

The Executive

Minutes of the meeting held on 28 June 2017

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 Bridges, Dar, Manco, Rowles and Stogia

Exe/17/076 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 17 May 2017 as a correct record.

Exe/17/077 Manchester Arena - Attack and Recovery

On 22 May 2017, Manchester experienced a horrific terrorist attack with a bomb being exploded in the foyer area at the Manchester Arena as a performance by Ariana Grande was drawing to an end. A report submitted by the Chief Executive provided account of the attack and described the work of the Council and partner organisations since then in responding to it.

In the attack 19 victims were killed at the scene, including children. Three more victims died later at hospital. The bomber was also killed in the explosion. At least 245 people had been physically injured. Paramedics initially treated 60 walking wounded in the city centre, and 59 serious trauma victims were treated in hospitals.

The report described the responses and actions immediately after the incident and in the following days, explaining how the police, other emergency services, the health service, the Council, local people and business in Greater Manchester, the Government and Security Services had been involved.

Lessons from previous incidents had proved the benefits of early consideration of the recovery phase. Therefore, whilst simultaneously supporting the response efforts, Manchester City Council, in discussion with government departments, had begun to implement the recovery arrangements set out within the GM Strategic Recovery Guidance. On the 31 May GMP had formally handed over the response phase to the local authority led recovery phase. Manchester City Council was now leading a multi-agency Recovery Co-ordination Group to deliver a Recovery Strategy.

The report described in detail the work on immediate and longer term psychological, physical, practical and social support for:

- Bereaved families
- Injured and their families – ranging from those with minor to life changing injuries
- Children and young people

- Staff of all of the agencies who responded
- The audience at the arena and their families
- The wider public

The community recovery work was seeking to:

- encourage communities to stand together and promote unity and positive stories;
- build community resilience to extremism and hate;
- work with communities to identify community assets and co-design activities (including hard to reach groups/most vulnerable communities);
- safeguard and provide support to those most affected and vulnerable (individuals and institutions);
- manage risk and increase community confidence to report suspicious activities and hate crime;
- provide communities with reassurance; and
- counter negative narratives and myth busting.

A dialogue had been established with the 19 businesses who were affected by the inner cordon that was put in place in and around the Manchester Arena. Business continuity plans had been implemented and across the city and city region the opportunity to promote the need for all organisations to revisit business continuity plans was being taken. This was to be supported by the Manchester Business Continuity Forum. Work was underway to determine the short-term and medium-term impacts on retail businesses, hotel operators, the music economy and the wider visitor economy within the city and city region.

At the meeting tributes were paid to the many people in the Council, the Police and other public services, and to the other Mancunians who had responded to the attack and been part of the city's recovery. It was also reported that a presentation on Civil Contingency Planning was to be given at the next meeting of the Council in July.

The incident that had taken place on the 22 May was one of the worst atrocities ever seen on UK soil and had been absolutely devastating to all Mancunians, those who live here and those who associate themselves with the city. The report demonstrated that as a city and as a Council, through the resilience arrangements that were in place, we had been able to respond quickly and effectively with a clear focus on those most affected. The continuing approach to recovery would ensure that those affected by this incident received the best possible support and care. The report also explained the importance of ensuring that the recovery arrangements transitioned into established mainstream structures and processes that would be sustainable in the longer-term. A further report was to be provided later in the year to update on the progress of the recovery.

Decision

To note the response and recovery work undertaken to date in relation to the Manchester Arena attack, as well as the potential long-term impacts for those affected.

Exe/17/078 Grenfell Tower Fire - The implications for Manchester

(Councillor Rowles declared a pecuniary interest in this item of business and withdrew from the meeting for its consideration. Councillors Bridges, S Judge, B Priest and Craig each declared a personal interest in the report as a member of the Board of a Registered Housing Provider referred to in the report).

Scores of people had died after a huge fire had engulfed Grenfell Tower, a west London residential tower block, in the morning of Wednesday, 14 June. While 80 people were currently presumed to have died, the Police were advising that the final toll would not be known until at least the end of the year. As the fire had spread rapidly up the outside of the building the building's external cladding quickly came under scrutiny. Other fire-safety and building evacuation provisions in the tower had also been raised as matters of concern.

