

The Executive

Minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2016

Present: Councillor– Leese in the Chair

Councillors Andrews, Battle, Flanagan, N Murphy, S Murphy, S Newman, B Priest and Rahman

Also present as Members of the Standing Consultative Panel:
Councillors Akbar, Bridges, Dar and Stogia

Exe/16/147 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 November 2016 as a correct record.

Exe/16/148 Autumn Statement and Spending Review 2016

We considered a report that provided an overview of the key announcements within the Chancellor of the Exchequer's 2016 Autumn Statement. The Chancellor's statement to the House of Commons had set out the government's long term economic planning intentions and priorities.

The report described the most significant announcements that had been included in the Statement. The Chancellor had announced a new National Productivity Investment Fund worth £23bn over five years. This was to be spent on the four areas considered as being most in need of investment to improve overall productivity in the economy: housing, transport, digital communications and innovation. The ways that Greater Manchester might benefit from some of that funding were outlined in the report, including the various initiatives and funds set up to promote housing development, increase the supply of affordable housing and encourage more development on public land.

In addition to and alongside the 2016 Autumn Statement, the Government had also published a Northern Powerhouse Strategy that responded to the work that Greater Manchester had undertaken over recent months to have the Northern Powerhouse recognised and supported by the Government's policy framework. The Strategy highlighted four priorities: connectivity, skills, innovation and trade. It also recognised existing Government commitments to the Northern Powerhouse including £13bn for transport in the North over the course of this Parliament, £60m development funding for Northern Powerhouse Rail, £235m for the Sir Henry Royce Institute, £38m for the National Graphene Institute, £15m for Northern Powerhouse trade missions and £78m for the Factory.

The report also drew attention to the absence in the Statement of any announcements on social care spending that would have recognised the pressures

being experienced nationally. It was explained at the meeting that in recent months more and more attention had been given to the developing crisis in social care across the whole country. The cuts to local authority budgets had resulted in a lack of funds to provide good levels of social care support and this funding gap was predicted to worsen in the coming years. The City Treasurer told the meeting that extent of this funding gap in Greater Manchester was £2billion. The cuts were now causing significant problems for the NHS with hospital discharges prevented by the lack of care and support services to help patients at their homes. This problem, known as 'bed-blocking' required more investment in home care social services so as to ease the pressures on hospitals and improve the care of vulnerable people.

Subsequent to the Statement being made the Government had indicated its intention to allow local authorities to raise additional monies for social care funding through increases in Council Tax. This proposal had not been well received as it would not raise enough money to fund the gap in social care funding, and would raise funding disproportionately: allowing authorities with a higher council-tax-base to raise more funds even if they did not have the greatest need for more funds. We too added our concerns about this proposed increases in Council Tax. It was not going to be adequate to address the crisis in social care and was not the most appropriate funding mechanism to ensure good provision of social care services in Manchester.

We noted that the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee had also considered and noted this report at a recent meeting (Minute RGSC/16/52).

Decision

To note the report and the concerns that were raised in the meeting about the crisis of inadequate government funding for adult social care and the consequences of that on the NHS and on peoples' lives.

Exe/16/149 School Place Planning and Admissions, including specific proposals for a new secondary school

In recent years we had approved a range of measures that had increased the supply of primary and secondary school places in the city (Minutes Exe/13/002, Exe/13/003 and Exe/15/111). A report submitted by the Director of Education and Skills continued that work and addressed three aspects of future school place planning. It provided an update on school place planning and the 2016 reception and year 7 allocations. It outlined the future need for additional secondary school places and the approach being taken to secure sufficient places. The report also sought approval to commence the required process to develop a new secondary school in the central area of the city from September 2018 to help meet the projected increased demand for places in that part of the city.

For the new September 2016 school intakes at Reception and Year 7, 6,937 applications had been received for the September 2016 Reception intake: that being children just starting their formal education. The applications for a 2016 Year 7 secondary place had peaked at 6,877 during the summer period. In addition, further in-year applications were expected for all school year groups from families newly

arriving in the city. There had been 3,853 such applications in the 2015/16 academic year, and the forecasts for 2016/17 were for this to increase, with over 1,000 applications already received.

The report explained that the growing population of primary school-aged children that had been addressed in the 2013 decisions was beginning to reach secondary school age, and therefore additional secondary school places were going to be needed across the city.

