

## **Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2017**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Ollerhead - in the Chair

Councillors Ahmed Ali, Andrews, Barrett, Connolly, Davies, Hitchen, Karney, Lanchbury, Moore, Russell, Siddiqi, Strong, A Simcock and Watson

Councillor B Priest, Deputy Leader

Councillor Flanagan, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources

#### **Apologies:**

Councillor Pritchard

### **RGSC/17/34            Minutes**

The Committee considered the minutes of the meeting held on the 20 June 2017. Further to minute RGSC/17/28 (Budget – Local Government Financing), a Member requested that Officers prepared a report on the impact of the austerity cuts on residents of the City which could be placed on the Committee's Work Programme. The Member also requested that the Chair liaised with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to arrange for a delegation to visit the Prime Minister to discuss her offer to consider how government and local authorities could work together in delivering public services in light of cuts to Local Authority budgets.

#### **Decision:**

1. To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2017.
2. To agree that a report on the impact of the austerity cuts on residents of the City is be placed on the Committee's Work Programme;
3. To request that the Executive Member for Member for Finance and Human Resources arrange a delegation, to include the Chair of the Scrutiny Committee, to visit the Prime Minister to discuss how government and local authorities could work together on delivering public services in light of cuts to Local Authority budgets .

### **RGSC/17/35            Councillor Call for Action – Brookdale Park**

The Committee received a Councillor Call for Action (CCfA) from the Councillor Leech, Ward Councillor for Didsbury West. Councillor Leech informed the Committee that his concern related to the decision to demolish the portacabin in Brookdale Park, located in the Miles Platting and Newton Heath Ward, advising that evidence had not been provided that this decision provided best value for money. He reported that Officers had initially supported a proposed Community Asset Transfer, which would have brought the building back into use, using lottery funding. He stated that he was not disputing the decision not to allow a Community Asset Transfer; however, he questioned why it had only been suggested to demolish the building after this decision, as the building had been left unused for some time before this.

Councillor Leech advised that he had received a briefing paper from the Head of Corporate Estates and Facilities which set out the history to the building and the rationale as to why the decision to demolish had been reached. He stated that had he had been provided this prior to submitting his CCfA he would not have proceeded with this course of action. However, he still felt that there was a need for Scrutiny to exercise its powers and scrutinise whether the decision to demolish was the best value for money.

The Property Strategy Manager advised the Committee that the building was a portacabin/temporary type of structure built in 1985 and had been vacant since 2012. She outlined a number of concerns about the condition of the building and reported that in 2014 a surveyor had recommended its demolition. She advised that, due to the costs of bringing the building to an acceptable standard, maintaining it and securing it, demolition was the most cost effective decision.

The Chairman expressed his disappointment that Councillor Leech still wished for this issue to be considered by the Scrutiny Committee having commented that having received a briefing paper, a number of his initial concerns had been addressed.

The Ward Councillors for Miles Platting and Newton Heath, who were in attendance, requested that Councillor Leech retract from his request, the allegation that they had been opposed to a Community Asset Transfer of the building as this was not factually correct. Councillor Leech did not agree to retract this from his request.

Having considered the request by Councillor Leech, and the information provided by the Property Strategy Manager, the Committee was minded to exercise its powers and scrutinise whether the decision to demolish the portacabin was best value for money. The Chair emphasised that when the Committee looked at this issue in more detail at a future meeting, the Committee would focus solely on the financial decision to demolish the portacabin.

**Decision:**

To agree that the Committee scrutinises whether the decision to demolish the portacabin at Brookdale provides the best value, at a future meeting.

**RGSC/17/36                      Changes to Council Tax Support Scheme for Care Leavers**

The Committee received a report from the City Treasurer and Director of Children's Services, presented by the Head of Revenue and Benefits, which sought Executive approval of a proposal for the Council to exercise its discretionary powers in accordance with section 13A(1)(C) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, to support Care Leavers by offering a Council Tax discount of up to 100% for care leavers living in the city.

The Committee was advised that looked after children and Care Leavers were amongst the most vulnerable groups in society and whilst the Council had positive arrangements to support these young people, they tended to leave home at a younger age and have more abrupt transitions to adulthood than their peers. As corporate parents, the Council wanted to make sure that young people's experiences

leaving care and moving into independent living were positive and improved their life chances.

