



Joanne Roney OBE
Chief Executive
Telephone: 0161 234 3006
j.roney@manchester.gov.uk
PO Box 532, Town Hall
Extension, Manchester
M60 2LA

Tuesday, 19 March 2019

Dear Councillor / Honorary Alderman,

Meeting of the Council – Wednesday, 27th March, 2019

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the Council which will be held at 10.00 am on Wednesday, 27th March, 2019, in The Council Chamber, Level 2, Town Hall Extension.

1. The Lord Mayor's Announcements and Special Business

2. Interests

3. Minutes

To submit for approval and signature the minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2019. 7 - 76

4. Proceedings of the Executive

To submit the part proceedings of the meeting on 13 February and the minutes of the meeting held on 13 March 2019 (to follow) and in particular to consider: 77 - 92

Exe/19/10 Capital Programme Monitoring 2018/19

To recommend that the Council approve the virements over £0.5m between capital schemes to maximise use of funding resources available to the City Council set out in the appendix to these minutes.

Exe/19/31 Capital Programme Update

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

- (a) ICT – End User Experience. A capital budget allocation and transfer of £4.193m from the ICT Investment Plan budget is requested, funded by borrowing.
- (b) ICT – Wi-Fi Business Case. A capital budget allocation and transfer of £1.468m from the ICT Investment Plan budget is requested, funded by borrowing.

Exe/19/32 Relocation of Leaving Care Services to Seymour Road

To recommend that the Council approve a capital allocation of up to £1.2m to cover any unforeseen costs, funded by prudential borrowing; and

To recommend that the Council delegate authority to Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources, to set the final budget for the project, the capital allocation and the borrowing.

5. Questions to Executive Members under Procedural Rule 23

6. Scrutiny Committees

To note the minutes of the following committees:

93 - 170

Health – 5 February and 5 March 2019

Children and Young People – 5 February and 5 March 2019

Neighbourhoods and Environment – 6 February and 6 March 2019

Economy – 6 February and 6 March 2019 (to follow)

Communities and Equalities – 7 February and 7 March 2019 (to follow)

Resources and Governance – 7 February and 7 March 2019 (to follow)

7. Proceedings of Committees

171 - 194

To submit for approval the minutes of the following meetings and consider recommendations made by the committee:

Audit Committee – 11 February and 11 March 2019 (to follow)

Constitutional and Nomination 27 May 2019 (to be tabled)

Health and Wellbeing Board – 20 March 2019 (to follow)

Licensing Committee – 4 March 2019

Licensing and Appeals Committee – 4 March 2019

Planning and Highways Committee – 14 February and 14 March 2019 (to follow)

Standards Committee – 21 March 2019 (to follow)

Personnel Committee – 13 February and 13 March 2019 (to follow) and in particular to consider:

PE/19/08 Senior Management Arrangements for the Homelessness Service

To recommend to Council that the Director of Homelessness Services post is remunerated at Grade SS4 (£94,072 - £103,863).

PE/19/11 Pay Policy Statement 2019/20

To note the organisations Pay and Grading Structure for the financial year 2019/20 (appended to the Pay Policy Statement) and recommend it for Council approval.

PE/19/12 Director of ICT

To recommend that Council approves the post of Director of ICT be recruited to at Grade SS4 (£94,072 - £103,863) increasing to £95,953 - £105,940 from 1 April 2019 with an additional market rate supplement of up to £30,000, subject to the stipulated review processes after 18 months.

8. Business of the Combined Authority, Joint Authorities and Joint Committees

To receive answers to any questions raised in accordance with Procedural Rule 24 on the business of: (a) the Greater Manchester Combined Authority, (b) the Greater Manchester Waste Disposal Authority, and (c) any other joint authority.

9. Key Decisions Report

The report of the City Solicitor is enclosed.

195 - 198

10. Notice of Motion - Public Health Funding

The public health grant funds vital services and functions that prevent ill health and contribute to the future sustainability of the NHS. Local authorities are responsible for delivering most of these services, but their ability to do so is compromised by public health grant reductions and the broader funding climate.

In 2018/19 and 2019/20 every local authority will have less to spend on public health than the year before. Taking funds away from prevention is a false economy. Without proper investment in public health people suffer, demand on local health services increases and the economy suffers. Poor public health costs local businesses heavily through sick days and lost productivity. Unless we restore public health funding, our health and care system will remain locked in a 'treatment' approach, which is neither economically viable nor protects the health of residents.

The Government is looking to phase out the Public Health Grant by 2020/21. Thereafter, they plan to fund public health via 75% business rates retention. Whatever the model, it is vital that local authorities have enough funding to deliver the functions and services they need to provide.

Deprived areas often suffer the worst health outcomes, so it is also vital that areas with the greatest need receive sufficient funding to meet their local challenges.

This Council notes that around four in ten cancers are preventable, largely through avoidable risk factors, such as

stopping smoking, keeping a healthy weight and cutting back on alcohol. Smoking accounts for 80,000 early deaths every year and remains the largest preventable cause of cancer in the world. Smoking-related ill health costs local authorities £760 million every year in social care costs. Additionally, obesity and alcohol account for 30,000 and 7,000 early deaths each year respectively. All three increase the risk of: cancer, diabetes, lung and heart conditions, poor mental health and create a subsequent burden on health and social care.

This Council believes that the impact of cuts to public health on our communities is becoming difficult to ignore. This case becomes more pressing given the Government's consideration of a 10-year plan for the NHS. For this reason, we support Cancer Research UK's call for increased and sustainable public health funding.

This Council calls on the Government to deliver increased investment in public health and to support a sustainable health and social care system by taking a 'prevention first' approach. In turn, Manchester City Council will continue to support and fund public health initiatives to the best of our abilities -to prevent ill-health, reduce inequalities and support a health and social care system that is fit for the future.

Proposed by Councillor T Judge, seconded by Councillor Wilson and also signed by Councillors K Simcock, Raikes, Cooley, B Priest and Kirkpatrick

11. Notice of Motion - Intentional Homelessness

As a Council we have a responsibility to look after children and young people who come into our care. This responsibility does not stop when these young people leave care it continues through until they turn 25.

Currently if a care leaver presents as homeless to this council they can still be deemed intentionally homeless. We know our young people often face extensive challenges for a variety of reasons and sometimes need extra support to assist them to transition to adulthood.

These are Our Young people and we have a duty to support them as their corporate parents. This involves supporting them through their mistakes and providing guidance to help them make more positive choices in the future. This task is made more difficult if the young person is deemed intentionally homeless as this can lead to them losing touch with services.

In Manchester we are developing the homelessness pathway for all young people across the city. This is designed to support young people and prevent homelessness in the first place. We are however aware that sometimes people slip through the net.

This Council will

- 1) Ensure effective and appropriate support is available through personal advisors to our young people and that this support is effectively communicated to the young people
- 2) Take a clear stance and change policy to ensure that no care leavers are classed as intentionally homeless, and are always supported back into accommodation.

Proposed by Councillor S Judge, Seconded by Councillor Taylor, and also signed by Councillors Midgley, Sheikh, Richards and Bridges

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Joanne Roney', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

**Joanne Roney OBE
Chief Executive**

Information about the Council

The Council is composed of 96 councillors with one third elected three years in four. There is currently one vacancy. Councillors are democratically accountable to residents of their ward. Their overriding duty is to the whole community, but they have a special duty to their constituents, including those who did not vote for them.

Six individuals with previous long service as councillors of the city have been appointed Honorary Aldermen of the City of Manchester and are entitled to attend every Council meeting. They do not however have a vote.

All councillors meet together as the Council under the chairship of the Lord Mayor of Manchester. There are seven meetings of the Council in each municipal year and they are open to the public. Here councillors decide the Council's overall strategic policies and set the budget each year.

Agenda, reports and minutes of all Council meetings can be found on the Council's website www.manchester.gov.uk

Members of the Council

Councillors:-

Hitchen (Chair), Akbar, Ahmed Ali, Azra Ali, Nasrin Ali, Sameem Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Andrews, Appleby, Barrett, Battle, Bridges, Chohan (Deputy Chair), Clay, Collins, Connolly, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Dar, Davies, Douglas, Ellison, Evans, Farrell, Flanagan, Green, Grimshaw, Hacking, Harland, Hassan, Hewitson, Holt, Hughes, Igbon, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, Leese, J Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Madeleine Monaghan, Mary Monaghan, Moore, N Murphy, S Murphy, Newman, Noor, O'Neil, Ollerhead, Paul, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reeves, Reid, Riasat, Richards, Rowles, Russell, Sadler, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, A Simcock, K Simcock, Smitheman, Stogia, Stone, Strong, Taylor, Watson, Wheeler, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright (plus one vacancy)

Honorary Aldermen of the City of Manchester –

Gordon Conquest, William Egerton JP, Andrew Fender, Audrey Jones JP, Paul Murphy OBE, Nilofar Siddiqi, John Smith and Keith Whitmore.

Further Information

For help, advice and information about this meeting please contact the Committee Officer:

Donald Connolly
Tel: 0161 234 3034
Email: d.connolly@manchestser.gov.uk

This agenda was issued on **Tuesday, 19 March 2019** by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Manchester City Council, Level 3, Town Hall Extension (Lloyd Street Elevation), Manchester M60 2LA

Council

Minutes of the meeting on 8 March 2019

Present: The Lord Mayor, Councillor June Hitchen – in the Chair

Councillors –

Akbar, Ahmed Ali, Appleby, Azra Ali, Ali N, Andrews, Barrett, Bridges, Chohan, Clay, Collins, Connolly, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Y Dar, Davies, Douglas, Ellison, Evans, Flanagan, Fletcher-Hackwood, Grimshaw, Hacking, Harland, Hassan, Holt, Hughes, Igbon, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, Leese, Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Madeleine Monaghan, Moore, N. Murphy, S Murphy, Newman, Noor, O’Neil, Ollerhead, Paul, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq Reeves, Reid, Riasat, Richards, Russell, Sadler, Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, A Simcock, K Simcock, Stogia, Stone, Taylor, Watson, Wheeler, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

Honorary Aldermen of the City of Manchester –

Mr Andrew Fender and Mrs Nilofar Siddiqi

CC/19/15 Lord Mayor’s Special Business –International Women’s Day

The Lord Mayor informed the Council that in recognition of International Women’s Day she had invited three guest speakers to address the Council. The Lord Mayor introduced Lucy Powell MP (Manchester Central), Councillor Azra Ali and Councillor Sarah Judge.

CC/19/16 Minutes

Decision

To agree the minutes of the ordinary meeting held on 30 January 2019 as a correct record.

CC/19/17 Motion without notice – Suspension of Council Rule

The Leader of the Council moved a motion without notice (Council Rule 19.1(k) to suspend Council Rule 18.3, to allow the submission of an amendment that was moved on the Council Tax Resolution 2019/20 at the meeting of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee 25 February 2019, after the deadline for the receipt of amendments.

Resolution

The motion was put to Council and voted on, and the Lord Mayor declared that it was carried.

Decision

That Council Rule 18.3 be suspended to allow the amendment on the Council Tax Resolution 2019/20 to be considered.

CC/19/18 The Council's Revenue and Capital Budget 2019/20 to 2023/24

The proceedings of the Art Galleries Committee on 13 February 2019 which provided details of the Art Galleries budget for 2019/20 were submitted for approval. In addition, the part proceedings of the Executive on 13 February 2019 were submitted for approval, which contained details on the following:

- The Council's Budget 2019/20 covering report;
- Medium Term Financial Plan 2019/20 - 2021/22;
- Capital Strategy and Budget 2019/20 to 2023/24;
- Corporate Core Business Plan 2019/20;
- Neighbourhoods Directorate Business Planning 2019/20;
- Children's Services and Education Business Planning 2019/20;
- Dedicated Schools Grant 2019/20;
- Strategic Development Business Planning 2019/20;
- Housing Revenue Account 2019/20 to 2021/22;
- Manchester Health and Care Commissioning – Adult Social Care Business Plan and Pooled Budget Planning 2019/20;
- Homelessness Business Planning 2019/20;
- Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy 2019/20.

The Council considered:

- The Capital Strategy and Budget (Budget 2019/20 – 2023/24) report of the Chief Executive and City Treasurer;
- The Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy 2019/20 report of the City Treasurer; and
- The Council Tax Resolution 2019/20 report of the Chief Executive, the City Treasurer and the City Solicitor containing revised budget calculations, as authorised by the Executive.

In addition, the Council received the minutes of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee on 25 February 2019 that had considered the Budget Report 2019-2020.

The following amendment from Councillor Ellison to the Council Tax Resolution 2019/20 on the report of the City Treasurer and Chief Executive was circulated:

“To allocate a budget of £1.5m over three years, to be phased £420k in the first year and £540k in both subsequent years, to increase the capacity of the City Council to tackle anti-social behaviour in our neighbourhoods, to be funded out of the proposed reimbursement of £1.5m to the general fund reserve budgeted for in 2018/19.”

The Leader confirmed that the amendment proposed by Councillor Ellison had been accepted for incorporation into the Council Budget motion. Councillor Ellison confirmed that he had consented to the amendment being incorporated into the motion moved by the Leader of the Council.

Council was invited to approve proposals to ensure that the Housing Revenue Account for 2019/20 does not show a debit balance, as set out in Appendix 1 to these minutes.

As part of the recommendations within minute reference Exe/19/12 of the part proceedings: **Medium Term Financial Plan 2019-2020 – 2021/2022** Council was also invited to approve for 2019/20:

- (a) an increase in the basic amount of Council Tax (i.e. the City's element of council tax) by 3.49% (including 1.5% for adult social care);
- (b) the contingency sum of £1.6m;
- (c) delegation of authority to the City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to make allocations from the inflationary pressures and budgets to be allocated sum of £9.945m (as shown in Table 4 of those minutes). In doing so it was noted that the MHCC elements of those costs (Table 5) had been included in the Pooled Budget and were subject to draw-down in consultation with MHCC Finance Committee, and consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources;
- (d) the corporate budget requirements to cover levies / charges of £70.090m, capital financing costs of £70.090m, capital financing costs of £44.507m, additional allowances and other pension costs of £10.030m and insurance costs of £2.004m;
- (e) the estimated utilisation of £8.596m in 2019/20 of the surplus from the on street parking and bus lane enforcement reserves, after determining that any surplus from these reserves is not required to provide additional off street parking in the authority;
- (f) the position on reserves as identified in the report as identified in the report submitted, noting that the position is subject to any further calls on reserves that had arisen prior to the meeting;
- (g) allocate from the existing Our Manchester Budget a fund of £300,000 to support community groups not currently in receipt of Council support under the VCS Grants Scheme but who have now made sufficient progress in their development to be able to receive support from the Council; and also that a £100,000 be set aside to support new and existing groups, particularly where there is a need for support to help reduce demand on Council services.

In considering the **Capital Strategy and Budget 2019/20 to 2023/24** report of the Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which presented the 2017/18 capital programme

and forward commitments alongside the capital strategy for the City Council, the Council was asked to:

1. Approve the budget changes for the 2018/19 capital programme.
2. Approve the capital programme as presented in Appendix 2 (for £495.3m in 2018/19, £505.6m in 2019/20, £419.0m in 2020/21, £244.0m in 2021/22 £86.9m in 2022/23 and £39.0m in 2023/24) which will require prudential borrowing of £617.2m to fund non-HRA schemes over the five-year period for which provision has been made in the revenue budget for the associated financing costs (within limits previously agreed).
3. Delegate authority to:
 - a) The Chief Executive and Director of Highways, in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment for the approval of the list of schemes to be undertaken under the Highways capital programme.
 - b) The Chief Executive and Director of Highways to implement the Highways schemes in accordance with the Capital Approval process and after consultation with the Executive Member for Environment on the final details and estimated costs.
 - c) The City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to add qualifying spend to save projects to the capital budget accordingly up to a maximum of £5m in 2019/20 and then £5m per year thereafter.
 - d) The City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to accelerate spend from later years, when necessary within the programme subject to resource availability.
 - e) The City Treasurer in consultation with Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to agree and approve where appropriate:
 - i. The programme of schemes for the delivery of the corporate asset management programme; and
 - ii. Proposals relating to Corporate Compulsory Purchase Orders.

As part of the recommendations within minute reference Exe/19/22 of the part proceedings: **Treasury Management Strategy Statement, Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy 2019/20** Council was also invited to approve:

1. The proposed Treasury Management Strategy Statement, in particular the:
 - Treasury Indicators attached at Appendix 3, of these minutes;
 - MRP Strategy outlined in Appendix 4;
 - Treasury Management Policy Statement at Appendix 5;
 - Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation at Appendix 6;
 - Borrowing Requirement listed in Appendix 7;

- Borrowing Strategy outlined in Appendix 8;
 - Annual Investment Strategy detailed in Appendix 9.
2. Delegation to the City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources, of authority to pursue any restructuring, rescheduling or redemption opportunities available, including amendments to the Treasury Management Strategy, if the changes require it. Any changes required to the Strategy will be reported to members at the earliest opportunity.

In considering the **Council Tax Resolution** report of the Deputy Chief Executive, City Treasurer, Chief Executive and City Solicitor which presented the recommended Council Tax resolution and Collection Fund budget for 2019/20, the Council was asked to:

1. Adopt the part proceedings of the Executive on 13 February 2019.
2. Note the position on reserves as detailed in Appendix 10 to these minutes.
3. Note that the budget has been prepared on the basis that the amendment to establish a Crime and Disorder Reserve of £1.5m is approved.
4. Note that the Council tax resolution included at Appendix 11 reflects the budget position, including the amendment reported at recommendation 3.
5. To note the amendment of £400k to support groups as part of the Our Manchester programme in paragraph 2.4 will be accommodated from within the existing Budget and if this requires any changes to the planned draw down of the Our Manchester Reserve in 2019/20 this will be reported through the Global Monitoring report.
6. Note the information on referenda as detailed in Section 3 of the report.
7. Approve the Council Tax determination attached as Appendix 11, subject to whether the proposal outlined at recommendation 3 is accepted to this report.
The Council Tax determination:
 - Calculates the Council tax requirement in accordance with Section 31A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 as amended by the Localism Act 2011.
 - Calculates a basic amount of Council Tax and an amount of tax for each valuation band (the City Council element) in accordance with Sections 31B and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992, as amended.
 - Sets an amount of Council Tax for each category of dwellings in each valuation band in accordance with Section 30 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992.
8. Determine affordable borrowing limits, prudential indicators, proposals in respect of treasury management, annual investment strategy and minimum revenue provision strategy. The prudential indicators are listed in Appendix 3 to this report.

9. Approve the Collection Fund Budget for 2019/20 as set out in Appendix 12 to this report.

Motion Made and Seconded:

1. To approve the proceedings of the Art Galleries Committee on 13 February 2019 which provided details of the Art Galleries budget for 2019/20, and the part proceedings of the Executive on 13 February 2019, which contained details on the following:
 - The Council's Budget 2019/20 covering report;
 - Medium Term Financial Plan 2019/20 - 2021/22;
 - Capital Strategy and Budget 2019/20 to 2023/24;
 - Corporate Core Business Plan 2019/20;
 - Neighbourhoods Directorate Business Planning 2019/20;
 - Children's Services and Education Business Planning 2019/20;
 - Dedicated Schools Grant 2019/20;
 - Strategic Development Business Planning 2019/20;
 - Housing Revenue Account 2019/20 to 2021/22;
 - Manchester Health and Care Commissioning – Adult Social Care Business Plan and Pooled Budget Planning 2019/20;
 - Homelessness Business Planning 2019/20;
 - Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy 2019/20.
2. To note the minutes of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee on 25 February 2019.
3. To approve the proposals, as set out in Appendix 1 of these minutes, to ensure that the Housing Revenue Account for 2019/20 does not show a debit balance.
4. To approve the recommendations as detailed in minute reference Exe/19/12 of the part proceedings: **Medium Term Financial Plan 2019/2020 – 2021/2022**, for 2019/20:
 - (a) an increase in the basic amount of Council Tax (i.e. the City's element of council tax) by 3.49% (including 1.5% for adult social care);
 - (b) the contingency sum of £1.6m;
 - (c) delegation of authority to the City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to make allocations from the inflationary pressures and budgets to be allocated sum of £9.945m (as shown in Table 4). In doing so it was noted that the MHCC elements of those costs (Table 5) had been included in the Pooled Budget and were subject to draw-down in consultation with MHCC Finance Committee, and consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources;

- (d) the corporate budget requirements to cover levies / charges of £70.090m, capital financing costs of £44.507m, additional allowances and other pension costs of £10.030m and insurance costs of £2.004m;
 - (e) the estimated utilisation of £8.596m in 2019/20 of the surplus from the on street parking and bus lane enforcement reserves, after determining that any surplus from these reserves is not required to provide additional off street parking in the authority;
 - (f) the position on reserves as identified in the report as identified in the report submitted, noting that the position is subject to any further calls on reserves that had arisen prior to the meeting;
 - (g) allocate from the existing Our Manchester Budget a fund of £300,000 to support community groups not currently in receipt of Council support under the VCS Grants Scheme but who have now made sufficient progress in their development to be able to receive support from the Council; and also that a £100,000 be set aside to support new and existing groups, particularly where there is a need for support to help reduce demand on Council services.
4. To approve the budget changes for the 2018/19 capital programme.
 5. To approve the capital programme as presented in Appendix 2 (for £495.3m in 2018/19, £505.6m in 2019/20, £419.0m in 2020/21, £244.0m in 2021/22 £86.9m in 2022/23 and £39.0m in 2023/24) which will require prudential borrowing of £617.2m to fund non-HRA schemes over the five-year period for which provision has been made in the revenue budget for the associated financing costs (within limits previously agreed).
 6. To delegate authority to:
 - The Chief Executive and Director of Highways, in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment for the approval of the list of schemes to be undertaken under the Highways capital programme.
 - The Chief Executive and Director of Highways to implement the Highways schemes in accordance with the Capital Approval process and after consultation with the Executive Member for Environment on the final details and estimated costs.
 - The City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to add qualifying spend to save projects to the capital budget accordingly up to a maximum of £5m in 2019/20 and then £5m per year thereafter.
 - The City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to accelerate spend from later years, when necessary within the programme subject to resource availability.

- The City Treasurer in consultation with Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to agree and approve where appropriate:
 1. The programme of schemes for the delivery of the corporate asset management programme; and
 2. Proposals relating to Corporate Compulsory Purchase Orders.

- 7. To approve the recommendations within minute reference Exe/19/22 of the part proceedings: **Treasury Management Strategy Statement, Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy 2018/19**:
 1. The proposed Treasury Management Strategy Statement, in particular the:
 - Treasury Indicators attached at Appendix 3, of these minutes;
 - MRP Strategy outlined in Appendix 4;
 - Treasury Management Policy Statement at Appendix 5;
 - Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation at Appendix 6;
 - Borrowing Requirement listed in Appendix 7;
 - Borrowing Strategy outlined in Appendix 8;
 - Annual Investment Strategy detailed in Appendix 9.
 2. Delegation to the City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources, the authority to pursue any restructuring, rescheduling or redemption opportunities available, including amendments to the Treasury Management Strategy, if the changes require it. Any changes required to the Strategy will be reported to members at the earliest opportunity.

- 8. That in consideration of the **Council Tax Resolution** report of the Deputy Chief Executive, City Treasurer, Chief Executive and City Solicitor which presented the recommended Council Tax resolution and Collection Fund budget for 2019/20, approval be given to:
 1. Adopt the part proceedings of the Executive on 13 February 2019.
 2. Note the position on reserves as detailed in Appendix 10 to these minutes.
 3. Note that the budget has been prepared on the basis that the amendment to establish a Crime and Disorder Reserve of £1.5m is approved.
 4. Note that the Council tax resolution, included at Appendix 11, reflects the budget position including the amendment reported at recommendation 3.
 5. To note the amendment of £400k to support groups as part of the Our Manchester programme in paragraph 2.4 will be accommodated from within the existing Budget and if this requires any changes to the planned draw down of the Our Manchester Reserve in 2019/20 this will be reported through the Global Monitoring report.

9. To note the information on referenda as detailed in Section 3 of the report.
10. To approve the Council Tax determination, as detailed in Appendix 11 which:
 1. Calculates the Council tax requirement in accordance with Section 31A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended by the Localism Act 2011.
 2. Calculates a basic amount of Council Tax and an amount of tax for each valuation band (the City Council element) in accordance with Sections 31B and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992, as amended.
 3. Sets an amount of Council Tax for each category of dwellings in each valuation band in accordance with Section 30 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992.
11. To agree the affordable borrowing limits (Appendices 7 and 8), prudential indicators (Appendix 3), proposals in respect of treasury management (Appendices 5 and 6), annual investment strategy (Appendix 9) and minimum revenue provision strategy (Appendix 4).
12. Approve the Collection Fund Budget for 2019/20 as set out in Appendix 12 to this report.

For the motion (82)

Akbar, Ahmed Ali, Appleby, Azra Ali, Ali N, Andrews, Barrett, Chohan, Clay, Collins, Connolly, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Y Dar, Davies, Douglas, Ellison, Flanagan, Fletcher-Hackwood, Grimshaw, Hacking, Harland, Hassan, Holt, Hughes, Igbon, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, Leese, Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Madeleine Monaghan, Moore, N. Murphy, S Murphy, Newman, Noor, O'Neil, Ollerhead, Paul, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq Reeves, Reid, Riasat, Richards, Russell, Sadler, Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, A Simcock, K Simcock, Stogia, Stone, Taylor, Watson, Wheeler, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

Against the Motion (0)

Abstentions (0)

The Lord Mayor declared that the motion was **carried**.

Decisions

1. To approve the proceedings of the Art Galleries Committee on 13 February 2019 which provided details of the Art Galleries budget for 2019/20, and the part proceedings of the Executive on 13 February 2019, which contained details on the following:
 - The Council's Budget 2019/20 covering report;
 - Medium Term Financial Plan 2019/20 - 2021/22;

- Capital Strategy and Budget 2019/20 to 2023/24;
 - Corporate Core Business Plan 2019/20;
 - Neighbourhoods Directorate Business Planning 2019/20;
 - Children's Services and Education Business Planning 2019/20;
 - Dedicated Schools Grant 2019/20;
 - Strategic Development Business Planning 2019/20;
 - Housing Revenue Account 2019/20 to 2021/22;
 - Manchester Health and Care Commissioning – Adult Social Care Business Plan and Pooled Budget Planning 2019/20;
 - Homelessness Business Planning 2019/20;
 - Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy 2019/20.
2. To note the minutes of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee on 25 February 2019.
3. To approve the proposals, as set out in Appendix 1 of these minutes, to ensure that the Housing Revenue Account for 2019/20 does not show a debit balance.
4. To approve the recommendations as detailed in minute reference Exe/19/12 of the part proceedings: Medium Term Financial Plan 2019/2020 – 2021/2022, for 2019/20:
- (a) an increase in the basic amount of Council Tax (i.e. the City's element of council tax) by 3.49% (including 1.5% for adult social care);
 - (b) the contingency sum of £1.6m;
 - (c) delegation of authority to the City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to make allocations from the inflationary pressures and budgets to be allocated sum of £9.945m (as shown in Table 4 of those minutes). In doing so it was noted that the MHCC elements of those costs (Table 5) had been included in the Pooled Budget and were subject to draw-down in consultation with MHCC Finance Committee, and consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources;
 - (d) the corporate budget requirements to cover levies / charges of £70.090m, capital financing costs of £44.507m, additional allowances and other pension costs of £10.030m and insurance costs of £2.004m;
 - (e) the estimated utilisation of £8.596m in 2019/20 of the surplus from the on street parking and bus lane enforcement reserves, after determining that any surplus from these reserves is not required to provide additional off street parking in the authority;
 - (f) the position on reserves as identified in the report as identified in the report submitted, noting that the position is subject to any further calls on reserves that had arisen prior to the meeting;

- (g) allocate from the existing Our Manchester Budget a fund of £300,000 to support community groups not currently in receipt of Council support under the VCS Grants Scheme but who have now made sufficient progress in their development to be able to receive support from the Council; and also that a £100,000 be set aside to support new and existing groups, particularly where there is a need for support to help reduce demand on Council services.
5. To approve the budget changes for the 2018/19 capital programme.
6. To approve the capital programme as presented in Appendix A (for £495.3m in 2018/19, £505.6m in 2019/20, £419.0m in 2020/21, £244.0m in 2021/22 £86.9m in 2022/23 and £39.0m in 2023/24) which will require prudential borrowing of £617.2m to fund non-HRA schemes over the five-year period for which provision has been made in the revenue budget for the associated financing costs (within limits previously agreed).
7. To agree to delegate authority to:
- The Chief Executive and Director of Highways, in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment for the approval of the list of schemes to be undertaken under the Highways capital programme.
 - The Chief Executive and Director of Highways to implement the Highways schemes in accordance with the Capital Approval process and after consultation with the Executive Member for Environment on the final details and estimated costs.
 - The City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to add qualifying spend to save projects to the capital budget accordingly up to a maximum of £5m in 2019/20 and then £5m per year thereafter.
 - The City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to accelerate spend from later years, when necessary within the programme subject to resource availability.
 - The City Treasurer in consultation with Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to agree and approve where appropriate:
 1. The programme of schemes for the delivery of the corporate asset management programme; and
 2. Proposals relating to Corporate Compulsory Purchase Orders.
8. To approve the recommendations as detailed within minute reference Exe/19/22 of the part proceedings: Treasury Management Strategy Statement, Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy 2019/20:
1. The proposed Treasury Management Strategy Statement, in particular the:

- Treasury Indicators attached at Appendix 3, of these minutes;
 - MRP Strategy outlined in Appendix 4;
 - Treasury Management Policy Statement at Appendix 5;
 - Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation at Appendix 6;
 - Borrowing Requirement listed in Appendix 7;
 - Borrowing Strategy outlined in Appendix 8;
 - Annual Investment Strategy detailed in Appendix 9.
2. Delegation of authority to the City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources, to pursue any restructuring, rescheduling or redemption opportunities available, including amendments to the Treasury Management Strategy, if the changes require it. Any changes required to the Strategy will be reported to members at the earliest opportunity.
9. That in consideration of the Council Tax Resolution report of the Deputy Chief Executive, City Treasurer, Chief Executive and City Solicitor which presented the recommended Council Tax resolution and Collection Fund budget for 2019/20, approval be given to:
1. Adopt the part proceedings of the Executive on 13 February 2019.
 2. Note the position on reserves as detailed in Appendix 10 to these minutes.
 3. Note that the budget has been prepared on the basis that the amendment to establish a Crime and Disorder Reserve of £1.5m is approved.
 4. Note that the Council tax resolution, included at Appendix 11, reflects the budget position including the amendment reported at recommendation 3.
 5. To note the amendment of £400k to support groups as part of the Our Manchester programme in paragraph 2.4 will be accommodated from within the existing Budget and if this requires any changes to the planned draw down of the Our Manchester Reserve in 2019/20 this will be reported through the Global Monitoring report.
10. To note the information on referenda as detailed in Section 3 of the Council Tax Resolution report.
11. To approve the Council Tax determination, as detailed in Appendix 11 which:
1. Calculates the Council tax requirement in accordance with Section 31A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended by the Localism Act 2011.
 2. Calculates a basic amount of Council Tax and an amount of tax for each valuation band (the City Council element) in accordance with Sections 31B and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992, as amended.
 3. Sets an amount of Council Tax for each category of dwellings in each valuation band in accordance with Section 30 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992.