It was required by the annual school capacity survey of the Department for Education (DfE) that local authorities provide full academic year projections of the overall capacity required within the school system. The forecast data that had been provided to the survey for Manchester was:

Primary Forecasts	Y0	Y1	Y2	Y3	Y4	Y5	Y6
Sep-2016	7,405	7,236	7,235	7,158	6,905	6,765	6,486
Sep-2017	7,610	7,570	7,411	7,413	7,321	7,060	6,886
Sep-2018	7,821	7,774	7,745	7,589	7,575	7,476	7,181
Secondary Forecasts	Y7	Y8	Y9	Y10	Y11		
Sep-2016	5,796	5,394	5,095	4,831	4,639		
Sep-2017	6,403	5,916	5,517	5,192	4,872		
Sep-2018	6,870	6,520	6,036	5,610	5,230		

In response to the increasing demand for primary places the Council had continued to work with its partners to develop additional primary school places in the parts of the city with highest demand. A number of further primary school expansions had recently been completed or were due to complete during this academic year. These were:

School Name	Completion	Reception Places
Crossacres Primary Academy	Summer 2016	30 (Temps)
Peel Hall Primary School	Summer 2016	30 (Temps)
Ringway Primary School	Summer 2016	30 (Temps)
Sacred Heart RC Primary School	Summer 2016	15 (Permanent)
William Hulme's Grammar School	Autumn 2016	30 (Permanent)
	Total	135

With the demand for secondary places also rising new secondary schools were being created in the city. The Dean Trust Ardwick school on Stockport Road had opened in September 2015, initially taking year 7 pupils and filling up year-on-year reaching a total capacity of 1,200 places. The Manchester Enterprise Academy Central was due to open in September 2017 on Lytham Road, Rusholme. That school would initially open with a year 7 cohort of 210, filling up year on year to reach a total capacity of 1,050 places.

As well as these new schools, other additional places had been found and created across the existing secondary schools. Some of these would see a permanent increase in a school's planned admission numbers. In other schools additional pupils had been accepted in one intake year only, creating a 'bulge year' in the school.

These additional places would mainly be available from September 2017. The summary of the places that were to become available was:

School Name	Completion	Extra	Nature
Co-Operative Academy Manchester	Summer 2017	120	(permanent)
Manchester Creative and Media Academy	Summer 2017	15	(bulge year)
Manchester Enterprise Academy (Central)	Summer 2017	210	(permanent)
Manchester Enterprise Academy (Wythenshawe)	Summer 2017	90	(permanent)
Manchester Health Academy	Summer 2017	90	(permanent)
	Total	525	

The report explained the present situation with regard to the opening of other Free Schools that were being funded directly by the Department of Education (DfE). This had been a successful route for creating capacity in Manchester with five primary free schools and one secondary special school already open. In more recent rounds of free school applications four sponsors received approval to establish five new schools in Manchester: three secondary schools, a primary school and a special school. These were:

School	Sponsor	Phase	Location	Places / year	Opening
Didsbury High School	Cheadle Hulme High School	Secondary 11-16	Didsbury	180	TBC
Eden Boys Leadership Academy (Islamic Faith)	Tauheedul Education Trust	Secondary 11-16	Cheetham	150	TBC
Eden Girls Leadership Academy (Islamic Faith)	Tauheedul Education Trust	Secondary 11-16	Cheetham	150	TBC
Pioneer House Special School	Piper Hill Learning Trust	Secondary 11-16 (SEN)	Northenden	100 (total)	Sept 16 (Temps)
Gorton Primary School	SS Simon and Jude Church of England Academy Trust	Primary 4-11	Gorton	60	TBC

The Council was also working with the academy trusts in the city to help them submit applications to DfE to secure further Free School provision for 2018 onwards. The concern with respect to the Free School programme was that it made strategic planning by the Council more difficult. The decisions on the location of new schools and whether they would be funded were not made by the Council, yet the Council remained responsible for ensuring there was an adequate provision of school places across the whole city. The report explained that the Council was in part able to respond to this uncertainty through the Free Schools Presumption Process, which allowed the Council to commit a site and funding to a new school that, once built, would be operated by a sponsor as a Free School. The stages of the Presumption Process were set out in the report and it was proposed that the Council began this

process in the spring term of 2017 to ensure that a provider had been identified by summer 2017 for an additional new secondary school opening in 2018 in the central east area of the city.

The report explained that in February 2016 the DfE had notified the Council that it was to receive £74m in Basic Need funding for the 2018/19 financial year. This was to be used to pay for projects to provide the required number of school places to support the city's growth ambitions. The Council would be able to use this allocation to fund the construction of the new secondary school.

The first step in the Presumption Process was consultation on the proposal for a new school and we agreed that this consultation should now begin. We also agreed to delegate the necessary authority to the Director of Education and Skills to progress the later stages of the process: developing and publishing the specification for the school, inviting potential sponsors to consider that specification, and selecting an appropriate site for the school.

We noted that the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee had also considered this report at a recent meeting and had endorsed its recommendations adding that the Director of Education and Skills should consult with the appropriate ward members over the proposed site of the school. (Minute CYP/16/55).

