



## **Executive**

Date: Wednesday, 11 September 2019

Time: 10.00 am

Venue: Council Antechamber - Level 2, Town Hall Extension

This is a supplementary agenda containing additional information about the business of the meeting that was not available when the agenda was published.

### **Access to the Council Antechamber**

Public access to the Antechamber is via the Council Chamber on Level 2 of the Town Hall Extension, using the lift or stairs in the lobby of the Mount Street entrance to the Extension. That lobby can also be reached from the St. Peter's Square entrance and from Library Walk. **There is no public access from the Lloyd Street entrances of the Extension.**

### **Filming and broadcast of the meeting**

Meetings of the Executive are 'webcast'. These meetings are filmed and broadcast live on the Internet. If you attend this meeting you should be aware that you might be filmed and included in that transmission.

## **Membership of the Executive**

---

### **Councillors**

Leese (Chair), Akbar, Bridges, Craig, N Murphy, S Murphy, Ollerhead, Rahman, Stogia and Richards

## **Membership of the Consultative Panel**

---

### **Councillors**

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

The Consultative Panel has a standing invitation to attend meetings of the Executive. The Members of the Panel may speak at these meetings but cannot vote on the decision taken at the meetings.

## Supplementary Agenda

---

### 3. Minutes

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 24 July 2019 (the minutes are to now attached).

3 - 16

## Information about the Executive

---

The Executive is made up of ten Councillors: the Leader and two Deputy Leaders of the Council and seven Executive Members with responsibility for: Children Services; Finance & Human Resources; Adult Services; Schools, Culture & Leisure; Neighbourhoods; Housing & Regeneration; and Environment, Planning & Transport. The Leader of the Council chairs the meetings of the Executive

The Executive has full authority for implementing the Council's Budgetary and Policy Framework, and this means that most of its decisions do not need approval by Council, although they may still be subject to detailed review through the Council's overview and scrutiny procedures.

It is the Council's policy to consult people as fully as possible before making decisions that affect them. Members of the public do not have a right to speak at meetings but may do so if invited by the Chair.

The Council is concerned to ensure that its meetings are as open as possible and confidential business is kept to a strict minimum. When confidential items are involved these are considered at the end of the meeting at which point members of the public and the press are asked to leave.

Joanne Roney OBE  
Chief Executive  
Level 3, Town Hall Extension,  
Albert Square,  
Manchester, M60 2LA

## Further Information

---

For help, advice and information about this meeting please contact the Committee Officer:  
Donald Connolly  
Tel: 0161 2343034  
Email: [d.connolly@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:d.connolly@manchester.gov.uk)

This supplementary agenda was issued on 10 September 2019 by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Manchester City Council, Level 3, Town Hall Extension (Mount Street Elevation), Manchester M60 2LA

## Executive

### Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 24 July 2019

**Present:** Councillor Leese (Chair)

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

**Also present as Members of the Standing Consultative Panel:**

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

**Apologies:** Councillor Midgley

**Also present:** Councillors: K Simcock and Wilson

#### Exe/19/58 Minutes

##### Decision

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 26 June 2019.

#### Exe/19/59 Council Resolution on Declaring a Climate Emergency

On 10 July 2019 the Council, having debated a motion and an amendment put forward by Councillors (Minute CC/19/52), had resolved

“This Council notes:

- The serious risks to Manchester’s people, of climate change/global heating affecting economic, social and environmental well-being, supply chains – including food security, financial systems and local weather, among many others;
- That in 2008 the ‘Principles of Tackling Climate Change in Manchester’ were agreed as a call to action to engage people from all walks of life in climate change action and, build support for a new way of thinking about climate change;
- That Manchester leads the way, with an agreed Paris compliant carbon budget set in December 2018 and an acceleration of the target for becoming a zero-carbon city by 12 years, setting 2038 as the new target for the city, based on research from the world-renowned Tyndall Centre for Climate Change;
- The recent and welcome upsurge of action by the young people of Manchester, exemplifying the radical traditions of which Manchester is proud.

