

## **Council**

### **Minutes of the meeting on 5 October 2016**

Present: The Right Worshipful, the Lord Mayor Councillor Austin-Behan – in the Chair

#### **Councillors –**

Akbar, Ahmed Ali, Azra Ali, N. Ali, Sameem Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Amesbury, Andrews, Appleby, Barrett, Battle, Bridges, Chohan, Collins, Connolly, Cookson, Craig, Curley, Dar, Davies, Ellison, Evans, Farrell, Fender, Flanagan, Fletcher-Hackwood, Green, Grimshaw, Hacking, Hassan, Hewitson, Hitchen, Hughes, Igbon, S Judge, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kirkpatrick, Knowles, Lanchbury, Leech, Lease, Lone, Longsdon, Ludford, Manco, Midgley, Mary Monaghan, Moore, N. Murphy, S. Murphy, E. Newman, S. Newman, Noor, Ollerhead, O'Neil, Paul, Peel, B Priest, H Priest, Pritchard, Rahman, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reeves, Reid, Richards, Russell, Sadler, Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, Siddiqi, A Simcock, K Simcock, Smitheman, Stogia, Stone, Strong, Taylor, Teubler, Watson, Webb, Wills and Wilson

#### **Honorary Aldermen of the City of Manchester –**

-

#### **CC/16/68 Urgent Business**

The Lord Mayor informed the Council that he had consented to the minutes of the Constitutional and Nomination Committee on 5 October 2016 being submitted for consideration as urgent business.

#### **CC/16/69 Lord Mayor's Special Business – Presentation on the Lord Mayor's visit to Charleville-Mézières**

Lord Mayor spoke of his recent visit to Charleville-Mézières which had strengthened the historic links with between French town and the people of Manchester. He told the Council that the town had been badly damaged in the First World War and people of Manchester had raised funds to help with its reconstruction after the war.

#### **CC/16/70 Lord Mayor's Special Business – Presentation on "Our Manchester"**

The Council received a presentation on "Our Manchester – The Manchester Strategy" from Sara Todd, Deputy Chief Executive, Jacque Allen of Wythenshawe Community Housing Trust and Craig Harris of the Clinical Commissioning Groups in Manchester. At the end of the presentation the Deputy Chief Executive answered questions from members.

**CC/16/71 Lord Mayor's Special Business – Presentation on “Women Against State Pension Inequality”**

Jan Fulster of the campaign group WASPI (Women Against State Pension Inequality) spoke to the Council about the inequalities created by the changes to the state pension age for women (reference: minute CC/16/81 below).

**CC/16/72 Minutes**

**Decision**

To agree the minutes of the meeting on 13 July 2016 as a correct record.

**CC/16/73 Proceedings of the Executive**

The proceedings of the Executive on 27 July 2016, and 14 September 2016 were submitted. The Council considered the following recommendations:

Exe/16/096 Updated draft St. John's Strategic Regeneration Framework and Factory Manchester

To recommend the Council to approve the capital funding arrangements and approve in principle its funding commitment to provide a contribution to the project of up to £20m to be funded from a mix of capital receipts and other Council resources.

Exe/16/102 Capital Programme Monitoring 2016/17

To recommend to Council the approval of the in-year budget transfers over £0.5m between capital schemes to maximise use of funding resources available to the City Council.

Exe/16/103 Global Revenue Budget Monitoring 2016/17

To recommend that the Council approve the use of £250,000 reserves to assist with Manchester's Residential Growth Strategy.

**Decisions**

1. To receive those minutes.
2. Updated draft St. John's Strategic Regeneration Framework and Factory Manchester:

To approve the capital funding arrangements and approve in principle the funding commitment to provide a contribution to the project of up to £20m to be funded from a mix of capital receipts and other Council resources.

3. Capital Programme Monitoring 2016/17:

To approve the in-year budget transfers over £0.5m between capital schemes to maximise use of funding resources available to the City Council as set out in the minutes of the meeting.

4. Global Revenue Budget Monitoring 2016/17:

To approve the use of £250,000 reserves to assist with Manchester's Residential Growth Strategy.

(Councillor Wilson declared a personal interest in minute Exe/16/091 as a school governor).

**CC/16/74 Questions to Executive Members under Procedural Rule 23**

Councillor Sue Murphy responded to a question from Councillor Leech about the numbers of unaccompanied Syrian child refugees in Manchester.