Decisions

1. To note the data relating to September 2016 admissions.
2. To note the pupil forecasts submitted to the DfE during summer 2016.
3. To support the principle that Basic Need funding is used to fund the new high school.
4. To agree that the Council begin consulting to gather local views on the plans to develop a new secondary school as a first step towards identifying a provider for the new school.
5. To delegate responsibility to the Director of Education and Skills in consultation with the Executive Member for Children's Services:
 - to progress the publication of a specification for the new school and an invitation to sponsor based on the outcomes of the consultation;
 - to make the final decision on the site for the school, also in consultation with the Ward Councillors for the chosen site; and
 - to identify a preferred sponsor to be recommended to the DfE.

Exe/16/150 High Speed 2 (HS2) Phase 2 Route Announcement

In January 2014 we had considered the Council's response to a government consultation that proposed the use of Manchester Piccadilly Station as a terminus for part of the HS2 high-speed rail line from London to the Midlands and the North of

England (Minute Exe/14/005). The government had also proposed that there be a station at Manchester Airport as part of the route of the HS2 line.

On 15 November 2016 the Secretary of State for Transport had announced the majority of the Government's preferred route for Phase 2b of HS2, to complete the full network. This had included a number of refinements to the route that were, in part, in response to the issues raised through the earlier consultation, and in part due to other factors. Government had launched a series of further consultation on seven areas where those refinements were considered to be substantial changes to the 2013 proposals. These consultations were to continue up to 9 March 2017, with decisions on all the final route then expected later in 2017.

The report described the implication for Greater Manchester of the route proposals

There would be new stations at Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Airport and a connection to the West Coast Main Line at Golborne, near to Crewe. The preferred route and stations had been confirmed with the exception of three elements which the Government was consulting on, two of which could have an impact on Greater Manchester: moving the proposed rolling stock depot at Golborne to a site north of Crewe; and changing the alignment on the approach to Manchester Piccadilly station so that it runs to the east of West Gorton.

The proposals for the HS2 station at Manchester Piccadilly were for it to be constructed alongside the existing main line station, not integrated within it. The HS2 platforms would be parallel with and alongside platform 1 but elevated, with the new concourse facilities at ground level. The station at Manchester Airport was to have two platforms and two tracks for non-stopping trains. The proposed location for the station was west of and parallel to the M56 motorway. The government's stated position was that the development of the station at the airport would be subject to agreement on an "appropriate local funding contribution".

A report submitted by the Chief Executive examined the implications for Manchester of the Secretary of State for Transport's announcements. It explained the importance of ensuring that the HS2 proposals and details were properly integrated with the Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) strategies being developed. It was considered to be essential to avoid the delivery of two separate HS2 and NPR standard rail stations at Piccadilly. Funding options for the station also needed to be developed as part of an integrated approach to design and delivery of HS2 and NPR.

The proposals for the Manchester tunnel, from the Airport to Piccadilly, and for the route of the line into Piccadilly station had been revised. The tunnel had been moved approximately 300m east since the consultation design, with the tunnel entrance being located in the Ardwick rolling stock depot and the track then taking a direct line to Piccadilly Station. This amendment reduced the impacts on the West Gorton area as well lessening flood risks. However, the line would significantly reduce the land available for regeneration around Piccadilly as set out within the HS2 Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework. It would also isolate a triangle of land between the HS2 line and the existing rail tracks, compromising the development potential of that land.

The report explained that the Government had previously announced £2.5m of funding to take forward work on the HS2 Growth Strategies for Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Airport stations (£1.25m per station). Each of these was to underpin the transformational redevelopment of these stations as interchange facilities between HS2, Northern Powerhouse Rail, local transport and intercontinental air connections. The strategies were considered to be fundamental components of the delivery of a Northern Powerhouse. The final Growth Strategies were to be submitted to Government in September 2017.

Decisions

1. To note the contents of the HS2 route announcement and the issues raised for the city and Greater Manchester.
2. To welcome the Government's intention to progress with proposed HS2 Stations at Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Airport.
3. To note the work being done to develop a HS2 Growth Strategy for Manchester Piccadilly and Manchester Airport to maximise the benefits of HS2 to the city Greater Manchester.
4. To agree that a response to the Government's consultation on the Phase 2b line of route be submitted in line with comments set out in Section 4 of the report, and work with Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) and partners to ensure that there is a coordinated response to the consultation.