It was reported that three Greater Manchester Local Authorities had already amended their Council Tax schemes and now offered a local discount to care leavers. They had reported that the number awarded and associated costs had been lower than they had initially anticipated (mainly due to the transience of this cohort). The remaining Greater Manchester Councils were considering implementing a local discount either within the current financial year or ready for the 2018/19 financial year.

Based on indicative costings the anticipated financial costs for the Council was estimated to be £42,000 per annum.

A Member sought clarification as to whether Care Leavers who were not from Manchester, but resided in Manchester, would be eligible for the scheme. The Member asked another question as to whether the scheme would be offered to Care Leavers who chose to move outside of Manchester, to a Local Authority where this scheme was not in place. The Member commented that Care Leavers would need to be reminded well in advance that the scheme would cease on their 21<sup>st</sup> Birthday.

The Head of Revenue and Benefits confirmed that the scheme was open to all Care Leavers that resided in Manchester, regardless of whether they were originally from Manchester or not. She explained that the scheme would not be available to Care Leavers who resided outside of Manchester as this was a local Council Tax discount specific to Manchester residents and it would be up to other Local Authorities to implement similar schemes. The Strategic Lead of Children Looked After confirmed that Care Leavers received support and training around budget management to ensure they were equipped with the necessary life skills to manage independently upon turning 21.

A Member asked whether the scheme was being reciprocated across all of the Greater Manchester Councils.

The Head of Revenue and Benefits advised that the proposed approach was discussed at a meeting of Greater Manchester Council Treasurers and a Greater Manchester approach was being considered that would include reciprocal agreements. A number of other Greater Manchester Councils had already implemented this scheme or were in the process of doing so.

A Member commented that this was an important scheme for the City Council and suggested that the Chair of the Committee reported back on this to all Members at the next full Council meeting.

A Member recommended that the Council's Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee monitored the implementation and take up of this scheme as part of the wider support offered to Care Leavers, which it already had responsibility for monitoring.

The Chair of the Committee, welcomed the proposals and suggested that as part of the Council Tax update report, which the Committee was scheduled to consider at its next meeting in September, the update included a section on this scheme.

**Decision:**

1. To note and welcome the steps being taken to support care leavers living in the city.
2. To endorse for approval by the Executive, that the Council:-
  - provides a discount of up to 100% discount of the Council Tax that is due, to care leavers who live in the city aged 18, 19 and 20 years, up to the date of their 21st birthday;
  - creates a local discount (s13A(1)(c) Local Government Finance Act 1992) policy to support this provision;
  - agrees that the discount will be awarded after all other discounts, exemptions (for example student discount) and Council Tax Support have been awarded;
  - agrees where there is a shared liability for the Council Tax due, the discount will only be paid to cover the share that the looked after person would be liable for.
  - agrees that any discounts should be awarded with immediate effect with the discretion to backdate to 1 April 2017, and that this discretion should be delegated to the Head of Revenues and Benefits on behalf of the City Treasurer; and
  - agrees that the Council monitors the costs of the scheme during the first year of implementation and provides delegated responsibility to the City Treasurer to amend as required to support a Greater Manchester approach and policy.
3. To recommend that the Children and Young People's Scrutiny Committee monitor the implementation and take up of this scheme, as part of the wider support offered to Care Leavers which it already has responsibility for monitoring;
4. To request that Officers include an update on the scheme as part of the next Council Tax update to this Committee;
5. To request that Officers actively pursue the implementation of a Greater Manchester wide reciprocal scheme with the Combined Authority; and
6. To request that the Chair of the Committee reports back on this important scheme to all Members at the next full Council meeting.

**RGSC/17/37                      Council Tax Support Scheme – Treatment of payments from the We Love Manchester Emergency Fund and London Emergency Trust**

The Committee received a report from the City Treasurer, presented by the Head of Revenue and Benefits, which sought Executive approval of a proposal to use the Council's discretion under section 13A(1)(c) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, to reduce the Council Tax liabilities to those people receiving payments from the We Love Manchester Emergency Fund (WLMEF) and the London Emergencies Trust (LET).

It was reported that following the recent tragic terrorist attacks in Manchester and London, emergency funds have been set up to help those affected. Manchester City Council launched a WLMEF and in London the LET had been set up. For a person receiving any means tested benefit, payments from either Trust would be treated as income or capital and potentially reduce or extinguish their entitlement.