This Council agrees (or to the extent that the below concern executive functions, recommends to the Executive) to:

- Declare a Climate Emergency;
- Continue working with partners across Manchester and GMCA to deliver the 2038 target, and determine if an earlier target can be possible, through a transparent and open review. Become carbon neutral by the earliest possible date;
- Encourage involvement in all wards by April 2020 through meetings as part of the Our Manchester strategy, to identify residents and partners who want to be actively involved in achieving the target, with provision for those who cannot attend. Ensure ward plans contain specific, measurable, achievable steps;
- Review all policies, processes and procedures to ensure the council can become carbon neutral. Present an action plan by March 2020 detailing how the city can stay within its carbon budget. Report back regularly to the NESC. Review the corporate plan;
- Work with the Tyndall Centre to review the actual emissions from aviation. Investigate the best way to include aviation in our overall carbon reduction programme in the long term;
- Make climate breakdown and the environment, an integral part of activity throughout the Council, including all decision making, ensuring key decisions take into account the impact on achieving the zero-carbon target and including an environmental impact assessment in all relevant committee reports;
- Ensure that everyone in the council receives carbon literacy training by the end of 2020. Make attendance easier by varying times and length of sessions;
- Encourage all staff on council business to use the lowest carbon, appropriate, travel;
- Investigate measures to ensure future procurement is carbon neutral. Increase the percentage of social value with an additional environmental element;
- Work with suppliers to green their supply chains, and support local production;
- Work with training providers to ensure Manchester residents can take on green jobs;
- Investigate and introduce measures to help reach domestic zero carbon levels including addressing fuel poverty and retrofitting existing homes;
- Investigate ways to ensure that future local plans place a mandatory requirement for all new development to be net zero carbon by the earliest possible date;
- Push GMCA to decarbonise public transport, heat and energy as early as possible;
- Through our role on GMPF, encourage divestment in fossil fuels as early as possible;
- Explore the possibility of introducing a 2030 target in line with the IPCC report;
- and request that a report on its viability be brought back to the Executive before the end of the year;
- Call on the government to:
  - provide powers and resources to make the zero-carbon target possible including funding for big capital projects
  - accelerate the reduction of carbon emissions from aviation
  - accelerate the decarbonisation of the electricity grid, funding low carbon energy generation
  - ensure that the UK prosperity fund focuses on enable the transition to a low carbon economy”

The Executive therefore considered the Council's resolution in so much as the Council had expressed a view on Executive Functions, and also unanimously supported the resolution.

### **Decisions**

1. To accept and adopt the Declaring a Climate Emergency motion that was adopted by the Council on 10 July 2019 to the extent that the motion concerns executive functions.
2. To request that the Chief Executive brings forward an implementation plan to a meeting of the Executive later this year.

### **Exe/19/60 The Eastlands Regeneration Framework**

Councillor Richards declared a personal interest in this item as a member of the Board of One Manchester.

In March 2019 the Executive had considered a draft of the proposed Eastland Regeneration Framework and had endorsed the draft as the basis for public consultation (Minute Exe/19/35). The Strategic Director – Growth and Development now submitted a report on the outcome of the consultation and on the proposed amendments to the Framework document to take account of the matters that had been raised in the consultation.

The consultation had run from 31 May to 26 June 2019. Letters inviting people to a consultation event had been sent out to around 4,000 residential addresses, landowners, local businesses and residents' groups in the area. The consultation events were also publicised using the Council's social media accounts and in other local media. Other elements of the consultation activities had included a drop-in event for residents and local businesses on the 6 June 2019 at Beswick Library; a consultation page on the Council's website which had provided details of the draft Framework and the opportunity to submit comments; and an email briefing to key public services and statutory providers and to local ward councillors.

The report also explained that SMG (the operators of the Manchester Arena) had confirmed that they had also conducted a campaign to raise awareness of the suggestion in the draft Eastlands Regeneration Framework for an events arena to be developed in Eastlands. SMG had commissioned a public relations agency, Fleishman Hillard Fishburn (FHF), to help raise awareness of the consultation period, the arena proposal and the impacts that might possibly have on the local communities. That awareness campaign had comprised:

- Canvassing at Eastlands ASDA on 14, 19, 20, 21 and 24 June;
- Distributing leaflets through door knocking in Miles Platting and the wider area on 19 June; and
- Distributing the leaflet to 5,700 households on 21 June across Clayton, West Bradford Road and Beswick.