12. To agree the affordable borrowing limits, prudential indicators, proposals in respect of treasury management, annual investment strategy and minimum revenue provision strategy.

13. To approve the Collection Fund Budget for 2019/20 as set out in Appendix 12 to this report.

Appendix 1

Housing Revenue Account Budget 2018/19 – 2021/22

	2018/19 (Forecast) £000	2019/20 £000	2020/21 £000	2021/22 £000	See Para.
Income					
Housing Rents	(60,279)	(59,914)	(61,239)	(62,462)	5.6
Heating Income	(709)	(734)	(749)	(764)	5.15
PFI Credit	(23,600)	(23,586)	(23,374)	(23,374)	5.12
Other Income	(1,093)	(1,166)	(1,157)	(1,047)	5.11
Funding from General HRA Reserve	2,764	(10,352)	(21,510)	(8,164)	7.1
Total Income	(82,917)	(95,752)	(108,029)	(95,811)	
Expenditure					
Northwards R&M & Management Fee	20,583	20,417	20,699	20,943	5.27
PFI Contractor Payments	35,322	33,418	36,227	31,356	5.12
Communal Heating	766	838	855	872	5.15
Supervision and Management	5,270	5,118	5,172	5,243	5.29
Contribution to Bad Debts	1,206	604	925	1,258	5.25
Depreciation	15,184	17,279	17,460	17,611	5.20
Other Expenditure	1,317	1,525	1,347	1,282	5.29
RCCO	0	13,749	22,565	14,483	5.29
Interest Payable and similar charges	3,269	2,804	2,779	2,763	5.21
Total Expenditure	82,917	95,752	108,029	95,811	
Total Reserves:					
Opening Balance	(99,939)	(102,703)	(92,351)	(70,841)	7.1
Funding (from)/to Revenue	(2,764)	10,352	21,510	8,164	
Closing Balance	(102,703)	(92,351)	(70,841)	(62,677)	

Appendix 2 – the proposed Capital Programme Budget

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Proposed Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
Highway Programme						
Highways Planned Maintenance Programme						
Planned Highways Maintenance Programme	221	432	75	0	0	0
Drainage	344	970	1,312	0	0	0
Large Patching repairs	2,000	1,088	1,281	1,313	0	0
Carriageway Resurfacing	5,400	5,287	7,190	7,535	0	0
Footway schemes	1,498	2,200	2,893	2,957	0	0
Carriageway Preventative	4,500	4,139	8,282	9,044	0	0
Bridge Maintenance	0	1,200	2,982	3,018	0	0
Other Improvement works	86	1,983	4,769	4,833	0	0
Project Delivery Procurement	0	757	1,681	1,703	0	0
Highways Stand Alone Projects Programme						
Ardwick Grove Village Parking	0	0	20	0	0	0
Didsbury Village Tram Stop Traffic Mitigation	0	0	18	0	0	0
Section 106 Highways work around Metrolink	0	0	47	0	0	0
Barlow Moor Road	0	27	0	0	0	0
Etihad Expansion - Public Realm	0	59	0	0	0	0
Velocity	155	567	0	0	0	0
Cycle City Phase 2	230	4,291	0	0	0	0
Safe Routes to Loreto High School	28	22	0	0	0	0
Safe Routes to Schools	22	58	0	0	0	0
Congestion Target Performance	20	215	0	0	0	0
Piccadilly Undercroft Gating	1	7	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
20mph Zones (Phase 3)	20	80	370	0	0	0
ITB Minor Works	10	93	0	0	0	0
Flood Risk Management - Hidden Watercourses	0	49	0	0	0	0
Flood Risk Management - Higher Blackley Flood Risk	0	41	0	0	0	0
Hyde Road (A57) Pinch Point Widening	106	1,766	2,123	0	0	0
Manchester/Salford Inner Relief Road (MSIRR)	6,032	5,553	100	0	0	0
Great Ancoats Improvement Scheme	453	3,065	5,015	0	0	0
Mancunian Way and Princess Parkway NPIF	438	4,479	3,197	0	0	0
Cycle Parking	19	10	0	0	0	0
Shadowmoss Rd / Mossnook Rd	10	16	0	0	0	0
Birley Fields Campus improvements	0	0	34	0	0	0
GMCRP Multi Sites	13	0	0	0	0	0
Princess Rd Safety Review	100	477	0	0	0	0
School Crossings	286	1,403	924	0	0	0
Kingsway Speed Cameras	13	11	0	0	0	0
Green Bridge at Airport City	425	1,341	1,216	0	0	0
Public Realm	833	1,426	400	400	0	0
Street Lighting PFI	11,050	12,000	1,731	0	0	0
Didsbury West S106	53	10	0	0	0	0
S106 Whalley Grove	50	25	0	0	0	0
A56 Liverpool Road	10	70	0	0	0	0
A56 Chester Road	16	35	0	0	0	0
M56	0	148	0	0	0	0
Pay and Display Machines	0	924	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
North Manchester Hospital Residents Parking	0	9	0	0	0	0
Parking Schemes	0	558	120	0	0	0
Sunbank Lane S278	21	30	0	0	0	0
Sharston Roundabout SCOOT	34	6	0	0	0	0
SEMMMS PROGRAMME						
Ringway Road Highway Imp Scheme	0	0	0	0	0	0
Local Roads (temp SEMMMS A6 Stockport)	2,962	0	0	0	0	0
SEMMMs A6 to Manchester Airport	78	0	0	0	0	0
Bus Priority Package Programme						
Bus Priority Package - Oxford Road	215	137	0	0	0	0
Bus Priority Package - Princess Street/Brook Street	50	103	0	0	0	0
Total Highways Programme	37,802	57,167	45,780	30,803	0	0
Environment Programme						
Waste Reduction Measures	320	1,471	0	0	0	0
Waste Contract	523	5,910	0	0	0	0
Blackley Crematorium Heat Exchanger	107	0	0	0	0	0
Christmas Market Electrical Equipment	137	0	0	0	0	0
Smart Litter Bins	258	0	0	0	0	0
Leisure Services Programme						
Parks Programme						
Hollyhedge Park Drainage IMPS	9	0	0	0	0	0
Heaton Park Pay & Display	464	0	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
PIP - Park Events Infrastructure	274	52	0	0	0	0
PIP - Unallocated	97	2,566	4,045	5,699	5,699	2,462
Smedley Lane Playing Fields S106	19	0	0	0	0	0
Somme 100 Year Memorial	130	0	0	0	0	0
Painswick Park Improvement	30	0	0	0	0	0
Heaton Park Southern Play Area	360	120	0	0	0	0
Didsbury Park Play Area S106	50	0	0	0	0	0
Wythenshawe Park Sport Facilities S106	152	0	0	0	0	0
Northenden Riverside Park	50	25	0	0	0	0
Age Friendly Benches	18	0	0	0	0	0
King George V Park	93	0	0	0	0	0
Leisure & Sports Facilities						
Arcadia (Levenshulme) Leisure Centre	10	0	0	0	0	0
National Taekwondo Centre	7	0	0	0	0	0
Indoor Leisure - Abraham Moss	675	1,709	9,076	3,107	0	0
Indoor Leisure - Moss Side	5,597	25	0	0	0	0
FA Hubs	0	13,000	0	0	0	0
Boggart Hole Clough - Visitors Centre	535	0	0	0	0	0
Mount Road S106	12	0	0	0	0	0
Event Seating Basketball	18	0	0	0	0	0
Velodrome Track	713	0	0	0	0	0
Contact Theatre loan	200	0	0	0	0	0
MAC - Booth St Car Park	148	0	0	0	0	0
Libraries and Info Services Programme						

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
Relocation of Manchester Visitor Info Centre (MVIC)	5	54	0	0	0	0
GM Archives Web Portal	10	118	0	0	0	0
Central Library Wolfson Award	37	0	0	0	0	0
Library Refresh	4	0	0	0	0	0
Roll Out of Central Library ICT	220	0	0	0	0	0
Refresh of Radio Frequency Identifier Equipment	12	0	0	0	0	0
Newton Heath Library	168	0	0	0	0	0
Withington Library Refurbishment	200	0	0	0	0	0
Open Libraries	42	450	0	0	0	0
Total Neighbourhoods Programme	11,704	25,500	13,121	8,806	5,699	2,462
Cultural Programme						
First Street Cultural Facility	12	0	0	0	0	0
The Factory (Build)	24,365	55,253	38,078	4,725	0	0
The Factory (Public Realm)	2,344	0	2,106	0	0	0
Corporate Estates Programme						
Asset Management Programme	9,026	11,840	9,551	7,385	0	0
Strategic Acquisitions Programme	8,731	4,331	3,000	3,000	0	0
Town Hall Complex Transformation Programme	67	0	0	0	0	0
Hammerstone Road Depot	932	7,083	6,940	7	0	0
Heron House	14,380	0	0	0	0	0
Registrars	1,400	0	0	0	0	0
Carbon Reduction Programme	100	8,500	1,290	0	0	0

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
Civic Quarter Heat Network	6,500	11,500	4,000	4,000	0	0
Lincoln Square	0	0	1,200	0	0	0
Brazenose House	678	0	0	0	0	0
Estates Transformation	0	215	0	585	0	0
Estates Transformation - Hulme District Office	4,680	234	0	0	0	0
Estates Transformation - Alexandra House	559	6,961	3,848	632	0	0
The Gallery Café	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ross Place Refurbishment	2,120	0	0	0	0	0
Development Programme						
Development Programme - East Manchester						
The Space Project - Phase 2	1,085	0	0	0	0	0
The Sharp Project	0	600	0	0	0	0
Digital Asset Base - One Central Park	9,443	620	0	0	0	0
Sustaining Key Initiatives	0	0	5,000	8,600	0	0
New Smithfield Market	32	468	0	0	0	0
Beswick Community Hub - Highway and Public Realm	2	0	0	0	0	0
Eastern Gateway - Central Retail Park	1,312	2,000	0	0	0	0
Eastern Gateway - New Islington Marina	1,800	3,332	0	0	0	0
Hall and Rogers	346	0	0	0	0	0
Development Programme - North Manchester						
Collyhurst Police Station liabilities	844	0	0	0	0	0
Northern Gateway	3,875	2,300	6,675	7,275	4,875	0
Development Programme - City Centre						
Hulme Hall Rd Lighting	39	0	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
ST Peters Square	602	400	0	0	0	0
Medieval Quarter Public Realm	488	1,500	0	0	0	0
City Labs 2	3,675	0	0	0	0	0
Manchester College	17,600	10,000	0	0	0	0
Development Programme - Enterprise Zone						
Airport City Power Infrastructure (EZ)	2,440	0	0	0	0	0
Development Programme - Stand Alone Projects						
Digital Business Incubators	3,500	0	0	0	0	0
Total Strategic Development Programme	122,977	127,137	81,688	36,209	4,875	0
Town Hall Refurbishment Programme						
Our Town Hall refurbishment	11,060	24,386	67,743	103,251	65,914	29,039
Total Town Hall Refurbishment Programme	11,060	24,386	67,743	103,251	65,914	29,039
Private Sector Housing Programme						
Brunswick PFI (PSH)						
Brunswick PFI Land Assembly	2,460	1,726	737	0	0	0
Collyhurst (PSH)						
Collyhurst Regeneration	10	173	3,700	0	0	0
Collyhurst Environmentals	65	62	0	0	0	0
Collyhurst Acquisition & Demolition (Overbrook & Needwood Close)	0	0	505	565	0	0
Collyhurst Land Assembly Ph1	20	63	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
Collyhurst Land Acquisitions Ph2	0	210	799	0	0	0
Eccleshall Street - 3 Sites	0	500		0	0	0
Housing Investment Model		0				
Site Investigation and Early Works HIF Pilot Sites	286	141	155	0	0	0
Miles Platting PFI (PSH)						
Miles Platting PFI Land Assembly	255	632	0	0	0	0
Private Housing Asist Citywide Programme						
Disabled Facilities Grant	8,062	7,929	6,200	6,200	0	0
Toxteth St CPO & environmental works	73	141	0	0	0	0
Bell Crescent CPO	0	482	0	0	0	0
Private Sect Housing Standalone Projects						
HCA Empty Homes Cluster Phase 2	90	801	891	0	0	0
Empty Homes Scheme (s22 properties)	0	2,000	0	0	0	0
Redrow Development Programme						
Redrow Development Phase 2 onward	300	0	0	0	0	0
West Gorton (PSH)						
West Gorton Compensation	0	4	0	0	0	0
West Gorton Ph 2A Demolition & Commercial Acquisitions	10	490	904	0	0	0
Armitage Nursery & Community Facility	1,215	2,160	0	0	0	0
Private Sector Housing - Stand Alone Projects						
HMRF	56	50	40	0	0	0
Collyhurst Acquisition & Demolition (Overbrook & Needwood Close)	5	0	661	0	0	0
Extra Care	3,555	2,445	0	0	0	0
Moston Lane Acquisitions	0	0	0	0	0	7,500

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
Equity Loans	0	0	397	0	0	0
West Gorton Community Park	514	1,336	0	0	0	0
Ben St. Regeneration	5,574	556	6,877	0	0	0
Homelessness	5,000	0	0	0	0	0
Marginal Viability Fund - New Victoria	0	1,827	6,263	1,984	0	0
Marginal Viability Fund - Bowes Street	0	929	2,385	0	0	0
Rent to Purchase	203	0	0	0	0	0
Total Private Sector Housing Programme	27,753	24,657	30,514	8,749	0	7,500
Public Sector Housing						
Northwards - External Work						
Charlestown - Victoria Ave multistorey window replacement and ECW - Phase 1	0	8,000	7,190	0	0	0
External cyclical works phase 3a	10	0	22	0	0	0
Collyhurst Environmental programme	312	0	0	0	0	0
Ancoats Anita St and George Leigh external cyclical works ph 3b	28	0	0	0	0	0
Harpurhey Lathbury & 200 Estates external cyclical works ph 3b	-25	0	38	0	0	0
Environmental works	113	0	0	0	0	0
Harpurhey Shiredale Estate externals	0	0	15	0	0	0
Moston Miners Low Rise externals	16	0	4	0	0	0
Newton Heath Limestone Drive externals	0	0	6	0	0	0
Renewal of 4 automatic pedestrian gates at Victoria Square	0	45	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
External cyclical works ph 3b Harpurhey - Jolly Miller Estate ph 3b	54	0	32	0	0	0
External cyclical works ph 3b Moston Estates (Chauncy/Edith Cliff/Kenyon/Thorveton Sq)	7	0	2	0	0	0
External cyclical works ph 3b Ancoats Smithfields estate	262	10	0	0	0	0
External cyclical works ph 4b Charlestown Chain Bar low rise	178	0	36	0	0	0
External cyclical works ph 4b Charlestown Chain Bar Hillingdon Drive maisonettes	1	0	4	0	0	0
External cyclical works ph 4b Crumpsall Blackley Village	131	0	0	0	0	0
External cyclical works ph 4b Higher Blackley South	281	0	31	0	0	0
External cyclical works ph 4b Newton Heath Assheton estate	93	0	16	0	0	0
External cyclical works Ph 4b Newton Heath Troydale Estate	792	0	74	0	0	0
External cyclical works Ph 5 New Moston (excl corrolites)	66	0	31	0	0	0
Environmental improvements Moston corrolites	267	0	0	0	0	0
Charlestown - Victoria Ave multistorey replacement door entry systems	0	0	18	0	0	0
ENW distribution network phase 4 (various)	0	219	0	0	0	0
Dam Head - Walk up flats communal door renewal	212	172	0	0	0	0
Delivery Costs	955	909	827	0	0	0
Northwards - Internal Work						
2/4 Blocks Heating replacement with Individual Boilers	24	0	122	0	0	0
Lift replacement / refurbishment programme	75	0	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
Fire precaution works - installation of fire seal box to electric cupboards on communal corridors in retirement blocks	6	0	0	0	0	0
Decent Homes mop ups ph 9 and decent homes work required to voids	212	0	0	0	0	0
One offs such as rewires, boilers, doors, insulation	377	0	0	0	0	0
Whitemoss Road and Cheetham Hill Road Local Offices - Improvements	202	0	0	0	0	0
Ancoats - Victoria Square lift replacement	0	265	0	0	0	0
Aldbourne Court/George Halstead Court/Duncan Edwards Court works	274	81	0	0	0	0
Boiler replacement programme	786	25	261	0	0	0
Kitchen and Bathrooms programme	0	1,788	94	0	0	0
Harpurhey - Monsall Multis Internal Works	0	2,385	85	0	0	0
Various - Bradford/Clifford Lamb/Kingsbridge/Sandyhill Court Internal Works	0	2,471	108	0	0	0
Collyhurst - Mossbrook/Roach/Vauxhall/Humphries Court Internal Works	0	2,791	106	0	0	0
Decent Homes mop ups phase 10 and voids	583	500	219	0	0	0
One off work - rewires, boilers, doors	100	200	0	0	0	0
Fire precautions multi storey blocks	0	1,078	1,000	0	0	0
Installations of sprinkler systems - multi storey blocks	0	2,380	221	0	0	0
Replacement of Prepayment Meters in High Rise Blocks	0	0	20	0	0	0
Delivery Costs	1,352	1,502	246	0	0	0
Northwards - Off Debits/Conversions						
Bringing Studio Apartments back in use	40	0	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
Delivery Costs	13	0	0	0	0	0
Homeless Accommodation						
Improvements to Homeless accommodation city wide	54	0	201	0	0	0
Plymouth Grove Women's Direct Access Centre	22	0	0	0	0	0
Improvements to Homeless Accommodation Phase 2	280	723	210	0	0	0
Delivery Costs	136	78	45	0	0	0
Northwards - Acquisitions						
Northwards Acquisitions	134	0	0	0	0	0
Stock Acquisitions	32	0	0	0	0	0
Delivery Costs	29	0	0	0	0	0
Northwards - Adaptations						
Adaptations	1,000	720	0	0	0	0
Northwards - Unallocated						
Northwards Housing Programme unallocated	0	1,033	17,697	21,988	0	0
Retained Housing Programme						
Collyhurst Maisonette Compensation & Dem	0	89	0	0	935	0
West Gorton Regeneration Programme						
West Gorton PH2A Low & High Rise Demolition	10	16	0	0	0	0
Future Years Housing Programme						
Collyhurst Estate Regeneration	0	700	8,695	10,235	1,841	0
Collyhurst Regen - Highways Phase 1	-97	0	190	97	1,394	0
Collyhurst Regen - Churnett Street	0	0	0	0	790	0
Collyhurst Regen - Needwood & Overbrook acquisition / demolition	3	0	124	0	0	0
Willert Street Park Improvements	36	0	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
North Manchester New Builds	6,358	163	0	0	0	0
North Manchester New Builds 2	75	500	10,700	0	0	0
North Manchester New Builds 3	250	0	0	0	0	0
Parkhill Land Assembly	0	0	0	4,270	0	0
Fire precautions multi storey blocks	0	1,200	0	0	0	0
Brunswick PFI HRA	30	0	0	0	0	0
Total Public Sector Housing (HRA) Programme	16,149	30,043	48,690	36,590	4,960	0
Children's Services Programme						
Basic Need Programme						
Cheetham Academy	-14	0	0	0	0	0
Briscoe Lane Academy	127	0	0	0	0	0
Stanley Grove - contribution to PFI	13	0	0	0	0	0
Dean Trust Ardwick	15	0	0	0	0	0
Ardwick PRU	40	0	0	0	0	0
ULT William Hulme	47	0	0	0	0	0
Lytham Rd	0	200	0	0	0	0
Manchester Health Academy expansion	3,242	0	0	0	0	0
Co-op Academy expansion	3,741	0	0	0	0	0
St Margaret's C of E	54	0	0	0	0	0
St Matthews RC	20	0	0	0	0	0
Plymouth Grove Refurbishment	4,574	427	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
Beaver Rd Primary Expansion	4,547	115	0	0	0	0
Lily Lane Primary	3,331	136	0	0	0	0
St. James Primary Academy	2,848	112	0	0	0	0
Crossacres Primary School	1,902	111	0	0	0	0
Ringway Primary School	1,337	60	0	0	0	0
Webster Primary Schools	1,859	111	0	0	0	0
St. Chrysostom's	160	0	0	0	0	0
Camberwell Park Specialist School	65	0	0	0	0	0
Piper Hill Special School	224	0	0	0	0	0
SEND Programme	101	8,264	15,150	0	0	0
Basic need - unallocated funds	235	20,032	44,007	1,138	0	0
Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM) - Unallocated	335	0	0	0	0	0
Schools Maintenance Programme						
Abraham Moss - Hall Heating	-4	0	0	0	0	0
Chorlton CofE Primary Rewire	16	0	0	0	0	0
Moston Lane Primary	8	0	0	0	0	0
Wilbraham Primary Roof	59	0	0	0	0	0
Abbott Primary School Fencing	94	0	0	0	0	0
Crowcroft Park PS-Rewire	531	0	0	0	0	0
Pike Fold Community Primary - Ground Stabilisation - Survey artificial play area	17	0	0	0	0	0
Charlestown Primary Defects	31	0	0	0	0	0
All Saints PS	-1	0	0	0	0	0
Collyhurst Nursery School	2	0	0	0	0	0
Armitage CE Primary	135	0	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
Higher Openshaw Comm School - Renew Boiler	101	0	0	0	0	0
Crowcroft Park PS - Roof Repairs	53	0	0	0	0	0
Northenden Primary School - Part Reroof	42	0	0	0	0	0
Abbot Community Primary - Ext Joinery Repair	248	0	0	0	0	0
St Mary's PS - Joinery Repairs	98	0	0	0	0	0
Sandilands PS - Joinery Repairs	181	0	0	0	0	0
Lancasterian ID Secure Lobby	38	0	0	0	0	0
Cheetwood PS - Rewire	499	0	0	0	0	0
Pike Fold Community Sch - Repairs to air handling units	53	0	0	0	0	0
Button Lane PS - Boiler Installation	60	0	0	0	0	0
Schools Capital Maintenance -unallocated	0	5,338	3,000	3,000	0	0
Education Standalone Projects						
Paintpots	31	0	0	0	0	0
Community Minded Ltd	28	0	0	0	0	0
Tiny Tigers Ltd-Cheetham Children Centre	79	0	0	0	0	0
Early Education for Two Year Olds - Unallocated	57	0	0	0	0	0
Gorton Youth Zone	538	962	0	0	0	0
Greenheys Toilets	67	0	0	0	0	0
Healthy Pupil Capital Funding	0	263	0	0	0	0
Special Educational Needs grant	38	2,871	164	0	0	0
Total Children's Services Programme	31,902	39,002	62,321	4,138	0	0
ICT Capital Programme						

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
ICT						
Solaris	11	0	0	0	0	0
ICT Infrastructure & Mobile Working Programme						
Citrix 7.6 Migration	3	0	0	0	0	0
Mobile Device Refresh	52	0	0	0	0	0
PSN Windows 2003	88	26	0	0	0	0
Data Centre UPS Installation	0	10	0	0	0	0
Core Switch Firmware	28	0	0	0	0	0
New Social Care System	2,039	509	0	0	0	0
End User Computing	796	90	0	0	0	0
Core Infrastructure Refresh	533	0	0	0	0	0
Income Management	1	0	0	0	0	0
Customer & Bus. Relationship Management System	1	0	0	0	0	0
Corporate Reporting Tool (Business Objects)	14	0	0	0	0	0
Internet Resilience	104	50	0	0	0	0
New Rent Collection System	70	14	0	0	0	0
Communications Room Replacement Phase 2	100	500	3,929	500	0	0
Care Leavers Service	91	0	0	0	0	0
Microsoft Enterprise Agreement Licensing renewal	227	0	0	0	0	0
Data Centre Network Design and Implementation	1,949	1,289	0	0	0	0
ICT Investment Plan	0	8,836	10,673	9,600	5,482	0
Infrastructure						
Wider Area Network Redesign	26	0	0	0	0	0

Project Name	2018/19 Proposed Budget	2019/20 Propose d Budget	2020/21 Proposed Budget	2021/22 Proposed Budget	2022/23 Proposed Budget	2023/24 Proposed Budget
	£'000's					
Total ICT Programme	6,133	11,324	14,602	10,100	5,482	0
Corporate Capital Programme						
ONE System Developments	23	25	0	0	0	0
Phase 1 Implementation - Locality Plan Programme Office	602	272	0	0	0	0
Integrated Working - Gorton Health Hub	1,400	10,150	8,627	2,619	0	0
Airport Strategic Investment	125,000	0	0	0	0	0
BioMedical Investment	7,000	5,500	6,100	2,700	0	0
Band on the Wall	0	200	0	0	0	0
Manchester Airport Car Park Investment	0	3,700	1,900	0	0	0
Total Corporate Capital Programme	134,025	19,847	16,627	5,319	0	0
Total Manchester City Council Capital Programme	399,505	359,063	381,086	243,965	86,930	39,001
Projects carried out on behalf of Greater Manchester						
Housing Investment Fund	95,805	146,522	37,951	0	0	0
Total GM projects	95,805	146,522	37,951	0	0	0
Total CAPITAL PROGRAMME	495,310	505,585	419,037	243,965	86,930	39,001

Appendix 3

Treasury Limits and Prudential Indicators for approval

Please note last years approved figures are shown in brackets.

Treasury Management Indicators	2019-20		2020-21		2021-22
	£m		£m		£m
Authorised Limit - external debt					
Borrowing	1,351.4	(1,672.7)	1,412.7	(1,684.5)	1,412.9
Other long term liabilities	170.0	(216.0)	170.0	(216.0)	170.0
TOTAL	1,521.4	(1,888.7)	1,582.7	(1,900.5)	1,582.9
Operational Boundary - external debt					
Borrowing	940.8	(1,381.4)	1,151.7	(1,435.0)	1,275.0
Other long term liabilities	170.0	(216.0)	170.0	(216.0)	170.0
TOTAL	1,110.8	(1,597.4)	1,321.7	(1,651.0)	1,445.0
Actual external debt	716.5	(1,192.0)	977.4	(1,259.6)	1,141.5
Upper limit for total principal sums invested for over 364 days	0	(0)	0	(0)	0
Capital Expenditure					
Non - HRA	475.5	(455.5)	370.3	(160.1)	207.4
HRA	30.1	(41.9)	48.7	(44.3)	36.6
TOTAL	505.6	(497.4)	419.0	(204.4)	244.0
Capital Financing Requirement (as at 31 March)					
Non – HRA	1,331.9	(1,664.4)	1,477.1	(1,730.5)	1,611.1
HRA	298.1	(298.1)	299.2	(299.3)	300.0
TOTAL	1,630.0	(1,962.5)	1,776.3	(2,029.8)	1,911.1

Maturity structure of borrowing during 2019-20	Upper Limit		Lower limit	
	under 12 months	80%	(70%)	0%
12 months and within 24 months	70%	(100%)	0%	(0%)
24 months and within 5 years	50%	(80%)	0%	(0%)
5 years and within 10 years	50%	(70%)	0%	(0%)
10 years and above	80%	(80%)	40%	(0%)
Has the Authority adopted the CIPFA Treasury Management Code?				Yes

The status of the indicators will be included in Treasury Management reporting during 2019/20. They will also be included in the Council's Global Revenue Budget monitoring.

Definitions and Purpose of the Treasury Management Indicators noted above (Indicators are as recommended by the CIPFA Prudential Code last revised in 2017)

Authorised Limit - external debt

The local authority will set for the forthcoming financial year and the following two financial years an authorised limit for its total external debt, excluding investments, separately identifying borrowing from other long-term liabilities. This prudential indicator is referred to as the Authorised Limit.

Operational Boundary - external debt

The local authority will also set for the forthcoming financial year and the following two financial years an operational boundary for its total external debt, excluding investments, separately identifying borrowing from other long-term liabilities. This prudential indicator is referred to as the Operational Boundary.

Both the Authorised Limit and the Operational Boundary need to be consistent with the authority's plans for capital expenditure and financing; and with its treasury management policy statement and practices. The Operational Boundary should be based on the authority's estimate of most likely, i.e. prudent, but not worst case scenario. Risk analysis and risk management strategies should be taken into account.

The Operational Boundary should equate to the maximum level of external debt projected by this estimate. Thus, the Operational Boundary links directly to the Authority's plans for capital expenditure; its estimates of capital financing requirement; and its estimate of cash flow requirements for the year for all purposes. The Operational Boundary is a key management tool for in-year monitoring.

It will probably not be significant if the Operational Boundary is breached temporarily on occasions due to variations in cash flow. However, a sustained or regular trend above the Operational Boundary would be significant and should lead to further investigation and action as appropriate. Thus, both the Operational Boundary and the Authorised Limit will be based on the authority's plans. The authority will need to assure itself that these plans are affordable and prudent. The Authorised Limit will in addition need to provide headroom over and above the Operational Boundary sufficient for example for unusual cash movements.

Actual external debt

After the year end, the closing balance for actual gross borrowing plus (separately), other long-term liabilities is obtained directly from the local authority's Balance Sheet. The prudential indicator for Actual External Debt considers a single point in time and hence is only directly comparable to the Authorised Limit and Operational Boundary

at that point in time. Actual debt during the year can be compared.

Upper limit for total principal sums invested for over 364 days

The authority will set an upper limit for each forward financial year period for the maturing of investments made for a period longer than 364 days. This indicator is referred to as the prudential limit for Principal Sums Invested for periods longer than 364 days.

The purpose of this indicator is so the authority can contain its exposure to the possibility of loss that might arise as a result of its having to seek early repayment or redemption of principal sums invested.

Maturity structure of new borrowing

The authority will set for the forthcoming financial year both upper and lower limits with respect to the maturity structure of its borrowing. These indicators are referred to as the Upper and Lower limits respectively for the Maturity Structure of Borrowing.

Local Prudential Indicators

The Council has not yet introduced Local Prudential Indicators to reflect local circumstances, but will review on a regular basis the need for these in the future.

Appendix 4

Minimum Revenue Provision Strategy

The Council implemented the new Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) guidance in 2011/12 and has assessed its MRP for 2019/20 in accordance with the main recommendations contained within the guidance issued by the Secretary of State under section 21(1A) of the Local Government Act 2003.

The Council is required to make provision for repayment of an element of the accumulated General Fund capital spend each year through a revenue charge (the Minimum Revenue Provision - MRP).

MHCLG Regulations require full Council to approve an MRP Statement, in advance of each year. If the Council wishes to amend its policy during the year this would need to be approved by full Council. A variety of options are available to councils to replace the previous Regulations, so long as there is a prudent provision. The options are:

- **Option 1:** Regulatory Method – can only be applied to capital expenditure incurred prior to April 2008 or Supported Capital Expenditure. This is calculated as 4% of the non-housing CFR at the end of the preceding financial year, less some transitional factors relating to the movement to the new Prudential Code in 2003.
- **Option 2:** CFR Method – a provision equal to 4% of the non-housing CFR at the end of the preceding financial year.
- **Option 3:** Asset Life Method – MRP is calculated based on the life of the asset, on either an equal instalment or an annuity basis.
- **Option 4:** Depreciation Method – MRP is calculated in accordance with the depreciation accounting required for the asset.

Options 1 and 2 may be used only for supported expenditure, which is capital expenditure for which the Council has been notified by Government that the costs of that expenditure will be taken into account in the calculation of Government funding due to the Council.

It is important to note that the Council can deviate from these options provided that the approach taken ensures that there is a prudent provision. The Council has historically followed option 1 for supported expenditure based on the level of support provided by Government through Revenue Support Grant (RSG).