Councillor Flanagan responded to a question from Councillor Leech about the evaluation of the roles and responsibilities of Council Staff in the City Solicitor's department.

Councillor Battle responded to a question from Councillor Leech about planning enforcement and work in default.

Councillor Battle responded to a question from Councillor Leech about the carbon footprint of domestic flights by councillors and council officers.

Councillor Nigel Murphy responded to a question from Councillor Leech about the replacement of 240 litre general household refuse bins with 140 litre bins.

Councillor Andrews responded to a question from Councillor Leech about the use of face down restraints in the Manchester Mental Health and Social Care Trust.

**CC/16/75 Scrutiny Committees**

The minutes of the following meetings were submitted:

Children and Young People – 19 July 2016 and 6 September 2016  
Neighbourhoods and Environment – 19 July 2016 and 6 September 2016  
Economy – 20 July 2016 and 7 September 2016  
Communities and Equalities – 20 July 2016 and 7 September 2016  
Resources and Governance – 21 July 2016 and 8 September 2016  
Health – 21 July 2016 and 8 September 2016  
Joint Health Scrutiny Committee – 5 July 2016

**Decision**

To receive those minutes.

(Councillor Curley declared a personal interest in item ESC/16/31 in relation to ‘One Manchester’)

### **CC/16/76 Proceedings of Committees**

The minutes of the following meetings were submitted:

Constitutional and Nomination Committee – 5 October 2016

The Committee had made a recommendation about changes to the membership of the AGMA Scrutiny Pool.

### **Decisions**

To receive the minutes of the Constitutional and Nomination Committee on 5 October 2016.

To approve the recommendation in relation to membership of the AGMA Scrutiny Pool.

Audit Committee – 14 July 2016 and 15 September 2016

Health and Wellbeing Board – 22 July 2016 and 31 August 2016

Licensing and Appeals Committee – 18 July 2016

Licensing Committee – 18 July 2016

Planning and Highways Committee -28 July 2016, 25 August 2016 and 22 September 2016

Standards Committee – 22 September 2016

Wythenshawe Area Committee – 22 September 2016

Personnel Committee – 28 July 2016, 4 August 2016 and 14 September 2016 and 28 September 2016. The Council considered the following recommendation:

PE/16/21 Senior Salaries Review

To recommend that Council approve the changes to salaries and role descriptions for SMT and support level posts of Deputy Chief Executive (Growth and Neighbourhood), City Solicitor, Strategic Director of Adults and Director of Neighbourhoods as detailed in the appendix to the report to ensure that there is no perception of unfairness and no gender bias arising from salary changes that have taken place out of sequence over time.

### **Decisions**

1. To receive those minutes.
2. Senior Salaries Review:

To approve the changes to salaries and role descriptions for SMT and support level posts of Deputy Chief Executive (Growth and Neighbourhood), City Solicitor, Strategic Director of Adults and Director of Neighbourhoods to ensure that there is no perception of unfairness and no gender bias arising from salary changes that have taken place out of sequence over time.

**CC/16/77 Business of the Combined Authority, Joint Authorities and Joint Committees**

There were no questions in relation to the Business of the Combined Authority, Joint Authorities and Joint Committees.

**CC/16/78 Urgent Key Decisions**

The Council noted the report of the City Solicitor on key decisions that had been exempted from call in.

**CC/16/79 Motion - Census 2021**

Motion proposed and seconded:

This council notes:

The obligations its owes to the Armed Forces community within Manchester City Council as enshrined in the Armed Forces Covenant; that the Armed Forces community should not face disadvantage in the provision of services and that special consideration is appropriate in some cases, especially for those who have given the most.

The absence of definitive and comprehensive statistics on the size or demographics of the Armed Forces community within the city of Manchester. This includes serving regular and reserve personnel, veterans, and their families.

That the availability of such data would greatly assist the council, local partner agencies, the voluntary sector, and national Government in the planning and provision of services to address the unique needs of the Armed Forces community within the city of Manchester

In light of the above, this council moves to support and promote the Royal British Legion's call to include a new topic in the 2021 census that concerns military service and membership of the Armed Forces community. We further call upon the UK Parliament, which will approve the final census questionnaire through legislation in 2019, to ensure that the 2021 census includes questions concerning our Armed Forces community.