Exe/16/151 Corridor Manchester: North Campus Strategic Regeneration Framework

The North Campus was formerly the home of the University of Manchester Institute of Science & Technology (UMIST) which merged with Manchester University in 2004. Many of the North Campus buildings were to be made redundant by the opening of the Manchester Engineering Campus Development (MEDC) in 2021. Therefore the Council, in partnership with Manchester University, had commissioned a Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) to consider an approach to the future redevelopment of the area. The 11.8 hectares site lies at a strategic location within Corridor Manchester, between Piccadilly Station and Oxford Road. It is bounded by the Mancunian Way, Princess Street, Whitworth Street and London Road. The site contains a number of key buildings including the Sackville Building and borders the Whitworth Street conservation area.

A report submitted by the Chief Executive set out the strategic context of the site and the redevelopment opportunities it presented. The site's position between two other city centre neighbourhoods undergoing significant regeneration (Mayfield and Circle Square - the former BBC site on Oxford Road) made it important that the strategic regeneration proposals aligned with and complimented those of the neighbouring areas. Therefore the vision for North Campus as set out in the draft SRF was for a mixed use neighbourhood with significant residential, commercial and educational components in the heart of the city centre. The draft SRF proposed a mix of uses

appropriate to a city centre location, including sufficient public amenity to ensure long term vitality. The document set out the scale of the different elements within the overall redevelopment. These elements had been set at the levels that should produce the best possible economic and regeneration benefits. The proposals included:

- a new hub for learning, research and development;
- high quality city centre public green spaces;
- a combination of cultural and community use buildings;
- between 1,000 and 2,500 new homes;
- 132,000m² of commercial office space;
- 13,000m² of retail and leisure space; and
- 400 - 500 new hotel rooms.

The area had the potential to develop a number of different neighbourhoods across the SRF area as whole, with varied uses and characteristics. These would collectively form North Campus, allowing a mix of uses across the site.

The report proposed, and we agreed, that there be a period of consultation on the draft SRF, the outcome of that to be reported to a future meeting.

Decisions

1. To endorse in principle the regeneration framework for the Corridor Manchester North Campus area.
2. To request the Chief Executive undertake a public consultation exercise on the regeneration framework with local stakeholders.
3. To request that a further report be brought forward, following the public consultation exercise, setting out comments received.

Exe/16/152 New Cross: A Final Neighbourhood Development Framework Update

In March we had considered and endorsed a draft New Cross Neighbourhood Development Framework (NDF) as a basis for consultation with local stakeholders and landowners (Minute Exe/15/041). In July 2015 we had considered the outcome of the consultation and approved the New Cross Neighbourhood Development Framework to guide and coordinate the future development of the area (Minute Exe/15/086). In July 2016 we had considered proposals for the NDF to be refreshed. In the July 2015 version of the NDF the New Cross neighbourhood was sub-divided into three Zones; and a greater emphasis had then been placed on Zone A. The need for a refresh had come about as a result of increased level of developer interest on key sites within Zones B and C. Therefore in July 2016 we had endorsed a draft of a revised document as the basis for consultation (Minute Exe/16/098).

The Chief Executive now presented a report that set out the outcome of the consultation. The consultation programme had run from 19 September to 21 October

2016 and the report listed the various consultation methods and media that had been employed.

The residents' consultation event and the business breakfast event had each attracted 21 local stakeholders. The online consultation website had received 147 visits, generating 19 responses or enquiries. Detailed written representations had also been received from or on behalf of MCR Properties, Royal Mail, the Marble Public House and Brewery, the Friends of Angel Meadow, the Homes and Communities Agency; Transport for Greater Manchester; Northwards Housing; Historic England; United Utilities; National Grid; Electricity North West; the Environment Agency and Network Rail. There had been four other written responses provided from participants in the residents' or business consultation events.

The report described the responses and feedback from stakeholders as being largely positive. The recurring themes and comments had included:

- strong support for the vision and priorities contained within the draft NDF;
- strong support for the redevelopment of New Cross Zones B and C and the establishment of a new residential-led, mixed use neighbourhood;
- strong support for the provision of core infrastructure to improve connectivity and permeability with the city centre and adjoining areas;
- support for the provision of improved public realm and amenity space as part of the framework masterplan with an improved pedestrian and residential environment;
- support for an integrated approach to car parking and the provision of on street parking solutions to serve the needs of a new residential and mixed-use community;
- highlighting the need for flexibility in the implementation of the Framework to ensure it responds effectively to the opportunities and constraints of individual developments;
- concerns expressed about the over-development of sites and the compatibility of new development with existing residential and commercial uses;
- highlighting the prominence of local Listed Buildings and heritage assets and the need for appropriate consideration as part of future development proposals; and
- highlighting the challenges posed by the fragmented nature of private land interests in priority locations in facilitating comprehensive development.