The assets created or acquired under Supported Capital Expenditure predominantly had long asset lives of c. 50 years, such as land or buildings, and an MRP of 4% suggests a significantly shorter asset life. As the level of notional RSG the Council receives has reduced in recent years, it was considered prudent to review the approach to MRP on supported borrowing to reflect the Government support received.

It was therefore agreed that from 2017/18 a provision of 2% of the non-housing CFR as at the end of the preceding financial year is to be made. This is in line with many other local authorities who have reviewed the basis for their MRP and have applied similarly revised policies.

It is the Council's policy that MRP relating to an asset will start to be incurred in the year after the capital expenditure on the asset is incurred or, in the case of new assets, in the year following the asset coming into use, in accordance with MHCLG's guidance.

The Council recognises that there are different categories of capital expenditure, for which it will incur MRP as follows:

- For non HRA Supported Capital Expenditure: MRP policy will be charged at a rate of 2% on a similar basis to option 1 of the guidance (the regulatory method) but at a lower rate, better reflecting the asset lives of the assets funded through Supported Borrowing.
- For non HRA unsupported capital expenditure incurred the MRP policy will be:
 - Asset Life Method – MRP will be based on a straight line basis or annuity method so linking the MRP to the future flow of benefits from the asset, dependant on the nature of the capital expenditure, in accordance with option 3 of the guidance.
 - If the expenditure is capital by virtue of a Ministerial direction, has been capitalised under a Capitalisation Directive, or does not create a council asset, MRP will be provided in accordance with option 3 of the guidance with asset lives calculated as per the table below:

Expenditure type	Maximum period over which MRP to be made
Expenditure capitalised by virtue of a direction under s16 (2) (b).	20 years.
Regulation 25(1) (a). Expenditure on computer programs.	Same period as for computer hardware.
Regulation 25(1) (b). Loans and grants towards capital expenditure by third parties.	The estimated life of the assets in relation to which the third party expenditure is incurred.
Regulation 25(1) (c). Repayment of grants and loans for capital expenditure.	25 years or the period of the loan if longer.
Regulation 25(1) (d). Acquisition of share or loan capital.	20 years, or the estimated life of the asset acquired.
Regulation 25(1) (e). Expenditure on works to assets not owned by the authority.	The estimated life of the assets.
Regulation 25(1) (ea). Expenditure on assets for use by others.	The estimated life of the assets.

Regulation 25(1) (f). Payment of levy on Large Scale Voluntary Transfers (LSVTs) of dwellings.	25 years.
--	-----------

- For PFI service concessions and some lessee interests: Following the move to International Accounting Standards arrangements under private finance initiatives (PFIs) service concessions and some lessee interests (including embedded leases) are accounted for on the Council's Balance Sheet. Where this occurs, a part of the contract charge or rent payable will be taken to reduce the Balance Sheet liability rather than being charged as revenue expenditure. The MRP element of these schemes will be the amount of contract charge or rental payment charged against the Balance Sheet liability. This approach will produce an MRP charge comparable to that under option 3 in that it will run over the life of the lease or PFI scheme.

In some exceptional cases, the Council will deviate from the policy laid out above provided such exceptions remain prudent. Any exceptions are listed below:

- Where capital expenditure is incurred through providing loans to organisations, and where those loans are indemnified or have financial guarantees protecting against loss, no MRP will be charged in relation to the capital expenditure. Similarly, loans given by the Council where any losses incurred on the investment will impact solely on a third party, such as those provided under the City Deal arrangement with the HCA, will not require an MRP charge.

Appendix 5

Treasury Management Policy Statement

1. This organisation defines its treasury management activities as:
The management of the organisation's investments and cash flows, its banking, money market and capital market transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of optimum performance consistent with those risks.
2. This organisation regards the successful identification, monitoring and control of risk to be the prime criteria by which the effectiveness of its treasury management activities will be measured. Accordingly, the analysis and reporting of treasury management activities will focus on their risk implications for the organisation, and any financial instruments entered into to manage these risks.
3. This organisation acknowledges that effective treasury management will provide support towards the achievement of its business and service objectives. It is therefore committed to the principles of achieving value for money in treasury management, and to employing suitable comprehensive performance measurement techniques, within the context of effective risk management.

The Council will invest its monies prudently, considering security first, liquidity second, and yield last, carefully considering its investment counterparties. It will similarly borrow monies prudently and consistent with the Council's service objectives.

Appendix 6

Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation

- i **Full Council**
 - receiving and reviewing reports on treasury management policies, practices and activities;
 - approval of annual strategy.

- ii **Responsible body – Audit Committee**
 - approval of/amendments to the organisation's adopted clauses, treasury management policy statement and treasury management practices;
 - budget consideration and approval;
 - approval of the division of responsibilities;
 - receiving and reviewing regular monitoring reports and acting on recommendations;
 - approving the selection of external service providers and agreeing terms of appointment.

- iii **Body with responsibility for scrutiny - Resource and Governance Scrutiny Committee**
 - reviewing the treasury management policy and procedures and making recommendations to the responsible body.

- iv **City Treasurer**
 - delivery of the function.

Appendix 7

Borrowing Requirement

The potential long-term borrowing requirements over the next three years are:

Table 2	2019/20	2020/21	2021/22
	£'m estimate	£'m estimate	£'m estimate
Planned Capital Expenditure funded by Borrowing	153.1	179.7	174.5
Change in Grants & Contributions	-5.1	48.8	2.6
Change in Capital Receipts	3.3	28.8	-0.7
Change in Reserves	16.1	32.7	19.6
MRP Provision	-24.8	-31.3	-37.0
Refinancing of maturing debt (GF)	2.8	2.2	4.7
Refinancing of maturing debt (HRA)	0.2	0	0.5
Estimated Borrowing Requirement	145.6	260.9	164.2
Funded by:			
GF	145.4	260.9	163.7
HRA	0.2	0	0.5

The borrowing detailed in Table 2 maintains the Council within the revised Government Debt Deal limit. The current Debt Deal expires in 2019/20 and it is not clear what will happen for the next Spending Review Period.

Appendix 8

Borrowing Strategy

General Fund

The proposed Capital Budget, submitted to Executive in February and Council in March contains significant capital investment across the city. The scale of the investment means the Council will need to undertake external borrowing in the future and will not be able to rely on internal borrowing alone. The first tranche of external borrowing was taken from the PWLB in quarter 4 of 2018/19. Where possible, internal borrowing will remain the first option due to the interest savings generated.

The Council's borrowing strategy must utilise the annual provision it is required to make to reduce debt, in the form of its Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP). If MRP is not used to reduce external debt it is held as cash so the most efficient arrangement is for MRP to be used to reduce the new long term debt expected to be required. This ensures that MRP is utilised and does not accumulate as cash on the Balance Sheet. Alternatively, MRP could be used to repay existing debt but this would be at considerable cost in the current interest rate environment.

In previous years this has not been an issue as the Council has had significant borrowing requirements year on year which have allowed it to utilise the MRP. However, the borrowing requirement may fall in the long term so a prudent strategy is to seek to borrow in the medium term with maturities to match the estimated MRP that is generated in that period. This avoids an accumulation of cash on the Balance Sheet that would need to be invested at a potential net cost and investment risk to the Council.

Following the HRA debt settlement the Council's debt position is one of significant internal borrowing meaning cash backed reserves and provisions in the HRA are being used in lieu of external debt. The external debt held is predominantly long term in nature.

The Council will continue to use its reserves and provisions to maximise internal borrowing whilst seeking to rebalance the portfolio with more medium term debt when there is a need to externally borrow. This must be done with a strong focus on achieving value for money on interest costs and balancing the risks to the overall debt portfolio.

HRA

The Council's proposed capital budget for 2019/20 and beyond does not contain any requirement for the HRA to borrow. It is expected that proposals will be brought forward to build new homes that require funding via borrowing so it is likely the HRA will have a borrowing requirement in 2019/20. Further details can be found in the HRA Business Plan report elsewhere on the agenda. The level of borrowing affordable is restrained by the statutory requirement for the HRA Business Plan to avoid going into a deficit.

The impact of any required further long term borrowing on the Business Plan will be reviewed which will inform the borrowing options pursued. Any temporary borrowing required will be sought from the General Fund. This is discussed further in Appendix 1.

Note, in the event that some of the current debt is required to be repaid, for example if one of the LOBO loans was called, the refinancing arrangements would need to be considered.

Borrowing Options

As stated above the Council's borrowing strategy will firstly utilise internal borrowing. However, as the overall forecast is for long term borrowing rates to increase the short term advantage of internal and short term borrowing will be weighed against the potential cost if long term borrowing is delayed as rates for longer term loans are expected to increase.

New borrowing will be considered in the forms noted below. All options will be evaluated alongside their availability and which provides best value for money. The options below are not presented in a hierarchical order.

Public Works Loan Board (PWLB)

PWLB borrowing is available for between 1 and 50 year maturities on various bases. This offers a range of options for new borrowing which could spread debt maturities away from a concentration in longer dated debt and allow the Council to align maturities to MRP.

In the March 2012 Budget the Chancellor announced the availability of a PWLB 'Certainty Rate' for local authorities which could be accessed upon the submission of data around annual borrowing plans for individual authorities. The Council submitted its return in April 2018. The Certainty Rate allows a local authority to borrow from the PWLB at 0.20% below their published rates.

The Government has also introduced a PWLB Infrastructure Rate to be borrowed at 0.40% below their published standard rates. There is a bidding process to access this rate and preference given to projects displaying high value for money. There are two bidding rounds each year, one runs from 1st May to 31st July 2018 and the second is from 1st January to 31st March 2019.

These reductions, alongside the flexibility the PWLB provides in terms of loan structures and maturity dates together with the current lack of availability of market debt options, suggest that should long term borrowing be required PWLB borrowing might provide the best value for money.

The Link forecast for the PWLB Certainty Rate is as follows:

Table 3	Mar 19	Jun 19	Sep 19	Dec 19	Mar 20	Mar 21
Bank Rate	0.75%	1.00%	1.00%	1.00%	1.25%	1.50%
5 yr PWLB rate	2.10%	2.20%	2.20%	2.30%	2.30%	2.60%
10 yr PWLB rate	2.50%	2.60%	2.60%	2.70%	2.80%	3.00%
25 yr PWLB rate	2.90%	3.00%	3.10%	3.10%	3.20%	3.40%
50 yr PWLB rate	2.70%	2.80%	2.90%	2.90%	3.00%	3.20%

A more detailed Link forecast is included in Appendix G to this report.

European Investment Bank (EIB)

The EIB's rates for borrowing are generally favourable compared to PWLB although the margin of benefit has now reduced. Rates can be forward fixed for borrowing from the EIB and this option will be considered if the conditions can be met and it offers better value for money.

The EIB appraises its funding plans against individual schemes, particularly around growth and employment and energy efficiency, and any monies borrowed are part of the Council's overall pooled borrowing.

Third Party Loans

These are loans from third parties that are offered at lower than market rates, for example Salix Finance Ltd is offering loans to the public sector at 0% to be used specifically to improve their energy efficiency and reduce carbon emissions.

Housing Investment Funding and the Homes and Communities Agency

Both HIF and HCA are MHCLG funding and only used in specific circumstances, see paragraphs 9.12-16 for further details.

Inter-Local Authority advances

Both short and medium term loans are often available in the inter Local Authority market.

Market Loans

There are usually various offers available from the general market including LOBOs or forward starting loans. The Council will give consideration to forward fixing debt, whereby it agrees to borrow at a point in the future at a rate based on current implied market interest rate forecasts.

Local Authority Bond Agency

The UK Municipal Bonds Agency was established in June 2014 with the primary purpose of reducing local authority financing costs by:

- Issuing bonds in the capital markets and on-lending to councils.

- Lending between councils.
- Sourcing funding from 3rd party sources, and on-lending to councils.

Although the Agency's aim is to raise finance for Local Authorities by issuing municipal bonds to capital markets, at the time of writing the first bond has yet to be issued. The Council will continue to monitor the Agency's development and whether it can offer a competitive option for future borrowing.

These types of borrowing will need to be evaluated alongside their availability particularly whilst there is a very limited availability of traditional market loans. The traditional market loans available tend to be Lender Option Borrower Option (LOBO) loans and they are not currently offered at competitive rates of interest. LOBOs provide the lender with future options to increase the interest rate whilst the local authority has the option to repay if the increase in the rate is unacceptable to them.

Following HRA reform the vast majority of the Council's existing debt portfolio consists of LOBOs and the Authority needs to consider diversifying its loan book to reduce the impact of any volatility that may cause these loans to be called. It should be noted that the Council's current LOBO loans are unlikely to be called in the medium term at current interest rates.

Homes and Communities Agency Funding

The Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) has made £31.8m funding available to the City Council and this was received during the three years 2015/16 to 2017/18. The funding is, in effect, a 'loan' of the HCA's receipts from the disposal of its land and property within Greater Manchester (GM) as agreed in the GM City Deal. The funds can be used to invest in any project which supports GM City Deal objectives. Some of the funds are passed on to other GM authorities for projects within their areas.

The funding from the HCA is held as an interest free loan until an investment approval is made. At this point the approved element of the loan becomes risk-based with the return to the HCA based on the performance of that investment. The location of the project depends on where the receipts originate from and whether the receipt is due to the sale of residential or commercial property. Proceeds from commercial property are not borough-specific, whereas proceeds from residential property are.

The funds received are to be repaid to the HCA in March 2022. No interest will be charged to MCC for the receipt of the funds. Should an investment made not be recovered, the loss is deducted from the amount due to the HCA. Conversely, should any profit be made by an investment these will be added to the amount due to the HCA.

Housing Investment Funding (HIF)

The Council has arranged with the Homes and Communities Agency to receive housing investment funding on behalf of Greater Manchester. The funds are treated as a loan to the Council in a similar manner to HCA funds as detailed in paragraphs 9.12-14. These monies are then be invested in housing related projects with any

losses met by Government (up to 20%) or by guarantee from the ten Greater Manchester Local Authorities (including Manchester). All the Housing Investment Fund schemes are approved by the GMCA and the Council's role is to act as a host for the financial arrangements.

Total HIF funding of £300m has been agreed with the MHCLG of which £197.7m has been received to date. The majority of HCA and HIF funds are expected to transfer to the GMCA in quarter 4 2018/19 following the Authority being granted the statutory borrowing powers required. The element of the investment which was already committed at the time of the transfer is being retained by the Council until the investment completes.

Sensitivity of the forecast

In normal circumstances the main sensitivities are likely to be the two scenarios noted below. Council officers in conjunction with the treasury advisors will continually monitor the prevailing interest rates and the market forecast, adopting the following responses to a change of sentiment:

- ***If it were felt that there was a significant risk of a sharp FALL in long and short term rates***, e.g. due to a marked increase of risks around relapse into recession or of risks of deflation then long term borrowings will be postponed.
- ***If it were felt that there was a significant risk of a much sharper RISE in long and short term rates than that current forecast***, perhaps arising from a greater than expected increase in world economic activity or a sudden increase in inflation risks, the portfolio position will be re-appraised. The likely action will be that fixed rate funding will be drawn whilst interest rates remain relatively cheap.

External v. Internal borrowing

The current borrowing position reflects the historic strong Balance Sheet of the Council as highlighted in Section 5. The policy remains to keep cash as low as possible and minimise temporary investments.

The next financial year is again expected to be one of historically low Bank Rate. This provides a continuation of the opportunity for local authorities to review their strategy of undertaking new external borrowing. At Appendix F there is an in depth analysis of economic conditions provided by Link Asset Services, the Council's independent treasury advisors.

Over the next three years, investment rates are expected to be significantly below long term borrowing rates. This would indicate that value could best be obtained by limiting new external borrowing and by using internal cash balances to finance new capital expenditure or to replace maturing external debt.

This will be weighed against the potential for incurring additional long term costs by delaying new external borrowing until later years when longer term rates are forecast to be significantly higher. Consideration will also be given to forward fixing rates

whilst rates are favourable.

Against this background caution will be adopted within 2019/20 treasury operations. The City Treasurer will monitor the interest rate market and adopt a pragmatic approach to changing circumstances, reporting any decisions to the appropriate decision making body at the next available opportunity.

Policy on borrowing in advance of need

From a statutory point of view a Local Authority has the power to invest for 'any purpose relevant to its functions under any enactment, or for the purposes of the prudent management of its financial affairs.' The MHCLG takes an informal view that local authorities should not borrow purely to invest at a profit. This does not prevent the Council temporarily investing funds borrowed for the purpose of expenditure in the reasonable near future.

This Council will not borrow in advance of need to on lend. Any decision to borrow in advance in support of strategic and service delivery objectives will be in the context of achieving the best overall value for money, for example to minimise the risk of borrowing costs increasing in the future and that the Council can ensure the security of such funds. In determining whether borrowing is undertaken in advance of need the Council will:

- ensure that there is a clear link between the capital programme and maturity profile of the existing debt profile which supports the need to take funding in advance of need;
- ensure the ongoing revenue liabilities created and implications for future plans and budget have been considered;
- evaluate the economic and market factors that might influence the manner and timing of any decision to borrow;
- consider the merits and demerits of alternative forms of funding;
- consider the alternative interest rate bases available, the most appropriate periods to fund and repayment profiles to use; and
- consider the impact of borrowing in advance temporarily (until required to finance capital expenditure) increasing investment cash balances and the consequent increase in exposure to counterparty risk, and other risks, and the level of such risks given the controls in place to minimise them.

Forward Fixing

The Council will give consideration to forward fixing debt, whereby the Council agrees to borrow at a point in the future at a rate based on current implied market interest rate forecasts. There is a risk that the interest rates proposed would be higher than current rates it can be beneficial as it avoids the need to borrow in advance of need and suffer cost of carry. It may also represent a saving if rates were to rise in the future. Any decision to forward fix will be reviewed for value for money and will be reported to Members as part of the standard treasury management reporting.

Debt Rescheduling

It is likely that opportunities to reschedule debt in the 2019/20 financial year will be limited particularly as the Council has no existing PWLB loans other than those expected to be taken in the last quarter of 2018/19.

As short term borrowing rates will be considerably cheaper than longer term rates, there may be some opportunity to generate savings by switching from long term debt to short term debt. These savings will need to be considered in the light of the premiums incurred and the likely cost of refinancing those short term loans once they mature compared to the current rates of longer term debt in the existing portfolio.

The debt portfolio following HRA reform consists mainly of LOBOs, and the premia for rescheduling these make it unlikely there will be a cost effective opportunity to reschedule. The premia relates to the future interest payments associated with the loan and compensation for the lender for the buy-back of the interest rate options the loan has embedded in it.

The Council will continue to monitor the LOBO market and opportunities to reschedule, redeem or alter the profile of existing LOBO debt. The reasons for any rescheduling to take place will include:

- the generation of cash savings and / or discounted cash flow savings;
- helping to fulfil the strategy outlined above in this section;
- enhancing the balance of the portfolio (amending the maturity profile and/or the balance of volatility)

Any restructuring of LOBOs will only be progressed if it provides value for money and reduces the overall treasury risk the Council faces. The Council's Constitution delegates to the City Treasurer the authority to pursue any restructuring, rescheduling or redemption opportunities available.

Consideration will also be given to the potential for making savings by running down investment balances to repay debt prematurely. It is likely short term rates on investments will be lower than rates paid on current debt.

All rescheduling will be reported to the Executive as part of the normal treasury management activity. If rescheduling requires amendments to the Treasury Management Strategy the City Treasurer will be asked to approve them in accordance with her delegated powers and the changes will be reported to Members.

Appendix 9

Annual Investment Strategy

General Fund

Introduction

The Council will have regard to the MHCLG's Guidance on Local Government Investments (the Guidance) and the 2011 and 2017 revised CIPFA Treasury Management in Public Services Code of Practice and Cross Sectoral Guidance Notes (the CIPFA TM Code). The Council's investment priorities are:

- the security of capital; and
- the liquidity of its investments.

The risk appetite of the Council is low in order to give priority to the security of its investments. The Council will also aim to achieve the optimum return on its investments commensurate with desired levels of security and liquidity.

The borrowing of monies by an Authority purely to invest or on-lend and make a return is unlawful and this Council will not engage in such activity. However the Council may provide loan finance funded from borrowing if this supports the achievement of the Council's strategies and service objectives.

The Icelandic banks crisis and the financial difficulties faced by UK and international banks that followed have placed security of investments at the forefront of Treasury Management investment policy. Similarly the move in the local authority sector to commercial investment had led to a reinforcement of these principles under the revised Prudential Code.

The Council's TMSS focusses solely on treasury management investments. CIPFA has revised the Prudential Code to strengthen disclosure requirements for investments which are commercial in nature, in that they are neither treasury or strategic capital investments. The Council does not hold any commercial investments and details of strategic capital investments can be found in the Capital Strategy and Budget Report to the Executive.

Changes to Credit Rating Methodology

Through much of the financial crisis the main rating agencies provided some institutions with a ratings 'uplift' due to implied levels of government backing should an institution fail. In response to the evolving regulatory regime and the declining probability of government support the rating agencies are removing these 'uplifts'.

The changes do not reflect any changes in the underlying status of the institution or credit environment, merely the removal of the implied levels of sovereign support built into ratings during the financial crisis. The regulatory and economic environments now mean that financial institutions are much stronger and less prone

to failure in a financial crisis.

The key change to the regulatory framework in respect of banks was introduction of the European Union's Banking Recovery and Resolution Directive (BRRD). In response to the banking crisis some governments used taxpayer funds to support banks. BRRD now requires 'bail-in' to be applied in such a scenario. In the UK this requires that after shareholders' equity, depositors' funds over c.£85k (linked to the Euro) will be used to support a bank at risk. The £85k threshold is not available to local authorities and all bank deposits are at risk of bail-in. This increases the risk to the Council of holding unsecured cash deposits with banks and building societies.

Investment Policy

As previously, the Council will not just utilise ratings as the sole determinant of the quality of an institution. It is important to continually assess and monitor the financial sector on both a micro and macro basis and in relation to the economic and political environments in which institutions operate. The assessment will also take account of information that reflects the opinion of the markets. The Council will engage with its advisors to maintain a monitor on market pricing such as 'credit default swaps'¹ and overlay that information on top of the credit ratings.

Investment in banks and building societies are now exposed to bail-in risk as described above and lower operational limits for these investments were adopted in 2016/17. This is apart from the limit with Barclays bank; Barclays is the Council's main banker and is the investment destination of last resort for the close of daily trading. These revised limits are operational changes and to preserve flexibility should circumstances change the overall investment limits approved for banks and building societies for 2018/19 will be maintained in 2019/20.

The investment constraint brought by bail-in risk means the Council has sought to identify ways that it can broaden and diversify its basis for lending. During 2018/19 the Council decided to reduce its exposure by maintaining a lower level of bank deposits. This strategy saw a significant proportion of the Council's investments placed with the Government (via the DMO) or with other Local Authorities.

From October 2018, in line with the 2018/19 TMS, the Council has started to deposit in Money Market Funds (MMFs) to further diversify the basis for lending, using four MMFs which meet the Council's TMSS criteria. Although MMFs are not directly exposed to bail-in risk there could be a secondary exposure related to the extent that the individual Fund includes bank deposits within its portfolio of investments. Application of bail-in in this scenario would impact on the overall status of the Fund and it is likely that the Council would be able to withdraw from participation in the Fund in such a situation.

To December 2018 the majority of the investment portfolio was with the DMO and other Local Authorities. For liquidity purposes an average of £15m has been held in

¹ A credit default swap is a financial instrument that effectively provides the holder insurance against a loan defaulting. The CDS spread is the difference between the price at which providers are willing to sell the swap, and the price at which buyers are willing to buy. A relatively high spread may suggest that the loan is more likely to default.

Bank Deposits and from October 2018 Money Market Funds deposits have averaged £20m. This highlights the relatively low credit risk that the Council takes when investing.

For 2019/20 investment the Council will continue to consider trading in Treasury Bills, Certificates of Deposit and Covered Bonds. In addition to diversification each of these options offer the Council benefits which are noted in paragraphs 10.32-36 below. Treasury Bills, Certificates of Deposit and Covered Bonds require the Council to have specific custodian and broker facilities which have been opened. Officers are working to monitor these markets to prompt participation in the instruments when rates are favourable. Work is continuing to open further access points to markets and to identify opportunities for benefit which are new to the Council.

It should be noted that, whilst seeking to broaden the investment base officers will seek to limit the level of risk taken. It is not expected that the measures considered above will have a significant impact on the rates of return the Council currently achieves.

HRA

In order to maintain efficient, effective and economic treasury management for the Council as a whole, the HRA will only be able to invest with the General Fund. This is discussed further in Appendix I.

Specified and Non-Specified Investments

Investment instruments identified for use in the financial year are listed below and are all specified investments. Any proposals to use other non-specified investments will be reported to Members for approval.

Specified investments are sterling denominated, with maturities up to a maximum of one year and meet the minimum 'high' rating criteria where applicable. Further details about some of the specified investments below can be found in later paragraphs in this Section.

Table 4	Minimum 'High' Credit Criteria	Use
Term deposits – banks and building societies*	See Para 10.9.	In-house
Term deposits – other Local Authorities	High security. Only one or two local authorities credit-rated	In-house
Debt Management Agency Deposit Facility	UK Government backed	In-house
Certificates of deposit issued by banks and building societies covered by UK Government guarantees	UK Government explicit guarantee	In-house
Money Market Funds (MMFs)	AAA _M	In-house
Treasury Bills	UK Government backed	In-house
Covered Bonds	AAA	In-house

* Banks & Building Societies

The Council will keep the investment balance below or at the maximum limit based on the institutions credit rating as detailed in paragraph 10.23. If this limit is breached, for example due to significant late receipts, the City Treasurer will be notified as soon as possible after the breach, along with the reasons for it. Please note this relates to specific investments and not balances held within the Council's bank accounts, including the general bank account.

Creditworthiness policy

The Council applies the creditworthiness service provided by Link Asset Services. This service employs a sophisticated modelling approach utilising credit ratings from the three main credit rating agencies; Fitch, Moody's and Standard & Poor's. Link supplement the credit ratings of counterparties with the following overlays:

- credit watches and credit outlooks from credit rating agencies
- Credit Default Swap spreads to provide early warning of likely changes in credit ratings
- sovereign ratings to select counterparties from only the most creditworthy countries

The above are combined in a weighted scoring system which is then combined with an overlay of CDS spreads. The end product is a series of colour coded bands which indicate the relative creditworthiness of counterparties. This classification is called durational banding.

The Council has regard to Link's approach to assessing creditworthiness when selecting counterparties as it uses a wider array of information than just primary ratings and by using a risk weighted scoring system does not give undue preponderance to just one agency's ratings.

In summary the Council will approach assessment of creditworthiness by using the Link counterparty list and then applying its own counterparty limits and durations. All credit ratings will be monitored on a daily basis and re-assessed weekly. The Council is alerted to changes to ratings of all three agencies through its use of the Link creditworthiness service.

- If a downgrade results in the counterparty/investment scheme no longer meeting the Council's minimum criteria, its further use as a new investment will be withdrawn immediately.
- In addition to the use of Credit Ratings, the Council will be advised of information in Credit Default Swap against the iTraxx benchmark² and other market data on a weekly basis. Extreme market movements may result in the downgrade of an institution or removal from the Council's lending list.

Sole reliance will not be placed on the use of this external service. In addition, the Council will also use market data and market information, information on government support for banks and the credit ratings of that government support.

² The Markit iTraxx Senior Financials Index is a composite of the 25 most liquid financial entities in Europe. The index is calculated through an averaging process by the Markit Group and is used as the benchmark level of CDS spreads on Capita Asset Services' Credit List.

Investment Limits

In applying the creditworthiness policy the Council holds the security of investments as the key consideration and will only seek to make treasury investments with counterparties of high credit quality.

The financial investment limits of financial institutions will be linked to their short and long-term ratings (Fitch or equivalent) as follows:

<u>Long Term</u>	<u>Amount</u>
Fitch AA+ and above	£20 million
Fitch AA/AA-	£15 million
Fitch A+/A	£15 million
Fitch A-	£10 million
Fitch BBB+	£10 million

The Council will only utilise those institutions that have a short term rating of F2 or higher, (Fitch or equivalent).

UK Government (including the Debt Management Office)	£200 million
Greater Manchester Combined Authority	£200 million
Other Local Authorities	£20 million

In seeking to diversify the Council will utilise other investment types which are described in more detail below and ensure that the investment portfolio is mixed to help mitigate credit risk. The following limits will apply to each asset type:

Total Deposit	Amount
Local Authorities	£250 million
UK Government	£200 million
-Debt Management Office	
-Treasury Bills	
Money Market Funds	£60 million
Certificates of Deposit	£25 million
Covered Bonds	£25 million

It may be prudent to temporarily increase the limits shown above, as in the current economic environment it is increasingly difficult for officers to place funds. If this is the case officers will seek approval from the City Treasurer and any increase in the limits will be reported to Members through the normal treasury management reporting process. Any HCA funds invested with other local authorities will form part of the £20m limit noted above.

Country Limits

The introduction of bail-in arrangements means that the Council's exposure to bank and building society deposits should be limited and these deposits will only form part of a diversified investment portfolio to help mitigate the risk.

Previously the Council's treasury management strategies included investment limits to specific countries, such as those rated AAA. The introduction of bail-in arrangements suggests that less reliance can be placed on sovereign support for individual institutions and the country limits have been removed. The focus of credit rating evaluations will be on the individual banks, building societies and organisations.

Money Market Funds

The removal of the implied levels of sovereign support that were built into ratings throughout the financial crisis has impacted on bank and building society ratings across the world. Rating downgrades can limit the number of counterparties available and to provide flexibility the Council will use MMFs when appropriate as an alternative specified investment.

MMFs are investment instruments that invest in a variety of institutions therefore diversifying the investment risk. The funds are managed by a fund manager and have objectives to preserve capital, provide daily liquidity and a competitive yield. The majority of money market funds invest both inside and outside the UK. MMFs also provide flexibility as investments and withdrawals can be made on a daily basis.

MMFs are rated through a separate process to bank deposits. This looks at the average maturity of the underlying investments in the Fund as well as the credit quality of those investments. The Council will only use MMFs where the institutions hold the highest AAA credit rating and those which are UK based.

As with all investments there is some risk with MMFs in terms of the capital value of the investment. European legislation has required existing and new MMFs to convert to a Low Volatility Net Asset Value (LVNAV) basis by January 2019. This basis allows movements in capital value, but there is a restriction that the deviation cannot be more than 20 basis points, e.g. on a deposit of £100 the Fund must ensure withdrawal proceeds are no greater than +/- 20p.

For international investments the Council requires that the countries concerned must possess AAA status if there is a direct investment in a sovereign state. This is not applicable to MMFs. Whilst MMFs invest outside the UK their investment risk is identified on the basis of the total Fund rather than the ratings of the individual components within it. Should a country (or institution) become a higher risk in a MMF portfolio the Fund's management will seek to realign the investment portfolio to maintain the MMF's overall credit rating.

Treasury Bills

Treasury Bills are marketable securities issued by the UK Government and counterparty and liquidity risk is relatively low although there is potential risk to value arising from an adverse movement in interest rates unless they are held to maturity.

Weekly tenders are held for Treasury Bills so the Council could invest funds on a regular basis. This would provide a spread of maturity dates and reduce the volume

of investments maturing at the same time.