The Committee was advised that under section 13A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 local billing authorities had the discretion to grant reductions and exemptions on an individual basis for a class of council tax payers. In practice this would mean that the Council would make a discretionary award to reduce the Council Tax liability, equivalent to what the claimant would have received under the Council's Council Tax Support Scheme (CTSS) had they not received the compensation from either the WLMEF or the LET.

It was reported that if the proposal was agreed, it would continue indefinitely until the government introduced regulations to make a disregard of these payments as a prescribed requirement of Council Tax Support schemes.

A Member asked whether the discretionary payment was just for people who resided in Manchester. The Member asked another question as to whether the proposed change to the scheme would allow for any future emergency funds to be included. The Member asked a further question on what steps other Greater Manchester Local Authorities were taking to address this issue.

The Head of Revenue and Benefits advised that the scheme would only be for people who resided in Manchester who were in receipt of payments from either the WLMEF or LET and that the proposal to amend the scheme was intended to be a temporary arrangement until government amended the primary legislation. The proposed change to the scheme would not account for any possible future emergency funds as any exemptions need to be specifically detailed within the scheme. She advised that the government had written to all Local Authorities across the country encouraging them to implement similar exemptions to their schemes, however, Manchester City Council could not enforce the exemption on another local authority if someone was living outside of the city who was in receipt of either payment.

A Member suggested that the Officers investigated whether there was any suitable mechanisms that the Council could consider using to inform other local authorities of residents who were living in their areas that were in receipt of either payment

A Member suggested that the Committee should receive a report on the governance and working arrangements of the WLMEF at a future meeting.

**Decision:**

1. To note and welcome the proposals to support those residents within the City who are receiving payments from the We Love Manchester Emergency Fund and the London Emergencies Trust.
2. To endorse for approval by the Executive, that the Council:-

- exercises its discretionary powers to reduce the liability of a liable person for council tax under section 13 A (1) (c) of the Local Government Finance Act for people receiving payments from the We Love Manchester Emergency Fund and London Emergencies Trust; and
  - agrees that this arrangement is not time limited and will be administered until government make alternative statutory provision
- 3 To request that the City Treasurer, Head of Revenue and Benefits and the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources investigate whether there is a suitable mechanism that the Council could use to inform other local authorities of residents who were living in their areas that were in receipt either payment;
4. To request that the Scrutiny Team Leader adds an item to the Committee's Work Programme on the governance and working arrangements of the 'We love Manchester Emergency Fund'.

### **RGSC/17/38 Section 106 Annual Monitoring report 2016/17**

The Committee considered a report of the Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing, which provided Members with an overview of activity relating to Section 106 (S106) agreements during the last financial year. The report also included an update on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), which had a direct bearing on how local planning authorities negotiated S106 agreements.

The Committee was advised that as of the end of March 2017, 450 Agreements had been signed. 13 of these were signed during the 2016/17 period. Whilst a number of the obligations were of a financial nature, a proportion comprised of a nonfinancial obligation; some were a mix of both and there were a small number which related to variations to agreements signed in previous years. Of the 13 agreements signed during 2016/17 only seven related to planning applications submitted during the same period, the remaining six related to applications submitted in previous years.

It was reported that over 2016/17, the City Council had received £490,355.19 in S106 contributions. This provided a cumulative total of £20,735,667 in recorded contributions held in Trust received through S106 activity.

The report went on to provide a breakdown of S106 agreements on a ward by ward basis.

In terms of CIL, it was reported that the Council had yet to decide on the introduction of CIL. To date, key factors for consideration included the lack of flexibility of CIL when compared with the existing S106 arrangements and a concern that CIL could either deter development if set too high or under-achieve infrastructure contributions if set too low. Whilst the level of CIL would take these issues into account at the time it was set, it was difficult to anticipate how the market would change, particularly as it was not clear how the economy would respond to current pressures and opportunities. Furthermore, the complexity of Manchester's development opportunities challenged the effectiveness of broad viability assessments, taking account of issues including multiple ownerships, historic contamination and the mixed-use nature of many schemes.