The report explained that the SMG/FHF leaflet had encouraged people to respond directly to the Council through the website. The leaflet itself did not direct people to a copy of the draft Framework. SMG had indicated to the Council that FHF had communicated with in excess of 300 people at the ASDA and at least a further 150 through the door-to-door campaign through estates in Clayton, Miles Platting and Beswick.

The consultation had generated 1,445 unique responses onto the Council's website. Of those: 492 responses were assessed as coming from within the Eastlands Regeneration Framework area; 474 from other "M" postcodes; 355 from other Greater Manchester postcodes; 112 from outside Greater Manchester; and the remainder (12) had not given a postcode or location. The specific proposals for developing the land in and around the New Islington tram stop on Pollard Street had been responded to by way of an online petition on an external website that had been signed by more than 2,600 people. It was not known whether the people signing that online petition were residents of Manchester or elsewhere. The SMG/FHF awareness campaign had also resulted in 329 postcards being submitted.

The report examined the issues that had been raised by those responding to the consultation. At the meeting concerns were expressed that the SMG/FHF campaign had been potentially misleading and undertaken in such a way as to misrepresent the proposals in the draft Framework so as to try to generate local opposition to the possible inclusion in the Framework of the development of an entertainment events arena in the Etihad Campus area. Such a new arena venue would therefore potentially operate in competition with SMG's existing arena venue in the city centre, giving the company a commercial interest in such proposals being resisted. The leaflet that had been distributed on SMG's behalf had not made it clear that it was on behalf of a commercial operator with a possible conflicting interest. A copy of the leaflet was appended to the report. The report gave an example of how the leaflet had implied that the development of such an arena would be funded by the Council's money, which was incorrect and therefore misleading. In the responses to the consultation it was evident that many of the residents had been misled by that, believing that the Council was intended to invest its money in developing a second arena at the Etihad Campus: something the residents had opposed. In truth, no such investment was being considered by the Council.

It was considered to be likely that many of the respondents to the consultation had been responding to the SMG/FHF material and not to the actual draft Framework document. The report explained that many of the concerns that had been raised by those who had responded were already explicitly addressed within the draft Framework. The issues of transportation to and from the Etihad Campus, traffic congestion, air pollution and the potential for car parking to become a significant neighbourhood issue had been raised as issues linked with a potential new large indoor arena. However, the draft Framework already included specific proposals and mitigations for each of those.

The report examined each of the key issues raised by the consultees and also the matters raised by the organisations that had responded. The report set out the Council's response to each of those, highlighting where the draft Framework

document was to be amended to take the outcome of the consultation into account. A copy of that draft Framework was appended to the report.

A number of city-centre commercial organisations had also responded including SMG, the operator of the Manchester Arena; MJV, a company involved in the running of the Arndale; DTZ, and the owner of the Printworks leisure complex. The report detailed the matters that had been raised by each of the significant city-centre respondents, including the potential that a new leisure destination in Eastlands could have a significant adverse impact on the on-going operation of key attractions within the city-centre. In each case the Council's response to those issues was explained in the report.

The report also examined the consultation responses that had specifically related to the Pollard Street sub-area of the overall Framework area. The draft of the Regeneration Framework had set out a clear intent to bring forward a redevelopment scheme for this sub-area: known as the MXM scheme. It was explained that the MXM scheme proposal and ambition reflected the decisions that had previously made in respect of the redevelopment of this area of land as set out in the Ancoats and New Islington Development Framework that was approved by the Executive in December 2016 after being subject to public consultation (Minute Exe/16/153).