There is a large secondary market for Treasury Bills so it is possible to trade them in earlier than the maturity date if required and to purchase them in the secondary market. In the majority of cases the Council will hold to maturity to avoid any potential capital loss from selling before maturity and will only sell the Treasury Bills early if it can demonstrate value for money in doing so.

Certificates of Deposit

Certificates of Deposit are short dated marketable securities issued by financial institutions so the counterparty risk is low. The instruments have flexible maturity dates so it is possible to trade them in early although there is a potential risk to capital if they are traded ahead of maturity and there is an adverse movement in interest rates. Certificates of Deposit are subject to bail-in risk as they are given the same priority as fixed deposits if a bank was to default. The Council will only deal with Certificates of Deposit that are issued by banks and meet the credit criteria.

Covered Bonds

Covered Bonds are debt instruments secured by assets such as mortgage loans. They are issued by banks and other non-financial institutions. The loans remain on the issuing institutions' Balance Sheet and investors have a preferential claim in the event of the issuing institution defaulting. All issuing institutions are required to hold sufficient assets to cover the claims of all covered bondholders. The Council would only deal with bonds that are issued by banks which meet the credit criteria, or AAA rated institutions, (e.g. insurance companies).

Liquidity

Based on cash flow forecasts, the level of cash balances in 2019/20 is estimated to range between £0m and £230m. The higher level can arise where for instance large Government grants are received or long term borrowing has recently been undertaken.

Investment Strategy to be followed in-house

Link's view of forecast Bank Rate is noted at Section 8. The current economic outlook is that the structure of market interest rates and government debt yields have several key treasury management implications:

- The Bank of England has adopted a more aggressive tone in its provision of guidance to financial markets. The Bank has indicated there will be a need to gradually raise the Bank Rate to 1.5% over the next three years to keep inflation under control.
- Link's view is that Bank Rate will continue at its current rate of 0.75% until June 2019 when a rise to 1.00% is predicted. Thereafter rises to 1.25% in March 2020, 1.50% in December 2020 and to 1.75% in June 2021 are

forecast.

- Forecasting as far ahead as 2021 is difficult as there are many potential economic factors which could impact on the UK economy. There are also political developments in the UK, (especially over the terms of Brexit), EU, US and beyond which could have a major impact on forecasts;
- Investment returns are likely to remain relatively low during 2019/20 and beyond;
- Growth in the Eurozone after several years of depression following the financial crisis started to improve from 2016 and now has substantial strength. However, the European Central Bank is struggling to achieve its 2% inflation target and therefore rates will possibly not start to rise until 2019.

There will remain a cost of carry to any new borrowing which causes an increase in investments as this will incur a revenue loss between borrowing costs and investment returns.

The Council will avoid locking into longer term deals while investment rates are at historically low levels unless attractive rates are available with counterparties of particularly high creditworthiness which make longer term deals worthwhile and within the risk parameters set by the Council.

For 2019/20 it is suggested the Council should target an investment return of 0.50% on investments placed during the financial year. For cash flow generated balances the Council will seek to utilise its business reserve accounts and short-dated deposits (overnight to three months) in order to benefit from the compounding of interest.

End of year Investment Report

At the end of the financial year, the Council will receive a report on investment activity as part of the Annual Treasury Report.

Policy on the use of External Service Providers

The Council uses Link Asset Services as external treasury management advisors and has access to another provider who is an approved supplier should a second opinion or additional work be required. The Council recognises that responsibility for treasury management decisions remains with the organisation at all times and will ensure that undue reliance is not placed upon its external service providers.

The Council recognises there is value in employing external providers of treasury management services to acquire access to specialist skills and resources. It will ensure the terms of the Advisor's appointment and the methods by which their value is assessed are properly agreed and documented, and subjected to regular review.

Appendix 10

Proposed Use of Reserves

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2019 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Purpose
Schools Reserve	20,000	(259)	0	19,741	19,482	19,223	18,964	
General Fund Reserves								
Statutory Reserves	19,133	(10,000)	11,352	20,485	21,945	22,486	22,012	
Earmarked Reserves	240,923	(99,086)	99,732	241,569	224,180	202,735	188,807	
General Fund Reserve	21,279	0	165	21,444	21,444	21,444	21,444	
Total General Fund	281,335	(109,086)	111,249	283,498	267,569	246,665	232,263	
Housing Revenue Account Reserves:								
Housing Revenue Account General Reserve	67,335	(10,353)	0	56,982	35,471	27,308	27,048	
HRA PFI reserve	10,000	0	0	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	
HRA Residual liabilities fund	24,000	0	0	24,000	24,000	24,000	24,000	
Housing Insurance reserve	1,570	0	200	1,770	1,970	2,170	2,370	
Total HRA	102,905	(10,353)	200	92,752	71,441	63,478	63,418	
TOTAL RESERVES	404,240	(119,698)	111,449	395,991	358,492	329,366	314,645	
SCHOOLS RESERVE								
LMS Reserve	20,000	(259)	0	19,741	19,482	19,223	18,964	School balances - These are not MCC resource and so cannot be used by MCC
Sub Total Schools	20,000	(259)	0	19,741	19,482	19,223	18,964	
STATUTORY RESERVES								

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2019 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Purpose
Bus Lane Enforcement Reserve	11,636	(4,242)	5,000	12,394	12,902	12,910	12,418	Ringfenced reserve which can only be applied to specific transport and highways related activity.
On Street Parking	2,863	(5,611)	5,049	2,301	3,615	5,024	6,433	Ringfenced reserve which can only be applied to specific transport and highways related activity.
Ancoats Square Reserve	1,878	(118)	0	1,760	1,642	1,524	1,406	Received from the HCA to cover the revenue costs of maintaining Ancoats Square for a period of at least 25 years.
Spinningfields Commuted Sum	969	(9)	0	960	951	942	933	Funds received as part of an agreement to cover maintenance costs.
New Smithfield Market	349	0	20	369	369	369	369	To contribute towards funding the development plans for the market
Great Northern Square Maintenance Fund	303	(20)	0	283	263	243	223	Set up in accordance with the agreement with the developers of the site. It will be used for upgrading of the square.
Education Endowments	17	0	0	17	17	17	17	Kept as part of future payments for school prizes
Landlord Licensing Reserve	319	0	1,283	1,602	1,387	658	(586)	Smoothing reserve
Art Fund Reserve	35	0	0	35	35	35	35	For art purchases
St Johns Gardens Contingency	764	0	0	764	764	764	764	Contribution from St Johns Gardens tenants for maintenance works
Sub Total Statutory	19,133	(10,000)	11,352	20,485	21,945	22,486	22,012	
<u>EARMARKED RESERVES</u>								
<u>BALANCES HELD FOR PFI'S</u>								
Street Lighting PFI	567	(37)	0	530	425	255	15	Established to fund the requirements over 25 years re: the PFI contract for Street Lighting service via external contractors

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2019 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Purpose
Temple PFI	665	0	12	677	564	441	295	Established to fund the requirements of the PFI scheme over 25 years
Wright Robinson PFI Reserve	1,312	0	40	1,352	1,392	1,432	1,472	PFI Scheme 25 year contract drawdown will be in future years as expenditure exceeds grant.
Total held for PFI's	2,544	(37)	52	2,559	2,381	2,128	1,782	
<u>Reserves directly supporting the revenue budget</u>								
Adult Social Care	3,060	(3,643)	4,493	3,910	1,760	0	0	To support Adult and Social Care Improvement Plan
Social Care Reserve	16,597	(7,677)	2,904	11,824	5,609	31	31	To address pressures in social care, in particular the need to invest in early help and prevention in Children's Services and continued pressures on LAC budgets
Crime and Disorder	1,500	(420)	0	1,080	540	0	0	To fund Anti-Social Behaviour Team
Budget smoothing reserve	2,500	(2,500)	0	0	0	0	0	To address pressures in social care, in particular the need to invest in early help and prevention in Children's Services and continued pressures on LAC budgets
Total held to support the revenue budget	23,657	(14,240)	7,397	16,814	7,909	31	31	
<u>RESERVES HELD TO SMOOTH RISK / ASSURANCE</u>								
<u>Risks</u>								
Historic Abuse Claims Reserve	600	0	0	600	600	600	600	For potential future legal cases

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2019 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Purpose
Planning Reserve	1,975	(300)	0	1,675	1,375	1,075	775	Reserve to be used to fund costs of staff and studies required to meet our statutory obligations to bring forward a Local Plan
Transformation Reserve	8,953	0	0	8,953	8,953	8,953	8,953	To support costs of future service change.
Airport Dividend reserve	45,413	(45,413)	45,413	45,413	45,413	45,413	45,413	The additional airport dividend will be used to support future years budget
Land Charges Fees Reserve	373	0	0	373	373	373	373	To mitigate risk across financial years
Pension Risk Fund - MWL	514	0	10	524	0	0	0	To fund wind up costs in 2020/21
Manchester International Festival	1,508	(500)	0	1,008	508	0	0	To fund the additional costs of the Manchester International Festival Fund and Factory.
Highways reserve	702	(28)	0	674	646	618	590	Committed sums received that will be utilised for highways schemes in future years
Insurance Fund	12,124	(500)	0	11,624	11,124	10,624	10,124	The insurance fund has been established to fund risks that are self-insured.
Fleet Maintenance Reserve	21	(21)	0	0	0	0	0	Reserve created for smoothing the impact of vehicle repair and maintenance costs.
Children's Services Reserve	15	(15)	0	0	0	0	0	The reserve is being held for any unexpected issues arising from Academy transfers given the level of uncertainty around any costs falling to the LA within a short timescale.
Taxi Licensing Reserve	280	0	266	546	546	546	546	This is a smoothing reserve to equalise the income and expenditure of running the function over financial years. Income ringfenced by statute.
Newton Heath Market Reserve	22	0	0	22	22	22	22	To fund future markets expenditure

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2019 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Purpose
Rogue Landlord reserve	0	0	100	100	100	100	100	This reserve holds the funding for investigation into poor property conditions in the private rented sector in Manchester with the purpose of improving housing conditions for tenants by enforcing compliance with statutory regulations and standards.
Selective Licensing reserve	300	0	235	535	535	535	535	Costs for administering the reputable landlord initiative and ensure compliance
Investment Estate smoothing reserve	1,000	(700)	0	300	300	300	300	To manage budget pressures due to the volatility in investment income.
Business Rates Reserve	18,416	(2,490)	9,403	25,329	22,839	20,349	19,859	To mitigate Business Rates income risk
TOTAL Risk/Smooth	92,216	(49,967)	55,427	97,676	93,334	89,508	88,190	
RESERVES HELD TO FUND CAPITAL SCHEMES AND OTHER SPECIFIC PROJECT RELATED COSTS								
Regeneration reserve	13,521	(2,325)	0	11,196	8,871	7,296	6,096	To deliver regeneration projects.
Enterprise zone reserve	893	(75)	563	1,381	1,313	0	0	To fund the borrowing costs of projects
Capital Fund Reserve	48,008	(13,435)	22,405	56,978	56,805	48,178	34,115	Contribution to schemes which are being brought forward to support employment and growth as part of the Council's Capital Programme. Used to fund high priority strategic development opportunities in the city for those that do not attract external funding. This can also be used for revenue.

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2019 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Purpose
Capital Financing Reserve	29,730	0	5,000	34,730	39,730	44,730	49,730	To reflect increase in borrowing costs due to the Council's capital investment
Eastlands Reserve	4,218	(6,463)	5,118	2,873	2,309	2,179	2,380	English Institute of Sport - Sport England MCFC income
Total to fund capital scheme and other specific relates costs	96,370	(22,298)	33,086	107,158	109,028	102,383	92,321	
RESERVES TO SUPPORT GROWTH AND REFORM								
Better Care	3,303	(1,955)	0	1,348	75	75	75	Contributions received from CCG's
Town Hall Reserve	10,820	(2,889)	2,400	10,331	7,943	5,732	3,504	To fund revenue expenditure on the Town Hall Complex Programme
Clean City	412	(412)	0	0	0	0	0	To support green initiatives
NW Construction Hub Reserve	11	(11)	0	0	0	0	0	The capital programme section manages the NWCH, other LA's pay a fee to use the service and the income is used to cover the cost of retendering every three years.
Our Manchester reserve	5,092	(4,685)	1,100	1,507	7	7	7	Additional investment made available as part of the 2017-2020 budget process to drive forward the delivery of Our Manchester
TOTAL	19,638	(9,952)	3,500	13,186	8,025	5,814	3,586	
GRANTS USED OVER ONE YEAR								
English Partnership (HCA)	1,562	(500)	0	1,062	562	0	0	HCA approval required to Fund Development appraisal and Eastlands Project team

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2019 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Purpose
Other Grants and Contributions	443	(451)	90	82	82	82	82	Various local Environment scheme and initiatives i.e. 'clean up campaigns'
Contributions Other Local Authorities	358	(71)	35	322	322	322	322	Relates to various ongoing Civil Contingencies schemes.
Other Grants and Contributions Regeneration	116	(26)	0	90	90	90	90	Unspent grant received in previous year
Fraud Fund	136	(70)	0	66	0	0	0	Unspent grant received in previous year
Supporting People	418	(418)	0	0	0	0	0	Unspent grant received in previous year
Asylum Seekers	358	0	0	358	287	191	191	£482k will be drawn down from the Asylum Seekers reserve that was originally set aside from The Target Asylum Contracts, earned by the NW consortium team. This will fund the Local Authority Asylum Support Officer (LAASLO) project. Remaining balance is to fund residual costs to be incurred by the local authority
Collection Initiatives Reserve	839	(197)	0	642	580	580	580	Small reserves on Corporate Core
Flood management reserve	74	0	0	74	74	74	74	Unspent grant received in previous year
TOTAL	4,304	(1,733)	125	2,696	1,997	1,339	1,339	
<u>SMALL SPECIFIC RESERVES</u>								
Investment Reserve from Surpluses	151	(151)	0	0	0	0	0	Funding belonging to schools which the Council holds on their behalf. The purpose is to fund repairs and improvements to school kitchens.
Nuclear Free Zone	51	0	0	51	51	51	51	General reserve

Reserve	Closing Balance 31/03/2019 £000	Withdrawals £000	Additions £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2020 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2021 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2022 £000	Closing Balance 31/03/2023 £000	Purpose
Highways Commuted Sum	599	(14)	0	585	571	557	543	Funds received as part of developer agreements
NSM - Car Boot	263	(45)	0	218	228	238	248	Used to fund repairs and maintenance of facilities for traders.
Cemeteries Replacement	401	0	40	441	481	521	561	To purchase land for burials
Primary School Catering Reserve	127	(127)	0	0	0	0	0	Reserve established to support the Service's competitiveness by smoothing school meal prices during the 3 year price planning period.
Catering R & M Insurance Account	166	(166)	0	0	0	0	0	Reserve established to meet refurbishment cost of school kitchens.
Brexit Reserve	241	(346)	105	0	0	0	0	To fund BREXIT related costs that fall across more than one year
Towns and Villages Councils with ALMOs Group (CWAG) Reserve	70	(10)	0	60	50	40	30	Held in relation to the running costs of CWAG which is administered by MCC
Graves And Memorials	97	0	0	97	97	97	97	Money held in trust for repair and development costs for gravestones
Other Small Specific reserves	28	0	0	28	28	28	28	Small specific reserves
Total Small Specific Reserves	2,194	(859)	145	1,480	1,506	1,532	1,558	
TOTAL EARMARKED RESERVES	240,923	(99,086)	99,732	241,569	224,180	202,735	188,807	
Total General Fund Reserves	281,335	(109,086)	111,249	283,498	267,569	246,665	232,263	

Appendix 11

COUNCIL TAX

SETTING THE AMOUNT OF COUNCIL TAX FOR THE COUNCIL'S AREA

RESOLVED

1. That the estimates prepared by the Executive at its meeting on 13 February 2019 be approved.
2. That it be noted that the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer acting under delegated powers has determined the amount of 116,015 as the Council Tax base for Manchester for the year 2019/20 in accordance with Section 31A (3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and regulations 3 to 5 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012.
3. That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2019/20 in accordance with Sections 31A to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:-

- | | |
|--------------------|---|
| (a) £1,517,525,607 | being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in the Section 31A (2) (a) to (f) of the Act. |
| (b) £1,358,496,000 | being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) (a) to (d) of the Act. |
| (c) £159,029,607 | being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Sections 31A(4) of the Act, as its council tax requirement for the year. |
| (d) £1,370.77 | being the amount at 3(c) above divided by the amount at 2 above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31B(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year. |

- (e) Valuation Bands

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£913.85	£1,066.15	£1,218.46	£1,370.77	£1,675.39	£1,980.00	£2,284.62	£2,741.54

being the amount given multiplying the amount at 3(d) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to

dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation bands.

4. That it be noted that for the year 2019/20 the major precepting authorities have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

Precepting Valuation bands

Greater Manchester Mayoral Police and Crime Commissioner Precept

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£132.20	£154.23	£176.27	£198.30	£242.37	£286.43	£330.50	£396.60

Greater Manchester Mayoral General Precept (including Fire Services)

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£51.29	£59.84	£68.39	£76.95	£94.05	£111.15	£128.24	£153.90

5. That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 3(e) and 4 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2019/20 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below.

Valuation bands

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£1,097.34	£1,280.22	£1,463.12	£1,646.02	£2,011.81	£2,377.58	£2,743.36	£3,292.04

1. CALCULATING THE COUNCIL TAX REQUIREMENT

Section 31A Calculations

- 1.1 Section 31A of the Local Government Finance 1992 requires the Council to make three calculations:-
- (i) an estimate of the Council's required gross revenue expenditure -Section 31A(2)
 - (ii) an estimate of its anticipated income (excluding that from council tax) and of reserves to be used to aid the revenue account - Section 31A(3)

(iii) a calculation of the difference between (i) and (ii) above, (i.e. the Council Tax requirement) - Section 31A(4)

1.2 In its Section 31A(2) calculation the Council is required to allow for the following:

Section 31A(2)(a) - the estimated revenue account expenditure it will incur during the year in performing its functions;

Section 31A(2)(b) - an appropriate allowance for contingencies for the year, e.g. for unforeseen occurrences such as disasters, storm damage, higher than expected inflation etc.;

Section 31A(2)(c) - any raising of financial reserves for future expenditure - examples of this include payments into a redemption fund, internal insurance etc;

Section 31A(2)(d) - any revenue account deficit for a previous financial year which has not yet been provided for;

Section 31A(2)(da) – any amount estimated to be transferred from the general fund to the collection fund in accordance with regulations by reference to sums received by the authority in respect of business rates.

Section 31A(2)(e) - any amount estimated to be transferred from the General Fund to the Collection Fund in accordance with Section 97(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 - i.e. the Council's share of any collection fund deficit;

Section 31A(2)(f) - any amounts estimated to be transferred from the General Fund to the Collection Fund by direction of the Secretary of State under Section 98(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 - including an estimate of the shortfall in the collection of Non-domestic Rates in excess of the allowance

1.3. In its Section 31A(3) calculation the Council must calculate the aggregate of sums to be put against gross expenditure, namely:

Section 31A(3)(a) - estimated income from fees, charges, and government grants (including RSG) plus other sums payable into the general fund (but excluding council tax).

Section 31A(3)(aa) – Any amount estimated to be transferred from the collection fund to the general fund in accordance with regulations by reference to sums received by the authority in respect of business rates.

Section 31A(3)(b) - any amount estimated to be transferred from the Collection Fund to the General Fund in accordance with Section 97(3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 - i.e. the Council's share of any collection fund surplus.

Section 31A(3)(c) - sums to be transferred from the Collection Fund to the General Fund pursuant to a direction of the Secretary of State under Section 98(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 - including allowances for costs of collection of business rates.

Section 31A(3)(d) - the amount of financial reserves/balances which the authority intends to use towards meeting its revenue expenditure.

1.4 On the basis of current estimates, the calculations would be as follows: -

	HRA £	Other £	Total £
Expenditure			
Section 31A(2)(a)	£95,752,000	£1,308,924,607	£1,404,676,607
Section 31A(2)(b)	£0	£1,600,000	£1,600,000
Section 31A(2)(c)	£0	£111,249,000	£111,249,000
Section 31A(2)(d)	£0	£0	£0
Section 31A(2)(da)	£0	£0	£0
Section 31A(2)(e)	£0	£0	£0
Section 31A(2)(f)	£0	£0	£0
	£95,752,000	£1,421,773,607	£1,517,525,607
Income			
Section 31A(3)(a)	(£85,399,000)	(£812,060,971)	(£897,459,971)
Section 31A(3)(aa)	£0	(£321,465,500)	(£321,465,500)
Section 31A(3)(b)	£0	(£18,749,000)	(£18,749,000)
Section 31A(3)(c)	£0	(£1,123,529)	(£1,123,529)
Section 31A(3)(d)	(£10,353,000)	(£109,345,000)	(£119,698,000)
	(£95,752,000)	(£1,262,744,000)	(£1,358,496,000)

1.5 **Council Tax Requirement under Section 31A(4)** being the amount by which the aggregate under Section 31A(2) exceeds the aggregate under Section 31A(3) is £159,029,607.

2. **CALCULATING THE BASIC AMOUNT OF COUNCIL TAX**

2.1. Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 requires the Council to calculate the basic amount of its Council Tax - this is in effect the City Council element of the Band D Council tax.

2.2 This calculated by applying the following formula -

Where:

R is the Council Tax requirement, and

T is the approved Council Tax base

2.3 Calculating the Basic Amount of Council Tax

Council Tax Requirement	£159,029,607
Divided by:	
Council Tax Base	116,015

Band D Basic Amount of Council Tax is: £1,370.77

Appendix 12

COLLECTION FUND BUDGET 2019/20	Budget Estimate
	£'000
<u>EXPENDITURE</u>	
<u>COUNCIL TAX</u>	
(Surplus) / Deficit B/fwd	(6,480)
Precepts:	
- Mayoral General (including Fire Services)	8,927
- Mayoral Police & Crime Commissioner	23,006
- City of Manchester	159,029
Total Precepts	190,962
Council Tax Total Expenditure	184,482
<u>BUSINESS RATES</u>	
(Surplus) / Deficit B/fwd	(13,405)
Payments/Transfers:	
- Mayoral General (including Fire Services)	3,329
- City of Manchester	329,567
Total Payments/transfers	332,896
Business Rates Total Expenditure	319,491
Collection Fund Total Expenditure	503,973
<u>INCOME</u>	
<u>COUNCIL TAX</u>	
Council Tax Income	198,359
Write Off of uncollectable amounts	(834)
Allowance for Impairment	(6,563)
<u>Council tax receivable</u>	190,962
<u>Contribution of Council Tax (surplus) / deficit:</u>	
- Mayoral General (including Fire Services)	(5,478)
- Mayoral Police & Crime Commissioner	(721)
- City of Manchester	(281)
Total Contribution to Council Tax (surplus) / deficit	(6,480)
Council Tax Total Income	184,482

COLLECTION FUND BUDGET 2019/20	Budget Estimate
	£'000
<u>BUSINESS RATES</u>	
Non Domestic Business Rates Income	372,823
Enterprise Zone Relief	(1,034)
Cost of Collection Allowance	(1,124)
Losses in Collection	(10,823)
Increase in Provision for Appeals	(26,946)
<u>Business rates receivable</u>	332,896
<u>Contribution of Business Rates (surplus) / deficit:</u>	
- Mayoral General (including Fire Services)	(134)
- City of Manchester	(13,271)
Total Contribution to Business Rates (surplus)/deficit	(13,405)
Business Rates Total Income	319,491
Collection Fund Total Income	503,973
<u>MOVEMENT ON FUND BALANCE</u>	
Council Tax (Surplus) / Deficit C/fwd	0
Business Rates (Surplus) / Deficit Cfwd	0
Collection Fund (Surplus) / Deficit	0

Executive

PART PROCEEDINGS of the meeting held on Wednesday, 13 February 2019

Present: Councillor Leese (Chair)

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

Also present as Members of the Standing Consultative Panel:

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

Also present: Councillor Flanagan

Exe/19/7 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Executive on 16 January 2019 were confirmed as a correct record.

Exe/19/8 Deputy Chief Executive - Sara Todd

The Deputy Chief Executive, Sara Todd, was leaving the Council to take up the post of Chief Executive of Trafford Council. This would be the last meeting of the Council's Executive that the Deputy Chief Executive was to participate in. Thanks and appreciation were given for all the work the Deputy Chief Executive had done for the Council and for the city, and best wishes were expressed for her new job.

Exe/19/9 Global Revenue Budget Monitoring report to the end of December 2018

A report was submitted to provide a summary of the position of the 2018/19 revenue budget at the end of December 2018. The report gave details of the projected variances to budgets, the position of the Housing Revenue Account, Council Tax and business rate collection, and the state of the Council's contingency funds. Projecting forward from the position at the end of December 2018 it was forecast that by the year-end in March 2019 the revenue budget would be overspent by £1.060m, which was better than the previous projection of an £3.974m overspend as reported in December (Minute Exe/18/115).

The report explained the steps that were being taken to further reduce the size of the projected overspend and to achieve a balanced budget.

In the report the following revenue budget virements were proposed and agreed:

- estimated sum of £2.957m to be vired from Children's Services to Adult Social Care for 2018/19 in advance of this work on disaggregating business support to the Adults and Children's Services Directorates.

- a virement of £500k from underspend within Revenues and Benefits budget to the discretionary payments budget to provide further support to vulnerable households, this being £400k for discretionary housing payment budget and £100k to the Welfare Provision Scheme.
- a virement of £60k from non-pay to pay in the Streetworks team to fund two additional FTE's to process the permits for a higher number of partial road closures due to the scaffolding/hoarding requirements for developments in the city.

When setting the 2018/19 budget the Council has agreed to hold some funds that were to be allocated throughout the year. The report proposed one use of some of these budgets to be allocated. This was agreed:

- an extra £146k allocated to the budget for effluent costs arising from increased pumping of water from landfill sites at Barlow Hall Farm and Cringle Farm. The recently repaired pump had increased the volume of water being pumped, and so the effluent charges for that volume of water.

Similarly, when setting the 2018/19 budget the Council has agreed to hold a central contingency fund to meet unexpected demands. The report proposed one allocation from that fund. This was agreed:

- Manchester Arena First Anniversary Commemoration - £277k to fund costs associated with a number of events held across the City.

The report also addressed use of the Council reserves. These were agreed:

- Music Hub Grant - £19k to be drawn down from the Children's Services reserve to enable disadvantaged children to attend cross music centres, and to support the tuition of endangered instruments.
- Car Park Dilapidation Surveys - £203k to be drawn down from the Parking reserve to conduct a dilapidation survey of all assets included in the NCP/Joint Venture, to help determine how off street parking should be managed at the end of the existing NCP/JV arrangement.

Notification had also been received of an additional external grant which had not been approved as part of the 2018/19 budget setting process. The proposed use of this funding was agreed:

- £71k from the Department of Education for support to end homelessness; the funding to enable the Council to employ specialist Personal Advisors to provide intensive support to care leavers who are at highest risk of homelessness or rough sleeping.

Decisions

1. To note the report.
2. To approve the proposed virements as set out above.
3. To approve the use of budgets to be allocated as set out above.
4. To approve the use of contingency funds as set out above.

5. To approve the use of reserves as set out above.
6. To approve the use of grants in addition to that already planned, as set out above.

Exe/19/10 Capital Programme Monitoring 2018/19

The City Treasurer's report informed us of the revised capital budget 2018/19 to 2023/24 taking account of agreed and proposed additions to the programme, profiling changes, and the latest estimates of forecast spend and resources for the 2018/19 capital programme. The report explained the major variations to forecast spend, and any impact that variations had on the five-year Capital Programme.

Appended to the report was a schedule of projects within the overall capital programme where the allocations needed to be revised and funding allocations vired between projects. The appendix showed the virement needed for each scheme and each project. We agreed to recommend to the Council the proposed virements greater than £500,000, as set out in the appendix to these minutes. The virements of less than £500,000 we approved.

Also appended to the report was a full schedule of all projects within the Capital Programme which set out the agreed budget for each project from 2018/19 to 2023/24.

Decisions

1. To recommend that the Council approve the virements over £0.5m between capital schemes to maximise use of funding resources available to the City Council set out in the appendix to these minutes.
2. To note that approval of movements and transfers to the full capital programme, including projects on behalf of Greater Manchester, will reflect a revised total capital programme budget of £600.5m and a latest full year forecast of £493.0m. Expenditure to the end of December 2018 is £336.2m.
3. To agree that the capital budget be amended to reflect movement in the programme, attributable to approved budget increases and updates to spending profiles.
4. To approve the virements below £0.5m between capital schemes to maximise use of funding resources available to the City Council set out in the appendix to these minutes.
5. To note that capital resources will be maximised and managed to ensure the capital programme 2018/19 remains fully funded and that no resources are foregone.
6. To note that approval of movements and transfers to the Manchester City Council capital programme will reflect a revised capital programme budget of

£468.2m and a latest full year forecast of £397.2m. Expenditure to the end of December 2018 is £265.9m.

7. For projects carried out on behalf of Greater Manchester, to agree that the capital budget be amended to reflect movement in the programme, attributable to approved budget increases and updates to spending profiles.
8. To note that approval of movements and transfers to the Greater Manchester capital programme will reflect a revised capital programme budget of £132.3m against a latest full year forecast of £95.8m. Expenditure to the end of December 2018 is £70.3m.

[Exe/19/11 to Exe/19/22 in Part Proceedings A]

Exe/19/23 Council Tax Support Scheme Changes

In October 2016 we had considered and endorsed for public consultation a revised Council Tax Support (CTS) Scheme (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). In September 2018 the City Treasurer had proposed further changes to the CTS Scheme, and it had been agreed that those proposals should be the subject of public consultation (Minute Exe/18/90).

A report submitted by the City Treasurer set out the outcome of the consultation, and the responses to the issues that had been raised by consultees. The report proposed that the revised scheme be adopted. An Equalities Impact Assessment was appended to the report setting out the more detailed equalities issues that would arise if the recommendations in the report were accepted and implemented.

The consultation had run from 5 November 2018 to 16 December 2018. The consultation documents had been provided on the Council website and paper questionnaires were sent to Libraries, advice groups in the city, the Customer Service Centre, and also to Councillors to distribute. A direct-mail distribution of 30,000 questionnaires had also been employed, sent to 5,911 Universal Credit households currently claiming CTS, 9,089 other households currently claiming CTS, and 15,000 other households paying Council Tax without claiming CTS.

A total of 1,051 responses had been received including 809 paper questionnaires and 242 online responses. The report set out a detailed examination of the responses: 55% of the respondents had agreed that the Council should change to a banded CTS scheme from April 2019, 12% had disagreed and 33% had not expressed a view either way.

The report explained that Universal Credit was to become the single mainstream source of benefits for most working age people on low income. Officers within the Council had therefore been considering the impact of Universal Credit on the Council Tax Support scheme, and how best to provide support to people claiming Universal Credit. It had been concluded that it would be appropriate to align Manchester's Council Tax Support Scheme with Universal Credit (UC), particularly if that would

enable the Council to draw on the assessment work carried out by the Department of Work and Pensions.

As a result of the analysis a banded scheme was being proposed. For a person entitled to UC, if their income was below their applicable amount or the same as their applicable amount, their Council Tax Support would be 82.5% of their Council Tax liability less any non-dependant deductions applicable. For those with a higher income their Council Tax Support would be the lower percentage according to the amount by which their income was above their applicable amount. The proposed banding being:

Excess weekly income greater than	Excess weekly income no more than	% reduction of Council Tax liability
£80.01	-	Nil
£75.01	£80.00	12%
£50.01	£75.00	30%
£25.01	£50.00	45%
£0.01	£25.00	70%
-	£0.00	82.5%

The report examined the implication of this on claimants and described the steps that would need to be taken for the successful changeover to a banded scheme, including how to avoid frequent trivial changes and what transitional arrangements should apply for those who would see a reduction in their support under these proposals.