Furthermore, there was potential for changes to the way CIL was managed nationally. In November 2015 a national CIL review group was established. The purpose of the group was to assess the extent to which CIL could provide an effective mechanism for funding infrastructure and to recommend changes that would improve its operation in support of the Government's wider housing and growth objectives. Based on its findings that, in brief, CIL provided unrealistic financial expectations; was divorced from the local plan-making process and had little relationship with infrastructure plans, the group had submitted recommendations to Government in February 2017. The key recommendations were that Government considered replacing CIL with a hybrid system of a broad and low level Infrastructure Tariff and Section 106 for larger developments; and Combined Authorities should be enabled to set up an additional Mayoral type of Strategic Infrastructure Tariff. The Government had agreed to examine these options for reforming the system of developer contributions and the expectation was that an announcement would be made at the Autumn Budget 2017.

A Member commented that the S106 process was not clear and lacked transparency and asked why, at times, there lengthy delays between the S106 agreement being made, the money being received and the scheme being implemented. The Member also commented that this information would be helpful if, in future, this was contained within the breakdown of S106 agreements on a ward by ward basis

The Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing advised that S106 contributions were attached to specific planning permissions, and it was at the point of granting planning permission where the principle of the S106 contribution was identified. The Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing agreed to include in future reports details of when S106 contributions were agreed, received and then implemented.

A Member asked whether there had been any indication from the Combined Authority as to whether the Greater Manchester (GM) Mayor was intending to introduce a Strategic Infrastructure Tariff and if so, what effect this would have on the City.

The City Treasurer advised that the ability for the GM Mayor to introduce Strategic Infrastructure tariff was contained within the Local Government Finance Bill which was omitted from the Queen's speech, so it was not clear at the present moment whether the GM Mayor could introduce such a tariff. The Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing agreed to provide a briefing paper to Members on this issue.

A Member raised concern that out of all the S106 agreements submitted in the last 12 months, only four related to the provision of affordable housing.

The Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing advised affordable housing was a key aspect the Council aimed to secure with all developers, however, due to the downturn in the housing market, it had not been possible to secure more affordable housing within S106 agreements until recently, as there had been a recent upturn in housing developments. Ward Councillors were encouraged to raise this issue on any housing developments within their wards.

A Member commented that S106 monies should ideally be spent in the Wards to which the development occurs and raised concern that not all Ward Members were consulted on S106 proposals that were being funded from developments within their Wards but implemented in neighbouring or other Wards. In relation to this another Member asked for clarification as to what the Council's policy was on consultation with Ward Councillors on S106 proposals.

The Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing advised that, in the main, S106 agreements were tied geographically to the Ward in which the development was taking place. Where improvements were made outside of the Ward in which the S106 agreement was made, then the relevant Ward Councillors should be consulted with and made aware as to why the decision to invest the S106 contribution outside of the Ward was being taken. The Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing advised that if any Member had specific examples of this occurring then this would be looked at outside of the Committee meeting.

**Decision:**

1. To note the report.
2. To request that the Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing circulates to all Members the information on S106 contributions on a ward by ward basis;
3. To request that in relation to (2), this information includes details of when S106 agreements are made, when S106 contributions are received, and when S106 contributions required spending by;
4. To request that Planning Officers consult with all Ward Councillors on S106 proposals associated to their respective wards;
5. To request that the Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing provides a briefing paper to members of the Committee on the implications of the GM Mayor introducing a Strategic Infrastructure tariff and what effect this would have on the city;
6. To request that the Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing provides members with a break down on revenues from CIL from core cities in order to give a more accurate reflection with Manchester
7. To refer to the Economy Scrutiny Committee the issue of the provision of affordable housing connected to S106 agreements; and
8. To request that the Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing in consultation with the Scrutiny Team Leader arrange a training session on S106 agreements for all members of the Council.

**RGSC/17/39                      Update on the Capital Gateway Process**

The Committee considered a report of the City Treasurer, presented by the Deputy City Treasurer, which set out the revised process for the approval of capital schemes. The report detailed the proposed new governance arrangements which included the establishment of a Capital Board to oversee the programme, as well as the strengthening and expansion of the role of Portfolio Boards in the assurance and approval process. The report also detailed the various stages of scheme approval from evaluation through to the authority to spend.



