

The Executive

Minutes of the meeting held on 12 September 2018

Present: Councillor Leese (Chair)

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

Present as Members of the Standing Consultative Panel:

Councillors: Karney, Sheikh, Midgley, Ilyas, Taylor and S Judge

Apologies: Councillor Rahman, Leech and M Sharif Mahamed

Also present: Councillors: A Simcock

Exe/18/87 Minutes

Decision

To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meetings on 25 July 2018.

Exe/18/88 Proposals for a Resident Parking Policy

A report submitted by the Operational Director of Highways proposed a new resident parking policy for the city so that resident parking schemes could contribute to making the city an even more attractive place to live, work and visit. The report explained the importance of their being a balance between residents being able to park a car close to their property, or have deliveries made, and the other demands on the road space. The other demands varied across the city so there needed to be a common approach to the design of residents' parking schemes that also responded to local differences in a sensitive and appropriate way.

The report proposed that future resident parking schemes be based on a set of common key principles:

- a) The operation of resident parking schemes needs to be self-financing. The City Council should not commit future revenue support to such schemes.
- b) There should be broad consistency across schemes so that the design of schemes aimed at tackling similar problems should not differ e.g. in the case of schemes designed to tackle parking around hospital sites.
- c) Schemes should be introduced in an equitable way so that there is appropriate financial support for residents who would be disproportionately affected by the impact of a charging scheme.
- d) There needs to be clear evidence of majority support in the area concerned for the introduction of a scheme as well as clearly established evidence of need.
- e) Enforcement of resident parking schemes should be fit for purpose. (A review of scheme enforcement is to take place looking at ways to increase / improve enforcement).

- f) Schemes need to be appropriate and proportionate to the parking issues being faced by residents in any given area.
- g) Any visitors' permits made available as part of scheme design need to be linked to a specific vehicle and not be transferable.
- h) It will be important to consider the 'knock-on' implications for adjoining areas in terms of displacement as part of any assessment.

The report explained that in addition to the four parking schemes already being developed (Rusholme, North Manchester General Hospital, Hathersage Road Area, and St George's) there were eight other locations across the city that had been identified as being in need of some form of residential parking scheme. The report explained the issues that would need to be considered in order for these eight other schemes to be developed in accordance with the above principles: including the first of being self-financing, with residents living within the area of a scheme paying for their own and visitor permits for their vehicles.

The meeting was addressed by Councillor A Simcock, a ward councillor for the Didsbury East ward. Councillor Simcock spoke as the Council's representative on the Christie Hospital Council of Governors, and also as the Chair of the Christie Hospital Neighbourhood Forum. He asked that the proposed extension of the Christie Hospital residents parking scheme be considered as the fifth named scheme already under development rather than one of the eight other schemes that were to be developed in accordance with the principles being proposed in the report. He explained the rationale for seeking that change, describing the significance of that scheme to the Strategic Planning Framework for the Christie Hospital site that had been approved by the Executive in 2013 (Minute Exe/13/161). The Christie Hospital had already agreed to finance the capital cost of the scheme and the extent of the area to be included had been provisionally agreed, extending into four council wards. The elected councillors for those wards had made progress with the scheme an election pledge in the May 2018 local election. He explained that a number of significant development schemes at the hospital were dependent on the extended parking scheme being approved.

We also noted that the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee had also considered the report at a recent meeting (Minute NESC/18/38). The committee had not endorsed the recommendations made in the report and had put forward other recommendations for the Executive to consider.

Having considered the views expressed by the Scrutiny Committee, and being mindful of the need to do more to help residents cope with parking problems in their neighbourhoods whilst not adding to the Council's revenue budget pressures, we agreed that the principles set out the report be used as the basis of further work, and that the four scheme already underway should proceed. We also agreed to accept an additional principle that had been suggested by the Scrutiny Committee - Local business such as the Universities, Hospitals and the Etihad Stadium, that were seen to impact on residents parking as a result of their expansion should contribute and pay for residents parking schemes.

