sessions as well. There were other elements of the project that the consultants were happy with and the feedback from the consultation had helped to shape the project.

Executive (24.7.23)

Councillor Jerrome noted that the previous consultation had stated that without a 5-year contract the programme could not proceed. Councillor Jerrome asked what had changed which enabled the programme to proceed with only a 2-year contract. Executive Member responded that had conversation with the LTA and they were very keen to increase access to tennis and so they had revised their offer to the Council to enable the Pilot Scheme to go ahead.

Councillor Jerrome stated that the project went against the ethos of parks being free and asked whether the Executive agreed with that statement. The Executive Member agreed that parks should be free to access but not all services and resources should be free. The proposal offered much better facilities than were currently available with the highest price within the scheme was £3.00 per hour, which was much less than the cost of using private courts. There would be a range of prices for different times of day or year with the potential for some free sessions.

Councillor Jerrome asked whether the park covenants could be made public. The Corporate Director of Place responded that he thought that the covenants had been made public and he would check to ensure it had been done.

Councillor Jerrome asked if the programme made more money than needed to maintain the courts that were part of the programme whether those monies would be used to maintain or improve other courts across the borough. The Corporate Director of Place responded that if the programme did produce more monies, it would be for the Executive to decide what to do at that time.

Following the discussions, the Leader Moved the recommendations and they were approved.

RESOLVED:

1. That the report be noted.
2. That the implementation of a 'pilot' of the sustainable operating model as set out in Option 3 C of this report (as verbally amended during the meeting to remove reference to Davyhulme Park forming part of the pilot), which includes the introduction of access gates, charging policy and the procurement of a specialist operator be approved.
3. That delegation of authority to the Corporate Director of Place to procure an operator and to agree the terms of the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) funding and finalise the terms of any funding agreement be approved.
4. That the delegation of authority to the Director of Legal and Governance to agree and enter into any documents required to implement the above decisions be approved.

19. UPDATE ON TRAFFORD COUNCIL'S MAYORAL CHALLENGE FUND ACTIVE TRAVEL REPRIORITISATION AND INDICATIVE 2023/24 ACTIVE TRAVEL SCHEME DELIVERY PROGRAMME

Executive (24.7.23)

The Executive Member for Climate change introduced the report and the details contained within. The report covered the progress of the different projects across the area and the Executive Member note that they were all at different levels of development with one completed so far. The Committee were informed that the consultation on the proposals had been completed and that the next area of focus would be the Urmston active neighbourhood which was progressing.

The Leader welcomed the report and the £30M of funding that would be put into active transport in the area over the next year.

The Executive Member for Highways, Environmental, and Traded Services welcomed the report and particularly the plans for the top of talbot road, the additional crossing measures being brought in and the additional safety the plans would deliver for residents. The Leader thanked Councillor Adshead and the points he made about additional safety.

The Executive Member for Health and Care welcomed the report and the safety measures it would deliver, especially in the wake of the accident on the A56 over the weekend. The Executive Member for Health and Care highlighted the way the proposed plans would help to tackle health inequalities across the area.

Councillor Evans for details of the £4.7M spent on the Talbot Road development within the plans. The Corporate Director of Place responded that a breakdown of the costs could be provided to Councillor Evans. The Executive Member for Climate Change added that the cyclops junctions had a high cost as they represented quite large engineering projects.

Councillor Jerrome welcomed the plans but felt that there was a lack of strategic vision and asked whether the council should focus on plans near schools to maximise the outcomes. Councillor Williams thanked Councillor Jerrome for some of his points but disagreed with his point about the lack of strategic vision as officers had worked very hard about delivering the works in a key commuter route and connecting into the A56. The Leader added that the Council were working closely with TFGM with the aim being to ensure someone as young as 8 years old would be able to travel safely across the borough.

Councillor Ennis asked about where plans were up to on the late-night trams scheme. Councillor Williams responded that he would raise the question at the next meeting of the B-Network and feedback the response to Councillor Ennis.

Following the discussions, the Leader Moved the recommendations and they were approved.