A report submitted by the Strategic Director (Development) detailed the review and actions that had been already been undertaken in relation to High Rise Residential buildings within Manchester. Manchester and its Registered Housing Provider Partners had been undertaking extensive survey and review measures in order to offer assurance to all of their residents on the fire safety of their homes. The priority was High Rise Residential blocks, defined as those over 6 stories high. The City Council is the landlord for 35 High Rise Residential buildings across the City, for which different management arrangements were in place. Registered Housing Providers own 26 High Rise Residential buildings. In addition the City Council own and manages Woodward Court temporary homelessness accommodation which also comes under the definition of High Rise, giving a total of 62 social High Rise Blocks. The report estimated that there were a further 150 or more privately owned High Rise blocks in the city.

Across the country, including in Manchester, many samples of the external cladding used on other High Rise buildings had been tested and found to be of a similar type to that used on Grenfell Towers. None of the 35 Council owned high rise residential buildings had any of the materials used on the Grenfell Tower, but some of those owned by other Registered Housing Providers had failed these safety tests. In Manchester work was being undertaken to remove such cladding and insulation from those buildings.

Appended to the report was a schedule of all the High Rise buildings that were being assessed, and the results of any tests on their cladding or other materials.

Private landlords had been urged to confirm with their tenants that a Fire Risk Assessment is in place for their building and where there were any doubts, they should contact the Fire Officer to seek advice.

The Council's building control service had also been involved in checking buildings. Working together with the fire officer, a prohibition notice had been issued on an unoccupied building under construction which had suspect screening fitted. That building was being converted from office use to residential under 'permitted development' rights. This measure was introduced by Government in 2015 to allow developers to fast track changes in buildings without the normal regulatory controls provided through the planning system.

The report explained that the City Council remained committed to doing everything necessary to prevent any such incident happening in Manchester, the safety of residents living in their own homes being fundamental: residents must be safe but must also feel safe and be confident that their landlord takes their fire safety seriously. The Council would continue to monitor the situation and would support all partners in making the right judgements when the results of materials and cladding tests became known. The immediate priority had been to ensure that all our residents remained safe in their own homes. As sampling and advice followed from the investigations into the Grenfell Tower fire, the Council and its partners would put in place all the resources needed and carry out all necessary works to help make our residents living in socially owned buildings feel safe in their homes.

Members of the Executive expressed their appreciation for the work and dedication being shown by the Council's staff and the staff of other landlords that were part of this work to ensure that residents remained safe in their homes.

At the meeting concern was also expressed about the building control and development control arrangements that the Government had put in place as it was felt these were potentially an ongoing source of risk. It was agreed that the permitted development rights that allowed offices to be converted to residential blocks without planning permission from the local authority should be removed. Also that building control should revert to being a statutory function, with fire certificates issued by the Fire Authority.

A report was to be submitted to the next meeting to provide an update on the testing of building material samples and other actions that were being taken.

Decision

To endorse the actions that are being taken relating to fire safety in high-rise residential buildings.

Exe/17/079 Our Manchester Voluntary and Community Sector Funding

A joint report was considered from the Deputy Chief Executive, Growth and Neighbourhoods and the Strategic Director, Adult Social Services. The report explained that in the summer of 2016 the Council had committed to a co-design process for the Council's funding support arrangements with representatives from the voluntary sector and the Clinical Commissioning Groups. The purpose of this process was to design a new way of investing in the voluntary sector which would support the Our Manchester approach by helping the sector to be stronger and more resilient.

The report explained how the work on the design of the new approach had proceeded through late 2016 and early 2017, including consultation with funded organisations and the wider Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) community. There had also been workshops in the north, south and centre of the city. VCS members of the co-design group had co-presented at those workshop and all co-design group members facilitated table discussions. Members of the co-design group

had also attended the Age Friendly Manchester Board and the Good Neighbours network meeting. An analysis of the outcomes of all these consultations was appended to the report.

The report then described the proposals for the funding model that the co-design process had developed. These would involve a grant programme of two rounds. The aim of the first round, referred to as the “General Fund”, would be to support the voluntary and community sector in Manchester to carry out the activities that they identify as being most effective in meeting the aims of the Our Manchester Strategy. Applicants would identify their own outcomes to meet one or more of the aims of the Our Manchester Strategy. This General Fund would fund the following activities: direct services; influencing change; and networking and partnership support. The criteria that were to be used to assess applications to the General Fund were set out in the report.

The second round, referred to as the “Targeted Fund”, would specify which geographical communities and communities of identity were to be targeted, based on gaps identified when the General Fund was awarded. The aim of this fund being to stimulate the development of community and voluntary sector activity by people who live or work within a geographical community or who are part of a community of identity. This funding would only be offered to organisations successful in their application to the General Fund.