Many respondents in this consultation were opposed to the potential loss of green space around the New Islington tram stop on Pollard Street. The report explained that the proposals being developed for the MXM had taken into account the guidance that had been contained in the Ancoats and New Islington Development Framework. It was anticipated that the scheme would seek to create a new linear green park along the canal from Great Ancoats street all the way through to Milliners Wharf. The park would run over 300 meters in length with an area of over 3,200 sq metres. It was also likely that the development would include new public square at the heart of the MXM scheme of about 140 sq. metres area.

Having considered the matters raised as part of the consultation, the responses to each of those as set out in the report, and the proposed changes to the draft Framework, it was agreed that the proposals contained within the revised Eastlands Regeneration Framework would seek to deliver the Sports and Innovation Zone on the Etihad Stadium and also new opportunities to develop a new leisure and recreation offer with that could further the growth of a sport, leisure and recreation economic cluster across the Eastlands area. Beyond the Etihad Campus the Framework would seek to promote the creation of new commercial development that would contribute to the creation of jobs within the area. The concerns over the possible economic impact on the city centre of the development of a new leisure arena were considered and the responses to those concerns, as set out in the report, were accepted.

It was noted that the report had also been considered at a meeting of the Economy Scrutiny Committee meeting in July. The committee had made three recommendations relating to the adoption of the Framework, which were all accepted (Minute ESC/19/33).

It was agreed that the Development Framework should therefore be adopted. Authority to approve and publish the final version, which would include the amendments arising from the consultation, was delegated to the Strategic Director.

## Decisions

1. To note the summary of issues and comments received from residents, businesses and other interested parties set out in Section 3 to 5 of the report and approve the suggested amendments set out in these sections to the final version of the Eastlands Regeneration Framework.
2. To accept the recommendations made by the Economy Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 18 July 2019 (Minute ESC/19/33):
  - to incorporate the Council's carbon reduction targets into the final version of the Eastlands Regeneration Framework;
  - that in respect of new commercial led opportunities associated with the Pollard Street Sub Area, to incorporate the preservation and promotion of high quality public realm and green space within the proposals; and
  - to take into account the views of the Committee and Local Ward Councillors in respect of new commercial led opportunities associated with the Etihad Campus Commercial Zone Sub Area.
3. To approve the proposed approach set out in Section 3 of the report in respect of new commercial led opportunities associated with the Pollard Street Sub Area.
4. To approve the proposed approach set out in Section 5 of the report in respect of new commercial led opportunities associated with the Etihad Campus Commercial Zone Sub Area.
5. To delegate to the Strategic Director – Growth & Development, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Executive Member for Housing & Regeneration, authority to approve the final version of the Eastlands Regeneration Framework, with the intention that, if approved, it will become a material consideration in the Council's decision making as a Local Planning Authority.

## **Exe/19/61 Addendum to the Christie Hospital Christie Strategic Planning Framework**

In June 2014 the Christie Strategic Planning Framework (SPF) had been considered approved (Minute Exe/14/055). In April 2017 a fire had caused substantial damage to the Paterson Building on the Christie Hospital site. That building had not been encompassed with the SPF when it was approved in 2014. Therefore, in March 2019 we had considered and endorsed as the basis for public consultation an addendum to the Christie SPF to provide a context for the future development of the site of the Paterson Building (Minute Exe/19/34).



A review of refurbishment options for the Patterson Building had revealed that it would not be possible to repair and retain the building and that it will need to be demolished. The purpose of the addendum to the SPF was therefore to help establish how the size, form and mass of a new building would be dictated by the core cancer research functions to be accommodated inside it. It was intended to also show how a bespoke architectural solution could ensure that floor layouts and vertical arrangements meet the specialist research, healthcare and collaboration needs, with individual labs adjacent both horizontally and vertically to allow the speed and ease of movement of people.

The consultation on the draft SPF Addendum had taken place in April and May 2019. The consultation period had ended on 16 May 2019 after a six-week period. Consultation letters had been sent out to around 4,000 local residents, landowners, council members and other stakeholders. Those letters had explained the consultation process, how to participate, and where to access the draft document. A copy of the draft had been published on the Council's website, and comments had been invited.