Having considered details as set out in the report, the outcome of the consultation and the views expressed by the consultees, and also the finding of the Equality Impact Assessment, it was agreed that the proposed changes should be brought into effect from 1 April 2019.

Decisions

1. Note the outcomes of the consultation process and the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) both of which have supported and informed the final recommendations.
2. Make the following changes to the Council Tax Support Scheme from 1 April 2019 in respect of people entitled to Universal Credit.
 - i. A person for whom the Council receives both an electronic notification of a new claim for, and subsequently a related first payment of, Universal Credit from the Department for Work and Pensions shall be deemed to have made a claim for a reduction under this scheme on the first day of entitlement to Universal Credit to which that notification of first payment refers.
 - ii. The amount of an award in respect of a day under this scheme for a person entitled to Universal Credit shall be a percentage of the amount set by the authority as the Council Tax for the relevant financial year in respect

of the dwelling in which he is a resident and for which he is liable. This is subject to any discount which may be appropriate to that dwelling under the 1992 Act, divided the number of days in that financial year, less the daily rate of any deductions in respect of non-dependants which fall to be made. That percentage shall be the percentage specified in the following table according to the band in which their excess income falls.

Excess weekly income greater than	Excess weekly income no more than	% reduction of Council Tax liability
£80.01	-	Nil
£75.01	£80.00	12%
£50.01	£75.00	30%
£25.01	£50.00	45%
£0.01	£25.00	70%
-	£0.00	82.5%

- iii. People who have a temporary break in their Council Tax Support (up to six months) because an associated award of Universal Credit has ended or the amount of Universal Credit in payment rises to a level that ends entitlement to Council Tax Support and that award of Universal Credit is subsequently reinstated (whether at the same rate or at a different rate) or drops to a level that triggers eligibility for Council Tax Support, are required to make a new claim for Council Tax Support. A new claim in these circumstances shall be treated as made on the date on which entitlement to Universal Credit resumed / reduced or six months before the day on which the claim is actually received, whichever is the later.
 - iv. The Council will monitor and review the Council Tax Support Scheme to ensure that it continues to support the Council's policies. The Council Tax Support Scheme may be amended for subsequent years, but should this happen there will be further consultation. If no revised scheme is published, this scheme will continue to apply to subsequent years. However, the figures set out in the scheme in respect of applicable amounts, income and capital disregards and non-dependants deductions may still be uprated to allow for inflation. Any such uprating will take effect on 1 April each year. If the figures provided in the prescribed requirements change, the Council reserves the right to amend the figures quoted in the scheme without further consultation.
 - v. Where the Council receives notification from the Department for Work and Pensions of a change to Universal Credit and the changed assessment does not result in an alteration to the amount of a reduction under this scheme, the Council is not required to notify the claimant of its recording of that change.
3. Agree that the Council's Discretionary Council Tax Payment Scheme is used to support households during the transitional period of moving to the banded scheme and Universal Credit. The scheme would cover the current anomalous and exceptional circumstances as well as supporting those households

disproportionately impacted by Universal Credit transfer including families with children.

Exe/19/24 Council Tax Charges on Empty Properties

In November 2018 the Government had introduced powers for councils to charge increased Council Tax Premiums for long term empty (LTE) properties that had been unoccupied and unfurnished for over two years. These powers extended the 50% empty property premium that had been introduced by the Council in April 2013 (Minute Exe/13/006). In December 2018 the Executive had considered a proposal to introduce those higher premiums and it had been agreed then that there should be public consultation on that change (Minute Exe/18/111).

The Rating (Property in Common Occupation) and Council Tax (Empty Property Bill) Act 2018 had received Royal Assent on 1 November 2018. The Act gave councils discretion to apply increased LTE Premiums on unoccupied and unfurnished properties to further encourage owners of long term empty properties to find ways to bring them back in to use. The premiums that would be allowed were:

- 200% of the Council Tax from 1 April 2019 if empty for more than two years
- 300% of the Council Tax from 1 April 2020 if empty for more than five years
- 400% of the Council Tax from 1 April 2021 if empty for more than ten years

The report explained that a range of consultation methods had been employed to reach as many potentially affected landlords as possible. The consultation had been open from 17 December 2018 to 14 January 2019, and in that time 344 responses had been received. The breakdown of those was:

- 303 from members of the public,
- 43 from landlords of a property in Manchester that was not empty,
- 19 described themselves as 'other',
- 12 from local business owners,
- 10 from landlords of a property in Manchester that was empty,
- 5 from a local charity, voluntary or community organisation,
- 1 was a local councillor.

The report examined the responses and there was general support for all the changes being proposed, including that 76% of respondents agreed and 19% disagreed with the proposal that the Council should increase the Council Tax charge for homes that were unoccupied and unfurnished for two years or more, with the amount charged increasing the longer the property was empty.

The report set out the predicted financial impacts of the changes, both on landlords and on the Council's income. The total revenue impact of the change was predicted to be over £1.3m in 2019/20.

The report also explained that an Equality Impact Assessment had been carried out on these proposals, and a copy of the findings of that assessment was appended to the report.

Having considered the outcome of the consultation and the findings of the Equality Impact Assessment it was agreed that the proposed changes set out in the report should be introduced with effect from 1 April 2019.

Decisions

1. Note the outcomes of the consultation exercise and the Equality Relevance Assessment, both of which have informed the final recommendations.
2. Adopt the discretionary powers to charge higher levels of Council Tax on properties that have been unoccupied and unfurnished for two, five and ten years.
3. Remove the 100% discount currently available for up to one month when a property first becomes unoccupied and unfurnished.
4. Remove the 50% discount available for up to one year when a property is unoccupied due to major works or structural alterations.

Exe/19/25 Northern Gateway Strategic Regeneration Framework Update

The area then defined as the “Northern Gateway” extended in a north-eastern arc from Victoria Station, taking in the neighbourhoods of NOMA, the Lower Irk Valley, New Cross and Collyhurst. This area covered 155 hectares, running from the City Centre to the intermediate relief route (Queen’s Road). It was bisected by the key arterial roads to Rochdale and Oldham, and the main trans-Pennine rail line and northern metrolink routes.

Plans for the regeneration of this area have been under consideration for some years. Approval had been given in September 2015 to identify and appoint a private sector investor and delivery partner to work alongside the council to unlock and deliver the significant residential potential of an area (Minute Exe/15/099). In March 2017 it was reported that the development partner had been found – the Far East Consortium International Ltd (Minute Exe/17/065). In March 2018 we noted the progress that was being made in the production of a draft Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) and Masterplan for the area (Minute Exe/18/028). In July 2018 we had considered a draft of the revised SRF for the area and agreed that the revised document should be subject to public consultation (Minute Exe/18/074).

A report now submitted by the Strategic Director (Development) explained that the consultation had run for eight weeks between 6 August and 1 October 2018. A range of methods had been used including a questionnaire and letters sent to properties, businesses and landlords in the Northern Gateway area, information on the council’s website and six consultation drop-in sessions for members of the public. In total 423 people attended the drop-in sessions, 98 written responses were received via the consultation questionnaire with a further 25 written representations received from a mix of landowners, businesses, statutory consultees, and other non-statutory stakeholders.

The report examined the issues that the consultees had raised in their responses. The majority of responses were generally supportive, with at least 70% of respondents agreeing or strongly agreeing with each of the Design and Development Principles in the draft SRF. The specific issues that consultees had raised were described and responded to in the report, including the views of other local authorities, statutory agencies, statutory undertakers and utilities, and major landowners. Appended to the report was a schedule of the revisions made to the SRF as a result of the consultation, and other changes.

Having taken into consideration the outcome of the consultation, the responses to the issues raised by consultees and the proposed changes to the draft SRF, it was agreed that the revised document be adopted.

Decisions

1. Note the comments received on the draft SRF and the response to these comments.
2. Note the changes made to the SRF as set out in the report.
3. Approve the Northern Gateway SRF with the intention that it will become a material consideration in the Council's decision making process as Local Planning Authority.

Exe/19/26 Northern Gateway Implementation and Delivery

A report submitted by the Strategic Director (Development) set out details of the Phase 1 Implementation Strategy for the Northern Gateway. It explained that the Council had entered into a joint venture with the Far East Consortium (FEC) in April 2017 for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Northern Gateway for housing and ancillary development. As part of the delivery arrangements, the Council and FEC had established a joint venture (JV) company, Northern Gateway Operations Limited (OpCo), to have strategic input into and oversight of the development of the Northern Gateway area.

It was reported that the Government's Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) had been identified as the most significant potential source of funding that could be utilised to support a range of investment within major infrastructure projects to help accelerate and unlock housing delivery in the Northern Gateway. Making a bid for money from the fund was proposed and supported. That money could be directed toward physical infrastructure to support new and existing communities or toward land acquisition in order to accelerate the creation of place and housing delivery.

The report explained that Council Officers had been working on a feasibility study and outline phasing strategy for the delivery of up to 530 new homes in the Collyhurst neighbourhoods, of which up to 130 were to be built for social rent resulting in at least 20% of the new build housing being affordable. The process to be followed to identify the possible sites for those developments was agreed.

It was noted that the potential upfront costs associated with acquiring sites for future development had meant that the JV partners had explored opportunities for a co-investment arrangement with the Council. It was now anticipated that this co-investment in land assembly would be in the form of a commercial loan from the Council, set at a rate of interest acceptable to both parties and which would be State Aid compliant. The principle of using such an approach was endorsed. The terms of that loan were to be the subject of a report to a further meeting.

Decisions

1. To note the contents of the report and the progress being made to establish appropriate governance and implementation arrangements to secure the delivery of the Northern Gateway initiative.
2. To note that the City Council has submitted an Expression of Interest for the Northern Gateway to be designated for inclusion within the Government's Garden Communities Programme and request that a further report is brought back to a future meeting once the outcome of this submission is known.
3. To note the update provided in relation to the progress being made in developing an application for Housing Infrastructure Fund to support the delivery of the Northern Gateway initiative.
4. To delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Strategic Director (Development) to finalise and submit the Housing Infrastructure Fund application to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government by the deadline of 22 March 2019 and to request that a further report on the outcome of this bid is brought to a future meeting of the Executive, together with any proposals for the investment of any funding that is secured.
5. To note the intention to deliver an early phase of development within Collyhurst as well as on the edge of the City Centre
6. To delegate authority to the Strategic Director, Development in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration and local elected members to identify appropriate locations for the delivery of up to 530 new homes, including up to 130 new Council Houses, within the Collyhurst neighbourhood so that detailed consultations can be undertaken with the local community to draw up proposals for a detailed funding and delivery plan, for consideration by a future meeting of the Executive.
7. To note the intention to prepare a costed schedule of place-making interventions for the Phase 1 development area which will be used by the Local Planning Authority as the basis for negotiating Section 106 developer contributions. All developments will be expected to provide Section 106 contributions towards the provision of identified place-making activities.
8. To note the progress being made in assembling land to deliver the objectives of the Northern Gateway programme.

9. To delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the City Solicitor, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to negotiate the terms of a commercial loan between the Council and Far East Consortium (FEC) to support land acquisition as part of the Joint Venture programme, noting that approval of the loan would be subject a decision by the Council.

10. To delegate authority to the City Solicitor to enter into and complete all documents or agreements necessary to give effect to the decisions above.

Exe/19/27 Decision Notices of the GMCA, the AGMA Executive and a joint meeting of the GMCA and the AGMA Executive

Decision

To receive and note the Decision Notices for the meetings of the Joint GMCA and AGMA Executive on 11 January 2019, the GMCA on 25 January 2019, and the AGMA Executive on 25 January 2019.

Appendix to Minute Exe/19/10 – Proposed Capital Virements

Proposed Capital Virements £m	2018/19 Virement	2019/20 Virement	2020/21 Virement	2021/22 Virement
Highways				
Highways Stand Alone Projects				
Public Realm	175	557		
Hostile Vehicles Mitigation Measures	-175	-89		
Automatic Bollard Replacement		-468		
Drainage		184		
Other Improvement works		-184		
Total Highways	0	0	0	0
Private Sector Housing				
Collyhurst Regeneration			-505	-565
Collyhurst Acquisition & Demolition (Overbrook & Needwood Close)			505	565
Total Private Sector	0	0	0	0
Public Sector Housing				
01.00 Northwards - External Work				
Environmental improvements Moston corolites	87			
Charlestown - Victoria Ave multi-storey replacement door entry systems	-19	-182	3,480	
Electricity North West distribution network phase 4 (various)	-122	-163		
External cyclical works phase 3a		-10		
External cyclical works phase 3b Ancoats Smithfields estate		10		
Delivery Costs		220	-125	
Replacement door entry Clifford Lamb Ct and Monsall multi storey blocks		-95		
02.00 Northwards - Internal Work				
Decent Homes mop ups phase 9 and decent homes work required to voids	27		-27	
Collyhurst - Rainwater pipes/guttering rectification work	-141	-85		
Boiler replacement programme	-75	-246	261	
Kitchen and Bathrooms programme	-2,107	-1,224	34	
Aldbourn Court/George Halstead Court/Duncan Edwards Court works		81		
Harpurhey - Monsall Multi Internal Works		2,385	85	
Fire precautions multi storey blocks	-676	-746	-500	

Proposed Capital Virements £m	2018/19 Virement	2019/20 Virement	2020/21 Virement	2021/22 Virement
Installations of sprinkler systems - multi storey blocks	-2,000	-2,779		
Various - Bradford/Clifford Lamb/Kingsbridge/Sandyhill Court Internal Works		2,471	108	
Collyhurst - Mossbrook/Roach/Vauxhall/Humphries Court Internal Works		2,791	106	
Replacement of Prepayment Meters in High Rise Blocks	-58	-694	20	
Delivery Costs		265	23	
05.00 Northwards - Off Debits/Conversions				
Bringing Studio Apartments back in use	-57	-78		
Delivery Costs		-12		
06.00 Homeless Accommodation				
Delivery Costs		19	19	
12.00 Northwards - Acquisitions				
Northwards Acquisitions	32			
Stock Acquisitions	-32			
14.00 Northwards - Adaptations				
Northwards Housing Programme	5,141	-1,928	-3,484	
Total Public Sector Housing (HRA)	0	0	0	0
Children's Services				
Basic Need				
Cheetham Academy	-14			
Cavendish Community - Increase capacity	-266			
Ashbury Meadow - Increase capacity	-71			
E-Act Academy - increase capacity	-11			
Claremont - Increase capacity	-71			
Briscoe Lane Academy	-23			
Manchester Communication Primary Academy	-224			
Dean Trust Ardwick	4			
United Learning Trust - William Hulme	47			
Lytham Rd	-143			
Co-op Academy expansion	270			
St Matthews RC	-172			
Beaver Rd Primary Expansion	-14			
Lily Lane Primary	-305			
St. James Primary Academy	-57			

Proposed Capital Virements £m	2018/19 Virement	2019/20 Virement	2020/21 Virement	2021/22 Virement
Crossacres Primary School	-17			
Ringway Primary School	-166			
Webster Primary School	-49			
St. Chrysostom's Primary School	160			
Camberwell Park Specialist School	65			
Piper Hill Special School	224			
SEND Programme		8,365	15,150	
Basic need - unallocated funds	833	-8,365	-15,150	
Schools Maintenance				
Abraham Moss - Hall Heating	-4			
Moston Lane - re-roof	-338			
Chorlton CofE Primary Rewire	1			
Wilbraham Primary Roof	19			
Abbott Primary School Fencing	-15			
Pike Fold Community Primary - Ground Stabilisation - Survey artificial play area	1			
Charlestown Primary Defects	-14			
All Saints Primary School	-1			
Collyhurst Nursery School	2			
Armitage CE Primary	3			
Higher Openshaw Community School - Renew Boiler	-25			
Crowcroft Park Primary School - Roof Repairs	-9			
Abbot Community Primary - Ext Joinery Repair	-14			
St Mary's - Joinery Repairs	-21			
Sandilands - Joinery Repairs	12			
Cheetwood - Rewire	112			
Pike Fold Community School - Repairs to air handling units	-11			
Button Lane Primary - Boiler Installation	-24			
Schools Capital Maintenance - unallocated	326			
Education Standalone Projects				
Tiny Tigers Ltd-Cheetham Children Centre	79			
Early Education for Two Year Olds - Unallocated	-79			
Total Children's Services	0	0	0	0
ICT Capital				
ICT Infrastructure & Mobile Working				
Citrix 7.6 Migration	2			

Proposed Capital Virements £m	2018/19 Virement	2019/20 Virement	2020/21 Virement	2021/22 Virement
Mobile Device Refresh	3			
PSN Windows 2003	-26			
Data Centre UPS Installation	-10			
Core Switch Firmware	-30			
Income Management	-32			
Customer & Bus. Relationship Management System	-32			
Corporate Reporting Tool (Business Objects)	3			
Communications Room Replacement Phase 2	5			
New Rent Collection System		9		
ICT Investment Plan	117	-9		
Total ICT	0	0	0	0
Total CAPITAL PROGRAMME	0	0	0	0

This page is intentionally left blank

Health Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2019

Present:

Councillor Farrell – in the Chair
Councillors Clay, Curley, Lynch, Mary Monaghan, Paul, Riasat, Wills and Wilson

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing
Councillor Midgley, Assistant Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing
Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources
Nick Gomm, Director of Corporate Affairs, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Peter Blythin, Director Single Hospital Service
Professor Matthew Makin, Clinical Director at North Manchester General Hospital
Michael McCourt, Chief Executive, Manchester Local Care Organisation
Dr Sohail Munshi, Medical Director, Manchester Local Care Organisation
Mark Edwards, Chief Operating Officer, Manchester Local Care Organisation
Steve Wilson, Executive Lead for Finance and Investment, Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Partnership
Ed Dyson, Executive Director of Planning and Operations, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning

Apologies: Councillor Holt, O'Neil and Reeves

HSC/19/06 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2019 as a correct record.

HSC/19/07 Single Hospital Service Progress Report

The Committee considered a report of the Director, Single Hospital Service that provided an update on the City of Manchester Single Hospital Service Programme. It set out the work that had taken place since the creation of Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust (MFT) on 1 October 2017 and described the approach used within MFT to track the anticipated benefits of the merger. It also outlined the part MFT was playing in the work being led by Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Partnership to transfer North Manchester General Hospital (NMGH) into MFT.

The Director, Single Hospital Service referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Providing a background and rationale for the SHS;
- Describing the work of the Integration Steering Group (ISG), chaired by the Director for the Single Hospital Service, that continued to oversee delivery of all

- integration work streams, providing resource and support to help work stream leads deliver their objectives;
- An update on the Integration Programme, noting the published Year One Post-Merger Report;
 - A description of the benefits realised for both staff and patients in relation to a range of services; and
 - An update on the proposed acquisition of North Manchester General Hospital.

The Committee were also shown two videos that demonstrated the improvements that had been achieved to date and how staff had been engaged throughout this process.

A Member sought clarification on the role of the Council of Governors and enquired if they would vote on the final decision to incorporate NMGH into the City of Manchester Single Hospital Service Programme. The Director Single Hospital Service reported that the Council of Governors had been established to review the probity and governance of the transition process and ensure that due diligence had been observed, however they would not have a vote on the final decision to transfer NMGH into MFT.

Members expressed their frustration at the length of time taken to incorporate NMGH into the City of Manchester Single Hospital Service Programme and asked what could be done to speed this process up. Members enquired if the recent senior management change at Salford Royal had any impact on this process. The Executive Lead for Finance and Investment, Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Partnership acknowledged the frustrations expressed by the Committee. He commented that the process was complex and was dictated by national guidance and process, however the commitment was given at a Greater Manchester level to move NMGH into the SHS, stating that the strategic case would be completed by March 2019 and this would be followed by a national agreement to proceed to implementation phase. He said that all partners, both local and national, including NHS Improvement recognised the case to move NMGH into the SHS and were positively involved with delivering this programme. He further commented that risks associated with this programme were closely monitored and reviewed to support this transaction.

Members sought an assurance on how any financial deficit Pennine Acute Hospital Trust had would be apportioned to NMGH. The Executive Lead for Finance and Investment, Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Partnership explained that this was being carefully considered. He further responded to a question regarding the suggestion that services would be disrupted or withdrawn at the NMGH site prior to the move to the SHS by giving an assurance to the Committee that the expectation was to maintain the current service at the site and any change would have to be considered by the Transaction Board.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing sought an assurance that had previously been given to the Committee that Members would be informed of any proposed changes to service prior to them being implemented would continue to be honoured. The Director Single Hospital Service said that he remained committed to this request.

A Member commented that rumours frequently circulated amongst residents in North Manchester regarding the removal of services at NMGH and recommended that the senior leadership team at NMGH provided the Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing and the Chair of the Health Scrutiny Committee with regular updates regarding the progress on the move of NMGH into the City of Manchester Single Hospital Service Programme.

The Director Single Hospital Service acknowledged the comment regarding rumours and stated that they sought to address this by holding monthly team meetings to address any concerns and answer any questions staff had. He said that these sessions were very well attended and had proved useful. He further commented that the staff were the Trusts strongest asset and the delivery of the SHS provided an opportunity to look at the terms and conditions of staff and pay grades to harmonise this across the estate. He said this was being undertaken with the full involvement from staff side.

In response to a question from a Member regarding the number of patients currently attending NMGH who would be diverted to other sites with Pennine Acute Trust the Clinical Director at North Manchester General Hospital said that this had been modelled and figures would be circulated following the meeting. He said that this activity needed to be considered in the context of other wider programmes, such as Healthier Together, noting that in addition to providing a service for local residents NMGH delivered specialised services, such as the Infectious Diseases Department. The Committee noted that the identity of each hospital would be retained as this was understood by the local population. He further commented that the recent change at Salford Royal would not have any impact to this programme of work.

In response to a question regarding patient and public engagement the Director of Corporate Affairs, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning said that a number of events had been delivered in North Manchester and the programme of delivering Health Checks in the area provided an opportunity for staff to engage with residents and make them aware of the proposals and obtain their views. In addition, regular meetings were held with Healthwatch and strong relationships had been established with local faith groups.

In response to a concern expressed by a Member regarding patient choice the Executive Director of Planning and Operations, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning said that the delivery of the SHS would not impact on the provision of patient pathways and patient choice would be maintained.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing said that she welcomed the discussion at the meeting and stressed the importance of bringing NMGH into the City of Manchester Single Hospital Service Programme as quickly and as safely as possible. She further welcomed the stated commitment given that any proposed changes to the services delivered at NMGH would be reported to the Committee.

Decision

The Committee;

1. Express their disappointment at the length of time taken to incorporate North Manchester General Hospital into the City of Manchester Single Hospital Service Programme;
2. Welcomes the commitment given that the Committee would be informed of and consulted with on any proposed changes to services at North Manchester General Hospital prior to them being implemented; and
3. Requests that a progress report be submitted for consideration at an appropriate time.

HSC/19/08 Manchester Local Care Organisation

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Executive, Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO) that provided Members with an update on the progress made across core business areas of MLCO.

The Chief Executive, MLCO referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Describing the MLCO Delivery Priorities in 2018/19 that had been defined by the business plan which was approved by Partners at the MLCO Partnership Board in March 2018;
- High Impact Primary Care, the key new care model that had been designed as a response to the small percentage of the Manchester population that were very vulnerable and had such complex health and social care needs that they find it difficult to navigate and access the standard services offered across General Practice, community nursing and social care;
- An update on Integrated Neighbourhood Working;
- Manchester Community Response (MCR), a seven-day service that provided community based intermediate care, reablement and rehabilitation services to patients, often older people, after leaving hospital or when they are at risk of being sent to hospital;
- An update on the Adult Social Care Improvement Programme;
- Engagement activities with staff, partners and patients;
- Describing the MRI priority discharges and escalation work to support local people by working to prevent the need for admission to hospital wherever possible, and getting people home from hospital in a timely and safe manner when they do need hospital care; and
- MLCO Business Plan and Phase 2.

Members welcomed the report and the progress delivered to date, noting that some Members of the Committee had recently met the Neighbourhood Leads in their area. A Member commented that he was disappointed that the report did not mention any work or activities with Public Health. The Chief Executive, MLCO noted the comment, however reassured the Committee that addressing the social injustice of health inequalities and delivering preventative work was fundamental to the work and success of the MLCO.

A Member enquired what was being done to support the cohort of patients who had historically found it difficult to engage with services, such as drug and mental health services due to entrenched problems, or on occasion services had failed to support patients with complex needs appropriately due to services working in silos. The Chief Executive, MLCO commented that the MLCO brought teams of health professionals together, with the correct skills set to better coordinate and deliver care in a multi-disciplinary and collaborative manner.

The Director of Adult Social Care stated that the Complex Reablement Team had been established to engage with and offer the appropriate support and treatment for those patients with complex needs from staff with the appropriate skills set, as it was recognised that services had not previously addressed those patients needs in a coordinated way.

The Chief Operating Officer, MLCO advised that the leadership role within the Neighbourhood Teams would be responsible for coordinating services and care across those teams and the system would be flexible to respond to need so that the correct interventions could be delivered to support people appropriately. He further informed the Committee that a Mental Health Lead would be appointed to each Neighbourhood Team which was welcomed by the Members.

A Member noted that people often fell into difficulties with their housing provider as a consequence of their health and that had an impact on both them and their families. The Chief Executive, MLCO commented that the wider determinants of health were understood and that included housing. The Director of Adult Social Care advised that a dedicated post within the MLCO would be established to focus on the issue of housing.

In response to a question regarding the reported increase in Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards referrals the Director of Adult Social Care said that this reflected a national trend following a recent High Court Judgement ruling. She said that teams are currently being recruited to respond to this increase in demand.

Decision

To note the report.

HSC/19/09 Updated Financial Strategy and Directorate Business Plans 2019-20

Further to item HSC/18/50 the Committee considered the report of the Chief Executive and the City Treasurer that provided an update on the Council's financial position and set out next steps in the budget process, including scrutiny of the draft budget proposals and Directorate Business Plan reports by this Committee.

The Committee was invited to consider and make recommendations to the Executive on the budget proposals which are within the remit of this Committee and to comment on the Directorate Business Plans which had been designed to ensure the

Council invests in the services that are valued by its residents, achieving both high quality services and outcomes for residents as well as a balanced budget.

The Committee considered the Manchester Health and Care Commissioning - Adult Social Care Business Plan and Pooled Budget contribution 2019/20.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing commented that continued austerity and unfair local government funding settlements had a significant detrimental effect on the lives of Manchester residents and the provision of a range services. She said that the Council's financial planning and investment in the Airport Group had supported the delivery of services and further commented that an assumption and reliance on Council Tax to fund Adult Social Care was fundamentally flawed and was not sustainable long term.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing said that the Council remained committed to protecting vulnerable residents from the worst of these financial cuts and remained committed to improving services. She commented that the increase in the number of people who were homeless and rough sleeping could be linked to the imposition of welfare reform and the introduction of Universal Credit.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources said that the funding allocation model was flawed and needed to change to ensure residents of the city received a fair settlement, noting that it did not take into account density or deprivation levels. He said that the budget that had been presented was designed to protect the most vulnerable in the city.

Members of the Committee commented that the decade of austerity that had been imposed on Manchester had been very unfair and had impacted on the lives of many Manchester residents. The Committee thanked the Executive Members and the officers for investing what money was available into protecting and improving those services that helped the most vulnerable in the city. Members further commented that government needed to invest appropriate funding into preventative activities and Public Health, in addition to delivering a fair financial settlement for Manchester.

Members discussed the need to consider the terms and conditions of those staff who deliver homecare, noting that staff were not paid for travel time. The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing said that Manchester City Council had pledged its support to the Ethical Care Charter and would use its influence through the commissioning and procurement process to drive improvements to the terms and conditions of those staff working in the care sector.

Decision

To note the reports and recommend that the comments of the Committee are submitted to the 13 February 2019 meeting of Executive for consideration.

HSC/19/10 Overview Report

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.

Decision

To note the report and approve the work programme.

Health Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2019

Present:

Councillor Farrell – in the Chair
Councillors Battle, Clay, Curley, Holt, Lynch, Mary Monaghan, O’Neil, Paul, Riasat, Reeves and Wills

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing
Nick Gomm, Director of Corporate Affairs, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning

Dr Chris Ward, Consultant Physician Genitourinary Medicine, The Northern Integrated Contraception, Sexual Health & HIV Service

Matthew Swanborough, Director of Corporate Resilience, MFT

Marie Rowland, Associate Director of Performance, MFT

Paul Thomas, Urgent Care System Resilience Manager, MHCC

Mark Edwards, Chief Operating Officer, Manchester Local Care Organisation

Dr Rosemary Morton, Emergency Medical Consultant, MFT

Apologies: Councillors Paul and Wilson

HSC/19/11 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2019 as a correct record.

HSC/19/12 Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) National Trial Expansion

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Population Health and Wellbeing that provided information on the implications for Manchester following the announcement by NHS England in January 2019 of the plans to expand the Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) Impact Trial to 26,000 participants by 2020. This represented a doubling of the current number of people on the trial nationally.

Dr Chris Ward, Consultant Physician Genitourinary Medicine, The Northern Integrated Contraception, Sexual Health & HIV Service referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Providing a description of PrEP as a way for people who did not have HIV, but who were at substantial risk of HIV infection to reduce their risk of acquiring HIV;
- Information on the eligibility criteria for the PrEP Impact Trial;
- Information on the treatment pathway for trial participants;
- Data on the current trials across Greater Manchester clinics, noting that this was overseen by the PrEP Programme Oversight Board that was jointly chaired by Public Health England (PHE) and NHS England;

- At their meeting of 15 January 2019 the PrEP Oversight Board had supported in principle the recommendation to double the number of trial places so that it could address emerging questions from the trial and more robustly inform the design and rollout of a full national programme;
- Noting that the Board had asked that a rapid engagement exercise with local authority commissioners and research sites be undertaken to assess their capacity to accept additional places; and
- Information on the Manchester response to this announcement to expand the trial and a description of the next steps, including the consideration to be given to improving access and pre booking appointments.

Members of the Committee noted that whilst they fully supported the extension of the trial, even with a doubling of the size the demand and waiting lists remained significantly high. A Member further commented that in reality the number of people who would benefit from PrEP would be higher still. The Committee were unanimous in calling for the national roll out of PrEP, appropriately funded by the NHS.

Dr Ward responded to comments from the Committee by stating that it was recognised that many people were registered on more than one waiting list to be accepted onto the trial. He said that to address this, work was ongoing to establish one waiting list across Greater Manchester that could be centrally administrated to remove any duplication. He said that whilst people remained on the waiting list they were encouraged to purchase PrEP online, noting that regrettably there were cases where people had contracted HIV whilst on the waiting list. He said that for those people who could not afford to purchase PrEP at approximately £19 per week, applications could be submitted to the Terrence Higgins Trust hardship fund, and if successful the individual would be provided with a code that they could use to purchase PrEP online. Dr Ward further stated that consultants would support those smaller clinics to deliver any extended programme.