It was reported that capital project approvals relating to new schemes commencing from 2017/18 onwards would be progressed through a revised Capital Approval Process (CAP) which would replace the existing Capital Gateway arrangements. The new schemes approved as part of the Capital Programme 2017/18 to 2021/22 would be further categorised in terms of 'priority' schemes, which would move forward subject to certain conditions being met, and 'in principle' schemes which, although met the requirement for strategic fit, required further detail on the financial implications and/or deliverability to support the anticipated outcome. This new approach to scheme assessment, prioritisation and subsequent measurement of achievement would enable the Council to make more informed decisions based on business cases brought forward.

It was reported that the governance arrangements were currently being finalised and would ensure that the relevant Executive Member was supportive of any proposal being developed. No scheme would enter the programme without the support of the Executive leadership. The new approval process would oversee the arrangements from project pipeline to post implementation review and was based around five checkpoints which were detailed in the report. The aim of the new process was to improve the information upon which capital investment decisions were made, and to improve transparency and strengthen accountability in the delivery and monitoring of the capital programme.

A Member asked as to which Officers and Members formed the Capital Board.

The Deputy City Treasurer advised that the Board was comprised of the Chief Executive, as Chair, the City Treasurer and Strategic Directors who would represent the Portfolios. Members would be represented in the approval process through the Deputy Leader (Councillor B Priest) and the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources.

A Members asked whether the Head of Audit had commented on the revised process and whether there was any scope to include consultation with Legal Services within the process, particularly in relation to the implications for contract arrangements

The Deputy City Treasurer confirmed that a representative from Internal Audit had been invited on to the sub group and membership had also consisted of a representative from Legal Services, as well as the Director of Capital Programmes. It was reported that consideration of the contract arrangements would form part of the procurement process at the point where a contract was to be issued and not the capital approval stage.

A Member commented that consideration should be given to including the Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing on the Capital Board.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources agreed that the Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing should have some involvement with the Capital Board and agreed to look into how this could be implemented.

The Chair raised concern that there appeared to be a lack of engagement with Elected Members, other than Executive Members, within the process and asked what provision could be made to include more engagement with non-Executive Members.

The Deputy City Treasurer acknowledged the need for Elected Member involvement in the process and advised that they should be consulted at stage one of the process – the development of the initial business case. The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources commented that proposals specific to a ward should be consulted with the Ward Councillors by the relevant Executive Member before the proposal is signed off. The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources extended an open invitation for any Member who wanted to gain a better understanding as to how the Capital Gateway process operated to shadow him through the approval process of a proposed scheme.

The Chair also raised concern that the information provided on the Register of Key Decisions in relation to capital expenditure was often too vague and more detail needed to be included in order to improve transparency of the Council's decision making process.

**Decision:**

1. To note the report.
2. To support the proposals within the report;
3. To request a further report at the meeting in December 2017

**RGSC/17/40            Establishment of an Ethical Procurement Sub Group**

The Committee considered the report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, which set out the proposed Terms of Reference for the Ethical Procurement Sub Group (Ref RGSC/17/24).

The Committee was invited to discuss and make any necessary revisions to the Terms of Reference proposed and determine which Members from the Scrutiny Committee will form part of the membership of this Sub Group and appoint a Chair of the Sub Group.

It was proposed that the work programme would be developed and set by the appointed Chair, Head of Corporate Procurement and the Scrutiny Team Leader, and then shared with the Sub Group Members in advance of the first meeting. The appointed Chair, Head of Corporate Procurement and the Scrutiny Team Leader would also make a determination on the frequency of meetings required which would need to be agreed by the Sub Group. The Sub Group would also review the work programme at each meeting and if necessary amend as the Group see fit.

**Decision:**

1. To agree the Terms of Reference subject to the inclusion of the monitoring of KPI's, outcomes and deliverability of projects;
2. To agree the membership of the Sub Group from this Committee as:-  
Councillors Lanchbury, Moore, Ollerhead, Russell and Watson;

3. To agree that Councillor Ollerhead is appointed as Chair of the Sub Group;  
and
4. To agree that the work programme of the Sub Group will be established developed and set by the appointed Chair, Head of Corporate Procurement and the Scrutiny Team Leader, and then shared with the Sub Group Members in advance of the first meeting.

### **RGSC/17/41            Budget update**

The Committee considered a report of the City Treasurer, which provided an update on the latest available intelligence on local government financing following the Queens Speech, the latest position on European Funding following the triggering of Article 50 in March 2017 and an update on the Councils budget setting process, including the communications and engagement in place following the budget process for 2017/18-2019/20.