Around 500 individual responses were received that opposed the adoption of the Addendum. Those included representations from The Withington Civic Society and The Withington Village Regeneration Partnership. Many of those objecting had commented that they recognised and valued the work undertaken at The Christie but were unable to support the building proposals in the draft Addendum. Two petitions opposing the proposals had also been received: one online that has 280 signatures and one hand written with 121 signatures.

Forty individual responses had been received in support of the proposals and about 2,000 postcards had also expressed support.

Responses have been received from local ward councillors: Stanton, Leech, Kilpatrick, Kelly Simcock, Wilson and Chambers.

The report explained that the objections to the proposals in the draft Addendum broadly fell into five categories:

- that the process of producing an addendum to the SPF was not an appropriate way to deal with the potential redevelopment of a single building;
- the building would be too big for the site and the area;
- that it would be possible to distribute the new floor-space more efficiently at a lower height, which would provide larger building floorplates;
- adverse impacts of additional car parking and traffic; and
- detailed issues about the impact on the amenity of nearby homes and on the wider area.

For each of these categories the range of more specific issues that had been raised were set out in the report. The report also detailed the responses of the local ward councillors who had responded.

For each of these categories the report then set out responses to the issues that had been raised. It was also explained that many of the concerns about the impact of the proposed scheme on the amenity of residents in the area, whilst being very important

matters, did not come within the remit of the Executive or the adoption of the Addendum to the SPF. They were instead matters that would have to be fully considered as part of the determination of the planning application which had been submitted.

The meeting was addressed by Councillor Kelly Simcock, a ward councillor for the Didsbury East Ward. She expressed her support for the redevelopment of the Patterson building in a way that would be sensitive as possible to the concerns of the local community and to residents' concerns about the proposed height of the building.

The meeting was also addressed by Councillor Wills, a ward councillor for the Withington Ward. He too shared residents' concerns about the building's height and sought an assurance that all options had been examined to reduce the height of the building. He also expressed concerns about the possible introduction of retail facilities in the base of the new building and the possible harmful impact those might have on the nearby village centre.

The meeting was then addressed by Mr Nick Jones, the project sponsor for the redevelopment at the Christie. He told the meeting how the project would build on the strengths of the Christie Hospital that were already well established in Manchester. The displacement of staff after the fire in the former building had been very detrimental to the research work on the site and harmful to the effective cooperation of researchers and clinicians dealing with the treatment of cancers. He explained that the design of the proposed building was to encourage 'team science' with a research environment that would help the Christie attract and retain the world's top talent, and thereby to bring substantial benefits the people of Manchester and the region.

Members of the Executive and the Consultative Panel spoke on the wide range of views that had been expressed by consultees and there was recognition of the concerns and objections to the proposed height of the new building, and whether the case had been made that the size of the proposed building was justified by the need to provide high quality and world-leading research and collaboration space. Assurance were also given that such a building would not set a precedent for other planning applications as the very specific requirements of the intended use of this new building would be a material consideration that could not be applied to applications for other tall buildings in that part of the city.

Having considered the responses to the consultation it was agreed that the proposed addendum to the SPF sought to capture a major research and medical facility within Manchester which would have significant medical and economic benefits for the City and the region. Whilst residents in the area clearly value the work undertaken at the Christie they also have considerable concerns about the height of the new building and the wider issues of additional traffic and parking that would arise once it was operational. The draft addendum did not set out a policy position but recognised the opportunity there was to develop a facility of national and international significance at the site, it would help to ensure that The Christie would remain a strategically significant clinical, research and employment facility. The addendum was therefore approved and adopted.

## **Decisions**

1. To note the outcome of the public consultation on the Addendum to the 2014 Christie Strategic Planning Framework.
2. To note the matters raised at the meeting by Councillors K Simcock and Wills, and Mr N Jones of the Christie Hospital.
3. To approve the addendum to the 2014 Christie Strategic Planning Framework (SDF) and request that the Planning and Highways Committee take the Framework into account as a material consideration when determining planning applications for the site.

### **Exe/19/62 Expansion of the Residents' Parking Zone around the Christie Hospital**

A report submitted by the Director of Highways proposed an extension to the existing residents' parking scheme adjacent to the Christie Hospital.