A copy of the proposed final version of the Framework was appended to the report. The responses of the consultees had been carefully considered and a range of amendments had been made to the draft so as to strengthen the Framework where appropriate. Further clarity has been provided to reference the significance of the utilities infrastructure present in Zone C owned and managed by Electricity North West and National Grid. Additional context had been provided to note the significance of Listed Buildings and other heritage assets and structures. Further detail had also been included to emphasise the 'site by site' approach to car and cycle parking solutions.

We approved the final version of the Framework.

The report also addressed an implementation strategy for the Framework. Achieving the vision set out in the Framework would only be possible if the key constraints were tackled, including:

- the fragmented nature of third party land holdings and the lack of consolidated ownerships in key parts of the framework area;
- the limited number of sites in public sector control through which influence on development can be exerted; and
- the poor quality and layout of the existing built form in key locations.

The principle components of the implementation strategy would therefore be:

- the appointment an investor partner to support delivery of the Northern Gateway;
- continue strategic land assembly, which may need to be supported by the Council's compulsory purchase powers; and
- continued negotiation with land and property owners throughout the New Cross Neighbourhood.

The report described each of these components in detail and we agreed that the Strategic Director (Development) should develop this further through dialogue with key stakeholders.

Decisions

1. To note the comments received from stakeholders; including local land and property owners, residents, businesses, along with public and statutory consultees, and approve the final version of the New Cross NDF Update as a material consideration in the Council's decision making as a Local Planning Authority.
2. To note the Implementation Strategy set out in Section 6.0 of the report and provide authority to the Strategic Director (Development) to further develop this strategy in dialogue with key stakeholders; including potential investors and developer partners, landowners and existing businesses.
3. To note that this Implementation Strategy is likely to require the City Council to assemble land for redevelopment and to work in partnership with investor and developer partners to this end.
4. To note that land assembly activity in this location may ultimately need to be underpinned by the use of Compulsory Purchase Order powers.
5. To request that a further report on the progress with the Implementation Strategy - including progress with the Northern Gateway - is brought to a future meeting.

Exe/16/153 Refresh of the Ancoats and New Islington Neighbourhood Development Framework

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). A report submitted by the Chief Executive presented the outcome of the consultation and proposed that the final version of the Framework be adopted. A copy of the Framework was appended to the report.

The consultation programme had run from 19 September to 21 October 2016 and the report listed the various consultation methods and media that had been employed.

Both the residents' consultation event and the business breakfast event had each attracted 21 local stakeholders. The online consultation website had received 305 visits, which generated six responses. In total there had been 19 responses to the consultation.

The report explained that the comments and feedback received via the consultation have been generally supportive and consistent with the themes and priorities contained within the document. The key themes and comments that had been expressed by consultees were listed in the report. It was explained that, given the level of support that consultees had expressed, only minor changes had been made to the draft Framework to produce the final version that was being put forward for adoption. A plan indicating the extent of the Conservation Area and the key Listed Buildings and heritage assets had been added. Highway advice and comments had also been added, including a comment around the provision of 100% cycle parking for new developments. Planning advice had been included in the sections that referred to the Poland Street area, the back of Ancoats and the Ashton Canal corridor, primarily focused on exemplary design quality across both areas and the need to ensure that height and massing should be informed by their immediate context.

We agreed to the adoption of the proposed Framework document.

The report also addressed the implementation of the proposal in the Framework. Council Officer's would continue discussions with land and property owners to establish individual aspirations in relation to the future use of sites. Where appropriate, in areas with fragmented land ownership, the Council could seek to acquire third party land interests by agreement. However, we also noted that the fractured nature of land ownership across the area might require the use Compulsory Purchase Order powers to successfully deliver the vision set out in the Framework.

Further reports on the proposals for the longer term stewardship and the establishment of improved place and estate management arrangements for both neighbourhoods were to be presented to future meetings.

Decisions

1. To note the comments received from stakeholders including local landowners, residents, businesses as well as statutory consultees.

2. To approve the final version of the refreshed Ancoats and New Islington Neighbourhood Development Framework to guide and co-ordinate the future development of the area, with the intention that it will be a material consideration in the Council's decision making as a Local Planning Authority.
3. To note that to fully deliver the vision and objectives set out in this Framework, the City Council may be required to assemble land for redevelopment or to work in partnership with investor and developer partners to this end.
4. To note that land assembly activity in this location may ultimately need to be underpinned by the use of Compulsory Purchase Order powers.
5. To note that a further report on the development and implementation of the delivery strategy, including any land assembly matters, will be brought to a future meeting.
6. To note that further reports on the proposals for the longer term stewardship and the establishment of improved place/estate management arrangements for both neighbourhoods will be brought back to a future meeting at the appropriate time.

