



Joanne Roney OBE
Chief Executive
Telephone: 0161 234 3006
j.roney@manchester.gov.uk
PO Box 532, Town Hall
Extension, Manchester
M60 2LA

Tuesday, 17 March 2020

Dear Councillor / Honorary Alderman,

Meeting of the Council – Wednesday, 25th March, 2020

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the Council which will be held at 10.00 am on Wednesday, 25th March, 2020, in The Council Chamber, Level 2, Town Hall Extension, Manchester City Council.

1. The Lord Mayor's Announcements and Special Business

2. Interests

To allow members an opportunity to declare and record any personal, prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interest they might have in any items which appear on this agenda; and record any items from which they are precluded from voting as a result of Council Tax or Council rent arrears. Members with a personal interest should declare that at the start of the item under consideration. If members also have a prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interest they must withdraw from the meeting during the consideration of the item.

3. Minutes

5 - 74

To submit for approval the minutes of the budget meeting held on 6 March 2020.

4. Proceedings of the Executive

75 - 108

To submit the second part proceedings of the meeting of the Executive on 12 February 2020, the minutes of the meeting on 11 March 2020, and the minutes of the meeting on 25 March 2020 (to be tabled). In particular to consider:

Exe/20/43 Capital Programme Update

To recommend that the Council approve the following changes to the Council's capital programme:

- a) Growth and Development – Piccadilly Gardens Phase 1. A capital budget virement of £1.811m is requested, funded by Sustaining Key Initiatives budget.
- b) Growth and Development – HOME Arches Phase 1. A

- capital budget increase of £0.215m is requested, funded by Borrowing.
- c) Neighbourhoods - Purchase of Electric RCV's. A capital budget increase of £9.4m is requested, funded by £5.7m Borrowing and £3.7m Invest to save.
 - d) Public Sector Housing - Northwards Housing 2020/21 Capital Programme. A capital virement of £10.406m is requested from Northwards Housing Unallocated, funded by HRA (RCCO).
 - e) Growth and Development – Carbon Reduction Programme Phase 2. A capital budget increase of £15m is requested, funded by Borrowing.
 - f) Growth and Development – Carbon Reduction Action Plan Delivery. A revenue budget increase of £1m is requested, funded by Capital Fund.
 - g) Growth and development – Greening of the City. A capital budget increase of £1m is requested, funded by Capital Fund.

Also to consider any recommendations that are made to Council arising from the meeting of the Executive to be held on 25 March, the minutes of which will be tabled.

5. Questions to Executive Members and Others under Procedural Rule 23

To receive answers to any questions that councillors have raised in accordance with Procedural Rule 23.

6. Scrutiny Committees

109 - 202

To note the minutes of the following committees:

Resources and Governance on 4 February 2020 and 3 March 2020

Health on 4 February 2020 and 3 March 2020 (to follow)

Children and Young People on 5 February 2020 and 4 March 2020

Neighbourhoods and Environment on 5 February 2020 and 4 March 2020

Economy on 6 February 2020 and 5 March 2020

Communities and Equalities 6 February 2020, 5 March 2020 (to follow) and 11 March 2020 (to follow)

7. Proceedings of Committees

203 - 232

To submit for approval the minutes of the following meetings and consider recommendations made by the committee:

Audit Committee on 11 February 2020 and 10 March 2020

Personnel Committee on 11 March 2020 (to be tabled). The meetings was adjourned, to be resumed on 25 March 2020. It is likely that when it meets on 25 March the Committee will make recommendations to this meeting of the Council. They will be set

out in the minutes which will be tabled at the Council meeting.

Planning and Highways on 16 January 2020, 13 February 2020
and 12 March 2020 (to follow)

Standards Committee on 19 March 2020 (to follow)

Health and Wellbeing Board on 18 March 2020 (to follow)

Constitutional and Nomination on 25 March 2020 (to be tabled)

**8. Constitutional Amendments and Other Matters for Council
Business Continuity**

The report of the Chief Executive, Deputy Chief Executive and
City Treasurer, and the City Solicitor will follow.

**9. Findings of the Standards Committee into complaints
against a Councillor**

233 - 242

The report of the Monitoring Officer is attached, including the
Summary Decision Notice of the Standards (Hearing) Sub
Committee.

Yours faithfully,



Joanne Roney OBE
Chief Executive

Information about the Council

The Council is composed of 96 councillors with one third elected three years in four. Councillors are democratically accountable to residents of their ward. Their overriding duty is to the whole community, but they have a special duty to their constituents, including those who did not vote for them.

Seven individuals with previous long service as councillors of the city have been appointed Honorary Aldermen of the City of Manchester and are entitled to attend every Council meeting. They do not however have a vote.

All councillors meet together as the Council under the chairship of the Lord Mayor of Manchester. There are seven meetings of the Council in each municipal year and they are open to the public. Here councillors decide the Council's overall strategic policies and set the budget each year.

Agenda, reports and minutes of all Council meetings can be found on the Council's website www.manchester.gov.uk

Members of the Council

Councillors:-

Hitchen, Abdullatif, Akbar, Azra Ali, Ahmed Ali, Nasrin Ali, Sameem Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Andrews, Appleby, Battle, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Chohan (Chair), Clay, Collins, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Y Dar, Davies, Dobson, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Farrell, Flanagan, Green, Grimshaw, Hacking, Hassan, Hewitson, Holt, Hughes, Igbon, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, T Judge (Deputy Chair), Kamal, Karney, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, Leese, J Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Madeleine Monaghan, Mary Monaghan, Moore, N Murphy, S Murphy, Newman, Noor, O'Neil, Ollerhead, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reeves, Reid, Riasat, Richards, Rowles, Russell, Sadler, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, A Simcock, K Simcock, Stanton, Stogia, Stone, Strong, Taylor, Watson, Wheeler, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

Honorary Aldermen of the City of Manchester –

Gordon Conquest, Andrew Fender, Audrey Jones JP, Paul Murphy OBE, Nilofar Siddiqi and Keith Whitmore.

Further Information

For help, advice and information about this meeting please contact the Committee Officer:

Donald Connolly
Tel: 0161 234 3034
Email: d.connolly@manchestser.gov.uk

This agenda was issued on **Tuesday, 17 March 2020** by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Manchester City Council, Level 3, Town Hall Extension (Lloyd Street Elevation), Manchester M60 2LA

Council

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, 6 March 2020

Present:

The Right Worshipful, the Lord Mayor Councillor Chohan – in the Chair

Councillors:

Akbar, Ahmed Ali, Azra Ali, Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Andrews, Battle, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Clay, Collins, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Davies, Dobson, Doswell, Evans, Farrell, Flanagan, Grimshaw, Hassan, Hewitson, Hitchen, Holt, Hughes, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick, Leech, Leese, J Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Madeleine Monaghan, Mary Monaghan, N Murphy, Newman, Noor, O'Neil, Ollerhead, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reid, Riasat, Richards, Rowles, Russell, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, A Simcock, K Simcock, Stanton, Stogia, Stone, Taylor, Watson, Wheeler, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

CC/20/15. The Lord Mayor's Special Business - Election of Councillor Kenneth Dobson

The Lord Mayor congratulated Councillor Dobson on his recent winning of the recent by-election in Clayton and Openshaw and welcomed him on his return to the Council.

CC/20/16. The Lord Mayor's Special Business - Hearts for the Arts Awards 2020

The Lord Mayor congratulated Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Leisure, Culture and Skills who had been declared the national arts champion councillor in the Hears for Arts Awards 2020. The award had recognised Councillor Rahman as a true champion of the Arts and a huge believer in celebrating the diversity of the city.

CC/20/17. The Council's Revenue and Capital Budget 2020/21

The Council met to consider and set the 2020/21 budget, Council Tax resolution for 2020/21 and Collection Fund budget for 2020/21. In doing so, the proceedings of the Art Galleries Committee on 12 February 2020 which provided details of the Art Galleries budget for 2020/21 were submitted for approval. In addition, the part proceedings of the Executive on 12 February 2020 were submitted for approval, which contained details on the following:

- The Councils Budget 2020/21 – Covering Report;
- Medium Term Financial Plan 2020/21 - 2022/23;
- Capital Strategy and Budget 2019/20;
- Council Business Plan 2020/21;

- Children and Education Budget 2020/21;
- Adult Social Care and Population Health Budget 2020/21;
- Manchester Health and Care Commissioning Budget 2020/21;
- Homelessness Budget 2020/21;
- Neighbourhoods Directorate Budget 2020/21;
- Growth and Development Budget 2020/21;
- Corporate Core Budget 2020/21;
- Dedicated Schools Grant 2020/21;
- Housing Revenue Account 2020/21 to 2022/23;
- Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy 2020/21;
- Budget 2020/21 Public Consultation Outcomes; and
- Budget 2020/21 Equality Impact Assessment.

The Council also considered the following reports:-

- The Capital Strategy and Budget 2020/21;
- The Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy 2020/21; and
- The Council Tax Resolution 2020/21.

In addition, the Council received the minutes of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee on 24 February 2020 that had considered the Budget Report 2020-2021.

Councillor Leese moved the proceedings of the Art Galleries Committee and part proceedings of the Executive, both held on 12 February 2020, the Revenue and Capital Budgets (as amended by the joint report of the City Treasurer, Chief Executive and City Solicitor) and the recommendations as detailed in the above reports, which were seconded by Councillor Ollerhead (Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources). In seconding the recommendations, Councillor Ollerhead, presented his budget statement for 2020/21 to Council.

Councillor Stanton, Opposition Lead Member on Finance, responded to the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources budget statement for 2020/21.

The Council then considered four amendments to the Council Budget 2020/21.

The first amendment, moved by Councillor Stanton, and seconded by Councillor Kilpatrick was as follows:-

“To allocate a budget of £960,000 phased equally over three years to enable the Council to make available a £10,000pa Green Neighbourhood Investment Fund in each of the 32 wards, encouraging our neighbourhoods to participate in carbon reduction on a community-led basis shaped by the priorities of the Manchester Climate Change Action Plan; to be funded out of the proposed £2.079m contribution to the Business Rates Reserve for 2020/21”.

The second amendment, moved by Councillor Kilpatrick and seconded by Councillor Stanton was as follows:-

“To allocate a budget of £960,000 phased equally over three years to enable the Council to deliver a programme of target hardening (including further alleygating) in areas of benefit; to be funded out of the proposed £2.079m contribution to the Business Rates Reserve for 2020/21 and to allocate a budget of £1.5m to enable the Council to deliver road safety & traffic calming schemes in areas of need; to be funded through transfer from the On-street Parking reserve”.

The third amendment, moved by Councillor Leech and seconded by Councillor Kilpatrick was as follows:-

“To establish a three-year budget totalling £600,000 to at least double 24-hour toilet provision in the City Centre, lessening the impact of any Public Space Protection Order on our homeless population; funded through a release of reserves”.

The fourth and final amendment, moved by Councillor Flanagan and seconded by Councillor Johns was as follows:-

“We wish to amend to amend this year’s budget and call on the Council to set up a one-off fund for £250,000 to be called the Spring Challenge Fund”.

Members then commented on the proposed amendments.

In his right of reply, Councillor Leese moved a motion without notice under Council Rule of Procedure 19.1(k), to suspend particular Rules, in order to suspend Rule of Procedure 18 - Amendments to be moved at Council.

On the motion without notice being put to the vote, the Lord Mayor declared it carried.

Councillor Leese then moved the following amendment in relation to the motions submitted by Councillors Stanton and Kilpatrick, which was seconded by Councillor N Murphy:-

“That Council neither supported or opposed the amendments and instead agrees to refer the consideration of the proposals within these amendments to the Executive”.

On the amendment proposed by Councillor Leese being put to the vote, the Lord Mayor declared it carried, the result being:-

For the amendment (79)

Chohan, Akbar, Ahmed Ali, Azra Ali, Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Andrews, Battle, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Clay, Collins, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Davies, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Farrell, Flanagan, Grimshaw, Hassan, Hewitson, Hitchen, Hughes, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick, Leech, Leese, J Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Madeleine Monaghan, Mary Monaghan, N Murphy, Newman, Noor, O'Neil, Ollerhead, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reid,

Riasat, Richards, Rowles, Russell, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, A Simcock, K Simcock, Stanton, Stogia, Stone, Taylor, Watson, Wheeler, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

Against the Amendment (0)

Abstentions (0)

Non voting (2)

Dobson and Holt

The Lord Mayor then put the remaining amendments from Councillors Leech and Flanagan to the vote. On being put to the vote the Lord Mayor declared that the amendment proposed by Councillor Leech was lost, the result being:

For the amendment (5)

Ahmed Ali, Kilpatrick, Leech, Reid and Stanton

Against the Amendment (74)

Chohan, Akbar, Azra Ali, Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Andrews, Battle, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Clay, Collins, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Davies, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Farrell, Flanagan, Grimshaw, Hassan, Hewitson, Hitchen, Hughes, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kirkpatrick, Leese, J Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Madeleine Monaghan, Mary Monaghan, N Murphy, Newman, Noor, O'Neil, Ollerhead, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Riasat, Richards, Rowles, Russell, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, A Simcock, K Simcock, Stogia, Stone, Taylor, Watson, Wheeler, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

Abstentions (0)

Non voting (2)

Dobson and Holt

and the amendment proposed by Councillor Flanagan was carried, the result being:

For the amendment (79)

Chohan, Akbar, Ahmed Ali, Azra Ali, Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Andrews, Battle, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Clay, Collins, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Davies, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Farrell, Flanagan, Grimshaw, Hassan, Hewitson, Hitchen, Hughes, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick, Leech, Leese, J Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Madeleine Monaghan, Mary Monaghan, N Murphy, Newman, Noor, O'Neil, Ollerhead, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reid, Riasat, Richards, Rowles, Russell, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, A Simcock, K

Simcock, Stanton , Stogia, Stone, Taylor, Watson, Wheeler, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

Against the Amendment (0)

Abstentions (0)

Non voting (2)

Dobson and Holt

The Lord Mayor then invited Council to vote on the amended budget motion as the substantive budget resolution, and in doing so, sought Council to:-

- (1) Approve proposals to ensure that the Housing Revenue Account for 2020/21 did not show a debit balance (as set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes);
- (2) Approve the virements over £0.5m between capital schemes to maximise use of funding resources available to the City Council (as part of the recommendations within **Capital Programme Monitoring 2019/20** (Minute Exe/20/11 refers));
- (3) Approve for 2020/21:
 - an increase in the basic amount of Council Tax (i.e. the Council's element of Council Tax) by 3.99%. The Council has consulted on the 2% Adult Social Care precept increase. If agreed, it is proposed to prioritise this resource to support adults with learning disabilities to help meet the increased need and complexity of residents;
 - the contingency sum of £0.860m;
 - corporate budget requirements to cover levies/charges of £71.327m, capital financing costs of £44.507m, additional allowances and other pension costs of £9.580m and insurance costs of £2.004m;
 - the inflationary pressures and budgets to be allocated sum of £10.271m; and delegate the final allocations to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources. The Manchester Health and Care Commissioner (MHCC) elements of these costs have already been included in the Pooled Budget. The use of these budgets will be agreed with the MLCO Partnership Board, which has representation from all key partners, along with identifying whether any more formal approvals are required in line with the Council's key decision thresholds.
 - the estimated utilisation of £9.579m in 2020/21 of the surplus from the on street parking and bus lane enforcement reserves, after determining that any surplus from these reserves is not required to provide additional off street parking in the authority; and

- the planned use of, and movement in, reserves as identified in the report, subject to the final call on reserves after any changes are required to account for final levies,

as set out in the **Medium Term Financial Plan** (Minute Exe/20/13 refers).

- (4) Approve the budget changes for the 2019/20 capital programme (as detailed in the **Capital Strategy and Budget 2019/20 to 2023/24** report);
- (5) Approve the capital programme as presented in Appendix 2 (for £318.0m in 2019/20, £378.4m in 2020/21, £288.8m in 2021/22, £208.3 in 2022/23 and £55.3m in 2023/24) which will require prudential borrowing of £710.7m to fund non-HRA schemes over the five year period for which provision has been made in the revenue budget for the associated financing costs (within limits previously agreed).
- (6) Delegate authority to:-
 - The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to approve capital expenditure on schemes which have budget approval.
 - The Chief Executive and Director of Highways in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment for the approval of the list of schemes to be undertaken under the Highways capital programme.
 - The Chief Executive and Director of Highways to implement the Highways schemes in accordance with the Capital Approval process and after consultation with the Executive Member for Environment on the final details and estimated costs.
 - The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to add qualifying spend to save projects to the capital budget accordingly up to a maximum of £5m in 2020/21 and then £5m per year thereafter.
 - The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to accelerate spend from later years when necessary within the programme subject to resource availability.
 - The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to agree and approve where appropriate the programme of schemes for the delivery of the corporate asset management programme.
 - The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and City Solicitor in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to agree and approve the governance process for bids to the proposed VCSE Fund.
- (7) Approve the proposed Treasury Management Strategy Statement (as detail in the **Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy 2020/21 report** (Minute Exe/20/19 refers)), in particular the:

- Borrowing Requirement listed in Section 7 of the report;
- Borrowing Strategy outlined in Section 10 of the report;
- Annual Investment Strategy detailed in Section 11 of the report;
- Prudential and Treasury Indicators listed at Appendix 3 of these minutes;
- MRP Strategy outlined in Appendix 4 of these minutes;
- Treasury Management Policy Statement at Appendix 5 of these minutes;
- Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation as detailed at Appendix 6 of these minutes;

- (8) Delegate to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources, the power to pursue any restructuring, rescheduling or redemption opportunities available, including amendments to the Treasury Management Strategy if the changes require it. Any changes required to the Strategy will be reported to members at the earliest opportunity; and

In considering the **Council Tax Resolution** report, the Council was asked to:-

- (9) Adopt the part proceedings of the Executive on 12 February 2020 and as amended today.
- (10) Note the position on reserves as detailed in Appendix 10 to these minutes.
- (11) Note that the budget has been prepared on the basis that the amendment to establish a Spring Challenge Fund of £250,000 is approved.
- (12) Note that the Council tax resolution included at Appendix 11 reflects the budget position, including the amendment reported at recommendation (11).
- (13) Approve the Council Tax determination attached as Appendix 11, subject to whether the proposal outlined at recommendation 3 is accepted to this report. The Council Tax determination:
- Calculates the Council tax requirement in accordance with Section 31A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 as amended by the Localism Act 2011.
 - Calculates a basic amount of Council Tax and an amount of tax for each valuation band (the City Council element) in accordance with Sections 31B and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992, as amended.
 - Sets an amount of Council Tax for each category of dwellings in each valuation band in accordance with Section 30 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992.
- (14) Determine affordable borrowing limits, prudential indicators, proposals in respect of treasury management, annual investment strategy and minimum revenue provision strategy. The prudential indicators are listed in Appendix 3 to this report.

- (15) Approve the Collection Fund Budget for 2020/21 as set out in Appendix 11 to this report.

For the motion (79)

Chohan, Akbar, Ahmed Ali, Azra Ali, Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Andrews, Battle, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Clay, Collins, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Davies, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Farrell, Flanagan, Grimshaw, Hassan, Hewitson, Hitchen, , Hughes, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick, Leech, Leese, J Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Madeleine Monaghan, Mary Monaghan, N Murphy, Newman, Noor, O'Neil, Ollerhead, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reid, Riasat, Richards, Rowles, Russell, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, A Simcock, K Simcock, Stanton, Stogia, Stone, Taylor, Watson, Wheeler, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

Against the Motion (0)

Abstentions (0)

Non voting (2)

Dobson and Holt

The Lord Mayor declared that the motion was carried.

Decisions

- (1) To approve the proceedings of the Art Galleries Committee on 12 February 2020 which provided details of the Art Galleries budget for 2020/21, and the part proceedings of the Executive on 12 February 2020, which contained details on the following:

- The Councils Budget 2020/21 – Covering Report;
- Medium Term Financial Plan 2020/21 - 2022/23;
- Capital Strategy and Budget 2019/20;
- Council Business Plan 2020/21;
- Children and Education Budget 2020/21;
- Adult Social Care and Population Health Budget 2020/21;
- Manchester Health and Care Commissioning Budget 2020/21;
- Homelessness Budget 2020/21;
- Neighbourhoods Directorate Budget 2020/21;
- Growth and Development Budget 2020/21;
- Corporate Core Budget 2020/21;
- Dedicated Schools Grant 2020/21;
- Housing Revenue Account 2020/21 to 2022/23;
- Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy 2020/21;
- Budget 2020/21 Public Consultation Outcomes; and

- Budget 2020/21 Equality Impact Assessment.
- (2) To note the minutes of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee on 24 February 2020.
- (3) To approve the proposals, as set out in Appendix 1 of these minutes, to ensure that the Housing Revenue Account for 2020/201 does not show a debit balance.
- (4) To approve the recommendations as detailed in minute reference Exe/20/13 of the part proceedings: Medium Term Financial Plan
- an increase in the basic amount of Council Tax (i.e. the Council's element of Council Tax) by 3.99% (including 2% for Adult Social Care);
 - the contingency sum of £0.860m;
 - the corporate budget requirements to cover levies/charges of £71.327m, capital financing costs of £44.507m, additional allowances and other pension costs of £9.580m and insurance costs of £2.004m;
 - delegation of authority to the Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to make allocations from the inflationary pressures and budgets to be allocated sum of £10.271m. In doing it was noted that the Manchester Health and Care Commissioner (MHCC) elements of these costs had been included in the Pooled Budget and were subject to draw-down in consultation with MHCC Finance Committee, and consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources;
 - the estimated utilisation of £9.579m in 2020/21 of the surplus from the on street parking and bus lane enforcement reserves, after determining that any surplus from these reserves is not required to provide additional off street parking in the authority; and
 - The position on reserves as identified in the report submitted, noting that the position is subject to any further calls on reserves that had arisen prior to the meeting.
- (5) To approve the budget changes for the 2019/20 capital programme.
- (6) To approve the capital programme as presented in Appendix 2 (for £318.0m in 2019/20, £378.4m in 2020/21, £288.8m in 2021/22, £208.3 in 2022/23 and £55.3m in 2023/24) which will require prudential borrowing of £710.7m to fund non-HRA schemes over the five year period for which provision has been made in the revenue budget for the associated financing costs (within limits previously agreed).
- (7) To agree to delegate authority to:

- The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to approve capital expenditure on schemes which have budget approval;
 - The Chief Executive and Director of Highways in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment for the approval of the list of schemes to be undertaken under the Highways capital programme;
 - The Chief Executive and Director of Highways to implement the Highways schemes in accordance with the Capital Approval process and after consultation with the Executive Member for Environment on the final details and estimated costs;
 - The Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to add qualifying spend to save projects to the capital budget accordingly up to a maximum of £5m in 2020/21 and then £5m per year thereafter;
 - The Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to accelerate spend from later years when necessary within the programme subject to resource availability.
 - The Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to agree and approve where appropriate the programme of schemes for the delivery of the corporate asset management programme.
 - The Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer and City Solicitor in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to agree and approve the governance process for bids to the proposed VCSE Fund.
- (8) To approve the recommendations within the Treasury Management Strategy Statement, Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy 2020/21 report (Minute Exe/20/19 refers):-
- The proposed Treasury Management Strategy Statement, in particular the:
 - Prudential and Treasury Indicators listed at Appendix 3 of these minutes;
 - MRP Strategy outlined in Appendix 4 of these minutes;
 - Treasury Management Policy Statement at Appendix 5 of these minutes;
 - Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation as detailed at Appendix 6 of these minutes;
 - Borrowing Requirement listed in Appendix 7 of the report;
 - Borrowing Strategy outlined in Appendix 8 of the report;
 - Annual Investment Strategy detailed in Appendix 9 of the report;
 - Delegation to the Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources, the power to pursue any restructuring, rescheduling or redemption opportunities available, including amendments to the Treasury Management Strategy if

the changes require it. Any changes required to the Strategy will be reported to members at the earliest opportunity.

- (9) That in consideration of the Council Tax Resolution report of the Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer, Chief Executive and City Solicitor which presented the recommended Council Tax resolution and Collection Fund budget for 2020/21, approval be given to:
- Adopt the part proceedings of the Executive on 12 February 2020 and as amended today.
 - Note the position on reserves as detailed in Appendix 10 to these minutes.
 - Note that the budget has been prepared on the basis that the amendment to establish a Spring Challenge Fund of £250,000 is approved.
 - Note that the Council tax resolution included at Appendix 11 reflects the budget position, including the amendment reported above.
- (10) To approve the Council Tax determination attached as Appendix 11, which:
- Calculates the Council tax requirement in accordance with Section 31A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 as amended by the Localism Act 2011.
 - Calculates a basic amount of Council Tax and an amount of tax for each valuation band (the City Council element) in accordance with Sections 31B and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992, as amended.
 - Sets an amount of Council Tax for each category of dwellings in each valuation band in accordance with Section 30 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992.
- (11) To agree the affordable borrowing limits, prudential indicators, proposals in respect of treasury management, annual investment strategy and minimum revenue provision strategy.
- (12) Approve the Collection Fund Budget for 2020/21 as set out in Appendix 11 to this report.

Appendix 1

Housing Revenue Account Budget 2019/20 – 2022/23

	2019/20 (Forecast) £000	2020/21 £000	2021/22 £000	2022/23 £000	See Para.
Income					
Housing Rents	-59,775	-60,881	-62,030	-63,497	5.6
Heating Income	-754	-600	-612	-625	5.15
PFI Credit	-23,586	-23,374	-23,374	-23,374	5.1
Other Income	-1,164	-1,281	-1,203	-1,069	5.10
Funding from General HRA Reserve	3,029	-18,441	-14,016	-14,068	7.1
Total Income	-82,250	-104,577	-101,235	-102,633	
Expenditure					
Northwards R&M & Management Fee	20,379	20,694	20,984	21,455	5.27
PFI Contractor Payments	31,824	36,296	32,599	31,639	5.1
Communal Heating	858	584	595	607	5.15
Supervision and Management	5,020	5,223	5,291	5,360	5.29
Contribution to Bad Debts	504	613	937	1,279	5.25
Depreciation	17,279	17,378	17,517	17,785	5.20
Other Expenditure	1,295	1,169	1,189	1,016	5.29
RCCO	2,287	19,841	19,360	20,762	5.29
Interest Payable and similar charges	2,804	2,779	2,763	2,730	5.2
Total Expenditure	82,250	104,577	101,235	102,633	
Total Reserves:					
Opening Balance	-107,365	-110,394	-91,953	-77,937	7.1
Funding (from)/to Revenue	-3,029	18,441	14,016	14,068	
Closing Balance	-110,394	-91,953	-77,937	-63,869	

Appendix 2 – The proposed Capital Programme Budget

Project Name	2019/20 Proposed Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
Highway Programme					
Highways Planned Maintenance Programme					
Planned Highways Maintenance Programme	400	75	0	0	0
Drainage	3,575	2,051	1,871	0	0
Large Patching repairs	2,884	1,311	1,311	0	0
Carriageway Resurfacing	6,485	3,697	3,563	0	0
Footway schemes	892	4,050	3,857	0	0
Carriageway Preventative	6,096	6,325	3,054	0	0
Bridge Maintenance	370	3,782	3,048	0	0
Other Improvement works	122	6,595	7,186	0	0
Highways Major Projects					
Hyde Road (A57) Pinch Point Widening	1,535	3,579	0	0	0
Manchester/Salford Inner Relief Road (MSIRR)	7,783	100	0	0	0
Great Ancoats Improvement Scheme	2,121	6,074	105	0	0
Mancunian Way and Princess Parkway NPIF	4,178	4,111	87	0	0
School Crossings	3,017	2,653	0	0	0
Cycle City Phase 2	1,475	2,843	0	0	0
Green Bridge at Airport City	2,055	839	71	0	0
A6 Stockport Road Pinch Point Scheme	183	730	8	0	0
Highways Stand Alone Projects Programme					
Velocity	54	0	0	0	0
Safe Routes to Loreto High School	212	0	0	0	0
20mph Zones (Phase 3)	70	86	0	0	0
Flood Risk Management - Hidden Watercourses	0	49	0	0	0
Flood Risk Management - Higher Blackley Flood Risk	0	41	0	0	0
Cycle Parking	15	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2019/20 Proposed Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
Shadowmoss Rd / Mossnook Rd	12	0	0	0	0
Princess Rd Safety Review	47	439	0	0	0
Public Realm	1,056	1,974	400	0	0
Street Lighting PFI	9,000	3,657	0	0	0
Didsbury West S106	1	23	0	0	0
A56 Liverpool Road	83	0	0	0	0
A56 Chester Road	51	0	0	0	0
Sunbank Lane S278	40	0	0	0	0
Sharston Roundabout SCOOT	40	0	0	0	0
Derwent Avenue S106	6	8	0	0	0
Woodhouse Park	50	15	0	0	0
Christie Extension RPZ	40	306	9	0	0
Residents Parking schemes	133	545	0	0	0
Arena Security Measures	185	12	0	0	0
Ladybarn District Centre	223	20	0	0	0
Levenshulme Mini Holland Cycling and Walking scheme	151	606	0	0	0
CCTV Operating System Upgrade	150	283	0	0	0
Northern/Eastern GW Walking and Cycling scheme-devel costs	119	601	0	0	0
Chimebank S.106	34	0	0	0	0
Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund	50	1,025	0	0	0
SEMMMS PROGRAMME					
Local Roads (temp SEMMMS A6 Stockport)	255	0	0	0	0
SEMMMS A6 to Manchester Airport	50	0	0	0	0
Bus Priority Package Programme					
Bus Priority Package - Oxford Road	5	302	0	0	0
Bus Priority Package - Princess Street/Brook Street	140	13	0	0	0
Total Highways Programme	55,443	58,820	24,570	0	0

Project Name	2019/20 Proposed Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
Environment Programme					
Waste Reduction Measures	250	1,209	0	0	0
Waste Contract	2,089	3,840	0	0	0
Smart Litter Bins	258	0	0	0	0
Leisure Services Programme					
Parks Programme					
Hollyhedge Park Drainage IMPS	2	0	0	0	0
Heaton Park Pay & Display	8	0	0	0	0
PIP - Park Events Infrastructure	289	0	0	0	0
Parks Development Programme	413	3,136	2,965	2,965	2,965
Heaton Park Bowls	48	0	0	0	0
Somme 100 Year Memorial	33	0	0	0	0
Painswick Park Improvement	30	0	0	0	0
Heaton Park Southern Play Area	370	0	0	0	0
Wythenshawe Park Sport Facilities S106	139	0	0	0	0
Northenden Riverside Park	75	0	0	0	0
King George V Park	81	0	0	0	0
Leisure & Sports Facilities					
Indoor Leisure - Abraham Moss	1,408	5,962	13,168	902	0
Indoor Leisure - Moss Side	93	0	0	0	0
Boggart Hole Clough - Visitors Centre	0	535	0	0	0
Mount Road S106	32	0	0	0	0
Velodrome Track	71	0	0	0	0
HSBC UK NCC Immediate Works	450	0	0	0	0
Active Lifestyle Centre Artificial Grass Pitch Replacement	198	0	0	0	0
Interactive Football Wall - Platt Fields Park	84	0	0	0	0
MAC - Booth St Car Park	148	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2019/20 Proposed Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
Culture Website	42	0	0	0	0
Festive Lighting Strategy	138	0	0	0	0
Manchester Regional Arena Track Replacement	812	254	434	0	0
Cremator & Mercury Abatement Plant Replacement Strategy	0	1,007	544	0	0
Hough End Master Plan - Strat Football Hub Development Costs	52	189	0	0	0
Range Stadium Capital Project	465	0	0	0	0
Libraries and Info Services Programme					
Relocation of Manchester Visitor Info Centre (MVIC)	59	0	0	0	0
GM Archives Web Portal	48	80	0	0	0
Central Library Wolfson Award	32	0	0	0	0
Central Library Refresh	0	194	763	0	0
Roll Out of Central Library ICT	7	0	0	0	0
Newton Heath Library	17	0	0	0	0
Open Libraries	157	301	0	0	0
Contact Theatre loan	200	0	0	0	0
Total Neighbourhoods Programme	8,598	16,707	17,874	3,867	2,965
Cultural Programme					
First Street Cultural Facility	14	0	0	0	0
The Factory (Build)	29,860	53,959	13,277	0	0
The Factory (Public Realm)	210	1,723	457	0	0
Corporate Estates Programme					
Asset Management Programme	9,317	11,650	9,030	0	0
MAC feasibility works	933	0	0	0	0
Town Hall Complex Transformation Programme	67	0	0	0	0
Hammerstone Road Depot	163	9,333	9,524	695	0
Carbon Reduction Programme	697	6,388	1,959	0	0

Project Name	2019/20 Proposed Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
Estates Transformation	0	0	800	0	0
Estates Transformation - Hulme District Office	702	0	0	0	0
Estates Transformation - Alexandra House	5,639	5,994	133	0	0
Ross Place Refurbishment	434	0	0	0	0
Proud Trust - Sidney Street	250	0	0	0	0
Development Programme					
Digital Assets Board (MCDA)					
The Space Project - Phase 2	0	987	0	0	0
The Sharp Project	60	540	0	0	0
Digital Asset Base - One Central Park	3,651	0	0	0	0
Strategic Acquisitions Board					
Strategic Acquisitions Programme	5,860	3,000	1,323	0	0
Sustaining Key Initiatives	0	0	5,000	8,600	0
Northern Gateway					
Northern Gateway	6,175	6,675	7,275	4,875	0
Eastern Gateway					
Eastern Gateway - Central Retail Park	400	729	0	0	0
Eastern Gateway - New Islington Marina	3,522	61	0	0	0
Hall and Rogers	57	0	0	0	0
City Centre					
ST Peters Square	999	0	0	0	0
Medieval Quarter Public Realm	76	1,587	0	0	0
City Labs 2	2,023	0	0	0	0
Manchester College	5,000	5,000	0	0	0
Digital Business Incubators	2,000	0	0	0	0
Lincoln Square	0	0	1,200	0	0
Other Strategic Development Initiatives					
Hulme Hall Rd Lighting	36	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2019/20 Proposed Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
New Smithfield Market	0	469	0	0	0
Heron House & Registrars	3,085	1,388	0	0	0
Civic Quarter Heat Network	9,557	9,507	4,000	0	0
Total Growth & Development Programme	90,787	118,990	53,978	14,170	0
Town Hall Refurbishment Programme					
Our Town Hall refurbishment	17,051	49,132	92,739	99,321	34,652
Total Town Hall Refurbishment Programme	17,051	49,132	92,739	99,321	34,652
Private Sector Housing Programme					
Brunswick PFI					
Brunswick PFI Land Assembly	1,176	550	558	0	0
Collyhurst					
Collyhurst Regeneration	0	178	1,000	2,700	0
Collyhurst Environmentals	0	55	0	0	0
Collyhurst Land Assembly Ph1	4	29	0	0	0
Collyhurst Land Acquisitions Ph2	0	0	210	799	0
Eccleshall Street - 3 Sites	0	500	0	0	0
Housing Investment Model	0				
Site Investigation and Early Works HIF Pilot Sites	185	65	0	0	0
Miles Platting PFI					
Miles Platting PFI Land Assembly	6	550	0	0	0
Private Housing Assistance					
Disabled Facilities Grant	6,500	7,501	6,200	0	0
Toxteth St CPO & environmental works	15	141	0	0	0
Bell Crescent CPO	0	0	0	0	482

Project Name	2019/20 Proposed Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
Redrow Development Programme					
Redrow Development Phase 2 onward	3	20	0	0	0
West Gorton					
West Gorton Compensation	0	4	0	0	0
West Gorton Ph 2A Demolition & Commercial Acquisitions	15	433	904	0	0
Private Sector Housing - Stand Alone Projects					
HCA Empty Homes Cluster Phase 2	386	415	891	0	0
Princess Rd	0	100	0	0	0
Empty Homes Scheme (s22 properties)	0	2,000	0	0	0
HMRP	100	40	54	0	0
Collyhurst Acquisition & Demolition (Overbrook & Needwood Close)	-3	0	664	0	0
Extra Care	0	1,245	1,200	0	0
Moston Lane Acquisitions	0	0	0	0	7,500
Equity Loans	0	397	0	0	0
West Gorton Community Park	1,026	805	0	0	0
Ben St. Regeneration	379	877	0	0	0
Marginal Viability Fund - New Victoria	505	6,705	3,290	0	0
Total Private Sector Housing Programme	10,297	22,610	14,971	3,499	7,982
Public Sector Housing					
Northwards - External Work					
Charlestown - Victoria Ave multistorey window replacement and ECW - Phase 1	3,740	8,209	3,574	0	0
External cyclical works phase 3a	2	0	0	0	0
Harpurhey Lathbury & 200 Estates external cyclical works ph 3b	0	-18	31	0	0
Environmental works	19	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2019/20 Proposed Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
Harpurhey Shiredale Estate externals	0	0	15	0	0
Moston Miners Low Rise externals	0	0	18	0	0
Newton Heath Limestone Drive externals	0	0	6	0	0
External cyclical works ph 3b Moston Estates (Chauncy/Edith Cliff/Kenyon/Thorveton Sq)	0	0	2	0	0
External cyclical works ph 3b Ancoats Smithfields estate	156	25	0	0	0
External cyclical works ph 4b Charlestown Chain Bar low rise	0	0	45	0	0
External cyclical works ph 4b Charlestown Chain Bar Hillingdon Drive maisonettes	0	0	15	0	0
External cyclical works ph 4b Cheetham Appleford estate	0	0	2	0	0
External cyclical works ph 4b Crumpsall Blackley Village	0	0	34	0	0
External cyclical works ph 4b Higher Blackley South	6	0	1	0	0
External cyclical works ph 4b Newton Heath Assheton estate	0	0	27	0	0
External cyclical works Ph 4b Newton Heath Troydale Estate	0	0	89	0	0
External cyclical works Ph 5 New Moston (excl corrolites)	0	0	9	0	0
Environmental improvements Moston corrolites	75	21	0	0	0
ENW distribution network phase 4 (various)	222	5	0	0	0
Dam Head - Walk up flats communal door renewal	140	0	0	0	0
Various Estate based environmental works	65	100	135	0	0
Delivery Costs	816	918	440	0	0
Northwards - Internal Work					
Decent Homes mop ups ph 9 and decent homes work required to voids	1	0	89	0	0
One offs such as rewires, boilers, doors, insulation	3	0	30	0	0
Ancoats - Victoria Square lift replacement	427	0	0	0	0
Aldbourn Court/George Halstead Court/Duncan Edwards Court works	12	0	0	0	0
Boiler replacement programme	-5	-6	0	0	0

Project Name	2019/20 Proposed Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
Harpurhey - Monsall Multis Internal Works	1,500	1,062	200	0	0
Newton Heath - Multies Internal Works	200	3,153	250	0	0
Higher Blackley - Liverton Court Internal Works	800	45	0	0	0
Various - Bradford/Clifford Lamb/Kingsbridge/Sandyhill Court Internal Works	2,598	132	0	0	0
Charlestown - Rushcroft/Pevensey Court Internal Works	700	711	150	0	0
Collyhurst - Mossbrook/Roach/Vauxhall/Humphries Court Internal Works	2,348	343	106	0	0
Decent Homes mop ups phase 10 and voids	378	384	0	0	0
One off work - rewires, boilers, doors	158	0	0	0	0
Fire precautions multi storey blocks	0	150	0	0	0
Installations of sprinkler systems - multi storey blocks	218	0	273	0	0
ERDF Heat Pumps	0	3,768	350	0	0
Charlestown - Rushcroft/Pevensey Courts Lift Refurb	0	0	525	0	0
One off type work (rewires/boilers/doors)	100	300	0	0	0
Fire Risk Assessments	300	3,046	2,500	0	0
Northwards - Harpurhey 200 Estate Internal Works	250	686	0	0	0
Rushcroft and Pevensey Courts Ground Source Heat Pumps	0	2,518	137	0	0
Delivery Costs	1,814	1,440	492	0	0
Northwards - Off Debits/Conversions					
Bringing Studio Apartments back in use	7	0	10	0	0
Various Locations - bringing bedsits back into use	0	0	104	0	0
Delivery Costs	2	0	13	0	0
Homeless Accommodation					
Improvements to Homeless accommodation city wide	1	0	36	0	0
Plymouth Grove Women's Direct Access Centre	0	0	28	0	0
Improvements to Homeless Accommodation Phase 2	345	662	147	0	0
Delivery Costs	46	73	23	0	0

Project Name	2019/20 Proposed Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
Northwards - Adaptations					
Public Sector Northwards Adaptations	200	0	0	0	0
Adaptations	750	770	0	0	0
Northwards - Unallocated					
Northwards Housing Programme	0	2,120	0	21,982	0
Retained Housing Programme					
Collyhurst Maisonette Compensation & Demolitions	0	89	0	935	0
West Gorton Regeneration Programme					
West Gorton PH2A Low & High Rise Demolition	10	16	0	0	0
Future Years Housing Programme					
Collyhurst Estate Regeneration	0	0	0	1,541	0
Buy Back Properties - Right to Buy	155	0	0	0	0
Collyhurst Regen - Highways Phase 1	0	190	97	1,394	0
Collyhurst Regen - Churnett Street	0	0	0	790	0
Collyhurst Regen - Needwood & Overbrook acquisition / demolition	0	125	0	0	0
Willert Street Park Improvements	0	10	0	0	0
North Manchester New Builds	227	319	0	0	0
North Manchester New Builds 2	442	2,850	0	0	0
North Manchester New Builds 3	294	351	0	0	0
Parkhill Land Assembly	0	0	4,270	0	0
Collyhurst	100	3,655	13,890	955	0
Buying Back Former Council Homes	0	500	500	500	0
Total Public Sector Housing (HRA) Programme	19,622	38,722	28,663	28,097	0
Children's Services Programme					
Basic Need Programme					
Holy Trinity VC Primary	47	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2019/20 Proposed Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
Lytham Rd	100	0	0	0	0
Plymouth Grove Refurbishment	107	0	0	0	0
Beaver Rd Primary Expansion	94	0	0	0	0
Lily Lane Primary	54	0	0	0	0
St. James Primary Academy	8	0	0	0	0
Crossacres Primary School	30	0	0	0	0
Ringway Primary School	5	0	0	0	0
Webster Primary Schools	11	0	0	0	0
Dean Trust Expansion	1,000	2,784	0	0	0
Brookside Rd Moston	362	4,920	1,745	28	0
North Hulme Adv Playground	278	3,400	683	11	0
Monsall Road (Burgess)	290	3,717	979	20	0
Roundwood Road	330	5,525	1,127	34	0
KS3/4 PRU Pioneer Street	70	0	0	0	0
SEND Expansions - Melland & Ashgate	866	0	0	0	0
Basic need - unallocated funds	200	488	22,115	43,286	0
Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM) - Allocated	266	0	0	0	0
Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM) - Unallocated	75	0	0	0	0
Schools Maintenance Programme					
Moston Lane - re-roof	19	0	0	0	0
Abbott Primary School Fencing	11	0	0	0	0
Crowcroft Park PS-Rewire	-2	0	0	0	0
Broad Oak Primary School Kitchen	85	730	0	0	0
All Saints Primary Rewire	419	0	0	0	0
Armitage Primary Windows	101	0	0	0	0
Bowker Vale Primary Heating	267	0	0	0	0
Buton Lane Primary Roof	183	0	0	0	0
Cheetwood Primary Heating	142	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2019/20 Proposed Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
Crosslee Comm Heating	81	0	0	0	0
Crowcroft Park Roof Repairs	120	0	0	0	0
Grange School Sports Hall	163	0	0	0	0
Higher Openshaw Rewire	773	0	0	0	0
Lily Lane Primary Windows	7	46	0	0	0
Moston Fields Joinery	184	0	0	0	0
Ringway Primary Roof	175	0	0	0	0
Sandilands Primary Windows	106	0	0	0	0
St Mary's Junior Windows	34	0	0	0	0
Ringway Primary School	10	0	0	0	0
Alma Park Gas Improvement	1	0	0	0	0
Schools Capital Maintenance - unallocated	1,644	2,854	3,000	0	0
Education Standalone Projects					
Paintpots	3	6	0	0	0
Early Education for Two Year Olds - Unallocated	0	52	0	0	0
Gorton Youth Zone	1,275	0	0	0	0
Healthy Pupil Capital Funding	257	0	0	0	0
North Ridge SEN	283	2,747	9	0	0
Special Educational Needs grant	0	1,160	0	0	0
Seymour Road	1,200	0	0	0	0
Commercial Wharf/ISS Refurbishment of YJS Building	294	0	0	0	0
Ghyll Head	25	1,091	0	0	0
Acquisition of land at Hyde Road	13,144	13	12	0	0
Total Children's Services Programme	25,197	29,533	29,670	43,379	0
ICT Capital Programme					
ICT					

Project Name	2019/20 Proposed Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
Solaris	2	0	0	0	0
ICT Infrastructure & Mobile Working Programme					
New Social Care System	1,699	0	0	0	0
End User Computing	117	0	0	0	0
Core Infrastructure Refresh	83	0	0	0	0
Internet Resilience	23	27	0	0	0
New Rent Collection System	33	0	0	0	0
Communications Room Replacement Phase 2	61	1,795	3,996	514	0
Data Centre Network Design and Implementation	2,867	250	0	0	0
End User Experience	699	3,425	0	0	0
Replacement Coroners System	83	0	0	0	0
Telephony	0	200	200	0	0
ICT Investment Plan	0	0	6,728	8,900	7,690
Infrastructure					
Wider Area Network Redesign	22	0	0	0	0
Total ICT Programme	5,689	5,697	10,924	9,414	7,690
Corporate Capital Programme					
ONE System Developments	11	0	0	0	0
Pay and Display Machines	750	174	0	0	0
Phase 1 Implementation - Locality Plan Programme Office	485	100	0	0	0
Integrated Working - Gorton Health Hub	1,970	17,171	2,272	481	0
Alcohol Treatment for Fibroscan Machine	40	0	0	0	0
BioMedical Investment	7,958	6,100	2,700	0	0
Band on the Wall	200	0	0	0	0
Manchester Jewish Museum Loan	0	290	0	0	0
Manchester Airport Car Park Investment	3,700	1,900	0	0	0

Project Name	2019/20 Proposed Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
FC United	250	0	0	0	0
VCSE Small premises works	0	500	500	0	0
Total Corporate Capital Programme	15,364	26,235	5,472	481	0
Inflation Fund	0	12,000	10,000	6,000	2,000
Total Manchester City Council Capital Programme	248,048	378,446	288,861	208,228	55,289
Projects carried out on behalf of Greater Manchester					
Housing Investment Fund	70,000	0	0	0	0
Total GM projects	70,000	0	0	0	0
Total CAPITAL PROGRAMME	318,048	378,446	288,861	208,228	55,289

Appendix 3

Treasury Limits and Prudential Indicators for approval

Please note last years approved figures are shown in brackets

Treasury Management Indicators	2020-21 %	2021-22 %	2022-23 %
Estimated Financing Costs to Net Revenue Stream¹	6.7%	7.3%	7.4%
Authorised Limit - external debt	£m	£m	£m
Borrowing	1,384.5 (1,684.5)	1,396.2 (1,412.9)	1,396.2
Other long term liabilities	190.0 (170.0)	190.0 (170.0)	190.0
TOTAL	1,574.5 (1,900.5)	1,586.2 (1,582.9)	1,586.2
Operational Boundary - external debt			
Borrowing	1,006.2 (1,151.7)	1,176.9 (1,275.0)	1,295.5
Other long term liabilities	190.0 (170)	190.0 (170.0)	190.0
TOTAL	1,196.2 (1,321.7)	1,366.9 (1,445.0)	1,485.5
Estimated external debt	792.8 (977.4)	1,016.4 (1,141.5)	1,174.3
Upper limit for total principal sums invested for over 364 days	0 (0)	0 (0)	0
Estimated Capital Expenditure			
Non - HRA	339.6 (370.3)	260.2 (207.4)	180.2
HRA	38.8 (48.7)	28.6 (36.6)	28.1
TOTAL	378.4 (419.0)	288.8 (244.0)	208.3
Estimated Capital Financing Requirement (as at 31 March)			
Non – HRA	1,543.1 (1,477.1)	1,706.5 (1,611.1)	1,802.5
HRA	299.2 (299.2)	300.0 (300.0)	301.0
TOTAL	1,842.3 (1,776.3)	2,006.5 (1,911.1)	2103.5

Maturity structure of borrowing during 2020-21	Upper Limit		Lower limit	
	under 12 months	80%	(80%)	0%
12 months and within 24 months	70%	(70%)	0%	(0%)
24 months and within 5 years	60%	(50%)	0%	(0%)
5 years and within 10 years	50%	(50%)	0%	(0%)
10 years and above	80%	(80%)	40%	(40%)
Has the Authority adopted the CIPFA Treasury Management Code?				Yes

¹ Note that for 2021-22 onward these are based on estimated net revenue budgets.