Decisions

1. To note the comments and recommendations of Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee.
2. To endorse in general, as the basis for further work, the key principles for future Residents' Parking Scheme as set out above, with the exception of (g) for visitor permits.
3. To add a further principle that residents of an area should not be asked to meet the revenue costs of any proposed scheme and where the need for the scheme arose primarily from a site, facility or institution that was sited in the neighbourhood and was creating the demand for parking, that the institution or facility should instead be asked to support the operation of that scheme.
4. To agree to proceed with the four schemes already under development: being Rusholme, North Manchester General Hospital, Hathersage Road area, and St Georges.
5. To ask the Chief Executive to carry out an assessment of all existing schemes and those in (4) above and where appropriate seek external revenue funding for those schemes.
6. To agree to consider means to reduce the revenue operating costs of existing and future schemes.
7. To agree that any other future schemes should not require the any increase in the existing revenue provision for Residents' Parking Schemes.

Exe/18/89 Manchester Homeless Strategy

In November 2013 we had adopted the "Manchester Homelessness Strategy 2013 – 2018" that set out the Council's priorities to address and prevent homelessness for the next five years (Minute Exe/13/154). In November 2017, as part of the work on the Homelessness and the City Centre Review, we had agreed proposals for the 2013 strategy to be revised to address a number of matters including the implications of the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 (Minute Exe/17/139).

A report now submitted by the Strategic Lead for Homelessness explained that the Council had undertaken the City Centre Review (Minute Exe/17/024) which had brought about additional investment for services for people who were rough sleeping. During late 2017 an in-depth review of the wider causes of homelessness in Manchester had been undertaken. That had included analysis of the available resources within the service to address the impact of the Homelessness Reduction Act. The Homeless Reduction Act had come into effect in April 2018. That had widened the access to prevention services for all households at risk of losing their home. Whilst that enabled the Council to support people who might be at risk of homelessness it also resulted in an increase in demand for services, and a requirement for closer partnership working.

A new strategy for addressing and reducing homelessness in Manchester had been developed through the Manchester Homelessness Partnership (MHP). The Partnership had been established in 2015 to bring together those with a personal insight into homelessness and the organisations working to reduce homelessness. The Partnership had since provided a radically different approach to how services were designed and commissioned, and had been instrumental in the development of the new strategy.

The report set out the how the partnership had developed this strategy. The strategy was to focus on three key aims:

- making homelessness a rare occurrence: increasing prevention;
- making any experience of homelessness as brief as possible: improving temporary and supported accommodation; and
- making sure homelessness a non-recurring experience: increasing access to settled homes.

The report also described the plans for the implementation of the strategy and the Council's participation in that. It also set the new strategy in the context of the work being done across Greater Manchester. It was highlighted that this new strategy was to be for the whole city, so adopted by the Partnership as a whole, rather than a document produced and adopted solely by the Council. A copy of the document was appended to the report.

Decision

To endorse the proposed Strategy and commend it to the Manchester Homeless Partnership Board.

Exe/18/90 Proposed Changes to the Council Tax Support Scheme

In October 2016 we had considered and endorsed for public consultation a revised Council Tax Support (Minute Exe/16/126). In January 2017 we considered the outcome of the consultation and agreed to adopt a new support scheme (Minute Exe/17/012). The City Treasurer now submitted a report proposing further changes to the Council's Council Tax Support (CTS) Scheme, with the intention that these would also be subject to a period of public consultation. The basis of these proposed changes was to seek to ensure that that the scheme remained fit for purpose as working age residents in receipt of welfare benefits were moved onto Universal Credit (UC).

The report explained the challenges to the current scheme of Council Tax Support that were going to arise from the changeover to Universal Credit. One of the most significant of those being that it was not 'universal' and so Council Tax Support would need to be administered outside of and separately from UC. Under the current CTS scheme the entitlement to CTS was influenced by the entitlement to other benefits. As UC was set up so that the level of benefit could fluctuate, depending on a person's earnings, there was the possibility of a lot of administrative processing to deal with fluctuating levels of CTS benefits, making the scheme less straightforward for residents and more expensive for the Council to operate.