The report explained that the intention was for the fund to open to application from the start of September 2017, with decisions being taken and groups notified by early December 2017, and with new funding agreements running from 1 April 2018.

At the meeting thanks were expressed to all in the voluntary sector who had been involved in the co-design process and who had contributed and supported the development of these proposals. It was also reported that the criteria used in the assessment of bids would recognise the statutory duties to provide care services and would seek to maintain the continuing provision of those services.

In noting the success of this co-design process, a desire was expressed for the organisations that had been involved in this work to remain engaged and to contribute to the co-design of the actual services, as well as the co-design of the funding and bidding model. It was agreed that the desire to do this should be made explicit in the operation of the funds.

The use of Council buildings and the contribution that community asset transfer might make to the success of the Our Manchester Strategy was also raised at the meeting. It was felt that this now needed to be considered alongside the use of funding and grants to support the voluntary and community sector.

We noted that the report had also been considered at a recent meeting of the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee (Minute CESC/17/20).

Decision

To endorse the funding model put forward by the co-design group consisting of the Council, Clinical Commissioning Groups and the Voluntary and Community Sector.

Exe/17/080 Adult Social Care Reform Grant

We had previously commented on the funding pressures on Adult Social Care in Manchester (Minute Exe/17/030). In the 2017 Spring Budget the Government had announced an additional funding of £2 billion for adult social care, over three years. In the longer term, the Government had also given a commitment to establishing a fair and more sustainable basis of funding, in the face of the future demographic challenges.

A joint report from the Strategic Director Adult Social Services and the City Treasurer set out the implications of this announcement for Manchester. From this additional money the Council was to receive £12.92m in 2017/18, £7.64m in 2018/19 and £3.78m in 2019/20. It was being assumed that the £3.78m would then continue in future years. The money had to be pooled into the local Better Care Fund and was to be spent on adult social care and used for the purposes of meeting adult social care needs, reducing pressures on the and stabilising the social care provider market.

Manchester Health and Care Commissioning partners had established a set of principles to guide decisions on the allocation of the grant. Investments were to be used in accordance with the Locality Plan and were to:

- contribute and be part of implementation of Manchester Health and Care Commissioning and the Local Care Organisation;
- support Our Manchester by funding radical changes in assessment and involvement of families, carers and communities, tapping into their strengths and support;
- be a vehicle to channel investment into reform of adult social care for the long term as well as funding immediate performance improvements;
- align with GM Transformation Fund investment into the Local Care Organisation and with other existing revenue and capital available for investment in adult social care; and
- connect to the GM Adult Social Care Transformation Programme, the developing programme of investment for which is detailed at Section 6 below and the GM review of commissioning.

It was proposed that the adult social care grant funding be added to the Manchester Health and Care Commissioning partnership agreement and the detailed investment schemes and associated business cases then progressed within the set governance arrangements for Manchester Health and Care Commissioning. That proposal was supported.

It was explained that as the plans for the use of the funds were developed in more detail that additional reports would be presented to future meetings.

Decisions

1. To approve the addition of the adult social care grant to the Manchester Health and Care Commissioning partnership agreement.
2. To endorse the principles set out above to be used by Manchester Health and Care Commissioning for the deployment of funding.
3. To note that the adult social care grant funding represents an integral element of a substantial reform programme being progressed both locally and at a GM level as detailed in the report.

Exe/17/081 Future of the Section 48 Association of Greater Manchester Authorities Grant Scheme

The AGMA Executive had been operating a grant scheme under Section 48 of the Local Government Act 1985 on behalf of the ten Greater Manchester district councils. The current programme of grant funding to eligible voluntary organisations was agreed in December 2014 by AGMA. That scheme was in year 3 of the current three year funding cycle, finishing at the end of the 2017/18 financial year. With the establishment of the Combined Authority the AGMA Leaders had suggested a review of the options for the development of a new programme for culture under the GMCA, with a view to aligning the start of the new programme with the closure of the AGMA Section 48 scheme. However, 12 months' notice was required to close the existing AGMA scheme so that was likely to still be operating at least up to March 2019.

The City Solicitor presented a report that explained the proposals for consultation on the possible closure of the AGMA scheme, and the development of a successor GMCA scheme. The report described the issues that were likely to be important to the development of the funding strategy and priorities of any successor grants scheme.