The status of the indicators will be included in Treasury Management reporting during 2020/21. They will also be included in the Council's Capital Budget monitoring reports during 2020/21.

Definitions and Purpose of the Treasury Management Indicators noted above (Indicators are as recommended by the CIPFA Prudential Code last revised in 2017)

Estimated Financing Costs to Net Revenue Stream

The authority will set for the forthcoming year and the following financial years an estimate of financing costs to net revenue stream. The indicator recognises that ultimately all debts of a local authority fall on the taxpayer, and that therefore when considering affordability it is important to review the scale of financing costs to net revenue.

Estimated Capital Expenditure

The authority sets a capital budget for each financial year, which includes an estimate of the capital expenditure which might be incurred. The figures here also include changes to other long term liabilities.

Estimates Capital Financing Requirement

The capital financing requirement reflects the authority's underlying need to finance capital expenditure, and is based on all capital expenditure including that incurred in previous years.

Authorised Limit - external debt

The local authority will set for the forthcoming financial year and the following two financial years an authorised limit for its total external debt, excluding investments, separately identifying borrowing from other long-term liabilities. Other long term liabilities include PFI's, service concessions and finance leases. Due to the introduction of IFRS16 (Leasing) on the 1st of April 2020, more of the Council's lessee leases will be classed as finance leases and will therefore fall under the categorisation, therefore the value has increased from previous years. Work is underway to determine the value of this change in accounting standards, but £20.0m has been added to the indicator at this stage, and will be reviewed once this work is complete. This prudential indicator is referred to as the Authorised Limit.

Operational Boundary - external debt

The local authority will also set for the forthcoming financial year and the following two financial years an operational boundary for its total external debt, excluding investments, separately identifying borrowing from other long-term liabilities. This prudential indicator is referred to as the Operational Boundary.

Both the Authorised Limit and the Operational Boundary need to be consistent with the authority's plans for capital expenditure and financing; and with its treasury

management policy statement and practices. The Operational Boundary should be based on the authority's estimate of most likely, i.e. prudent, but not worst case scenario. Risk analysis and risk management strategies should be taken into account.

The Operational Boundary should equate to the maximum level of external debt projected by this estimate. Thus, the Operational Boundary links directly to the Authority's plans for capital expenditure; its estimates of capital financing requirement; and its estimate of cash flow requirements for the year for all purposes. The Operational Boundary is a key management tool for in-year monitoring.

It will probably not be significant if the Operational Boundary is breached temporarily on occasions due to variations in cash flow. However, a sustained or regular trend above the Operational Boundary would be significant and should lead to further investigation and action as appropriate. Thus, both the Operational Boundary and the Authorised Limit will be based on the authority's plans. The authority will need to assure itself that these plans are affordable and prudent. The Authorised Limit will in addition need to provide headroom over and above the Operational Boundary sufficient for example for unusual cash movements.

Estimated external debt

After the year end, the closing balance for actual gross borrowing plus (separately), other long-term liabilities is obtained directly from the local authority's Balance Sheet.

The prudential indicator for Estimated External Debt considers a single point in time and hence is only directly comparable to the Authorised Limit and Operational Boundary at that point in time. Actual external debt during the year can be compared.

Upper limit for total principal sums invested for over 364 days

The authority will set an upper limit for each forward financial year period for the maturing of investments made for a period longer than 364 days. This indicator is referred to as the prudential limit for Principal Sums Invested for periods longer than 364 days.

The purpose of this indicator is so the authority can contain its exposure to the possibility of loss that might arise as a result of its having to seek early repayment or redemption of principal sums invested.

Maturity structure of new borrowing

The authority will set for the forthcoming financial year both upper and lower limits with respect to the maturity structure of its borrowing. These indicators are referred to as the Upper and Lower limits respectively for the Maturity Structure of Borrowing.

Local Prudential Indicators

The Council has not yet introduced Local Prudential Indicators to reflect local circumstances, but will review on a regular basis the need for these in the future.

Appendix 4

Minimum Revenue Provision Strategy

The Council implemented the new Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) guidance in 2011/12 and has assessed its MRP for 2020/21 in accordance with the main recommendations contained within the guidance issued by the Secretary of State under section 21(1A) of the Local Government Act 2003.

The Council is required to make provision for repayment of an element of the accumulated General Fund capital spend each year through a revenue charge (the Minimum Revenue Provision - MRP).

MHCLG Regulations require full Council to approve an MRP Statement, in advance of each year. If the Council wishes to amend its policy during the year this would need to be approved by full Council. A variety of options are available to councils to replace the previous Regulations, so long as there is a prudent provision. The options are:

- **Option 1:** Regulatory Method – can only be applied to capital expenditure incurred prior to April 2008 or Supported Capital Expenditure. This is calculated as 4% of the non-housing CFR at the end of the preceding financial year, less some transitional factors relating to the movement to the new Prudential Code in 2003.
- **Option 2:** CFR Method – a provision equal to 4% of the non-housing CFR at the end of the preceding financial year.
- **Option 3:** Asset Life Method – MRP is calculated based on the life of the asset, on either an equal instalment or an annuity basis.
- **Option 4:** Depreciation Method – MRP is calculated in accordance with the depreciation accounting required for the asset.

Options 1 and 2 may be used only for supported expenditure, which is capital expenditure for which the Council has been notified by Government that the costs of that expenditure will be taken into account in the calculation of Government funding due to the Council.

It is important to note that the Council can deviate from these options provided that the approach taken ensures that there is a prudent provision. The Council has historically followed option 1 for supported expenditure based on the level of support provided by Government through Revenue Support Grant (RSG).

The assets created or acquired under Supported Capital Expenditure predominantly had long asset lives of c. 50 years, such as land or buildings, and an MRP of 4% suggests a significantly shorter asset life. As the level of notional RSG the Council receives has reduced in recent years, it was considered prudent to review the approach to MRP on supported borrowing to reflect the Government support received.

It was therefore agreed that from 2017/18 a provision of 2% of the non-housing CFR as at the end of the preceding financial year is to be made. This is in line with many other local authorities who have reviewed the basis for their MRP and have applied similarly revised policies.

It is the Council's policy that MRP relating to an asset will start to be incurred in the year after the capital expenditure on the asset is incurred or, in the case of new assets, in the year following the asset coming into use, in accordance with MHCLG's guidance.

The Council recognises that there are different categories of capital expenditure, for which it will incur MRP as follows:

- For non HRA Supported Capital Expenditure: MRP policy will be charged at a rate of 2% on a similar basis to option 1 of the guidance (the regulatory method) but at a lower rate, better reflecting the asset lives of the assets funded through Supported Borrowing.
- For non HRA unsupported capital expenditure incurred the MRP policy will be:
 - Asset Life Method – MRP will be based on a straight line basis or annuity method so linking the MRP to the future flow of benefits from the asset, dependant on the nature of the capital expenditure, in accordance with option 3 of the guidance.
 - If the expenditure is capital by virtue of a Ministerial direction, has been capitalised under a Capitalisation Directive, or does not create a council asset, MRP will be provided in accordance with option 3 of the guidance with asset lives calculated as per the table below:

Expenditure type	Maximum period over which MRP to be made
Expenditure capitalised by virtue of a direction under s16 (2) (b).	20 years.
Regulation 25(1) (a). Expenditure on computer programs.	Same period as for computer hardware.
Regulation 25(1) (b). Loans and grants towards capital expenditure by third parties.	The estimated life of the assets in relation to which the third party expenditure is incurred.
Regulation 25(1) (c). Repayment of grants and loans for capital expenditure.	25 years or the period of the loan if longer.
Regulation 25(1) (d). Acquisition of share or loan capital.	20 years, or the estimated life of the asset acquired.
Regulation 25(1) (e). Expenditure on works to assets not owned by the authority.	The estimated life of the assets.
Regulation 25(1) (ea). Expenditure on assets for use by others.	The estimated life of the assets.

Regulation 25(1) (f). Payment of levy on Large Scale Voluntary Transfers (LSVTs) of dwellings.	25 years.
--	-----------

- For PFI service concessions and some lessee interests: Following the move to International Accounting Standards arrangements under private finance initiatives (PFIs) service concessions and some lessee interests (including embedded leases) are accounted for on the Council’s Balance Sheet, and with the introduction of IFRS16 (Leasing) from the 1st of April 2020 more lessee leases will be classified in a similar way. Where this occurs, a part of the contract charge or rent payable will be taken to reduce the Balance Sheet liability rather than being charged as revenue expenditure. The MRP element of these schemes will be the amount of contract charge or rental payment charged against the Balance Sheet liability. This approach will produce an MRP charge comparable to that under option 3 in that it will run over the life of the lease or PFI scheme.

In some exceptional cases, the Council will deviate from the policy laid out above provided such exceptions remain prudent. Any exceptions are listed below:

- Where capital expenditure is incurred through providing loans to organisations, and where those loans are indemnified or have financial guarantees protecting against loss from a third party of high credit quality, no MRP will be charged in relation to the capital expenditure. Similarly, loans given by the Council where any losses incurred on the investment will impact solely on a third party, such as those provided under the City Deal arrangement with the HCA, will not require an MRP charge.

Appendix 5

Treasury Management Policy Statement

1. This organisation defines its treasury management activities as:
The management of the organisation's investments and cash flows, its banking, money market and capital market transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of optimum performance consistent with those risks.
2. This organisation regards the successful identification, monitoring and control of risk to be the prime criteria by which the effectiveness of its treasury management activities will be measured. Accordingly, the analysis and reporting of treasury management activities will focus on their risk implications for the organisation, and any financial instruments entered into to manage these risks.
3. This organisation acknowledges that effective treasury management will provide support towards the achievement of its business and service objectives. It is therefore committed to the principles of achieving value for money in treasury management, and to employing suitable comprehensive performance measurement techniques, within the context of effective risk management.

The Council will invest its monies prudently, considering security first, liquidity second, and yield last, carefully considering its investment counterparties. It will similarly borrow monies prudently and consistent with the Council's service objectives.

Appendix 6

Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation

- i **Full Council**
 - receiving and reviewing reports on treasury management policies, practices and activities
 - approval of annual strategy

- ii **Responsible body – Audit Committee**
 - approval of/amendments to the organisation’s adopted clauses, treasury management policy statement and treasury management practices
 - budget consideration and approval
 - approval of the division of responsibilities
 - receiving and reviewing regular monitoring reports and acting on recommendations
 - approving the selection of external service providers and agreeing terms of appointment

- iii **Body with responsibility for scrutiny - Resource and Governance Scrutiny Committee**
 - reviewing the treasury management policy and procedures and making recommendations to the responsible body

- iv **Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer**
 - delivery of the function

Appendix 7

Borrowing Requirement

The potential long-term borrowing requirements over the next three years are:

Table 2	2020/21 £'m estimate	2021/22 £'m estimate	2022/23 £'m estimate
Planned Capital Expenditure funded by Borrowing	200.4	197.8	133.3
Change in Grants & Contributions	21.9	26.0	43.4
Change in Capital Receipts	(0.2)	(4.3)	(8.5)
Change in Reserves	27.5	27.7	14.8
MRP Provision	(26.6)	(30.9)	(33.3)
Refinancing of maturing debt (GF)	3.0	6.8	7.5
Refinancing of maturing debt (HRA)	0.0	0.5	0.8
Estimated Borrowing Requirement	226.0	223.6	158.0
Funded by:			
GF	226.0	223.1	157.2
HRA	0.0	0.5	0.8

Appendix 8

Borrowing Strategy

General Fund

Following the HRA debt settlement in 2012 the Council's debt position is one of significant internal borrowing meaning cash backed reserves and provisions are being used in lieu of external debt. The external debt held is predominantly long term in nature.

The proposed Capital Budget, submitted to Executive in February and Council in March contains significant capital investment across the city. The scale of the investment suggests that the Council will need to undertake external borrowing in the future and will not be able on to rely on internal borrowing alone. Where possible, internal borrowing will remain the first option due to the interest savings generated.

To this aim, the Council's borrowing strategy will utilise the annual provision it is required to make to reduce debt, in the form of its Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP). If MRP is not used to reduce external debt it is held as cash so the most efficient arrangement is for MRP to be used to reduce the new long term debt expected to be required. This ensures that MRP is utilised and does not accumulate as cash on the Balance Sheet. Alternatively MRP could be used to repay existing debt but this would be at considerable cost in the current interest rate environment.

Beyond the forecast period for capital investment and matching to the same principles as above, a prudent strategy is to seek to borrow in the medium term with maturities to match the estimated MRP that is generated in the same period. This avoids an accumulation of cash on the Balance Sheet that would need to be invested at a potential net cost and investment risk to the Council.

The overall strategy is therefore for the Council to continue to use reserves and provisions to maximise internal borrowing whilst seeking to rebalance the portfolio with more medium term debt when there is a need to externally borrow. This must be done with a strong focus on achieving value for money on interest costs and balancing the risks to the overall debt portfolio.

HRA

The Council's proposed capital budget for 2020/21 and beyond does not contain any requirement for the HRA to borrow. It is expected that proposals will be brought forward that require funding via borrowing so it is likely the HRA will have a borrowing requirement in 2020/21. The level of borrowing affordable is restrained by the statutory requirement for the HRA Business Plan to avoid going into a deficit.

The impact of any required further long term borrowing on the Business Plan will be reviewed which will inform the borrowing options pursued. Any temporary borrowing required will be sought from the General Fund. This is discussed further in Appendix I.

Note, in the event that some of the current debt is required to be repaid, for example if one of the LOBO loans was called, the refinancing arrangements would need to be considered.

Borrowing Options

As stated above the Council's borrowing strategy will firstly utilise internal borrowing. However as the overall forecast is for long term borrowing rates to increase the short term advantage of internal and short term borrowing will be weighed against the potential cost if long term borrowing is delayed as rates for longer term loans are expected to increase.

New borrowing will be considered in the forms noted below. All options will be evaluated alongside their availability and which provides best value for money. The options below are not presented in a hierarchical order.

Public Works Loan Board (PWLB)

PWLB borrowing is available for between 1 and 50 year maturities on various bases. This offers a range of options for new borrowing which could spread debt maturities away from a concentration in longer dated debt and allow the Council to align maturities to MRP.

In October 2019 the Treasury increased all PWLB rates by 100 basis points, citing concerns regarding the increased levels of debt local authorities were requesting in the current low-rate market environment. This means that although PWLB remains a highly accessible form of debt finance, it may not provide value for money and other market options may be preferable.

The Link forecast for the PWLB Certainty Rate is as follows:

Table 3	Mar 20	Jun 20	Sep 20	Dec 20	Mar 21	Mar 22	Mar 23
	%						
Bank Rate	0.75	0.75	0.75	0.75	1.00	1.00	1.25
5 yr PWLB rate	2.40	2.40	2.50	2.50	2.60	2.90	3.20
10 yr PWLB rate	2.70	2.70	2.70	2.80	2.90	3.20	3.50
25 yr PWLB rate	3.30	3.40	3.40	3.50	3.60	3.90	4.10
50 yr PWLB rate	3.20	3.30	3.30	3.40	3.50	3.80	4.00

A more detailed Link forecast is included in Appendix G to this report.

European Investment Bank (EIB)

The EIB's rates for borrowing are generally favourable compared to PWLB although the margin of benefit has now reduced. Rates can be forward fixed for borrowing from the EIB and this option will be considered if the conditions can be met and it offers better value for money.

The EIB appraises its funding plans against individual schemes, particularly around growth and employment and energy efficiency, and any monies borrowed are part of

the Council's overall pooled borrowing.

Third Party Loans

These are loans from third parties that are offered at lower than market rates, for example Salix Finance Ltd is offering loans to the public sector at 0% to be used specifically to improve their energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions.

Homes and Communities Agency funding

This is funding from Government and can only be used in specific circumstances. It is, in effect, a 'loan' of the HCA's receipts from the disposal of its land and property within Greater Manchester (GM), as agreed in the GM City Deal. The City Council is currently the accountable body for these funds, but decisions on how the funding should be used are made by the Greater Manchester Combined Authority. It is anticipated that the existing debt of this type held by the City Council, shown in the forecast portfolio earlier in this report, will be novated to the Combined Authority in 2020.

Inter-Local Authority advances

Both short and medium term loans are often available in the inter Local Authority market.

Market Loans

Following the increase in PWLB rates noted above, there has been a considerable increase in market activity relating to local authority debt. At the time of writing the report, the market is still developing and may take a couple of months to form and for debt pricing and structure to become clear.

It is anticipated that there will be a range of structures available, including forward starting loans.

Local Authority Bond Agency

The UK Municipal Bonds Agency was established in June 2014 with the primary purpose of reducing local authority financing costs by:

- Issuing bonds in the capital markets and on-lending to councils.
- Lending between councils.
- Sourcing funding from 3rd party sources, and on-lending to councils.

Although the Agency's aim is to raise finance for Local Authorities by issuing municipal bonds to capital markets, at the time of writing the first bond has yet to be issued. The Council will continue to monitor the Agency's development and whether it can offer a competitive option for future borrowing.

These types of borrowing will need to be evaluated alongside their availability, particularly whilst there is a very limited availability of traditional market loans. The

traditional market loans available tend to be Lender Option Borrower Option (LOBO) loans and they are not currently offered at competitive rates of interest. LOBOs provide the lender with future options to increase the interest rate whilst the local authority has the option to repay if the increase in the rate is unacceptable to them.

Following HRA reform the vast majority of the Council's existing debt portfolio consists of LOBOs and the Authority needs to consider diversifying its loan book to reduce the impact of any volatility that may cause these loans to be called. It should be noted that the Council's current LOBO loans are unlikely to be called in the medium term at current interest rates.

Sensitivity of the forecast

In normal circumstances the main sensitivities are likely to be the two scenarios noted below. Council officers in conjunction with the treasury advisors will continually monitor the prevailing interest rates and the market forecast, adopting the following responses to a change of sentiment:

If it were felt that there was a significant risk of a sharp FALL in long and short term rates, e.g. due to a marked increase of risks around relapse into recession or of risks of deflation then long term borrowings will be postponed.

If it were felt that there was a significant risk of a much sharper RISE in long and short term rates than that current forecast, perhaps arising from a greater than expected increase in world economic activity or a sudden increase in inflation risks, the portfolio position will be re-appraised. The likely action will be that fixed rate funding will be drawn whilst interest rates remain relatively cheap.

External v. Internal borrowing

The current borrowing position reflects the historic strong Balance Sheet of the Council as highlighted in Section 6. The policy remains to keep cash as low as possible and minimise temporary investments.

The next financial year is again expected to be one of historically low Bank Rate. This provides a continuation of the opportunity for local authorities to review their strategy of undertaking new external borrowing. At Appendix F there is an in depth analysis of economic conditions provided by Link Asset Services, the Council's independent treasury advisors.

Over the next three years, investment rates are expected to be significantly below long term borrowing rates. This would indicate that value could best be obtained by limiting new external borrowing and by using internal cash balances to finance new capital expenditure or to replace maturing external debt.

This will be weighed against the potential for incurring additional long term costs by delaying new external borrowing until later years when longer term rates are forecast to be significantly higher. Consideration will also be given to forward fixing rates whilst rates are favourable.

Against this background caution will be adopted within 2020/21 treasury operations. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer will monitor the interest rate market and adopt a pragmatic approach to changing circumstances, reporting any decisions to the appropriate decision making body at the next available opportunity.

Policy on borrowing in advance of need

From a statutory point of view a Local Authority has the power to invest for 'any purpose relevant to its functions under any enactment, or for the purposes of the prudent management of its financial affairs.' The MHCLG takes an informal view that local authorities should not borrow purely to invest at a profit. This does not prevent the Council temporarily investing funds borrowed for the purpose of expenditure in the reasonable near future.

This Council will not borrow in advance of need to on lend and profit from the difference in interest rate. Any decision to borrow in advance in support of strategic and service delivery objectives will be in the context of achieving the best overall value for money, for example to minimise the risk of borrowing costs increasing in the future and that the Council can ensure the security of such funds. In determining whether borrowing is undertaken in advance of need the Council will:

- ensure that there is a clear link between the capital programme and maturity profile of the existing debt profile which supports the need to take funding in advance of need;
- ensure the ongoing revenue liabilities created and implications for future plans and budget have been considered;
- evaluate the economic and market factors that might influence the manner and timing of any decision to borrow;
- consider the merits and demerits of alternative forms of funding;
- consider the alternative interest rate bases available, the most appropriate periods to fund and repayment profiles to use; and
- consider the impact of borrowing in advance temporarily (until required to finance capital expenditure) increasing investment cash balances and the consequent increase in exposure to counterparty risk, and other risks, and the level of such risks given the controls in place to minimise them.

Forward Fixing

As noted above, the Council will give consideration to forward fixing debt, whereby the Council agrees to borrow at a point in the future at a rate based on current implied market interest rate forecasts. There is a risk that the interest rates proposed would be higher than current rates; however, it can be beneficial as it avoids the need to borrow in advance of need and suffer cost of carry. It may also represent a saving if rates were to rise in the future. Any decision to forward fix will be reviewed for value for money and will be reported to Members as part of the standard treasury management reporting.

Debt Rescheduling

It is likely that opportunities to reschedule debt in the 2020/21 financial year will be limited due to prevailing debt interest rates being relatively low.

As short term borrowing rates will be considerably cheaper than longer term rates, there may be some opportunity to generate savings by switching from long term debt to short term debt. These savings will need to be considered in the light of the premiums incurred and the likely cost of refinancing those short term loans once they mature compared to the current rates of longer term debt in the existing portfolio.

The debt portfolio following HRA reform consists mainly of LOBOs, and the premia for rescheduling these make it unlikely there will be a cost effective opportunity to reschedule. The premia relates to the future interest payments associated with the loan and compensation for the lender for the buy-back of the interest rate options the loan has embedded in it.

The Council will continue to monitor the LOBO market and opportunities to reschedule, redeem or alter the profile of existing LOBO debt. The reasons for any rescheduling to take place will include:

- the generation of cash savings and / or discounted cash flow savings;
- helping to fulfil the strategy outlined above in this section;
- enhancing the balance of the portfolio (amending the maturity profile and/or the balance of volatility)

Any restructuring of LOBOs will only be progressed if it provides value for money and reduces the overall treasury risk the Council faces. The Council's Constitution delegates to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer the authority to pursue any restructuring, rescheduling or redemption opportunities available.

Consideration will also be given to the potential for making savings by running down investment balances to repay debt prematurely. It is likely short term rates on investments will be lower than rates paid on current debt.

All rescheduling will be reported to the Executive as part of the normal treasury management activity. If rescheduling requires amendments to the Treasury Management Strategy the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer will be asked to approve them in accordance with the delegated powers accorded to the position and the changes will be reported to Members.

Appendix 9

Annual Investment Strategy

General Fund

Introduction

The Council will have regard to the MHCLG's Guidance on Local Government Investments (the Guidance) and the 2011 and 2017 revised CIPFA Treasury Management in Public Services Code of Practice and Cross Sectoral Guidance Notes (the CIPFA TM Code). The Council's investment priorities are:

- The security of capital; and
- The liquidity of its investments.

The risk appetite of the Council is low in order to give priority to the security of its investments. The Council will aim to achieve the optimum return on its investments commensurate with desired levels of security and liquidity.

The borrowing of monies by an Authority purely to invest or on-lend and make a return is unlawful and this Council will not engage in such activity. However the Council may provide loan finance funded from borrowing if this supports the achievement of the Council's strategies and service objectives.

The Council's TMSS focusses solely on treasury management investments. The Council does not hold any commercial investments and details of strategic capital investments can be found in the Capital Strategy and Budget Report to the Executive.

Investment Policy

The Council's investment policy is to manage the Council's cash flow through investments in high credit quality.

As in previous years, the Council will not just utilise ratings as the sole determinant of the quality of an institution. It is important to continually assess and monitor the financial sector on both a micro and macro basis and in relation to the economic and political environments in which institutions operate. The assessment will also take account of information that reflects the opinion of the markets. The Council will engage with its advisors to maintain a monitor on market pricing such as 'credit default swaps'² and overlay that information on top of the credit ratings.

Investment in banks and building societies are now exposed to bail-in risk following

² A credit default swap is a financial instrument that effectively provides the holder insurance against a loan defaulting. The CDS spread is the difference between the price at which providers are willing to sell the swap, and the price at which buyers are willing to buy. A relatively high spread may suggest that the loan is more likely to default.

the introduction of the EU's Banking Recovery and Resolution Directive, which means depositor's funds over £85,000 are at risk of "bail-in" if the bank fails. In response to this, the Council adopted lower operational limits for such investments in 2016/17 and these remain.

The exception is the limit with Barclays bank; Barclays is the Council's main banker and is the investment destination of last resort for the close of daily trading. These revised limits are operational changes and to preserve flexibility should circumstances change the overall investment limits approved for banks and building societies for 2019/20 will be maintained in 2020/21.

In line with the policy adopted in this strategy in previous years, options to diversify the investment portfolio have been reviewed and adopted. The Council now actively uses money market funds alongside deposits with banks, other local authorities and the Debt Management Agency.

For 2020/21 the Council will continue to consider investing in Treasury Bills, Certificates of Deposit and Covered Bonds. In addition to diversification each of these options offer the Council benefits which are noted in more detail below. These instruments require the Council to have specific custodian and broker facilities which have been opened. Officers are working to monitor these markets to prompt participation in the instruments when rates are favourable, and to identify and resolve any governance challenges arising from investing in instruments which have an active secondary market. Work is continuing to open further access points to markets and to identify opportunities for benefit which are new to the Council.

It should be noted that, whilst seeking to broaden the investment base officers will seek to limit the level of risk taken. It is not expected that the measures considered above will have a significant impact on the rates of return the Council currently achieves.

Specified and Non-Specified Investments

Investment instruments identified for use in the financial year are listed below and are all specified investments. Any proposals to use other non-specified investments will be reported to Members for approval.

Specified investments are sterling denominated, with maturities up to a maximum of one year and meet the minimum 'high' rating criteria where applicable. Further details about some of the specified investments below can be found in later paragraphs in this Section.

Table 4	Minimum 'High' Credit Criteria	Use
Term deposits – banks and building societies ³	See Creditworthiness Policy.	In-house

³ Banks & Building Societies

The Council will keep the investment balance below or at the maximum limit based on the institutions credit rating as detailed in paragraph 10.21-10.22. If this limit is breached, for example due to significant late receipts, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer will be notified as soon as possible after the breach, along with the reasons for it. Please note this relates to specific investments and not balances held within the Council's bank accounts, including the general bank account.

Table 4	Minimum 'High' Credit Criteria	Use
Term deposits – other Local Authorities	High security. Only one or two local authorities credit-rated	In-house
Debt Management Agency Deposit Facility	UK Government backed	In-house
Certificates of deposit issued by banks and building societies covered by UK Government guarantees	UK Government explicit guarantee	In-house
Money Market Funds (MMFs)	AAA _M	In-house
Treasury Bills	UK Government backed	In-house
Covered Bonds	AAA	In-house

Creditworthiness Policy

The Council applies the creditworthiness service provided by Link Asset Services. This service employs a sophisticated modelling approach utilising credit ratings from the three main credit rating agencies; Fitch, Moody's and Standard & Poor's. Link supplement the credit ratings of counterparties with the following overlays:

- credit watches and credit outlooks from credit rating agencies
- Credit Default Swap spreads to provide early warning of likely changes in credit ratings
- sovereign ratings to select counterparties from only the most creditworthy countries

The above are combined in a weighted scoring system which is then combined with an overlay of CDS spreads. The end product is a series of colour coded bands which indicate the relative creditworthiness of counterparties.

The Council has regard to Link's approach to assessing creditworthiness when selecting counterparties as it uses a wider array of information than just primary ratings and by using a risk weighted scoring system does not give undue prominence to just one agency's ratings.

In summary the Council will approach assessment of creditworthiness by using the Link counterparty list and then applying its own counterparty limits and durations. All credit ratings will be monitored on a daily basis and re-assessed weekly. The Council is alerted to changes to ratings of all three agencies through its use of the Link creditworthiness service.

- if a downgrade results in the counterparty/investment scheme no longer meeting the Council's minimum criteria, its further use as a new investment will be withdrawn immediately.
- in addition to the use of Credit Ratings, the Council will be advised of information in Credit Default Swap against the iTraxx benchmark⁴ and other

⁴ The Markit iTraxx Senior Financials Index is a composite of the 25 most liquid financial entities in Europe. The index is calculated through an averaging process by the Markit Group and is used as the benchmark level of CDS spreads on Link Asset Services' Credit List.

market data on a weekly basis. Extreme market movements may result in the downgrade of an institution or removal from the Council's lending list.

Sole reliance will not be placed on the use of this external service. In addition the Council will also use market data and market information, information on government support for banks and the credit ratings of that government support.

Investment Limits

In applying the creditworthiness policy the Council holds the security of investments as the key consideration and will only seek to make treasury investments with counterparties of high credit quality.

The financial investment limits of financial institutions will be linked to their short and long-term ratings (Fitch or equivalent) as follows:

<u>Long Term</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Fitch AA+ and above	£20 million
Fitch AA/AA-	£15 million
Fitch A+/A	£15 million
Fitch A-	£10 million
Fitch BBB+	£10 million

The Council will only utilise those institutions that have a short term rating of F2 or higher, (Fitch or equivalent).

UK Government (including the Debt Management Office)	£200 million
Greater Manchester Combined Authority	£200 million
Other Local Authorities	£20 million

In seeking to diversify the Council will utilise other investment types which are described in more detail below and ensure that the investment portfolio is mixed to help mitigate credit risk. The following limits will apply to each asset type:

Total Deposit	Amount
Local Authorities	£250 million
UK Government	£200 million
Debt Management Office	
Treasury Bills	
Money Market Funds	£75 million
Certificates of Deposit	£25 million
Covered Bonds	£25 million

It is proposed that the limit for Money Market Funds increases by £15m, when compared to last year's Strategy. This reflects the role the funds have been playing in the Council's investment portfolio, and would allow the Council to have 5 active funds as opposed to 4. There is a risk to taking this approach, in that it potentially increases the investments in one type of instrument at any given time, but the nature of Money Market Funds and the diversification of instruments within the Fund helps to mitigate this.

It may be prudent to temporarily increase the limits shown above, as in the current economic environment it is increasingly difficult for officers to place funds. If this is the case officers will seek approval from the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and any increase in the limits will be reported to Members through the normal treasury management reporting process.

Durational Limits

Operationally the Council has in recent years not invested cash for more than three months, which was a product of security concerns following the financial crisis of 2008/09 and the relatively volatile nature of the Council's cash flow.

The financial markets have changed significantly since 2008/09, and the transparency of creditworthiness has improved. It is therefore proposed that the Council formally states, as part of the Investment Strategy, that it will invest for up to 364 days provided that such investments form part of the management of the cash flow and not for increased yield. On this basis, such investments will only be made if the cash flow forecast at the time indicates a level of "core" cash which will not be required for the investment period.

Money Market Funds

The removal of the implied levels of sovereign support that were built into ratings throughout the financial crisis has impacted on bank and building society ratings across the world. Rating downgrades can limit the number of counterparties available and to provide flexibility the Council will use MMFs when appropriate as an alternative specified investment.

MMFs are investment instruments that invest in a variety of institutions therefore diversifying the investment risk. The funds are managed by a fund manager and have objectives to preserve capital, provide daily liquidity and a competitive yield. The majority of money market funds invest both inside and outside the UK. MMFs also provide flexibility as investments and withdrawals can be made on a daily basis.

MMFs are rated through a separate process to bank deposits. This looks at the average maturity of the underlying investments in the Fund as well as the credit quality of those investments. The Council will only use MMFs where the institutions hold the highest AAA credit rating and those which are UK or European based.

As with all investments there is some risk with MMFs in terms of the capital value of the investment. European legislation has required existing and new Constant Net Asset Value MMFs to convert to a Low Volatility Net Asset Value (LVNAV) basis by January 2019. This basis allows movements in capital value, but there is a restriction that the deviation cannot be more than 20 basis points, e.g. on a deposit of £100 the Fund must ensure withdrawal proceeds are no greater than +/- 20p.

Treasury Bills

Treasury Bills are marketable securities issued by the UK Government and

counterparty and liquidity risk is relatively low although there is potential risk to value arising from an adverse movement in interest rates unless they are held to maturity.

Weekly tenders are held for Treasury Bills so the Council could invest funds on a regular basis. This would provide a spread of maturity dates and reduce the volume of investments maturing at the same time.

There is a large secondary market for Treasury Bills so it is possible to trade them in earlier than the maturity date if required and to purchase them in the secondary market. In the majority of cases the Council will hold to maturity to avoid any potential capital loss from selling before maturity and will only sell the Treasury Bills early if it can demonstrate value for money in doing so.

Certificates of Deposit

Certificates of Deposit are short dated marketable securities issued by financial institutions so the counterparty risk is low. The instruments have flexible maturity dates so it is possible to trade them in early although there is a potential risk to capital if they are traded ahead of maturity and there is an adverse movement in interest rates. Certificates of Deposit are subject to bail-in risk as they are given the same priority as fixed deposits if a bank was to default. The Council will only deal with Certificates of Deposit that are issued by banks and meet the credit criteria.

Covered Bonds

Covered Bonds are debt instruments secured by assets such as mortgage loans. They are issued by banks and other non-financial institutions. The loans remain on the issuing institutions' Balance Sheet and investors have a preferential claim in the event of the issuing institution defaulting. All issuing institutions are required to hold sufficient assets to cover the claims of all covered bondholders. The Council would only deal with bonds that are issued by banks which meet the credit criteria, or AAA rated institutions, (e.g. insurance companies).

Liquidity

Based on cash flow forecasts, the level of cash balances in 2020/21 is estimated to range between £0m and £230m. The higher level can arise where for instance large Government grants are received or long term borrowing has recently been undertaken.

Investment Strategy to be followed in-house

Link's view of forecast Bank Rate is noted at Section 9. The current economic outlook is that the structure of market interest rates and government debt yields have several key treasury management implications.

On the assumption that the UK and EU agree a Brexit deal including the terms of trade by the end of 2020 or soon after, then Bank Rate is forecast to increase only slowly over the next few years. Link's view is that Bank Rate will rise to 1.00% by March 2021.

This suggest that investment returns are likely to remain relatively low during 2020/21, and beyond given the global economic outlook.

There will remain a cost of carry to any new borrowing which causes an increase in investments as this will incur a revenue loss between borrowing costs and investment returns.

The Council will avoid locking into longer term deals while investment rates are at historically low levels unless attractive rates are available with counterparties of particularly high creditworthiness which make longer term deals worthwhile and within the risk parameters set by the Council.

For 2020/21 it is suggested the Council should target an investment return of 0.50% on investments placed during the financial year. For cash flow generated balances the Council will seek to utilise its business reserve accounts and short-dated deposits (overnight to three months) in order to benefit from the compounding of interest.

End of year Investment Report

At the end of the financial year, the Council will receive a report on investment activity as part of the Annual Treasury Management Report.

Policy on the use of External Service Providers

The Council uses Link Asset Services as external treasury management advisors and has access to another provider who is an approved supplier should a second opinion or additional work be required. The Council recognises that responsibility for treasury management decisions remains with the organisation at all times and will ensure that undue reliance is not placed upon its external service providers.

The Council recognises there is value in employing external providers of treasury management services to acquire access to specialist skills and resources. It will ensure the terms of the Advisor's appointment and the methods by which their value is assessed are properly agreed and documented, and subjected to regular review.

Appendix 10

Proposed Use of Reserves

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2024 £000	Purpose
Schools Reserve	19,069	(259)	1,923	20,733	22,398	22,139	21,880	
General Fund Reserves								
Statutory Reserves	21,734	(10,015)	9,951	21,670	23,424	24,748	26,222	
Earmarked Reserves	296,130	(105,188)	93,695	284,637	264,606	266,671	261,240	
General Fund Reserve	21,420	0	1,597	23,017	23,017	23,017	23,017	
Total General Fund	339,284	(115,203)	105,243	329,324	311,047	314,436	310,479	
Housing Revenue Account Reserves:								
Housing Revenue Account General Reserve	73,960	(17,996)	0	55,964	41,748	27,480	25,978	
Major Repairs Reserve	1,240	(1,240)	0	0	0	0	0	
HRA PFI reserve	10,000	0	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	
HRA Residual liabilities fund	24,000	0	0	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	
Housing Insurance reserve	1,789	0	200	1,989	2,189	2,389	2,589	
Total HRA	110,989	(19,236)	200	91,953	77,937	63,869	62,567	
TOTAL RESERVES	469,342	(134,698)	107,366	442,010	411,382	400,444	394,926	
SCHOOLS RESERVE								

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2024 £000	Purpose
LMS Reserve	22,916	(259)	0	22,657	22,398	22,139	21,880	School balances assumed year-end position. These are not MCC resource and so cannot be used by MCC. There are no further known schools planning to transfer to academy status.
Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG)	(3,847)	0	1,923	(1,924)	0	0	0	DSG - Allocation to schools and retained Central DSG. £3.847m to be recovered over two years from DSG.
Sub Total Schools	19,069	(259)	1,923	20,733	22,398	22,139	21,880	
STATUTORY RESERVES								
Bus Lane Enforcement Reserve	13,084	(4,275)	4,546	13,355	13,547	13,239	12,931	Ring-fenced reserve which can only be applied to specific transport and highways related activity.
On Street Parking	3,881	(5,304)	5,405	3,982	5,852	7,831	9,810	Ring-fenced reserve which can only be applied to specific transport and highways related activity.
Ancoats Square Reserve	2,732	(118)	0	2,614	2,496	2,378	2,260	Received from the Homes and Communities Agency to cover the revenue costs of maintaining Ancoats Square for a period of at least 25 years.

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2024 £000	Purpose
Spinningfields Commuted Sum	607	(9)	0	598	589	580	571	Funds received as part of an agreement to cover maintenance costs.
Great Northern Square Maintenance Fund	283	(20)	0	263	243	223	203	Set up in accordance with the agreement with the developers of the site. It will be used for upgrading of the square.
Education Endowments	17	0	0	17	17	17	17	For future payments for school prizes
Landlord Licensing Reserve	400	(170)	0	230	119	0	0	Smoothing reserve
Art Fund Reserve	31	0	0	31	31	0	0	For art purchases
Manchester Safeguarding	69	(69)	0	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	Children's Safeguarding Board activity. The Board is a joint responsibility with MCC & CCG
St Johns Gardens Contingency	630	(50)	0	580	530	480	430	Contribution from St Johns Gardens tenants for maintenance works
Sub Total Statutory	21,734	(10,015)	9,951	21,670	23,424	24,748	26,222	
EARMARKED RESERVES								
BALANCES HELD FOR PFI'S								

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2024 £000	Purpose
Street Lighting PFI	250	(250)	0	0	0	0	0	Established to fund the requirements over 25 years re: the PFI contract for Street Lighting service via external contractors
Temple PFI	689	(125)	12	576	453	307	307	Established to fund the requirements of the PFI scheme over 25 years
Wright Robinson PFI Reserve	1,351	0	40	1,391	1,431	1,471	1,511	PFI Scheme 25 year contract drawdown will be in future years as expenditure exceeds grant.
Total held for PFI's	2,290	(375)	52	1,967	1,884	1,778	1,818	
Reserves directly supporting the revenue budget								
Adult Social Care	7,695	(5,545)	0	2,150	0	0	0	To support Adult and Social Care Improvement Plan
Social Care Reserve	13,255	(7,135)	920	7,040	1,462	1,462	1,462	To address pressures in social care, in particular the need to invest in early help and prevention in Children's Services and continued pressures on LAC budgets
Crime and Disorder	1,080	(540)	0	540	0	0	0	To fund the Anti-Social Behaviour Team

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2024 £000	Purpose
Budget smoothing reserve	10,651	(7,066)	0	3,585	0	0	0	Planned use to smooth the impact of previous funding reductions on the revenue budget
Total held to support the revenue budget	32,681	(20,286)	920	13,315	1,462	1,462	1,462	
RESERVES HELD TO SMOOTH RISK / ASSURANCE								
Risks								
Planning Reserve	2,467	(300)	0	2,167	1,867	1,567	1,267	Used to smooth the volatility of planning fee income to avoid budget pressures if fee income drops
Transformation Reserve	9,483	(333)	0	9,150	8,817	8,483	8,149	To support costs of future service change.
Airport Dividend reserve	55,809	(47,080)	47,080	55,809	55,809	55,809	55,809	The income in the reserve is from the Manchester airport dividend which is then used a year in arrears to support the Medium Term Financial Plan
Land Charges Fees Reserve	320	(320)	0	0	0	0	0	To smooth the budget impact, planned to utilise in 2020/21
Pension Risk Fund	524	0	0	524	0	0	0	To fund external pension liabilities

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2024 £000	Purpose
Manchester International Festival	1,493	0	10,667	12,160	11,160	10,113	9,019	To fund agreed future Manchester International Festivals / Factory grant from the reserve. Grant agreement will be aligned to the Arts Council England funding cycle.
Highways reserve	1,010	(89)	0	921	832	743	654	Funds received as part of developer agreements that will be utilised for highways schemes in future years
Insurance Fund	17,091	(500)	0	16,591	16,091	15,591	15,091	The insurance fund has been established to fund risks that are self-insured.
Fleet Maintenance Reserve	25	(25)	0	0	25	50	0	Reserve created for smoothing the impact of vehicle repair and maintenance costs.
Taxi Licensing Reserve	1,000	(1,000)	0	0	0	0	0	This is a smoothing reserve to equalise the income and expenditure of running the function over financial years. Income ring-fenced by statute.
Newton Heath Market Reserve	22	0	0	22	22	22	22	To fund the future market provision

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2024 £000	Purpose
Rogue Landlord reserve	40	(40)	0	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	This reserve holds the funding for investigation into poor property conditions in the private rented sector in Manchester with the purpose of improving housing conditions for tenants by enforcing compliance with statutory regulations and standards.
Selective Licensing Reserve	346	(165)	0	181	0	0	0	Costs for administering the reputable landlord initiative and ensure compliance
Investment Estate smoothing reserve	1,524	(700)	0	824	824	824	824	To manage budget pressures due to the volatility in investment income.
Business Rates Reserve	22,737	(3,165)	2,754	22,326	19,161	18,671	18,181	To mitigate Business Rates income risk due to the volatility of assumptions
TOTAL Risk/Smooth	113,891	(53,717)	60,501	120,675	114,608	111,873	109,016	
RESERVES HELD TO FUND CAPITAL SCHEMES AND OTHER SPECIFIC PROJECT RELATED COSTS								

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2024 £000	Purpose
Investment Reserve	12,623	(2,325)	0	10,298	8,723	7,523	6,323	To deliver priority regeneration projects.
Enterprise zone reserve	1,084	(1,061)	1,500	1,523	1,962	2,401	3,333	To underwrite the borrowing costs for development in the Oxford Road Corridor
Capital Fund Reserve	68,408	(10,366)	17,559	75,601	75,601	79,425	77,048	Contribution to schemes which are supporting employment and growth, future carbon reduction investments and high priority strategic development opportunities in the city .
Capital Financing Reserve	34,730	0	5,000	39,730	44,730	49,730	54,730	To reflect increase in borrowing costs due to the Council's capital investment
Eastlands Reserve	3,434	(5,682)	5,118	2,870	2,740	2,941	3,670	This reserve reflects the contribution from Manchester City Football Club and will be used for various projects including English Institute of Sport.
Total to fund capital scheme and other specific relates costs	120,279	(19,434)	29,177	130,022	133,756	142,020	145,104	

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2024 £000	Purpose
RESERVES TO SUPPORT GROWTH AND REFORM								
Integration Reserve	2,343	(1,273)	0	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	The reserve is a joint resource between Manchester City Council and Manchester Clinical Commissioning Group to support the infrastructure requirements that underpin the mobilisation of the Locality Plan.
Town Hall Reserve	10,668	(3,185)	2,400	9,883	7,467	5,041	0	To fund commitments for the Town Hall Complex Programme
Troubled Families Reserve	1,332	(1,332)	0	0	0	0	0	This was set up to support the scaling up on the community budgets work
Our Manchester reserve	3,570	(2,556)	530	1,544	0	0	0	Additional investment made available as part of the 2017-2020 budget process to drive forward the delivery of Our Manchester initiatives
TOTAL	17,913	(8,346)	2,930	12,497	8,537	6,111	1,070	
GRANTS USED OVER ONE YEAR								

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2024 £000	Purpose
English Partnership (Homes and Communities Agency)	1,019	(457)	0	562	0	0	0	HCA approval required to Fund Development appraisal and Eastland's Project team
Other Grants and Contributions - Neighbourhood Services	289	(110)	0	179	89	0	0	Various local Environment scheme and initiatives i.e. 'clean up campaigns'
Emergency Planning	367	(167)	0	200	100	0	0	Relates to various ongoing Civil Contingencies schemes
Other Grants and Contributions- Growth and Development	89	(89)	0	0	0	0	0	Unspent grant received in previous year
Fraud Fund	136	(80)	0	56	0	0	0	Unspent grant received in previous year
Asylum Seekers	359	(71)	0	288	192	92	0	This will fund the Local Authority Asylum Support Officer (LAASLO) project.
Collection Initiatives Reserve	824	(231)	0	593	493	393	293	Small reserves on Corporate Core
MAES Reserve	2,562	(500)	0	2,062	1,562	1,062	562	To fund Manchester Adult Education Services (MAES)
Flood management reserve	37	(37)	0	0	0	0	0	Unspent grant received in previous year
Brexit - Local Resilience Forum	201	(201)	0	0	0	0	0	To fund BREXIT related costs that fall across more than one year

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2024 £000	Purpose
Brexit Reserve	105	(105)	0	0	0	0	0	To fund BREXIT related costs that fall across more than one year
TOTAL	5,988	(2,048)	0	3,940	2,436	1,547	855	
SMALL SPECIFIC RESERVES								
Catering Reserve	151	0	0	151	0	0	0	Funding belonging to schools which the Council holds on their behalf. The purpose is to fund repairs and improvements to school kitchens.
Nuclear Free Zone	47	(5)	0	42	37	32	27	General reserve/ GM contributions. At the end of the year any surplus/deficit is adjusted in the reserve

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2024 £000	Purpose
Carbon Reduction Reserve	227	(227)	0	0	0	0	0	To fund revenue initiatives which support the target for Manchester to become a zero carbon city by 2038 at the latest and specifically, to support the delivery of the Council's 2020-25 Action Plan which is due to be approved by the Executive in Spring 2020. This will include service specific training to support staff in identifying the carbon impact of investment plans, development of business plans for external funding and accessing support for the Council to develop innovative approaches to our future zero carbon energy needs.
New Smithfield Market - Car Boot	256	(45)	55	266	276	286	296	Used to fund repairs and maintenance of facilities for traders.
Cemeteries Replacement	441	0	40	481	521	561	601	To purchase land for burials

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2024 £000	Purpose
Primary School Catering Reserve	313	(313)	0	0	0	0	0	Reserve established to support the Service's competitiveness by smoothing school meal prices during the 3 year price planning period.
Catering Repairs and Maintenance Insurance Account	166	(5)	0	161	54	54	54	Reserve established to meet refurbishment cost of school kitchens.
Councils with ALMOs Group (CWAG) Reserve	66	(10)	0	56	46	36	26	Held in relation to the running costs of the Council With ALMOs Group which is administered by MCC
Graves and Memorials	97	0	0	97	97	97	97	Money held in trust for repair and development costs for gravestones
Trading Standards Reserve	121			121	121	121	121	Specific grants such as Tobacco control, control of migration etc.
Housing Compliance Reserve (Fixed Penalty Notices)	340	(31)	0	309	234	156	156	Revenue collected from enforcement activity is ring-fenced to functions related to Housing Compliance.