The report set out a package of proposed changes to the current scheme to mitigate the consequences of claimants moving onto Universal Credit, including the introduction of a banding structure for level of support based on ranges of excess weekly income. It was hoped that these bands would accommodate much of the fluctuation in UC levels without there needing to be a matching fluctuation in the Council Tax Support.

We noted that the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee had also considered the Treasurer's report at a recent meeting (Minute RGSC/18/46). The Committee had supported the proposed changes to the CTS Scheme. It had also recommended that other possible changes to some aspects of the current scheme be considered for inclusion in the consultation on the changes set out in the report. These additional changes related to the support to families with three or more children.

It was agreed that the changes proposed in the report should be consulted upon. It was also agreed that the further changes recommended by the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee should be considered by the City Treasurer, and if possible without causing undue delay, included in the consultation. Authority was therefore delegated to the City Treasurer to decide on the contents and timing of the consultation.

Decisions

1. To endorse the proposals contained in the report and that there should be formal consultation on those proposals.
2. To note the comments and recommendations of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee.
3. To delegate authority to the City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to finalise the consultation proposals and the timing of the consultation, either on the basis as set out in the report, or also adding further proposals as put forward by the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee if those could be incorporated without the consultation being unreasonably delayed.
4. To note that the outcome of the consultation will be reported back to a future meeting.

Exe/18/91 The Transport for Greater Manchester Committee

A report submitted by the City Solicitor explained that the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) was proposing to change the constitution of its Transport for Greater Manchester Committee (TfGMC). The intention was to reduce the size of the committee from its present size of 33 members down to 23. In order to achieve that the GMCA had devised proposals for how the 10 districts in Greater

Manchester would appoint or Nominate Councillors to sit on the committee, and for the Greater Manchester Mayor to also nominate a person to sit on the committee.

As the TfGMC would be exercising some executive and non-executive functions the change would require the support of the executive and of the Council of each of the 10 districts. The actual appointment and nomination of Manchester City Councillors to the new committee would be done by the Council, on the advice of the Constitutional and Nomination Committee. The report asked for the Executive to agree to the governance changes that arose from these proposals.

Decisions

1. To agree the reduction in size of the Transport for Greater Manchester Committee (TfGMC) to 23 members.
2. To agree that each of the 10 Greater Manchester district councils shall:
 - appoint one member to the TfGMC (save for Manchester City Council which shall appoint two members); and
 - nominate one further member to be appointed to the TfGMC by Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) to ensure political balance.
3. To agree that the GMCA shall appoint one member.
4. To agree that the Mayor of Greater Manchester shall nominate one further member to be appointed to the TfGMC by the GMCA.
5. To agree that the TfGMC Operating Agreement be amended to reflect the above changes.
6. To agree that the TfGMC Terms of Reference be amended to ensure that they reflect the Mayor of Greater Manchester's current transport powers.
7. To agree that the Operating Agreement and Terms of Reference of the TfGMC be further reviewed in 2019/20 when the final Mayoral transport powers are agreed by Order.

Exe/18/92 Capital Programme Update

A report concerning requests to increase the capital programme was submitted. We approved five changes under delegated powers. These changes would increase Manchester City Council's capital budget by £3.533m in 2018/19 and by £0.508m in 2019/20.

Decisions

To approve the following changes to the City Council's capital programme:

1. Highways – SEMMMS A6 Scheme. An increase in the capital budget of £2.962m in 2018/19, funded by Department for Transport grant (DfT).

2. Highways – Large Patching Programme. An increase in the capital budget of £0.439m in 2018/19, funded by Department for Transport grant via Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA).
3. Highways – School Crossings Programme. An increase in the capital budget of £0.132m in 2018/19, funded by external contributions from Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM).
4. Highways – MSIRR Great Ancoats Improvement Scheme. An increase in the capital budget of £0.308m in 2019/20, funded by external contributions from Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM).
5. Corporate Services – Band on the Wall Loan. An increase in the capital budget of £0.2m in 2019/20, funded by capital fund.