Decisions

1. To endorse the proposal to authorise a consultation on closure of the scheme to be undertaken by AGMA to inform a final decision on closure that will be taken at a later date.
2. To agree to support the development of a new funding programme for culture, under the GMCA, as a potential replacement for the Section 48 Scheme.
3. To note that it is intended to run the consultation for a new GMCA programme for culture at the same time as the consultation on closure of the Section 48 scheme.

Exe/17/082 Corridor Manchester Spatial Framework

The Oxford Road Corridor is economically the most important area within Greater Manchester and contains one of the largest higher-education campuses in the UK, with close to 70,000 undergraduates and postgraduates studying at The University of

Manchester, Manchester Metropolitan University and the Royal Northern College of Music. The area also includes the Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust and Manchester Science Partnership's Manchester Science Park.

The Corridor Manchester Partnership consists of Manchester City Council, Manchester Metropolitan University, The University of Manchester, Central Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Bruntwood, ARUP, and Manchester Science Partnerships. The Corridor Manchester Board's vision for the area being:

“Manchester's cosmopolitan hub and world-class innovation district, where talented people from the city and across the world learn, create, work, socialise, live and do business; contributing to the economic and social dynamism of one of Europe's leading cities.”

The Strategic Director (Development) submitted a report seeking support for a new Strategic Spatial Framework (SSF) for the Oxford Road Corridor area. The purpose of the new draft framework was to guide development in the Oxford Road Corridor in ways that reflects the area's physical and locational characteristics, that would support future growth and which would complement existing developments in adjacent areas.

To achieve the vision for the area this new draft document proposed that the City Council and its partners should identify and support locations for future potential growth, recognising that North Campus and the rationalisation of the Universities' estates could provide opportunities to support the growth of business clusters and of the Higher Education Institutions. Areas offering possible future opportunities to increase the density of development were also identified. Place making proposals, including public realm, linkages, and the amenity of existing residents in relation to privacy, traffic and transport, would be critical factors in these locations. The opportunities for sites to allow further development and growth would be considered by the Corridor Manchester Partnership, together with other landowners and businesses in the area. In appropriate cases, the Council might consider the use of its powers, including, where justified, compulsory purchase powers, to facilitate important developments.

The report explained that the intention was for public consultation to now take place to seek views on and establish support for this new Corridor Manchester Strategic Spatial Framework. The principles of the framework, as described in the report, were endorsed and the proposal for public consultation agreed.

Decisions

1. To endorse in principle the summary Strategic Spatial Framework and spatial plan as set out in this report;
2. To request the Chief Executive to undertake a consultation exercise on the draft Strategic Spatial Framework with local stakeholders, landowners, businesses and residents affected by the proposals contained within it, and report back on the outcome of the consultation.

3. To agree that the Council should consider using its Compulsory Purchase Order powers to acquire sites as appropriate, where it can be demonstrated that this will contribute to the further growth of the Oxford Road Corridor.

Exe/17/083 Manchester Metropolitan University Estate Strategy 2017

A report by the Strategic Director (Development) explained that for the previous two years the Manchester Metropolitan University had been developing a new strategy for its property estate to set out the University's ambitions and plans up to 2027. Officers of the Council had been working with the University on the development of that strategy. As part of this work the University had identified a number of key strategic projects including:

- a new facility for the Faculty of Arts and Humanities;
- a new facility for the Faculty of Science and Engineering;
- a new International Screen School Manchester;
- a new Manchester Sport Institute;
- strategic investment to deliver the Student Residential Accommodation Strategy;
- strategic investment in an expanded Library and Student Commons; and
- a heat network and Energy Centre.

The report set out the University's rationale for each of these.

With regard to the proposal for a new Manchester Sport Institute it was explained that there was an ongoing dialogue with the University to develop the case for the Etihad Stadium to be a potential location for the Institute. In that way it would provide the world-class Higher Education facility offering sports related undergraduate and postgraduate courses. Proposals for such a facility were set out within the draft Eastlands Regeneration Framework. The draft Eastlands Regeneration Framework was currently subject to public consultation, and it was explained at the meeting that a decision had been taken to extend the period of the consultation to allow more time for local residents to consider and respond to the proposals in it, including the possible creation of The Sports Institute.

Decisions

1. To note the contents of the report and to endorse the Manchester Metropolitan University's Estate Strategy as appended to this report, but so far only as the same does not prejudice the Council's rights, powers, duties and obligations as a local authority, planning authority, highway authority or in any other such capacity.
2. To note that further reports will be submitted in due course in respect of the Manchester Sport Institute and in respect of a new Student Accommodation Strategy for the city which will seek to support the ambitions set out in the Manchester Metropolitan University's Estate Strategy.