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2024 £000	Purpose
Community Safety Reserve	468	(250)	0	218	218	218	218	A collection of grants the majority of which require spending plans to be agreed with key partner organisations such as GM Police.
Litter Reserve (Fixed Penalty Notices)	65	0	0	65	65	65	65	Revenue collected from enforcement activity is ring-fenced to functions related to litter.
Great Ancoats Management Improvement Reserve	206	0	0	206	206	206	206	Specific reserve for use within defined areas within Great Ancoats. Spending plans still under discussion.
Social Value Fund	96	(96)	20	20	20	20	20	New Reserves for Social Funding income from successful tenders
Other Small Specific reserves	28	0	0	28	28	28	28	Small specific reserves
Total Small Specific Reserves	3,088	(982)	115	2,221	1,923	1,880	1,915	
TOTAL EARMARKED RESERVES	296,130	(105,188)	93,695	284,637	264,606	266,671	261,240	
Total General Fund Reserves	339,284	(115,203)	105,243	329,324	311,047	314,436	310,479	

Appendix 11

COUNCIL TAX

SETTING THE AMOUNT OF COUNCIL TAX FOR THE COUNCIL'S AREA

RESOLVED

1. That the estimates prepared by the Executive at its meeting on 12 February 2020 be approved.
2. That it be noted that the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer acting under delegated powers has determined the amount of 118,864.6 as the Council Tax base for Manchester for the year 2020/21 in accordance with Section 31A (3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and regulations 3 to 5 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012.
3. That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2020/21 in accordance with Sections 31A to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| (a) £1,566,690,733 | being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in the Section 31A (2) (a) to (f) of the Act. |
| (b) £1,397,254,000 | being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) (a) to (d) of the Act. |
| (c) £169,436,733 | being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Sections 31A(4) of the Act, as its council tax requirement for the year. |
| (d) £1,425.46 | being the amount at 3(c) above divided by the amount at 2 above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31B(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year. |

(e) Valuation Bands

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£950.31	£1,108.69	£1,267.08	£1,425.46	£1,742.23	£2,059.00	£2,375.77	£2,850.92

being the amount given multiplying the amount at 3(d) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated

by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

4. That it be noted that for the year 2020/21 the major precepting authorities have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

Precepting Valuation bands

Greater Manchester Mayoral Police and Crime Commissioner Precept

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£138.86	£162.01	£185.15	£208.30	£254.58	£300.87	£347.16	£416.60

Greater Manchester Mayoral General Precept (including Fire Services)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£60.63	£70.73	£80.84	£90.95	£111.16	£131.37	£151.58	£181.90

5. That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 3(e) and 4 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2019/20 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below.

Valuation bands

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£1,149.80	£1,341.43	£1,533.07	£1,724.71	£2,107.97	£2,491.24	£2,874.51	£3,449.42

1. CALCULATING THE COUNCIL TAX REQUIREMENT

Section 31A Calculations

- 1.1 Section 31A of the Local Government Finance 1992 requires the Council to make three calculations:-
- (i) an estimate of the Council's required gross revenue expenditure -Section 31A(2)
 - (ii) an estimate of its anticipated income (excluding that from council tax) and of reserves to be used to aid the revenue account - Section 31A(3)
 - (iii) a calculation of the difference between (i) and (ii) above, (i.e. the Council Tax requirement) - Section 31A(4)
- 1.2 In its Section 31A(2) calculation the Council is required to allow for the following:

Section 31A(2)(a) - the estimated revenue account expenditure it will incur during the year in performing its functions;

Section 31A(2)(b) - an appropriate allowance for contingencies for the year, e.g. for unforeseen occurrences such as disasters, storm damage, higher than expected inflation etc.;

Section 31A(2)(c) - any raising of financial reserves for future expenditure - examples of this include payments into a redemption fund, internal insurance etc;

Section 31A(2)(d) - any revenue account deficit for a previous financial year which has not yet been provided for;

Section 31A(2)(da) – any amount estimated to be transferred from the general fund to the collection fund in accordance with regulations by reference to sums received by the authority in respect of business rates.

Section 31A(2)(e) - any amount estimated to be transferred from the General Fund to the Collection Fund in accordance with Section 97(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 - i.e. the Council's share of any collection fund deficit;

Section 31A(2)(f) - any amounts estimated to be transferred from the General Fund to the Collection Fund by direction of the Secretary of State under Section 98(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 - including an estimate of the shortfall in the collection of Non-domestic Rates in excess of the allowance

- 1.3. In its Section 31A(3) calculation the Council must calculate the aggregate of sums to be put against gross expenditure, namely:

Section 31A(3)(a) - estimated income from fees, charges, and government grants (including RSG) plus other sums payable into the general fund (but excluding council tax).

Section 31A(3)(aa) – Any amount estimated to be transferred from the collection fund to the general fund in accordance with regulations by reference to sums received by the authority in respect of business rates.

Section 31A(3)(b) - any amount estimated to be transferred from the Collection Fund to the General Fund in accordance with Section 97(3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 - i.e. the Council's share of any collection fund surplus.

Section 31A(3)(c) - sums to be transferred from the Collection Fund to the General Fund pursuant to a direction of the Secretary of State under Section 98(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 - including allowances for costs of collection of business rates.

Section 31A(3)(d) - the amount of financial reserves/balances which the authority intends to use towards meeting its revenue expenditure.

1.4 On the basis of current estimates, the calculations would be as follows:-

	HRA	Other	Total
	£	£	£
Expenditure			
Section 31A(2)(a)	£104,577,000	£1,346,904,733	£1,451,481,733
Section 31A(2)(b)	£0	£860,000	£860,000
Section 31A(2)(c)	£0	£114,349,000	£114,349,000
Section 31A(2)(d)	£0	£0	£0
Section 31A(2)(da)	£0	£0	£0
Section 31A(2)(e)	£0	£0	£0
Section 31A(2)(f)	£0	£0	£0
	£104,577,000	£1,462,113,733	£1,566,690,733
Income			
Section 31A(3)(a)	(£86,136,000)	(£825,431,178)	(£911,567,178)
Section 31A(3)(aa)	£0	(£332,726,000)	(£332,726,000)
Section 31A(3)(b)	£0	(£17,108,000)	(£17,108,000)
Section 31A(3)(c)	£0	(£1,123,822)	(£1,123,822)
Section 31A(3)(d)	(£18,441,000)	(£116,288,000)	(£134,729,000)
	(£104,577,000)	(£1,292,677,000)	(£1,397,254,000)

1.5 **Council Tax Requirement under Section 31A(4)** being the amount by which the aggregate under Section 31A(2) exceeds the aggregate under Section 31A(3) is £169,436,733.

2. CALCULATING THE BASIC AMOUNT OF COUNCIL TAX

2.1. Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 requires the Council to calculate the basic amount of its Council Tax - this is in effect the City Council element of the Band D Council tax.

2.2 This calculated by applying the following formula -

Where:

R is the Council Tax requirement, and

T is the approved Council Tax base

2.3 Calculating the Basic Amount of Council Tax

Council Tax Requirement	£169,436,733
Divided by:	
Council Tax Base	118,864

Band D Basic Amount of Council Tax is: £1,425.46

Appendix 12

COLLECTION FUND BUDGET 2020/21	Budget Estimate
	£'000
<u>EXPENDITURE</u>	
<u>COUNCIL TAX</u>	
(Surplus) / Deficit B/fwd	(5,998)
Precepts:	
- Mayoral General (including Fire Services)	10,811
- Mayoral Police & Crime Commissioner	24,759
- City of Manchester	169,437
Total Precepts	205,007
Council Tax Total Expenditure	199,009
<u>BUSINESS RATES</u>	
(Surplus) / Deficit B/fwd	(12,202)
Payments/Transfers:	
- Mayoral General (including Fire Services)	3,438
- City of Manchester	340,353
Total Payments/transfers	343,791
Business Rates Total Expenditure	331,589
Collection Fund Total Expenditure	530,598
<u>INCOME</u>	
<u>COUNCIL TAX</u>	
Council Tax Income	212,443
Write Off of uncollectable amounts	(838)
Allowance for Impairment	(6,598)
<u>Council tax receivable</u>	205,007
<u>Contribution of Council Tax (surplus) / deficit:</u>	
- Mayoral General (including Fire Services)	(271)
- Mayoral Police & Crime Commissioner	(699)
- City of Manchester	(5,028)
Total Contribution to Council Tax (surplus) / deficit	(5,998)

Council Tax Total Income	199,009
COLLECTION FUND BUDGET 2020/21	Budget Estimate
	£'000
<u>BUSINESS RATES</u>	
Non Domestic Business Rates Income	383,883
Enterprise Zone Growth	(576)
Cost of Collection Allowance	(1,124)
Losses in Collection	(11,529)
Increase in Provision for Appeals	(26,863)
<u>Business rates receivable</u>	343,791
<u>Contribution of Business Rates (surplus) / deficit:</u>	
- Mayoral General (including Fire Services)	(122)
- City of Manchester	(12,080)
Total Contribution to Business Rates (surplus)/deficit	(12,202)
Business Rates Total Income	331,589
Collection Fund Total Income	530,598
MOVEMENT ON FUND BALANCE	
Council Tax (Surplus) / Deficit C/fwd	0
Business Rates (Surplus) / Deficit Cfwd	0
Collection Fund (Surplus) / Deficit	0

This page is intentionally left blank

Executive

Part Proceedings (B) of the meeting held on Wednesday, 12 February 2020

Present: Councillor Leese (Chair)

Councillors: Akbar, Bridges, Craig, N Murphy, Ollerhead, Rahman, Stogia, and Richards

Also present as Members of the Standing Consultative Panel:

Councillors: Karney, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Midgley, Ilyas, Taylor and S Judge

Apologies: Councillor S Murphy and Leech

Also present: Councillors: Flanagan, Johns and Stanton

Exe/20/22 Manchester Climate Change Update

An update on work to address climate change was considered. The Council's key leadership role had resulted in the establishment of the city's partnership-based approach to climate action. That had started with the creation of the "Manchester: A Certain Future Steering Group" in 2010. The approach recognised the need for everyone in the city to be mobilised to play their full part in tackling climate change. Since then the city has been using to the science to inform and develop the city's climate change strategy.

In February 2008 we approved "17 Principles of Tackling Climate Change in Manchester" and committed the city to becoming low carbon by 2020 (Minute Exe/08/27). In January 2009 we had gone on to adopt the "Call to Action" that sought to inspire and enable stakeholders to become fully engaged in the need to undertake mainstream activities in different ways to reduce carbon dioxide emissions (Minute Exe/09/4). In February 2014 we had approved the Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) for 2014/15 to 2016/17 (Minute Exe/14/22). In 2015 that plan was extended to run until 2017/18 (Minute Exe/15/034). In November 2018 we had adopted, on behalf of the city, the Tyndall Centre's proposed targets and definition of zero carbon. We also committed to developing a draft action plan by March 2019, and a final detailed plan by March 2020, setting out how the city will ensure that it stays within the proposed carbon budget (Minute Exe/18/101). In July 2019 the Council then declared a climate emergency (Minute CC/19/52) which was considered and accepted by the Executive later that month (Minute Exe/19/59).

The target to reduce Manchester's CO₂ emissions by 41% by 2020, from 2005 levels, was based on recommendations by the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research at the University of Manchester (the Tyndall Centre). In June 2018 Manchester Climate Change Agency and the Manchester Climate Change Partnership had commissioned the Tyndall Centre to recommend targets to further define the city's commitment to 'play its full part in limiting the impacts of climate change', as set out

in the Our Manchester Strategy. The Tyndall Centre's report was due on 28 February 2020 but work to date had identified the following draft recommendations:

- Retain the existing 15 million tonne CO₂ carbon budget for 2018-2100
- Note that the updated carbon budget approach based on the latest scientific synthesis report by the IPCC would allow an increase in the carbon budget to 18 million tonnes CO₂ but that by retaining the 15 million tonne budget showed ambition and leadership
- Focus on immediate action to achieve a minimum reduction rate of 13% per annum and meeting interim (five-year) carbon budgets
- Note that if the city did not reduce emissions by 13% per annum, an increased rate will be required from 2020 in order to stay within budget.
- Carbon budgets should be revisited in five years or in response to a new scientific synthesis report.

The Tyndall Centre had also been commissioned to examine and report on carbon emissions from aviation. To date that had identified the following areas for Manchester to consider:

- To note that aircraft emissions could not be overlooked – additional action is required to meet the Paris Agreement 'well below 2°C' commitment
- UK aviation emissions needed to fit within a Paris-compliant national pathway. Noting that the Tyndall Centre's recommended carbon budget includes 1,262 million tonnes CO₂ for aviation from 2018-2100, versus 1,705 million tonnes based on current UK Government policy forecasts.
- Survey data made it possible to monitor and report Manchester residents' flights from UK airports, including from Manchester Airport
- A method for monitoring and reporting flights taken by Manchester businesses could be developed. To be aware of potential double counting with residents' flights.
- Manchester City Council and Manchester Airport should work with UK Government to ensure a Paris-compliant aviation strategy for the UK as technological change alone was not sufficient.
- Could Manchester Airport become a pioneer organisation (as part of the Manchester Climate Change Partnership) for managing the impact of its ground operations?

The final Tyndall Centre report on aviation was to be completed by 21 February 2020.

Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25 was being produced by the Manchester Climate Change Partnership and Agency to set out their recommended approach for Manchester to meet its targets. Since the publication in February 2019 of the Draft Manchester Zero Carbon Framework 2020-38, there had been three key developments:

- The review of emissions targets
- the Partnership and Agency had chosen to focus on the next five years, 2020-25, seeking to emphasise the point that urgent action was needed
- Adaptation and resilience to the changing climate had been identified as an additional objective, broadening the scope of the Framework from carbon reduction

The final version of the Framework was in development and was to be published by the Partnership and Agency on 28 February 2020. It would be considered at the next meeting of the Executive in March 2020.

Decision

To note the citywide progress and the summary of the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research review of targets.

Exe/20/23 School Place Planning and Admissions

A report from the Director of Education used the school admissions data for 2019/20 to forecast future demand for primary and secondary school places in the city and to make the case for supporting the creation of a new primary school in the city centre and a new secondary school in east Manchester.

The city's population was increasing. It was predicted to be around 664,000 by the mid-2020, compared to 504,000 when measured in the 2011 Census. The October 2018 school census had identified 77,372 pupils attending Manchester Schools, that had increased to 79,429 pupils in the October 2019 census. Given that change, and the predictions of population change, ensuring a sufficient supply of high quality school places would remain a priority for the Council.

The report explained that the Council was working with its partners to develop additional places in targeted areas, utilising Basic Need funding from the government for the site and building works. The development of new schools by a local authority required the use of the free school presumption process, working with an approved sponsor to establish the school. All new schools established through the presumption process were therefore classified as Free Schools.

In response to this forecast demand the Council had been working with Renaker Build to establish a new primary school as part of the Crown Street phase 2 development in the city centre (Minute PH/18/58). The school was expected to provide 210 places for primary age children along with a 26 place nursery. The free school presumption process for this school would now be used and it was anticipated that the school would admit its first pupils in 2024. A second new primary school was also being investigated by the Star Academies Trust, if a permanent site for it could be acquired. That was forecast to open in 2023.

In relation to secondary school places, the report explained that plans to develop a new secondary school at Nutsford Vale, Matthews Lane (Minute PH/18/21) had not progressed as expected. To safeguard the future development of a new secondary school in east Manchester approval had been given to fund the acquisition of the Showcase Cinema site on Hyde Road (Minute Exe/20/08). Some of that site could be given over for a new secondary school. If that site proved to be suitable then the new school at Matthews Lane would not be progressed as it was becoming clear that constructing a school on Nutsford Vale would be overly expensive.

The development of a new secondary school at the Hyde Road site would still require a free school presumption process to be undertaken to identify a preferred sponsor. That process should conclude in late summer or early autumn 2020 and the first places made available in September 2021 school admissions. However, opening of the school for September 2021 would require the use of temporary accommodation for a period of up to three years while the new school was being built.

The meeting was addressed by Councillor Johns as a councillor for the Deansgate ward. He thanked the Executive member and the education team for the work they had put into securing the development of the new primary school in the city centre. He spoke of the excitement there was amongst residents at the prospect of a new primary school within their local community.

It was noted that the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee had also considered this report and had endorsed its recommendations (Minute CYP/20/12).

Decisions

1. That Basic Need funding be used to fund a new high school and contribute towards the development of a city centre primary school.
2. To request that officers undertake a consultation to gather views on the plans to develop a new primary school in the city centre and a new secondary school in east Manchester as a first step towards identifying a provider for the new school.
3. To delegate authority to the Director of Education in consultation with the Executive Member for Children's Services to progress the publication of a specification for each new school and invitations to sponsor based on the outcomes of the consultation; and to identify a preferred sponsor for each school to be recommended to the DfE.
4. To note the data relating to September 2019 admissions and the pupil forecasts that had been submitted to the Department for Education.

Exe/20/24 Refresh of the Ancoats and New Islington Neighbourhood Development Framework

Ancoats including New Islington is a distinctive neighbourhoods close to the city centre and adjacent to the neighbourhood of Miles Platting. In April 2014 we endorsed a draft Ancoats and New Islington Neighbourhood Development Framework (NDF) as a basis for consultation with local stakeholders and landowners (Minute Exe/14/041). In October 2014 we considered and approved a final version of the Framework (Minute Exe/14/109). Then, in July 2016 we had endorsed a draft of a refreshed Ancoats and New Islington Neighbourhood Development Framework so that it could be subject to further consultation with local stakeholders and landowners (Minute Exe/16/099). In December 2016 a final version of that Framework had been approved (Minute Exe/16/153).

A report now submitted by the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) explained that it was now felt to be necessary to set the objectives for those elements of the NDF that related to the Back of Ancoats Poland Street area; and to set objectives for the redevelopment of the Council-owned former Central Retail Park site that on Great Ancoats Street.

To ensure that new affordable housing could be developed in the NDF area it was proposed that three sites in Council ownership should now be set aside for this purpose. Those sites were land adjacent to Butler Street; land adjacent to Downley Drive; and the former Ancoats Dispensary. These three sites were shown on a map included in the report. Together the three sites should provide for up to 145 new homes.

For the Back of Ancoats Poland Street area the report the report explained that the purpose of the refresh of the 2016 NDF was to ensure that it incorporated current thinking in terms of the redevelopment of the area and was properly aligned to the current market context relating to a number of key issues including zero carbon and affordable housing. The report described this areas as having an interrupted street grid pattern that was dominated by two industrial estates at Poland Street; vacant and underutilised sites that detract from the visual amenity; as being part of the Conservation Area but gaining little benefit from the that; as having some open space at Kemp Street that attracted a high level of anti-social behaviour; with a lack of pedestrian footfall and visible daytime activity; and with low value buildings that do not front onto the Rochdale Canal and therefore do not exploit the advantage of a waterside location.

The specific objectives that were now being proposed for this area in the refresh of the NDF were:

- the reinstatement of the grid pattern street layout to improve connectivity and movement through the area as well as creating legible routes that draw pedestrians into the area and through to the surrounding areas;
- the creation of a mixed living and working neighbourhood, delivering flexible commercial floorplates for office and modern light industrial uses that can co-exist with a residential development that offers a range of typologies and tenures including the provision of affordable housing; and
- the creation of high quality amenity and green spaces integrated with surrounding uses and would draw people into and through the area.

A copy of the draft NDF for the “Character Area 3 – Poland Street Zone” was appended to the report. The intention was for a period of public consultation on that draft. That was supported.

The Council’s acquisition of the former Central Retail Park site had been agreed in September 2017 (Minute Exe/17/122). At that time the agreed objectives for the site had been:

1. to secure full control over the future redevelopment of this site in a manner that would accord with the extant and any future iteration of the wider Ancoats and New Islington Neighbourhood Development Framework;

2. to shape the development strategy to ensure that the site made a significant contribution to the future growth of the city in line with the Council's Residential Growth and wider economic growth ambitions; and
3. to promote the redevelopment of the site in a timely manner and appropriately sequenced ensuring that the Council's interest in its wider land portfolio across Ancoats and New Islington was protected and potentially enhanced.

Since then OBI Property, a Manchester based commercial property agency, had been commissioned to evaluate whether a commercial-led proposal for Central Retail Park could deliver a significant commercial workspace / office scheme. The outcome of that evaluation was positive and described in the report. It was believed that there would be demand for commercial development on the site.

Therefore, it was felt that a revised framework for the site would help to deliver an exemplary net zero carbon commercial district with the ability to attract new businesses and talent to Manchester. The development would bring together activities and people to create a vibrant mixed use neighbourhood, complementing and uniting the surrounding districts. In doing so, the proposal also represented a key opportunity to help unlock the potential of East Manchester.

A copy of the draft of the revised "Central Retail Park Development Framework" was appended to the report. The intention was for that draft to be subject to public consultation with the outcome reported to a future meeting.

To enable to redevelopment of the site to progress it was explained that the Council should now undertake a market engagement exercise to appoint a Development / Investment Funding Partner(s) to deliver on the proposals in the draft Framework. Once that had been done a commercial plan for the site could be prepared.

Decisions

1. In respect of the draft revisions to the Poland Street Character Area of the NDF, to:
 - a) note that the City Council will use its remaining land assets within the NDF area to deliver and influence the delivery of new net zero carbon development;
 - b) approve that these sites in the City Council's land ownership, land adjacent to Butler Street, land adjacent to Downley Drive, and the former Ancoats Dispensary, as identified on Map 1 of this report be used to promote affordable housing; and
 - c) endorse the draft revisions to the Back of Ancoats Poland Street Character Area 3, as set out in the draft that was appended to the report, as a basis for public consultation, and that a final version be brought back to a future meeting.
2. In respect of the former Central Retail Park site, to:

- a) approve the commercial led mixed use development strategy for the Central Retail Park site as set out in the report;
 - b) note the intention to commence an exercise to engage the market to identify a Development / Investment Funding Partner(s) with the objective to deliver a net zero carbon commercial led mixed use development on the Central Retail Park site;
 - c) delegate authority to the Chief Executive or the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, the City Solicitor, the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), the Head of Development, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources, and the Deputy Leader with the Corporate Property portfolio, to finalise the detail of that market exercise;
 - d) note that a Commercial Plan for the Central Retail Park site was to be brought to a future meeting for approval following the appointment of the Development / Investment Funding Partner(s); and
 - e) endorse the draft revisions to the Great Ancoats Street Frontage (the former Central Retail Park site) Character Area of the NDF, as set out in the draft Development Framework that was appended to the report, as a basis for public consultation, and that a final version be presented to a future meeting.
3. To authorise the City Solicitor to enter into and complete all documents and agreements necessary to give effect to these decisions.

Exe/20/25 City Centre Transport Strategy Engagement Outcomes

In October 2019 a report had been considered on proposals for a revised City Centre Transport Strategy (CCTS) that would be aligned to the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040. It was felt that a new strategy was needed to take account of the ongoing and future predicted growth of the city centre and of changes in the policy context since the adoption of the 2010 strategy. The new strategy would incorporate the GM 2040 Strategy and the goal of being a zero-carbon city by 2038. The drafting of the strategy would take into account the outcomes of the City Centre Transport Strategy Conversation that had taken place in the autumn of 2018. It had been agreed that the Council would undertake an engagement and co-design exercise with key stakeholders in the city centre and surrounding wards in order to further develop the strategy with support from Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) and Salford City Council (Minute Exe/19/82). A report now submitted by the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) set out the outcomes of that exercise.

The engagement exercise had taken the form of seven workshops in the city centre, four in December 2019 and three in January 2020. These workshops included an introductory presentation and a facilitated group discussion, with in-depth participation from attendees. Qualitative responses were recorded during the session. Some participants also provided further comments and feedback after the

workshop. In all 52 people had taken part in the workshops and 22 of those had gone on to provide additional feedback after the event.

The report set out the outcomes from the workshops and the views of the stakeholders who had taken part. Participants had agreed the strategy should be ambitious in setting targets for each mode of transport. Participants also commented that transport is one of the main contributors of CO₂ emissions, so the targets should be more ambitious to recognise the Climate Emergency declared by the Council. Improving air quality was also a priority. Stakeholders recognised behaviour change should be a key part of the strategy, as well as combination of quick-wins and longer-term interventions.

Detailed findings were set out under three headings: walking, cycling and the role of city centre streets; the role of public transport; and managing traffic and parking. Some geographic areas of the city centre had been identified as needing specific interventions including Deansgate, Stevenson Square and the wider Northern Quarter, Mosley Street, Cross Street and Chinatown.

The report explained that the next step in the process would be to use the information gathered to inform a draft strategy document, to be developed with Salford City Council. That draft would then be the subject of further public consultation. That was agreed.

Decisions

1. To note the intention to produce a revised City Centre Transport Strategy.
2. To note the outcome of the engagement exercise on the strategy.
3. To agree to now hold a wider public consultation on the draft strategy.
4. To delegate authority to the Head of Local Planning and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport, to finalise with Salford City Council and Transport for Greater Manchester the draft strategy document and the terms of the public consultation.
5. To request that a report be made on the outcomes of the consultation, seeking approval for a final version of the City Centre Transport Strategy.

Exe/20/26 First Street Strategic Regeneration Framework Addendum

In July 2012 we had considered and endorsed the revised and updated First Street Development Framework (Minute Exe/12/082). In November 2015 we had adopted an updated and revised version of the Framework, having first considered the views put forward during consultation on a draft of that document (Minute Exe/15/125). In July 2018 a further update to the Framework had been brought forward and we had agreed that there should again be a period of public consultation on the proposed

revisions (Minute Exe/18/075). In November 2018 a final version of that Framework had been considered and approved (Minute Exe/18/106).

A report now proposed that an addendum to the framework be considered to address the future development of three specific sites:

- The Little Peter Street site which was bounded by Little Peter Street to the north, Albion Street to the east and the River Medlock to the south. This site is within the ownership of the City Council and operated by NCP as a surface car park. This was envisaged as becoming a high quality, landmark commercial development.
- The One City Road site bounded by City Road to the north, Medlock Street to the west, River Street to the south, and Shortcroft Street to the east; occupied by a 4 storey office building with a private surface car park. This was envisaged as being a commercially-led development with two new buildings.
- The Premier Inn site at the southern end of Medlock Street facing the junction with the Mancunian Way which accommodates the five-storey Premier Inn building, and its associated car parking area of 113 spaces with the future as a commercially led, mixed use development.

It was proposed and agreed that there now be public consultation on the addendum to the Framework.

Decisions

1. To approve in principle the draft First Street Development Framework Addendum.
2. To request that a public consultation exercise on the addendum be undertaken with local stakeholders.
3. That a further report be made setting out comments received during the consultation.

Exe/20/27 St Mary's Parsonage - Strategic Regeneration Framework

The proposed St Mary's Parsonage Strategic Regeneration Framework area is located in the heart of the city centre, bound by three main arterial routes in and out of the city centre; Deansgate, Bridge Street and Blackfriars Street. Immediately to the south of the site is Spinningfields, and to the north is the Ramada Complex, Deansgate. The area benefits from important green space, with Parsonage Gardens being a tranquil green square in the city centre. It is also adjacent to the River Irwell, but with little connection with the river at present.

A report from the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) explained that it was felt that there were significant opportunities for the area to contribute to the Council's zero carbon target by improving the environment for walking and cycling and the reduction of motor vehicles from the area. There was the opportunity to create carbon neutral buildings of the highest standard of energy efficiency and to refurbish and redevelop the area's existing heritage buildings to significantly reduce their carbon footprint.

A draft Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) for the area had been developed. The report explained that there are a number of buildings in the neighbourhood felt to be no longer fit for purpose. Replacing these buildings should positively contribute to the area, with high quality design and materials, whilst respecting listed buildings. The report addressed specific proposals for key sites within the overall area including:

- Kendal Milne building & Multi Storey Car Park
- Reedham House & No.3 St Mary's Parsonage
- Albert Bridge
- Alberton House & Cardinal House
- No.1 North Parade

It was explained that the indicative phasing of the redevelopment of the sites within the SRF area was likely to be dependent on the aspirations of the landowners within the SRF area. The phasing being anticipated was

- 2021-2023: - Kendal Milne building refurbishment and the King Street West multi-storey car park redevelopment
- 2022-2023: - Cardinal House refurbishment
- 2022-2024: - Alberton House refurbishment
- 2022-2025: - Albert Bridge House and Bridge Street surface car park redevelopment, delivering three new buildings

It was thought to be crucial for the first phase of development to be supported by a public realm strategy and delivery plan.

It was agreed that the St Mary's, Parsonage areas was an important but underutilised city centre neighbourhood with potential to significantly contribute towards the regeneration and growth ambitions of the city. The intention was for there to be public consultation on the draft SRF for the area, with the outcomes of that reported to a future meeting. That was agreed.

Decisions

1. To approve in principle the draft St Mary's Parsonage Strategic Regeneration Framework.
2. To request the Strategic Director undertake a public consultation exercise on the addendum with local stakeholders.
3. That a further report be made setting out comments received during the consultation.

Exe/20/28 Empty Houses to First Time Buyer Homes - Update Report

In October 2017 approval had been given for the approve the establishment of the Housing Affordability Fund to allow the Council to invest directly into the provision of affordable homes in Manchester (Minute Exe/17/129). The fund would allow the

Council to support new-build scheme in the city and also to help purchase existing properties to allow them to be made into affordable homes.

In March 2018 two schemes were approved developed to utilise the fund to improve the availability of affordable housing in the city. These were: a “Rent to Purchase” scheme, and an “Empty houses to First Time Buyer Homes” (Minute Exe/18/026).

A report was now considered that provided an update on the Empty Houses Scheme, proposing the use of some of the Fund to grant funds to a registered social landlord so that could bring empty properties back into use as affordable homes.

The report explained the social landlord Mosscafe St Vincent’s could acquire the empty properties and undertake their refurbishment. The homes would then be marketed to first time buyers or residents, on or below the average household income, who wish to become owner-occupiers. Based on combined acquisition and refurbishment costs of around £120,000 and a sales programme which would require a 10% non-recoverable subsidy, an initial investment by the Council of £2m could potentially deliver 90 homes from empty properties in the city.

The grant payment would be secured under the provisions of Section 22 of the Housing Act 1996 which grants the Council the power to provide financial assistance in the form of grants or loans to a registered social landlord for the provision of housing. This proposal was agreed.

Decisions

1. To approve the giving of grant funding to Mosscafe St Vincent’s (MSV) under the provisions of Section 22 of the Housing Act 1996 in order to bring empty properties back into use for affordable home ownership.
2. To authorise the City Solicitor to enter into any agreements to give effect to this decision.

Exe/20/29 Northern Gateway Strategic Business Plan (Part A)

(Having introduced this item of business Councillor Leese left the meeting at this point. Deputy Leader Councillor N Murphy took the Chair)

In March 2017 we had authorised the City Solicitor, City Treasurer and Strategic Director (Development) to enter into an agreement with the Council’s preferred investment partner for the regeneration of the Northern Gateway lands, Far East Consortium International Limited (FEC). We had also delegated authority to the Chief Executive to dispose of the Council’s interest in land at the Northern Gateway Site (Minute Exe/17/064).

The Council had entered into the Joint Venture (JV) with the Far East Consortium (FEC) in April 2017 for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Northern Gateway for housing and ancillary development. As part of the delivery arrangements, the Council and FEC established a JV company, Northern Gateway Operations Limited

(OpCo), to have strategic input into and oversight of the development of the Northern Gateway.

In February 2019 we approved the Strategic Regeneration Framework for the Northern Gateway, the 155 hectare land area made up of the adjacent neighbourhoods of New Cross, the Lower Irk Valley and Collyhurst. This Framework was to support the opportunity to deliver up to 15,000 new homes over a 15-20 year period (Minute Exe/19/25).

In June 2019 consideration was given to the preferred approach to facilitating strategic land acquisitions within the Northern Gateway SRF area, and approval given to making a loan of up to £11 million to FEC (Minutes Exe/19/52 and Exe/19/57).

A report now submitted by the Strategic Director, Growth and Development described in outline the Strategic Business Plan for the Joint Venture. A copy of the plan was appended to the confidential Part B report on this item of business (Minute Exe/20/32). The purpose of the plan was to set the strategic context for the Northern Gateway and to set the parameters for the subsequent Development Area Business Plans. The Strategic Business Plan was to be updated annually to ensure that it could take account of any changes in national and local policy, market sentiment or wider economic implications. It was to be used to monitor the progress of the Northern Gateway project.

The report explained that the Financial Model contained in the Strategic Business Plan was currently showing a minimal return against the overall projected Gross Development Value. The overall plan would not be at a sufficiently viable for a developer to undertake the overall development without additional external public sector investment. This low level of return and high level of development risk was a consequence of the costs associated with the huge site-wide infrastructure requirements which needed to be addressed to tackle abnormal costs and support the delivery of housing at the scale set out in the plan. In total the investment into necessary “place-making” infrastructure to support development across the entire Northern Gateway was currently estimated at circa £165m. A bid of £51.6m to the Government’s Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) would, if successful, support the delivery of such infrastructure, but additional investment would still need to be secured from a range of sources including Section 106 developer contributions. It was however fully anticipated that the initial Development Area Business plan would be financially viable.

The initial Development Area Business Plan had to be for not less than 1,000 homes. Development Area 1 comprises three development phases:

- Collyhurst Phase 1 (Collyhurst Village and Collyhurst South)
- Former Angelgate site
- Addington Street

The total number of homes to be delivered within Development Area 1 was anticipated to be around 1,045 with a mixture of type and tenure, and the majority of homes being provided as open market for sale. The Development Area was to provide a mix of one, two, three and four bed properties in the form of apartments,

maisonettes and townhouses. The Joint Venture was committing to delivering 20% affordable homes across Development Area 1. That would include around 130 social rented dwellings delivered in Collyhurst and on-plot shared ownership homes at the former Angelgate site.

The plan assumed that where capital receipts were generated within the Northern Gateway area that those would be ring-fenced for re-investment into supporting the delivery of the Northern Gateway SRF objectives.

Councillor Flanagan addressed the meeting as a councillor for the Miles Planning and Newton Heath ward. He welcomed the significant investment in regeneration, redevelopment and place-making that was to come to the ward and the wider area. He also welcomed the opportunity that local residents were to have to stay in the area, occupying new homes so as to allow the demolition and redevelopment of existing properties. He suggested that a new name for the overall programme be considered as 'Northern Gateway' did not have the same relevance for the local community as the names already in use for their neighbourhoods.

It was noted that the Economy Scrutiny Committee had also considered the report at a recent meeting of the committee and had endorsed the recommendations (Minute ESC/20/13).

Decisions

1. To note the summarised content of the Strategic Business Plan, the detail of which was explained in another report (Minute Exe/20/32 below).
2. To note the summary of the intended content for the production of the initial Development Area Business Plan which was to focus on the delivery of up to 1,000 homes in the neighbourhoods of New Cross, Red Bank and Collyhurst.
3. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader, Deputy Leader and the Executive Member for Finance and HR, to approve the full initial Development Area Business Plan.
4. To agree to the principle of ring-fencing Capital Receipts or overage generated from the disposal of Council-owned land through the Northern Gateway Joint Venture for re-investment into supporting the delivery of the Northern Gateway SRF objectives.
5. To note the intention of the Development Manager to appoint a Registered Provider partner to assist with the delivery of affordable housing on JV land within the Red Bank and New Town neighbourhoods to help meet the commitment of providing 20% affordable housing within the initiative.
6. To note that the Northern Gateway is currently characterised by large tracts of vacant and underutilised brownfield land and that for development of any scale to be delivered, significant "place-making" infrastructure interventions will be required and consequently a strategic approach towards leveraging

investment from a range of sources will be necessary, including the capture of S106 developer contributions for the purposes of place-making infrastructure.

7. To note the intention to explore options for the preparation of a costed “place-making” infrastructure strategy for the Northern Gateway against which Section 106 developer contributions can be sought, with any such strategy being the subject of a future report and public consultation.
8. To note the current situation with regard to the funding submission of £51.6m to the Government’s Housing Infrastructure Fund and the significant potential impact of this funding on the overall viability of the initiative.
9. To note the significant contribution that the Northern Gateway initiative can make to the City’s affordable housing delivery ambitions and the various means available to the Council such as the Housing Affordability Fund through which investment can be leveraged to deliver affordable housing at scale within this area.
10. To note that, subject to a positive announcement from Government relating to the Housing Infrastructure Fund, a further report will be made regarding the specific terms and conditions applicable in advance of any decision to enter into a Funding Agreement.
11. To note that a Social Value strategy will be developed specifically for the Northern Gateway given the value of contracts/works to be carried out and the anticipated duration of the Joint Venture Partnership.

Exe/20/30 Decisions of the GMCA 7 January and 31 January 2020
(Councillor N Murphy in the Chair)

Decision

To note the decisions made by the GMCA on 1 and 31 January 2020.

Exe/20/31 Exclusion of the Public
(Councillor N Murphy in the Chair)

Decision

To exclude the public during consideration of the following item which involved consideration of exempt information relating to the financial or business affairs of particular persons and public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Exe/20/32 Northern Gateway Strategic Business Plan (Part B)
(Public excluded, Councillor N Murphy in the Chair)

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which set out the Northern Gateway Strategic Business Plan as prepared by the Development Manager, FEC, on behalf of the Northern Gateway Operations Limited joint venture company. A copy of the plan was appended to the report. The report also provided detail on the scale of FEC investment to date and the level of further investment required.

It was noted that the Economy Scrutiny Committee had also considered the report at a recent meeting of the committee and had endorsed the recommendations (Minute ESC/20/15).

Decisions

1. To approve the Strategic Business Plan on behalf of the City Council as one of the two Shareholders in the Northern Gateway Joint Venture.
2. To note the financial commitments made to date by the Development Manager, FEC, since the signing of the Joint Venture legal agreements in April 2017.

Executive

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 11 March 2020

Present: Councillor Leese (Chair)

Councillors: Akbar, Bridges, Craig, N Murphy, Ollerhead, Rahman, Stogia and Richards

Also present as Members of the Standing Consultative Panel:

Councillors: Karney, Leech, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Midgley, Ilyas and Taylor

Apologies: Councillors S Murphy and S Judge

Also present: Councillors Andrews, Hacking and Stanton

Exe/20/34 Update on COVID19 (Coronavirus)

The Chair agreed to the following item of urgent business due to the need to update Executive Members on COVID 19 (coronavirus) at a national and local level and the steps that had and were being taken in Manchester.

The Chief Executive advised that the Council was responding to national guidance that was being issued and reassured members that work had begun on Business Continuity Planning for the Council services. The Director of Population Health advised that as at the present moment, the UK was in a “containment” phase of tackling the spread of the virus but acknowledged that this was likely to change and the virus would spread further. He advised that the Prime Minister had called a meeting of COBRA earlier in the week and a further meeting would take place later in the week to determine the country’s next steps.

In terms of Manchester, a COVID19 Locality Planning Group had been established and would report to the Health and Wellbeing Board on Wednesday 18 March. He advised that the number of reported cases in Manchester had been misreported in Manchester and in fact it was three Manchester residents who had been infected by the virus. A further two people were being treated in Manchester hospitals but were not Manchester residents. He advised that nationally, 382 cases had been reported and number had not risen as sharply as some other European countries. The current approach of self-isolation was working well and plans were in place for more locality testing. The Locality Planning Group had established a number of workstreams, including communications, Schools/Early Years settings, homelessness and street based services, HROD (business continuity) and Primary Care work.

It was reported that restricting the spread of the virus amongst Adult Social Care and Care Homes remained a concern a priority and there was a need to ensure that Care Homes had appropriate Business Continuity Plans in place. On a positive note, the Director of Population Health advised that the number of new cases being reported of

people infected with the virus in Wuhan, the epicentre, was reducing daily and was now in single figures.

The Executive Member for Adult Social Care thanks all the staff involved in the co-ordinating work that had been undertaken to date. She explained that it was important that the Council, Councillors and residents listened and followed the advice of health professionals. She commented that business continuity plans would be subject to evolving discussions and that if any Members had any concerns she was happy to be a point of contact.

Decisions

The Executive thanks the Chief Executive and Director of Population Health for the update.

Exe/20/35 Minutes

Decision

To confirm the minutes of the meeting on 12 February 2020 as a correct record.

Exe/20/36 Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25

In November 2018, the Executive agreed to establish a science-based carbon reduction target for Manchester, which required the city as a whole to adopt a carbon budget of 15 million tonnes of CO₂ between 2018 and 2100. This would require a year-on-year reduction of at least 13%, emissions to be halved within five years, and lead to the city becoming zero carbon by 2038 at the latest. In March 2019 the Executive endorsed the Manchester Zero Carbon Framework 2020-38, as the city's outline approach to meeting its targets, as proposed by the Manchester Climate Change Partnership and in July 2019, the Council declared a climate emergency. This declaration recognised the need for the Council, and the city as a whole, to do more to reduce its carbon emissions and mitigate the negative impacts of climate change. It also demonstrated the Council's commitment to be at the forefront of the global response to climate change and to lead by example

In February 2020 the Climate Change Partnership published a final version of the Framework, the Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25. The Framework was intended to provide the overarching structure for organisations to 'plug-in' their own bespoke plans, guided by 15 actions, as set out in the report, with the delivery of organisations' plans to be supported and enabled by incentives, standards and infrastructure provided by the Manchester Climate Change Agency, the Council, Manchester's strategic partners, the Greater Manchester Combined Authority, UK Government and their agencies.

The report explained that to realise the zero carbon vision for the city the Framework committed to achieve four headline objectives:

- Staying within the carbon budget for the city;
- Climate adaptation and resilience;
- Health and wellbeing; and
- Inclusive, zero carbon and climate resilient economy.

In addition to the four headline objectives, the Framework also set out seven key areas where urgent action was required:

- Buildings (new and existing);
- Renewable energy;
- Transport and flying
- Food
- The things we buy and throw away;
- Green infrastructure and nature-based solution; and
- Supporting and enabling residents and organisations to act.

The Climate Change Partnership had invited the Executive to consider three proposals in relation to the Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25:

- Formally adopt the Manchester Climate Change Framework's aim, vision, objectives and targets as the definition of what Manchester needs to achieve in order to 'play its full part in limiting the impacts of climate change';
- On behalf of the city, endorse the Manchester Climate Change Framework as Manchester's high-level strategy for achieving the aim, vision, objectives and targets; and
- Deliver the Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan for the period 2020-25 in order to contribute towards the successful implementation of the citywide Framework.

It was commented that this report was one of the most important reports the Executive had had to consider for many years and it was reassuring to see that proposals to move to a green future were being developed in an Our Manchester way - working with residents and organisations to deliver this agenda. It was also reported that this year's Manchester Day would be themed around Climate Change, with Deansgate and St Stephenson Square closed to all vehicles and invitations to attend had been sent to Greta Thunberg and David Attenborough.

Members noted the hard work that had gone into developing the Framework and thanked all the officers involved for their contributions. An area of concern raised was the consequence of not achieving the required 13% reduction in CO₂ each year from now until the Framework was reviewed in 2023 and it was explained that if sufficient progress was not made in the first few years, then there would be a need to increase the percentage of CO₂ reduction for each year after, placing more pressure on the ability for the Council to achieve its 2030 zero carbon target.

It was also commented that the Framework was probably the most ambitious plan in Europe, if not the world, and that Manchester should be proud of the commitment it has made, with the work to be undertaken over the next five years being the most crucial. It was noted that other places across the country and the world would need to

develop plans that were as ambitious as Manchester's if real change to addressing climate change was to be achieved

It was noted that the report had also been considered at a recent meeting of the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee and the committee had endorsed its recommendations (Minute NESC/20/19).

Decisions

1. To note the content of the Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25. Endorses the Manchester Climate Change Framework as Manchester's high-level strategy for achieving the aim, vision, objectives and targets
2. To adopt the Manchester Climate Change Framework's aim, vision, objectives and targets as the definition of what Manchester needs to achieve in order to 'play its full part in limiting the impacts of climate change'.
3. To agree to deliver the Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan for the period 2020-25 in order to contribute towards the successful implementation of the citywide Framework

Exe/20/37 Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan 2020-25

Manchester City Council's Climate Change Action Plan 2020-25 sets out the actions that need to be delivered to ensure that the Council plays its full part in delivering the city's zero carbon ambition.