In January 2018 the Planning and Highways Committee had approved an application for a tiered car park at the hospital to provide eight levels of decked parking and the reconfiguration of a surface level car park (Minute PH/18/10).

That approval was subject to the signing a legal agreement whereby the Christie would provide the necessary funding so that the City Council could design, implement and operate the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) at the Christie over an extended area. The report explained that £1m of funding has been secured from the Christie to implement the scheme and to contribute to the on-going revenue costs for enforcement of the scheme.

The existing CPZ had been implemented in 2015 and had proved to be largely successful in addressing the impact on local residents of hospital staff and visitors parking in the surrounding residential streets. However, it had also caused significant displaced parking into the wider neighbourhood beyond the limit of the 2015 CPZ. As the hospital's staff and visitor numbers were forecast to increase this proposed extension to the current CPZ sought to address these issues and lessen the impact of the displaced parking on the residents in the affected neighbourhoods.

Appended to the report was a map showing the extent of the current CPZ and the area to be included in the extension. The intention was for the extended area to operate in the same way as the existing scheme: Monday to Friday, 8am to 6pm with a mixture of residents' only parking bays, "past this point" residents' parking streets and limited waiting for up to 3 hours with an exemption for residents with permits.

The report explained that the process to introduce the extension to the scheme would involve three rounds of consultation with local residents and local councillors. That would begin with a questionnaire to residents. Feedback from the questionnaires would inform the design of the scheme. The design would subject to a second stage consultation with residents. Feedback from that would be considered and changes

made to the design if necessary before the scheme was subject the statutory consultation as the third step.

The meeting was addressed by Councillor Kelly Simcock for a second time. She welcomed the proposed extension to the CPZ and thanked the Christie Hospital for supporting its expansion through the provision of the £1m to allow it to go ahead.

We were grateful to The Christie, and the Christie's Neighbourhood Forum and the local councillors, all of whom had contributed to making it possible for this proposal to now be brought forward. As well as welcoming and supporting the proposal to extend the existing CPZ to a wider area, it was agreed that it would also be helpful to undertake a review of the existing scheme as part of the next stages of the work.

### **Decision**

To approve the design of an expanded residents parking scheme around the Christie.

### **Exe/19/63 Revenue Budget Monitoring 2019/20 to the end of May 2019**

A report was submitted to provide a summary of the position of the 2019/20 revenue budget at the end of May 2019. 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 May 2019 it was forecast that by the year-end in March 2020 the revenue budget would be overspent by £3.495m. The report explained that the projected overspend was predicted to mainly arise in the children and adult social care budgets. Costs for external residential placements for children were higher than predicted. In the adult social care budgets there was significant pressure in the in-house supported accommodation budgets and home care services.

The report explained how each of the directorates was seeking to mitigate and address the budget pressures. The key risks would continue to be monitored and mitigations sought as required throughout 2019/20. The achievement of the approved savings targets would also be integral to this process and would continue to be closely monitored and reported throughout the year.

The report proposed a number of budget virements to reallocate funds between areas of the Council's work. These were agreed:

- £300k from Chief Executive Corporate Items to the cross-cutting savings budget in Corporate Core Directorate made up of savings of £150k due to additional annual leave purchased by staff and the introduction of a shared cost (salary sacrifice) model for the purchase of Pension Additional Voluntary Contributions; and
- £560k from Cross cutting savings budget in Corporate Core Directorate to allocate across Directorates following the rationalisation of the senior management structures; and
- £2.692m from the Youth Service budget from Children's Services to Neighbourhood Services to reflect a change in reporting arrangements.

When setting the 2019/20 budget the Council has agreed to hold some funds for contingencies, and other money that was to be allocated throughout the year. The report proposed the use of some of these budgets to be allocated. These were agreed:

- the release of £335K of non-pay inflation to enable the continued disposal of appropriate material at Redgate Holdings Ltd; and
- the release of £5.084m to service budget for the 2019/20 annual pay award.