Exe/17/084 New Islington Marina

In June 2016 we noted that a number of defects have come to light associated with core infrastructure within the New Islington Marina that would require immediate attention. These issues primarily related to the raised water level in the Marina causing seepage onto adjacent development sites and sink holes appearing near the Marina. There was also a defective sewer that would need to be decommissioned. At that time a capital budget of £350,000 was approved to allow the delivery of essential enabling works associated with works to the canal arm in the New Islington Marina (minute Exe/16/060).

The Strategic Director (Development) now submitted a report to provide an update on actions being taken and the outcome of enabling works that had been undertaken. The conclusions of this were set out in the report along with a schedule of the full programme of works that were needed to eliminate the problems at the site. The report explained that in order to undertake the works in the Marina in the most cost effective and safe manner, it was going to be necessary to relocate the 30 boats that are currently moored there. Boaters had been written to several times during 2016 to make them aware that this may be the case. In May 2017 a further letter had been issued giving advance warning that all boaters would need to leave the Marina by 31 August 2017.

The report also provided an update on actions being taken to establish a Management Company that would take on responsibility for future management and maintenance arrangements for New Islington, which was to be funded through an estate charge which would be levied upon development plots within the New Islington Estate.

The meeting was addressed by two representatives of the New Islington Marina Residents' Association, Ms Maher and Ms Milward. They spoke of their feeling that the Council had developed these plans with apparently no consideration of the consequences that a forced eviction was going to have on the lives of the people who had their homes in the Marina. There were fears that being forced to move out the area would cost residents their jobs and livelihoods and harm the schooling of their children. They questioned whether consideration had been given to undertaking the works in a phased manner that would allow boats to remain in the Marina. They hoped to have the opportunity to discuss how the project might be undertaken without resulting in a devastating impact on the residents' lives and homes. If a phased approach was not feasible the residents sought some assurance that alternative sites would be found in Manchester that would allow them to continue with their lives, and keep their jobs in Manchester. They also asked to be involved in any risk assessments that were to be undertaken that would examine the possible impacts of works on the health and safety of the boaters and residents of the Marina.

The meeting was also addressed by Councillor Manco, a Councillor for the Ancoats and Clayton Ward that included this area. He spoke of his meeting and discussions with the residents and of their concerns for their futures. He explained his hope that the future management arrangements that might be put in place at the Marina would not price the existing residents out of being able to return to their neighbourhood.

An apology was given to the representatives of the residents if any impression had been given that their concerns and fears were not being taken into consideration and were not being taken seriously by the Council. It was explained that discussions were taking place with the Canals and Rivers Trust and with Peel Holdings to try and identify temporary moorings for the residents to move to that would ensure they were able to retain their employment in the city and continue with the education of their children. That the residents were acknowledging that the work was essential and had to be done was welcomed. It was also explained that the options of phasing the work had been examined. That had concluded that phasing the work so that the residents could remain at the Marina would significantly lengthen how long the project would take and make it much more expensive to carry out, and so would not be practical. However, the Council was experienced and had developed good working practices in dealing with other situations where developments had required residents to be relocated, and had well developed policies on that. It was agreed that the residents of the Marina should be treated in a comparable way and should receive the same consideration that other Manchester residents had in the past. A commitment was given to work with the residents of the Marina so that these works had as little impact on their lives as possible.

Decisions

1. To note that the report provides an update on progress in identifying a scheme of works that will address the defects associated with core infrastructure within the New Islington Marina that require immediate attention.
2. To note that the project costs of £5.2m will be met from within the existing Capital Programme Budget 2017-18 to 2021-22, approved by the Executive in February 2017.
3. To note that a Management Company (ManCo) for the New Islington Estate will be set up with responsibility to oversee the collection of the estate charge that will be levied on all developments within the estate, and that any future management and maintenance costs for the estate common parts will be met from the estate charge.
4. To note that the estate charge cannot be used to pay for the essential remedial works within the marina core infrastructure.
5. To agree that the work with the residents continues so that a suitable course of action can be established.

Exe/17/085 Progress of the Residential Growth Action Plan

In March 2016 we had endorsed the Manchester Residential Growth Strategy which set out the key priorities for delivering residential growth over the period 2016 – 2025 (Minute Exe/16/043). That Strategy had been accompanied by an Action Plan setting out the key actions to be delivered during the first year of the Strategy. A report now submitted by the Strategic Director (Development) described the successes achieved and the progress made since the Strategy had been adopted.