It was reported that the Council has been working with partners to take action on climate change for over 10 years and had developed a series of action plans with associated targets, the most recent of which covered the 2016-20 period. The Council's previous CO₂ target was to reduce its direct emissions from buildings, energy and transport by 41% by 2020 from a 2009/10 baseline. The latest available data from 2018/19 revealed that a 48.1% reduction had been achieved.

The Climate Change Action Plan 2020-25 made a number of specific commitments:

- Deliver at least a 50% reduction in carbon emissions from the Council's buildings, energy and transport by 2025 (from circa 30-32,000 tonnes in 2019/20 to circa 15-16,000 tonnes in 2024/25) via a 13% year on year reduction;
- Report quarterly on progress against the actions in the plan and provide quantitative reports on data in tonnes of CO₂; and
- Become zero carbon by 2038 at the latest (based on the Tyndall Centre for Climate Research definition of zero which is at least a 95% reduction i.e. a reduction of 35,547 tonnes CO₂ from the 2018/19 total which would mean that the Council's direct emissions in 2037/38 would be less than 1,871 tonnes CO₂).

It was reported that the estimated savings which would need to be achieved over the next 5 years would be:

Direct Emissions Action 2020-25	Annual Carbon Saving (tonnes CO₂)
Completion of Phase 1 Buildings Carbon Reduction Programme	1,400
Completion of Phase 1 (a) Buildings Carbon Reduction Programme - ERDF Supported	400
Phase 2 of Carbon Reduction Programme	3,000
Large scale energy generation scheme	7,000
Completion of the final year of the street lighting LED replacement programme	220
Estimated carbon emissions saving benefit from the decarbonisation of the National Grid	800
Completion of the Civic Quarter Heat Network and connection to the Town Hall, Town Hall Extension, Art Gallery and Central Library	1,600
Replacement of half of waste fleet vehicles with Electric Vehicles	900
Reductions to the Council's Fleet through increase in number of Electric Vehicles	400
Reduction in staff travel via car, taxi, air, train	100
Total Estimated Savings	15,820

The Plan also set out the different roles the Council had, including enabling and influencing, reducing direct emissions and reducing indirect emissions.

The report highlighted that additional revenue and capital funding has been identified to respond to the 10 July 2019 Climate Emergency Declaration and to deliver the Plan which would be kept under review as further detailed funding for specific projects or programmes was agreed. It was explained that the Council's Zero Carbon Coordination Group and associated workstreams would be responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Plan and identifying additional sources of internal and external funding.

Members again, noted the hard work that had gone into developing the Action Plan and thanked all the officers involved for their contributions. It was commented that there was a clear commitment and momentum within local communities and amongst young people in wanting to tackle climate change and that the Council needed to harness this to help it achieve the commitments within the Plan. It was also commented that whilst some service areas had adopted a "business as usual" approach to integrating tackling climate change within the delivery of services, all Council services would need to quickly adopt this approach.

It was noted that the report had also been considered at a recent meeting of the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee and the committee had endorsed its recommendations (Minute NES/20/20).

Decisions

1. To note the content of the Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan 2020-25.
2. To adopt the Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan 2020-25.
3. To delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport, to update and amend the action plan as necessary; and
4. To note that future editions of the action plan to be reported to the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee and published on the Council's website at: www.manchester.gov.uk/zerocarbon.

Exe/20/38 Planning and Climate Change

Manchester's commitment to climate change had been well documented, from adopting a science-based carbon budget of 15 million tonnes of CO₂ between 2018 and 2100 and endorsing the draft Manchester Zero Carbon Framework as the city's overarching approach to meet science-based targets on tackling climate change, to declaring a Climate Emergency in July 2019, which recognised the need for the Council, and the city as a whole, to do more to reduce its carbon emissions and mitigate the negative impacts of climate change.

The planning system was one of the ways which could help mitigate climate change and assist in influencing and supporting those involved in place-making and shaping the use of land and buildings. With regard to climate change there was a statutory duty on local planning authorities to include policies in their local plans that are designed to tackle climate change and its impacts. The revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (as of 2019) now included a stronger emphasis on future development, previously lacking in the older version, stating that plans must "pro-actively shape places in a way that contributes to radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, minimise vulnerability and improve resilience". It further notes that local planning authorities need to take account of the Climate Change Act 2008.

The report explained that the Framework also contained policies on a wide range of other topics such as significantly boosting the supply of housing, the use of land and the importance of development being viable to willing developers. The balance between these factors was left to local planning authorities to strike through its Local Plan preparation. Manchester's current local plan, the Core Strategy was adopted in 2012 and was about to undergo a refresh and the Council's declaration on climate change would be at the heart of this review which would seek to align policy and processes to tackle this key issue.

It was also reported that whilst the NPPF may contain policies on climate change there was a distinct lack of practical advice and support to local authorities on how to secure a radical reduction in carbon emissions. For a local planning authority, the test was therefore how to address its vision for future development in the local plan process in the context of the NPPF. It was also recognised that there were other potential challenges at a national level which were likely to impact on the Council's climate change ambitions such as the deregulation of planning through the expansion of permitted development rights.

Prior to the adoption of the Council's development plan - the Core Strategy in 2012, the City's quality agenda was supported by the Guide to Development Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Endorsed in 2007, this provided the step change to a more comprehensive set of environmental policies in the Core Strategy. And with regard to climate change, the SPD set out a requirement, which still existed today, for planning proposals to be supported by an Environmental Standards Statement. The Core Strategy now embedded the principles of the Guide and introduced a number of policies that sought to enhance the built and natural environment and incorporate local and global environmental protection in planning activity.

It was also reported that the submission of a Construction Management Plans (CMP) were encouraged, and although these were not material considerations for the local planning authority, the purpose of requesting a CMP at the planning stage was to seek early consideration of associated issues by relevant parties as it was recognised that these could cause concern in areas particularly of significant growth. It also allowed for potential amenity and environmental issues and mitigation measures to be identified.

In advance of the refresh of the Core Strategy, and to help steer developers and applicants and those who needed more encouragement, officers had been considering how the Council could strengthen its position to address climate change. One way to provide a greater focus on the issue was through the information required at application stage. The validation checklist was used to specify the documents that had to be submitted before an application could proceed. Whilst this was updated in 2018 to allow for greater transparency with regards to viability assessments, it would seem timely to amend the list further particularly regarding the requirements for and contents of an environmental standard and a sustainability statement.

It was further explained that as the Council worked towards its 2038 zero carbon target ambition through the local plan review, an updated evidence base, including that on low carbon and renewable energy generation, flood risk assessments which understood climate change scenarios, and consideration of the viability of development would be prepared. The focus would be on the ability of local policies to ensure that new buildings played a key role in delivering carbon reduction. Discussions with the industry had already highlighted that it was clear that many responsible developers already recognised that it was incumbent on them to address climate change issues and many contractors, developers and occupiers had an understanding of their corporate social responsibility and how important this issue was to decision makers.

Decisions

1. To note the report.
2. To agree to officers formally reviewing the Council's approach to address the challenge of responding to the climate emergency via the planning process in advance of changes to the Government's position on this issue following its recent consultation.
3. To request that officers commence a review of the local validation list and to commence work with stakeholders to establish a Manchester Building Standard with the aim to achieve the best possible standards in new design with respect to carbon performance in order to support local plan policy formation to inform the review of Manchester's local plan.
4. To delegate authority to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport, to amend the process for consultation and adaptation of changes to the local validation list.
5. To endorse the development of guidance notes on retrofitting homes.

Exe/20/39 Re-designation of Northenden Neighbourhood Forum

The concept of Neighbourhood Planning was introduced through the Localism Act 2011. It enabled local community organisations (comprising at least 21 individuals) to initiate and produce Neighbourhood Development Plans and Neighbourhood Development Orders. In order to do this a community organisation needed to apply to the Council for the designation of a Neighbourhood Area in their locality; and also for designation of the organisation as a Neighbourhood Forum.

The Northenden Neighbourhood Forum (the Forum) had applied for a re-designation of the forum as required by the relevant Act and Regulations. In November 2013 the Council designated a Neighbourhood Forum and a Neighbourhood Area in Northenden. The Neighbourhood Forum designation expired in November 2018, whilst the Neighbourhood Area designation remained in existence. The current application, if approved, would re-designate the Forum for a new five year period.

It was reported that the consultation on the re-designation had run from 17 December 2019 to 4 February 2020, and had received responses from nine organisations and individuals. Five responses objected to the re-designation, one was in support and three were neutral. The representations had been taken into account when making the recommendation in relation to the Forum's application.

The assessment of the re-designation application, based on the analysis of the representations and the assessment of the Forum's application pointed to some concerns with respect to the prevailing situation with respect to the Forum. Notwithstanding the concerns identified, the overall conclusion was that the Forum should be recommended for re-designation.

It was explained that whilst re-designation was recommended, it was clear that the Forum could benefit from some further guidance to ensure the Forum worked effectively with locally elected members and the wider community in Northenden and how it may expedite renewed progress on a neighbourhood plan, taking account of any updated evidence base and ensuring a robust community engagement programme.

Decisions

1. To re-designate the Northenden Neighbourhood Forum organisation as a Neighbourhood Forum.
2. To instruct officers to provide the feedback, as set out in paragraphs 5.5 and 5.6 of the report, to the Northenden Neighbourhood Forum.

Exe/20/40 Wythenshawe Hospital Draft Strategic Regeneration Framework

Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust (MFT) have developed a draft Strategic Regeneration Framework for the transformation of the Wythenshawe Hospital Campus. The draft Framework envisaged the development of the Wythenshawe Hospital Campus and its surroundings as a sustainable health village over a 10 to 15 year period, enhancing the Hospital whilst diversifying uses to include complementary commercial, leisure and retail set within a high quality, greener public realm. These proposed outcomes were in line with the Council's existing Core Strategy policies for the Hospital and its surrounding area.

It was reported that the draft Framework addressed the opportunities to deliver a range of economic, social and environmental benefits for local residents and across Greater Manchester, whilst also placing net zero carbon ambitions for the Campus at the heart of the strategy. Importantly, the masterplanning work and strategy had considered future changes in accessibility and transport, including major investment in public transport and other strategic transport infrastructure that would enhance the accessibility of the site, as well as improved opportunities for walking, cycling and other sustainable transport planning.

At the forefront of the ambitions set out in the Wythenshawe Campus Strategic Regeneration Framework were the following key objectives:

- To create an enhanced clinical environment that was in line with modern standards and delivered a hospital that was accessible and welcoming for patients and visitors;
- To achieve net zero carbon development across the masterplan in line with the commitments of MFT, Bruntwood and Manchester City Council;
- To deliver inclusive growth, ensuring that the local community derived maximum benefit from the investment into the Campus including (through job creation), local employment and training opportunities;
- To support a masterplan that provided a range of employment, including jobs that could contribute towards a rise in productivity and pay in the foundational sectors of the economy, such as retail and social care;

- To create world class research facilities to support the work of clinicians and academics in keeping MFT at the forefront of innovative developments in healthcare;
- To ensure that MFT continues to attract the best people to work at the Wythenshawe Campus and to create a safe, efficient and stimulating work environment; and
- To maximise the opportunities to develop MFT land for commercial uses which supported the work of MFT.

It was reported that the benefits to be secured for Wythenshawe, Manchester and Greater Manchester that would arise from the proposals set out in the draft Framework for the Wythenshawe Hospital Campus and its surroundings were potentially very significant

It was explained that subject to the approval, the intention was that the draft Framework would be the subject of a public consultation exercise that would take place between March and June 2020 involving landowners, local residents, businesses, developers, statutory and non-statutory bodies and other local stakeholders. Feedback would be gathered to help refine and finalise the Framework. Once the representations had been assessed, a final version of the Framework, incorporating any necessary amendments, would be brought back to a future meeting of the Executive for consideration and approval.

Councillor Andrews, Ward Councillor for Baguley, was invited to comment on the report. He welcomed the proposals commenting that all local ward councillors were in support of the redevelopment of Wythenshawe Hospital. He raised concerns in relation to the potential impact of construction traffic to local residents and the local area once redevelopment commenced and requested that the Executive worked with its partners, including Transport for Greater Manchester, to ensure that the impact to residents was mitigated as best as possible

Decisions

1. To endorse the Wythenshawe Hospital Campus Strategic Regeneration Framework as a basis for public consultation.
2. To request that in advance of a final version of the Framework being approved, a further report is brought back to the Executive following the public consultation exercise, summarising the consultation responses and any amendments that have been made to the Framework as a result and to include detail on proposal as to how the site will be serviced during construction and by public transport thereafter.

Exe/20/41 Manchester Fort Draft Strategic Regeneration Framework

The Manchester Fort Shopping Park was established as a bulky goods shopping destination in 2004 and had since evolved into one of the largest and most successful retail parks of its kind in the North West. It was a well-known feature of the City's shopping landscape. The Park occupied a strategic location in North

Manchester; adjacent to the intersection of the main radial routes of Cheetham Hill Road and Queens Road and played a significant role in contributing to the economy and social wellbeing of Manchester and complements the City Centre and established district centres of Cheetham Hill, Harpurhey and Newton Heath.

The owners of the Park were now looking to continue their long-term investment and commitment to ensuring that the Park continued to play its part in the continued regeneration, revitalisation and growth of North Manchester. It was noted that the Park was also located adjacent to the Northern Gateway area, which extended northwards from the edge of the City Centre to Queen's Road, incorporating the neighbourhoods of New Cross, Collyhurst and the Lower Irk Valley. Over the next 10 to 15 years, the Council, working with Far East Consortium (FEC) intended to bring forward up to 15,000 new homes in this location and the Park would play a key part in the local retail offer for new and existing residents in the Northern Gateway.

The vision established in the draft Development Framework sought to make much more of the space currently dominated by the remnants of the bulky goods offer through a comprehensive redesign of this section of the Park.

It was envisaged that the redesign could be achieved through the sub-division or remodelling of the existing bulky goods floorplates facilitating a significant enhancement of the Park's offer by creating an opportunity to deliver smaller, more flexible units capable of accommodating a variety of new formats, as and when leases came up for renewal or of earlier opportunities arose. It was explained that the vision may not be realisable in the short term, but it was important to set a positive context for the future, to support and encourage investment that sustains and enhances the Park.

Within the Park as a whole, the draft Framework envisaged some broadening of the retail offer, with the potential for a convenience food offer to help diversify and provide greater resilience for the Park, subject to proportionate testing of impact and alternative locations.

It was explained that the Park owners (Nuveen) had already undertaken a period of informal public consultation which provided the local community with an opportunity to view and comment on the draft Development Framework at an early stage of its preparation. This public consultation was publicised through approximately 2,000 information leaflets distributed to the surrounding community, social media posts and posters in community venues. Two public consultation events were held at the Shopping Park in July 2019 to provide local residents and stakeholders with the opportunity to find out more and to comment on the initial draft document. There was also a dedicated project website which hosted the consultation materials and an online feedback form.

It was reported that the intention was to now undertake a more formal consultation exercise with residents, shoppers and wider stakeholders focused on the detailed proposals set out in the Draft Framework. Subject to the approval, the intention was that the draft Framework would be the subject of a public consultation exercise that would take place in Spring 2020 involving landowners, local residents, businesses, developers, statutory and non-statutory bodies and other local stakeholders.

Feedback would be gathered to help refine and finalise the Framework. Once the representations had been assessed, a final version of the Framework, incorporating any necessary amendments, would be brought back to a future meeting of the Executive for consideration and approval.

Decisions

1. To approve the draft Framework as a basis for a public consultation exercise that will be undertaken with the local community and other stakeholders.
2. Requests that a further report be brought back to the Executive following this public consultation exercise, setting out the details of the outcomes of this process and any amendments that have been made, in advance of a final version of the Framework being approved.

Exe/20/42 The Strategy to further improve Children Social Care Services

Following Ofsted's inspection in 2017 which judged Manchester's Children's Services to no longer be inadequate, the service had continued to make progress and improvements in the services it provided. This was evidenced through independent peer reviews and through Ofsted's focused visits in 2018 and more recently December 2019. However, it was evidently clear in order for the service to continue to make improvements as the Council strived for Manchester's Children's Services to be judged a 'good or better' by Ofsted, a key success factor was for there to be a stable, talented and confident workforce.

It was explained that failure to achieve this could potentially undermine and reverse the progress that has been made to date, thus bringing a reputational and arguably financial risk the council. Consequently, the proposed strategy was intended to be flexible/adaptive in order to respond to changing fiscal and social policy over the next five years. As a result, the strategic approach to service delivery would continue to be informed by a dynamic Directorate Business Plan which would be focussed on delivering safe, effective and efficient services.

In addition, the approach to service planning, delivery and service improvement and the basis for the services strategic endeavours would continue to be informed by the 'Our Manchester' behaviours, principles, relationship focussed practice, the signs of safety, passionate about our ways of working and performance; tracked and monitored via measurable goals and objectives articulated in our service practice model (Our Practice in Manchester) and Directorate Plan.

It was highlighted that improving the quality of social work practice was a key short, medium and long term priority for the service. To date, there had been significant progress with regards to the 'infrastructure' to support and underpin this and continuous improvement through self-assessment was now an embedded approach and would continue throughout the next five years. As such, the report set out the following financial incentive proposals for the recruitment and retention of social workers, the impact of which would be reviewed 18 months after implementation and in accordance with the market rate policy to measure the success of the approach:

Social Worker Level 1	£2,000 retention payment after 2 years' service; paid either in a lump sum or alternatively in 3 instalments of £666 on their 2 year anniversary, 6 months later and a further 6 months after that. We propose to engage staff on the preferred option.
Senior Social Worker	£5,000 market rate supplement,
Team Manager	Continuation of £5,487 market rate supplement - supported with a consistent and clear set out objectives identified in About You.

It was noted that the aim of these proposals was to mitigate against a twofold risk associated with an unsuccessful recruitment and retention strategy and a continued reliance on high cost agency staff, who by the nature of their employment are less likely to buy into the organisation's vision and objectives.

Furthermore, it was explained that the proposed the initiatives as set out in the report would cost £2.335m in 2020/21, reducing to £2.061m from 2021/22 onwards and would be funded through the effective use of:

- The Social Care Grant as indicated in the current budget plan for 2020/21.
- Application of a vacancy factor of 10%, which is a reduction of 10% against the performance since September 2019 and would be considered 'healthy; this would compare favourably to a national turnover and vacancy rate. In addition this also allows for student/new social workers to come into the service thus bringing a dynasim and creating opportunities for progression.
- Incorporating the current 'Families First Team' within Manchester's Early Help Service to strengthen and extend the reach of the Troubled Families programme, which will release monies that then can be redirected and avoid any compulsory redundancies.

Decisions

1. To note that the grading and pay changes referred to in the report will be considered by the Personnel Committee or dealt with under powers delegated to Chief Officers.
2. Having given due regard to the strategic ambitions, challenges in recruitment of qualified children and families social workers in order for the Council to have a stable, confident and talented social work workforce, to approve the funding proposals to provide the budget for the grading and pay changes referred to in the report.
3. Agrees that the service continues to actively promote the successes, initiatives and activity of the Education and Children Services and Neighbourhood

Directorates in order to continually improve the experiences and outcomes of Manchester's children and young people.

Exe/20/43 Capital Programme Update

A report concerning requests to increase the capital programme was submitted. The report explained that all capital projects were reviewed throughout the approval process with regard to the contribution they can make to Manchester being a Zero-Carbon City. Projects did not receive approval unless the contribution to this target was going to be appropriate.

It was agreed to recommend six changes to the Council and to make a further three changes under delegated powers. These changes would increase the capital budget by £25.615m across 2019/20 to 2021/22, funded from borrowing, invest to save initiatives, government grants and capital receipts.

The report also provided a progress report on the Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (Education Basic Needs) project. The project included three expansions to existing special schools which met the needs of Manchester residents with an Education, Health and Care Plan. All projects had been developed to RIBA stage 2 design and were currently progressing to stage 3. All planning applications were due to have been submitted by April 2020 and works were expected to commence on site from May 2020 onwards with completion of schemes in summer 2021. The total anticipated cost of works being brought forward would be £20.2m funded by government Education Basic Need grant.

Decisions

1. To recommend that the Council approve the following changes to the Council's capital programme:
 - a) Growth and Development – Piccadilly Gardens Phase 1. A capital budget virement of £1.811m is requested, funded by Sustaining Key Initiatives budget.
 - b) Growth and Development – HOME Arches Phase 1. A capital budget increase of £0.215m is requested, funded by Borrowing.
 - c) Neighbourhoods - Purchase of Electric RCV's. A capital budget increase of £9.4m is requested, funded by £5.7m Borrowing and £3.7m Invest to save.
 - d) Public Sector Housing - Northwards Housing 2020/21 Capital Programme. A capital virement of £10.406m is requested from Northwards Housing Unallocated, funded by HRA (RCCO).
 - e) Growth and Development – Carbon Reduction Programme Phase 2. A capital budget increase of £15m is requested, funded by Borrowing.
 - f) Growth and Development – Carbon Reduction Action Plan Delivery. A revenue budget increase of £1m is requested, funded by Capital Fund.
 - g) Growth and development – Greening of the City. A capital budget increase of £1m is requested, funded by Capital Fund.

2. To approve the following changes to the City Council's capital programme:-
 - a) Highway Services – Levenshulme Active Neighbourhoods Early Works. A capital virement of £0.327m is requested from Highways Investment Programme, funded by Borrowing.
 - b) Children's Services – North Ridge High School – Special Capital Fund Additional Funding. A capital virement of £0.477m is requested from Special Educational Needs Grant Unallocated, funded by Government Grant.
 - c) Public Sector Housing – Housing Delivery Model. A revenue budget increase of £0.100m is requested, funded by Housing Investment Fund.
3. To note the update on Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (Education Basic Needs) project.

Exe/20/44 Revenue Budget Update 2020/21

The Council's revenue budget for 2020/21 was approved at Full Council on 6 March 2020 (Minute CC/20/17). The budget contained investment for priority areas including £9.9m for Children's Services, £23.3m for Adult Social Care and £1.352m for Homelessness. It also included £7.5m of efficiency savings, of which £4.6m were being reinvested back into the budget.

At that meeting the Council had also approved an amendment to allocate a budget of £250k in 2020/21 for a one-off Spring Challenge Fund. The purpose of the funding was to provide a sustainable approach to improving neighbourhoods. This was to be funded from the Council's revenue contribution to capital budget that was held as part of the capital financing budget and was included within the revenue budget. Now the amendment had been formally approved Executive was asked to comment on how the Challenge Fund should be implemented.

It was also noted that two further budget proposals had been referred to the Executive by Full Council. Both were budget amendments that were not put to Council but were instead referred to the Executive for consideration. These were not yet included in the Revenue Budget for 2020/21:

- To allocate a budget of £960,000 phased equally over three years to enable the Council to make available a £10,000 per annum Green Neighbourhood Investment Fund in each of the 32 wards, encouraging our neighbourhoods to participate in carbon reduction on a community-led basis shaped by the priorities of the Manchester Climate Change Action Plan; to be funded out of the proposed £2.079m contribution to the Business Rates Reserve for 2020/21.
- To allocate a budget of £960,000 phased equally over three years to enable the Council to deliver a programme of target hardening (including further alleygating) in areas of benefit; to be funded out of the proposed £2.079m contribution to the Business Rates Reserve for 2020/21 and to allocate a

budget of £1.5m to enable the Council to deliver road safety and traffic calming schemes in areas of need; to be funded from On Street Parking Reserve.

The Executive was also asked to comment on the approach they would like to take in consideration of these two budget proposals.

The report also detailed proposed additional capital funding of £15m to support the work to reduce the carbon produced from the Council's operational estate and £1m for greening the city both of which, if supported, would be incorporated into the Council's Capital budget. It also included the establishment of a revenue budget increase of £1m funded by the Capital Fund. This was to fund a dedicated team to deliver the commitments within the Carbon Reduction Plan.

Finally, there was a recommendation in the Capital Update report for a revenue budget increase of £100k funded by the Housing Investment Reserve. This initial investment was to provide additional capacity to allow work to establish the viability of a Manchester bespoke scheme, identify indicative land and any title or grant issues, and develop a report leading to full approval of a model by summer 2020.

Decisions

1. To note that the £250k amendment for the Spring Challenge Fund has been approved by Full Council and agrees that where suitable proposals are put forward from residents and/or community groups, these are reported by Ward Members to the relevant Executive Member who will consult with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to determine approval of any funding.
2. To agree that in respect of the above, final approval of any funding requests from residents and organisations in the Moston Ward (the ward of the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources) be in consultation with the Leader of the Council rather than the Executive Member.
3. To defer consideration of the amendment from Councillor Stanton for a Green Neighbourhood Investment Fund, until all local ward plans have been accumulated which would identify areas of spend to tackle carbon reduction, which was likely to be September 2020.
4. To defer consideration of the amendment from Councillor Kilpatrick's for a programme of target hardening (including further alleygating) until there is greater certainty of the Council's future budget position.
5. To note the revenue budget position for 2020/21 as amended to include the additional budget changes summarised in section 2 of the report and that these changes are subject to Full Council approval on 25 March 2020.
6. To note that Council referred two further budget amendments to the Executive for consideration.

Exe/20/45 Our Town Hall Project - Decision on the Notice to Proceed

In a report to Executive in December 2018, it was noted that Lendlease had been selected as the preferred Management Contractor for the Our Town Hall (OTH) project (Minute Exe/18/120 refers).

The Council had engaged Lendlease as its Management Contractor to manage the project, procure the works, advise on risk and to contract with works package contractors who had the primary responsibility for undertaking the works. The Management Contractor would assume the financial and contractual burden associated with administering the works packages, but would not undertake any of the construction works itself. The Management Contractor was to be paid a fee for its services (split between the pre-construction period and the construction period) and be reimbursed the cost of its preliminaries and overheads.

The contract with the Management Contractor required that before the Council issued the Notice to Proceed (NTP) it had to satisfy itself that a number of key documents and dates had been agreed with the Management Contractor, including the supplemental particulars, project cost plan, date of completion, and the preliminaries cost schedule. It was reported that these documents had been agreed

The original capital budget for the Town Hall project of £306.1m was approved by Executive on 8 February 2017 (Minute Exe/17/27 refers) as part of the Council's Capital Programme. Since that time the project had been through various stages of design, with the budget re-based at RIBA Stage 3 within an overall capital envelope of £305.2m. The capital movement between the original budget at February 2017 and latest budget of £305.2m was made up of transfers from the capital budget to support costs which could not be capitalised. These included design team expenses, programme managements costs, communications and minor changes on planned preventive maintenance.

At the point of NTP, the forecast capital cost projection remained at £305.2m. This allowed for budgets set aside to address residual risk and which would incorporate the costs of inflation movements, changes in scope/design and general contingencies. The overall construction budget was £243.483m. This included the value of the project cost plan and contract to be entered into with the Management Contractor, costs incurred prior to the appointment of the Management Contractor, and an allocation for other specific costs and contingencies.

Following consideration of the proposal to issue the Notice to Proceed by the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 24 February 2020 (Minute RGSC/20/17 refers) the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasure had taken the key decision to approve Capital Expenditure of £243,483,000 to Our Town Hall Notice to proceed with the main contract.

Decisions

1. To note that on the basis of the Tranche 1 Works Packages procured to date (60% by value), and the level of design readiness to procure the balancing Tranche 2 (40%) packages, the project was suitably advanced for the Council

- to Commit to Construct, noting the arrangements that are in place to manage the risk of cost and programme overrun in the Tranche 2 Works Packages.
2. To note that a date for completion of 22 December 2023 had been agreed with the Management Contractor.
 3. To note that the Decision to give Capital Expenditure (Construction) approval to Our Town Hall in the sum of £243.483m was made, and published 27 February 2020. This decision had been considered by the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 24 February 2020, at which it endorsed the proposed recommendations. The Notice to proceed with the main construction works was to be issued to the Management Contractor (Lendlease) and construction would commence on site in March 2020.

Exe/20/46 Establishment of new trading company as a vehicle for claiming exhibition tax relief at Manchester Art Gallery

Museums and Galleries Exhibition Tax Relief (MGETR) was introduced by the Government on 1 April 2017 and was a tax relief for museum or gallery-related companies (which could include a charity or other entity that did not actually pay any corporation tax) who created and installed new exhibitions, with 16% of the eligible costs of creating and installing exhibitions (including staffing and premises costs) able to be claimed back.

It was explained that a qualifying company must either be a charity that maintained a museum or gallery or a wholly owned subsidiary of a charity or local authority that maintains a museum or gallery.

As such it was proposed that approval be given to the establishment of a City Council wholly owned trading company called Manchester Art Gallery Exhibitions Productions Company Ltd (MAGEP). Once established this would enable the Manchester Art Gallery to benefit from the Government exhibition tax relief scheme in line with the budget efficiency proposals.

Decision

1. To agree to the establishment of the Manchester Art Gallery Exhibitions Productions Company as set out in this report. The arrangements would be finalised subject to final due diligence and further tax advice.
2. To delegate authority to the City Solicitor and Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure to take all necessary steps to establish the Company and set up appropriate Governance arrangements to give effect to the above resolution.

Exe/20/47 Future Dates and Times of Executive meeting

The Chair informed Members that there was a need to hold an additional meeting of the Executive which would meet on Wednesday 25 March at 8:30am. He also informed Members of a proposal to move the time of the Executive meetings in the 2020/21 Municipal Year from 10:00am to 2:00pm.

Decisions

1. To note that a further meeting will be scheduled for Wednesday 25 March at 8:30am.
2. To note that the time of the Executive meetings in the 2020/21 Municipal Year move from 10:00am to 2:00pm

Exe/20/48 Exclusion of the Public

Decision

To exclude the public during consideration of the following item which involved consideration of exempt information relating to the financial or business affairs of particular persons and public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Exe/20/49 Proposed Disposal of 16 - 18 Bennett Road, Crumpsall

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), on a proposal to dispose of a property at less than best value to Manchester Jewish Housing on the condition that they refurbished the property as either 2 or 4 dwellings and that those properties were let at social rent levels and subject to scrutiny of the costs and income by the Head of Development.

Decisions

1. To authorise the disposal of the property at less than best value to Manchester Jewish Housing Association on the terms as set out in the report.
2. To authorise the Head of Development and the Head of Housing Services to finalise the terms of the transaction and for the City Solicitor to execute the necessary documentation.

Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 4 February 2020

Present:

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair
Councillors Ahmed Ali, Andrews, Clay, Lanchbury, B Priest, Rowles, A Simcock, Stanton and Wright

Also present:

Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources

Apologies: Councillors Davies, Moore and Wheeler

RGSC/20/7 Minutes

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 7 January 2020 as a correct record.

RGSC/20/8 The Council's Updated Financial Strategy and Budget reports 2020/21

Further to Minute RGSC/20/02, the Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which provided a further update on the Council's financial position and set out the next steps in the budget process.

In conjunction with the above, the Committee also received and considered the Corporate Core medium term financial plan (MTFP) and budget proposals for 2020/21, the Council's Capital Strategy and Budget 2019/20 to 2023/24 and the Housing Revenue Account 2020/21 to 2022/23.

The Committee was invited to consider and make recommendations on the budget proposals which were within the remit of the Committee prior to their submission to the Executive on 12 February 2020.

In relation to the Council's updated Financial Strategy and Budget 2020/21, some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- There was concern with regard to the 'Fair Funding Review' that following research by the Personal Social Services Research Unit (PSSRU), there was a potential reduction in future funding of circa 14% in relation to Adult Social Care funding in Manchester and an assurance was sought that the Council would continue to lobby government on the 'Fair Funding Review';
- Was social deprivation taken into account as part of the 'Fair Funding Review';
- How had the contribution of just over £2m to the Business Rates reserves been determined, what was the existing level of this reserve and how did this compare to other Greater Manchester local authorities; and

- Clarification was sought as to how the potential increase in income of £1m in 2020/21 relating to Housing Benefit for temporary accommodation would be derived.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer assured the committee that the Council was making substantial representations to government on the potential implications of the 'Fair Funding Review' and the changes proposed in terms of Adult Social Care funding in Manchester were deeply concerning.

The Deputy City Treasurer advised that the Fairer Funding Review was more population based and not deprivation based, which was often a key indicator in the level of need in respect of Adult Social Care.

The Deputy City Treasurer explained that the additional contribution to the Business Rate reserve was derived from the additional £3.7m growth in Business Rates income, of which £1.7m was to be set aside to meet the demand pressures within Children's Services, with the remainder to be placed in the Business Rates reserve. At present the total value of this reserve was approximately £19m. In terms of comparisons to other local authorities, it was agreed that this information would be provided to the Committee after the meeting.

The Deputy City Treasurer advised that the potential additional £1m income would be derived from the ability to claim Housing Benefit for temporary accommodation based on a small scale transfer of existing properties to be managed by Registered Providers (RPs). It was reported that this additional income would be reinvested in the service.

In respect of the Corporate Core Budget Report 2020/21, some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Would the anticipated £50k saving through collaborative work with other local authorities in regards to capital programmes be achieved this financial year and who were these other local authorities;
- Assurance was sought that with the removal of long term vacant posts, this would not impact on service delivery and staff morale;
- What were the ongoing pressures to the Coroner's Service that required a further £400k mitigation and whilst acknowledging the that the Coroners Service was independent from the Council, why was it not being required to make a savings contribution;
- In relation to commissioning and procurement, what was the nature of the specialist audit work referred to in the report;
- Assurance was sought that any savings within Revenues and Benefits did not impact on the ability for residents to contact the Council through the shared service centre;
- In Table 1 within the report, why was the budget for the capital programme reducing;
- What was the reason for the uplift in costs within the existing Business Support arrangements;
- What was the nature of the additional transitional costs as part of the changeover arrangements to the new contractor for the repairs and management works for the Corporate Estate and clarification was sought as to

whether it was correct that the new contractor was required to find ways in reducing this cost;

- Had the feasibility study been undertaken yet for the provision of a further public convenience within the city centre; and
- Further information was sought on the proposed funding for zero carbon staffing and the bringing forward of the pension fund contribution.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that the Council had an agreement with one particular local authority in Greater Manchester to collaborate on capital programmes to strengthen the capacity of delivery, which centred around improvements to their capital checkpoint process and planning and delivery of some of their capital schemes.

It was explained that across a number of service areas in the Corporate Core, vacant posts had been budgeted at the top of their grades which would never be filled at this level and accordingly the turnover factor had been adjusted to ensure budgets were not being held where they were not required. Secondly, a review had been undertaken of long term vacancies and were no longer required, these posts had been removed from the staff structures

The Head of Finance advised that in terms of the Coroners Service that the additional funding was required to deal with an increase in complex cases and the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer agreed to circulate the trend data around the cases and complexity to Members after the meeting.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer explained the nature of the specialist audit work that had been undertaken, and advised that this was reported to the Council's Audit Committee on an annual basis. She also advised that any savings derived from a review of the Shared Service Centre would come from the changes in how the Council operated and the removal of any long term vacancies.

The Head of Finance advised that Table 1 within the report detailed the revenue budget of the capital programme which was an income target and the reduction was as a result of adjustments to the budget. Assurance was given that there was no direct impact on the capital programme resulting from this reduction. He also advised that the uplift in costs within the existing Business Support arrangements was a result of a number of additional posts being created to help support additional needs and also as a result of increases of salaries of existing posts due to the complexity of the work required.

The Deputy City Treasurer confirmed that it was part of the contract with the new contractor for the repairs and management works for the Corporate Estate that they were required to improve quality and deliver efficiencies once they start the contract. The transitional costs related to the TUPE process of staff that transferred over from the original contractor to the new contractor.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer commented that there had been no formal work undertaken around a further public convenience in the city centre but the feasibility of this was being looked at.

The Deputy City Treasurer explained that by bringing forward the pension fund contribution, this would result in an additional £750,000 saving over each of the next three years.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that in terms of zero carbon staffing, there would be a further two FTE posts recruited to and the Council had underwritten the cost of the Chief Executive post of the Climate Change Agency for a year in recognition of its importance. Additional funding had also been identified for the need to draw in the expertise that was required.

In relation to the Council's Capital Strategy and Budget 2019/20 to 2023/24 some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- In terms of carbon reduction proposals, how was the Council going to determine what measures to invest in, given a number of the measures would be expensive to implement and a number funding commitments had already been made for the next four years;
- There was concern in regards to the implications to the Council and the Highways infrastructure following the recent announcement by the Prime Minister to prohibit the sale of petrol, diesel and hybrid vehicles by 2035;
- Was there an opportunity to advocate that the Council was planting more trees to contribute towards addressing issues of carbon dioxide emissions;
- Was there any potential for private tenants and/or corporate landlords to be part of the Civic Quarter Heat Network;
- Was there any possibility to identify a budget for small works packages relating to highways improvements;
- There was still concern that there was no identified funding for Highways capital programme from 2022 onwards;
- In relation to investment in car park assets, was there any update on the NCP Joint Venture;
- There was concern that the cost of some of the carbon reduction proposals, such as the retrofit works to make existing housing stock zero-carbon and the ambition to deliver carbon efficient schools would be too expensive for the Council to implement; and
- It was commented that whilst reducing carbon emissions was an important duty on the Council, there was a need to ensure that this did not result in other important areas becoming overlooked, such as the fire safety of high rise properties.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer explained that the report only detailed capital schemes that had already approved through the checkpoint process and, as such, it did not list everything that the Council would be delivering. It was also explained that the report also set out the priorities for the decisions around future investment for the next three to five years and as the Carbon Reduction Action Plan developed, specific costing proposals would be incorporated into the capital strategy.

It was acknowledged that whilst the announcement by the Prime Minister would have an impact on the Council and the Highways network, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer referenced several pieces of work being undertaken that would look to contribute towards addressing the consequences of the announcement. It was also

reported that in terms of the Civic Quarter Heat Network, there was the intention for private tenants and/or corporate landlords to be incorporated in its use.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources commented that he was in early discussions with members of the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee around identifying a small budget that could be used to support small works highways investment, however, he clarified that this would not be a secondary highways budget. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer confirmed that investment in the City's highways network was still a priority for the Council, but as a significant amount of funding was received from central government, it was not possible to factor in specific programmes into the capital strategy until the funding became available.

The Deputy City Treasurer advised that work was still on going with the NCP Joint Venture and agreed circulate the timescale of the replacement of the Joint Venture with NCP to members following the meeting.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer commented that discussions were underway with the DfE around future funding for the delivery of carbon efficient schools and the Council was also exploring external funding streams to contribute to the cost of the retrofitting of Council housing and operational estates.

In relation to the Housing Revenue Account 2020/21 to 2022/23 some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Would the proposed rent increases still be within the Local Housing Allowance rate; and
- Why was there a variance in heating charges at different schemes.

The Head of Finance advised he would provide confirmation that the proposed rent increases were within the Local Housing Allowance rate. The Head of Housing explained that the variance in heat charges was based on the consumption in previous years and were set to try and cover the anticipated consumption.

Decisions

The Committee recommends that their comments be submitted for consideration by the Executive at their meeting on 12 February 2020, and in doing so, notes the proposed recommendation's to the Executive relating to the Capital Strategy and Budget 2019/20 to 2023/24 and the Housing Revenue Account 2020/21 to 2022/23, those being:-

- Capital Strategy and Budget 2019/20 to 2023/24

The Executive is requested to:

- (1) Approve and recommend the report to Council, including the projects for Executive approval in section 6.2.
- (2) Note the capital strategy.

- (3) Delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to make alterations to the schedules for the capital programme 2019/20 to 2023/24 prior to their submission to Council for approval, subject to no changes being made to the overall estimated total cost of each individual project.
- Housing Revenue Account 2020/21 to 2022/23

The Executive is recommended to:

- (a) Note the forecast 2019/20 HRA outturn as set out in section 4.
- (b) Approve the 2020/21 HRA budget as presented in Appendix 1 and note the indicative budgets for 2021/22 and 2022/23.
- (c) Approve the proposed 2.7% increase to dwelling rents, and delegate the setting of individual property rents, to the Director of Housing and Residential Growth and the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration and the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources.
- (d) Approve the proposal that where the 2020/21 rent is not yet at the formula rent level, the rent is revised to the formula rent level when the property is relet.
- (e) Approve the proposed 2020/21 changes for communal heating charges as detailed in paragraphs 5.15 to 5.19.
- (f) Approve the proposed 2020/21 Northwards management fee as detailed in paragraphs 5.27 to 5.28.
- (g) Approve the proposed increase in garage rental charges as outlined in paragraph 6.1

RGSC/20/9 Domestic violence and abuse funding and commissioning review

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods), which provided a response to questions raised at the Scrutiny Committee meeting in September 2019 about the review of domestic violence and abuse funding and commissioning arrangements.

The main points and themes in the report, included:-

- The re-tendering and re-commissioning of domestic violence and abuse accommodation services had been progressed satisfactorily, with contracts being awarded to the successful bidders and mobilisation arrangements being implemented, in advance of commencement in April 2020;
- Negotiations were ongoing with the Director of Population, Health and Wellbeing regarding allocation of contributory funding to enable further continuation of the MiDASS service;
- Confirmation was awaiting of the CSP grant that provided for a range of other services and initiatives such as behaviour change programmes, counselling for children affected by DV&A and intervention for those affected by child to parent violence;
- The review team had noted Members' comments and reflected them in the drafting of the scope and terms of reference of the review of all Domestic

Violence and Abuse services, which would be approved at the Domestic Violence and Abuse Strategy Group;

- Details were provided of intended spend on DV&A services whilst the funding and commissioning review was completed and its recommendations finalised; and
- Once the review was completed, the findings and recommendations, and the updated Domestic Violence and Abuse Strategy, would be submitted to the Strategy Group for endorsement and to the CSP Board for final ratification and, in the case of the Strategy, approval to launch and publish.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees' discussions were:-

- Had the Domestic Violence and Abuse Strategy Group approved the draft terms of reference and timescale for the review;
- There was a need to ensure work with other GM local authorities continued to take place and grow to aid in reciprocal arrangements;
- Assurance was sought that there would be a consistent level of service provided across the organisations that were receiving funding;
- Was it recognised that there was reduction in the number of domestic violence incidents occurring;
- It was positive to see the prominence the Council was giving to supporting those who had been subject to domestic abuse;
- It was reiterated that the review, whilst being cognisant of budgetary pressures, should not be restricted to the current financial envelope; and
- In terms of funding, where did the CSP grant come, when would confirmation of receipt of this be received and connected to this, if the CSP grant was not received and/or reduced, what would be the Council's alternative plan for delivering these services.

The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) confirmed that the Domestic Violence and Abuse Strategy Group had met on the 23 January 2020 and approved the draft terms of reference and timescale for the review. It was reported that GM Strategy Group existed whose purpose was to look at what services needed to be commissioned and supported at a GM level and the Council was represented on this Group.

The Committee was advised that as part of the review, service users and those with lived experiences would be consulted to ensure the provision of services recently recommissioned met the needs of victims. It was also reported that there had been an increase in the reporting of domestic abuse incidents. This did not necessarily mean that there had been an increase in the number of incidents occurring, but could reflect that more victims were having the confidence to report incidents and it was hoped that as part of the review, an outcome would be the reduction in the number of statutory service interventions and an increase in the number of early interventions to prevent victims coming into crisis accommodation.

The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) advised that the Council that it was hoping to receive notification of the CSP grant funding by the end of February 2020 and it had a high level of confidence that it would receive the funding required to continue to deliver domestic violence and abuse services. She acknowledged that if the grant

was reduced, then the Council would have to look at mainstream funding to continue to deliver services.

The Chair proposed that the Council wrote to the Mayor of Greater Manchester setting out its concern around the unreasonable wait in receiving notification of CSP funding and also its concern in relation to the impact in the ability to deliver services should there be a reduction in this grant funding.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report; and
- (2) Requests that the Chair writes to the Mayor of Greater Manchester setting out our concern around the unreasonable wait in receiving notification of CSP funding, and that the Committee would not want to see any elements of this budget reduced, and also setting out its concern in relation to the impact in the ability to deliver domestic violence and abuse services should there be a reduction in this grant funding;
- (3) Recommends that should the budget provision from the GMCA reduce, that this would be reported to the Committee ;
- (4) Recommends that in event that the budget provision from the GMCA reduces the Council should increase its spend to make up the shortfall; and
- (5) Reiterated the previous recommendation that whilst the Committee is cognisant of the budgetary pressures of the Council, the DV&A review should not be constrained to the current spending envelope.

RGSC/20/10 ICT update

Further to minute RGSC/19/54, the Committee considered a report of the Interim Director of ICT, which provided an update on the proposed reshaping of Council's Information and Data Strategy. The report also included an update on the resilience of the Council's IT service provision.

Some of the key points referred to in the report included:-

- An overview of the work that had been ongoing to ensure that the Council remained on track in order for the Cabinet Office to deem the Council PSN compliance in 2020;
- An update on ICT resilience and key projects;
- The reasons for a pause in data storage migration in relation to the new Data Centre Programme and the work being done to get the project back on its critical path to limit the impact to timescales and budget;
- Details of work that was being undertaken under the Network Refresh Programme;
- Progress to date with the procurement of a new core telephony and contact centre systems;
- An update on the progress in the adoption of the Liquidlogic suite of systems;

- The Council's intended move to adopt Microsoft technology for productivity, collaboration and communication, in place of the current Google software, which was scheduled to be completed by the end of September 2020;
- An update on the progress to date with the refresh of the ICT strategy; and
- The ICT revenue and capital budget positions.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees' discussions were:-

- An assurance was sought that the Council did not share residents' personal data with external companies other than its required partners;
- An assurance was sought that the Council would achieve PSN compliance in April 2020;
- What were the financial implications associated with the delay in the data storage migration in relation to the new Data Centre Programme and who would absorb this cost;
- Why was the original decision taken to use the Google platform for collaboration when Microsoft offered a similar product at the same point in time;
- Were there any critical legacy systems that were currently operating on the existing Google platform and if so, what steps were being put in place to ensure these transitioned over to Microsoft without significant risk;
- There was concern that the intended implementation target date of the Microsoft collaboration platform was ambitious given the number of other significant projects that the Directorate was currently working on; and
- There was slight concern that the ICT strategy was being refreshed whilst the Council did not yet have a permanent Director of ICT in post.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources assured the Committee that the Council did not provide any personal data it held on residents to external companies, other than its partners and only where it was required to do so. He added that in most, if not all circumstances, any data that was shared was anonymised. He added that the Council was currently looking at how it collected and stored residents' data with a view to adopting an appropriate set of principles.

The Head of Programme Office assured the Committee that the work that had been undertaken to date was on track for the Council to achieve PSN compliance in April 2020. The Committee was advised that analysis would need to be undertaken of some of the legacy systems to identify what they currently supported in order to identify suitable alternatives.

In terms of the financial implications in the delay of the data centre migration, the Chair asked for the costs and officers agreed to provide accurate costs following the meeting. However, it was confirmed in the meeting that any costs for the changes to the network design would be absorbed by the supplier.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer noted the concerns raised in refreshing the ICT strategy when a permanent Director was not in post and advised that interviews for this position were being undertaken on 7 February 2020. She also advised that the original decision to use the Google platform for collaboration was taken based on it being the most cost effective option at the time and acknowledged

that since then, Microsoft had developed its collaboration platform (Microsoft 365), which now had greater functionality than the current Google platform.