Exe/16/154 Cornbrook Hub

Manchester Ship Canal Developments (MSCD) has a significant landholding in the Cornbrook area, and was proposing to develop large scale residential schemes around the Pomona area in Trafford. In December 2013 we had endorsed, in principle, the new Strategic Regeneration Framework for The Cornbrook Hub area and requested that the Chief Executive undertake a public consultation exercise on the proposals (Minute Exe/13/176). The Framework was for land on the western fringe of the city centre, part of a ribbon of development around the Bridgewater Canal and railway lines that link the city centre with other parts of Salford and Trafford. The area is adjacent to Chester Road, the Bridgewater Canal and the Cornbrook Metrolink station. It is partly in Manchester and partly in Trafford, the area in Manchester being around 1ha of land bounded by Chester Road, the railway viaduct and Cornbrook Road. In September 2014 we had considered the outcome of the consultation and then approved the final draft of the Strategic Regeneration Framework for the Cornbrook Hub area (Minute Exe/14/085). In July 2015 we had endorsed the proposed approach to the development of the Cornbrook Hub Site and given in principle approval to the use of compulsory purchase powers to deliver the regeneration of the area (Minute Exe/15/089).

A report submitted by the Strategic Director (Development) explained that the delivery strategy for the scheme had been under review. Consideration had been given to the potential to use the Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) powers available to the Combined Authority (CA) and the Greater Manchester Elected Mayor, rather than the CPO powers of each of Manchester City Council and Trafford Borough Council, as had been envisaged in July 2015.

The report explained the origin of the CA powers and the advantages of using them compared to the initial approach we had endorsed in 2015. The proposed new powers were wider than the planning CPO powers held by the two councils and also, in some respects, easier to use. They were also likely to be more cost efficient and could be implemented and applied more quickly. The new strategy would therefore necessitate requesting the CA to utilise its powers and to agree to the delegation to the Chief Executives of Trafford and Manchester Councils to promote the CPO.

Under the 2015 strategy MSCD had agreed to underwrite the total cost of the CPO process. Under the agreed CPO Indemnity Agreement MSCD had initially agree to indemnify both Manchester City Council and Trafford Council for internal officer time commitments, and any external consultant time, incurred through the CPO process. They would also provide an indemnity for all compensation liabilities associated with the CPO. If this new strategy were to be adopted an indemnity would also need to be provided by MSCD in respect of any costs incurred, and compensation payable, by the Combined Authority in promoting and making the CPO.

Given this revised approach, the draft timescales included in the report showed that the land assembly could be completed by the end of 2018.

Decisions

1. To approve the alternative delivery strategy as detailed in section 2 of the report utilising the Greater Manchester Combined Authority Regeneration Compulsory Purchase powers.
2. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader, to present a report to the Combined Authority requesting that a Compulsory Purchase Order is promoted by the Combined Authority in respect of the Cornbrook neighbourhood, as detailed in Appendix One of the report. The report to the Combined Authority asking the Combined Authority to appoint Manchester City Council to act on its behalf in taking all necessary steps to prepare the case for the CPO, including but not limited to securing an appropriate indemnity in respect of the Combined Authority's costs in promoting and making the CPO.

Exe/16/155 Capital Programme – Proposed Increases

A report concerning a request to increase the capital programme was submitted. We approved the proposed changes which would increase the capital budget by £190k in 2016/17 and £978k in 2017/18, funded by the Better Care Fund Social Care Grant.

The report also listed the changes to the Capital Programme that had been approved by the City Treasurer, under delegated powers. These four changes totalled a further increase of £769k.

Decisions

1. To approve an increase in the capital budget of £190k in 2016/17 and £978k in 2017/18 for Adult Services, Locality Plan Programme Office. This project is to develop the infrastructure to enable the co-location of the integrated community health and care teams throughout Manchester.
2. To note increases to the programme of £769k as a result of delegated approvals.

Exe/16/156 Global Revenue Budget Monitoring

A report was submitted to provide a summary of the position of the 2016/17 revenue budget at the end of October 2016. The report gave details of the projected variances to budgets, the position of the Housing Revenue Account, Council Tax and business rate collection, revised prudential borrowing indicators, and the state of the Council's contingency funds. Projecting forward from the position at the end of October 2016, it was forecast that by the year-end in March 2017 the revenue budget would be under-spent by £0.995m overall.

The report set out and we agreed the proposed use of an additional grant that had been received since the revenue budget was approved in February. This was:

- £180k over three years to be UK city partner in Synchronicity, part of the European Commission's Horizon 2020 programme prompted by the Future Cities Catapult and Digital Catapult.

We also supported the proposed release of £1.5m from the Environmental Initiatives budget to support the delivery of the Highways Reactive Maintenance Programme to carry out small scale repairs to the Highway and Support the cleaning and repair of highway drainage.