RESOLVED:

1. That the report be noted.
2. That the reprioritisation of MCF funded active travel schemes with a forecast delivery budget of circa £13.01m based on the delivery priorities set out in Section 2 be noted.

**Executive
(24.7.23)**

3. That the inclusion the A56 Phase 2 scheme with an indicative budget allocation of £1.6m into the MCF programme, noting the requirement for the scheme to follow the MCF governance and approvals process to secure MCF funding be noted.
4. That the indicative active travel programme of works for 2023/24 which would achieve the delivery of four active travel work schemes be noted.
5. That the implications of the reprioritised development programme together with the wider proposed active travel scheme pipeline as set out in Section 3 of the report be noted.
6. That the delegation of authority to the Corporate Director of Place, in consultation with the Director of Finance and Systems, to accept and spend Mayoral Challenge Fund (MCF) funding allocation, on a scheme-by-scheme basis, for the implementation on the delivery and development priorities as set out in Sections 2 and 3 of the report be approved.
7. That the delegation of authority to the Corporate Director of Place, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance, to negotiate and finalise the grant delivery agreements, construction contracts and any other contracts or documents required to implement this decision be approved.
8. That the delegation of authority to the Corporate Director of Place, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance, to award a contract to a recommended contractor for each Scheme once an agreed delivery agreement is in place.
9. That the delegation of authority to the Director of Legal and Governance to enter into any contracts or other documents required to implement the decision be approved.

20. BUDGET MONITORING PERIOD 2

The Executive Member for Finance, Change, and Governance introduce the report and highlighted the layout of the report and how it made the information clear and easy to take in. The Committee were asked to note the different sections of the report. The Executive Member then went through the most salient points within the report, which included some concerns along with the continued work of the Finance and Change Board.

Following the introduction Councillor Butt asked where the £430K for public Health had come from. The Executive Member for Finance, Change, and Governance responded that the funding came through central government, although the funding had been received late.

Councillor Butt asked whether some properties could be bought and converted to provide some inhouse social care places. The Executive Member for Finance, Change, and Governance stated that it was not just about the building and that there were many elements to look at including accessibility of other services and staff to deliver the service.

Executive (24.7.23)

Following the discussions, the Leader asked the Executive to note the report.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

21. CORPORATE PLAN ANNUAL REPORT

The Leader introduced the report and drew the Committee's attention to the many achievements that the Council had obtained over the course of the previous year across the borough. The Leader recognised that those achievements would not have been possible without the Officers who worked for the Council.

The Executive Member for Economy and Regeneration spoke about multiple pieces of work that were currently ongoing and the impact the completion of those projects would have on the community.

The Executive Member for Climate Change noted that the Council had some challenges over the year as well as success, such as the admissions performance. The Executive Member for Climate Change asked whether some of the performance indicators should be change due to the authority's inability to influence them for example the private electric vehicle ownership. Highlighted and welcomed the appointment of a new climate change lead and hoped that they would help to drive the work forward.

The Executive Member for Health and Care asked the Committee to note the work that had been done around health inequalities and informed the Committee that work was ongoing around smoking cessation and using vapes to encourage quitting while challenging the uptake of vaping among young people. The Executive Member for Health and Care highlighted the work that had been done to help residents to claim benefits that they were due.

The Executive Member for Leisure, Culture, Art, and Heritage noted the good work being done with Trafford leisure and the increase in physical activity within the borough.

Councillor Evans welcomed the report and its format. Councillor Evans noted the drop in GCSE results and asked if the reason for the drop off was known. The Corporate Director for Children's Services informed the Committee that indicators for the coming year were looking very positive and highlighted the impact of inequalities upon GCSE attainment.

Councillor Butt noted levels of obesity in the most deprived areas and the need for access to physical activity. In response to Councillor Butt the Executive Member for Health and Care spoke about residents who accessed food banks and the difficulties that they faced in feeding their families in healthy ways with the foods available to them. So, while having access to physical activity was important the challenges were also around diet.

Following the discussions, the Leader asked the Executive to note the report.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

**Executive
(24.7.23)**

The meeting commenced at 6.30 p.m. and finished at 8.11 p.m.