The Head of Programme Office reaffirmed that it was the intention of the Directorate to complete the migration from Google to Microsoft 365 by the end of September 2020.

Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report; and
- (2) Requests an update report to a future meeting on the progress being made with the migration from Google to Microsoft 365 and all other major ongoing IT projects.

RGSC/20/11 Delivering the Our Manchester Strategy

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources, which provided an overview of work undertaken and progress towards the delivery of the Council's priorities, as set out in the Our Manchester Strategy (OMS), for those areas within his portfolio.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions within the Executive Members report were: -

- What further work was being done to encourage other organisations to promote the city becoming a Living Wage City;
- Achieving the Living Wage employer accreditation was welcomed by Members;
- Was there any more information on the work that the Executive Member had undertaken to address the Council's climate change agenda, with reference to the income received by the Council from Manchester Airport;
- The improvements in the BHeard results from the 2019 survey were recognised;
- Was the Executive Member undertaking any work to lever any significant sources of external funding to tackle climate change;
- Had any consideration been given to updating the content of Listening in Action material, with reference to the Council's position in tackling climate change;
- What was the Executive Member's views on the position of apprenticeships as part of the 'Our People' strategy; and
- What more could be done to improve how the Council promoted its employment opportunities in order to attract the best people possible.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources advised that in terms of working towards becoming a Living Wage city, he was engaging with a number of anchor institutions to actually commit to paying the Manchester living wage to its staff. In terms of climate change, he reported that responsibility for Manchester Airport fell in the Leader portfolio, but he would pass on the Committee's comments. He advised that going forward schemes within the Capital Programme would need to demonstrate how they would contribute to addressing the Council's climate change

agenda and in terms of Social Value, he was awaiting results back from a pilot within Highways where a 10% weighting in terms of addressing climate change had been included in two tenders, to see if this was something that could be rolled out across all Council tenders.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources commented that the Council would also look to try and source any external funding streams that were available to tackle climate change, such as grants for external charging point for electric vehicles. He added that the Council would also look to use its leverage with other organisations to push this agenda forward. He advised there was a HR refresh taking pace and the feedback from the BHeard survey would feed into the content of future Listening in Action sessions.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources commented that he was very passionate about apprenticeships and advised that last year, the Council (excluding schools) had exceeded its target in the number of apprenticeship starts and data would be released around this at the Social Value Conference on the 14 February 2020.

In terms of recruitment, the Executive Member acknowledged that in certain sectors the Council struggled to compete with the private sector as it was not able to match salary levels, however, he commented that working for the Council had a number of other non-monetary benefits and it was these benefits that the Council needed to promote more in order to attract the best possible applicants.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

RGSC/20/12 Overview Report

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report;
- (2) Agrees the work programme.

RGSC/20/13 Legal Services Update

The Committee received a presentation from the Deputy City Solicitor, which informed Members of the structure and role of the Council's Legal Services department and provided an update on the work undertaken by the Department.

The main points and themes within the presentation included:-

- An overview of the aspects of work the different teams within Legal Services undertook;
- Examples of areas of success in delivering, innovative and excellent legal services that provided value for money;
- How the Department contributed to the Council's corporate plan priorities; and
- An overview of the positive responses from Legal Services 2019 client survey.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Further information on the diversity of the service's workforce would be welcomed in future reports;
- Was there any potential increase in capacity for supporting aspects of adult social care around protecting vulnerable children and adults;
- Concern was raised in relation to the turnaround time on leases associated with the Council and was there any KPI's in relation to this specific area;
- Clarification was sought as to what legal responsibility the Council had to staff who had been TUPE transferred to another employer;
- Clarification was sought as to what the single justice procedure was, implemented in Manchester by the Legal Services Regulatory Team;
- It was requested that Members be provided with the short guide to the constitution

The Deputy City Solicitor advised that the service was working with Children and Families and Adult Services around the deprivation of liberty for children, to assess what this would mean in terms of additional volumes of work due to the complex nature of the work required.

The Deputy City Solicitor commented that she was not aware of any specific issues in relation to the delays in granting leases but agreed to look into this. She advised that it was dependent on the type of lease arrangement that was being sought as to how long these would take to progress.

The Committee was advised that once council staff had been TUPE transferred to a new employer, whilst their employment rights were protected by law, the Council's legal obligation to them ceased to exist after their transfer was completed.

The Deputy City Solicitor explained that the single justice procedure allowed the Council to deal with particular matters, such as fixed penalty matters in connection to environmental crimes in the city, by a way of electronic means where a guilty plea had been entered into. This saved the need for the Council to have a solicitor attend court to deal with individual cases. This had saved time and money and had been picked up as an area of good practice amongst other Greater Manchester local authorities. She also gave a commitment to provide members with a copy of the short guide to the constitution.

Decision

The Committee notes the presentation.

RGSC/20/14 Exclusion of Press and Public

Decision

To exclude the public during consideration of the following items which involved consideration of exempt information relating to the financial or business affairs of particular persons and public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information

RGSC/20/15 Legal Services update (Public Excluded)

The Committee considered a report of the City Solicitor, which set out how the Council's Legal Service Department was funded, which included commercially confidential information regarding external contracts to partner organisations.

Having had regard to the report, the Committee asked a number of questions to which the City Solicitor responded.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 3 March 2020

Present:

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair
Councillors Ahmed Ali, Andrews, Clay, Davies, B Priest, Rowles, A Simcock, Stanton, Wheeler and Wright

Also present:

Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources

Apologies: Councillors Lanchbury and Moore

RGSC/20/20 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2020 as a correct record.

RGSC/20/21 Evaluation of the Our Manchester approach

The Committee considered a report and presentation of the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform that provided an evaluation of the Our Manchester approach, including how Our Manchester was helping to deliver the required Council savings targets. This report sought to illustrate what progress to date had been made, through the supporting Our Manchester Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.

The Strategic Lead for Intelligence and Data Science referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included: -

- Describing what the Evaluation Framework had delivered;
- Information on the Bringing Services Together for People in Places (BSTPIP) programme;
- The approach to monitoring and evaluating BSTPIP and next steps;
- Information on a range of work streams;
- Our Manchester Voluntary and Community Sector Grants Case studies;
- Information on the Our Manchester Investment fund (OMIF);
- Workforce training, and culture, to embed the Our Manchester behaviours in everything we do;
- Communications and Engagement; and
- Analysis of the impact of Our Manchester in delivering Council Savings.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were: -

- What was the difference between the OMIF and the Neighbourhood Investment Fund;

- How was resident feedback captured and measured to enable the benchmarking of satisfaction with neighbourhoods;
- How would Members be informed of resident engagement events;
- How were the priorities for respective wards, as referred to within the report, identified;
- Whilst recognising the positive outcomes for individuals and the challenge in quantifying those outcomes, the report did not provide the Committee with sufficient detail on financial investment and savings achieved to effectively scrutinise;
- Was Our Manchester a strategy or a branding exercise, noting that resident voluntary work and community projects had existed prior to the introduction of Our Manchester;
- Acknowledging the improvements in providing health and social care services in multidisciplinary teams at a neighbourhood level, however the anticipated financial savings were not realised;
- Greater Manchester Police (GMP) were working towards consistent Neighbourhood footprints but were not yet fully aligned operationally;
- Had staff absenteeism improved as a result of the introduction of Our Manchester; and
- All Members should undertake the Our Manchester Experience training.

The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform informed the Committee that the Our Manchester Investment Fund was additional funding that allowed for the scaling up of those resident projects that demonstrated Our Manchester values and were sustainable. He commented that once established they could apply for future funding for projects through the Neighbourhood Investment Fund.

He stated that the Our Manchester approach involved fundamentally changing how the Council and partners worked across the city and the relationships with residents and communities, in order to deliver the Our Manchester Strategy for the city. The approach therefore needed to become embedded in everything that we do.

On BST PIP, he further stated that partners, including GMP were committed to aligning themselves to the neighbourhood model, however due to issues with their IT systems GMP had not operationally aligned to this service model as yet.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer commented that it was important to understand the report in the context of a reduction in staffing resources experienced by both the Council and partners, however the ambition was to deliver and improve services to the residents of Manchester despite this. She further commented that feedback from staff had indicated that they welcomed the opportunities to engage in voluntary work to support local communities.

The Strategic Lead for Intelligence and Data Science stated that positive outcomes had been delivered for residents by staff by adopting the Our Manchester approach. He stated that this had been supported by staff attending with the Our Manchester Experience that had challenged staff to consider how they worked and the behaviours they exhibited.

The Strategic Lead for Intelligence and Data Science informed the Committee that the resident survey was an online portal, available on the Council's website that residents could complete and this tool was one of the methods for capturing this information. In response to comments from the Committee who stated that they were unaware of this survey, Officers stated that information on this would be circulated to Members following the meeting.

In response to the priorities identified within different wards, the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform stated that these were the product of a number of different services, including Council services, housing providers and police who were working in multidisciplinary teams in neighbourhoods. He stated that these were very early days in the model of working and Members would be informed of their progress via ward coordination meetings. In response to specific ward related enquiries from Members he stated that he would discuss those outside of the meeting.

The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform acknowledged the comments regarding the financial reporting of this activity and this would be provided in future update reports. He stated that the largest investment in this programme was in the staff and this impacted on all the services the Council delivered which presented a challenge when evaluating or providing numerical outcomes and comparisons. He further added that consideration would also be given to including additional case studies to illustrate this work in future reporting, which the Chair welcomed. He further stated that the comments relating to staff absenteeism and Our Manchester Member training and information would also be included in future update reports.

A Member further commented that consideration needed to be given to the language and terminology used throughout the report and how the information was presented. She further recommended that a future update report include information and examples of those teams applying statutory duties, such as enforcement officers and benefit officers to illustrate how they were responding to the Our Manchester approach way of working with both residents and other services.

The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform provided examples of how officers working in statutory services were encouraged to engage in different conversations when interacting with residents. The Chair requested that any future update reports include data on the numbers of staff having undertaken the Our Manchester Experience. The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform informed the Members that the Experience had been refreshed and described the intention was to deliver this to staff who, for various reasons were unable to attend the Castlefield location with the intention of having 7,000 staff having undertaken this by the end of March 2021 (3,000 staff within the next twelve months) and Directorates were encouraged to prioritise those staff attending these events.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

RGSC/20/22 Our Transformation Programme - progress update

The Committee considered a report and presentation of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and City Solicitor that provided an overview of recent progress on the Our Transformation Programme and next steps.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- Describing that Our Transformation was the work to modernise and digitise how the council operated;
- Providing an overview of the strategic context of Our Transformation;
- Providing an overview of the five programmes which together made up Our Transformation;
- Providing an overview of the how Our Transformation was resources; and
- Further detail on each of the programmes.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were: -

- How were residents involved with the programme, in particular the design and development of digital processes, commenting that not all residents had access to digital services;
- Expressing concern that some services were digital only and this could contribute to digital exclusion;
- Making reference to a positive experience that included accurate and timely information when applying online to renew a passport, and could a similar model be implemented in Manchester;
- Was there any conflict between empowering officers to take decisions and reduce bureaucracy and statutory requirements;
- Was the resourcing of the programme sufficient to deliver the work and ambitions described;
- What was being done to support staff through technological and system changes; and
- How was carbon reduction being addressed through this activity.

The Strategic Lead, Business Change stated that the reference to digital that the Member had referred to was specifically describing the activities to modernise, streamline and digitise how the council operated and communicated across a range of internal systems and services. She described that as this project progressed residents would be consulted with via existing channels such as resident forums and staff in Neighbourhood Teams. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that all channels of resident communication and access to the Council were important and this was recognised and that the work initially was looking that the internal CRM (Customer relationship management) system.

The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform acknowledged the experience of the Member when applying for his passport and stated that examples and systems of good practice were being considered, however he noted that the UK Government had invested significantly into the online digital passport service. The Strategic Lead, Business Change informed the Committee that work was ongoing to address digital inclusion, including work to support older residents and hard to reach groups and information on this work would be provided to the Committee following the meeting.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer provided an example of empowering officers to take decisions by explain that currently the arrangements were that she would have to sign off any honoraria payments. She stated that whilst this was appropriate for complex applications, managers should be enabled to make local decisions and be accountable for standard applications. She stated that this would also contribute to decisions being taken in a timely manner. The Strategic Lead, Business Change qualified the report by confirming that decision taking would still be in accordance with the Council's constitution and the agreed scheme of delegation to ensure that the decision making process were safe and legal. The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform further commented that the City's Climate Change Plan had a specific action to review all of the Council's decision-making processes and policies to ensure carbon zero was embedded throughout. He stated this would be included in the carbon literacy training that would be rolled out to all staff.

The Strategic Lead, Business Change commented that to achieve the full breadth of work described, additional resources would be identified to deliver projects, such as support for the roll out of Microsoft 365. She said they were mindful to avoid the need to recruit external consultants and to utilise the existing workforce, recognising the challenge this would present and this continued to be reviewed by the Our Transformation Board, Chaired by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer with representatives from a range of services. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that the delivery of this this programme of work was a priority and the Senior Management Team were committed to delivering this.

In regard to the roll out of Microsoft 365, the Strategic Lead, Business Change stated that a migration plan would be produced, with the roll out commencing in April 2020 to be completed by September 2020. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that a new Director of ICT was now in post to deliver this project and this would be supported by the Change Team and staff from Microsoft.

In response to a comment from the Chair regarding the dangers of change fatigue experienced by staff and what support was being offered to staff, the Strategic Lead, Business Change stated they were mindful of this and all changes were being implemented 'with' staff rather than 'to' staff, and where possible changes to systems were being coordinated so they were rolled out at the same time and managed appropriately. The Chair requested that the Committee's gratitude was relayed to all staff involved.

In response to a specific question the Strategic Lead, Business Change stated that Time Wise was a flexible working accreditation and Wyse Terminals were the units to enable staff to access the Council's IT systems as opposed to a laptop or desk top computer.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

RGSC/20/23 Policy and Performance Priorities

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform (PPR) that provided information on the priorities and performance of the Council's Policy, Performance and Reform department for the 2020/21 Municipal Year.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- Providing a background and context to PPR;
- A structure chart;
- Describing the ambitions and priorities for PPR;
- Information on the City Policy Service;
- Information on resources and programmes;
- An update on the activities of the Policy and Partnerships team;
- Information on Reform and Innovation;
- The vision for Performance, Research and Intelligence;
- An update on the activities and vision of the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion (EDI) Team; and
- Equalities performance management.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were: -

- Further clarification was sought on the statements contained within the report that described Manchester as a particularly difficult city to enumerate;
- Did the team have enough capacity to undertake the enumeration;
- Was the Residential Development Tracker and the Commercial Development Tracker available at a ward level and was this available to Councillors;
- What plans were in place to deliver the Windrush day;
- More resources were required to implement Green and Blue Infrastructure and what was being done to secure external funding to deliver climate change activities;
- Were the number of upheld Ombudsmen complaints comparable with other core cities; and
- What was the approach to utilising the services of external agencies to deliver consultations.

Officers described that work was ongoing so that the data used to produce the reports was aligned to the methodology of the ONS (Officer for National Statistics) and additional resources had been identified to support the national census work and due to the challenges in Manchester, including the nature of the housing stock and migration, the Chief Executive was currently in discussions with the ONS to ensure the appropriate number of enumerators were available in Manchester to deliver this work. Members noted that it was anticipated that, if carried out with appropriate resource, the Census would show Manchester's population was much higher than projected by ONS. Members commented that this could impact on Local Government funding allocations and requested that a briefing note was circulated to Members on this issue. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that population data was also a factor when Local Government funding was calculated, adding that this was also factor for health service funding.

The Committee was informed that the Residential Development Tracker and the Commercial Development Tracker was an analysts tool and was not available in the current format for public consumption, however the outcomes were reported into other sources of data and information that was provided to Members, such as budget forecasting.

In response to the specific question on Windrush day, Officers described that Local Authorities could apply for a fund from the Government to deliver such events and Manchester had submitted a bid and had prepared a delivery plan in anticipation of an award. Members were advised that the nature of the event would be determined by the scale of any funding awarded.

Officers described that the Council's Climate Change Action Plan, that included activities around tree and hedge planting was being considered at the relevant Scrutiny Committee that week prior to its submission to Executive. Members were informed that the Council was working with partners, including Transport for Greater Manchester to progress the actions to mitigate climate change. The Committee were also advised that officers within the Resources and Programmes team were actively investigating alternative sources of funding to progress climate change activities.

In respect to Ombudsmen complaints the Committee was informed that the Corporate Complaints Team would monitor and report on this activity, adding that targets were established.

In regard to Equalities and the 'Excellent' status of accreditation, Members were advised that work was ongoing to understand the options to ensure this status was retained in 2021. A Member suggested that consideration should be given to work with the Equality and Human Rights Commission to ensure preparations for 2021 were appropriate.

In response to discussion on consultations and the use of external agencies, officers stated that consideration would be given as to the scale of the required consultation and any technical requirements that were required and a corporate commissioning framework was established to appoint consultants when required.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

RGSC/20/24 Overview Report

The report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

Decision

The Committee notes the report and approves the work programme.

Health Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 4 February 2020

Present:

Councillor Farrell – in the Chair
Councillors Clay, Curley, Holt, Mary Monaghan, Newman, O'Neil, Riasat and Wills

Apologies: Councillor N. Ali

Also present:

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing
Councillor Ilyas, Assistant Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing
Nick Gomm, Director of Corporate Affairs, Manchester Health and Care
Commissioning (MHCC)
Heather Etheridge, Head of Service Be Well, Big Life Group
Dr Cordelle Mbeledogu, Consultant in Public Health Medicine, MLCO/MHCC
Lydia Fleuty, Population Health Programme Lead, MHCC
Dr Sohail Munshi, Chief Medical Officer, MLCO
Mark Edwards, Chief Operating Officer, MLCO
Annabel Hammond, Integrated Neighbourhood Team (INT) Lead
Chris Martin, INT Lead
Karin Connell, Work and Skills Lead, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning

HSC/20/05 Urgent Business – Novel Coronavirus

The Chair invited the Consultant in Public Health to provide the Committee with a verbal update on the recent Coronavirus outbreak.

She described that the Novel coronavirus (2019-nCov) was a new strain of coronavirus first identified in Wuhan City, China. As a group, coronaviruses were common across the world. Typical symptoms of coronavirus include fever and a cough that may progress to a severe pneumonia causing shortness of breath and breathing difficulties. The infection prevention control measures were good hand hygiene and messages that would be used to prevent other respiratory disease, catch it, bin it, kill it messages (sneeze/cough into tissue then put in bin.)

Generally, coronavirus could cause more severe symptoms in people with weakened immune systems, older people, and those with long-term conditions like diabetes, cancer and chronic lung disease and that to date two patients in England had tested positive for coronavirus. Members were informed that at the time of reporting the risk level in the UK had increased from low to moderate, adding that the UK did not need to change its front line response but did need to ensure plans were in place for if the situation got worse.

She described that Greater Manchester and Manchester organisations were working well together to ensure that health protection systems were in place to respond to the novel Coronavirus. Work was nationally led by Public Health England (PHE) and,

from a health perspective, officers were working with the local NW PHE team as well as the following health organisations:

- Manchester Health and Care Commissioning;
- North Manchester General Hospital Infectious Diseases Unit;
- Northern Care Alliance;
- Manchester University NHS Foundations Trust;
- North West Ambulance Service; and
- Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Partnership.

PHE was also working with Manchester Airport and enhanced monitoring arrangements had been established from 29 January 2020 for direct flights from China. She said that this was an evolving situation and advice and information was regularly updated and available on the Public Health website.

The Consultant in Public Health stated that the preparedness arrangements in Greater Manchester were good and there were already pathways and plans in place, noting that Manchester was fortunate to have the Regional Infectious Disease Unit situated in North Manchester.

Members were informed that the Greater Manchester Resilience Forum (GMRF) coordinated local multi-agency activities to prepare for a range of incidents and emergencies. These arrangements were complimented by the GM Local Health Resilience Partnership (LHRP), which provided a specific focus on preparedness for public health related incidents.

These arrangements had supported a range of local partners to work together over many years to develop various system-wide health plans and capabilities, such as the GM Multi-Agency Outbreak Plan which detailed arrangements for multi-agency response to a High Consequence Infectious Disease (HCID), such as the 2019 Novel Coronavirus. Manchester also had a Manchester Multi Agency Outbreak Plan that set out the local operational arrangements which complemented the GM Multi-Agency Outbreak Plan.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing commented that there had been reports of sections of the local community experiencing discrimination and stigma as a result of the outbreak in China. She said that Manchester was an open, international and welcoming city and at such a difficult time solidarity had to be shown to the Chinese community in the city. She encouraged all Councillors, in their capacity as community leaders to tackle stigma and discrimination.

Decision

To note the verbal update.

HSC/20/06 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Health Scrutiny Committee of the 7 January 2020 were submitted for approval. Cllr Curley requested that his attendance be recorded.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 7 January 2020 as a correct record, subject to the above amendment.

HSC/20/07 Updated Financial Strategy and Budget Reports 2020/21

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Executive and the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which provided an update on the Council's overall financial position and set out the next steps in the budget process, including scrutiny of the budget proposals and budget report by this Committee.

In conjunction to the above, the Committee also considered the Adult Social Care and Population Health Budget 2020/21 that provided the final budget proposals following the contents of the provisional Local Government Settlement received late December 2019 and feedback from scrutiny committees during January 2020.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Noting that any future cuts to budgets would be extremely difficult;
- The notion that austerity was over was untrue and the government needed to fund local authorities appropriately and fairly;
- Council Tax was being used to fund services to support vulnerable residents in the city and this message needed to be explicit with residents; and
- The Committee thanked the Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing and officers for their continued commitment and dedication to supporting the most vulnerable residents in Manchester.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing stated that despite the continued failure of government to adequately and fairly fund adult social care, Manchester remained committed to responding to the issue in an imaginative and proactive manner to protect the most vulnerable residents in the city.

Decisions

The Committee recommend that their comments be submitted for consideration by the Executive at their meeting of 12 February 2020.

HSC/20/08 Delivering the Our Manchester Strategy

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being, which provided an overview of work undertaken and progress towards the delivery of the Council's priorities, as set out in the Our Manchester strategy, for those areas within her portfolio.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Welcoming a well informed and detailed report;

- Welcoming the information provided on improving mental health services; and
- Thanking the Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being for her dedication and hard work on behalf of Manchester residents.

Decision

To note the report.

HSC/20/09 Manchester's Approach to Prevention and Wellbeing Services - an update focused on social prescribing

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Population Health and Consultant in Public Health Medicine that provided an overview of current social prescribing provision in Manchester within the context of the Prevention Programme, and outlined the high level plans for the future development of prevention and wellbeing services in the city, through the 2021 Wellbeing Model.

Officers referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Providing the national and local strategic context for social prescribing;
- A summary of the model for social prescribing, and information on how this was being delivered in Manchester; and
- Describing the plans for further developing prevention and wellbeing support services.

To complement the report, the Committee received a video presentation from Big Life who delivered social prescribing services in Manchester. The video presentation detailed case studies of two residents who had overcome major barriers to their health and wellbeing with the support of Be Well, a social prescribing service for Central and South Manchester.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Noting that people often had complex needs as a result of social deprivation;
- Welcoming the presentation that contained case studies and was the service available to younger people;
- Were GP's engaged with this programme and making appropriate referrals for their patients;
- Noting that people experienced barriers to employment as a result of criminal convictions received when they were younger and work needed to be done with employers to support them as this had an impact on their health and opportunities and outcomes;
- Consideration needed to be given to supporting volunteers;
- Recognising that the network of volunteers and availability of venues was different across the city;
- What was being done to connect with and support BAEM (Black, Asian and Ethnic Minorities) residents and younger people experiencing mental health issues who may not present to services and as a result not be referred to this service;

- Were Northwards Housing a partner organisation of the Big Life Group;
- Would the smoking cessation offer be available citywide; and
- Were referrals to and the take up of services monitored.

The Head of Service, Be Well informed the Members that they did work with young people, aged 18 years plus and demographic data would be shared with the Committee following the meeting. She also confirmed that they had an effective monitoring and tracking system established that enabled them to monitor an individual's progress and identify any gaps in provision. She advised that this intelligence was shared amongst the team and was available to staff. She further stated that rigorous monitoring helped identify any GP practices that had a low number of referrals to the service. She advised that if this was identified the practice would be approached to discuss any barriers and offer any additional support. She described that the service had built effective and personal relationships with practices. She responded to the comment regarding young people by advising that they promoted their service in a variety of settings identified as places where young people used. She further commented that they were seeking to work with and engage with employers to address the issues experienced by young people accessing employment opportunities.

In response to the question regarding Northwards Housing, the Head of Service, Be Well stated that they had just recently been awarded the contract to deliver this service in the north of the city and Northwards would be engaged in this programme as a partner organisation.

The Consultant in Public Health Medicine acknowledged the comment regarding the network of volunteers in the community and that this was a challenge in some areas, particularly in the north of the city. She stated that the approach to develop this was to build on existing community strengths, utilise local intelligence and develop community leaders so this grew from the local neighbourhood. She advised that this approach was being specifically focused in the north of the city. She said that by using local intelligence this would assist in identifying any gaps in provision and help inform the response. She commented that this would also assist with issues around non engagement with services and hard to reach groups.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being advised that a social prescribing development fund would be used to support this activity. She said this fund would be used creatively to deliver long term benefits for local communities, and this was a means to empower people in their local communities and build on their strengths.

The Consultant in Public Health Medicine said that they did work with front line health workers, including GP practices to encourage them to engage in conversations with residents and make appropriate referrals for appropriate support, such as Be Well. She said that whilst improvements had been realised this was still work in progress. She described that to support this the social prescribing services had retained the same name and provided a single hub model for referrals, as previous barriers had resulted from GP practices having to navigate a range of different services, often short lived that had made it difficult for practiced to keep track of. She said that Be

Well may not be the most appropriate service for someone experiencing mental health problems, however other services and support was available.

In response to the question regarding the smoking cessation service, the Committee were informed that a city wide offer will be available from April 2020.

Decision

To note the report.

HSC/20/10 Manchester Healthy Weight Strategy (Draft)

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Population Health and Consultant in Public Health that provided an introduction to the draft Manchester Healthy Weight Strategy 2020-2025, which would take a whole system, partnership approach to tackling obesity in the city.

Officers referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- The strategy had been developed across four key themes; Food & Culture, Physical Activity, Environment & Neighbourhoods and Support & Prevention;
- The strategy had been informed by a wide variety of stakeholders, and supported the Public Health England (PHE) guidance 'Reducing obesity was everybody's business' (PHE 2018); and
- Following comments by the Health Scrutiny Committee and the Manchester Patient and Professionals Advisory Group the final draft of the Strategy would be produced for the Health and Wellbeing Board.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- The maps provided within the report referred to previous ward boundaries;
- Mental health and its relationship to healthy weight needed to be more explicit within the report;
- Recognising that physical activity amongst children had reduced and this needed to be addressed and noting the influence technology had and how children played;
- The food industry needed to be challenged to take responsibility, noting that processed food was cheaper than eating healthier;
- Noting that food deserts existed in certain areas that reduced options and access to healthier food choices; and
- Schools and hospitals should be deterred from providing vending machines that contained unhealthy food.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being welcomed the comments from the Committee and stated that these would be taken into consideration before the final strategy was produced. She stated that the issue of healthy weight was not just a health issue and a holistic response was required. She stated that consideration needed to be given to the wider determinants of health and all partners needed to use their levers and policies to influence behaviour change. She said that

Manchester, for example should seek to use its powers through licensing and planning policy to influence behaviour change.

In response to the comments from Members, officers stated that the maps in the report would be reviewed to ensure they were correct. The Consultant in Public Health stated that relationships between healthy weight and mental health was understood and was contained within the report, however following the comments this would be reviewed to ensure this was appropriately addressed and presented within the final report.

The Commissioning Manager acknowledged the comments regarding young children being overweight and stated that they were working with Manchester Active to increase participation in physical activity amongst children and younger people. He further described that the Healthy Schools Teams had worked with catering teams within schools to ensure healthy food options were available to children and there were no vending machines in schools.

The Commissioning Manager acknowledged the challenge presented by the food industry and supported the comment from the Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being in using all local levers available, in particular planning to influence behaviour change. He described that examples of good practice from other authorities to promote a healthy relationship with food were to be utilised and consideration would be given as to how this city wide strategy could connect into other services delivered in local neighbourhoods.

Decision

To note the report.

HSC/20/11 Update on the work of health and social care staff in the Manchester Integrated Neighbourhood Teams

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director of Adult Social Care and The Chief Operating Officer, Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO) that updated Members on the work of health and social care staff in the Manchester Integrated Neighbourhood Teams (INTs).

Officers referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Providing a background and context of the MLCO;
- Describing progress to date;
- Providing examples of MLCO Neighbourhood Plans on a page;
- Examples of the MLCO in action and neighbourhood stories to illustrate the benefits achieved; and
- The approach to developing the neighbourhood model in 2020/21 and the emerging priorities for 2020/2021.

To complement the report, the Committee received a video presentation that described the benefits of this model of service delivery and the experiences of different staff working within these teams.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Supporting the integration model and recognising the benefits this could deliver for residents;
- Consideration needed to be given to how the information contained within the plans on a page were presented to ensure they were legible;
- Questions were raised as to the validity of some of the data describes within the plans, with a Member commenting that he did not recognise them; and
- Welcoming the initiatives described to reach out to sections of the community to promote and increase the take up of health checks.

In response to the specific comment raised regarding the figures presented, the Executive Director of Adult Social Care stated that she would respond to the Member following the meeting. She further thanked the Members for their continued support for the Integrated Neighbourhood Teams and suggested that if they had not already done so, they should visit their local teams.

The Chief Medical Officer, MLCO acknowledged the positive comments from the Members regarding using initiatives to increase the take up of health checks. He stated that these projects would be evaluated with the ambition that similar projects be rolled out.

The Chair commented that it was important to recognise that different areas of the city had different infrastructures and different models of community support, both formal and informal. He said that it was important that this was acknowledged and INTs should complement and enhance existing communities rather than a single model being imposed.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being acknowledged this comment and stated that the model was not to impose services on people, but rather with people and communities to best improve their health outcomes.

Decision

To note the report.

HSC/20/12 Living Wage accreditation

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Workforce and Organisation Development, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning that provided Members with an overview of the living wage accreditation status of Manchester Health and Wellbeing Board partner organisations.

Accreditation as living wage employers, and promotion of the real living wage to partners and suppliers would contribute to the development of a progressive and

equitable city, where those on the lowest salaries were able to benefit more from economic growth and investment in health and social care services. This formed part of the locality social value approach and also supported the embedding of 'good work' practice to improve health outcomes for the collective health and social care workforce.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Members welcomed the report and supported the introduction of the real living wage; and
- An assurance was sought that Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust would pay third party staff the real living wage.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being stated that Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust were committed to paying the real living wage third party staff, and were currently reviewing contracts to ensure this could be achieved. Members requested that an update on this be provided at an appropriate time.

Decision

To note the report.

HSC/20/13 Overview Report

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

The Chair informed the Members that the report listed for March entitled 'Residential Care Strategy' would be deferred, and a report entitled 'Manchester Foundation Trust Clinical Service Strategy Programme Update' would be included on the March agenda.

Decision

To note the report and approve the work programme, subject to the above amendments.

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2020

Present:

Councillor Stone – in the Chair

Councillors Alijah, Hewitson, Kilpatrick, Lovecy, McHale, Madeleine Monaghan, Reid, Sadler and Wilson

Co-opted Voting Members:

Ms Z Derraz, Parent Governor Representative

Ms S Barnwell, Parent Governor Representative

Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative

Co-opted Non Voting Members:

Mr L Duffy, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

Ms J Fleet, Primary Sector Teacher Representative

Also present:

Councillor Leese, Leader of the Council

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools

Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources

Councillor Flanagan, Ward Councillor for Miles Platting and Newton Heath

Detective Superintendent Jamie Daniels, Greater Manchester Police (GMP)

Apologies:

Councillors Cooley, T Judge and Reeves

Mrs J Miles, Diocese of Salford Representative

CYP/20/08 Minutes

Decision

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2020.

CYP/20/09 Publication of Greater Manchester Mayor, Independent Assurance review of the effectiveness of multi-agency responses to child exploitation in Greater Manchester

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which informed Members of the work that had been undertaken within the Council following the issues being raised that led to the Mayor's Independent Assurance Review and provided reassurance that the response to the exploitation and abuse of children had strengthened significantly in Manchester.

The Chair began by stating that this was an issue of great concern to the Committee and that their thoughts were with the people affected. He advised that the Committee had scrutinised the work on complex safeguarding over the past few years, through report and visits, but still had questions and concerns that they wanted to raise through this meeting.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services introduced the report, highlighting that the Council had been pro-actively working with GMP to make improvements in response to the emerging findings from the review, without waiting for the report to be published. He also advised that, where appropriate, employees from the time period that the report covered had been referred to the relevant regulatory body.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools drew Members' attention to the statements that the Council had issued following the publication of the report. He advised the Committee that there had been significant changes made since the time period which the report covered but that the Council could not be complacent on this issue.

The Leader outlined his role in safeguarding, following the introduction of the Children Act 2004, which had been implemented in 2006. He informed Members that he was responsible for ensuring the adequacy of the Council's safeguarding responsibilities and outlined how he did this. This included monthly meetings with the Executive Member for Children and Schools and quarterly meetings with the Chief Executive and Executive Members and members of the Senior Leadership Team with responsibility for safeguarding adults and children, where performance indicators were reviewed and issues discussed.

The Chair highlighted that at the meeting of the Council on 29 January 2020 Members had agreed a pledge on safeguarding children.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- The issue of Manchester children being placed in homes outside of the city and non-Manchester children being placed in homes within the city and how to ensure safeguarding in these cases;
- How patriarchal attitudes at the time contributed to an environment where the sexual abuse of girls was not effectively challenged;
- Problems with GMP's new computer system iOPS;
- What was being done to engage with shopkeepers and others in busy retail districts who might spot issues of concern in their area;
- Working effectively with other Council services, such as taxi licensing, to address child sexual exploitation;
- Concerns that the team undertaking the review had not been able to obtain all the relevant information and, that, in addition to the ongoing criminal investigation, further investigation should take place of the failings of the Council;
- Changes in the methods being used to groom children, including via social media; and
- That all Councillors would receive training on issues such as their corporate parenting responsibilities and the exploitation of children and that, as the perpetrators in these cases had come from particular communities, Ward Councillors from these communities could play an important role.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services informed Members of the safeguards in place for children living in residential children's homes, regardless of where the home was. These included visits from Social Workers, reviews of the care plans for individual children by an Independent Reviewing Officer, oversight of homes from commissioning services, inspection and monitoring visits from independent professionals under Regulation 44 of the Children's Homes (England) Regulations 2015 and regulation by Ofsted. A Member expressed concern about the regulations relating to children from outside Manchester being placed in commissioned homes in Manchester, advising that Members should campaign for the legislation to be changed to require the child's Social Worker to report to the authorities in Manchester. The Leader supported this comment, adding that at present small children's homes did not require planning permission and often the Council and GMP did not know they were there until there was a problem.

In response to a Member's comments, the Deputy Director of Children's Services informed Members that it was clear that children in the city remained vulnerable to exploitation and were experiencing exploitation and, while recognising that improvements had been made, he assured Members that neither the Council nor GMP were complacent on this issue.

The Strategic Head of Early Help outlined the work taking place through the Community Safety Partnership to reduce and prevent harm, through engaging with a wide network of organisations such as hotels and licensing and trading services. She also assured Members that the Council and GMP were committed to acting on the lessons learnt from past failings. She advised Members that it was recognised that young adults were also vulnerable to exploitation and a co-ordinated approach was being adopted to prevent and address the exploitation of both children and vulnerable adults.

Detective Superintendent Jamie Daniels offered GMP's apologies for the failings and mistakes of the past in responding to child sexual exploitation. He addressed the Member's comments regarding the iOPS system, acknowledging the challenges it had presented; however, he reported that the key problem with how the force had dealt with child sexual exploitation in the past had not been record-keeping but that it had not been a high enough priority. He assured Members of the high priority that this was now being given, outlining how GMP's safeguarding teams worked in partnership with the Council and shared information, and he updated them on the recent successes which had resulted in offenders being charged. He informed the Committee that he hoped that this would enable them to rebuild the trust of victims who had been failed in the past. The Chair welcomed that officers from GMP had attended recent scrutiny committee meetings, where relevant, and stated that he hoped this would continue.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools advised the Committee that many Ward Councillors had a good knowledge of what was happening in their area and that they and other people in their local areas and retail centres needed to know where to report safeguarding concerns. He informed Members that meetings would be set up in localities so that people knew who to contact and that he would circulate details of these meetings to Ward Councillors.

The Leader outlined the weaknesses in information-sharing between GMP and the Council in the time period covered by the report and the challenges in obtaining and sharing information from that time period now. He reported that, although no minutes were available of the gold group meeting which had taken place at the Town Hall in April 2005, the decision to end Operation Augusta had already been taken earlier in the day by GMP and he highlighted that, while this was the wrong decision, GMP had been prioritising based on the measures of police effectiveness set down by the Home Office and Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary. He advised the Committee that the Coroner's report into the death of Victoria Agoglia was a sealed file which the Council did not have access to and that the Coroner was accountable to the Chief Coroner, not to either Manchester City Council or Rochdale Borough Council, of which he was an employee. In response to a Member's request, the Leader agreed to write to the Coroner to ask that the file on the death of Victoria Agoglia be released.

The Leader highlighted that Victoria Agoglia's mother had been in the care system herself, under the care of Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council, and had later died of a drug overdose and that there had been a systemic failure which had allowed this to be repeated. He reported that, through the use of early intervention and early help, Manchester City Council aimed to break these cycles, although he acknowledged that there was still more work to do to improve the outcomes for Our Children (Looked After Children).

The Leader expressed concern that, where offenders were prosecuted through Operation Augusta, the offences they were prosecuted for and the sentences received did not reflect the severity of the abuse. He advised Members that, unfortunately, there was a propensity, both then and now, for juries to disbelieve the principal witness because they were a child who the prosecution could describe as a drug-taker and a child prostitute. He informed Members about ongoing work to identify and pursue perpetrators and advised that this prevented complete transparency, as sharing information could risk alerting perpetrators that they were being investigated.

The Chair commented that sentencing from more recent cases indicated that this issue was being treated more seriously now.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services advised the Committee that discussions had taken place with social services staff from this time period who were still employed by the Council, that it had not been judged that their conduct met the threshold for referral to the regulator and that they had been made aware of the Council's whistleblowing policy, in case there were any issues they wished to raise.

A Member requested an update on the phase of the review referred to in section 1.4 of the assurance review of Operation Augusta. Detective Superintendent Jamie Daniels advised that he would provide a written response to this query.

Detective Superintendent Jamie Daniels reported that, while for crimes such as burglaries and robberies the police were dealing predominately with adults who they were easily able to engage with and obtain evidence and statements from, the

victims of some types of crimes, including child sexual exploitation, had complex needs and additional vulnerability. He advised that in the past, the response had often been to disregard these victims because of these challenges, rather than recognising that they should be provided with additional support. He confirmed that there were still offenders who had not been brought to justice and advised that part of the approach to addressing this was for GMP to try to re-build trust with victims so that they felt confident to go through the criminal justice system. He provided information about the GMP teams currently working to bring these offenders to justice. The Leader reported that many of the victims had chosen to get on with their lives and did not welcome being contacted by the police and that it was important to be sensitive to their privacy and needs and the risk of re-traumatising them.

Detective Superintendent Jamie Daniels acknowledged that the methods being used to groom children were evolving. He reported that detailed examination of the cases referred to the Complex Safeguarding Hub, along with information from national sources, were being used to identify and address new methods being used.

Decisions

1. To emphasise the role that departments across the Council and external organisations, including the voluntary and community sector, have in addressing child sexual exploitation.
2. That the Committee will continue to monitor complex safeguarding at future meetings.
3. That this work will also be monitored through the Corporate Parenting Panel, which all Members are encouraged to attend.
4. To thank Detective Superintendent Jamie Daniels and his colleagues at GMP and to look forward to continuing to build the relationship with GMP.

CYP/20/10 Planning for Ofsted's 'Proportionate' Inspection of Manchester's Children's Services - April 2020 to April 2021

The Committee received a presentation of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided information on the planning for Ofsted's 'proportionate' inspection of Manchester's Children's Services.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services referred to the main points and themes within the presentation which included:

- Information on Ofsted's new ILACS (Inspection of Local Authority Children's Services) Framework, which was implemented in 2018;
- Areas of focus for the ILACS;
- The process for an ILACS; and
- Planned activity during 2020/21.

The Committee recognised the progress that had been since the 2014 Ofsted inspection.

In response to a Member's question, the Deputy Director of Children's Services reported that the Signs of Safety model worked to build on a family's strengths but with a clear focus on risk, understanding the risks and the contribution of partners in ameliorating risk.

In response to a Member's question on Social Workers' workloads and the stability of the social work workforce, the Executive Member for Children and Schools advised the Committee that Ofsted had recognised that the Council was addressing this. He informed Members that money had been set aside in the budget for this and that further details would be included in a future report.

Decision

That the Committee will continue to monitor this work in the lead up to the next Ofsted inspection.

CYP/20/11 The Council's Updated Financial Strategy and Budget reports 2020/21

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Executive and the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which provided an update on the Council's overall financial position and set out the next steps in the budget process, including scrutiny of the budget proposals and budget report by this Committee.

In conjunction to the above, the Committee also considered the Children and Education Services Budget 2020/21 which provided the final budget proposals following the contents of the provisional Local Government Settlement received late December 2019 and feedback from scrutiny committees during January 2020. In addition, the Committee received the School Budgets 2020/21 which provided a summary of the confirmed Dedicated School Grant (DSG) allocation from the 2020/21 settlement announced on 19 December 2019, and the budget allocation across individual school budgets and Council-retained schools budgets.

The proposed 2020/21 budget reflected the fact the Council had declared a climate emergency by making carbon reduction a key consideration in the Council's planning and budget proposals.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources outlined the national context within which the budget was being set, highlighting the significant decrease in funding to the Council since 2010.

The Ward Councillor for Miles Platting and Newton Heath highlighted the issue of homeless families being placed in temporary accommodation in a different area and who would fund transport to school, where it was in the child's interests to continue to attend their existing school. The Executive Member for Children and Schools outlined how Executive Members were working together to look at how services could be better co-ordinated to address homelessness and meet the needs of people who were homeless. He reported that he would also be meeting with the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services, the Director of Homelessness and

Deputy Leader Councillor Sue Murphy to consider how Children's Services and the Homelessness Service could work better together to support homeless families. He advised that he would take forward the issue raised by the Member. The Chair requested that the Committee receive a report at a future meeting on this area of work. A Member questioned whether a joint subgroup should be established with the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee to look at this issue in more detail. The Chair advised that he would not be recommending this at this time but that he would speak to the Chair of the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee about how best to scrutinise this subject.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- Educational Psychology including the overspend and the future commissioning arrangements;
- That the Troubled Families grant had recently been confirmed for a further year by the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government and was the Council prepared if this funding was not continued in future years; and
- That additional money had been allocated to the High Needs Block of the DSG but that this followed several years of the funding being frozen when the number of pupils in Manchester was increasing.

In response to points raised by Members in relation to fostering, adoption and residential placements, the Chair advised Members that these issues were regularly discussed at the Corporate Parenting Panel, which all Members were invited to attend, and that reports on these issues would also be considered at future Committee meetings.

The Director of Education informed Members that there had been an overspend on the Educational Psychology budget because of the increasing numbers of children with an Education and Health Care Plan (EHCP) and she outlined when Educational Psychology services were used in relation to EHCPs. She reported that the Council would be carrying out an open tender for Educational Psychology services. The Chair requested that the Committee receive a short note in a future Overview Report on the tendering process for the Educational Psychology service.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services reported that plans had been made to spend the Troubled Families funding which had recently been confirmed, stating that this work was well-evaluated, achieving good outcomes and providing value for money. The Head of Finance advised that this was a one-year budget and that, if no further funding was provided by the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government for this programme, the Council would need to make a decision in next year's budget process about what its priorities were.

Decisions

1. To agree the strategy outlined in the reports.
2. To request that the Committee receive a report on the work taking place to better co-ordinate services to support families, children and young people affected by homelessness.

3. To request a short note in a future Overview Report on the tendering process for the Educational Psychology service.

CYP/20/12 School Place Planning and Admissions

The Executive Member for Children and Schools outlined the process that was currently taking place regarding the proposal to close Newall Green High School, advising that this was not the Council's decision. He informed Members that the Council had written to the Regional Schools Commissioner and the Department for Education to oppose the closure. A copy of the letter that the Executive Member had written to the Regional Schools Commissioner was shared with the Committee.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools advised that closing Newall Green High School was not in the interests of the children at the school and their families and that there was not capacity elsewhere within the school system to accommodate all the children if this school did close. He informed Members that the Council had discussed with the Trust which ran the school some options to address the budget concerns which had led to their proposal to close the school. He reported that he was also awaiting a response from the Regional Schools Commissioner.

Members discussed their concerns at the proposed closure of the school, including concerns for the children and staff affected and that high schools in south Manchester were increasingly clustered around one area, with children in Wythenshawe having less local provision. A Member advised that, although a listening period was taking place, she felt as though a decision had already been made.

In response to a Member's question, the Executive Member for Children and Schools reported that the Council did not have any formal powers in relation to this decision but he outlined what the Council was doing to try to influence the decision, including lobbying at the highest level and meeting with the Trust to try to identify a solution.

The Chair recommended that the Committee endorse the letter which the Executive Member for Children and Schools had sent to the Regional Schools Commissioner, opposing the closure of the school.

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education which provided an update on school admissions for the academic year 2019/20 along with plans for creating additional capacity in response to forecast demand across primary and secondary schools. The report stated that investment in modern, energy efficient and high quality education infrastructure would drive reductions in carbon across the estate of schools.

The Committee was invited to comment on the report prior to its submission to the Executive on 12 February 2020.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- School admission applications 2019/20;
- School population forecast;
- Approach to securing sufficient school places; and
- Actions to secure sufficient school places, including proposals for a new primary school and a new secondary school and the expansion of Dean Trust Ardwick.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- The geographical spread of schools, particularly the number of high schools in the West Didsbury and Chorlton area;
- The importance of taking into account future housing development when planning for school places;
- Whether maintained schools could still voluntarily convert to academies;
- Whether it was appropriate for International New Arrivals with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) to initially be placed in a mainstream school while they were assessed; and
- The challenge for small schools expanding from one-form entry to two- or three-form entry.