Development activity and investment in residential construction had increased significantly in 2016/17 and further expansion was expected to continue in 2017/18. The progress achieved was summarised as:

- 58 residential developments on-site across the city with circa 7,000 new homes currently under construction including 27 developments on-site in the city centre providing around 5,000 new homes.
- New homes on-site in the city centre were up by 135% since 2015/16.
- A forecast that about 1,800 new homes would complete across the city by the end of 2016/17, over 60% of which would be houses outside the city centre.
- A forecast that close to 3,000 new homes were to complete in 2017/18 including over 1,500 in the city centre.
- The Housing Affordability Policy Framework had been published to support increased delivery of between 1,000 to 2,000 affordable new homes each year.

The report also explained that the limited timescales used in the 2016/17 action plan had resulted in challenges in maintaining a strategic oversight and a coherent narrative. Whilst each of the actions directly related to the 6 priority areas of the Residential Growth Strategy, they did not sufficiently paint the picture of an overall programme of activity. It has also become apparent that many of the actions associated with the priority residential growth schemes were of a medium to long-term nature and should be reflected as such in the action plans.

To address those challenges a revised Draft Residential Growth 5-year Action Plan 2017-2022 had been developed and a copy of this was appended to the report. This five-year Action Plan would provide greater clarity over the medium and longer-term actions that were considered to be key to the overall delivery of our residential growth objectives. We approved this revised five-year plan.

Decisions

1. To note the report and the progress that has been made in delivering on the actions as set in the 2016/17 Residential Growth Action Plan.
2. To approve the revised five-year Residential Growth Action Plan for the period 2017 - 2022 as set out in Appendix 2 of the report.

Exe/17/086 Capital Programme – Proposed Increases

A report concerning requests to increase the capital programme was submitted. We approved five changes under delegated powers. These changes would increase the Council's capital budget by £3,490k in 2017/18, £1,850k in 2018/19, and £1,050k in 2019/20.

The report also presented details on a further nine changes that had been approved by the City Treasurer under delegated powers, and on one other change to the programme that had been approved by the Leader. Taken together those ten agreements would involve capital expenditure of £4.543m.

Decisions

1. To approve:
 - (a) Highways Programme – The Green Bridge at Airport City. To increase the capital budget by £3,000k; £100k in 2017/18, £1,850k in 2018/19 and £1,050k in 2019/20 funded by external contributions from Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM).
 - (b) Highways Programme – Manchester and Salford Inner Relief Road (MSIRR) Regent Road and Water Street. To increase the capital budget by £1,242k in 2017/18, funded by external contributions from the Greater Manchester Combined Authority.
 - (c) Growth and Neighbourhoods – Armitage Sports Centre Hockey Pitches. To increase the capital budget by £77k in 2017/18, funded by the Stadium Rental Reserve.
 - (d) Private Sector Programme 17/18 – Disabled Adaptations 17/18. To increase the capital budget by £591k in 2017/18 funded by the Disabled Facilities Grant.
 - (e) Northwards Programme – North Manchester New Builds. To increase the capital budget by £1,480k in 2017/18 funded by HCA grant funding.
2. To note increases to the programme of £4,543k as a result of delegated approvals.

Exe/17/087 Revenue Outturn 2016/17

The City Treasurer submitted a report on the final outturn on the General Fund for 2016/17. The overall revenue outturn for the year was a net underspend of £0.689m

The report also outlined the final year-end figures for the Housing Revenue Account, showing the final outturn position for the HRA as an overall surplus of £4.981m that had been transferred to the Account's reserves.

The report included details of service budget variances, and the requests for carry forward into the 2017/18 budgets some of the under-spent funds from 2016/17.

The final figures being presented assume approval for a request for funding from the non-pay inflation consisting of a virement of £759k to Adult Services relating to 12 new clients for Learning Disability residential cases (£474k), increased residential and nursing clients (£119k) and additional Delayed Transfer of Care cases (£166k). That proposal was supported.

The outturn figures presented also included the virement of £1.668m from the Transport levy budget with a corresponding increase in the amount of the Levy

funded through the bus lane income. The principle of this transfer had been agreed in December 2016 (Minute Exe/16/156). The City Treasurer was now reporting the total that had been transferred.