The report explained two proposed major budget virements. For the first, income from planning applications was ahead of budget as a result of the number of developments across the city. There was a forecast of a £1m surplus at year end and it was proposed that this be transferred to reserves. The second was for part of the adults' investment funding of £7.3m that was agreed in the 2015/16 budget setting process. There remained £2.6m of this money that was uncommitted and it was proposed this be used to mitigate budget pressures. We supported these proposals, both of which would be subject to the approval of the Council.

The report also put forward the virement of £285k from Growth and Neighbourhoods to the Corporate Core so as to allow the CCTV service to transfer from Growth and Neighbourhoods to the Highways service, within the Corporate Core. We supported this proposal.

The report also proposed, and we agreed, that £1.337m that was contained in a reserve created from carried forward unspent grant for street cleansing and recycling collections be utilised to help secure planned savings in waste disposal costs.

Decision

1. To note the contents of the report.
2. To approve the proposed use of additional grants as set out above.
3. To note the allocation of the Environmental Initiatives budget as set out above.
4. To recommend that Council approve the budget virements of £3.6m being £1m additional income from planning applications and £2.6m of uncommitted money allocated to adults' investment funding.
5. To approve the proposed virement of £285k for the transfer of the CCTV service as outlined above.
6. To approve the use of £1.337m of reserves established from the carry forward across financial years of a grant for street cleansing and recycling collections to enable the Council to meet the waste disposal savings through a reduction in residual waste in conjunction with a programme of education, engagement and enforcement.
7. To agree the principle of the Highways virement proposed in paragraph 10.4 in principle and then delegate to the City Treasurer and the Executive Member for Finance to approve the final amount.

Exe/16/157 Manchester Tech Hub – Digital Incubator

Project Forward was the local name given to the Government initiative to support the development of innovative businesses across the North of England. This was to be achieved through investment in technology incubators in Leeds, Manchester and Sheffield, which would nurture start-ups, foster collaboration, and provide mentoring, learning and business support. In March 2016 we considered a report on the use of the £4m grant from Department for Culture, Media and Sport that was to be paid to the Council to help delivery partners to secure and refurbish a property in the city centre to establish new facilities providing workspace, business incubation and other services for entrepreneurs and small and medium-sized businesses (SMEs) who rely on, and innovate in, digital technologies and their applications (Minute Exe/16/045).

A joint report by the Chief Executive and the City Treasurer described the outcome of the procurement exercise that we had supported in March. Expressions of Interest had been received from five potential applicants of which three had met the key grant criteria. Of the three, two scored equally well in the assessment process. Given the scoring on the submissions made by Allied London and MSP Bruntwood, it was felt that there was a strong case for sharing the grant equally between those two applicants. Following clarification of the applications, both applicants had confirmed that they would be able to deliver the same quantum of space but for half the cost. This would therefore result in the grant funding creating a greater number of business start ups and jobs in the city. The Department for Culture, Media and Sport had confirmed that splitting the grant in this way was appropriate.

The Allied London tech hub was to be located within Enterprise City, St John's and was to focus on Retail, Media and TV. The Bruntwood / MSP tech hub was to be located at Oxford House, within the Circle Square development, focusing on Data Science and Innovation.

Decisions

1. To note the procurement process undertaken and the outcome of this.
2. To award a grant of £2 million each to Bruntwood / Manchester Science Partnerships Limited and Allied London Properties Limited for the establishment of two new tech hubs in the City Centre.
3. To delegate the approval of the detailed grant agreement conditions to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader and Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources.
4. To authorise the City Solicitor to prepare and sign the grant agreement and associated legal documents subject to the delegated approval.

Exe/16/158 Draft Manchester Residential Quality Guidance

In February 2015 we had expressed our desire that development agreements should deliver sustainable quality homes (Minute Exe/15/027). In March 2015 we had requested the creation of a document to set out key principles for design quality and sustainability standards for residential development in the city (Minute Exe/15/049). At that time we had also adopted, on an interim basis, the London Housing Design Guide Space standards as a basis for assessing new residential developments, pending the preparation of specific guidance for Manchester. In July 2016 we endorsed the draft Manchester Residential Quality Guidance as a basis for consultation with local stakeholders, landowners, voluntary, statutory, professional and development related interest groups (Minute Exe/16/067).

A report from the Strategic Director (Development) and the Deputy Chief Executive (Growth and Neighbourhoods) set out the outcome of the consultation. It explained that 74 written responses had been received. Of those, 50 responses (68%) agreed or strongly agreed with the draft document. Eight responses (11%) disagreed with the draft document. The overwhelming majority of responses had been largely supportive of the document with a small number of respondents commenting on a number of the recommendations and suggesting proposed changes.