The Director of Education reported that the Council wanted to have a good geographical spread of schools across the city but that it was challenging to identify suitable, available land across the city to build new schools, particularly high schools. She reported that her service worked with housing colleagues to understand future housing development and that this had been factored into the plans outlined in the report. She confirmed that maintained schools could still opt to become academies but that fewer schools were now choosing to do so. She advised that it was not always clear what level of assessment International New Arrivals with SEND had had and that sometimes once they were placed in a mainstream school, had had their needs assessed and had settled in this was the right setting for them; however, she advised that officers were reviewing arrangements for how best to quickly settle this group of children and get an understanding what their needs were. She acknowledged that it was a challenge for small schools to expand to two- or three-form entry but advised that the Council was able to offer them support through this.

In a response to a Member's question, the Head of Access advised that she would provide him with data on the number of school appeals and how many were successful.

Decisions

1. To record the Committee's opposition to the proposed closure of Newall Green High School and to endorse the letter which the Executive Member for Children and Schools has sent to the Regional Schools Commissioner
2. To endorse the recommendations to the Executive that they:
 1. Note the data relating to September 2019 admissions;

2. Note the pupil forecasts submitted to the Department for Education (DfE) during summer 2019;
3. Support the principle that Basic Need funding is used to fund the new high school and contribute towards the development of the city centre school;
4. Agree that the Council undertakes consultation to gather views on the plans to develop a new primary school in the city centre and a new secondary school in east Manchester as a first step towards identifying a provider for the new school; and
5. Delegate responsibility to the Director of Education in consultation with the Executive Member for Children's Services to:
 - progress the publication of a specification for each new school and invitations to sponsor based on the outcomes of the consultation.
 - Identify a preferred sponsor for each school to be recommended to the DfE.

CYP/20/13 Overview Report

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit was submitted. The overview report contained key decisions within the Committee's remit, responses to previous recommendations and the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to approve.

A Member requested a response to the previous recommendation that further information be provided on the number of siblings who had been allocated places at different schools. The Head of Access confirmed that she would provide this.

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme.

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 4 March 2020

Present:

Councillor Stone – in the Chair
Councillors Sameem Ali, Alijah, Cooley, Hewitson, T Judge, Kilpatrick, Lovecy, McHale, Madeleine Monaghan, Reeves, Reid, Sadler and Wilson

Co-opted Voting Members:

Ms Z Derraz, Parent Governor Representative
Ms S Barnwell, Parent Governor Representative
Mrs J Miles, Diocese of Salford Representative

Co-opted Non Voting Members:

Mr L Duffy, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

Also present:

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools
Darren Parsonage, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC)
Katy Calvin-Thomas, Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO)
Nicola Marsden, MLCO
Karen Fishwick, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust

Apologies:

Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative
Ms J Fleet, Primary Sector Teacher Representative

CYP/20/14 Minutes

The Chair expressed his disappointment that the Department for Education (DfE) had agreed to the closure of Newall Green High School, noting that the Committee had opposed this. The Executive Member for Children and Schools reported that there had been a lot of local opposition to this and that the Council had opposed its closure. He informed Members that the Council had worked to develop an alternative proposal to save the school, including offering some additional investment, but had only received a response to its proposal after the decision had been announced. He reported that the Council was working to address the issues resulting from this decision, including finding new school places for affected pupils and looking at the pupils' transport needs. Members requested that an oral update on this be provided at the meeting of the Ofsted Subgroup on 18 March 2020 and that further information be provided at the Committee's meeting on 27 May 2020, to include how current Year 10 pupils, who would remain at the school, would be supported and the role of the academy trust in the lead up to this decision. The Chair requested that officers also keep him updated between these meetings. He advised that all Committee Members were welcome to attend the Ofsted Subgroup meeting on 18 March 2020.

Decisions

1. To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2020.
2. To request that the meeting of the Ofsted Subgroup on 18 March 2020 receive an oral update on work to address the issues arising from the decision to close Newall Green High School, including progress in finding new school places for the affected pupils.
3. To request that further information in relation to the decision to close Newall Green High School be provided to the Committee's meeting on 27 May 2020, to additionally include how current Year 10 pupils, who will remain at the school, will be supported and the role of the academy trust in the lead up to this decision.
4. To request that the Chair be kept updated between these meetings.

CYP/20/15 Annual Report on Special Educational Needs and/or Disability (SEND)

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which set out in detail the legal and strategic context in which services were delivered to children with SEND, a profile/demography of need in Manchester and an outline of the advice, support and services that were available for children and their families. In addition, the report detailed how children and their families were influencing and shaping how agencies and services worked together so that Manchester City Council and its partners continually improved the experiences and outcomes of children with SEND. It reported that investment in modern, energy efficient and high quality education infrastructure would drive reductions in carbon across the estate of schools.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Overall population with SEND;
- How parents'/carers' and children's and young people's views impacted on strategic decisions;
- The Local Offer;
- How an integrated transparent pathway allowed parents and young people to access services across education, health and social care;
- How children and young people with SEND had their needs met through excellent education, health and care services, jointly commissioned where appropriate;
- Preparing for Adulthood (PfA);
- Improved outcomes and standards across education and training; and
- The workforce.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- To recognise the good work taking place in this area;
- How parents could be assisted to obtain the right adaptations for their children;
- Transport, including travel training;
- That mainstream schools which had a reputation for providing high quality support to pupils with SEND attracted more pupils with SEND and that this could place additional budget pressures on the school, particularly where children did not yet have an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP);
- The importance of early identification of SEND;
- That some children with SEND benefited from being in a special school which had high aspirations for them but that for most children, including those with moderate learning difficulties, being in an inclusive, mainstream school was the best option; and
- Support for young people once they left school, including support for a transition to adult social care and health services.

The SEND Lead informed Members about work taking place to streamline the assessment and provision of equipment for children with mobility needs, for use both at school and in the home, and advised that officers would be able to provide further information at a future meeting as this work progressed.

The SEND Lead informed Members that approximately 35 pupils per year received travel training through a contract with the Travel Training Partnership which gave them the skills to travel to school independently and also to travel for leisure activities, which the young people found valuable. She reported that some short break providers were also being asked to help young people to develop the skills to travel independently and that schools would be offered training on how to deliver travel training to pupils with SEND, to enable more pupils to benefit from this. The Director of Education informed Members that officers were in discussions with Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) about improving transport for young people with SEND, including the issuing of concessionary passes, and that a meeting was being arranged between young people from the Changemakers group and TfGM so that the young people could raise their issues directly.

The Head of Schools Quality Assurance and Strategic SEND informed the Committee that, if a school was facing financial challenges due to a high proportion of pupils with SEND, there was a mechanism for reviewing its funding, although she advised that there had only been one school so far where it had been considered appropriate to make adjustments to the budget.

The Head of Schools Quality Assurance and Strategic SEND informed Members that information on work to identify children with SEND at the earliest stage was covered in the Early Years report which had also been submitted to the Committee. She reported that a key element of the new Inclusion Strategy was the identification of any SEND, particularly Social Emotional and Mental Health (SEMH) needs. Darren Parsonage from MHCC reported that girls tended to be better at hiding their needs, which might delay an autism diagnosis, but that the social communication pilot in south Manchester was identifying girls' needs earlier which would ensure they got the right support as soon as possible.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools highlighted the budget pressures which schools and councils were facing on a national level. He reported that the budget proposals due to be considered at the Budget Council meeting on 6 March 2020 included additional resources for the Statutory Assessment Team which dealt with EHCPs and that an additional £20 million had already been agreed to fund more special school places. The Chair advised Members that, although funding for the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant had been increased this year, this followed several years of under-funding, and that Members should continue to campaign for more funding.

A Member who was also a Parent Champion and a member of Manchester Parent Carer Forum outlined how parents of children with SEND were supporting each other and arranging activities where these were not already available in the local area. She advised the Committee that work was still ongoing and there was still room for improvement but that, as long as these issues were being discussed and parents were being included in these conversations, further progress could be made. The SEND Lead read out some comments from Jordan Navarro from Manchester Parent Carer Forum which recognised the multi-agency work taking place and the progress made so far to improve outcomes for children and young people with SEND. In his comments, he advised that there was a lot more work to be done but that he was confident that further progress would be made, working in collaboration with parents and carers.

The SEND Lead reported that the local authority and health services now had responsibility for supporting young people with SEND up to the age of 25. She informed Members that significant work was taking place with partners, including adult social services, health services and education, to improve the transition for young people who would require support into adulthood and ensure that they were able to have a good life as adults.

Decisions

1. To encourage Members to lobby the government for more funding for pupils with SEND.
2. To note that Ofsted inspection reports for special schools are being monitored through the Ofsted Subgroup.

[Samantha Barnwell declared a personal interest as a Parent Champion and a member of the steering group for the Manchester Parent Carer Forum.]

[Councillor Wilson declared a personal interest as a governor at Broad Oak Primary School.]

[Councillor Stone declared a personal interest as a governor at Manchester Secondary Pupil Referral Unit.]

CYP/20/16 Improving Children's Outcomes Through Collaboration and Working in Partnership in a Locality

The Committee received a presentation of Children's Services and Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO) which provided an update on the development of the

Children's Services Locality Model and partnership working with the MLCO.

The main points and themes within the presentation included:

- Update on the Children's Services locality programme;
- Partnership working with MLCO;
- The Smoke Free Family pilot;
- Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder and the opportunity for a future partnership pilot in relation to this; and
- Next steps.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- To welcome the presentation and the work taking place;
- Venues within the community which could be used to engage with people, including the role of Sure Start Centres and the benefits of the co-location of different services;
- The role that schools and ward co-ordination could play in this work;
- The impact of smoking on health;
- That marijuana and shisha smoking were also issues of concern, not only tobacco smoking;
- That it was important to focus on and review how successful the work was in accessing hard-to-reach groups; and
- Smoking outside of hospitals, including hospitals providing facilities for smokers.

The Strategic Head of Early Help thanked Members for their comments, stating that they would be taken into account. The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services described the three phase approach to this work, starting with work within the Council on Early Years and Early Help, then collaboration and partnerships and finally looking at leadership, governance and accountability arrangements, which he suggested the Committee might want to consider at a future meeting. He also suggested that the appropriate scrutiny committee might want to look at the licensing issues relating to shisha smoking.

Katy Calvin-Thomas from the MLCO informed the Committee that Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust was working hard to prevent smoking on its sites and to encourage and support people to stop smoking. She offered to provide further information on how the Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust was dealing with smoking around its hospital sites, to which the Chair agreed. The Executive Member for Children and Schools advised Members that he would circulate a briefing note on work that was already taking place to address smoking in pregnancy.

Katy Calvin-Thomas reported that many adult health services were co-located with social care, mental health services and the Voluntary and Community Sector and that, as many parents were users of these services, they were looking into how this could be joined up with the work relating to children and families.

Decisions

1. To request further information on how the Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust is dealing with smoking around its hospital sites and to note that the Executive Member for Children and Schools will circulate a briefing note on work that is already taking place to address smoking in pregnancy.
2. To request an update in 12 months' time on both the Smoke Free Family pilot project and how the wider work is being expanded.
3. To encourage Members to discuss these issues through their Ward Co-ordination meetings.

CYP/20/17 Early Years Service

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided an update on the strategic and operational priorities in relation to Early Years.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- LGA Early Years Peer Review;
- Overview of Early Years Quality Assurance arrangements;
- Early Outcomes Fund;
- Performance and outcomes for the Healthy Child Programme and the Early Years Delivery Model (EYDM);
- Ages and Stages (ASQ3) Results;
- Communication and Language Pathway;
- Parenting Pathway;
- Planned evaluation of the EYDM;
- Summary of key Early Years outcomes; and
- Forward plan and priorities.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- To recognise the positive outcomes from the LGA Early Years Peer Review;
- To encourage Members to attend the meetings of the Ofsted Subgroup, which considered Ofsted inspection reports for early years settings;
- Concern about children who were not receiving adequate support and whose families were not engaging with early years services; and
- That training sessions were currently being delivered on Adverse Childhood Experiences and to encourage other Committee Members to arrange to attend if they had not already done so.

The Strategic Head of Early Help advised Members that the Sure Start Centres provided both universal services and a targeted offer and that they had skilled Outreach Workers working to engage with families who were not accessing services.

She reported that a Greater Manchester project called Data Analytics aimed to identify at an earlier stage which children were not on course to be school ready and outlined the approach which would be taken to improve school readiness, advising that further information could be provided at a future meeting as this work developed.

Nicola Marsden from MLCO drew Members' attention to the improvement in the uptake of the Developmental Assessments over the previous 12 months. She reported that the number of Health Visitor vacancies had reduced from 19 to 8 since September 2019 and that additional nursery nurses and administrative resources had been employed to support this work. She advised Members that take-up of the Developmental Assessments was being improved through providing assessments in the child's home and on Saturdays, improving the quality of their data and publicising the assessments through a range of settings including Sure Start Centres and GPs' surgeries. Karen Fishwick from Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust outlined how her service identified and engaged with families whose children had not had their Developmental Assessments, including through their Missed Appointment Policy, through referrals from other health services and through outreach work.

Decision

To receive an update report in 12 months' time and to note that aspects of this work will also be monitored through other reports on the Committee's work programme.

CYP/20/18 Overview Report

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit was submitted. The overview report contained key decisions within the Committee's remit, responses to previous recommendations and the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to approve.

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme.

Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2020

Present:

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair
Councillors Azra Ali, Butt, Flanagan, Hassan, Hughes, Jeavons, Kilpatrick, Lynch, Razaq, Sadler, Whiston, White and Wright

Apologies: Councillors Appleby and Lyons

Also present:

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods
Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport
Jonny Sadler, Programme Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency
Dr Chris Jones, Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research

NESC/20/10 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2020 as a correct record.

NESC/20/11 Updated Financial Strategy and Budget Reports 2020/21

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Executive and the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update on the Council's overall financial position and set out the next steps in the budget process, including scrutiny of the budget proposals and budget report by this Committee.

In conjunction to the above, the Committee also considered the Neighbourhoods Directorate Budget Report 2020/21 that provided a further updated Neighbourhoods medium term financial plan, and budget proposals for 2020/21. The report had been updated in order to reflect feedback from the January round of scrutiny meetings on the original draft proposals.

The Committee also considered the updated Homelessness Budget 2020/21 report that had been produced to reflect feedback from Members at their meeting of 8 January 2020, the outcome of the provisional Local Government Finance Settlement and other government funding notifications. It further set out the Directorate's budget proposals and strategy for 2020/21.

The proposed 2020/21 budget would reflect the fact the Council had declared a climate emergency by making carbon reduction a key consideration in the Council's planning and budget proposals.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Information was sought on the charging policy and car parks;
- Information was sought on how the revenue collected from bus lane fines was allocated;
- Was there any intention to continue co-locating staff from the Housing Benefit Team within the Homelessness Team to assist in maximising residents' entitlement to Housing Benefit;
- A holistic approach was required between Children's' Services and the Homelessness Department to adequately fund transport arrangements to enable families and their children to continue to attend their school when placed out of area in temporary accommodation; and
- The funding arrangements from central government provided to support homeless people were not consistent and were often short term which could result in services being vulnerable.

Officers responded by advising that information on the charging policy and car parks would be provided following this meeting to Members and the revenue from bus lane fines was ring fenced.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources acknowledged the comment regarding adequately funding transport arrangements to enable families and their children to continue to attend their school when placed out of area in temporary accommodation. He stated that he would address this with officers, the Executive Member for Children and Schools and the Deputy Leader with responsibility for homelessness.

The Strategic Lead, Homelessness stated that they continued to lobby government for adequate, long term funding to support homeless people and she confirmed that the strategic vision was to use temporary accommodation within the city where possible, rather than out of area. Officers commented that the specific budget cost of temporary accommodation, whether in Manchester or out of area was approximately the same; however, they acknowledged a comment from a Member that there were additional budget costs associated with out of area placements, such as travel to school as discussed.

The Chair stated that she welcomed the work of the homelessness team to support some of the most vulnerable people across the city. She stated that the response to the issue of homelessness should be system wide, including health partners, children's and adults' services and population health. She further supported services and teams co-locating to support homeless families, such as early years' services.

Decision

The Committee recommend that their comments be submitted for consideration by the Executive at their meeting of 12 February 2020.

NESC/20/12 Climate Change

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update on progress to develop the city-wide and Council

plans to address climate change, noting that the Manchester Climate Change Partnership and Agency had developed information to support organisations in Manchester to play their full part in achieving the commitment for the city as a whole to adopt a carbon budget of 15 million tonnes of CO₂ between 2018 and 2100. This would require a year-on-year reduction of at least 13%, emissions to be halved within five years, and lead to the city becoming zero carbon by 2038 at the latest.

The Committee received a progress update on the development of the city-wide Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25, and Tyndall Centre review of targets and the draft Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan 2020-25 for consideration and comment.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Concern was expressed about the Council's scrutiny process for agreeing the proposed targets and agreeing an action plan for the City Council, in particular given the commitment to an open and transparent process. Clarification was sought as to the decision making process and the level of scrutiny;
- Reiterating the need for immediate action to reduce the city's CO₂ emissions;
- What additional resources had been allocated to support this activity following the declaration of the Climate Emergency motion;
- What contingency plans were in place to mitigate the withdrawal of European funding;
- How did Manchester compare to other cities, both nationally and internationally in its response to climate change;
- Members and residents needed to be confident that the Council was responding to the issue of climate change and taking all of the actions available to it;
- Information on what the Council had been doing to address climate change needed to be reported so progress could be measured against this;
- Concern was expressed regarding the extraction of chemicals used in LED lighting and batteries and enquired if this was ethically sourced;
- The Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan 2020-25 needed to measure carbon reduction in tonnes so as to align with the decision to adopt a carbon budget and to assist with the monitoring of progress;
- A more ambitious plan for the planting of trees needed to be implemented;
- Emissions from the aviation industry needed to be addressed;
- Planning policy should be used to promote more sustainable journeys to and from the airport; and
- The importance of engaging with young people on the issue of climate change, including using faith and other community based groups.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport responded to the question regarding the decision making process. She informed the Members that the Executive would be invited to formally adopt the science-based targets in line with the Paris Agreement and endorse the Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25 framework on behalf of the City and approve the Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan 2020-25 at their meeting of 11 March 2020.

Members recommended that the Committee have an opportunity to scrutinise the

reports that were to be considered by the Executive at their March meeting and any comments and formal recommendations that arose were to be forwarded to the Executive for consideration.

Dr Jones, Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research informed the Members that they had reported their findings to the Climate Change Subgroup in January and that based on current scientific analysis the draft recommendations and key points in regard to direct emissions were for Manchester to retain the existing 15 MtCO₂ carbon budget; to revisit carbon budgets in five years or in response to a new scientific synthesis report; focus on above 13% per annum reduction rate and meeting interim budgets; noting that delays in achieving the 13% per annum reductions would require higher reduction rates in subsequent years; noting that in relation to a date to become zero carbon, this was determined by historic emissions and the reduction rate then required in future years to stay within the 15m tonne budget i.e. the zero carbon date would change if the 13% average annual reduction target was not met; and that in relation to the potential 2030 zero carbon date, insufficient detail had been provided to enable Tyndall to analyse whether or not this was in line with the latest science.

Mr Sadler, Programme Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency stated that the draft city-wide Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25 set out how the city as a whole needed to play its full part in tackling climate change, to ensure that Manchester stayed within its carbon budget of 15 MtCO₂. He described that this strategy had been informed by the current science on climate change. He stated that this overarching strategy for the city would have bespoke action plans sat beneath them for different organisations and sectors. He stated that whilst the need to respond to climate change was recognised by partner organisations, and a range of plans and actions had been implemented, the challenge now for the city was to significantly scale up this activity over the next five years. He stated that he welcomed the opportunity to hear the comments and feedback from Members on how the Agency could best work with the Committee and Members on climate change.

Mr Sadler, Programme Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency informed the Members that Manchester was represented at the Core Cities Network and European Networks, and would continue to do so. He described that this provided an opportunity to influence and learn from other cities on this important issue. Dr Jones, Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research stated that Manchester was pioneering in regard to adopting a carbon budget for the city and other cities they were working with were looking to adopt a similar model. In regard to the issue of emissions from the aviation industry he stated that the current work being undertaken by the Tyndall Centre would develop recommendations on next steps, and likely to identify the next stage of work needed.

Mr Sadler, Programme Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency acknowledged the comment regarding the importance of engaging with young people on the issue of climate change and he made reference to the success of the Youth Climate Action Summit that had taken place 17 January 2020. He informed Members that the Manchester Climate Change Youth Board were seeking to appoint a Youth Climate Action Champion and the Manchester Climate Change Partnership were seeking to

appoint a schools' representative to join the Partnership.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer acknowledged the comment on the need for urgent action on this issue. She stated that a significant amount of work had already been implemented, including the delivery of the Civic Quarter Heat Network project and embedding low carbon and energy efficiency measures within the Council's annual maintenance programme and general estates management. In regard to funding, she described that climate change considerations were embedded into decisions and practices across the Council. She described that the Capital Strategy would focus more on prioritising investment in areas that would support delivery of the zero carbon ambitions. She said that the Council would continue to seek and lobby for additional external funding in order to escalate this activity, and to work with its partner organisations to assist with this work. She stated that consideration would be given as to how this activity could be reported.

In response to the question regarding the extraction of chemicals used in the production of LED lighting and batteries, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that a briefing note would be circulated to Members of the Committee following the meeting.

The Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships informed the Committee that Neighbourhoods Directorate were leading on the issue of climate change at a neighbourhood level for the Council, and Neighbourhood Team Officers underwent carbon literacy training during November and December 2019 and that the programme of training would continue to be rolled out, with 800 staff currently trained.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport stated that the government had failed to recognise or adequately understand the issue of climate change which was evidenced through the lack of appropriate funding and powers provided to local authorities to address this issue. She said the despite this, the Council recognising the importance of the issue and was committed to working in partnership and collaboratively with local partners to respond to the issue of climate change. She reiterated the importance of delivering improvements in emissions over the next five years. She further commented that everybody had responsibility to respond to the climate emergency.

Decisions

The Committee: -

1. Note the reports and thanked the representatives from the Manchester Climate Change Agency and Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research for attending the meeting.
2. Recommend that the Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan 2020-25 be amended to report targets in metrics of tonnes CO₂ to align with the decision to adopt a science based carbon budget and assist with measuring progress against this budget.

3. Recommend that the Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport produce quarterly progress reports to report progress against the carbon budget target.

NESC/20/13 Planning Conditions and Enforcement

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director Development that provided information requested relating to a number of planning related matters principally around the use and enforcement of planning conditions.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- Information on planning conditions;
- The approach to enforcement action, including case studies;
- The monitoring of developments, including case studies;
- Data on the number of complaints investigated by the compliance team in the last 5 years;
- Conditions involving trees and open space, including case studies;
- Information on the number of complaints received specifically in relation to trees;
- Information on how the Planning Service worked with the Highway Authority and Social Providers; and
- A summary of the legal framework within which the planning system must operate.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Information was sought in regard to who complaints, especially relating to construction should be directed to;
- Noting the low number of complaints relating to trees and commenting that these were relatively low;
- Further information was requested in relation to the work undertaken with housing providers and the importance of keeping local Members informed of developments;
- Consideration needed to be given to the impact of developments on residents and neighbourhoods, in particular the ability to deliver neighbourhood services such as bin collection; footpath closure and appropriate signage;
- Further information was sought on enforcement and the criteria applied to the public interest test;
- Did the city receive any compensation for road closures incurred as a result of private developments;
- What was the response to developers not complying with, or requesting removal of conditions, particularly in regarding to landscaping and green space;
- Members stated that information relating to planning being available in conservation areas, including providing information to local estate agents.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing acknowledged the comment regarding the surprisingly low number of complaints relating to trees and confirmed

that these were accurate. She stated that the Planning Department worked with social housing providers at all levels during development and acknowledged that dialogue with local Members had not always been consistent and this would be addressed.

In reference to the issue of construction, the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing stated that many applications would require a Construction Management Plan that sought to mitigate disruption in the area. She advised that a virtual team was being established with officers from across a range of services, including the Highways Department to respond to any issues or complaints that may arise.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing stated that an application to have a planning condition removed or varied would have to be submitted and due consideration given, however these applications were relatively low. She stated that if Members had specific concerns regarding conditions not being adhered to they should notify her and these would be investigated. She stated the local planning authority had powers to enforce breaches of planning control, adding that typically where formal notices were issued the compliance period is a minimum of 28 days, however each case would be considered to ensure the most appropriate and expedient action was taken to address any specific issue. In regard to the issue of the public interest test, the legal officer informed Members that there was no specific legal definition, however guidance relating to this was provided by the Crown Prosecution Service.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing stated that the local Neighbourhood Teams were proactive in local areas, including conservation areas and were a source of intelligence. She further informed Members that permission was currently being sought from the relevant Secretary of State to obtain legal powers to control the use of 'To Let' signs which were causing issues in parts of the city.

The Head of Network Management informed Members that the Council did not receive any payment by way of compensation when roads were closed when developments were being built. He described that the Highways Department worked with developers and contractors at pre application stage to understand and mitigate where possible the need for road closure, such as installing temporary traffic lights as an alternative to road closure and to ensure the sites and immediate area were safe. With reference to the comment regarding signage, he stated that this would always be asked for and if issues did arise officers would seek to address this.

Decision

The Committee recommend that the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods and the Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport work together to ensure that appropriate measures are in place to mitigate the disruption to residents and services delivered in neighbourhoods that result from building construction.

**NESC/20/14 Delivering the Our Manchester Strategy - The Executive
Member for Environment, Planning & Transport**

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Member for the Environment, Planning and Transport that provided an overview of work undertaken, and progress towards the delivery of the Council's priorities as set out in the Our Manchester strategy for those areas within the Executive Member's portfolio.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Welcoming the reported repairs to over 40,000 highway defects, cleansing of over 100,000 gullies and around 7,000 drainage repairs undertaken;
- Requesting an update on the Public Cycle Hire Scheme;
- Was the work completed on the Manchester and Salford Inner relief route (Regent Road) as reported;
- Recognising the importance of climate change, all Executive Members needed to be explicit in how they would address this through their associated portfolio;
- Ward Plans needed to address climate change and support this activity; and
- Recognising the importance of promoting walking and cycling and the need to invest in schemes and improve footpath conditions and crossings.

With regard to the Public Cycle Hire Scheme, the Executive Member for the Environment, Planning and Transport responded by stating that Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) was currently tendering this scheme, building on lessons learnt and it was expected that the approved scheme would be launched later this year.

She reported that there was a snag list relating to the Manchester and Salford Inner relief route (Regent Road) works following completion of the major works that were currently being addressed by the contractor.

In respect of ward plans, the Executive Member for the Environment, Planning and Transport stated that some wards were further developed and detailed in relation to climate change and she would encourage Members to share good practice to build on this. She further confirmed that all Executive Members recognised the importance of climate change and did work together, across their remits to address this.

In regard to improving walking and cycling the Executive Member for the Environment, Planning and Transport acknowledged the importance of this. She stated that the city was committed to improving this and said that she was working with colleagues in TfGM to access the Greater Manchester Mayor's Cycling and Walking Challenge Fund to support this. She further commented that the introduction and development of the Bee Network would further support alternative methods of transport and influence behaviour change. She stated that as this progressed local Members would be kept informed.

Decision

To note the report.

NESC/20/15 Delivering the Our Manchester Strategy - The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods that provided an overview of work undertaken, and progress towards the delivery of the Council's priorities as set out in the Our Manchester strategy for those areas within the Executive Member's portfolio.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Recognising improvements in the number incidents of flytipping;
- Were officers working in Neighbourhood Teams engaged with the climate change agenda; and
- Welcoming improvement in recycling rates and how this could continue to improve.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods informed the Committee that he regularly visited and met with staff working within Neighbourhood Teams and he confirmed that they were all passionate and committed to engaging and working with local communities to support climate change.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods further commented at least one of the grants available to each ward through the Neighbourhood Investment Funds each year should be used to deliver a climate change themed project.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods welcomed the comment from the Member who described that he had witnessed a reduction in flytipping, however stated this would continue to be closely monitored and action taken against any person responsible for this. In response to a request for further detail on how the additional investment had been used to address flytipping in the city, he referred Members to the waste report that had been considered by the Committee at their meeting of 9 October 2019 and the compliance and enforcement report submitted to the meeting of 4 December 2019.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods commented that improvements in recycling rates continued to improve and work to build in this this continued, noting that the introduction of new communal container bins should support this activity. He further commented that all planning application were required to provide an appropriate waste management plan. He further recognised the importance of engaging with schools and young people around the issues of climate change and recycling to influence long term behaviour change.

Decision

To note the report.

NESC/20/16 Overview Report

The report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

A Member requested that both the Chair and the Deputy Chair of the Licensing Committee be invited to attend the March meeting during consideration of the item on Taxi Licensing. The Scrutiny Support Officer confirmed that an invitation on behalf of the Committee would be sent.

Decision

The Committee notes the report and approves the work programme.

Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 4 March 2020

Present:

Councillor Appleby – in the Chair
Councillors Azra Ali, Butt, Hassan, Hughes, Jeavons, Kilpatrick, Lynch, Lyons, Razaq, Sadler, Whiston, White and Wright

Apologies: Councillor Igbon

Also present:

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods
Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport
Councillor Richards, Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration
Councillor Sheikh, Assistant Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport
Councillor Grimshaw, Deputy Chair of the Licensing Committee
Councillor Midgley, Assistant Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration
Jonny Sadler, Programme Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency
Mike Simpson, Head of Growth, One Manchester
Judy Noah, Head of Development, One Manchester

NESC/20/17 Appointment of a Chair

In the absence of Councillor Igbon, a nomination was sought for the Chair of the meeting. Councillor Appleby was nominated and seconded.

Decision

To appoint Councillor Appleby as Chair of this meeting.

NESC/20/18 Minutes

Decisions

1. To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2020 as a correct record.
2. To receive the minutes of the Climate Change Subgroup meeting of the 23 January 2020.

NESC/20/19 Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that described that in November 2018, the Council's Executive had agreed to establish a science-based carbon reduction target for Manchester, which required

the city as a whole to adopt a carbon budget of 15 million tonnes of CO₂ between 2018 and 2100. This would require a year-on-year reduction of at least 13%, emissions to be halved within five years, and lead to the city becoming zero carbon by 2038 at the latest.

In March 2019 the Council's Executive endorsed the Manchester Zero Carbon Framework 2020-38, as the city's outline approach to meeting its targets, as proposed by the Manchester Climate Change Partnership.

The Programme Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- Introducing the Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25, Our strategy towards making Manchester a thriving, zero carbon, climate resilient city;
- Describing the key principles and approach to developing the framework;
- Noting that the Framework included ambitions regarding aviation CO₂ emissions and indirect emissions;
- Describing the four objectives that need to be met by 2025;
- Describing the Our Vision for 2025;
- Noting the consequence if the objectives were not met in 2020-25;
- Detailing the urgent actions to be taken to meet our commitments;
- An overview of the governance and partnership arrangements;
- Describing how progress was to be measured and reported;
- Information on how the framework would be reviewed to ensure it was current and up to date;
- Information on how Manchester would work with other cities; and
- A summary of the action plans to be taken by the Manchester Climate Change Partnership during 2020-25.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Welcoming the Framework and noting that it was every citizens' responsibility, both locally, nationally and internationally to take actions to address climate change;
- Welcoming the inclusion of aviation CO₂ emissions and requesting an update on the Agency's discussions with Manchester Airport in due course;
- Welcoming recent announcements regarding the introduction of green buses in Manchester;
- Calling upon the Government to recognise the importance of the climate emergency and fund local authorities appropriately to respond to the issue;
- Noting that the Government had failed to respond to the Clean Air Plan submission;
- In regard to new builds, consideration needed to be given to sourcing local materials; and
- Welcoming the partnership approach and what was being done to engage with other sectors to build upon this model.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport stated that Manchester would continue to work with Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) to

deliver cleaner, carbon free public transport. She stated that the Clean Air Plan had been submitted to the Government over ten months ago, however no response had been received to date. She described that despite this, Manchester would continue to work with partners to understand and deliver this important work and reiterated the call for appropriate funding from Government to scale up this activity.

The Programme Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency addressed the comments regarding sourcing local materials by commenting that this needed to be considered in the context of understanding and mitigating indirect emissions. He described that developers were beginning to recognise and respond to the climate emergency, noting that Bruntwood who own, let and manage buildings, workspace and science facilities were members of the Manchester Climate Change Partnership. He further made reference to the UK Green Building Council that was established to radically improve the sustainability of the built environment, by transforming the way it was planned, designed, constructed, maintained and operated.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport commented that the Council would seek to influence building developments by using Planning Policy to raise the environmental standards of new builds and commented that a report was to be considered by the Executive at their meeting of 11 March 2020 that provided a context to how planning would support the Councils ambitions on climate change.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer informed the Members that climate change would be considered in all decisions taken by the Council and would be central to the Local Plan refresh.

The Programme Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency stated that the Partnership would continue to engage with the Airport regarding aviation CO₂ emissions and an update on this would be provided to the Committee at an appropriate time. He further stated that the Partnership would continue to engage with other sectors and key organisations across this city to promote and escalate this work.

Decisions

The Committee;

1. Note of the Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25
2. Endorse the recommendations that Executive:
 1. Formally adopt the Manchester Climate Change Framework's aim, vision, objectives and targets as the definition of what Manchester needs to achieve in order to 'play its full part in limiting the impacts of climate change';
 2. On behalf of the city, endorse the Manchester Climate Change Framework as Manchester's high-level strategy for achieving the aim, vision, objectives and targets; and
 3. Deliver the Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan for the

period 2020-25 in order to contribute towards the successful implementation of the citywide Framework.

**NESC/20/20 Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan
2020-25**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that described the actions which would achieve a 50% reduction in the Council's direct CO₂ emissions between 2020 and 2025, as well as the enabling and influencing actions which will support the city's zero carbon ambitions.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- The Plan made a number of specific commitments;
- A summary of the estimated savings which would need to be achieved over the next 5 years;
- The different roles the Council had including enabling and influencing, reducing direct emissions and reducing indirect emissions;
- Noting that additional revenue and capital funding had been identified to respond to the 10 July 2019 Climate Emergency Declaration and to deliver the Plan;
- Presenting the table of actions;
- A summary of climate change research and insight;
- A summary of the second Youth Climate Action Summit that took place on the 17 January 2020; and
- A Summary of policy and funding asks of Greater Manchester and government.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport commented that following feedback from the Committee, the plan had been updated to include saving metrics in tonnes, a quarterly update against the actions would be produced and an annual carbon savings report would be produced. She further thanked Members and Officers for their work in bringing this plan together.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Noting the risk to future European funding arrangements;
- Local events and meetings on the issue of climate change should be organised across all wards to engage with local residents;
- Welcoming the Plan as presented and noting the inclusion of metrics in tonnes;
- Further information was sought on the Phase 2 Carbon Reduction Plan for the Council's operational estate;
- What was being done to understand the condition of housing stock within the Private Rented Sector;
- The approach to planting new trees; and
- Had there been a skills audit undertaken to ensure the correct work force was available or trained to deliver this agenda.

In response to the comments expressed regarding future European funding arrangements the Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships informed the Committee that confirmation was still required regarding future access to Horizon 2020 funding. He described that work continued with other Core Cities and Euro cities to understand the options for future funding streams to support this activity. In response to the other comments he stated that the Private Rented Sector was a diverse housing sector and the proposed stock condition survey was proposed to provide a better understanding of this sector. In response to the issue of trees, he stated that the challenge would be to accurately record the numbers of new trees planted, especially if they were planted on private land. He further commented that the Council had a Tree Action Plan and that a Tree Opportunity Mapping assessment would inform the planting to ensure that the appropriate species of trees were planted.

The Head of Corporate Estate and Facilities provided an overview of the anticipated activities relating to Phase 2 of the actions to reduce CO₂ emissions from the Council's operational estate by a further 50% reduction between 2025 and 2030. He informed Members that they would be kept informed of this work as this developed.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer described that there were many positive examples of resident engagement around the issue of climate change and ward plans would incorporate climate change actions.

In response to the question regarding a skills audit across the city to deliver the climate change agenda, the Chair informed the Committee that the Economy Scrutiny Committee had considered this item at a recent meeting and requested that the Scrutiny Support Officer circulate those reports to the Members for information. The Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships stated that the Work and Skills Board oversaw this activity and that a 'Skills for a Zero Carbon Economy' subgroup had been established.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport reiterated the importance of delivering actions and reducing emissions in the next five years. She stated Manchester had developed an ambitious, informed and visionary plan for the next five years to respond to the climate emergency. She stated that the government had failed to respond adequately to the climate emergency and she called upon the government to establish a dedicated Climate Emergency Budget to support Manchester and other local authorities to respond to climate change.

The Chair advised that updates on the Action Plan would continue to be received by the Committee and the Climate Change Subgroup would continue to monitor specific aspects of the action plan in further detail.

Decisions

The Committee;

1. Note of the Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan 2020-25.
2. Endorse the recommendations that Executive:

1. Adopt the Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan 2020-25.
2. Delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport, to update and amend the action plan as necessary. Future editions of the action plan to be reported to the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee and published on the Council's website at: www.manchester.gov.uk/zerocarbon

NESC/20/21 Taxi Licensing and Work across Greater Manchester

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) that provided the Committee with information on the work undertaken in Manchester and across Greater Manchester (GM) to improve standards across Private Hire Taxis.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- Providing contextual and background information with key information regarding current issues affecting the regulation of Taxis and Private Hire Licences in the City;
- Manchester's processes and standards;
- Information on the GM Minimum Licensing Standards;
- The approach to improving Clean Air through vehicle emissions standards and the Clean Taxi Fund; and
- How Manchester was working with GM colleagues and the trades to meet the challenges and strive to improve standards.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Supporting the intention for all GM standards to be raised to match that of Manchester;
- What was the anticipated timescale for introducing a standard policy across GM;
- Noting that the Manchester standards were designed to protect public safety;
- Supported the call for a reform of national legislation to improve standards nationally;
- What was the rationale for the different age limits for hackney vehicles compared to private hire vehicles and what funding was available for vehicle scrappage schemes;
- The compliance team needed to focus their attention on areas around the airport following complaints of antisocial behaviour by non-Manchester licensed private hire drivers;
- Were there delays in issuing licenses due to DBS (Disclosure and Barring Service) checks;
- Had consideration been given to using accredited garages as test centres for vehicles;

- Could conditions be introduced to address vehicle idling.

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that she was aware of the issues regarding drivers' behaviour around the airport area articulated by the local ward Member. She advised that she would continue to liaise with the local Neighbourhood Teams to seek to address the issues described. She stated that she would encourage residents observing any anti social behaviour to report the details to the home licensing authority as Manchester could not enforce against drivers from out of the area. The Chair asked if consideration could be given to having enforcement officers visible to deter drivers as residents may not feel comfortable in tackling drivers.

The Deputy Chair of the Licensing Committee stated that he would speak with the Members outside of the meeting to discuss specific concerns.

The Licensing Unit Manager informed the Members that a consultation exercise on the proposals to standardise the conditions across GM would be undertaken in June 2020 and this would include proposals to address vehicle idling. She stated that Executive Members and lead officers across GM were in support of the proposals to raise standards, however a change in government policy was required to raise standards nationally. She further advised that DBS checks usually took between two and three weeks to be returned, but on occasion these could take longer and informed the Committee that this process was not in the control of the Council. In regard to vehicle testing centres and using alternative accredited garages she advised that the in-house facility was satisfactory and there were no delays in offering retests. She advised that the tests provided by the in-house offer was of a higher standard to the MOT test and enabled the monitoring of the quality and consistency of the testing to be undertaken. In response to a question regarding the decision taken in London to suspend UBER's licence, she advised that this situation was continuously reviewed in Manchester.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods stated the difference in the vehicle age criteria was in recognition that Private Hire Vehicles were on the road for longer periods and Hackney Carriage vehicles were approximately five times more expensive than a Private Hire vehicle. He further commented that Manchester was still awaiting a response from Government regarding the proposals to fund a clean taxi scheme.

Decision

To note the report.

NESC/20/22 Private Rented Sector Strategy 2020-2025

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director Growth and Development) that provided the committee with a progress update on the Market Rental Strategy and sets out the key themes for a draft Private Rented Sector (PRS) strategy for the city.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- Providing a background and context of the private rented sector, both nationally and locally;
- An overview of the interventions delivered via the Market Rental Strategy 2015-20;
- Information on the approach to reviewing the strategy, including feedback from both renters and landlords;
- An overview of the Private Rented Sector Strategy 2020-2025, noting that the refreshed strategy would continue to focus on the areas that were most challenging, targeting resources to improve housing outcomes for some of our most vulnerable residents;
- The approach to short term lettings;
- Information on a range of Greater Manchester (GM) Initiatives;
- Strategic themes;
- The approach to delivering zero carbon and retrofitting properties;
- The approach to fire safety; and
- Next steps.

To supplement the report, the Committee received a presentation that further described the activities listed above. It further provided information on the place-based partnership work with Registered Providers and the One Manchester intervention rationale, that included using Affordable Housing Programme grant to acquire further homes from the private sector for refurbishment at an affordable rent (at Local Housing Allowance levels) and shared ownership options.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Had there been any update following the Government's consultation on the use of Section 21 notices (Notice to Quit);
- Supporting the work to address empty properties;
- What work was being done to address short term lets;
- What was the approach to signposting tenants to obtain advice and information on their rights;
- How many improvement or compliance notices had been issued to private landlords outside of the designated Selective Licensing areas; and
- What training was offered to private landlords.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration stated that despite reference being made to Section 21s in the Queen's speech, to date no further details had been made known and she was not confident that the Government had any intention to protect tenants in the PRS from unfair evictions. She further advised that work was ongoing with the Communications Team to promote sources of advice and information for tenants in the PRS.

The Interim Director for Housing and Residential Growth informed the Members that the Private Rented Sector Strategy 2020-2025 would seek to address the issue of empty properties and short term lets.

The Neighbourhood Manager, Environmental Health, Trading Standards and Housing stated that training had been delivered to landlords, that included information on property standards and the intention was to develop and deliver this training further. In response to the specific question regarding the number of notices issued outside of designated Selective Licensing areas, she stated this information would be circulated following the meeting.

Decision

To note the report.

NESC/20/23 Update on Selective Licensing Schemes

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) that provided a review of the four Selective Licensing schemes, commenting on their effectiveness to date and made a recommendation to consider further schemes.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- Providing an overview of selective licensing, the legislative framework and the criteria used for introducing these in locations;
- Progress to date across all four Selective Licensing schemes in Manchester;
- Information on enforcement activity, including those issued to address poor property conditions;
- Analysis of the impact to date to address issues such as anti social behaviour and flytipping;
- Providing case studies and feedback from residents;
- Lessons learned; and
- Considerations for further Selective Licensing Schemes.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Recognising the improvements that had been achieved in the designated selective licensing areas;
- Was there enough capacity with the teams to undertake inspections and engage with landlords;
- When would Selective Licensing be introduced in other areas of the city; and
- Was the register of licensed properties publicly available, similar to that of the Houses in Multiple Occupation register.

The Neighbourhood Manager, Environmental Health, Trading Standards and Housing informed the Committee that lessons learnt from current schemes would be used to inform any future schemes. She stated that she had no concerns regarding the delivery of enforcement work, adding that compliance inspections were a means to identify issues with properties and to then take positive action on behalf of tenants. She added that the team were always seeking opportunities to engage with private landlords to raise standards within the PRS. She further stated that the register of licensed properties was publicly available.

The Head of Community Safety, Compliance and Enforcement explained that currently legislation allowed for 20% of privately rented homes in the local authority to be subject to Selective Licensing. She said that consideration could be given to further schemes beyond the next phase as long as this was kept within the 20% limit and would welcome Members comments and local knowledge on future proposed schemes. Adding that as part of the formal process, any proposed new areas would be subject to public consultation.

Decisions

To note the report.

NESC/20/24 Overview Report

The report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme. The Chair commented that Members would be holding a Work Programming session in May to inform the Committee's work programme for the new municipal year.

Decision

The Committee notes the report and approves the work programme, subject to the above comments.

Economy Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 6 February 2020

Present: Councillor H Priest (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors: Abdullatif, Hacking, Johns, Noor, Raikes, Shilton Godwin and Stanton

Apologies: Councillor Green and K Simcock

Also present: Councillors: Leese and Richards

ESC/20/7 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on the 5 December 2019 as a correct record.

ESC/20/8 Minutes of the District Centres Sub Group

Decision

To receive the minutes of the meeting held on the 28 November 2019 as a correct record.

ESC/20/9 The Council's Updated Financial Strategy and Budget reports 2020/21

Further to Minute ESC/20/02, the Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which provided a further update on the Council's financial position and set out the next steps in the budget process.

In conjunction to the above, the Committee also received the Growth and Development medium term financial plan (MTFP) and budget proposals for 2020/21.

The Committee was invited to consider and make recommendations on the budget proposals which were within the remit of the Committee prior to their submission to the Executive on 12 February 2020.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Members welcomed that additional investment in district markets had been allocated within the updated budget proposals;
- There was a lack of information within the budget proposals around equality, diversity and inclusion and an assurance was sought that this would be an area of focus; and
- Further information was asked for in relation to the additional income stream that the installation of solar panels on Northwards properties generated for the Council.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) clarified that as part of the suite of reports that were being submitted to the Executive, there would be a separate report analysing the Equality Impact Assessment of the 2020/21 budget across the whole Council

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration advised that further work was being done to look at Northwards housing in terms of zero carbon ambitions and part of this was around energy supply into the properties and the energy usage. Due to the success of the previous installation of the solar panels, this would be considered more broadly across the Council's housing stock. She added however, that in addressing zero carbon with, initial assessments for the retrofitting of Northwards properties would cost in excess of £200m to carry out the works. She advised that further work would need to be undertaken to understand how this cost could be absorbed but commented that fundamentally a commitment had been made to look at the retrofitting of this housing stock.

The Leader advised that in terms of non-council housing stock, in the first instance making it zero carbon or recusing carbon emissions would have a cost rather than an income. He advised that this was highlighted in the Manchester Climate Change Update report which was going to the Executive on 12 February and had also been considered at Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee on Wednesday 5 February.

Decision

The Committee recommends that their comments be submitted for consideration by the Executive at their meeting on 12 February 2020

ESC/20/10 Delivering the Our Manchester Strategy - Update from the Leader

The Committee considered the report of the Leader of the Council, which provided an overview of work undertaken and progress towards the delivery of the Council's priorities, as set out in the Our Manchester strategy, for those areas within his portfolio.