In response to a question from a Member regarding follow up appointments, Dr Ward informed the Committee that nobody was compelled to attend appointments, however national guidance recommended 3 monthly follow up appointments. He said part of the study was also to understand people's patterns of behaviour when taking PrEP, noting that people's attitude and understanding of risk changed depending on their relationship status.

Members noted that the number of trial places for people not in the category of 'Men who have sex with men' (MSM) were not recruited to in the majority of trial locations. Dr Ward commented that these places could not be reallocated to MSM patients, however work was ongoing with a range of partners to reach out to other groups identified as being of a high risk of contracting HIV, commenting that if a person came forward that met the criteria they could be allocated a place on the trial immediately as there were currently no waiting lists for this cohort. He further advised that MSM in central Manchester were aware of PrEP, however this was not always the case in other areas of Greater Manchester and work was ongoing to train health professionals on the subject of PrEP so they could raise awareness of this with patients identified as being at risk.

The Director of Population Health and Wellbeing stated that Sexual Health services were underfunded nationally and the contingency fund of £25k identified to support the additional trial clinics would invariably have an impact on the delivery of other services. He said that lobbying was ongoing to secure additional funding from NHS England. Members commented that the funding arrangements were grossly unfair, unsustainable and ultimately put peoples' lives at risk and made reference to the motion adopted by Council at their meeting of 30 January 2019.

The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing commented that lobbying of central government for adequate funding was also ongoing at a Greater Manchester level, commenting that the decision not to fund this service could be seen as an ideological decision by the government.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

HSC/19/13 Winter Pressures

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Performance and Quality Improvement and the Integrated Commissioning and Chair of the Manchester / Trafford Urgent and Emergency Care Board that provided an overview of urgent care winter pressures for 2018/19.

Matthew Swanborough, Director of Corporate Resilience, MFT referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Information on the joint system-wide planning taken across the Manchester urgent care system;
- The surge and escalation approach taken in order to manage periods of pressure; and
- The resulting impact on the 4 hour performance target in Accident and Emergency Departments (A&E).

Members noted that the report did not contain any comparative data which made it very difficult to assess any improvements in performance. Paul Thomas, Urgent Care System Resilience Manager, MHCC stated that in line with national reporting the performance against targets was reducing. He further informed the Committee that a full analysis of the 10 key interventions that had been agreed across the health and social care system for winter would be undertaken.

Dr Rosemary Morton, Emergency Medical Consultant, MFT stated that there had been a 7% increase in the number of attendees at A&E, stating that those patients attending A&E had higher medical needs. She described that patients would be assessed and treatment provided was based on the patients clinical need, which made the 4 hour performance target to a certain extent meaningless.

Dr Morton explained that the majority of problems experienced in hospitals could be attributed to patient flow throughout the whole hospital. She said that work was

ongoing to address this, stating that a discharge lounge had been established to facilitate patient discharge in the mornings to free up bed space. She commented that improved patient flow improved the overall efficiency of a hospital.

Dr Morton addressed a question from a Member regarding the number of patients attending A&E for non emergency issues. She said that whilst this was always subjective, initial analysis of the available data indicated that many people attended A&E as they were unable to secure an appointment with their GP. She said more needed to be done to make people aware of other sources of non emergency health advice and care, such as pharmacies.

Mark Edwards, Chief Operating Officer, Manchester Local Care Organisation (LCO) stated that the continued development and delivery of the LCO would significantly support the pressures experienced by A&E Departments, especially for frail and elderly patients who presented. He said that the emerging model of care, delivered in neighbourhoods would identify care needs and deliver support and care for people to help them remain in their own home and community, supported by a range of appropriate, multi-disciplinary health and social care teams.

Marie Rowland, Associate Director of Performance stated that improvements had been made in regard to the treatment of patients presenting at A&E with mental health issues. She said that feedback from patients, families and carers had been very positive. She said that the delivery of an improved patient care pathway demonstrated the commitment to responding to mental health in the same way as physical health.

Matthew Swanborough, Director of Corporate Resilience, MFT responded to a question regarding the number of readmissions following discharge by stating that this was actively monitored and the rates of readmissions across the MFT site were low. He further replied to a question by confirming that the winter period was defined as December to April.

The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing stated that the continued commitment to delivering a seven day GP service would help divert people away from attending A&E unnecessarily, noting that the pressures experienced at hospitals were not confined to a four month period but were experienced all year. She also stated that work was ongoing to address the issue of recruiting and retaining staff by promoting the profession and the place as an attractive career option. She described that work was being delivered at a GM level to address this national issue and made reference to the 'Be a Greater Manchester Nurse' campaign.

Decisions

1. The Committee notes the report.
2. Requests that an update report is submitted in a years time and that the report contains comparative performance data against previous years.

HSC/19/14 Care Homes

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Adult Services that highlighted the current Care Quality Commission (CQC) and Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC) quality compliance status of the nursing and residential care homes across Manchester and explained the efforts being made to support and improve the standard of care and quality for the residents in receipt of those services, noting that the Our Manchester ambition was for all care homes to achieve good or outstanding CQC ratings within the next 2 years.

The Director of Adult Services referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Providing information on the current CQC rating of the nursing and residential care homes across Manchester and explaining the efforts being made to support and improve the standard of care and quality for the residents in receipt of those services;
- Describing the work undertaken by the performance and quality improvement (PQI) team with the inadequate care homes of Manchester since April 2017, had seen the reduction of the 7 providers we started with, to the current 1 that is in the City and was inspected in December 2018;
- Providing information on the PQI framework for adult social care (ASC). Describing that the framework brought health and social care colleagues closer together, and focused efforts in areas that needed it the most, such as care homes that were rated as “inadequate” or “requires improvement” with the CQC;
- All homes that had a “require improvement” rating from the CQC had been visited during 2018/19 in a prioritised order and were subject to a high level of scrutiny by the care home improvement group;
- The ASC PQI team were currently working with the two main tools within the framework to assess and monitor quality across the sector with care homes being the first cohort of providers;
- Information on the current CQC ratings for care homes in Manchester as of February 2019, noting that self-assessment used by the care homes rated as good and outstanding had also proven effective as services maintained their outcome following recent inspection;
- Describing the work undertaken at a Greater Manchester level to develop good practice;
- Describing the new models of care with future commissioning of care homes offering a more holistic approach to care placement and monitoring, in line with Our Manchester values; and
- Future improvement initiative.

Members welcomed the improvements reported to date and supported the stated ambition for all care homes to achieve good or outstanding CQC ratings within the next 2 years, noting that this demonstrated an Our Manchester approach to delivering improvements. A Member commented that consideration also needed to be given as to where Care Homes / Residential Homes were located as this was very important to people in receipt of care and their families.

A Member commented that it was very important to recognise that Care Home systems could be very difficult for families of those receiving care to navigate and it was important to remember at all times that it was people, who were potentially vulnerable who were in receipt of care in such places. The Director of Adult Services acknowledged and agreed with this comment.

The Director of Adult Services further referenced that the MLCO, MHCC and Manchester Metropolitan University had co-produced teaching care home packages which had prioritised the top 5-10 nursing and residential care settings that admitted the most number of patients into the Manchester Royal Infirmary, North Manchester General Hospital and Wythenshawe. The educational packages would be delivered by experts in subject areas such as catheter care, wound care, mobilisation, nutrition and hydration, dementia care and so forth.

The Performance and Quality Improvement Manager, Adult Social Care responded to questions from the Committee regarding sharing good practice and experience across care homes to help improve and maintain standards. He said that a 'buddy scheme' had been established to support homes identified as requiring improvement following inspection. A Member commented that those homes that had moved from a requires improvement rating to a good or outstanding CQC rating should be used as a 'Buddy' as these homes had successfully undertaken an improvement journey.

In response to a question from a Member, the Performance and Quality Improvement Manager, Adult Social Care informed the Committee that they actively worked with the CQC post inspection to address any issues identified and on occasion had successfully challenged ratings. He stated that the predominate issue identified for improvement by the CQC related to the category of 'Well Led' and work was ongoing across providers to address this.

The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing stated that a report on the ongoing Bed Based Review, that focused on the entire continuum of provision that was not either delivered within a person's home (e.g. homecare / domiciliary care) or within an acute setting and for which the person required a bed would be submitted to the Committee for consideration at an appropriate time.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

HSC/19/15 Overview Report

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.

Decision

To note the report and approve the work programme.

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 5 February 2019

Present:

Councillor Stone – in the Chair
Councillors Hewitson, T Judge [CYP/19/09 - CYP/19/12], Lovecy and Sadler

Co-opted Voting Members:

Mrs J Miles, Representative of the Diocese of Salford
Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative
Ms Z Stepan, Parent Governor Representative

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children's Services
Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources
Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Schools, Culture and Leisure

Professor Craig Harris, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC)

Apologies:

Councillors Alijah, McHale and Madeleine Monaghan
Mr A Arogundade, Parent Governor Representative
Mr L Duffy, Secondary sector teacher representative
Mrs B Kellner, Representative of the Diocese of Manchester
Mr R Lammam, Primary sector teacher representative

CYP/19/8 Minutes

The Chair informed Members that the session on the number of children becoming Looked After, which had taken place the previous week, had been very useful and that the presentation slides had been circulated to all Members.

Decision

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 8 January 2019.

CYP/19/9 Updated Financial Strategy and Directorate Business Plans 2019-20

Further to item CYP/18/63, the Committee received a report of the Chief Executive and City Treasurer which provided an update on the Council's financial position and set out the next steps in the budget process, including scrutiny of the draft budget proposals and Directorate Business Plan reports by the Committee.

The Committee also received a report of the Strategic Director for Children's and Education Services which set out in broad terms the directorate's key priorities, key activities and revenue and capital strategy for 2019-20; within the context of the Directorate Business Plan for the period 2017-20 and proposed savings. In addition, the report set out both the progress made to date in delivering identified savings and

focus for the final year of the three-year plan; refreshing the Directorate's Business Plan for 2018-20 in the context of changing resources, challenges and opportunities.

The Committee also received a report of the Director of Education which provided a summary of the confirmed Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) grant allocation from the 2019-20 settlement announced on the 16 December 2018 and the budget allocation across individual school budgets (ISB) and Council retained schools budget (RSB) which was reported to Schools Forum on 14 January 2019.

The Committee was asked to consider and make recommendations to the Executive on the budget proposals which were within its remit and to comment on the Directorate Business Plans which have been designed to ensure the Council invested in the services that were valued by its residents, achieving both high quality services and outcomes for residents as well as a balanced budget.

The Executive Member for Children's Services, the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources and the Executive Member for Schools, Culture and Leisure outlined the context of the reports, in particular the financial challenges the Council was facing. The Strategic Director for Children's and Education Services and the Head of Finance provided Members with an overview of the reports.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- To welcome the additional funding for Children's Services and to note the importance of budget saving targets being realistic;
- How inclusion of pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) could be improved;
- To request information on how school funding per pupil had changed in recent years;
- That some schools had a significant underspend on their budgets, which could be utilised elsewhere; and
- To thank Executive Members and officers for their hard work in developing the draft budget proposals and business plans in difficult financial circumstances.

The Strategic Director for Children's and Education Services reported that there was an increased demand for school places for children with SEND and drew Members' attention to the work taking place to increase the number of places in special schools and alternative provision; however, he reported that the aim was that children with SEND be integrated into mainstream schools wherever possible. The Head of Finance reported that, while school funding had increased, the number of pupils had also risen. She informed Members that she would provide details of school funding per pupil in recent years.

The Executive Member for Schools, Culture and Leisure reported that the Council had been working with schools which had a significant underspend on developing their plans for these funds and that, in some cases, schools had agreed to give the funds to the Council to re-allocate it to where it was needed.

Decisions

The Committee:-

1. Supports the draft budget proposals and the Children and Education Services Business Plan.
2. Supports the proposals set out in the Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) report, while noting that more funding was needed for the DSG, the High Needs Block and the Early Years Block and that Members would continue to lobby and challenge the government on this.
3. Asks the Head of Finance to provide details of school funding per pupil in recent years.

CYP/19/10 Children's Services Proxy Targets

The Committee received a presentation from the Deputy Director of Children's Services which provided proxy indicators on progress to improve children's services.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the presentation which included:

- Registrations for Early Help Assessments (EHAs);
- The reduction in referrals to children's social care;
- The reduction in the number of Children Missing from Home;
- The reduction in first time entrants to the Youth Justice System; and
- The formulation of the new Inclusion Strategy.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- That the way the information was provided in the scorecard was very useful;
- Request for clarification on the time period that the data related to;
- How children who were Missing From Education were tracked, particularly if they had left the city and their whereabouts was unknown;
- The capacity of the Early Help Hubs to expand to undertake more work; and
- When was the Inclusion Strategy due to be published.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services clarified that the data was a snapshot from a particular day, not aggregated figures. The Director of Children's and Education Services reported that the Council had a Casework Team which dealt with children who were Missing From Education. He informed Members that children who left the city remained on their caseload until the Council found out where they were, for example, if a new school requested their records or if it was confirmed that the

child had left the country. He reported that the team undertook enquiries with a range of bodies, including the UK Border Agency, other local authorities and the police to locate children. He suggested that the Committee might want to consider having a report on the strengthening of the safeguarding arrangements in relation to this. He informed Members that Early Help was not a service but a way of working and that the focus was on effective partnership working. The Executive Member for Children's Services informed Members about a recent school visit he had undertaken and advised Members that schools were already doing a lot of work to support families which was not currently recorded in the Early Help data. The Chair noted the value of visiting schools and reported that a date would be arranged for the Committee to visit St Brigid's RC Primary School.

The Strategic Director of Children's and Education Services reported that the Inclusion Strategy should be ready in time for the Committee's May 2019 meeting.

Decisions

1. To receive a report at a future meeting on the systems in place to safeguard children who are Missing From Education and whose whereabouts are unknown.
2. To receive the Inclusion Strategy at a future meeting.
3. To request that a visit be arranged to St Brigid's RC Primary School.

CYP/19/11 Edge of Care Services

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Children's Services which provided an update on the services and interventions supporting children on the edge of care (at risk of becoming 'looked after'). The report covered the range of approaches utilised and the impact achieved from the services and interventions, and outlined new innovations being developed in Greater Manchester. The report addressed challenges and provided evidence of impact and value for money from the interventions.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Governance and accountability arrangements;
- Value for money;
- The Edge of Care Panel;
- Edge of Care services and interventions;
- An analysis of admissions and discharges into the Looked After system;
- The impact from Edge of Care interventions; and
- New developments.

The Manager of Alonzi House outlined the services that Alonzi House provided to families whose children were at risk of becoming 'looked after' and provided anonymised examples of families that had been supported. She informed Members

how staff built relationships with the families, listened to the views of the child and the parents to understand what was going on within the family and supported them to work through their problems.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- To welcome the good work outlined in the report and to recognise the important role of Early Help in improving outcomes for children;
- Request to visit Alonzi House; and
- To ask for an update on the implementation of the "No Wrong Door" model.

The Strategic Head of Early Help reported that Alonzi House already had a lot of elements of the "No Wrong Door" model. She informed Members that the Council would retain the best parts of Alonzi House's current work but that this new model provided the opportunity to do more, for example, in relation to services for young people with complex mental health problems. She outlined the work taking place with partners to progress this and reported that this model was expected to be fully implemented by April 2019.

Decisions

1. To thank the Manager of Alonzi House for her hard work and to request that she and the Strategic Head of Early Help pass on the Committee's thanks to all staff working at Alonzi House and in Early Help.
2. To request a further report in the new municipal year to update Members on the progress and impact of this work.
3. To request that a visit be arranged to Alonzi House.

[Councillor Stone declared a personal interest as a Regulation 44 Visitor to Alonzi House.]

CYP/19/12 Multi Agency Safeguarding Arrangements

The Committee received a report and presentation of the Strategic Director of Children's Services. The report and presentation provided information on the outcome of work by Manchester City Council, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC) and Greater Manchester Police (GMP), in consultation with partners and existing Safeguarding Children and Adult Board members, to review existing arrangements, taking into account strengths, areas for improvement and opportunities to align with wider strategic objectives and plans.

The main points and themes within the report and presentation included:

- The case for change;
- The context and statutory requirements;

- The arrangements;
- The capacity to deliver;
- The budget; and
- Transitional and implementation arrangements.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- To note that the proposed structure seemed quite complex and to request further clarification; and
- How GMP would be involved in this work.

Professor Craig Harris from MHCC reported that the proposed structure was simpler than the previous one. He reported that each Board had a lead organisation, with a lead officer assigned, and that the terms of reference and membership would be developed. He reported that the new arrangements brought together the Children's and Adults' Safeguarding Boards and would reduce duplication and enable members of these Boards to focus on strategic rather than operational work. He outlined the involvement of GMP in the new safeguarding arrangements. The Strategic Director of Children's and Education Services reported that GMP were aligning themselves to the Council's locality social work offices and would be building stronger relationships with the social work teams, which would have a positive impact in areas such as domestic abuse.

Decisions

1. To welcome the new safeguarding arrangements outlined in the report.
2. To request an annual report and an update report.

CYP/19/13 Overview Report

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit was submitted. The overview report contained key decisions within the Committee's remit, responses to previous recommendations and the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to approve.

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme.

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2019

Present:

Councillor Stone – in the Chair

Councillors Sameem Ali, T Judge, Lovecy, McHale, Madeleine Monaghan and Sadler

Co-opted Voting Members:

Mr A Arogundade, Parent Governor Representative

Mrs B Kellner, Representative of the Diocese of Manchester

Mrs J Miles, Representative of the Diocese of Salford [CYP/19/14 - CYP/19/18]

Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative

Ms Z Stepan, Parent Governor Representative

Co-opted Non Voting Members:

Mr R Lammas, Primary sector teacher representative

Mr L Duffy, Secondary sector teacher representative

Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children's Services

Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Schools, Culture and Leisure

Apologies:

Councillors Alijah and Hewitson

CYP/19/14 Minutes

The Chair informed Members that the requested visit to Alonzi House would take place early in the next municipal year. A Member who was also the Chair of the Ofsted Subgroup reported that the Ofsted Subgroup would be receiving a progress update on Lily Lane Primary School at a future meeting in the new municipal year.

Decisions

1. To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2019.
2. To receive the minutes of the Ofsted Subgroup meeting held on 29 January 2019.

CYP/19/15 School Governance Update

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education which outlined the support that the Council had provided to assist with the development of effective school governance across the city.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Governor recruitment;

- Governor training, development and support; and
- School quality assurance.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- How academies, which were not required to have a local authority governor, were engaged;
- What was being done to fill the school governor vacancies; and
- That Ofsted inspections considered the effectiveness of the governing body and what could be done to address any issues related to the governing body before schools were inspected.

The School Governance Lead reported that, while they were not legally required to have a local authority governor, some multi-academy trusts (MATs) had asked the Council to nominate someone to join their governing body. She reported that the Council had good connections with the MATs in the city and that MAT Chairs attended the Chair of Governors' briefings. She reported that addressing governor vacancies was a challenge as there was a turnover of governors for reasons outside of the Council's control, such as changing family circumstances. She also commented that it was important to ensure that suitably skilled individuals were recruited and were matched appropriately to the right school for them. She outlined the steps being taken to recruit to vacancies, including working with Governors for Schools, using the Manchester Jobs website and working with Manchester Metropolitan University to hold roadshows with their staff to promote the role of school governors. In response to a question from the Chair, she advised Members that most vacancies were in north Manchester but that most volunteers were from south Manchester.

The School Governance Lead reported that the Council's Quality Assurance Team visited schools' governing bodies and offered support where needed. She informed Members that the Council had also provided some schools with funding for an external review of their governing body and that this approach had been praised by Ofsted. The Director of Education outlined how the Support and Challenge Board was engaging with schools, including Chairs of Governors, particularly focusing on schools which were currently judged as "requires improvement" and which were due another inspection.

Decisions

1. To thank the School Governance Lead and the School Governance Unit for their valuable work.
2. To note that Members will consider how they can use their networks to encourage people to apply for governor vacancies, especially in north Manchester.
3. To note that the Committee has previously requested a briefing session on the new Ofsted Framework, to be arranged when the details of the Framework are known, and to request that an invitation to this be extended to all Members.

[Dr Omara declared a personal interest as the Chair of the Manchester Governors Association.]

CYP/19/16 Attainment and Progress 2018

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education which provided an analysis of the 2018 outcomes of statutory assessment at the end of the Early Years Foundation Stage, Key Stage 1, Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4. The report also included a summary of performance according to groups by ethnicity.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- The outcomes of all pupils at every key stage;
- Outcomes for disadvantaged children and those eligible for Free School Meals (FSM);
- Progress for pupils with English as an Additional Language (EAL);
- Outcomes for children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND);
- Outcomes for Manchester pupils by ethnicity; and
- Next steps.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- To note that the education system in Manchester had improved in recent years, particularly the primary sector;
- Request for information on the Progress 8 measure;
- What was being done to address the gap in achievement between different groups of pupils;
- The impact of higher-achieving pupils from Wythenshawe choosing to attend secondary schools in neighbouring local authority areas; and
- How the outcomes for pupils with SEND who attended mainstream schools compared with those who attended special schools.

The Head of Schools Quality Assurance and Strategic SEND reported that Progress 8 measured pupils' progress between Key Stage 2 and Key Stage 4 and compared it with the national average progress but did not take into account other factors, such as whether pupils were from a disadvantaged background. She reported that there was a gap between the outcomes of advantaged and disadvantaged pupils in the city, although it was smaller than the gap nationally. She outlined some of the work taking place to improve outcomes, for example, investment in Early Years and schools using their Pupil Premium Funding to improve outcomes for disadvantaged pupils. The Director of Education reported that the percentage of Early Years settings in Manchester which were judged as "good" or better by Ofsted had increased from 64% to 98% in recent years and that this should result in improvements in outcomes as this cohort of children progressed through the education system.

The Director of Education informed Members that children in Wythenshawe primary

schools achieved well but that a significant number of the higher achievers then went to secondary schools in neighbouring local authorities. She reported that work was taking place to support the four secondary schools in Wythenshawe and improve the educational outcomes for the pupils, using a whole community approach. She informed the Committee that this included working with a range of partners, such as housing providers, Manchester Airport, local businesses, youth providers and leisure centres, to promote the importance of education and that this would include positive messages about the local secondary schools.

The Head of Schools Quality Assurance and Strategic SEND reported that it was difficult to compare outcomes for pupils with SEND in mainstream schools to those in special schools as many special schools did not use the same measures; however, she reported that Manchester's special school sector was one of the city's strengths with National Leaders of Education working in the sector and that these Leaders would be providing support to mainstream schools on their provision and teaching for pupils with SEND.

Decisions

1. To thank staff and students for their hard work over the past year.
2. To request information in a future report on the performance of pupils with SEND in special schools compared to those in mainstream schools and further information on the progress and outcomes for children from ethnic groups which are currently performing less well, including white British children.
3. To receive a report on the work taking place to support the four secondary schools in Wythenshawe and improve the educational outcomes for the pupils, including any good practice which can be shared with other areas of the city.

CYP/19/17 Manchester Youth Justice Service

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided an update on the work and strategic priorities of the Youth Justice Service including the findings of the recent inspection, the wider review of the service that was planned prior to the announcement of the inspection and the progress achieved in reducing re-offending rates.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Performance and impact in relation to the strategic objectives set by the national Youth Justice Board;
- The inspection of Manchester Youth Justice Service by Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Probation (HMIP);
- HMIP's findings and recommendations;
- The review of the Youth Justice Service; and
- Developments in Youth Justice Services across Greater Manchester.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions

were:

- The concerns raised by the HMIP inspectors about the service's premises in north Manchester;
- Whether progress had been made in filling vacancies;
- What was being done to address the number of young people with SEND who were in the Youth Justice System; and
- Work with partner agencies to reduce the over-representation of black and minority ethnic (BME) young people in custody.

The Strategic Lead for Early Help and Youth Justice outlined the incident at the service's north Manchester premises which took place during the inspection. She reported that some of the work with young people which had previously taken place at that premises had now been moved to a different venue and that, following a risk assessment and consultation with the Council's Health and Safety team, additional security had been put in place at the north Manchester building. She reported that the service was currently in the process of moving out of that premises. She informed Members that the level of staff vacancies was unrelated to this issue as they were in other parts of the service. She reported that the level of vacancies and staff caseloads had improved in recent months and that the service was working to speed up the recruitment process and get new staff in post more quickly.

The Head of Youth Justice informed Members that young people with SEND were over-represented in the Youth Justice System nationally. She reported that Manchester Metropolitan University had led a large piece of work on this and that Youth Justice Services across Greater Manchester were working in partnership with the university to use the research to influence practice. She reported that the Service worked closely with the Education Service to identify young people at risk of entering the Criminal Justice System and was raising awareness with other stakeholders such as the Pupil Referral Units and the police of the issues relating to young people with SEND and the Criminal Justice System.

The Head of Youth Justice reported that BME young people were over-represented in the custodial population both in Manchester and nationally. She reported that her service was looking for any evidence of unconscious bias in its own practices, including pre-sentencing reports, and was also raising awareness with and asking questions of other agencies. She reported that officers in her service would be receiving training on unconscious bias. She also informed Members that the Management Board and all partner agencies would monitor data and work together to address this issue.

Decisions

1. To receive an information report in July and a more detailed report later in the year, provisionally scheduled for September 2019.
2. To request that a future report include further information on what is being done to address the number of young people with SEND entering the Youth Justice System, including further information on the work with Manchester Metropolitan University.

CYP/19/18 Leaving Care Service

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided an update on progress on the Leaving Care Service.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- An update on the service, including the voice and influence of young people, the workforce and the flexibility and responsiveness of the service;
- An update on work to ensure suitable accommodation for Our Young People (care leavers); and
- Next steps.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- Concern that Our Young People were still facing many of the same challenges which previous generations leaving care had faced;
- To welcome the work to ensure suitable accommodation for Our Young People;
- The importance of access to education, employment and training for Our Young People; and
- What was the impact of extending the provision of support to Our Young People up to the age of 25.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services informed Members about work taking place to increase Our Young People's access to employment and training opportunities, including work with the private sector and programmes such as Mind The Gap, which supported young women to move into full-time work or education. He offered to provide further information on the work relating to education, employment and training in a future report to the Committee. The Service Manager emphasised the importance of early intervention and reported on work to ensure that Personal Advisers were able to support young people from aged 14 upwards to identify their career ambitions, including backup plans, and to plot pathways for achieving these.

The Service Manager acknowledged that supporting young people up to the age of 25 represented a challenge for the Leaving Care Service. He reported that the service provided to young people over the age of 21 was needs-led and young person-led, with the young person choosing the level of contact they wanted to maintain; however, he advised that they would be contacted at a minimum once a year. He informed Members that young people over the age of 21 should naturally start to disengage from the service but that the message to the young people was that the service was there if they needed it.

Decision

To request a further report in 6 months' time to monitor the progress being made to improve outcomes for Our Young People.

CYP/19/19 Overview Report

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit was submitted. The overview report contained key decisions within the Committee's remit, responses to previous recommendations and the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to approve.

The Chair informed Members that this was Mrs Kellner's last Committee meeting, as she was resigning from her post as Co-opted Member for the Diocese of Manchester. He thanked her for her contribution over the years, particularly on the Ofsted Subgroup, where her experience as a former headteacher had been invaluable.

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme.

Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2019

Present:

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair
Councillors Appleby, Flanagan, Harland, Hassan, Hughes, Jeavons, Kilpatrick, Noor, Reid, Sadler, White and Wright

Councillor S Murphy, Deputy Leader
Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods
Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport
Councillor Richards, Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration
Councillor Midgley, Ward Councillor for Chorlton Park
Councillor Shilton Godwin, Ward Councillor for Chorlton Park
Councillor A Simcock, Ward Councillor for Didsbury East
Peter Boulton, Head of Highways, Transport for Greater Manchester

Apologies: Councillors Azra Ali, Chohan, Hewitson, Lyons

NESC/19/07 Sara Todd and Fiona Worrall

In recognition that Sara Todd would be leaving Manchester City Council to take up the position of Chief Executive at Trafford Council, the Chair expressed thanks and appreciation on behalf of the residents of Manchester for all her dedication and hard work over the years and wished her every success in her new role.

The Committee also noted that Fiona Worrall had recently celebrated her thirty year anniversary of working for Manchester City Council. Members congratulated Fiona on this achievement and thanked her for her continued hard work and the support that she had offered the Committee.

NESC/19/08 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9 January 2019 as a correct record.

NESC/19/09 Updated Financial Strategy and Directorate Business Plan 2019/20

Further to item NESC/18/52 the Committee considered a report of the Chief Executive and the City Treasurer that provided an update on the Council's financial position and set out next steps in the budget process, including scrutiny of the draft budget proposals and Directorate Business Plan reports by this Committee.

The Committee was invited to consider and make recommendations to the Executive on the budget proposals which were within the remit of this Committee and to comment on the Directorate Business Plans which had been designed to ensure the Council invested in the services that were valued by its residents, achieving both high quality services and outcomes for residents as well as a balanced budget.

The Committee considered in turn the Neighbourhoods Budget and Business Plan, the Strategic Development Budget and Business Plan and the Homelessness Budget and Business Plan.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Noting that despite continued austerity and years of unfair funding settlements the Council had remained committed to supporting the most vulnerable residents, and acknowledging that investments had been made in services to improve the lives of Manchester residents;
- Support was expressed for the call to regulate bus services across Manchester, noting that areas of the city were underserved and this had an impact on residents' opportunities to access jobs and engage in the city's cultural offer;
- An explanation was sought regarding the highways budget underspend;
- More needed to be done to tackle rogue landlords, noting that vulnerable tenants were often housed in premises that were not suitable;
- Was there an intention to extend the Selective Licensing Scheme for private landlords;
- Supporting the stated commitment given to building social and affordable housing, adding that this needed to be provided across the city;
- Was the funding for homelessness services sustainable in future years;
- Had there been an investment in staff within the homelessness teams to deal with the increased demand on this service;
- Consideration needed to be given to developing a policy to stop placing homeless families into hotels;
- Noting the programme to purchase houses to accommodate homeless families where would these properties be located and would those families be offered support;
- Noting the costs associated with homelessness it was important to acknowledge the wider additional costs to a range of services, including Children's and Health services, that resulted from homelessness;
- Was the number of asylum seekers placed in Manchester known and was the accommodation that they were provided with checked to ensure it was safe;
- Welcoming the support offered to the Lord Mayor's Homelessness Charity by Vincent Kompany whose testimonial dinner had raised £216K for good causes;
- Clarification was sought as to where the proposed additional investment of £0.5m identified within the Neighbourhoods Directorate Business Planning: 2019-20 would be spent and how the impact of this investment would be measured;
- What was the cost to the Council of removing fly tipping;
- Consideration should be given to introducing CCTV at household waste and recycling centres to monitor vehicles and help identify fly tippers;
- Consideration needed to be given to domestic bin sizes to support residents to dispose of their waste appropriately and encourage recycling; and

- The bulky waste collection service needed to be promoted amongst residents, such as applying information stickers on bins.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport said that the budget proposals demonstrated that Manchester City Council was trying to mitigate the continued cuts to public services that had been experienced worst by Labour run authorities. She described that the city was growing with resulting demands on services, however funding had been reduced year on year. She described that the Council had listened to the views of residents throughout previous years' budget consultation exercises and had striven to keep neighbourhoods clean and invested in repairing the highways network, acknowledging the point raised regarding the importance of having a safe and reliable road network for all users. She explained the reasons for the Highways underspend in previous years and how this had been reprogrammed to deliver the programme of works.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration welcomed the support for the stated commitment to deliver social and affordable housing for Manchester residents and reiterated the points made regarding the unfair budget cuts year on year. She said that work was being developed to establish an enforcement team specifically for the Private Rented Sector, stating that they had issued over £1/4m in Civil Penalties to landlords to date and once recovered, this money would be reinvested back into the enforcement team. She further informed the Committee that the Council had been successful in a bid to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government for further funding for work to address Rogue Landlords.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration further commented that an evaluation of the Selective Licensing scheme would be undertaken and this would inform discussions in regard to if this scheme would be extended into other areas and due to the broadening of HMO licencing the team would be expanded to cover the new properties now covered by HMO licencing.