The Committee was advised that considerable uncertainty remains around the future arrangement for local government finance. There were a number of notable omissions from the Queens Speech, but the commitment to bringing forward options for improving the Social Care system remained as did the commitment to introduce 'fairer funding' for schools although the specific schools reforms and national fair funding system were omitted.

The Local Government Finance Bill had been progressing through Parliament before the June General Election and provided the legislative framework for the introduction of 100% Business Rates Retention and other rates policy and regulation, and included a review of funding distribution. The Bill was omitted from the Queen's Speech, leaving outstanding many issues relating to Local Government finance. The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), in communication with the Special Interests Group of Metropolitan Authorities (SIGOMA), had confirmed that Ministers remained committed to Local Government taking greater control of their income. DCLG were engaging with Ministers on the options for future reform without an immediate Bill and they would contact Local Authorities once they were in a position to resume working on the future of Local Government finance reform.

Following the European Union (EU) referendum in 2016, there had been a high degree of uncertainty on the implications on the 2014-2020 European Structural Investment Funds (ESIF) programme (comprising of European Regional Development Fund and European Social Fund) and also other EU funding programmes. It was reported that after leaving the European Union the Structural Funds would be closed. However, depending on the 'Brexit deal', the Council and local partners may still have access to transnational funds. The Council would continue to work with Core Cities in lobbying Government and also with Greater Manchester colleagues in the support of the delivery of the Greater Manchester ESIF programme and would continue to deliver its own EU projects. For the budget process, work would be carried out over the summer to refresh the assumptions underpinning the Medium Term Financial Plan using the latest assessment of the national position and an update on the assumptions made locally.

The Committee was advised that at the end of the budget consultation in February 2017, a commitment was made to continue to inform and engage residents in the budget process. With a better view about what matters to people and the places and services most valued in the city, a two phased communications and engagement approach was developed. Phase one commenced immediately after the budget was set and focused on how the consultation responses were reflected in the budget itself – ‘you said, we’re doing’. Phase two, Our Manchester Days, carried on the budget conversation by highlighting the services delivered, planned investments and going behind the scenes of the services. This has been done using an Our Manchester approach, encouraging people to comment, share and engage.

A Member commented that it was important that the Council outlined to the public the impact of the five stressed budgets, as detailed in the report, especially homelessness in the City Centre. The Member suggested that as the country’s Business and Public Sectors did not have a clear stewardship of the economy by the government, the Committee should look to invite the Governor of the Bank of England to a future meeting of the Committee to outline the direction the Manchester Economy.

A Member asked whether the outcomes of the recent Highways ‘Our Manchester Day’ was going to be shared with all Ward Councillors. The Member asked a supplementary question as to how the outcomes and proposed actions were going to be monitored and how could Ward Councillors check this progress.

The Head of Communications agreed that the information would be shared with Ward Councillors. The Officer advised that a meeting between the Director of Highways, the Executive Member for Environment and herself would be taking place to discuss how the information gathered was to be taken forward and used.

A Member raised concern about the potential impact of a Brexit deal on the Council’s partners, such as the Universities. A Member suggested that the Committee invited the Vice Chancellor of the University of Manchester to a future meeting to outline the potential impact of Brexit on the University.

**Decision:**

1. To note the report;
2. To invite the Governor of the Bank of England, Mark Karney, to a future meeting of the Committee, to discuss the future direction the Manchester Economy; and
3. To invite the Vice Chancellor of the University of Manchester, Dame Nancy Rothwell, to a future meeting of the Committee, to outline the potential impact of Brexit on the University.

**RGSC/17/30            Overview Report**

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

A Member asked for an update on Minute RGSC/16/30 as the original request had been made In October 2016.

The City Treasurer agreed to take responsibility for circulating an update to this particular Minute.

**Decision:**

1. To note the report and approve the work programme subject to the following amendments:-
  - to consider the decision to demolish the portacabin at Brookdale provides the best value for money (Minute RGSC/17/35 refers) at its meeting in October 2017;
  - to consider an update on Belle Vue Aces at its meeting in October 2017;
  - to invite the Council's AGMA Scrutiny representatives to the meeting at which the GM Mayor is invited to.