The Chair invited Dr Marc Hudson from Climate Emergency Manchester to speak. He welcomed that the Council had declared a climate emergency and outlined the role of his organisation, highlighting that they set up a petition to establish a seventh scrutiny committee to specifically look at addressing climate change and a call for the Council to examine other sources of funding, including the use of strategic reserves. He commented that having submitted a Freedom of Information request, it had been highlighted that there had been limited speeches on climate change to Manchester residents from the Leader, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport or the Chief Executive since the Council had passed the Climate Emergency motion in July 2019, and urged that more attention was given to this by local politicians and senior council officials.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions within the Leaders report were:-

- Was there any further anticipated funding from government to mitigate the impact of Brexit in Manchester;
- Was there any serious prospect of an alternative construction for HS2 to accelerate the construction between Birmingham and Manchester;
- Was there any update on the future of Trans Pennine Express rail service;
- Was there any update on the alternative proposals for Piccadilly train station, given that neither of the two current options were future proof;
- Connected to the above, was there any further update on the future of, Platforms 15 and 16 at Piccadilly Station
- Further information was requested on the multi-agency approach to improving the work and life prospects of the 25% of 50 – 67 year olds in receipt of out-of-work benefits;
- Was there any indication of what the Shared Prosperity Fund would look like and where possible shortfalls in funding might be with lack of access to European funding streams; and
- Was there any update on the approval of the Greater Manchester Industrial Strategy by the newly formed Government.

The Leader advised that at the present moment, it was not expected that government would provide any further funding to Manchester to mitigate the impact of Brexit. In terms of the construction of HS2 between Birmingham and Manchester, GM was proposing an alternative timetable, adding that Government had already indicated that they wanted to accelerate the timetable of the construction of Northern Powerhouse Rail by 2035. In relation to Trans Pennine Express (TPE) rail service, they were the 5th worst performing rail franchise in the country and the likelihood in the short term was that they would likely need to reduce the number of services operating due to the failure to undertake work at Manchester Oxford Road and Piccadilly Station. TPE attended and were held to account at the GM Mayors Transport Board which met quarterly and the work to improve the performance of TPE was considered at each meeting.

The Committee was advised that in relation to HS2 and the future of Piccadilly station, work had been commissioned to look at the exiting proposals for the station which had resulted in an alternative option being put forward to deliver a solution that would suitable accommodate both HS2 and Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) – a single station, consisting of six platform pointing towards Leeds as opposed Stockport. This alternative had attracted government's interest and a peer review was currently being undertaken. This in turn meant that should the new proposal be successful, all existing HS2 and NPR plans that had been considered through Scrutiny and the Executive would need to be remodelled. In terms of platforms 15 and 16, The Combined Authority was preparing a GM Infrastructure Plan which would cover a wide remit and encompass a review of the Castlefield corridor as well as the future of platforms 15 and 16 at Piccadilly station.

The work with over 50's was effectively taking the working well approach and increasing the number of people put through this approach and although the ambition was to get as many people of working age into work, it was also about improving peoples quality of life.

It was anticipated that announcement around the Shared Prosperity Fund would be made around the time of the budget, bearing mind European Regional Development Funding was still being applied for. Clearly what Manchester was asking for was that the quantum should be equivalent to what was previously received through European funding plus match funding and continued to be devolved.

Furthermore, in relation to the GM Industrial Strategy, the Leader reported that it was anticipated that the newly formed Government would continue to support the GM Industrial Strategy.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

ESC/20/11 Delivering the Our Manchester Strategy - Update from the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration, which provided an overview of work undertaken and progress towards the delivery of the Council's priorities, as set out in the Our Manchester strategy, for those areas within her portfolio.

The Chair invited Dr Marc Hudson from Climate Emergency Manchester to speak. He welcomed the fact that Northwards Housing had achieved Platinum level for Carbon Literacy amongst their staff and that One Manchester had converted a block of maisonettes to meet the PassivHaus standard as well as deliver new build PassivHaus homes. He commented that it would be good to know when conversations around winning hearts and minds would become Council policy.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- More information was requested on the role of Manchester Housing Providers Partnership and how this information could be shared with all Councillors;
- What were the number of affordable homes that had already been built;
- How many illegal evictions had been addressed;
- More information was requested on the work being done to tackle short term lettings;
- Could an update be provided on the Landlord licensing pilot;
- There was concern around the number of HMO's issued with hazard letters and the enforcement notices served for serious disrepair;
- What was the time scale for the drop in session in connection to Project 500; and
- Had the initial stages of the Northwards Housing review commenced.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration advised that the feedback from the first meeting of the Manchester Housing Providers Partnership had been positive and useful. Going forward it was planned that these meetings would take place on a quarterly basis and will take a steer from Members in terms of theming these meetings in order to address some of the persistent issues that Members are facing in their wards. In terms of the work associated with Winning Hearts and

Minds, this was conversations taking place with the Council's social landlords and was centred around delivering a consistent message around individual responsibilities associated to climate change and the small changes that individuals could make to make a difference.

The Committee was advised that land and resources for over 50% of the Council's affordable housing target had been identified and consultation with Ward Members would be undertaken in regards to specific sites.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration reported that there had been success in relation to the work around addressing section 21 evictions and the work of the compliance and enforcement team, which had focussed around improving standards of accommodation for residents. In terms of short term lets, a task group had been brought together from across the Council to manage the neighbourhood impact of such let, however, it was commented that a steer from Government was really required, akin to Scotland, in order to provide the powers necessary in Manchester to address the problems associated with such types of lettings.

The Committee was also advised that in terms of Landlord licensing, it was the Executive member's ambition to extend this scheme beyond the current four pilots to an additional four areas. Feedback so far from the pilots has been positive, highlighting that by having a very targeted approach, there was the ability to make a real impact on areas where standards were lowest and presented the most challenges.

It was reported that the HMO licencing scheme was in the process of scaling up and it was anticipated that the impact of this would result in more enforcement action being taken against properties that did not meet the necessary standards.

Furthermore, the Committee was advised that Project 500 drop in sessions had been agreed for the end of February and the Northwards Housing review was in the process of being concluded, which would be reported back to a future meeting.

Decision

The Committee notes the update.

ESC/20/12 Overview Report

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report;
- (2) Agrees the Work Programme as submitted

ESC/20/13 Northern Gateway Strategic Business Plan

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director – Growth and Development, which provided a high level summary of the Strategic Business Plan in the Northern Gateway Joint Venture. The report also provided an update on the current position with regards to the Housing Infrastructure Fund bid submitted to Government by the Council and the proposed approach to ancillary infrastructure funding and delivery arrangements.

The Leader referred to the key points and themes within the report included:-

- It was a requirement of the Northern Gateway Joint Venture Agreement for the Development Manager (FEC) to produce a Masterplan and a Strategic Business Plan, incorporating a Financial Model, for the approval by Northern Gateway Operation Limited (OpCo) and by the respective Shareholders of OpCo (FEC and the Council);
- The purpose of the Strategic Business Plan was to set the strategic context for the Northern Gateway, based upon an overarching Financial Model and to set the parameters for the subsequent Development Area Business Plans;
- The Strategic Business Plan would be updated annually to ensure that it took account of any changes in national and local policy, market sentiment or wider economic implications and was to be used as a mechanism to monitor the progress of delivery of the Northern Gateway;
- The Plan was very ambitious, providing 15,000 homes, of which, at least 3000 would be affordable housing and also a significant amount would be social housing; and
- Overall the Plan would equate to over a quarter of the housing development expected for the city as detailed in the outline Greater Manchester Spatial Framework.

Councillor Karney, Ward Member for Harpurhey addressed the Committee, welcoming the proposals for major housing intervention, including an additional 130 new council homes in the Collyhurst area. He added that it was important that the Council was able to provide affordable homes within the schemes that were within the Strategic Business Plan which were in reach of Manchester residents who wanted to remain in the areas that they had grown up in.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Members welcomed the proposals within the Strategic Business Plan, including the provision of new homes for people who were already living in the area;
- Had any work been done to scope out the wider social benefit that would be brought about by the proposals within the Strategic Business Plan;
- Assurance was sought that the delivery of infrastructure works, including flood mitigation in the Lower Irk Valley as indicated within the report would not displace any flood water to other parts of the city;
- More information was requested on the proposals to expedite the move to a zero carbon economy including zero carbon development;
- Clarification was again sought on what the definition of affordable housing was;

- Was the tonnage of carbon emissions this Pan was likely to produce known so that plans could be made to mitigate this;
- Consideration needed to be given to how the Strategic Business Plan might impact on existing communities and how these communities could be included throughout the process of development in order to avoid issues that had occurred in other regeneration schemes across the city.

The Leader advised that a lot of engagement with residents within the area that the Strategic Business Plan covered had already taken place, so it was not anticipated that the proposals would come as a shock or a surprise to them. He added that there would only be a relatively small amount of intervention in existing housing stock and that residents whose existing home would be affected by the scheme in Collyhurst would have the benefit of seeing their new homes built before their existing home was demolished. In terms of the definition of affordability, the Leader clarified that this would be what Manchester residents could afford and as set out in the Manchester Labour Manifesto, this would equate to be no more than 30% of a household's total gross monthly income.

The Committee was advised that in relation to the wider social benefits, specifically healthier neighbourhoods, the strategic business case for a new general hospital at the North Manchester General Hospital site had been submitted and an outline business case was proposed for November 2020, with the start of development expected for 2021. He advised that this would underpin a lot of work to achieve the objectives of the Manchester Population Health Plan and Manchester Work and Skills Strategy across the whole of North Manchester, not just the Northern Gateway scheme.

In terms of achieving zero carbon, the Leader explained that this was a real challenge to the whole of the construction industry supply chain, the main challenge at present being the cost in using new materials and providing a more localised energy supply balanced against the ability to deliver the outcomes of the Strategic Business Plan.

The Head of Residential Growth also advised the Committee of the works proposed to mitigate future flood risks within the area covered by the Strategic Business Plan.

Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report;
- (2) Endorses the recommendations to the Executive, these being:-
 - (1) To note the summarised content of the Strategic Business Plan, the detail of which is appended to the Part B report on this agenda.
 - (2) To note the intention of the Development Manager to appoint a Registered Provider partner to assist with the delivery of affordable housing on JV land within the Red Bank and New Town neighbourhoods to help meet the commitment of providing 20% affordable housing within the initiative.

- (3) To note that the Northern Gateway is currently characterised by large tracts of vacant and underutilised brownfield land and that for development of any scale to be delivered, significant “place-making” infrastructure interventions will be required and consequently a strategic approach towards leveraging investment from a range of sources will be necessary, including the capture of S106 developer contributions for the purposes of place-making infrastructure.
- (4) To note the intention to explore options for the preparation of a costed “placemaking” infrastructure strategy for the Northern Gateway against which Section 106 developer contributions can be sought. Note that any such strategy would be brought before Executive as part of a full consultation exercise.
- (5) To note the current situation with regard to the funding submission of £51.6m to the Government’s Housing Infrastructure Fund and the significant potential impact of this funding on the overall viability of the initiative.
- (6) To agree to the principle of ring-fencing Capital Receipts or overage generated from the disposal of Council-owned land through the Northern Gateway Joint Venture for re-investment into supporting the delivery of the Northern Gateway SRF objectives.
- (7) To note the significant contribution that the Northern Gateway initiative can make to the City’s affordable housing delivery ambitions and the various means available to the Council such as the Housing Affordability Fund through which investment can be leveraged to deliver affordable housing at scale within this area.
- (8) To note the summary of the intended content for the production of the initial Development Area Business Plan which will focus on the delivery of up to 1,000 homes in the neighbourhoods of New Cross, Red Bank and Collyhurst and delegate authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader, Deputy Leader and the Executive Member for Finance and HR to approve the full initial Development Area Business Plan.
- (9) To note that, subject to a positive announcement from Government relating to the Housing Infrastructure Fund, a further report will be brought before Executive regarding the specific terms and conditions applicable in advance of any decision to enter into a Funding Agreement.
- (10) To note that a Social Value strategy will be developed specifically for the Northern Gateway given the value of contracts/works to be carried out and the anticipated duration of the Joint Venture Partnership.

ESC/20/14 Exclusion of Press and Public

Decision

To exclude the public during consideration of the following items which involved consideration of exempt information relating to the financial or business affairs of particular persons and public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information

ESC/20/15 Northern Gateway Strategic Business Plan (Press Excluded)

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director – Growth and Development, which set out the Northern Gateway Strategic Business Plan as prepared by the Development Manager, FEC, on behalf of the Northern Gateway Operations Limited (OpCo) joint venture company.

The report also provided detail on the scale of FEC investment to date and the level of further investment required.

The Committee asked questions to which the Leader and Officers responded.

The report would also be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 12 February 2010.

Decision

The Committee endorses the recommendations to the Executive as set out in the report, those being

- (1) To approve the Strategic Business Plan on behalf of the City Council as one of the two Shareholders in the Northern Gateway Joint Venture.
- (2) Note the financial commitments made to date by the Development Manager, FEC, since the signing of the Joint Venture legal agreements in April 2017.

Economy Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 5 March 2020

Present:

Councillor H Priest (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors Abdullatif, Green, Johns, Noor, Raikes, Shilton Godwin and Stanton

Also present:

Councillor Leese, Leader

Councillor Richards, Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration

Councillor Lovecy (Minute ESC/20/18) only

Apologies: Councillor Hacking and K Simcock

ESC/20/16 Minutes

Decisions

- (1) To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2020 as a correct record.
- (2) To receive the minutes of the District Centre Subgroup meeting of the 19 February 2020.

ESC/20/17 District Centres

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) that summarised the work of the Subgroup that had commenced their enquiry in March 2016 and presented their final recommendations.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were: -

- Welcoming the report and enquired how was this work was being shared with other local authorities;
- Noting that an evidence based approach was useful to share good practice, promote growth and stimulate activity in other areas of the city;
- Acknowledging that appropriate levels of staff resourcing remained a challenge and welcomed the comment from the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration that this would be explored further;
- Were residents engaged in the identity branding of district centres; and
- Had consideration been given to using other sources of data, other than footfall to measure activity in district centres.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration paid tribute to the Chair of the Subgroup and all of the Members who had participated in the work of the group. She also expressed her gratitude to the Institute of Place Management for the support provided to the work of the group. She acknowledged the quick wins that had been delivered in the pilot areas and noted the importance of these to engage local

stakeholders in with this work. She commented that the challenge would be in resourcing this activity going forward, however the importance of district centres to delivering the zero carbon city ambition was recognised and adequate consideration needed to be given to this when developing the Local Plan.

Dr Steve Millington endorsed the comments from the Executive Member and thanked the Members for engaging with the Institute of Place Management to deliver this work.

The Chair of the District Centres Subgroup stated that she wished to thank all of the Members and officers who had engaged with the Subgroup. She advised that the rationale for establishing the Subgroup was in recognition of the importance of district centres, both as a catalyst for economic activity and to promote and deliver a sense of place and identity for local residents, whilst recognising the changing nature of the high street. She described that an Our Manchester approach had been used to deliver this work and the group recognised the importance of partnership working.

The Chair of the District Centres Subgroup stated that it was important to ensure the basics were right, such as ensuring district centres were free of litter, pavements were maintained and signage was appropriate, stating that this would all contribute to delivering a sense of place and identity.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) informed the Committee that options were being considered for building additional capacity within the Growth & Development Directorate to deliver the ambitions described within the report. He stated that this work would be delivered in conjunction with local stakeholders, noting that this approach would also inform local branding campaigns for individual district or neighbourhood centres. Dr Millington stated that it was recommended that place branding should be informed and designed by local communities through participation and consensus, rather than being imposed and he provided an example of where this had been delivered successfully. In regard to the comment raised regarding footfall, he described that this had been used as it provided a universal measure, however other sources of data were captured and utilised.

Officers reported that they would continue to work with colleagues across Greater Manchester to promote this work and share good practice. Dr Millington stated that the Withington Project had been shared as an example of good practice with European networks and this had been well received. He advised that a conference would take place in Manchester in September 2020 that would bring together European partners and enable for the sharing of good practice.

Decisions

The Committee;

- (1) Note the report and recommendations made by the Institute of Place Management (IPM) summarised in paragraphs 3.3 to 3.5 of the report.
- (2) Whilst taking note of the need for additional staff capacity, endorse the District Centres Subgroup's recommendations set out in Section 3 with a

recommendation that the Executive be asked to endorse the policy recommendations arising from this sub group's work.

- (3) Recommend that an update report on the implementation of the recommendations is submitted to the Committee for consideration in six months' time.

ESC/20/18 High Speed North (High Speed 2 and Northern Powerhouse Rail) update

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) that provided Members with an update on High Speed 2 (HS2) and Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) following the publication of the independent review of HS2 by Douglas Oakervee and the recent announcement on HS2 by the Prime Minister on 11 February 2020.

The Leader introduced the report and added that the Prime Minister had recently announced that HS2 and NPR would be delivered in full and that a new delivery body had been established to oversee the integration of HS2 into NPR. He further stated that the terms of reference for the commission to review infrastructure had also been released and the draft report for the options for Piccadilly station would allow for an appraisal and evaluation of these, noting that the report had recommended a review of the entire rail network in and around the city. He stated this was a rapidly changing and positive development.

The Deputy Head of City Centre Growth and Regeneration stated that since the Committee report had been written, the Department for Transport had announced that they would be publishing a response to the independent review of HS2 and they were currently preparing a timetable for the delivery of the Crewe to Manchester section of Phase 2.

Councillor Lovecy, Ward Councillor for Rusholme stated that the Council position was to oppose the proposed location of Vent Shaft 4. She stated that the Committee should recommend that the Council urgently request that the Minister for Transport should publish the findings of consultation undertaken last year on the proposed location of the fourth vent shaft and autotransformer station, adding that it was her opinion that the exercise had been flawed. She further stated that the Committee should also recommend that the Minister for Transport instruct HS2 to investigate alternative sites for this vent, adding that the current location was inappropriate and there was widespread opposition to this.

The Leader stated that he supported the recommendation to urge the Minister to release the findings of the consultation. He stated that the position of the Council was to oppose the current proposed location for fourth vent shaft and said that if the preferred option for Piccadilly station was accepted the tunnel required would not be travelling along the current proposed route and the number of vent shafts required could be reviewed. He further informed the Committee that it would be himself who made any request to the Secretary of State to release the findings of the consultation exercise and it would be the Chief Executive who would submit any representations

regarding the location of vents, inclusion of social value and training to the National Infrastructure Commission.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were: -

- Supporting the comments of Councillor Lovecy;
- Seeking an assurance that Manchester would benefit from the creation of new jobs and the building of new houses;
- Following the recent decision regarding the expansion of Heathrow, consideration needed to be given to potential legal challenges to the HS2 project;
- Calling for the project to commence as soon as possible in the North, with decisions taken locally to deliver the described benefits to Manchester and the wider region;
- Recognising the importance of connectivity;
- What consideration had been given to communications and the branding of this project;
- Would social value be delivered as part of this significant investment;
- Recognising the need to train and equip residents with the necessary skills to deliver the HS2 project and the resulting benefits, such as housing construction; and
- How would any redesign of Piccadilly train station impact on Metrolink.

The Leader acknowledged the comments regarding the legal challenge to the expansion of Heathrow and described that his understanding was that the grounds for that challenge were specific to that decision making process. He described that following the decision to integrate NPR into HS2 it was likely that this work would progress in a timely manner in the North to deliver the required upgrade of the Trans Pennine line. He acknowledged the comment regarding the use of the term High Speed and stated that it had existed for ten years so it was unlikely that this would be changed and reiterated that the project would increase capacity, not was not solely focused on speed. He further supported the call for local decision making and stated that he had recommended that an additional body, in addition to the three proposed delivery bodies (Euston Station, HS2 Ltd and High Speed North including NPR) be established to consider the development of Piccadilly station and the surrounding area and this would include options for increasing Metrolink capacity at the station.

The Leader further commented that a commitment had been given by Government to deliver the Eastern leg of the project, nothing that this important as this would contribute to the delivery of an improved and connected rail network for the UK. He stated that representations would be made to the National Infrastructure Commission to ensure that the maximum social value and training and apprenticeship opportunities were delivered through this national project. Commenting further that the Manchester College in consultation with industry partners were already considering and planning for the delivery of future skills requirements and delivered a career led curriculum.

The Deputy Head of City Centre Growth and Regeneration commented that the Greater Manchester Growth Strategy had identified the number of homes and jobs that could be delivered across Greater Manchester as a benefit of the project. The

Leader added that discussion would continue be had with Government as to how the training would be delivered and maximised so people could access these new employment opportunities.

Decisions

The Committee: -

- (1) Recommend that the Chief Executive, or a nominated officer write to the National Infrastructure Commission to recommend that social value, training and apprenticeship opportunities are delivered through the establishment of the various project delivery bodies; and to request that an update on the proposals for the location of Vent Shaft 4 and the autotransformer station be provided and this to be circulated to local Members.
- (2) Recommend that the Leader write to the Secretary of State for Transport to request that the results of the public consultation exercise on the proposals for the location of Vent Shaft 4 be published.

ESC/20/19 Withington Village Draft Development Plan

This item was withdrawn

ESC/20/20 Economy Dashboard Quarter 3 2019/20

The Committee considered the Economy Dashboard for Quarter 3 2019/20.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were: -

- Welcoming the inclusion of Marmot indicators and requesting that life expectancy data at a Neighbourhood level be included;
- Recommended that comparative data and analysis against other core cities in relation to living wage activity be included;
- Noting the importance of wellbeing and these metrics should be prominent in future reporting;
- Clarification was sought on how Manchester wellbeing data was captured and recorded;
- Recommending that consideration should be given to reporting metrics as trends over time in addition to presenting snap shots of data;
- Consideration needed to be given to how the Council engaged with, and used all available levers with a range of organisations and business sectors across the city to maximise the number of residents in receipt of the Real Living Wage;
- Members may wish to consider a report on Living Hours at a future meeting of the Committee; and
- Comparisons between the outcomes for Manchester residents and other comparable European cities should be reported.

Officers acknowledged the comments from Members and stated that life expectancy data was being analysed, however expressed caution against drawing comparisons with other core cities as it was important to compare against areas with similar factors

and social dynamics. He further stated that the importance of health and wellbeing was understood and would continue to be reported against, noting the emphasis the Industrial Strategy placed on health and wellbeing. He informed the Committee of how surveys were undertaken in Manchester to capture a range of information, including wellbeing. He stated that the Council consulted with residents on a range of issues throughout the year and consideration would be given as to how this information could inform and be used when reporting against these metrics, however currently there was no specific Manchester wellbeing survey. The Leader stated that further consideration would be given to this area.

Officers reported that the format for presenting the wealth of data was constantly being reviewed to ensure it was appropriate and accessible, and further noted the comment regarding comparisons and benchmarking against European cities.

The Chair recommended that a report on the Living Wage and Living Hours would be scheduled as an item for consideration at a future meeting of the Committee. The scope of this report would be discussed with officers and scheduled for an appropriate date.

Decision

To note the report.

ESC/20/21 Overview Report

The report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

A Member recommended that consideration needed to be given to scheduling a future meeting dedicated to skills and the world of work, with the Manchester College invited and this could include contributions from young people. The Chair commented that Members would be holding a Work Programming session in May to inform the Committee's work programme for the new municipal year and this would present an opportunity to scope this and other items further.

Decision

The Committee notes the report and approves the work programme, noting the above comments and those of the Chair relating to the Living Wage and Living Hours discussed under the previous item of business.

Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2020

Present:

Councillor Hacking - In the Chair
Councillors Andrews, Chambers, Collins, M Dar, Doswell, Douglas, Evans,
Grimshaw, Hitchen and Rawson

Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader
Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources
Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure
Louise Harding, MCRactive

Apologies:

Councillors Kirkpatrick and Rawlins

CESC/20/08 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9 January 2020 as a correct record.

CESC/20/09 Review of Advice Services in Manchester - Final Report and Recommendations

The Committee received a report of the Review of Advice Services in Manchester Task and Finish Group which presented the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Review of Advice Services in Manchester Task and Finish Group. The Task and Finish Group had been established to consider the availability of advice services across the city, with a view to producing recommendations to be considered in the budget in the next financial year.

The Chair informed Members that the Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing was unable to attend the meeting for personal reasons but had provided some comments on this work. A Member proposed that this item be deferred to the 5 March meeting in order that the Executive Member could attend, to which the Chair agreed.

Decision

To defer this item to the Committee's meeting on 5 March 2020.

CESC/20/10 The Council's Updated Financial Strategy and Budget reports 2020/21

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Executive and the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which provided an update on the Council's overall financial position and set out the next steps in the budget process, including scrutiny of the budget proposals and budget report by this Committee.

In conjunction to the above, the Committee also considered the Neighbourhoods Directorate Budget Report 2020/21 which provided the final budget proposals following the contents of the provisional Local Government Settlement received late December 2019 and feedback from scrutiny committees during January 2020.

The proposed 2020/21 budget reflected the fact the Council had declared a climate emergency by making carbon reduction a key consideration in the Council's planning and budget proposals.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources outlined the national context within which the budget was being set, highlighting the significant decrease in funding to the Council since 2010.

A Member noted the statement within the update on the Council's overall financial position that, with regard to homelessness, the service had identified a potential increase in income of £1m in 2020/21 relating to Housing Benefit for temporary accommodation which would be available from Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) based on a small scale transfer of existing properties to be managed by Registered Providers (RPs) by end of March 2020 and increasing incrementally throughout 2020/21 and that this would reduce the net cost to the Council. She asked how much impact this incremental increase would have on the budget. The Head of Finance advised that he would circulate a response to this question to the Committee.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) explained that the proposal to explore the establishment of a separate wholly owned company in relation to gallery exhibitions was a way of managing tax payments and would not impact on staff.

A Member asked whether the costs of the implementation of a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) in the city centre had been factored into the community safety budget. Deputy Leader Councillor Nigel Murphy confirmed that it had but added that there would not be any additional resources for the implementation of the PSPO and its introduction was about using existing resources in the best way.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) provided an overview of the costs associated with Bereavement Services and offered to provide a breakdown of the costs, if Members were interested.

The Chair referred back to the Committee's comments when the budget had been considered at its January meeting, highlighting Members' view about the importance of funding work to address anti-social behaviour. The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) informed Members that funding for the Anti-Social Behaviour Team had been increased in 2018/19 and that this level of funding was being maintained.

Decision

To re-iterate the Committee's comments from its 9 January meeting, supporting the proposals while emphasising the importance of funding work to tackle anti-social behaviour.

CESC/20/11 Equality Impact Assessments

The Committee received a report of the City Solicitor which reviewed a selection of the Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) produced in support of the Council's business planning process for 2019/2020. It outlined the context of why the Council undertook EIAs and some of the key themes emerging from the business priority-related analyses produced in the last year. It also described changes to the Council's approach to business planning for 2020-21, and the implications for how equality impacts would be considered within the plan and how the process of producing EIAs would be managed moving forwards.

The report noted that EIAs would be produced if actions arising from the Council's Climate Change Action Plan had a disproportionate impact on certain communities. The plan would recognise that climate change would have differential impacts on communities across the city, for example in terms of poor air quality and more frequent incidences of extreme weather.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Update on 2019-20 EIA Activity;
- Refreshed approach to business planning and EIAs; and
- Strengthening the approach to EIAs.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- That an EIA had not been completed for the Peterloo Memorial and whether lessons had been learnt from the mistakes that were made in that case;
- Request for further information on the EIA process, including how officers were made aware of it and whether EIAs were monitored by the Equalities Team;
- The timing of EIAs in relation to when decisions were taken, including in the case of the proposed Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) for the city centre;
- The importance of having a framework for EIAs setting out when they should be completed and what they should include and how Members could access the EIAs;
- That levels of deprivation were not included in the EIAs; and
- That EIAs should focus on having a positive impact rather than solely on minimising the negative impact on particular groups.

The Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager acknowledged that an EIA had not been completed in relation to the Peterloo Memorial and informed the Committee that work was taking place to safeguard against similar problems in future. He advised the Committee that he would provide them with further information on this.

The Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager informed Members that EIAs were part of the Project Initiation Process for Council projects but that this practice was not always fully embedded in the process and one of the challenges for his team was to address this.

The Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager confirmed that an EIA had been produced for the city centre PSPO and was expected to be signed off before a decision was taken. He agreed that EIAs should be completed before decisions were taken and reported that his team needed to have influence across the organisation to ensure that this happened. He advised that the best practice model was to complete the EIA at the earliest stage to identify any issues and give the relevant service the opportunity to adjust the proposal so that either the final proposal did not have this disproportionate impact or, if that was not possible, so that decision-makers could take this information into account when making their decision. The City Solicitor advised that, as the Lead Officer for Equality within the Senior Management Team, it was part of her role to use her influence to ensure that this analysis was prioritised and factored into decision-making and that she expected her colleagues and peers to ensure that this was being done within their Directorates.

The Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager informed the Committee that the part of the Equality Act 2010 which would have addressed socio-economic disadvantage was never enacted and that it had previously been decided not to include it in the Council's EIAs on this basis; however, he advised that this would be given further consideration as part of the review of the EIA Framework. He advised Members that there was also an opportunity to make the process more meaningful and to engage with key stakeholders over this.

Decision

To note the report and to ask the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager to consider the comments made by Members.

CESC/20/12 Manchester Playing Pitch Strategy

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided an update on the Manchester Playing Pitch Strategy and Site Action Plan.

The report noted that delivery of priority projects identified in the Playing Pitch Strategy and Site Action Plan would contribute to achieving the zero-carbon target for the city and that projects would be subject to their individual business case and agreed funding strategy.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Background and context;
- Governance;
- Study area;
- Site Action Plan update;
- Supply and demand update;

- Short-term action plan; and
- Investment opportunities.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- Concern about playing pitches being lost, for example to new housing developments, and what was the Council doing to address this;
- Concern at the level of response from Ward Councillors to the individual ward plans they had been sent;
- Plans for increased access to outdoor floodlit tennis courts;
- Whether the planned 17 new non-turf cricket pitches would be spread across the city and to question the different pricing for Further Education (FE) Institution-affiliated clubs compared to the price charged to non-FE-affiliated young people;
- Concern that local young people were unable to access playing pitches in their area due to block bookings by clubs;
- How under-represented groups could be supported to access Sport England's Community Asset Transfer Fund; and
- That some pitches and associated facilities, such as changing rooms, were in a poor condition and that it was important to address this.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure advised the Committee that the Strategy was committed to protecting playing pitches and he offered to discuss with the Member his concerns about the future of specific playing pitches in his local area. The Member requested that the Executive Member arrange a meeting to discuss this, inviting other relevant Ward Councillors and Louise Harding from MCRactive. Louise Harding outlined the process for dealing with applications to build on land where there was a playing pitch, advising that she would be consulted and would object to the application and that, if the developer wanted to proceed, they would have to submit a mitigation for the loss of the playing field in consultation with the relevant stakeholders.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure agreed that it was important for Ward Councillors to engage with this area of work and advised that he would send another reminder to all Members to ask them to provide feedback on the plans for their ward.

Louise Harding advised the Committee that there was demand for outdoor floodlit tennis courts across the city but, at present, the Council was waiting for an investment strategy from the Lawn Tennis Association (LTA) which it could consider. She informed Members that the new cricket pitches would be located across the city and offered to provide further details of this and of the pricing structure. The Chair asked that consideration be given to how young people could be encouraged to use the facilities by removing any bureaucratic obstacles, such as needing to be FE-affiliated to receive a better rate. The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure informed Members that a range of discounts and offers, such as free swimming, were available to young people and he offered to provide further information in a future report.

Louise Harding advised the Committee that her understanding was that Manchester clubs were given priority when booking pitches but that she would speak to the operators about the booking process. She informed Members that there was capacity to support groups seeking Community Asset Transfers. The Chair commented that the Committee would be receiving a report on the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) Infrastructure Service at its next meeting and advised that he would ask that information on the support available to groups seeking a Community Asset Transfer, and whether this was included in the infrastructure contract, be included in this report.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure agreed that the condition of some pitches needed to be improved and advised that the Strategy included a focus on investing in existing provision which had not received any investment for many years. In response to a Member's question, he advised Members that Wythenshawe Park have a 10-year development plan and that plans for how to sustain the Wythenshawe Games could be incorporated into this.

Decision

To note the report.

CESC/20/13 Delivering the Our Manchester Strategy

The Committee received a report of the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure which provided an overview of work undertaken and progress towards the delivery of the Council's priorities as set out in the Our Manchester Strategy for those areas within the portfolio of the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Widening access and participation;
- Culture;
- Zero carbon and the climate emergency;
- Parks;
- Young people; and
- MCRactive.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- To thank the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure for his work;
- Questions on behalf of a member of the public regarding work to address climate change;
- Request for further information on the successful bid to the Home Office "Libraries of Sanctuary" project, including more detail on what this was, how much funding had been awarded and the timescales;
- Request for further information on the new libraries post funded by the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) which would manage a project to reduce digital exclusion in the city, including how much funding had been received, whether it was a full-time post and how long the post would be funded for; and

- What else could be done to widen access and participation in libraries, galleries, culture and leisure.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure outlined the work HOME had been doing to address climate change. The Chair recommended that the Member send the questions from the member of the public to the Executive Member for him to respond.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure reported that he would provide the Member with a response to her questions on the funding from the Home Office and the GMCA outside of the meeting.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure reported that access and participation could be increased by changing people's perceptions that some activities or events were not for them and by improving communication. He informed Members about the three online platforms which were due to be launched the following month to inform Manchester residents about cultural activities, sport and leisure activities and activities for young people that were available in the city. He advised the Committee that some of the barriers to participation included transport, socio-economic background and affordability and that these would take time to address but that there was a willingness across the sector to do this. A Member emphasised the importance of ensuring accessibility for people from all socio-economic backgrounds, including ensuring that information was not only available online. The Executive Member confirmed that information was shared using a range of methods and reported that events were being held in wards, rather than just in the city centre, to better engage with local communities.

Decision

To note the report.

CESC/20/14 Overview Report

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit was submitted. The overview report contained a list of key decisions yet to be taken within the Committee's remit, responses to previous recommendations and the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to approve.

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme.

This page is intentionally left blank

Audit Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2020

Present:

Councillor Ahmed Ali - In the Chair
Councillors Clay, Lanchbury, Stanton and Watson
Independent Co-opted members: Dr S Downs and Dr D Barker

Also Present:

Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member Finance and Human Resources
Karen Murray, Mazars
Stephen Nixon, Mazars

Apologies: Councillor Russell

AC/20/01 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2019 as a correct record.

AC/20/02 Internal Audit Assurance Report

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management that provided a summary of the audit work undertaken and opinions issued in the period April to December 2019.

The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management introduced the key themes as set out within the report. The Chair then invited questions from the Committee.

A Member sought further information regarding the current vacancies within the Audit Department. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated that two temporary staff had been appointed to cover imminent vacancies and the intention was to have implemented a full review and restructure by the end of June 2020, following the appropriate consultations. He described that this programme of work was being delivered in conjunction with Bolton Council and he envisaged that this approach, in addition to reviewing the progression opportunities for staff would make Manchester an attractive and interesting place to work that would also help assist with the recruitment and retention of staff.

A Member enquired if staff with audit responsibilities across the schools' estate were appropriately trained and competent to discharge their responsibilities. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management commented that appropriate oversight and support for this function was promoted across all schools for this critical role and advice and guidance, including lessons learnt was provided to Head Teachers. A

Member commented that a service level agreement should be introduced regarding training for school business managers to assist them and support them in the areas of activity and themes that emerged from the audit work. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated that he would raise this with colleagues in the Education Department and the Schools Group with a view to progressing this, noting that issues seemed to arise when schools deviated from agreed purchase protocols and systems.

A Member sought clarification as to who was responsible for recommendations identified for schools and if any remained outstanding, where were these reported to and monitored. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management clarified that there existed a separate schools' recommendations tracker and that they were monitored, and if areas of concern were identified these would be reported to the Executive Member for Children and Schools and if appropriate to the Audit Committee. He further stated that clarification would be sought as to whether any outstanding recommendations relating to schools needed to be included in the regular Outstanding Audit Recommendations report that was considered by the Committee.

The Head of Internal Audit and Risk commented that there was significant work required to improve Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIA) and said that work had been undertaken to reiterate the importance for officers to complete these in a timely manner and a programme of actions had been agreed, in consultation with the City Solicitor to improve this area of activity. A Member noted the importance of this as failure to carry out a DPIA when required or to consult the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) when necessary, could lead to the Council facing enforcement action with the maximum financial penalty of 10 million euros. A Member commented that any information and guidance issued to staff in relation to DPIA's should also be circulated to all Members.

In response to comments made regarding Section 106 money, the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated that the audit of this activity had taken place during a period of change to this system. He stated that the planned improvements and identified key actions should significantly enhance the arrangements in place to monitor s106 agreements. A Member commented upon the importance of the development of a database that would enable records and information to be consolidated and supported the inclusion of this as an identified key action and recommended that this activity was reported back to the Committee, in particular the reported delays in the spending and movement of monies and the indications that there may have been a number of unspent historical balances remaining on SAP. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated that a progress report would be submitted to the Committee at an appropriate time.

In response to a question from the Committee regarding her opinion on the completion of DPIAs by officers of the Council, the City Solicitor stated that as an organisation the Council was still learning about Key Decisions and DPIAs and she was of the opinion that they were not purposefully not completed. She stated that the importance of this was recognised corporately and a programme of staff training, including the development of a template for staff to use and communications was ongoing to officers across the organisation. She further reiterated the importance of retaining the right data and information for the right amount of time. She stated that to

support this the process required for staff completing DPIAs was appropriate and not too onerous for staff required to complete them and a user friendly guide had been produced and that this was continually reviewed, recognising the importance of the Group of officers who meet regularly to review and monitor this activity.

Decisions

The Committee;

1. Note the Internal Audit Assurance Progress Report to 31 December 2019.
2. Confirm and approve the proposed changes to the Internal Audit Plan 2019/20.

AC/20/03 Outstanding Audit Recommendations

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management that provided a summary of the current implementation position and arrangements for monitoring and reporting internal and external audit recommendations.

The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management introduced the key themes as set out within the report. The Chair then invited questions from the Committee.

Members sought an opinion as to whether those recommendations that were reported as being over nine months would be completed or whether the relevant Executive Member and Strategic Lead would be required to attend a future meeting of the Audit Committee to explain why they remained outstanding. A Member enquired if the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management was satisfied that the system for monitoring Outstanding Audit Recommendations was working efficiently. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management commented that the Committee had heard from the relevant officers and Executive Members in regard to the outstanding recommendations over nine months and further commented that this approach had assisted in keeping a focus and accountability on this area of work, noting that this approach had been supportive and helpful to the Audit Team.

A Member commented that whilst he welcomed the list of outstanding recommendations listed by length of time they remained outstanding, what was being done to recognise, and where appropriate prioritise new entries. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management acknowledged the comment and stated that consideration would be given to the format of the reporting and the allocation of a critical score against each entry to assist with the prioritisation of each individual recommendation.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer informed the Committee that both herself and other Senior Management Team members did assess the critical levels of each recommendation when the reports from Audit were received. She further added that whilst the ambition was always to reduce the number of outstanding recommendations, the number of these was relatively low when compared to the number of recommendations made.

A Member sought an update on the recommendations that remained outstanding in relation to the Disability Supported Accommodation Services and Transition to Adult Services. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated that an audit opinion on Disability Supported Accommodation Services would be provided at both the March and April 2020 meetings of the Committee and this would further update Members on the implementation of these. He further commented that the report would be updated and any revised target dates for the Transition to Adult Services recommendations would be included when this information was next reported to the Committee.

The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management responded to a question asked by a Member in regard to the implementation date of the Supervisions Google Form by advising that this would be checked and updated in the report for when it was next submitted to the Committee.

In response to a question asked by a Member in relation to the outstanding recommendations reported for Social Value and the associated KPIs (key performance indicators), the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management commented that a considered and robust response was received to the recommendations and he advised the Committee that a significant amount of work had been done in respect to the issues identified and he was confident that a number of the actions had been completed.

The Executive Member Finance and Human Resources addressed the Committee and stated that there were a number of measures implemented to monitor Social Value and KPIs. He described that an annual social value event was delivered each year by CLES (Centre for Local Economic Strategies) that benchmarked the authority against a range of metrics. He further described that consideration was being given to understanding and recording the wider benefits and societal outcomes of social value, including real stories and not to simply measure this activity in terms of a monetary value. He described that Manchester was pioneering the approach to social value and it was important to capture and describe the real stories and impact this approach had on the lives of residents and communities across the city. Members agreed that whilst important, social value should not simply be measured in the number of jobs and apprenticeships delivered and recognised the wider impact this approach had. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that consideration continued to be given to the governance arrangements to promote, challenge and deliver social value via the Council's procurement arrangements.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/20/04 Audit Strategy Memorandum

The Committee considered the report of the Council's external auditors Mazars that summarised their audit approach, highlighted significant audit risks and areas of key judgements and provide the Committee with the details of their audit team.

Karen Murray, Mazars introduced the key themes as set out within the report. The Chair then invited questions from the Committee.

A member of the Committee enquired if the reporting deadline of 31 July was achievable. Karen Murray described that last year there had been a challenge nationally to adhere to the deadline and it was anticipated that this would be repeated this year. She described that discussions were currently ongoing with the appropriate government minister to understand if this deadline could be extended, however Mazars continued to work to the 31 July deadline, pending any ministerial decision. She said that she would continue to liaise with the City Treasurer as these discussions progressed to ensure the correct opinion was delivered.

In response to a question regarding the IFRS 16 Leases accounting standard, Karen Murray described that work was ongoing to understand the impact of this reporting requirement. She stated that to date they as the external auditor were satisfied with the approach that was being taken by Manchester City Council to comply with this requirement to disclose this information and regular meetings with the finance team would continue to monitor this significant piece of work to comply with the relevant accounting standard.

The Chair supported a comment from a Member who described that the addition of another layer of reporting made it difficult for the lay reader to fully understand the Council's accounts and noted the additional work this represented for officers. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that the requirements to comply with the accounting were very challenging and she paid tribute to the staff who worked within the Finance Team. She described that consideration had been given to streamlining the reporting of the accounts, however to comply with the legislation and reporting standards this was very challenging and she commented that a summary of the accounts was always provided.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/20/05 The Committee's Work Programme

The Members considered the Committee's work programme. A Member requested that the meeting dates for the 2020/21 municipal year be circulated.

Decisions

The Committee;

1. Note the Work Programme.
2. Recommend that the Governance Officer circulate the meeting dates for the 2020/21 municipal year.

Audit Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2020

Present:

Councillor Ahmed Ali - In the Chair
Councillors Clay, Lanchbury, Stanton and Watson
Independent Co-opted members: Dr S Downs

Also Present:

Karen Murray, Mazars

Apologies: Dr Barker, Independent Co-opted member
Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member Finance and Human Resources

AC/20/06 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2020 as a correct record.

AC/20/07 Register of Significant Partnerships

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that presented the Register of Significant Partnerships 2019. The format, and the review and assurance process associated with the register was outlined in the report. The report focused on partnerships which had been added to the Register during 2019 and those where the governance strength rating had changed, or where the rating remained 'Medium' or 'Low' strength following completion of the latest self-assessment. The full draft Register was included as an appendix to the report.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Directorate Lead, Corporate Planning and Governance stated that a review would be undertaken of how this register was produced to strengthen the reporting and value of the document. He stated that the review would allow for consideration to be given as to the frequency of the reporting, reflect upon and identify any improvements to the reporting process. He stated that consideration would also be given as to whether an additional metric of rating could be introduced to strengthen the document and that the Committee would be kept informed as this work developed.

In response to a Members question regarding plans for when the current Strategic Director Growth and Development left his post, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that whilst not wishing to pre-empt any final decisions, the knowledge of all the partnerships and responsibilities was distributed across a number of officers within the Council.

In response to the reported rating of Medium for Manchester Health and

Care Commissioning (MHCC), the partnership between the Council and CCG to create a single health, social care and public health commissioning function for Manchester, the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform advised that work continued to progress in regard to this activity and commented upon the existing complex systems within the different organisations and the challenge this represented. However, he reassured the Committee that progress continued to be made. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated that a governance audit of MHCC had been undertaken approximately 12 months ago and progress continued to be made against those findings that had resulted in the Medium rating being awarded. The Directorate Lead, Corporate Planning and Governance directed Members to the section of the report that described the criteria applied to the awarding of the different ratings and described that these had been applied and that those ratings were reviewed by a moderation panel to ensure they were applied consistently and correctly.

In response to a Members comment regarding the importance of transition planning from Children Services to Adult Service, the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform advised Members that this was recognised and the respective services were actively working to improve transition pathways.

In response to a Members question regarding Northwards, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer informed the Committee that a review of ALMO (Arm's-length management organisations) governance arrangements was currently underway to ensure the existing arrangements were satisfactory, and the findings of this review would be reported at an appropriate time.

In response to a specific question regarding the Brunswick PFI, the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management advised the Committee that he would look into this and provide an update to the Committee at an appropriate time.

Decisions

The Committee note the report.

AC/20/08 Accounting Concepts and Policies, Critical Accounting Judgements and Key Sources of Estimation Uncertainty

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that explained the accounting concepts and policies, critical accounting judgements and key sources of estimation uncertainty that would be used in preparing the 2019/20 annual accounts. It also contained details of the new International Financial Reporting Standard (IFRS) 16 on leasing that was to be fully introduced by Local Government on 1 April 2020.

In response to a question from a member of the Committee regarding the anticipated impact on staff capacity to implement the International Financial Reporting Standard (IFRS) 16 on leasing, the Deputy City Treasurer stated that this requirement had been factored in to the teams' work planning.

Members noted the consequences of recent global events on world markets and the impact this could have on pension funds. The External Auditor acknowledged this comment and informed the Committee that consideration was being given as to how to respond to and navigate this emerging situation.

Decisions

The Committee;

1. Approve the accounting concepts and policies that will be used in completing the 2019/20 annual accounts
2. Note the critical accounting judgements made and key sources of estimation uncertainty.

AC/20/09 Annual Internal Audit Plan 2020/21

Decision

To defer consideration of this report to the next meeting of the Committee.

AC/20/10 Risk Management Strategy and Risk Register

Decision

To defer consideration of this report to the next meeting of the Committee.

AC/20/11 The Committee's Work Programme

The Members considered the Committee's work programme. A Member commented that following the decision to defer the previous two items of business to the next meeting, consideration needed to be given to the number of items of business scheduled for the next meeting. The Chair noted this comment and advised the Committee that he would discuss this with relevant officers

Decisions

The Committee note the Work Programme subject to the above comments.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 16 January 2020

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

Councillors: Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Hitchen, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeleine Monaghan Riasat, Watson and White

Also in attendance: Councillors Newman and Wheeler

PH/20/01 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications, since the agenda was issued, was circulated.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/19/02 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 19 December 2019 as a correct record.

PH/20/03 124820/FO/2019 - Land to the North East of Enterprise Way bounded by Roxholme Walk and Dentdale Walk and the Rear of Lincombe Road and Felskirk Road to the North, Manchester, M22 1PU

The committee considered a request for a site visit in view of a question raised about the proposed use of the site in relation to job creation and potential green issues.

Decision

To defer consideration of the matter to allow a site visit to be carried out by the members of the Committee.