The Deputy Leader responded to the comments regarding the Homelessness Budget paper and commented that the increased rates of homelessness and rough sleeping was a societal issue and the impact of continued welfare reform and that the introduction of Universal Credit had had a significant impact. She said that the budget proposed was designed to protect and invest in services for the most vulnerable people in the city. She said there was a move away from housing families in hotels and work was ongoing to improve temporary accommodation.

The Deputy Leader commented that the intention was to buy houses that were suitable for families and these would be bought where they were available. She said that support was available for families who were homeless and support would be provided as they moved into those properties. In response to the comments raised regarding a further breakdown of the homelessness budget she said this would be provided to the Committee. The Head of Finance commented that there were elements of the homelessness budget that were non-recurring.

The Strategic Lead for Homelessness said that in response to the increase in the number of people presenting as homeless the number of staff at the 'front door' had been increased to deal with the demand. She said that work was underway to deliver

this service in other locations, including developing options with the Local Care Organisation. She described that work was being progressed to increase homelessness prevention, this included a team to deal with Section 21 eviction notices and intervening on behalf of residents and working with Private Landlords to prevent evictions. In response to the question regarding asylum seekers she advised that there was a process in place whereby the location of properties was approved and Manchester was not above the 1:200 limit.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods stated that flytipping was increasingly associated with commercial waste and criminality and consideration was being given as to how interventions, such as CCTV and installing physical barriers could be implemented to address this. He said Manchester remained committed to identifying and prosecuting those responsible for flytipping, commenting that Manchester had been responsible for 10% of all prosecutions nationally.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods said that work would commence to review the size of different bins in passageways to ensure they were sufficient and to promote recycling. He further commented that he would circulate the cost of removing flytipping to the Committee.

In regard to the comments made about the bulky waste collection service the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods stated that a way of maximising the benefits of this would be for residents to 'pool' their allowance, noting that apartment blocks have one free collection allocated per apartment and consideration would be given to how this service could be further promoted amongst residents.

Decision

The Committee;

1. Note the reports and recommend that the comments of the Committee are submitted to the 13 February 2019 meeting of Executive for consideration.
2. Request that the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods provide the Committee with a breakdown of where the proposed additional investment of £0.5m described in the Neighbourhoods Directorate Business Planning: 2019-20 would be spent and how the impact of this investment would be measured;
3. Request that the Deputy Leader provide a further breakdown of the Homelessness Budget.

[Councillor Appleby declared a personal and non prejudicial interest as her partner is employed by Biffa and Councillor Hughes declared a personal and non prejudicial interest as he is employed as a bus driver.]

NESC/19/10 Action to address non-compliance in premises allowing shisha smoking

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Operating Officer, Neighbourhoods that provided an update on the work being carried out to address the issues of non-compliance in shisha cafes across the city.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- The legislative background and health background to tackling smoking, noting that Manchester had the highest premature mortality rates in the country for the three major smoking related conditions: lung cancer, heart disease and stroke;
- Describing the joint approach of the Population Health and Wellbeing Team and the Licensing and Out of Hours teams to address the breaches of the Health Act in some shisha premises, as well as the risks of smoking shisha generally;
- Information on the number of shisha premises per ward;
- Describing shisha smoking in the context of the premises licensing regime and planning legislation;
- The issues and concerns associated with such premises that included health implications, tax avoidance, breaches of planning legislation and immigration offences;
- The multi agency response to these concerns including an update on the Shisha Task Group that provided a forum for partners to share intelligence about these premises and plan multi agency operations;
- Describing the work undertaken to raise public awareness of the health impacts of smoking shisha, noting that recent analysis showed that smoking rates are now highest in age groups under 25; and
- Information on the enforcement activities undertaken by the Licensing and Out of Hours Team that included the issuing of Fixed Penalty Notices and prosecutions, accompanied by case studies.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Information regarding the health implications of smoking shisha should be published in a variety of languages;
- Information was sought regarding the laws relating to shisha premises; and
- What was being done to protect under 18's who attend such premises.

The Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing informed the Committee that a Premises License was not required as shisha bars generally did not offer any regulated entertainment activities, such as serving hot food after 11pm and/or selling alcohol. However, the Development Compliance Team did investigate alleged breaches of planning control, including, but not limited to, non-compliance with planning permissions, unauthorised operational development, material changes of use of land or buildings and the display of advertisements.

The Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing advised that in addition to the above, a multi agency approach had been developed with such partners as Greater Manchester Police, The Fire Service and HM Revenue and Customs so that a range

of powers could be exercised to address issues found at such premises in a coordinated and targeted manner.

In response to the comments made regarding the need to safeguard young people the Strategic Lead Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety said that they did work closely with Children's Services and the Multi Agency Safeguarding Hub to address any safeguarding concerns.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods described the significant health dangers associated with smoking shisha, stating that research studies had shown that smoking a shisha pipe for one hour was roughly equivalent to smoking one hundred cigarettes. He acknowledged the comment regarding the information leaflets being available in different languages, stating that this would be reviewed.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods said that whilst smoking shisha was in itself not illegal, it was however very difficult due to the weather to operate such a business legally. He further commented that the approach taken to tackling shisha premises was widely supported by local communities and that action would be taken against any premises who tried to obstruct officers in carrying out their lawful duties.

Decision

To note the report.

NESC/19/11 Scheme Review – Princess Road / Princess Parkway (Speed Limit Reduction)

The Committee considered the report of the Operational Director of Highways that provided a review of the speed limit reduction scheme that had been implemented on the A5103 Princess Road and the impact on two adjacent roads (Alexandra Road South and Nell Lane). The speed limit along Princess Road was recently reduced from 40 mph down to 30mph, implemented on the 30 April 2017 via the introduction of a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO). This temporary order was put in place as a safety precaution while the permanent order was progressed.

The scheme was developed in response to public concerns around road safety, and in particular the safety of pedestrians crossing Princess Road. The severity of the concerns had been heightened by two fatal collisions involving pedestrians at the Darley Avenue crossing in December 2015 and December 2016.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- Providing a background and rationale for introducing the speed limit;
- Data on traffic counts for periods prior to the introduction of the limit and post introduction;
- Comparative collision data analysis;
- Comparative data of vehicle volume and speed;

- Noting that the reduction in speed limit on Princess Parkway / Road, appeared to have had a positive effect in reducing the severity of collisions, which would correlate with a reduction in the overall speed of vehicles; and
- Overall there was a small reduction in the average vehicle speeds on Princess Parkway / Road, but generally these are not significant.

The Committee then heard from three local ward Councillors who had been invited to share their views and experience following the speed limit change. The three Members stated that the introduction of the speed limit had been very positive for local residents and shared with the Committee the comments received from residents. These included the reduced noise levels, a safer environment for pedestrians and safer crossings. The Members thanked officers for delivering the scheme and suggested that more should be done to publicise enforcement activity and that Greater Manchester Police should support residents undertaking speed watches in their communities.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Thanking those residents and ward Members who had been instrumental in campaigning for the reduction in the speed limit;
- Members of the Committee whose wards had been affected by the change welcomed the reduction in the speed limit;
- Was consideration been given to implementing similar speed restrictions on other arterial roads in Manchester;
- Members would welcome the introduction of speed restrictions on roads that led off Princess Road;
- Had any analysis been undertaken to understand the levels of traffic displacement following the introduction of the speed restriction;
- Expressing disappointment that Greater Manchester Police were not in attendance, noting that enforcement of this scheme was important;
- Members identified a number of locations along the route that they suggested may need to be reviewed to ensure they remained safe and requested that officers undertook this review; and
- Was this work coordinated with Highways England and neighbouring authorities.

The Director of Operations (Highways) welcomed the positive comments received regarding the scheme. He advised that nationally funding for such schemes had reduced however consideration would be given to prioritising future schemes and that the Committee would be informed as these plans developed.

The Head of City Wide Highways responded to questions stating that analysis of displaced traffic would continue and be reported in future update reports, and this analysis would inform the design of future schemes. He commented that officers were working with ward members and residents in Hulme to deliver further road safety improvements. He confirmed that the department did work with other neighbouring authorities and Highways England. In regard to speed cameras the Committee were informed that there were strict criteria that had to be met before these could be installed, however mobile cameras could be deployed. In response to the areas identified for further inspection by Members he gave an assurance that these would be investigated.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport informed the Committee that GMP had been invited to attend the meeting and contribute to the discussion, unfortunately however they had been unable to attend. She commented that she supported the call from Members for GMP to deliver targeted campaigns to address speeding and support residents organising speed watch campaigns.

Decision

The Committee;

1. Welcome the reported road safety improvements along the Princess Road / Princess Parkway;
2. Recommend that the displacement of traffic continues to be monitored and analysis of this data is provided in a future update report;
3. Recommend that officers explore the options for establishing an online resource to enable residents to provide feedback on this scheme and any future scheme;
4. Recommends that officers in consultation with Greater Manchester Police install road safety cameras where appropriate to improve road safety; and
5. To request an update report in 12 months' time.

NESC/19/12 Highways and the flow of traffic across the city

The Committee considered the presentation slide pack that had been submitted by Transport for Greater Manchester that described how traffic flow was managed and monitored through the city.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Welcoming the continued development of the City, recognising that it demonstrated the success of the city, however noting that such development needed to be delivered in a managed and coordinated way so as to minimise disruption to residents;
- Consideration needed to be given as to how planned works were communicated to residents, noting that complaints arose when this failed to be done adequately and if appropriate a Task and Finish Group would be established, at an appropriate time to review this activity;
- Local residents needed to be involved at an early stage in discussions regarding planned works, noting that meetings with residents and developers had proven beneficial to minimise issues and prevented problems escalating;
- Major schemes, such as Hyde Road needed to involve neighbouring authorities to deliver this scheme with minimum disruption;
- Consideration needed to be given to suspending bus lanes to facilitate the flow of traffic;

- Legal advice should be obtained regarding Stopping Up Orders and the time limits contractors and developers were permitted to close the highway and a review of all Stopping Up Orders issued should be undertaken to establish if there had been any breaches of such orders;
- A minimum standard should be agreed for the provision of alternative footpaths during works, noting that alternative footpaths needed to be safe for all users and include the provision of lighting; and
- The Leader of the Council should be invited to any future meeting when this subject was discussed to explain how developments had been modelled; the timetable for the delivery of the various schemes; what assessment of traffic displacement had been undertaken and how this was to be managed to minimise disruption.

The Director of Operations (Highways) acknowledged the comments raised regarding the need to improve communications with residents regarding planned highway improvement work to minimise complaints from residents and local businesses. He advised that works are coordinated with TfGM and utilities companies to minimise disruption and programme meetings are regularly convened to manage larger schemes and events.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport acknowledged that disruption did occur during development and roadworks, noting that developments would always be accompanied by utilities works and to highlight the scale of this challenge to manage the disruption she reported that 86 permits are issued per day to contractors. In addition, she commented that in addition to planned works utilities companies also responded to emergency works.

Decision

The Committee;

1. Recommend that legal advice is obtained in relation to Stopping Up Orders issued under provisions within the Town and Country Planning Act and the time limits contractors and developers are permitted to close the highway. Following this advice, a review of all Stopping Up Orders issued should be undertaken to establish if there had been any breaches of such orders;
2. Request that The Leader of the Council is invited to any future meeting when this subject is discussed to explain how developments had been modelled, the timetable for the delivery of the various schemes, what assessment of traffic displacement had been undertaken and how this was to be managed to minimise disruption;
3. To consider establishing a Task and Finish Group, at an appropriate time to consider the communications strategy for when planned major developments are to be delivered.

NESC/19/13 Overview Report

The 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.

Decisions

The Committee notes the report and approve the work programme.

Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 6 March 2019

Present:

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair
Councillors Azra Ali, Appleby, Chohan, Flanagan, Harland, Hassan, Hughes, Jeavons, Kilpatrick, Lyons, Noor, Reid, Sadler, White and Wright

Councillor S Murphy, Deputy Leader
Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport
Councillor Richards, Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration
Councillor Paul, Ward Councillor for Withington
Jonny Sadler, Manchester Climate Change Agency

Apologies: Councillor Hewitson

NESC/19/14 Minutes

A recommendation was proposed and seconded to amend a section within item NESC/19/09 to the following:

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration welcomed the support for the stated commitment to deliver social and affordable housing for Manchester residents and reiterated the points made regarding the unfair budget cuts year on year. She said the enforcement team had issued over £250,000 in Civil Penalties to landlords to date and once recovered, this money would be reinvested back into the enforcement team. She further informed the Committee that the Council had been successful in a bid to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government for further funding for work to address Rogue Landlords.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration further commented that an evaluation of the Selective Licensing scheme would be undertaken and this would inform discussions in regard to if this scheme would be extended into other areas, and due to the broadening of HMO licencing the team would be expanded to cover the new properties now covered by HMO licencing.

Decisions

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2019 as a correct record subject to the above amendment.

To note the minutes of the Behaviour Change and Waste Task and Finish Group meeting of 21 January 2019.

NESC/19/15 Update on Homelessness and Housing

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Adult Services and the Strategic Director, Development that provided an update on the work that was taking place to tackle homelessness and rough sleeping in the City; the use of temporary accommodation within the homeless service, including the inspection regime; and an update on Manchester Move and the Social Housing Allocations Policy.

The Deputy Leader referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- Homeless presentations had continued to rise compared to the previous financial year, in common with the growing picture across Greater Manchester and the UK;
- Describing the work that was taking place to support people who were sleeping rough in the city;
- An update on the Bed for Every Night initiative and the provision from April 2019;
- An update on the Rough Sleeping Initiative;
- The work progressed to work with the two Coroners for Manchester in order to improve the investigation and monitoring of homeless deaths;
- An update on dispersed temporary accommodation and the ongoing work to improve the standard of this accommodation;
- Information on the inspection of properties and the action plan that was being progressed;
- Describing the activities to safeguard families in dispersed accommodation;
- The approach taken to increase the number of large homes available for rehousing homeless families;
- An update on Bed and Breakfast Accommodation, noting there had been a significant increase in the number of single presentations occurring in January 2019;
- Describing the work to establish a hospital discharge protocol to reduce the number of people who present as homeless upon discharge from hospital;
- An update on Homeless Commissioned Services;
- The joint work with Children's Services to develop a new pathway model which will better meet the needs of all young people in the city, including care leavers and young people with complex needs;
- The work of the Section 21 team that had been established within the Housing Solutions service to work with households who had received a valid S.21 notice but remained in occupation of that property prior to eviction through the courts system;
- An update on the work of the Private Rented Sector team;
- Information on the Homefinder service and how this could be used as a resource to secure accommodation for homeless households;
- Describing the initiative to maximise Social Housing Stock;
- An update on Manchester Move, the Manchester Housing Allocation Scheme that set out the principles and rules by which people apply for social housing, including who qualified to join the housing register and how the Council prioritises who got a home;
- An update on Social Housing in Manchester, noting that there was currently under 68,000 social homes in Manchester; and

- Information on the Manchester Housing Register (MHR) and choice-based lettings (CBL) noting that the allocations scheme was currently being reviewed given the rising levels of homelessness and the cost of providing temporary and supported accommodation.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Homelessness was an issue that was taken very seriously by the Council and despite the continued funding cuts remained committed to addressing;
- Did the Outreach Team work outside of the city centre area;
- What was the current case load for floating support workers;
- A visit for Committee Members to meet the Floating Support Teams and accompany them during visits should be arranged;
- Did people accessing services need to pay any fee and/or travel costs, as there was a conception amongst some members of the public that this was the case;
- Was data available on the age, gender and race of people who were homeless;
- What standards were applied when assessing temporary accommodation to ensure it was appropriate and safe for people;
- The numbers of Section 21 notices issued (notice to quit an assured short hold tenancy) appeared to be increasing and what was being done to support people who were issued with one by their landlord;
- What was being done to understand the lessons learnt following the death of a homeless person;
- Further information was sought on the progress to purchase properties to accommodate larger families;
- What support was offered to people who presented as homeless but did not have a Manchester connection;
- What support was being offered to pay for transport costs for travel to school for those families who were temporarily accommodated out of area;
- Were homeless people involved in the design of services and were homeless people being engaged with in the City Centre Public Space Protection Order consultation exercise;
- Noting that people could have to wait a long time to have their homeless assessments completed when attending the Town Hall and this could be stressful and intimidating for people and what was being done to improve this;
- What was being done to support those individuals and families who were homeless as a result of domestic violence and abuse; and
- What was the time scale to complete the reported action plan that had been put in place to work with emergency accommodation owners to improve standards in accommodation.

The Deputy Leader stated that the A Bed for Every Night (ABEN) had been designed to provide a bed every night for people sleeping rough in Greater Manchester from early November until the end of March and that funding had been secured to extend this service to the end of April. She stated that this service had proved to be very successful and that this had created further demands on the service that presented a challenge. She confirmed that people did not have to pay a fee to access this service and if referred, assistance with transport costs could be provided. She advised that an analysis of the people accessing this service would be undertaken

and this information would be provided in future reports.

The Deputy Leader recognised the comment regarding the increased use of Section 21 notices by landlords in the Private Rented Sector. She said that a dedicated team had been established to work with people who had been served with a notice and to date 58 households had been supported. She informed the Committee that it had been established that approximately half of the notices issued were invalid and, of the ones that weren't, officers negotiated with landlords to allow people to remain in the property whilst alternative, appropriate accommodation was secured. She stated that it was very important to refer people as early as possible for support from this service.

The Director of Housing and Residential Growth further informed the Committee that a wider review of how the Private Rented Sector could be managed and influenced would be undertaken. Members supported this and requested that they be kept informed of this work and consulted with.

The Deputy Leader informed the Committee that the service was working closely with Children's Services to find solutions to the challenges experienced by families who were placed temporarily outside of the area, such as meeting the costs incurred with travel to school. In addition, she reported that work was ongoing with Children's Services to develop a protocol to support young people who were leaving care to protect them from homelessness. She further commented that consideration was being given to commissioning specific housing support for victims of domestic violence and abuse.

The Deputy Leader noted the tragic deaths of homeless people in the city and commented that it was understood that there was a link nationally between deprivation and homeless deaths. She said it would be very difficult to provide analysis of deaths of homeless people by ward level, however there is a thematic Safeguarding Adults Review being undertaken to understand any lessons that could be learnt, noting that this was a very complex issue. Work was also progressing with the Coroner's office to review future any deaths to better understand every incident. She further informed the Committee that she was a member of The Manchester Homelessness Partnership that included people with personal experience of homelessness and Public Space Protection Order would also be discussed at that forum. She stated that the City Centre Public Space Protection Order was designed to address anti-social behaviours and not criminalise homeless people.

The Strategic Lead for Homelessness reported the case-load for floating support staff was currently 36. She said that work was being done to reduce this figure and an additional team had been established to support people moving on into affordable accommodation. She confirmed that the Floating Support Team was proactive and services were delivered in areas outside of the city centre with the same support offered. She supported the recommendation that Members of the Committee visit the Floating Support Team. In response to a request from a Member she confirmed that the Homelessness Prevention Strategy would be circulated to Members for information. She advised the Committee that the Housing Health and Safety Rating System (HHSRS), a risk-based evaluation tool to help local authorities identify and protect against potential risks and hazards to health and safety from any deficiencies

identified in dwellings was used to assess properties and that information on this would be circulated. She further informed the Committee that a tender document was out for a Registered Housing Provider to take over the management of temporary accommodation, noting that this would allow for the maximum housing benefit to be awarded so the Council would be penalised for the move from the Government Temporary Management Fund to the Flexible Support Grant.

The Strategic Lead for Homelessness said that the Authority had a legal duty to provide advice and assistance to those people that did not have a local connection and that a reconnection service was offered whereby travel costs would be paid to allow people to return to their home area. In response to the comments regarding the requirement to present at the Town Hall for a homelessness assessment she acknowledged the concerns expressed by the Committee. She said that consideration was being given to identifying other appropriate locations where this service could be delivered and to simplify the process for applications as a way of better supporting people, commenting that Centrepoint provided a single point of contact for young people.

The Director for Housing and Residential Growth said that the process for purchasing the 62 homes to accommodate larger families had taken longer than expected due to the need to agree a legal mechanism to protect the Council's c£5m stake and legal agreements needing to be signed off by a number of Registered providers, however this was imminent. He said that it was recognised that this programme was a priority and he understood that Registered Providers had already acquired and identified for acquisition around 10 properties in anticipation of the agreement being signed. Additional properties would continue to be identified for possible purchase. He stated that Members would be kept informed of this progress and agreed to submit a written update to the next Committee meeting.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration informed the Committee that a review of the allocations policy would be undertaken that would involve consultation with Members. She said that this needed to be considered in conjunction with the Affordable Housing Policy that had been agreed the previous December. She described that the provision of social housing was being reviewed across Greater Manchester and stated that the Right To Buy scheme needed to end and grant funding was required to build new social housing and replace those properties lost through Right To Buy.

Decision

The Committee;

1. Note the report and support the response to the serious issue of homelessness in the city;
2. Recommend that a visit to the Floating Support Teams be arranged for Members of the Committee;
3. Request the Homelessness Prevention Strategy be circulated to Members; and

4. Request that information on the housing health and safety rating system (HHSRS) be circulated to Members.

[Councillor Azra Ali declared a personal and non prejudicial interest as she is employed by CGL Manchester and the Chair of Saheli Asian Women's Project.]

**NESC/19/16 Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan – Tackling Nitrogen
Oxide Exceedances at the Roadside – Outline Business
Case**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Solicitor that summarised the key features of Greater Manchester's feasibility study and its Outline Business Case (OBC) to reduce nitrogen dioxide exceedances in Manchester and across Greater Manchester (GM) in the shortest possible time. This OBC had been developed by Manchester City Council collectively with all Greater Manchester local authorities and the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA), and co-ordinated by Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) in line with Government direction and guidance.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- Describing the context and background to the report;
- Noting that poor air quality was the largest environmental risk to the public's health;
- The legal background;
- Information on the Government's UK Air Quality Plans;
- Noting that TfGM had been coordinating the GM feasibility study on behalf of the ten Greater Manchester local authorities, who remain legally responsible for reducing NO₂ to legal Limit Values; and
- Noting that the feasibility study process comprised a series of steps and processes, namely: Strategic Outline Case, Initial Evidence and Target Determination, Outline Business Case and Full Business Case.

The Committee had been invited to comment on this report prior to its submission to the Executive on the 13 March 2019.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were: -

- Consideration needed to be given to supporting small business through an appropriately funded vehicle replacement scheme;
- Members questioned the reason why private cars were not included in the vehicles affected by the proposed Clean Air Zone;
- Bus companies needed to take responsibility for their polluting vehicles that had a significant impact on the health outcomes of Manchester residents;
- Had social and economic impact assessments been undertaken;
- Priority should be given to supporting local taxi businesses to improve their fleet;
- Transport poverty was an issue and more investment was required in public transport infrastructure across all of the city to encourage people not to use their car and to link people to employment opportunities;

- Publicity campaigns should be targeted at people not using public transport;
- Electric vehicles remained expensive and there was a lack charging points; and
- The consultation exercise, when launched, should involve ward coordination to ensure that as many residents as possible were engaged with this agenda.

The Committee then heard from Councillor Paul, Ward Councillor for Withington. He stated that he was disappointed with the proposals and the outline timescales, commenting that immediate action was required to address the harmful effects of pollution caused by vehicles. He questioned why private cars had not been included in the proposed plan, commenting that the vast majority of vehicles on the road were private cars, and the many of these were not compliant with emission standards. He further suggested that consideration needed to be given to other courses of action, such as introducing car free days.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport stated that buses were one of the biggest contributors to poor air quality, noting the recent press reports that had included statements from local bus companies and said that she had found these to be very disappointing. She described that the objective of any penalty in a Clean Air Zones was for all vehicles which drove within the area of a Clean Air Zone to have engines which complied with emissions standards. The objective of the Clean Air Zone was to bring about reductions in emissions from vehicles and not to raise money. The proposals did not amount to a congestion charge. In regard to the issue of private cars she said that that option would not have delivered compliance any faster than the proposed way forward, and would not perform effectively in terms of reducing human exposure. An important consideration in this respect was that the average private car was not used for 95% of the time whereas other vehicles were used much more intensively.

In response to the comments regarding support for sole traders and small businesses she said that Clean Air Zones would not be introduced without the correct funding package for such businesses being supported by central government.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport said that a communications campaign had been launched before Christmas that had been well received and a further campaign would be launched from May to coincide with the public consultation exercise that would then inform the final plan.

The Head of City Policy informed the Committee that work was currently ongoing across Greater Manchester to consider standards for the taxi trade and this included discussions regarding emissions standards. He indicated that funding to help taxi and private hire drivers transition to cleaner vehicles would only be made available to vehicles registered in Greater Manchester. This may be one measure that will support efforts to reduce the number of vehicles that are registered with authorities outside Greater Manchester operating here. He further informed Members that an Equalities Impact Assessment of the proposals had been produced and that this was available as a background document to the report and had been circulated in advance of the meeting. In response to a question from a Member he acknowledged that there were other sources of pollution, however this report specifically dealt with Nitrogen Oxide Exceedances at the roadside, and other policies and strategies would address other sources of pollution.

Decision

The Committee note the report and endorse the recommendations that the Executive:

1. Note that the Council is legally obliged to produce a feasibility study to identify the option which will deliver compliance with the requirement to meet legal limits of nitrogen dioxide following the Secretary of State issuing a direction under the Environment Act 1995;
2. Adopt the feasibility study undertaken to date;
3. Approve the OBC (for submission to the government's Joint Air Quality Unit);
4. Note that further stakeholder engagement and public consultation is an essential part of the process to help inform and refine ongoing work to produce a Full Business Case by the end of the calendar year;
5. Approve the commencement of the public conversation and engagement activity from 15 May 2019;
6. Note that further reports will be submitted to Executive on:
 - a) the proposals for statutory consultation, informed by the outcome of the public conversation and engagement.
 - b) formal approval of the Full Business Case.
7. Agree that Transport for Greater Manchester continue with the activity to produce the Full Business Case on behalf of the ten Greater Manchester authorities, under the direction of the Greater Manchester Clean Air Steering Group; and
8. Delegate to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Executive Member for Transport, Planning and the Environment the approval of submission of supplementary information.

[Councillor Hughes declared a personal and non prejudicial interest as he is employed as a bus driver.]

NESC/19/17 Manchester Zero Carbon 2038 – Manchester City Council's Commitment

The Committee considered the report of the Head of City Policy, that noted that in November 2018, the Committee and Executive had agreed to the establishment of a science-based carbon reduction target for Manchester. This required the city to become zero carbon by 2038. Since then, the Manchester Climate Change Board, with the support of Anthesis, had developed a guide to support organisations in Manchester to play their full part in achieving this commitment. They had also developed a draft zero carbon framework 2020-2038 and started work to produce a draft action plan for 2020-25. This report set out a framework for future action, the citywide progress that had been made since November 2018 and the specific contribution being made by the Council.

The Committee had been invited to comment on this report prior to its submission to the Executive on the 13 March 2019.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- Noting that the Our Manchester Strategy set out the vision for Manchester to “be in the top flight of world-class cities by 2025” and committed the city to “playing our full part in limiting the impacts of climate change.”
- The Council supported the Manchester Climate Change Board (MCCB) to take forward work to engage partners in the city to address climate change;
- Noting that the Council had adopted a science-based carbon budget which was developed by the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research and committed the city to becoming zero carbon by 2038;
- Manchester’s carbon budget was broken down into short, medium and long term allocations. Each carbon budget outlined the emissions not to be exceeded for each period, in order to ensure that Manchester met its overall emission reduction commitments to 2038;
- Information on the Draft Zero Carbon Framework 2020-2038 and Action Plan 2020-22;
- Information on the Council’s Draft Action Plan, noting the initial action plan which outlined the high level actions that the Council would undertake between April 2019 and March 2020 in order to produce a comprehensive action plan by March 2020;
- This topic should be a regular agenda item at ward coordination meetings to ensure that as many residents as possible were engaged with this agenda; and
- It was recognised that residents needed to be engaged in a meaningful way to ensure they are able to contribute to the ambitious targets.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee’s discussions were: -

- The importance of retrofitting domestic properties and what was being done to support this activity;
- Consideration needed to be given to developing green jobs that could then link into local colleges to develop green skills and employment;
- It was important to engage all sections of the community in this agenda to deliver the required outcomes and Ward Coordination meetings and Neighbourhood Teams should be utilised to raise awareness of this important issue;
- More needed to be done to raise awareness as to the urgency of this issue;
- Expressing concern that the Greater Manchester Pension Fund continued to invest in fossil fuels and what was being done to address this;
- Park and Ride schemes should be established to encourage people to use alternative forms of transport, rather than cars; and
- The Chair suggested that she would meet with the Executive Member to discuss options for progressing this work through neighbourhoods.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport said that she welcomed the continued support and suggestions from the Committee to deliver this important commitment. She informed the Committee that a comprehensive delivery plan would be presented in 2020, however it was important that actions were taken straight away that involved all residents of Manchester in an ‘Our Manchester’ approach. She said the importance of achieving the carbon reductions could not be underestimated and all citizens of Manchester would play an active role in delivering

this. She said the bold and pioneering commitment given by Manchester to adopt a science based carbon budget was recognised both nationally and internationally.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport said that discussions were ongoing with the Greater Manchester Pension Fund regarding their investment in fossil fuels and an announcement on this issue could be imminent. Further information is expected at the Greater Manchester Green Summit on 25 March 2019.

Jonny Sadler, Manchester Climate Change Agency set out the urgency of this agenda; Manchester has formally agreed a science based carbon budget of 15 million tonnes CO₂ for 2018-2100. Annual emissions are currently approximately 2 million tonnes, meaning that the carbon budget will be spent by 2025 unless urgent action is taken. Mr Sadler commented that the leadership in this area expressed by Manchester and the Council was widely recognised nationally and internationally; but that work was needed to maintain this leadership. He noted the carbon budget and the emissions against this to date, stating that actions needed to be implemented immediately to improve emissions and that it was important that Members, with their local knowledge engage with their local residents and businesses to promote this activity, raise awareness and influence behaviour change. In regard to retrofitting housing he advised that Social Housing providers were committed to delivering this, however challenges existed for home owners and those in the private rented sector. He said there were a number of small initiatives to support this but scaling this up is urgently needed, through working with MCC and partners.

Mr Sadler fully endorsed the comments regarding green skills and employment and said that there was an opportunity to ensure these important connections were made in the city's Industrial Strategy. He advised that the importance of reducing carbon emissions was recognised and incorporated into a range of wider policies, such as health, noting that this would also allow partners to think creatively regarding funding opportunities. In regard to comments made regarding the membership of the Manchester Climate Change Board he stated that all partners acted to reduce their own emissions (MCCB members are responsible for 20% of the city's total) and to influence behaviour change across the city. He said that he fully supported Members engaging with their communities to promote this activity and said he would be very keen to encourage them to do more by providing examples of community activities for Members to consider utilising or adapting. He further supported the recommendation proposed by the Chair that carbon reduction should be a standing item at ward coordination meetings.