The report summarised the main changes in response to consultation as being:

- further clarification of the planning status of the document provided on page 17 'Planning Policy and Other Guidance';
- updated to reflect wider representation of different groups living in Manchester
- made clearer (in terms of size and font colour) with the addition of page numbering throughout the guidance document;
- updated to include external references to existing Historic England Guidance such as Streets for All, Sustainable Growth in Historic Areas and Design and

Heritage Champions to encourage and promote development which responds positively areas of historical significance;

- updated to reflect support for maintaining or enhancing the city's waterway;
- reference to emergency service access made within the 'Make it Practical' and secure reference to secure bin storage noted in 'Make it Practical'; and
- updated to make specific reference to ensuring access for disabled people and include reference for an appropriate level of disabled spaces to be provided as part of residential developments, in response to demand.

A proposed final version of the document was appended to the report. However, it was reported at the meeting that this version still required some minor error corrections and typographical changes and so further amendments were needed before the final version could be published.

It was also raised at the meeting that the space standards now being proposed in the draft were in some instances less generous than the space standards that had been accepted by the Council when the London Housing Design Guide Space standards had been adopted as the interim standards in the city. It was agreed that the final version should use whichever space standards were more generous between those in the draft and those in the London standards.

We therefore agreed that authority be delegated to the Strategic Director (Development) to make all these necessary amendments and corrections to the draft document, and to publish it as the final document.

Decisions

1. To acknowledge the work of the Residential Design Guide Sounding Board in overseeing the development of the "Manchester Residential Quality Guidance" document.
2. To delegate authority to the Strategic Director (Development) to make any necessary amendments and corrections to the draft submitted to the meeting, including the incorporation of the most generous of the alternative space standards, and to then publish the approved final version of the "Manchester Residential Quality Guidance" document.
3. To approve the "Manchester Residential Quality Guidance" document as a material consideration in the Council's decision making as a Local Planning Authority.
4. To approve that the guidance contained within the "Manchester Residential Quality Guidance" document should be reflected in the development of a new Development Plan for Manchester, on which work will commence within the next 12 months.

In November 2016 was had considered and commended to Council the “Housing Strategy for Manchester 2016-2021” (Minute Exe/16/139). The strategy had been adopted by the Council later in November (Minute CC/16/86).

In June 2016 we had considered and endorsed a set of principles on affordable housing and authorised consultation on those principles (Minute Exe/16/057).

A report submitted by the Strategic Director (Development) now proposed a Housing Affordability Policy Framework for Manchester that was to link household income to the provision of new homes across the city. This was to help ensure that residents on or below the average household income for Manchester would have access to decent and secure homes. The policy recommended that the Council aim to deliver between 1,000 and 2,000 new affordable homes in Manchester each year, seeking to use a range of resources to build social rented housing to replace those lost through the right to buy and through demolitions.

We noted that the Economy Scrutiny Committee had also considered and endorsed this report at a recent meeting (Minute ESC/16/58).

Decisions

1. To note the report.
2. To approve the Housing Affordability Policy Framework contained within Section 3 of the report.

Exe/16/160 National Cycling Centre Partnership – Naming Rights

A report from the Deputy Chief Executive (Growth and Neighbourhoods) was considered. This described a proposal to generate revenue by selling the naming rights and associated sponsorship rights of the National Cycling Centre (NCC). The Council was close to securing an eight year agreement with a major sponsor with a multinational brand. The revenue generated from this naming right agreement would be reinvested to support sport and leisure priorities in Manchester.

Decisions

1. To approve the proposal to implement the sale of the naming rights and associated sponsorship and branding rights.
2. To delegate authority to the City Treasurer and City Solicitor in consultation with the Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure and Events) to negotiate and agree the final terms of the agreements necessary to implement the proposal.
3. To authorise the City Solicitor to enter into and agree and complete on behalf of the Council all the necessary legal documentation giving effect to the above.

Exe/16/161 Decisions of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority

Decision

To receive and note of the decisions made at the meetings of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority on 25 November 2016.

Exe/16/162 Exclusion of the Public

A recommendation was made that the public be excluded during consideration of the next item of business.

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/16/163 National Cycling Centre Partnership – Naming Rights (Public Excluded)

A report submitted by the Deputy Chief Executive (Growth and Neighbourhoods) disclosed the identity of the company that was the seeking to secure the naming rights for the Centre. It also set out the financial implications to the Council of the proposed agreement.

Decisions

1. To approve the proposal to implement the sale of the naming rights and associated sponsorship and branding rights.
2. To delegate authority to the City Treasurer and City Solicitor in consultation with the Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure and Events) to negotiate and agree the final terms of the agreements necessary to implement the proposal.
3. To authorise the City Solicitor to enter into and agree and complete on behalf of the Council all the necessary legal documentation giving effect to the above.