The report also set out for consideration the requests to carry-forward into the 2017/18 budgets underspends and surpluses that had arisen in 2016/17. These totalled £700,000 and were:

- Readmanchester: £66,000 as funding for the summer term 2017 and a programme extension for the autumn term.
- Pike Fold School site demolition: £111,000 for the costs of the works.
- Community Compliance and Safety: £164,000 to appoint suitably experienced and qualified staff to undertake this function.
- Operational Property: £200,000 to mitigate against identified pressures in 2017/18 including a delay in the demolition of Fujitsu, a delay in the Heron House refurbishment, a loss of income from the Arndale Centre and ongoing costs at Belle Vue Stadium.
- Manchester Creative Digital Assets Ltd: £159,000 arising from increased income from tenant lettings and reduced operating costs. This proposal was addressed in a later report (Minute Exe/17/090 below).

These were all supported.

Decisions

1. To note the outturn position for 2016/17.
2. To approve the use of non-pay inflation as set out above.
3. To note the final Transport levy virement which had been approved in principle in December 2016, with authority delegated to the City Treasurer to approve the final amount.
4. To approve the requests for carry forward of underspends as identified in the report and set out above, and to recommend the Council approve one of the carry-forwards as set out in Minute Exe/17/090 (2) below.
5. To note the overall General Fund position for 2016/17.
6. To note the Housing Revenue Account position for 2016/17.

Exe/17/088 Capital Programme Monitoring 2016/17 – Outturn Report

The City Treasurer submitted a report to inform us of the outturn of capital expenditure and financing for 2016/17. The report also set out the variations between the 2016/17 outturn and the forecast of £271.9m made in the previous monitoring report in February 2017 (Minute Exe/17/043). The Capital Outturn for 2016/17 had been £212.2m, £61.7m less than the previous estimate in February. Within that total, the projects for the Greater Manchester capital programme had spent £53.8m.

The report set out an analysis of the capital expenditure in the year. It also explained where and how the 2016/17 outturn would have an impact on the three year Capital Programme for 2017/18 to 2019/20.

Decisions

1. To note the outturn of capital expenditure for 2016/17 was £212.2m.
2. To note the changes to the outturn attributable to movement in the programme that occurred after the previous monitoring report in February 2017.
3. To approve the budget transfers between capital schemes to maximise use of funding resources available to the Council.
4. To note the decisions of the City Treasurer regarding the funding of capital expenditure in 2016/17.
5. To note the impact of final expenditure in 2016/17 on the revised Capital Programme 2017/18 to 2021/22.

Exe/17/089 Hackney Carriage Fare Review 2017

In June 2016 we had reviewed the Hackney Carriage Fares and at that time had agreed that no change should be applied in 2016/17 (Minute Exe/16/069). In April 2017 the Licensing and Appeals Committee had undertaken its annual review of the fares (Minute LAP/17/8). In that review the Committee had concluded that an increase was warranted for 2017/18, and the recommendation was for an increase of 6.42%. We now considered a report submitted by the Deputy Chief Executive (Growth and Neighbourhoods), to which was appended a copy of the report that the Licensing and Appeals Committee had considered. Having considered the rationale for the proposed increase as set out in the reports we accepted the Licensing and Appeals Committee's recommendations.

Decisions

1. To agree an increase of 6.42% be applied to the hackney carriage fare, with the exception of the waiting time, which should remain as is:
Tariff 1 (Daytime) Waiting time every 38.89 seconds – 20p (£3.20 per ten minutes, £18.60 per hour);
Tariff 2 (Nighttime) Waiting time every 29.29 seconds 20p (£4.00 per ten minutes, £24.60 per hour).
2. To agree that the proposed fare to take effect from 1 August 2017 (provided no objections to the proposed fare are received).

Exe/17/090 Development of the City Council Digital Asset Base

In December 2014 we consider proposals to enhance the city's position as a centre of excellence for creative digital industries. We had authorised that feasibility assessment be undertaken on the One Central Park (OCP) site to assess its potential to contribute to the facilities offered by the Council. At that time we had also agreed to the setting up of a holding company that would take over the operation of the Council's assets that could include the SHARP Project, the SPACE Project and OCP (Minute Exe/14/136 and Exe/14/141). In March 2016 we had agreed proposals for the significant expansion of the SPACE Project (Exe/16/044). In June 2016 we had approved a Capital Budget increase of £6.7m for the refurbishment of OCP (£5.3m) and the tenants fit-out of phase 2 of the SPACE Project (£1.4m). We had also commissioned feasibility work and a detailed appraisal in relation to The SHARP Project (Minute Exe/16/079).