Amendment proposed and seconded:

Add as final paragraph

“This Council remains concerned that the exemplary care and support for Veterans provided through the Royal Chelsea Hospital in London has no equivalent in the north of England, and calls on the Chief Executive to explore with the Royal British Legion options to create facilities in Manchester which would correct this imbalance.”

The amendment was accepted.

### **Resolution**

The substantive motion, as amended, was put to Council and voted on and the Lord Mayor declared that it was carried.

### **Decision**

This council notes:

The obligations its owes to the Armed Forces community within Manchester City Council as enshrined in the Armed Forces Covenant; that the Armed Forces community should not face disadvantage in the provision of services and that special consideration is appropriate in some cases, especially for those who have given the most.

The absence of definitive and comprehensive statistics on the size or demographics of the Armed Forces community within the city of Manchester. This includes serving regular and reserve personnel, veterans, and their families.

That the availability of such data would greatly assist the council, local partner agencies, the voluntary sector, and national Government in the planning and provision of services to address the unique needs of the Armed Forces community within the city of Manchester

In light of the above, this council moves to support and promote the Royal British Legion’s call to include a new topic in the 2021 census that concerns military service and membership of the Armed Forces community. We further call upon the UK Parliament, which will approve the final census questionnaire through legislation in 2019, to ensure that the 2021 census includes questions concerning our Armed Forces community.

This Council remains concerned that the exemplary care and support for Veterans provided through the Royal Chelsea Hospital in London has no equivalent in the north of England, and calls on the Chief Executive to explore with the Royal British Legion options to create facilities in Manchester which would correct this imbalance.

### **CC/16/80 Motion - Expansion of selective schools**

Motion proposed and seconded:

Manchester City council believes that our young people need the best start in life. The council has worked hard to maintain a family of schools in spite of this government's creation of a fragmented education system. Manchester's schools have achieved excellent results in spite of the constant and disruptive changes to the education system under this Tory and the previous coalition government.

At a time when an even greater focus is needed on fostering better relations in and between communities, this council notes the government's proposal to encourage the opening of more new Grammar Schools.

This council believes that:

1. There is little evidence to prove that grammar schools are the solution to help the majority of students. We support the OECD's position that countries with selective education systems, on average, perform less well than countries with more comprehensive education systems
2. There is clear evidence to show that pupil selection discriminates against children and young people from less affluent backgrounds with lower attainment for those students outside of the system in areas where there are higher levels of pupil selection.
3. There is evidence to suggest that in England, the highest-performing boroughs and counties are comprehensive.
4. This proposed policy is a distraction from the greater challenges facing education such as the recruitment of more qualified teachers, the shortage of schools places and cuts to budgets.
5. This approach to pupil selection risks creating a two tier system and an 'us and them' division within education at a time when we need more than ever, to be bridging the gaps between the 'haves' and the 'have nots'. This proposed policy will not end 'selection by house price'.
6. This government should be focussed on trying to improve schooling across the board seeking to raise aspirations and attainment amongst all of our pupils - rather than the few.

Manchester Council will campaign to oppose the promotion of Grammar Schools in our city and seek to preserve the inclusive family of schools approach in our city aimed at providing the best possible education for all Manchester's children.

We call upon the government to abandon its plans to drive an even greater wedge between the rich and the poor through this policy and to focus its energies on investing in and supporting a system that raises standards and attainment across our entire school education system.

## **Resolution**

The motion was put to Council and voted on and the Lord Mayor declared that it was carried.

## **Decision**

Manchester City council believes that our young people need the best start in life. The council has worked hard to maintain a family of schools in spite of this government's creation of a fragmented education system. Manchester's schools have achieved excellent results in spite of the constant and disruptive changes to the education system under this Tory and the previous coalition government.

At a time when an even greater focus is needed on fostering better relations in and between communities, this council notes the government's proposal to encourage the opening of more new Grammar Schools.

This council believes that:

1. There is little evidence to prove that grammar schools are the solution to help the majority of students. We support the OECD's position that countries with selective education systems, on average, perform less well than countries with more comprehensive education systems
2. There is clear evidence to show that pupil selection discriminates against children and young people from less affluent backgrounds with lower attainment for those students outside of the system in areas where there are higher levels of pupil selection.
3. There is evidence to suggest that in England, the highest-performing boroughs and counties are comprehensive.
4. This proposed policy is a distraction from the greater challenges facing education such as the recruitment of more qualified teachers, the shortage of schools places and cuts to budgets.
5. This approach to pupil selection risks creating a two tier system and an 'us and them' division within education at a time when we need more than ever, to be bridging the gaps between the 'haves' and the 'have nots'. This proposed policy will not end 'selection by house price'.
6. This government should be focussed on trying to improve schooling across the board seeking to raise aspirations and attainment amongst all of our pupils - rather than the few.