PH/20/04 121099/FO/2018 - Land at Portugal Street East Manchester M1 2WX

The application submitted relates to the construction of two residential buildings (Use Class C3) comprising Block one (29 storeys) (224 apartments (four x one bed one person, fifty two x one bed two person, sixty four x two bed three person and one hundred and four x two bed four person) 25% one bed and 75% two bed) Block two

(twenty three storeys) (264 apartments forty four x one bed one person, forty four x one bed two person, ninety two x two bed three person and eighty four x two bed four person) (33% one bed and 67% two bed) with a linked central podium, to deliver four hundred and eighty eight units, shared amenity space, twenty seven car parking spaces, four hundred and ninety two cycle spaces, landscaping (including new public park), lighting, highways and associated works following demolition of existing buildings and structures.

The application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 19 December 2019 for a site visit which, took place prior to the meeting.

The application relates to a 0.88 hectares site bounded by Adair Street, Portugal Street East, the Piccadilly – Ashton-under-Lyne Metrolink line / Fair Street, Longacre Street and warehousing situated between Longacre Street and Heyrod Street.

The planning officer did not add anything further to the report submitted.

Councillor Wheeler addressed the Committee in his capacity as ward Councillor (Piccadilly). Reference was made to the size and cost of the proposed development (488 units) which did not include affordable housing, a social housing contribution or S106 contribution. Councillor Wheeler stated that this was unacceptable and the applicant is asked to reconsider the level of contribution.

The applicant's representative addressed the Committee on the application.

The Planning Officer reported with reference to affordable housing, the figures relating to this are provided in the report submitted and have been tested through an external independent organisation and verified by internal advisors and are consistent with other figures produced for the city centre. There is a clawback mechanism within the S106 agreement which will be retested at an agreed phase of the development process to check if there has been an uplift in incomes. The Committee was informed that the purchase of land to be used for public realm purposes had impacted on the profitability of the development and ability of the developer to contribute to affordable housing.

The Chair invited Committee members to ask questions and comments on the application.

A member referred to the planting arrangements for trees as part of the development and asked if these would involve planting on the street or in planters and what the maintenance arrangements would be. Officers were also asked what similar scale buildings were in the vicinity of the development site.

The Planning Officer reported that any planting of trees would be in the ground and not in planters. Check would need to be made on underground services before planting to prevent damage from digging and roots. The maintenance of public realm element of the development will be under the responsibility of the Portugal Street Partnership, which the Council is a stakeholder. A resident's service charge will include the maintenance cost for the public realm area and no public funding will be

used. The Committee was informed that the Oxygen building is within the vicinity of the development and is a similar height and scale (thirty-four storeys) to the proposed development.

A member referred to the allocation of three disabled parking spaces in the development of the twenty-seven spaces and asked planning officer why the allocated number was only three in view of the potential number of residents and visitors to the development that may have a disability and require a parking space.

The planning officer reported that the development is located within the city centre and is close to other sustainable transport links. The figure of three parking spaces is proportionate to the twenty-seven spaces allocated. Additional parking needs could be met off-site. Condition 26 of the application requires a parking management strategy for residents to be approved by the Council as Local Planning Authority. An additional Condition could be added to the application to increase the number of disabled parking places that would reduce the overall number of parking spaces due to the additional space required for a disabled parking space.

A member made reference to the age friendly benches in Whalley Range and commended their use within the public realm area of the development.

Decision

The Committee were Minded to Approve the application, subject to:

- A legal agreement in respect of reconciliation payment of a financial contribution towards off site affordable housing.
- The inclusion of an additional Planning Condition requiring the increase in the number of disabled parking spaces to 50% of the spaces proposed.

PH/20/05 121467/FO/2018 - Land Bounded by Adair Street, Portugal Street East, Longacre Street and Great Ancoats Street, Manchester M1 2WX

The application submitted is for the phased demolition of existing buildings including those marked within Plots A to E of the report and delivery of public realm (including hard and soft landscaping, tree planting and street furniture), including a public square, highways improvements and associated works.

The application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 19 December 2019 for a site visit which took place prior to the meeting.

The proposal relates to the land within the Portugal Street East (PSE) SRF boundary roughly bounded by Adair Street, Portugal Street East, the Piccadilly – Ashton under-Lyne Metrolink line and Longacre Street and Great Ancoats Street (0.91 hectares). The site comprises a mix of highway land and hardstanding with car parking and service areas and buildings which include a single storey building close to the junction of Norton Street and Epworth Street, a complex of buildings occupied by the GMB Group, one and two storey buildings adjacent on Heyrod Street opposite

Rammon House, Victoria Buildings on Great Ancoats Street and a two storey complex on Heyrod Street adjacent to Rammon House.

The planning officer did not add anything further to the report submitted.

The applicant's representative addressed the Committee on the application.

The Chair invited Committee members to ask questions and comments on the application.

A member referred to the application and asked for further explanation on the reference made to HS2 and the impact on the development site.

The planning officer reported that an area of the development land falls within a HS2 safeguarding zone and is identified as 'land potentially required during construction' and for provision of the Manchester Piccadilly High Speed Station multi-storey car park to the north of the new HS2 Station located at Travis Street.

Decision

The Committee approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted.

PH/20/06 125552/VO/2019 & 125553/LO/2019 - Town Hall Albert Square Manchester M2 5DB

The application was for a City Council Development restoration and refurbishment of Manchester Town Hall to facilitate its continued use as the primary civic building in Manchester, incorporating Council offices, civic spaces, Coroner's Courts and accommodation, state rooms and back-of-house support functions, together with ancillary functions, including events, visitor tours, cafe, visitor space and retail area (Sui Generis Use); works to include: revised entrance arrangements including new slopes to Albert Square and Cooper Street entrances; upgrade of catering facilities; roof works; new services, plant and equipment; installation of new building lighting; and associated works. An application for Listed Building Consent for external and internal restoration, refurbishment and alteration works to the Grade I Listed Town Hall building, together with installation of new building lighting was also submitted.

This proposal is one of two related applications that have been submitted in relation to the public realm and the Town Hall.

The works to the Town Hall is based upon eight core principles:

1. To secure the long-term future of the Town Hall, its civic role and its external setting.
2. To retain and enhance as a functioning and efficient Town Hall.
3. To restore and celebrate this significant heritage asset
4. To enhance the use of the building, as a visitor destination and increase access to Mancunians.

5. To transform users' and visitors' experiences.
6. To reduce carbon footprint and energy costs.
7. To maximise the commercial opportunities and offset costs to the public purse.
8. To deliver economic and social value for Manchester.

One of the main objectives of the Hall Project is to refurbish and restore the listed building back to its former glory and bring it back into functional civic uses.

The aim is to ensure the project has the maximum positive impact for Manchester residents and businesses and delivers a real legacy of direct and supply-chain jobs and helps those working on the project to gain skills and experience that they can build on and use throughout their careers, as well as inspiring others.

Design development has been informed by intrusive and due diligence surveys to fully understand the condition of the building and the public realm, including the condition of hard landscaping, trees and the location of utilities' routes.

The construction phase is scheduled to take place between 2019 and 2024 and would commence with works in the building and courtyard, which were granted planning permission and listed building consent in 2019.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further observations and modifications to conditions. Following this, two further representations were received. One representation referred to the closure of access to traffic and concerns about the creation of "no go" zones for lone pedestrians and cyclists in the city centre and danger to pedestrians from cyclists. The other representation referred to the Disabled Peoples Access Group concerns regarding a lack of consultation and that it only been informed recently about the proposal and would welcome an opportunity to provide views and comments on the development. In response to this the Committee was informed an access group representing various stakeholders, including disability representation and elected members, had been involved throughout the design process. The issues raised have been addressed in the application submitted.

No objectors were in attendance.

The applicant's representative addressed the Committee on the application.

The Chair invited Committee members to ask questions and comments on the application.

Members referred to the large amount of information contained within the late representations submission providing limited time for members to read and understand the document. Reference was made to the potential impact of the development on the surrounding residents and businesses and the planning officer was requested for an assurance that local consultation would continue as part of the Construction Management Plan. A member stated that council members felt left out

of the consultation process and would welcome the opportunity to visit the site to better visualise and understand what is proposed and question the Design Team.

The Planning Officer reported that there had been a number of revisions to the planning conditions which are very detailed and this had contributed the late circulation of the late representations document. The Construction Management Plan included regular scheduled meetings involving all stakeholders. The Planning Officer offered to arrange for members of the committee to visit and view the Town Hall building to provide an opportunity to speak to the Design Team on the proposals and ask questions.

A member referred to the late receipt of the late representations and stated that the committee must be confident that the decision taken on the application is made with all the information available and a good understanding of the proposals. In view of the scale and importance of the of the development it was proposed the approval of the application be subject to a condition for to a visit be arranged for committee Members within a month of making the decision for the committee to view the building and raise any concerns for the design team to implement. This was seconded.

The Director of Planning reported that it is not possible for the Committee to add a condition requiring the Committee's concerns raised as part of a visit to be implemented after making a decision to approve the application. The Committee's decision is based on the information contained within the report and the late representations submitted and officer input. The Director of Planning suggested that in view of the discussion, the committee could decide to make a visit and request that any comments or concerns are noted by the Director of Planning and reported to the Design Team.

The committee supported the request to arrange a visit for members of the committee to the Town Hall. Members also sought assurance that any comments would be relayed back to the Design Team and supported a proposal for the Director of Planning to be delegated authority, in consultation with the Chair, to record any concerns raised and to report them to the Design Team.

Decisions

1. To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the Late Representations submitted
2. That arrangements are made for members of the Planning and Highways Committee to visit the Town Hall Building and for the Director of Planning to be delegated authority, in consultation with the Chair, to record any comments and to report them to the Design Team.

(Councillor S Ali left the meeting during consideration of the application and did not return to the meeting.)

PH/20/07 124918/VO/2019 - Albert Square Manchester M2 4JW

The application was for a City Council Development for the refurbishment and expansion of Albert Square public realm, including its continued use for temporary events and activities throughout the year; works to include: the installation of a new surface water drainage scheme, removal of existing trees and replacement tree planting and soft landscaping; installation of new lighting columns, wayfinding signage and street furniture; creation of new sloped access to the Town Hall entrances; highways and servicing access works, and associated works.

This proposal is one of two related applications that have been submitted in relation to the public realm and the Town Hall.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further observations and modifications to conditions. Concern had been expressed by the Disabled Peoples Access Group and residents regarding the lack of consultation and engagement with scheme and sought reconsideration of some parts of the application. It was reported that the Design Team will continue to engage with stakeholder panels as the scheme progresses.

No objectors were in attendance.

The applicant's representative addressed the Committee on the application.

The Chair invited Committee members to ask questions and comment on the application.

A member commended the use of age friendly public benches in the public realm area of Albert Square and the siting of female statue/monument. Reference was made to the drainage arrangements and if these would help sustain the green areas proposed. Also, would safety barriers be included in the design.

The Planning Officer stated that there were no proposals to site any statues in Albert Square but the comments made would be passed to the Design Team. The drainage system had been designed to help to sustain the green area and the provide safety features to prevent access by vehicles. Conditions for this have been included in the application.

A member referred to the sustainability of business resulting from the application, arrangements for the proposed road closure, safety of pedestrians, emergency access and relocation of the taxi rank in Albert Square to Central Street and Clarence Street.

The Committee was informed that there would be a road closure process involving a separate consultation process involved. The safety of pedestrians in Albert Square has been considered involving lighting and CCTV and it will secure accreditation through Secure by Design. The relocation of the taxi rank will be for a twelve-month interim period and will then be considered as part of the review of taxi ranks in the City Centre. This will be considered by the Licensing Committee.

A member requested that a condition be added to require arrangements to be made for a visit for members of the Planning and Highways Committee to Albert Square to

allow members to visualise the proposals either through viewing the areas concerned or through drawings or digital images and for the Director of Planning to be delegated authority, in consultation with the Chair, to record any concerns raised and to report concerns to the Design Team.

A member requested explanation of the concerns received from the Guide Dogs for the Blind Association on the application. Concern was also expressed on the design features of the proposal, in particular, the combination of existing heritage features such as statues with modern designs and if this would be appropriate. Reference was also made to the height of the lighting totems and the wider consultation process that has helped to produce the final proposal.

The Planning Officer reported that the Association had raised issues regarding the vulnerability of blind people using Albert Square regarding the layout, hazards and cyclists. The Association had been invited to consultation meetings but no representatives had attended. Conditions have been included to address the concerns that were made. The heritage statues in Albert Square are listed and removing them would involve a lengthy process. The height of the lighting totems was proposed because they provide more light over the square. The Committee was informed that there has been a lengthy and broad process of consultation which has helped to inform the proposals taking in elements from across the range of responses to ensure the features are acceptable and appropriate to reflect the importance of the location.

Decisions

1. To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the Late Representations submitted:
2. That arrangements be made for a visit for members of the Planning and Highways Committee to Albert Square and for the Director of Planning to be delegated authority, in consultation with the Chair, to record any comments and to report the comments to the Design Team.

PH/20/08 124888/FO/2019 - Land Bounded by Addington Street, Marshall Street, Cross Keys Street And Chadderton Street, Manchester M4 4RJ

The application was for the erection of a six to nine storey residential building (Use Class C3) comprising eighty dwellings including nine townhouses and seventy-one apartments with resident's lounge, refuse, plant, new substation, cycle storage, an internal landscaped courtyard and improvements to the adjacent footways on Marshall Street, Chadderton Street, Addington Street and Cross Keys Street and other associated works following removal of existing car park.

The application was considered by the Planning and Highways Committee on 19 December 2020. The Committee was minded to refuse the application and requested officers bring back a report which addressed concerns relating to the affordable housing contribution. The application proposed a commuted sum of £220,000 towards offsite affordable housing. The detailed viability report submitted

with the application was independently tested on behalf of the City Council in order to ensure that it was robust and in line with current market conditions.

The planning officer did not add anything further to the report submitted.

Councillor Wheeler addressed the committee in his capacity as ward Councillor (Piccadilly) and stated that since the last meeting there had been no contact made with any ward councillors impacted by the proposal to discuss their concerns on the scheme. The Committee was requested to defer consideration until contact with ward councillors had taken place.

The applicant's representative addressed the Committee on the application.

Decision

The Committee approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted.

PH/20/09 125615/FO/2019 - Belle Vue Greyhound Stadium, Kirkmanshulme Lane, Manchester, M18 7BD

The application was for the renewal of previous planning permission 110616/FO/2015/N2 for the continuance of stock car racing for a maximum of eleven meetings per season between 1 March to 31 December (annually) for a temporary period of 4 years.

The Committee had previously approved application 62940/FU/NORTH2/01 in March 2002 for a temporary two-year period for Five Formula one and seven Regular stock car meetings to operate for two seasons subject to a number of conditions. In February 2004 a further temporary approval was granted by committee for the variation of conditions 1 and 3 of permission 062940/FU/NORTH2/01 to allow 8 stock car meetings per year including 4 Formula One events up to 31 October 2007. In February 2008, a temporary approval was granted by committee for the continuance of stock car racing for a maximum of eight meetings per season during a period from 1 March to 30 November for a temporary period of 4 years (ref: 085126/FO/2007/N2). Planning permission 097958/FO/2011/N1 related to the continuance of stock car racing for a maximum of eleven meetings per season during a period from 1 March to 31 December for a temporary period of 4 years; this application was given a temporary planning permission which expired on 1 March 2016.

A further application for the renewal of previous planning permission 097958/FO/2011/N2 for the continuance of stock car racing for a maximum of eleven meetings per season between 1 March to 31 December (annually) for a temporary period of 4 years (ref:110616/FO/2015/N2) was approved on 4 February 2016 for 4 years and will expire on 4 February 2020.

The Committee on 19 December 2019 was minded to approve residential development on this site, subject to a legal agreement for affordable housing (ref: 122160/FO/2018).

The Planning Officer reported a correction in Condition 4 that changed the closing time from 7.30pm to 9.30pm and changed the date for the May Bank Holiday from Monday 4 May 2020 to Friday 8 May 2020.

Decision

The Committee approve the application, subject to the conditions as corrected (Condition 4, below) and reasons set out in the report and the Late Representations submitted.

(Condition 4 - closing time change 7.30pm to 9.30pm and change the date of the May Bank Holiday from Monday 4 May 2020 to Friday 8 May 2020.)

PH/20/10 Confirmation of The Manchester City Council (Churchgate, Ford Lane) - Tree Preservation Order 2019

The application was for a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on 10 October 2020 and to recommend the confirmation of the Tree Preservation Order.

Decision

To instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the Tree Preservation Order at Churchgate, Ford Lane, Manchester M22 4NQ, under Section 199 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and that the Order should cover the trees as plotted on the plan attached to the report submitted.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 13 February 2020

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

Councillors: Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Hitchen, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeleine Monaghan, Watson and White

Also in attendance: Councillors Akbar, A Ali, Kilpatrick, Newman, O'Neil and Wright

PH/20/11 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications, since the agenda was issued, was circulated.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/19/12 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 19 December 2019 as a correct record.

PH/20/13 124820/FO/2019 - Land to the North East of Enterprise Way bounded by Roxholme Walk and Dentdale Walk and the Rear of Lincombe Road and Felskirk Road to the North, Manchester, M22 1PU - Woodhouse Park Ward

(Councillors Andrews and Flanagan both declared prejudicial interests in this item of business and left the meeting before it was considered)

The application related to the construction of a temporary 729 space car park, with associated access arrangements onto Enterprise Way, for a temporary period of five years. The application was deferred at the meeting of the Committee on 16 January 2020 for a site visit to be undertaken to allow members of the committee to view the site of the proposed development and surrounding area that were not available on the drawings and images included in the planning report submitted; due to the loss of employment land and the greenness of the site. The Committee undertook a site visit prior to the meeting.

The proposals are for car parking to be brought forward as an early phase of development to support the applicant's growth at existing office space at the Airport and in advance of their Headquarter offices being developed. The proposals would not result in the loss of employment land but would bring forward the site as an

earlier phase of development that is associated with a scheme granted planning permission by Committee at its meeting held in December 2018. It was explained that the proposal was not related to the operation of the airport but to the growth of a business located near to the airport.

The meeting was addressed by an objector who referred to the Climate Emergency that the Council has declared. He argued that the demand for ever more car parking capacity had to stop if there was to be a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions in the city. This application was an opportunity for the Council to show how travel to work needed to be reconsidered in the future. The application should be rejected and green travel options relied upon.

The meeting was then addressed by a representative of the applicant. He spoke of the applicant's investment in creating new jobs in Manchester and how the growth of the business was a boon to the city's economy and the economic wellbeing of the area.

Councillor O'Neil addressed the meeting as a ward councillor for the Woodhouse Park ward. He felt that the traffic generated from the operation of the airport was already adding to the pollution and carbon dioxide that were directly affecting the local communities, and that this application would only exacerbate that undesirable situation. He called on the committee to reject the application.

Councillor Newman also addressed the meeting as a ward councillor for the Woodhouse Park ward. He spoke of the levels of pollution that local residents face from the airport operations and the traffic generated by air passengers going to and from by the airport. This application would add to pollution and traffic in the area. The employment opportunities generated by the growth of the business were welcome but he sought an assurance that the jobs created would be taken up by local residents so that they did not result in more traffic.

The planning officer confirmed that the principle of a large car park at this site had been approved in a 2018 planning approval that had also dealt with the building of new offices for the company. This application was bringing forward the timing of the implementation of a part of that earlier consent. The applicant had provided a Green Travel Plan as part of the application to help reduce the level of additional traffic the expansion of the car park would generate, as the number of spaces available would still be fewer than the number of employees who were to be working at the site.

The Chair referred to investment into community and social infrastructure by the company to support community initiatives in the Woodhouse Park ward.

Given the relationship of the proposed car park to the delivery of the consent granted in 2018, it was proposed that approval of this application should be time-limited as the future of the whole site needed to be in accordance with the earlier consent. The long-term operation of the car park should not be independent of the proposed office development. The recommendation had approval for five years only. The Committee felt that two years would be more appropriate. It was proposed and agreed that a temporary consent of two years should be given.

Decision

To grant temporary consent for a period of two years subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the Planning Officer's report.

PH/20/14 125474/FO/2019 - Land Adjacent to Mayton Street, Manchester, M11 2AN - Clayton and Openshaw Ward

(Councillor Andrews re-joined the meeting for consideration of this application. Councillor Hitchen had to leave the meeting for part of this item and so took no part in the decision making)

The application submitted related to the erection of twenty three two storey dwelling houses with associated car parking, hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatments.

The application site comprises of land previously developed for housing that has been maintained as open green space. It is intersected by a network of footpaths with incidental mature tree planting and surrounded highways along Beede Street, Mayton Street, Herne Street, Newtown Close and Thames Close, which also provide access to neighbouring housing and communal on street car parking bays. The surrounding area mainly comprises of two storey pitched roof terraced housing with semi-detached houses located to the north of the site along Mayton Street and Beede Street. A mix of single, two and three storey houses and apartments are located to the south of the site.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further information on representations made and proposed further conditions that should be applied to any consent.

The meeting was addressed by a representative of the applicant. She said that the development would bring 23 much-needed high quality affordable family houses to Openshaw, with 17 for social rent and 6 for shared-ownership. The number of homes being proposed had been reduced from 39 to 23 so as to retain an area of open space as a community resource, preserving something that the community has been enjoying for some years.

The Committee welcomed the scheme and the contribution it was going to make to the provision of affordable homes in the city.

Decision

Minded to approve subject the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the further conditions and reasons proposed in the Late Representations, and also subject to entering into a Section 106 Agreement to secure a retained contribution of affordable housing as part of the authorised development, the Environment Agency being satisfied with the additional flood risk information and no adverse comments being received from the Coal Authority.

PH/20/15 124972/FO/2019 and 125248/FO/2019 - Land bounded by Mayfield Depot Building, Hoyle Street, Mancunian Way (A635), Baring Street, Buxton Street and Berry Street (inclusive) and McDonald Hotel along with associated roads and junctions and land adjacent to Mancunian Way (Former Mayfield Goods Yard), Baring Street Office 2, Manchester, M1 2AD - Piccadilly Ward

(Councillor Flanagan re-joined the meeting for consideration of this application)

The application 124972/FO/2019 was for the phased creation of around 2.4 ha (6 acres) of public park, including hard and soft landscaping and new bridges across the River Medlock; erection of 9 storey office development above basement with mezzanine and plant level (Class B1) with ground floor Class A1 (Shop), A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A3 (Café and Restaurant), A4 (Drinking Establishment) B1 (Office) uses, rooftop amenity spaces and terrace levels, associated public realm and riverside walkway; erection of an eleven storey Multi-Storey Car Park to provide 581 car parking spaces with associated landscaping; highways and infrastructure works including the creation of new junction from London Road to provide access to the multi-storey car park (MSCP) (Use Class Sui Generis); works to Baring Street, stopping up of Bond Street and Nether Street (alongside associated Traffic Regulation Orders to manage unrestricted parking to Buxton Street, Berry Street and Travis Street (to be delivered and implemented prior to the MSCP becoming operational)) alongside enabling works comprising phased demolition and site clearance, earthworks including re-profiling and construction of retaining walls for the land bounded by the Mancunian Way to the south, Mayfield Depot to the north, Baring Street to the west and Hoyle Street to the east. The site is located on Land bounded by Mayfield Depot Building, Hoyle Street, Mancunian Way (A635), Baring Street, Buxton Street & Berry Street (inclusive) and McDonald Hotel Along with associated Roads and Junctions, Manchester, M1 2AD.

The application 125248/FO/2019 was for the Erection of a thirteen storey building (including ground and mezzanine) comprising office space (Use Class B1) above flexible uses at ground and mezzanine levels (Class A1 (Shop), A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A3 (Café and Restaurant), A4 (Drinking Establishment), /D1 (Art Gallery, Museum and Conference & Training Centre)/D2 (Cinema)/ Theatre (Sui Generis)) with rooftop amenity spaces and external terrace levels, internal ancillary storage spaces for waste, cycles, rooftop plant, back of house functions and associated landscaping works. The site is located on land adjacent to Mancunian Way (former Mayfield Goods Yard), Baring Street Office 2, Manchester, M1 2AD.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted for application 124972/FO/2019 which provided further information on representations made.

The meeting was addressed by a representative of the applicant. He explained that at the heart of this application was the creation of a new public park in Manchester, with a river running through it. The park was felt to be an essential element of the application that would see the world-class regeneration of the mostly derelict Mayfield site, in accordance with the Mayfield Strategic Regeneration Framework. This new district would create a community in the city with a mix of employment,

shopping, leisure and homes. It would result in up to 10,000 new jobs. The historic depot at Mayfield was to be retained and restored as part of the scheme.

The committee welcomed the application for the redevelopment of this important area at the edge of the city centre, and the transformation that it would bring about. They discussed the objections that had been made and the extent of the car parking that was being proposed.

Decision

To approve both applications subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report.

PH/20/16 124302/FO/2019 - Land bounded by Chester Road, Hulme Hall Road and Ellesmere Street, Manchester, M15 4JY - Hulme Ward

The application was for the demolition of the existing building on site and the erection of a residential-led mixed use development within two build blocks ranging from eight to eighteen storeys in height. The development consists of three hundred and sixty-six residential units (C3); two hundred and seventeen square metres of commercial floor space (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, B1 or D2); associated car and cycle parking within a basement level; public realm and landscaping; access and servicing arrangements and other associated works.

The site is located on the north east side of the junction of Chester Road and Hulme Hall Road, and is within the St Georges area of Hulme. It is bounded by Hulme Hall Road, Chester Road and Ellesmere Street. It adjoins Sky Gardens, a new build residential scheme on Chester Road and Phoenix House, a 1960s industrial building on Ellesmere Street. The site is rectangular in shape and 0.38 hectares. There is a vacant light industrial unit on part of the site with the remainder used as a temporary site office and car parking and is bounded by a security fence.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further information on representations made. Additional photographic images of the development site were circulated. A representation had been made that the Committee undertake a site visit.

Decisions

To defer consideration of the matter to allow a site visit to be carried out by the members of the Committee.

PH/20/17 125654/FO/2019 - Former Church Inn, 84 Cambridge Street, Manchester, M15 6BP - Hulme Ward

The application was for the erection of a nine-storey purpose built student accommodation building comprising sixty-two units and associated landscape and highway works, following demolition of existing structures.

The site is located on the west side of Cambridge Street, Hulme, just north of the junction with Cavendish Street and to the south of the Mancunian Way. The site is viewed in the context of the Mancunian Way and Manchester City Centre when approaching Manchester from the south. The site measures 0.3 hectares comprises a vacant public house known as the Church Inn, the public house closed in March 2016. The site is bounded by student accommodation blocks immediately to the north (Cambridge House) and south (Manchester House), Cambridge Street to the east with Manchester Metropolitan University student accommodation and facilities on the opposite side of the street. To the west lies a housing estate managed by One Manchester, the site immediately adjoins the turning head to Bristle Street and lies in close proximity to property on Elmdale Walk and Dalesman Walk.

The Committee had on 14 March 2019 resolved to defer determination of an application in order to undertake a site visit before making a decision. The site visit took place on 11 April 2019, and the Committee were minded to refuse the application due to concerns expressed regarding the negative impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties resulting in a loss of amenity, overlooking and reduction in daylight. The application was deferred and the Director of Planning asked to bring a report which addresses the concerns raised and potential reasons for refusal. The applicant reviewed the scheme to address the concerns expressed by the Planning and Highways Committee and revised plans had been submitted in June 2019.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further information on representations and objections made. It also proposed a further condition that should be attached to a consent. Objections received referred to the negative impact of the development on residential amenity and the loss of green space. The applicant's late representations included copies of correspondence with two local councillors saying that those councillors no longer opposed the application.

A local resident spoke at the meeting to object to the application. He referred to the guidelines relating to loss of daylight and sunlight and asserted that the report showed there would be 152 transgressions of those guidelines if the scheme was built. He referred to the extent that the glazing of the building would result in the potential overlooking of the windows and gardens of adjacent properties, some at short distances. The development would also require access over land that was in other ownership, and permission for that had not been sought. Providing that access would result in the loss of an amenity space enjoyed by the existing residents of neighbouring properties. The access to the site was constrained and unable to deal with the likely traffic volumes or provide sufficient access for emergency vehicles.

The meeting was addressed by a representative of the applicant. He explained that this application was the developer's first scheme of student accommodation in Manchester, although they had much experience from other universities across the UK. Their approach is to work in partnership with universities, local council and other

local community stakeholders to ensure that their student accommodation developments are rooted in the communities. He explained how the proposals had been changed since they were considered in 2019 so as to address the concerns that the committee had raised at that time. The scale of the development had been reduced, bringing about improvements in the daylight and sunlight available to occupants. The development was supported by the university and two of the ward councillors.

The meeting was next addressed by Councillor Wright, a ward councillor for the Hulme ward. She said that the building was still too big for the proposed location, out of keeping with the neighbouring properties and would result in significant detriment to the residents of the neighbouring properties. She referred to the extent of the objections to the scheme from local people. She spoke of the unsatisfactory proposals for access and for the servicing and removal of waste, and where the bins for the building were to be sited. He asked the Committee to reject the application.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the applicant was negotiating with the other land owner to secure the necessary access to the rear of the building, but that the right of access over the land was primarily a legal matter for the applicant. Good access to the building and the servicing of the bins were to be addressed by the conditions being proposed. He confirmed that in planning terms the loss of daylight within this building, and to one of the adjacent buildings, was considered to be acceptable as the guidelines were intended to be used in a flexible manner.

The Committee referred to the size and massing of the proposed development and the impact it would have on the amenity of the neighbouring properties, as well as the concerns about how access to the rear was to be arranged, together with the proposals for waste management at the rear of the building. Members were also concerned by the suggestion that students did not need to enjoy the same levels of daylight as residents in other types of properties. Members also felt that there could be significant traffic generated at certain times of the day, if the experiences from other buildings in the city centre were replicated here.

Decisions

Minded to refuse for the reasons due to the negative impact of the proposed development on the character of the area by virtue of the height of the development proposal, the impact upon residential amenity with regards to the development proposals having an overbearing impact that would result in a loss of light to neighbouring property and with regards to the impact of deliveries, servicing and noise disturbance having an impact upon residential amenity.

**PH/20/18 117960/FO/2017 - High Elms, Upper Park Road, Manchester,
M14 5RU - Rusholme Ward**

The Committee was informed that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

PH/20/19 117961/LO/2017 - High Elms, Upper Park Road, Manchester, M14 5RU - Rusholme Ward

The Committee was informed that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

PH/20/11 123188/FO/2019 - Xaverian College Lower Park Road Manchester M14 5RB - Rusholme Ward

(Having been out of the room at the start of this item of business Councillor N Ali took no part in the decision making, Councillor M Monaghan was also not present for this item of business)

The application was for the Installation of fencing and gates to campus boundaries between 2.4 m and 2.7 metres in height. The application proposals relate to the boundary walls around the Xaverian College campus which is located in the Rusholme ward of Manchester. The College occupies a mix of new and converted buildings focused around an open area green space, however the Campus is spread over two distinct areas to the east and west of Lower Park Road. Many of the older buildings on the Campus are former residential villas which have been converted and extended to accommodate educational use. The campus is located within Victoria Park Conservation Area and contains the Grade II listed buildings known as Ward Hall, Marylands and Firwood which have all been converted for educational use in the past.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further information on representations made. A further eleven objections had been received including from the Manchester Civic, Society relating to the height and design of gates and railings, preservation of trees, loss of visual amenity.

The meeting was addressed by a representative of Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society who spoke about the possible impact the development would have on the Conservation Area. She spoke of the college's strategy to use high fences to help safeguard the learners, to give the college more time to respond to any risks to the students. She felt that as the strategy was untested, with no proof that all the measures the college was seeking were actually necessary. It was likely that the fencing would not need to be as high as that which is being proposed, making reference to the boundary walls that have been at the site. The proposed heights were excessive in the Conservation Area and a better design could actually enhance the area and not harm it.

Councillor Ali, a ward councillor for Rusholme ward, addressed the meeting. He spoke of the importance of the college and its heritage buildings to the character of the Conservation Area and the Victoria Park neighbourhood. He urged the college to consider using railings of 2.1m high rather than 2.4m in the more prominent parts of the boundary.

A representative of the applicant spoke next. He referred to the desire to maintain the aesthetic qualities of the college and the desire to avoid proposals that would

harm the college's estate and the wider Conservation Area. Nevertheless, the college was trying to adhere to the Department of Education advised minimum height of 2.4m on the site boundary.

The department's advisory minimum height was confirmed by the Planning Officer.

Members of the committee welcomed the way that the college had been working with the local community and the Civic Society to try to avoid harming the amenity of the area and expressed their desire that the cooperative approach continued into the future. The members accepted the college's desire to comply with the Department of Education's advisory height and welcomed the quality of the design that the college was proposing to use.

Decision

To approve both applications subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report.

PH/20/11 125186/FO/2019 - Riverside Lodge, 208 Palatine Road, Manchester, M20 2WF - Didsbury West Ward

(Councillor S Ali left the meeting part way through this item of business and took no part in the decision on this or the later item)

The application was for Rooftop extension to Block A to form 4 x 2 bedroom apartments and provision of an additional 5 car parking spaces. Riverside Lodge is residential complex on Palatine Road consisting of 34 flats split into two blocks. Block A is 4 storeys in height (flat nos. 1 to 16), while block B is a part 4/part 5 storey building housing flat nos. 17-34. The ground floor levels of both buildings are elevated as they sit on top of undercroft parking facilities for 34 cars. To the front of the blocks is a hard surfaced area used for servicing and parking, while at the rear there is a communal lawned area.

To the west of the site is a wooded area and beyond that stands the Green Belt. To the east of the site, on the opposite side of Palatine Road, stands a modern residential development set behind a Site of Biological Interest. To the north of Block B is another strip of woodland, beyond which stands three detached dwelling houses. Riverside Court, a 3 storey residential complex of 24 flats lies to the south of Block A. The row of trees along the rear boundary of the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and the site is located within Flood Zone 3.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further information and further objections that had been received from the local MP and local residents, and a further condition that was being recommended to any approval.

A local resident spoke as a representative of the owners of properties in Riverside Lodge. The application was a resubmission of a scheme that had been approved in 2014 but had lapsed before it had been commenced. However, the policy issues now raised by the application had changed since the prior approval had been given.

She commented on the lack of provisions for cycle storage, and also to the loss of daylight and sunlight to some of the residents in the blocks within the overall scheme. There would also be a loss of green space and a likelihood that local parking problems would be exacerbated.

Councillor Kilpatrick, a ward councillor for the Didsbury West ward addressed the meeting. He felt that the original consent should never had been given. He explained the setting of Riverside Lodge as an established site of two blocks close to the River Mersey. He described the loss of amenity that the approval would result in to the residents of Riverside Court and Riverside Lodge, highlighting the parking problems that will arise in the neighbourhood. He added that some of the proposed new parking was in an area that is at risk of flooding. He explained why he felt that application was contrary to the Council's policy on housing development outside of district centres. He asked the committee to reject the application.

The Planning Officer explained that the loss of daylight and sunlight had been considered and the development would result in only one of the neighbouring dwellings being below the guideline levels.

The members of the committee considered the merits of the application and were concerned about the potential harm to the character of the area due to the proposed car parking. They weighed up the extent of change in the scheme, and the guidance that might be relevant since the approval had been given in 2014. There were also concerns about the impact on residents during the construction period including the loss of the existing lift for a period of time.

Decision

Minded to refuse due to the harm the development would cause to the amenity of existing residents, the loss of green space in order to provide additional car parking, and the disruption to existing residents during the construction period, including the loss of the lift in the building for a period of time.

PH/20/11 125299/FO/2019 - Hologic (Warehouse Building), Crewe Road, Manchester, M23 9HZ - Brooklands Ward

The application relates to the erection of a 3 storey extension to provide new loading bay and storage area, with ancillary office accommodation on a mezzanine level with associated vehicle turning area. The proposed site on Crewe Road consists of two buildings: a two storey office and research facility and a packaging/ warehouse and office facility. The applicant also utilises an element of the building located on the opposite side of Crewe Road for storage. The application proposes to plant a landscaping screen, including 13 semi-mature trees, along the boundary with nos. 271 and 271a Wythenshawe Road.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representations that had been submitted by the applicant which provided further information and a further condition that was being recommended to any approval.

A representative of the applicant addressed the committee. The application was for a warehouse on an industrial estate. This would result in the creation of local employment and help reduce carbon emissions by bring manufacture and distribution of the company's product into one location instead of being spread across England. He spoke of the mitigations that were part of the application to address concerns about noise and visual impact.

The committee welcomed and supported the application and the contribution it will make to employment and reducing carbon dioxide emissions.

Decision

To approve, subject the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the further condition and reasons proposed in the Late Representations

This page is intentionally left blank

**Manchester City Council
Report for Information**

Report to: Council – 25 March 2020

Subject: Findings of the Hearing Panel in respect of Complaints
Concerning a Breach of the Code of Conduct for Members

Report of: The Monitoring Officer

Purpose of the Report:

To report to Council the findings of the Standards (Hearing) Sub Committee in respect of complaints concerning a breach of the Code of Conduct for Members.

Recommendations:

To note the report.

Wards Affected All

Manchester Strategy outcomes	Summary of the contribution to the strategy
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities	- Not directly applicable
A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city's economic success	- Not directly applicable
A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities	The reporting of the findings of the Standards (Hearing) Sub Committee to Council contributes towards promoting and maintaining high standards of conduct among Members. It also encourages fairness by Members in their conduct towards members of the public and other Members. It also contributes to fairness, transparency and accountability when allegations are made that a Member's behaviour has fallen below the expected standard.
A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work	- Not directly applicable
A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth	- Not directly applicable

Full details are in the body of the report, along with any implications for

- Equal Opportunities Policy
- Risk Management
- Legal Considerations

Financial Consequences – Revenue

None directly.

Financial Consequences – Capital

None directly.

Contact Officers:

Name: Fiona Ledden
Position: Monitoring Officer
Telephone: 0161 234 3087
E-mail: f.ledden@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Stephen Hollard
Position: Group Manager, Democratic Services Legal Team
Telephone: 0161 234 3336
E-mail: s.hollard@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

None.

1. Background

- 1.1 On 20 February 2020 complaints concerning the conduct of Councillor Karney were heard by the Standards (Hearing) Sub Committee acting as a Hearing Panel. The Hearing concluded that there had been a breach of the Code of Conduct for Members. The sanction imposed was that the Hearing Panel's findings should be reported to the Council.
- 1.2 The Hearing Panel's findings are included in the Annex to this report in the form of a Summary Decision, which has also been published on the Council's website.

ANNEX

SUMMARY OF THE DECISION FOLLOWING A HEARING OF A COMPLAINT THAT A MEMBER OF THE COUNCIL BREACHED THE CODE OF CONDUCT FOR MEMBERS

Member Complained of: Councillor Pat Karney
Complaint Reference: CCM 2019/06- 07- 09- 12- 13- 14
Date of Hearing: 20 February 2020

1. Background

- 1.1 In March 2019 seven complainants submitted complaints to the Council's Monitoring Officer concerning the conduct of Councillor Pat Karney, a member of the Council, shortly before and during the Council's Budget Meeting. The Monitoring Officer undertook an Initial Assessment of the complaints in accordance with the Council's Arrangements for dealing with Complaints that Council Members have failed to comply with the Code of Conduct for Members Having consulted with one of the Council's Independent Persons, she concluded, in her 3 July 2019 decision notice that the complaints should be referred for local investigation.
- 1.2 An Investigating Officer was appointed by the Monitoring Officer to conduct the investigation. Following his investigation the Investigating Officer issued a report, dated 23 October 2019, in which he concluded that there had been a breach of the Code of Conduct for Members (the Code) by Councillor Karney.
- 1.3 Having considered the Investigating Officer's report, and consulted the Independent Person, the Monitoring Officer determined that the matter should be referred for a local hearing. On 6 February 2020, one complainant withdrew their complaint. The Standards (Hearing) Sub-Committee served as the Hearing Panel.

2. The Alleged Conduct Complained Of

- 2.1 The Investigating Officer's report summarised the alleged conduct against the member as follows:

The incident occurred immediately before and at the Council's budget setting meeting on 8 March 2019.

Cllr Karney placed some letters behind the seat in which the Lord Mayor would sit during the meeting. The letters were positioned to read "10 years of Tory and Lib Dem cuts".

Cllr Leech, the leader of the Liberal Democrat group on the Council removed some of the letters before the meeting started. Cllr Karney confronted Cllr Leech demanding he return the letters.

Cllr Karney raised his voice and stated to Cllr Leech;

They are mine give them back to me. You do not run this council, if you want to run this council get more people elected. We make decisions about the council.

Now give them back to me now. That's vandalism, give them back to me, give them back to me now. We won't start till you give them back to me.

[at this point Cllr Karney grabs the letters from Cllr Leech]

How dare you. Vandal. How dare you.

Cllr Karney replaced the letters on the wall and the budget meeting commenced. The letters could be clearly seen on the Council's webcast of the meeting.

3. The Conduct of the Hearing

- 3.1 The conduct of the hearing is as detailed in the Hearing Panel's minutes, a copy of which are appended to (and forms part of) this Summary Decision.

4. The Hearing Panel's Decisions

- 4.1 The Hearing Panel's decisions are fully detailed in the appended minutes. However, the Panel's key conclusions are also set out below.
- 4.2 The facts as presented by the Investigating Officer were not disputed and were accepted by the Panel as the determined facts of the matter being considered.
- 4.3 Having considered the report of the Investigating Officer, and heard from the Member, the Panel does not feel there is sufficient evidence that the conduct of the Member amounted to harassment, bullying or abusive behaviour by the member against Councillor Leech. Therefore there is no breach of the Code of Conduct section 3.1(b).
- 4.4 The Panel does not consider on balance that the behaviour of the Member could reasonably be regarded as bringing the Member's office or the Council into disrepute. Therefore there is no breach of the Code of Conduct under section 5
- 4.5 The Panel agreed that in the having 14 of the letters of the sign displayed in the Council Chamber produced by the Member Services staff the Member did misuse the resources of the Council in breach of Section 6(b) of the code and in doing so failed to demonstrate having regards to the use of the Local Authority code of publicity in breach of section 6(c) of the Code of Conduct.
- 4.6 In considering the appropriate sanction that should be applied, if any, the panel took account of the remorse demonstrated by the Member and

concluded that the appropriate sanction was for the Panel's findings to be reported to Council for information.

4.7 It was agreed:

- That the findings of the Hearing Panel be reported to Council.
- To recommend to the Standards Committee that it review the processes and procedures regarding complaints against members.

Fiona Ledden
Monitoring Officer

On behalf of

The Hearing Panel

**APPENDIX- MINUTES OF THE STANDARDS (HEARING)_SUB-COMMITTEE 20
FEBRUARY 2020****Standards (Hearing) Subcommittee
Minutes of the meeting held 20 February 2020****(Acting with delegated authority)****Present:**

G Linnell – Co-opted Independent Member (Chair)
Councillors Andrews, Evans and Kilpatrick

SHS/20/01 Appointment of the Chair**Decision**

To appoint Mr G Linnell as the Chair of the Subcommittee for this hearing.

SHS/20/02 Exclusion of the Public**Decision**

To exclude the public during consideration of the following item which involved consideration of exempt information relating to any individual, and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

SHS/16/03 Consideration of complaints

(Public excluded)

A number of complaints had been made that the conduct of a member of the Council constituted a breach of the Council's Code of Conduct for Members. The Subcommittee conducted a hearing into the complaints in accordance with the Council's procedure for hearing of allegations of misconduct.

(a) The finding on the facts

The Monitoring Officer had appointed an independent Investigating Officer to examine the complaints. The Subcommittee considered the Investigating Officer's report. The report included statements from the complainants and from the Member. The Subcommittee also watched a video of the incident that had resulted in the complaints being made. None of the complainants had personally witnessed the incident, all had become aware of it when the video was published on a website.

The Subcommittee heard from the Member, and two other councillors who accompanied the Member as his representatives, including information that the exchange between the member and Councillor Leech was longer than evidenced by the video which was accepted by the Panel. The Member was given the opportunity to put questions to the Investigating Officer.

The Subcommittee noted the time that had elapsed between the incident and this Hearing taking place. In noting that, they were satisfied that the proper investigatory procedure had been followed in relation to these complaints.

Decision

That the facts were not disputed and were accepted by the Subcommittee as the determined facts of the matter being considered.

(c) Question as to whether the Code of Conduct had been breached

Having considered the report of the Investigating Officer and the written and oral statements of the Member the Subcommittee examined the Code of Conduct to consider whether the conduct of the Member breached that Code. The Investigating Officer's report addressed three sections of the Code of Conduct and the Subcommittee considered and reached a decision on each in turn.

Decisions

1. The Subcommittee did not feel there was sufficient evidence that the conduct of the Member amounted to harassment, bullying or abusive behaviour by the member against another Councillor. Therefore, there was no breach of the Code of Conduct section 3.1(b): "bully or be abusive to any person".
2. The Subcommittee agreed that in having 14 of the letters of the sign displayed in the Council Chamber produced by the Member Services staff the Member did misuse the resources of the Council in breach of Section 6(b) of the Code and in doing so failed to demonstrate having regards to the use of the Local Authority code of publicity in breach of section 6(c) of the Code of Conduct.

"Section 6(b) You must, when using or authorising the use by others of the resources of your authority:

- (i) act in accordance with the Council's reasonable requirements; and
- (ii) ensure that such resources are not used improperly for political purposes (including party political purposes);

Section 6 (c) You must have regard to any applicable Local Authority Code of Publicity made under the Local Government Act 1986."

3. The subcommittee did not on balance consider that the behaviour of the Member could reasonably be regarded as bringing the Member's office or the Council into disrepute. Therefore, there was no breach of the Code of Conduct under section 5: "You must not conduct yourself in a manner which could reasonably be regarded as bringing your office or the Council into disrepute."

(d) Decision whether a sanction should be applied

On the issue of whether a sanction was required, and if so of what nature, the Subcommittee considered the advice of the Investigating Officer as given in the written report and orally during the earlier part of the hearing. It also considered the matters raised by the Member in mitigation. The Subcommittee examined each of the sanctions that were available to it under the Council's Standards procedures.

Decisions

1. That a sanction be applied.
2. That the appropriate sanction to apply was that the findings of the Subcommittee be reported to Council.
3. On the procedural lessons to be learned from these complaints, and the time it has taken for them to come before a subcommittee, to recommend to the Standards Committee that it review the processes and procedures regarding complaints against members.

This page is intentionally left blank

City Council Meeting on 25 March 2020

Declaration of Councillors' Interests in Items Appearing on the Council Agenda

Name of Councillor _____

Agenda Item	Type of Interest	
	Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary / Council Tax or Rent Arrears -	
	Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary / Council Tax or Rent Arrears -	
Committee meeting and date	Minute Item No. / Agenda Item No.	
		Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary
		Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary
		Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary
		Personal / Prejudicial / Disclosable Pecuniary

Page 243

This page is intentionally left blank