The Strategic Director (Development) now submitted a report with proposals to continue to take these projects forward. The decisions in June 2016 had included approval of £5.3m of capital investment in OCP. The report now explained that the estimate for the works required would be £8.97m. The increase had arisen from an improved mechanical and electrical strategy, improved specification in all offices, moving circulation from the core of the building onto walkways in the courtyard. Part of the increase was also reflective of the lack of investment into the building to date.

The report also explained that the 'Silver' offices at The Sharp Project were currently used for low cost production offices and continued to be to the same specification as when the Council had acquired the property in 2009 from Sharp Electronics. As the focus of productions was to move from The Sharp Project over to Space Studios these offices in their current form were likely to become obsolete. There was therefore a requirement to improve them to a modern specification which would then provide for the growing tenant demand. The investment needed in these works was estimated as £0.6m.

The Revenue Budget Outturn Report for 2016/17 had explained proposals for carry forward into 2017/18 underspends and surplus of £159,000 generated by the operating company, Manchester Creative Digital Assets Ltd (MCDA) (Minute Exe/17/087 above). We supported that proposal.

The March 2016 report had also described how future phases of The SPACE Project beyond Phase 2 would look to utilise the site which currently houses the Wenlock Way Tower, the former R&D block, the former Executive suite and the former Canteen block. That would involve the demolition of the office tower block and the £1.5m of funding for that would come from the Council's own Asset Management Programme. The report now submitted explained that the projected costs of the demolitions was now £2.3m as it was now no longer considered feasible to seek to retain the Executive suite and the former Canteen block, and they too needed to be demolished.

Decisions

1. To recommend that the Council approve a Capital Budget increase of £4.27m on top of the existing capital approval of £5.3m, relating to the refurbishment of OCP (£8.97m) and the fit-out of office Space known as 'Silver' at The Sharp

- Project (£0.6m), funded from prudential borrowing, the cost of which will be funded from increased rental income.
2. To recommend that the Council authorise the City Treasurer in consultation with the Leader and Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to approve the capital budget and phasing of repayments subject to the development of a robust business case.
 3. To recommend that the Council approve the carry forward request of £159,000 for the 2016/17 Space/Sharp surplus from 2016/17 to be transferred to the Manchester Creative Digital Assets Ltd company.
 4. To note the progress to date in the development of the City Council's Digital Asset Base, the establishment of MCDA and the rebranding of The Space Project as Space Studios Manchester.
 5. To note the revised proposals in relation to OCP and request for an increase in the existing capital approval from £5.3m to £8.97m, that seek to enhance the facility and ensure it will continue to contribute to the continued growth of the city's digital sector as set out in Section 3.0 of the report.
 6. To note the latest developments at The Sharp Project and the proposals to refurbish the 'Silver' production offices, on a invest to save basis, into modern offices befitting of the sector and to satisfy tenant demand at The Sharp Project as set out in Section 4 of the report.
 7. To note the latest position in relation to the phase known as 'Black' at The Sharp Project and the current proposals in relation to feasibility, refurbishment and the latest tenant enquiries.
 8. To note the progress of the demolition of the Wenlock Way Tower adjacent to Space Studios Manchester and note the estimated Capital cost of £2.3m to be funded from Asset Management Plan.

Exe/17/091 Decisions of the meetings 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 31 March 2017 and 28 April 2017.

Exe/17/092 Decisions of the meetings of the Joint Greater Manchester Combined Authority and the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities Executive Board

Decision

To receive and note of the decisions made at the joint meetings of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and the Association of Greater Manchester Authorities Executive Board on 31 March 2017 and 28 April 2017.

Exe/17/093 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/17/094 Development of the City Council Digital Asset Base (Public Excluded)

A report was submitted to sets out the underpinning commercial rationale for funding the investment into One Central Park (OCP) and to summarise the business case behind the proposals described in the earlier item of business (Minute Exe/17/090 above). It also provided an overview of our proposed approach to dealing with the current tenant base at OCP. In addition, it provided the commercial proposal for the refurbishment of 'Silver' offices at The Sharp Project.

Decisions

1. To approve the commercial rationale for the delivery of One Central Park as covered in the report.
2. To approve the commercial rationale for the refurbishment of 'Silver' Offices at The Sharp Project, subject to the development of a robust business case.