The report also addressed use of the Council's reserves. It explained that the draw-down of £12K of reserves had been requested. This was approved:

- £12k draw down from Transformational Challenge Reserve to support Manchester's Fairtrade to promote Fairtrade in the city.

The report also explained that notification had been received in relation to specific external grants, the use of which had not confirmed as part of the 2019/20 budget setting process. Approval was given to the use of these funds:

- Local Government Association Cyber Resilience phase 1 grant of £25k, to be allocated to ICT, to support cyber security training for staff
- New Burdens funding of £85k to be allocated to Revenues and Benefits to fund additional temporary staffing resources.

It was noted that the report had also been considered at a meeting of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee meeting in July. The views of the Committee were noted (Minute RGSC/19/42).

## **Decisions**

1. To recommend that the Council approve the proposed virements over £0.5m as set out in paragraph 61 of the report.
2. To approve the use of budgets to be allocated, the use of a reserve, the use of grants in addition to that already planned, and the three proposed virements, all as set out above.

## **Exe/19/64 Capital Programme Update**

A report concerning requests to increase the capital programme was submitted. We agreed to recommend one change to the Council, and to make a four changes under delegated powers. These five changes would decrease the Council's capital budget by £2.858m across 2019/20 to 2021/22.

## **Decisions**

1. To recommend that the Council approve the following change to Manchester City Council's capital programme:

- (a) Highways – Hyde Road. A capital budget virement of £1.254m is requested, funded by a transfer from the Highways Investment Plan budget.
2. Under powers delegated to the Executive, to approve the following changes to the City Council’s capital programme:
- (b) Highways –Residents Parking Schemes (RPZ). A capital budget increase of £0.633m is requested, funded from External Contribution and Parking Reserve.
- (c) ICT – Early Years and Education Implementation (EYES). A capital budget decrease of £2.248m is requested and approval of a corresponding transfer of £2.248m to the revenue budget, funded by capital fund.
- (d) ICT – Telephony. A capital budget virement of £0.400m is requested, funded through a transfer from the ICT Investment Plan budget, alongside a capital budget decrease of £1.177m and approval of a corresponding transfer of £1.177m to the revenue budget, funded by capital fund.
- (e) ICT – Planning, Licensing, Land Charges and Building Control Application. A capital budget decrease of £0.066m is requested and approval of a corresponding transfer of £0.066m to the revenue budget, funded by capital fund.
3. To note increases to the programme of £0.757m as a result of delegated approvals.

### **Exe/19/65 Revising the Ethical Procurement Policy**

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer submitted a report that sought to incorporate into the Ethical Procurement Policy the “Unite Charter for Ethical Employment Standards in the Voluntary and Community Sector”.

The had been adopted in March 2016 (Minute Exe/16/042). Recently the Council had been approached by the Unite trade union to see how the union could work with the Council to further develop and monitor the Council’s Ethical Procurement Policy. Discussion with the union had led to the proposal that the “Charter for Ethical Employment Standards in the Voluntary and Community Sector” be incorporated into the Policy.

The proposed change to the policy’s wording was to add...

“As a local authority we are responsible for the procurement of a multitude of contracts within the voluntary and community sector. It is therefore appropriate that we as a responsible Council have signed up to Unite’s Charter for Ethical Employment Standards in the Voluntary and Community Sector in order to achieve the highest standards of ethical employment and behaviour. A link to the full charter that the Council have signed up to can be found in the appendix to the policy.”

A copy of the Charter would then be appended to the policy.

Those proposals were agreed.

### **Decisions**

1. To agree to the Unite Charter for Ethical Employment Standards in the Voluntary and Community Sector be included within the appendices of the Ethical Procurement Policy.
2. To agree the inclusion of the additional wording to section 5 of the Policy as detailed in the report.
3. To request that the Chief Executive signs the Charter on behalf of the Council to signify it has been included in the Policy.

### **Exe/19/66 Decisions from the Joint GMCA and AGMA Executive Board meeting on 28 June 2019**

#### **Decision**

To note the decisions of the Joint GMCA and AGMA Executive Board meeting on 28 June 2019.

This page is intentionally left blank