Manchester Council will campaign to oppose the promotion of Grammar Schools in our city and seek to preserve the inclusive family of schools approach in our city aimed at providing the best possible education for all Manchester's children.

We call upon the government to abandon its plans to drive an even greater wedge between the rich and the poor through this policy and to focus its energies on



investing in and supporting a system that raises standards and attainment across our entire school education system.

**CC/16/81 Motion - Make fair transitional state pension arrangements for 1950's women**

Motion proposed and seconded:

The Council calls upon the Government to make fair transitional state pension arrangements for all women born on or after 6th April 1951, who have unfairly borne the burden of the increase to the State Pension Age (SPA) with lack of appropriate notification.

Hundreds of thousands of women had significant pension changes imposed on them by the Pensions Acts of 1995 and 2011 with little/no/personal notification of the changes. Some women had only two years notice of a six-year increase to their state pension age.

Many women born in the 1950's are living in hardship. Retirement plans have been shattered with devastating consequences. Many of these women are already out of the labour market, caring for elderly relatives, providing childcare for grandchildren, or suffer discrimination in the workplace so struggle to find employment.

Women born in this decade are suffering financially. These women have worked hard, raised families and paid their tax and national insurance with the expectation that they would be financially secure when reaching 60. It is not the pension age itself that is in dispute - it is widely accepted that women and men should retire at the same time.

The issue is that the rise in the women's state pension age has been too rapid and has happened without sufficient notice being given to the women affected, leaving women with no time to make alternative arrangements.

The Council calls upon the Government to reconsider transitional arrangements for women born on or after 6th April 1951, so that women do not live in hardship due to pension changes they were not told about until it was too late to make alternative arrangements.

**Resolution**

The motion was put to Council and voted on, with members indicating that the individual votes be recorded:

Voting for the motion

Councillors: Akbar, Ahmed Ali, Azra Ali, N. Ali, Sameem Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Amesbury, Andrews, Appleby, Austin-Behan, Barrett, Battle, Bridges, Chohan, Collins, Connolly, Cookson, Craig, Curley, Dar, Davies, Ellison, Evans, Farrell, Fender, Flanagan, Fletcher-Hackwood, Grimshaw, Hacking,

Hewitson, Hitchen, Hughes, Igbon, S Judge, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kirkpatrick, Knowles, Lanchbury, Lone, Longsdon, Ludford, Manco, Midgley, Mary Monaghan, Moore, N. Murphy, S. Murphy, S. Newman, Noor, Ollerhead, O'Neil, Paul, Peel, B Priest, H Priest, Pritchard, Rahman, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reeves, Reid, Richards, Russell, Sadler, Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, Siddiqi, A Simcock, K Simcock, Smitheman, Stogia, Stone, Strong, Taylor, Teubler, Watson, Webb, Wills and Wilson

Voting against the motion

Councillor Leech

The Lord Mayor declared the motion carried.

### **Decision**

The Council calls upon the Government to make fair transitional state pension arrangements for all women born on or after 6th April 1951, who have unfairly borne the burden of the increase to the State Pension Age (SPA) with lack of appropriate notification.

Hundreds of thousands of women had significant pension changes imposed on them by the Pensions Acts of 1995 and 2011 with little/no/personal notification of the changes. Some women had only two years notice of a six-year increase to their state pension age.

Many women born in the 1950's are living in hardship. Retirement plans have been shattered with devastating consequences. Many of these women are already out of the labour market, caring for elderly relatives, providing childcare for grandchildren, or suffer discrimination in the workplace so struggle to find employment.

Women born in this decade are suffering financially. These women have worked hard, raised families and paid their tax and national insurance with the expectation that they would be financially secure when reaching 60. It is not the pension age itself that is in dispute - it is widely accepted that women and men should retire at the same time.

The issue is that the rise in the women's state pension age has been too rapid and has happened without sufficient notice being given to the women affected, leaving women with no time to make alternative arrangements.

The Council calls upon the Government to reconsider transitional arrangements for women born on or after 6th April 1951, so that women do not live in hardship due to pension changes they were not told about until it was too late to make alternative arrangements.