Decision

The Committee note the report and endorse the recommendations that the Executive:

1. Endorse the draft Manchester Zero Carbon Framework as the city's overarching approach to meeting its science-based climate change targets over the period 2020-38, as part of the wider Our Manchester policy framework;

2. Commit to work with partners to develop the final Framework and Action Plan for 2020-22 by March 2020, at the latest;
3. Commit to implement the Council's actions for 2019/20, as set out in Appendix 2;
4. Commit to produce a detailed action plan for the Council's climate change work during 2020-22, in terms of both direct, organisational emissions; and the influencing and enabling role that the Council can play through its planning, procurement, regulatory and other powers.
5. Commit to work with partners to secure the resources the city requires to commence full implementation of the Framework 2020-38 and Action Plan 2020-22, from April 2020.

NESC/19/18 Overview Report

The 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.

Member's noted that an Annual Work Programming Session was scheduled for the May meeting and requested that the following items should be scheduled for consideration at the appropriate time in the new municipal year; Section 21s, an update on the City Centre Public Space Protection Order consultation exercise, an update on the landlord licensing schemes, Highways Investment Programme update, Cycle Lanes and an update on waste and recycling.

Decisions

The Committee notes the report and approves the work programme subject to the above comments.

Economy Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 6 February 2019

Present:

Councillor H Priest (Chair) – in the Chair
Councillors Connolly, Davies, Douglas, Green, Hacking, Johns, Newman, Paul, Raikes, Razaq, Shilton Godwin and A Simcock

Also present:

Councillor Leese - Leader
Councillor Ollerhead - Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources
Councillor Richards - Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration
Councillor Stogia - Executive member for Highways, Planning and Transport

Apologies: Councillor K Simcock

ESC/19/8 Minutes

In relation to Minute ESC/19/1, Councillor Newman requested that the amendment he requested to the minutes of the meeting on 5 December 2018, be further amended to read as follows:-

- Why was the Local Housing Allowance lower in Wythenshawe in comparison to the rest of the city as this was proving problematic for Wythenshawe residents who were on low incomes.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9 January 2019 as a correct record; and
- (2) Requests that Minute ESC/18/56 be further amended as detailed above.

ESC/19/9 Northern Gateway Strategic Regeneration Framework Update

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Development), which provided an update of the outcome of the public consultation exercise carried out with local residents, businesses, landowners and key stakeholders, throughout August and September 2018, on the draft Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) for the Northern Gateway.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration referred to the main points and themes in the report which included:-

- Details of the SRF consultation process and communication methods used;

- A synopsis of the comments received via the consultation questionnaire and community representations, the majority of which were generally supportive of the proposals, and covered the following areas-
 - Housing and density
 - Community and social facilities
 - Accessibility and connectivity;
 - Green spaces and public realm;
 - Neighbourhood management
 - History and heritage of the Northern Gateway area;
- Comments from landowners and businesses received via written representation;
- An overview of statutory agency/stakeholder responses received via written representations; and
- Outcomes from a health stakeholder workshop which focussed specifically on the population health and care impacts of the draft SRF.

The Committee had been invited to comment on the report prior to its submission to the Executive on 13 February 2019.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- It was not felt appropriate for a news bulletin to have been released advising of the Council's intentions in regards to the Northern Gateway prior to these proposals having been through the Scrutiny and Executive processes;
- When would local Ward Councillors be consulted on the content of the proposed consultation;
- Assurance was sought that communities and local councillors would be fully involved in the proposed creation of new communities with their views taken into account;
- Was the low response rate to the consultation considered satisfactory on proposals of this scale;
- The emphasis on the green and blue space within the proposals was welcomed;
- It was pleasing to see proposals for district centres which would be aligned with public facilities;
- Whilst the investment and vision was welcomed, a commitment was sought that the rehousing of any residents would be handled in an appropriate and sympathetic manner;
- Was there any more information on the consultation comments in relation to revenue considerations; and
- Had any conversations started with communities in regards to the development plans.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration affirmed her position that she did value the scrutiny process and apologised that the recent press release had not reflected that the proposals would be considered by Scrutiny to allow the Executive to take into consideration any recommendations prior to a decisions being made. She also commented that there had been a number of one to one consultations with each Ward, which took place before Christmas 2018., and the proposals had not changed

since then. It was acknowledged that the communities needed to be at the heart of these proposals, and there had been good attendance at the drop in session that had taken place. Strong feedback had been received from residents around the facilities and support needed, which would be incorporated into how the vision would be developed. A commitment was made to continue to consult with residents as proposals developed.

In terms of the response level to the consultation process, it was reported that a lot of the geography the proposals covered were unpopulated or had a low residential base. In comparison to consultations on other proposals of a similar size, the level of responses that had been received were similar and considered satisfactory. Furthermore, the Committee was advised that the Council had not started any detailed consultations yet on the proposals, what had taken place so far was based on the high level strategic framework, and what was needed next was consulting with residents on detailed phasing plans following Executive approval of phase one.

The Committee was advised that in relation to revenue considerations, it was reported that a place management plan would be critical to address these considerations in order to increase enforcement and tackle issues that were prevalent in the area.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Requests that the Executive ensure that there is continued conversations with local residents and ward councillors on the proposals;
- (2) Endorses the recommendations contained within the report that the Executive:-
 - Note the comments received on the draft SRF and the response to these comments;
 - Note the changes made to the SRF as set out within appendix 4; and
 - Approve the Northern Gateway SRF with the intention that it will become a material consideration in the Council's decision making process as Local Planning Authority.

[Councillor Johns declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this item as his employer undertook the social economic vision for the Far East Consortium and left the meeting during consideration of this item].

ESC/19/10 Northern Gateway: Implementation and Delivery

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Development), which set out details of the Phase 1 Implementation Strategy for the Northern Gateway.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:-

- Governance arrangements for the Northern Gateway;

- Phase 1 development activity in years 1 to 5, which included Red Bank and New Town and development in Collyhurst;
- Tenure and typology mix and affordability of new housing;
- The infrastructure and funding required to deliver the Northern Gateway;
- Place management arrangements;
- The required land assembly to deliver Phase 1; and
- Emerging policy context.

The Committee had been invited to comment on the report prior to its submission to the Executive on 13 February 2019.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Consideration needed to be given as to how the city centre travel plan would impact on the Northern Gateway proposals;
- What role would Rochdale Road have in the proposals as there was a concern that within the Northern Gateway proposals, it was being referenced as an urban avenue but in the Transport Strategy 2040 it was referred to as an express bus corridor and what impact would the Bury and Rochdale allocations in the GMSF have in terms of the use of this road;
- Further details were requested on what were the other mechanisms being explored for the management of open spaces; and
- How was the Strategic Business Plan going to be scrutinised.

The Leader advised that to deliver the targets within the GMSF, there was a large dependence on central Manchester to achieve this and the number of housing units in this plan would be key to deliver these targets. A lot of the work taking place with TFGM at present was to see how a road system could be designed to accommodate public transport, cycling and walking whilst being liveable for those who lived on this route.

The Committee was advised that in terms of the mechanisms to manage open space, this would be dependent on how public open space was to be managed, whether it would be adopted or in some instances, part of private realm. What was recognised would be the need for a clear integrated strategy to place management.

The Leader advised that if this Committee was minded to, it could scrutinise the Strategic Business Plan, but added the caveat that this would need to be undertaken under a Part B item.

Councillors Karney and Flanagan were then invited to address the Committee with their views in regards to the proposals within the Northern Gateway. Both Councillors welcomed the development and regeneration proposals within the Framework. A request was made for Officers to provide more detail to local councillors on the outcome of the consultation that had taken place with local residents.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Requests that the Executive take into account the comments made by the Committee;
- (2) Requests that the outcome of the consultation with local residents is shared with local Councillors on a ward by ward basis; and
- (3) Endorses the recommendations contained within the report that the Executive:-
 - Note the contents of the report and the progress being made to establish appropriate governance and implementation arrangements to secure the delivery of the Northern Gateway initiative;
 - Note that the City Council has submitted an Expression of Interest for the Northern Gateway to be designated for inclusion within the Government's Garden Communities Programme and request that a further report is brought back to a future meeting once the outcome of this submission is known;
 - Note the update provided in relation to the progress being made in developing an application for Housing Infrastructure Fund to support the delivery of the Northern Gateway initiative and to delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Strategic Director, Development to finalise and submit the application to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government by the deadline of 22 March 2019 and to request that a further report on the outcome of this bid is brought to a future meeting of the Executive, together with any proposals for the investment of any funding that is secured;
 - Note the intention to deliver an early phase of development within Collyhurst as well as on the edge of the City Centre and to delegate authority to the Strategic Director, Development in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration and local elected members to identify appropriate locations for the delivery of up to 530 new homes, including up to 130 new Council Houses, within the Collyhurst neighbourhood so that detailed consultations can be undertaken with the local community to draw up proposals for a detailed funding and delivery plan, for consideration by a future meeting of the Executive;
 - Note the intention to prepare a costed schedule of placemaking interventions for the Phase 1 development area which will be used by the Local Planning Authority as the basis for negotiating Section 106 developer contributions. All developments will be expected to provide Section 106 contributions towards the provision of identified placemaking activities;
 - Note the progress being made in assembling land to deliver the objectives of the Northern Gateway programme and to delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the City Solicitor, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to agree and finalise the terms of a commercial loan between the Council and Far East Consortium (FEC) to support land acquisition as part of the Joint Venture programme. Note that approval of the loan would be subject to approval of full Council, requiring a Part B report at the appropriate time and

- Delegate authority to the City Solicitor to enter into and complete all documents or agreements necessary to give effect to the recommendations in this report.

[Councillor Johns declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this item as his employer undertook the social economic vision for the Far East Consortium and left the meeting during consideration of this item].

ESC/19/11 Consultation on the draft Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) and Manchester Local Plan Review - Update

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Development), which provided an update on the progress that had been made with the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) Consultation and how this Framework would provide a context for the preparation by individual authorities of updated Local Plans.

The Head of City Policy referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:-

- The GMSF was currently being prepared as a document jointly 'owned' by the ten Greater Manchester districts;
- The intention was that in the future the GMSF would become the GM Mayor's Plan, called a Spatial Development Strategy (SDS);
- The Spatial Development Strategy would still need support from the leaders of all ten districts and the GM Mayor;
- Each Council Leader had indicated that they would seek the support of their council before giving their endorsement to the GMSF;
- Details of the 2019 Draft Greater Manchester Spatial Framework, which included:-
 - Overall Development Targets;
 - Key Policy Proposals; and
 - Development Proposals for Manchester
- The relationship between the GMSF and Manchester's Local Plan; and
- A timetable of next steps to be taken.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Was the Council convinced that the city's housing needs would be met within the housing targets;
- What would happen if unanimity across the 10 GM Councils was not achieved;
- What was the current status of the Council's housing vision;
- Were council houses or social housing included within the GMSF housing targets;
- Assurance was sought that the creation and implementation of a GMSF was not the start of centralisation of planning call to a GM regional level; and
- How was the different type of housing demands taken into consideration as part of the GMSF.

The Leader advised that the GMSF would set out the vision for housing across Greater Manchester but would not be a formal planning document and as such, would not permit the GMCA to dictate what the Council could agree to build. He added that the next draft of the GMSF was due in Summer 2019, which would allow for each local authority to comment on the current proposals or make suggested amendments. If the 10 Greater Manchester Councils did not unanimously support the final proposals a fall back option would be to establish a joint development plan which would be created between two or more local authorities.

The Committee was assured that the creation and implementation of the GMSF would not provide any facility for Greater Manchester to take over development control arrangements that currently rested within each local authority

The Leader advised that the total housing figure within the GMSF was an aggregated figure for all 10 GM local authorities, based on an assessment of need and the subsequent land allocation had been identified taking the level of need for each local authority into account. He added that the amount of housing need for Manchester had not altered from the first incarnation of the GMSF in comparison to other GM local authorities.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

ESC/19/12 Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040: Draft Delivery Plan (2020-2025)

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Development and Deputy Chief Executive, which presented the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040 Draft Delivery Plan (2020-2025). The Plan had been developed in conjunction with the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) and was an important document in demonstrating how it was intended to effectively integrate new and existing development with future transport investments.

The Head of City Policy referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:-

- The purpose of the draft Delivery Plan;
- A summary of other GMSF supporting documents that had been prepared to support the proposals within the draft Delivery Plan;
- The content of the draft Delivery Plan;
- Implications for Manchester;
- Details of a proposed light touch consultation on the document which was being undertaken in parallel with the GMSF consultation; and
- Next steps and timescales

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Members were keen to understand how the relationship of this strategy and the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) would develop;

- Had there been any discussions with government around further devolution as referenced in the delivery plan;
- How developed were the proposals for a Metrolink tunnel for the city centre;
- Was there any plans to bring back into use redundant train lines for new tram train provision proposals;
- Had there been any progress with the need to bring about suitable changes to rail capacity to reflect the increased demand in services;
- Did the capacity of the Metrolink provision need reviewing;
- In terms of making improvements to public transport, consideration needed to be given to comfort, safety and cost;
- Members welcomed the emphasis on active travel within the strategy;
- It was felt that critical to the success of the strategy would be the need to reform bus services in Manchester and across the region;
- What happened to the proposed West Wythenshawe Metrolink loop; and
- There was concern that there was barrier to engagement with the proposed consultation as not many people would be aware of the link of the Delivery Plan to the GMSF and it was suggested that consultation on this Delivery Plan should be undertaken alongside the consultation on the GMSF, rather than as a subset of it.

The Leader advised that one of the main aims of tram trains was to relieve congestion on the heavy rail network as it was about increasing Metrolink provision and would only work where there was a discreet railway line that could be taken out of the current rail network to operate exclusively in this way. He added that the Secretary of State for Transport and Department for Transport were in support for developing tram train options.

The Head of City Policy supported the views of Members of the need to deepen the relationships between land use and transport planning through this process. With this delivery plan and the GMSF, Greater Manchester had a holistic plan which enabled the region to demonstrate the need for more transport investment to support growth. He added that to deliver the scale of ambition within the Plan, a recommitment by government to a transport fund for Greater Manchester was needed. In terms of a proposed Metrolink tunnel, he advised that this was still at a conceptual stage.

The Executive Member for Highways, Planning and Transport reinforced the need for investment from government in order to deliver the ambitions within the Plan and committed to work with local councillors to identify innovative ideas for city centre transport.

In relation to railway capacity, the Leader advised that the outcome of a comprehensive review by Network Rail was expected in March 2019, which would fit into the next expenditure round. He advised that it was anticipated that the review would identify the continued need for platforms 13 and 14 at Piccadilly station and that the platforms at Deansgate station required extending. He added that the fundamental problems that existed on the rail network within the city centre where at either ends of the Castlefield corridor, which would need some form of substantial interventions. In terms of capacity on the Metrolink service and intensification of the network, he advised that viable routes were required and following completion of the

Trafford Park line, there would be no capacity to add additional on street services within the city centre on the current network.

Safety and security of public transport users was taken seriously by the Council and TFGM and the Head of City Policy agreed to provide Members with more details on this.

The Leader concluded by advising the Committee that the West Wythenshawe loop had been renamed as the Davenport Green extension and was being considered in conjunction with HS2 proposals.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Endorses the Draft Delivery Plan, particularly in terms of its implications for the city and plans to deliver an effective, inclusive and sustainable transport system;
- (2) Notes the timetable set out in the report for agreeing a final version of the Delivery Plan later in 2019; and
- (3) Requests that Officers relay the views of the Committee back to the GMCA.

ESC/19/13 City Centre Transport Strategy - Feedback from the Responses to the Conversation held in Autumn 2018

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Development) and Deputy Chief Executive, which set out the responses to a conversation and engagement exercise to support the development of a refreshed City Centre Transport Strategy. The report also described the proposed next steps in developing an updated transport strategy for the City Centre taking account of the plans for growth.

The Head of City Policy referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:-

- The rationale as to why it was necessary to review the City Centre Transport Strategy;
- Highlights from the responses to the engagement exercise which included, but was not limited to:-
 - A total of 3700 responses had been received;
 - 90% of respondents identified air quality as an important issue;
 - 80% agreed that improving cycling, walking and public transport infrastructure would be the best way to improve air quality;
 - Congestion and traffic was identified as one of the biggest problems when travelling into and around the city centre;
 - Expanding the public transport network, cheaper and discounted travel and more frequent and reliable services were highlighted as being needed to encourage more people to use public transport to access the city centre;
 - Deansgate was highlighted as the main street in the city centre that had too little space for pedestrians; and

- Next steps, which involved the production of a draft strategy document for consultation that drew on the responses and identified specific schemes that would be needed to support future growth.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- How representative were the findings of the engagement exercise in terms of the demographics of the city;
- A Member felt that the issue with the space available on Deansgate was more to do with the volume of pedestrians rather than the physical width of the pavements;
- There was concern about proposals to take traffic out of the city centre and the impact this could have on Wards on the periphery of the city centre;
- There was concern that the pedestrianisation of roads could lead to increase in ground rents on local businesses;
- There was concern that proposed alterations to networks were not being built with cyclists being taken into account;
- How robust was the data collected from the survey of daily trips into the city centre in morning peak periods and did this data take into account journeys of those people who already lived in the city centre
- A Ward by Ward breakdown of the consultation was requested for Committee Members; and
- How was this strategy going to align with other emerging strategies;

The Leader acknowledged the need to consider the impact in areas surrounding the city centre and referenced that the report had identified that it would be important to consider the complementary measures required in areas surrounding the centre to ensure that any transport impacts that arose from the continuing growth of the city centre were effectively managed. The Executive Member for Highways, Planning and Transport added that the Council was reviewing parking within the city centre and the impact of parking on the periphery of the city centre and agreed to share the findings of this with Members.

The Committee was advised that the main differences of the sample used in the engagement exercise compared to the representative of the city was a slight gender in-balance of responses from men compared to women and respondents aged 25-54 were overrepresented whereas respondents over 65 were underrepresented. Aside from this, the representation of the responses to the engagement exercise was expected.

The Leader commented that rent levels tended to sit alongside the economic success of the city and there was evidence that if undertaken in the right way, pedestrianisation often improved access to businesses. He also added that over the next planning period the dominant form of transport in the city centre should be walking.

The Head of City Policy advised that the survey of daily trips into the city centre in morning peak periods had been undertaken for a number of years now and was a consistent data set, which looked at all the crossing points of the inner ring road. He added that this strategy was seen as a sub strategy of the 2040 Transport Strategy,

which the Council was working alongside TFGM and Salford City Council on its development. The next stage would be to develop specific schemes and proposals.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report and in particular the responses received to the City Centre Transport Strategy conversation and the proposed next steps in the development of a draft strategy document;
- (2) Welcomes the offer from the Executive Member for Highways, Planning and Transport to share the findings of the review of parking within the city centre and the impact of parking on the periphery of the city centre with Committee Members;
- (3) Requests that Officers provide a ward breakdown of the consultation responses with the relevant Ward Members; and
- (4) Agrees to receive a further report prior to the draft document for consultation being considered by the Executive.

ESC/19/14 Updated Financial Strategy and Directorate Business Plans 2019-20

Further to Minute ESC/18/55, the Committee considered a report of the Chief Executive and the City Treasurer which provided a further update on the Council's financial position and set out the next steps in the budget process.

The Committee was invited to consider and make recommendations on the budget proposals which were within the remit of the Committee and to comment on the Directorate Business Plans, prior to their submission to the Executive on 13 February 2019.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration and the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources outlined the context of the reports, in particular the challenges presented by funding reductions from the national government.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- It was felt that there needed to be more detail within Business Plan as to how the Council's living wage policy was being developed and enforced through contracts;
- The Committee welcomed the investment in Adult Social Care which would hopefully help older resident stay in employment longer; and
- The Committee welcomed the increased budget for compliance on private landlords and waste management.

The Leader agreed that more detail would be included in the Business Plan in regards to the Council's living wage policy and how this was being applied within contracts. He also commented that the Council would be developing and action plan as to how the quality of life for those aged 50 to 64 could be improved.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration commented that there was also other areas of focus taking place in regards to the private sector rental market, which would include a review and extend the selective licensing schemes and also an increase in the team that deals with HMO licensing.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes that this is the final year of a three year budget; and
- (2) Requests that the Executive take into account the comments made by the Committee.

ESC/19/15 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 requested that as part of next years work programme setting, consideration undertaking some work around the Greater Manchester Pankhurst Forces Scorecard as a number of areas related specifically to the economy.

A Member also suggested that the Committee also looked at housing wealth and ownership within the city, in order to consider if the wealth being generated through the rental of properties is remaining within the city

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) notes the report; and
- (2) agrees that if any Members have suggestions for inclusion in next year's work programme, they are to notify the Chair accordingly.

Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 7 February 2019

Present:

Councillor Hacking (Chair) – in the Chair [CESC/19/06, CESC/19/08 - CESC/19/11]
Councillors Andrews, M Dar, Douglas, Evans, Fletcher-Hackwood, Rawlins and Rawson

Also present:

Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader
Councillor S Murphy, Statutory Deputy Leader
Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources
Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Schools, Culture and Leisure

Chief Inspector Cherie Buttle, Greater Manchester Police (GMP)
PC David Fisher, GMP

Apologies:

Councillors Collins, Cooley and Kirkpatrick

CESC/19/6 Minutes

The Chair informed Members that the Committee would receive the information it had requested on the Council resources being invested in core events in a report to its meeting on 7 March 2019.

Decisions

1. To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2019 as a correct record.
2. To receive the minutes of the meeting of the Our Manchester Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) Fund Task and Finish Group held on 3 January 2019.

CESC/19/7 Begging and people who beg in the city centre

[Councillor Hacking declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in this item, due to his partner being employed by Manchester Action on Street Health (MASH), left the room, and took no part in discussions. Councillor Evans was nominated Chair in his absence and chaired the meeting for this item only.]

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Strategic Development) and the Chief Operating Officer (Neighbourhoods) which provided information on the proactive partnership work that was being undertaken in relation to begging.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:

- The context;
- Begging in Manchester;
- The emerging intelligence picture; and
- Next steps.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- That the data on the age of people begging in the city centre focused on those between the ages of 26 and 45, whereas those outside that age range were likely to need more support, and to request further information on the younger and older age groups;
- What was being done to improve the way the Council and GMP supported and motivated individuals who were begging to seek support and change their lives;
- The difficulty of separating the issues of rough sleeping and begging and the importance of scrutinising these two issues together, even though they fell within the remit of different scrutiny committees;
- Whether there was evidence of organised begging run by gangmasters; and
- What was the impact of the Big Change initiative, which encouraged the public to donate to a fund which provided people facing homelessness with practical items to support a long-term change.

The City Centre Public Services Manager informed Members that approximately 10% of those begging were under the age of 26. She reported that numbers diminished after the age of 55 because of the range of support services available to older people. She informed the Committee that young people who were begging were asked what support they needed and signposted to services and that, where there were safeguarding concerns, appropriate referrals were made. She advised Members that most of the young people who were begging were already known to officers working in this area.

The City Centre Public Services Manager reported that the Council and GMP had already made significant progress in making their systems work more effectively and in an integrated way to address the issue of begging and how individuals could be supported to change their lives. She reported that the criminal justice system was used where individuals refused to accept offers of help to change their behaviour and that officers had been working with the Crown Prosecution Service and the Probation Service to encourage the use of sentencing options such as a requirement to attend drug rehabilitation services, which could positively change the individual's behaviour, rather than just issuing a fine. Chief Inspector Cherie Buttle from GMP reported that the police had four officers in the city centre dedicated to dealing with rough sleeping and begging and that all officers received training on this. She advised Members that the first approach was to signpost the individual to appropriate services. She reported that enforcement was also used where appropriate but that those brought into custody were also signposted to services and the focus was on breaking the cycle of begging.

The Community Safety Lead reported that there was not currently much evidence in relation to organised begging in Manchester but that work had recently started under

Programme Challenger, Greater Manchester's partnership approach to tackling serious organised crime, to gather information on this.

PC David Fisher from GMP reported that over £250,000 have been distributed so far by the Big Change. He reported that the public was being encouraged to donate to the Big Change, rather than giving money to beggars on the street, and that the money was used to help keep people at risk of homelessness off the streets, for example, providing clothing and other items they needed to gain and maintain employment. The Deputy Leader advised that more needed to be done to communicate the positive impact of Big Change to the public and that he would take this forward, in conjunction with the Council's Communications Team.

Decision

To request a further report on begging and rough sleeping, noting that this spans the remit of two scrutiny committees whose Members should have the opportunity to scrutinise it. To request that this report include further information in response to Members' comments, in particular further information on the work to gather evidence in relation to organised begging.

[Councillor S Murphy declared a personal interest as a trustee of MASH.]

CESC/19/8 Updated Financial Strategy and Directorate Business Plans 2019-20

Further to item CESC/18/54, the Committee received a report of the Chief Executive and the City Treasurer which provided an update on the Council's financial position and set out the next steps in the budget process, including scrutiny of the draft budget proposals and Directorate Business Plan reports by the Committee.

The Committee also received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive which set out in broad terms the Neighbourhoods Directorate's key priorities, key activities and both the revenue and capital strategy for 2019-20. In the Business Plan for the period 2017-2020, directorates had set out their proposed savings in the context of their objectives. This report set out both the progress made to date in delivering these savings and the directorate's focus over the final year of the three-year plan. This report was a refresh of the directorate's Business Plan for 2018-20 in the context of changing resources, challenges and opportunities.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources outlined the context of the reports, in particular the challenges presented by funding reductions from the national government. The Chief Operating Officer (Neighbourhoods) provided Members with an overview of the reports. The Executive Member for Schools, Culture and Leisure highlighted investments and improvements being made in areas within the Committee's remit.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- To welcome that the Council was investing in services which residents had stated were important to them, despite the current financial situation;
- Whether there were any plans for the returned £2.7 million from the unused central business rates levy surplus;
- How confident were officers that an additional £163,000 would be generated from parks in 2019-20;
- Request for further information on the Manchester Volunteer Inspired Programme (MCRVIP); and
- To thank officers and Executive Members for their hard work in developing the budget proposals and business plans.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources reported that the £2.7 million was earmarked for addressing the budget pressures on the Children's Services budget. The Executive Member for Schools, Culture and Leisure informed Members that the Council had already managed to increase the income generated from cafes and other facilities in the city's larger parks and that responses to the consultation on the Parks Strategy had indicated that residents wanted more amenities, such as cafes, in parks. He reported that the first 15 park plans were being implemented, with support from partners including volunteers, and that he was confident that the income targets could be achieved. The Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure and Events) reported that 25% of the running costs for Manchester parks were funded by income generated through trading or secondary income from the parks. He informed the Committee that, based on benchmarking with other cities, he was confident that, with the right investment and approach, there was a lot of scope to increase the income generated from the city's parks.

In response to the question on the MCRVIP, the Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure and Events) informed Members that many local people had volunteered to support the Commonwealth Games held in Manchester in 2002 and had expressed an interest in continuing to volunteer at future events. He reported that in 2006 the Council had secured funding to establish a volunteering bureau which was primarily focused on sport and leisure events and that this model had been successful and had subsequently been adopted by other cities. He informed the Committee that the Council was now working to expand the MCRVIP to encompass other types of volunteering opportunities. The Chief Operating Officer (Neighbourhoods) reported that officers were working with colleagues in HROD (Human Resources and Organisational Development) on how this platform could be used to link Council staff to volunteering opportunities, as Council employees were now eligible for three days of volunteering leave per year.

Decisions

The Committee:-

1. Supports the way the Council is working to continue to provide services in the face of challenging financial circumstances.
2. Requests that the report on Events, which is scheduled for the 7 March meeting, include further information on the Manchester Volunteer Inspired Programme and how it links into the events programme.

CESC/19/9 Refreshed Business Plans - Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs)

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive which provided an overview of the role of Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) in the Council's business planning process for 2019/2020. It outlined the context of why the Council undertook EIAs and how this process was managed to support good quality analysis which informed decision making. It also described how the Council used Equality Delivery Plans as part of this process to highlight achievements on equality in the preceding year, as well as stating its commitments to equality activity and analysis over the remaining year of this budget cycle (2019-20).

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:

- Equality analysis and business planning; and
- The schedule of EIAs.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- To note that some of the data in the EIA schedule table within the report was listed as 'to be confirmed' and to ask when this information would be available, particularly in relation to timescales;
- To request further information on the use of EIAs outside of the budget process;
- To welcome the inclusion of EIAs for the Strategic Development Directorate; and
- To note that the item in the EIA schedule table which referred to "all major residential and commercial developments" was very broad.

The Head of Workforce Strategy informed Members that some of the information which was listed as 'to be confirmed' had become available since the report was published. He advised that it was anticipated that, by the Committee's meeting on 7 March 2019, this information would be available for all the EIAs, or if there were any gaps, there would be a clear reason for this. He outlined the process for completing EIAs, reporting that the completion of EIAs was service-led with support and quality assurance from the Equalities Team. He informed Members that over the next 12 months' work would be taking place to strengthen the governance and quality assurance of EIAs, train staff and ensure that EIAs were easily accessible to the public. He acknowledged that the item on the EIA schedule relating to "all major residential and commercial developments" was very broad and advised Members that he would provide further information on this in the report to the Committee's next meeting on 7 March 2019.

Decision

To note that the Committee will want to look at some of the EIAs at a future meeting and that this will include the Affordable Housing Policy and others to be identified at a later point.

CESC/19/10 Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) Infrastructure Service

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive which provided information on the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) Infrastructure Service, specifically on the co-design process and recommendations for a new VCS infrastructure service contract.

The Statutory Deputy Leader referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:

- The co-design process;
- The co-design recommendations; and
- Next steps.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- That the findings from the work of the Our Manchester VCS Fund Task and Finish Group were also relevant to this work, for example, in relation to communication with Members and clarity for VCS groups on what support and advice they could expect from the infrastructure provider and from the Council;
- How it would be ensured that organisations which were bidding for the contract did not have an advantage over others through having been involved in the co-design process;
- The need for clarity on what support the infrastructure provider could and could not provide so that Members knew when it was appropriate to signpost VCS groups to them and so that the groups were clear on what the offer was;
- Whether it was expected that the same amount of money would be invested in the infrastructure contract or whether the service would be reduced due to budget pressures;
- How the infrastructure provider was expected to facilitate the engagement of other suitable groups, such as disability-focused organisations, in fora where it was more appropriate for them to attend;
- How greater clarity could be provided on the support that the Council and the infrastructure provider each provided in relation to Community Asset Transfers and how support for Community Asset Transfers would be done differently in future; and
- The proposal that the contract could be awarded to more than one provider and how this would work.

The Statutory Deputy Leader advised Members that it was valuable to have the existing infrastructure provider involved in the co-design process so that they could share their experience but that it was important that they and other organisations which were interested in bidding for the contract were not involved in the later stages of making decisions about the content of the contract.

The Principal Resources and Programmes Officer advised Members that she would feed back to the Programme Lead the point about ensuring clarity on what the infrastructure provider could and could not provide. She informed Members that, as part of future funding rounds for the Our Manchester VCS Fund, a representative of

the Council's Programme Team would be present at meetings with the VCS groups to ensure consistency and clarity of information for the groups. She reported that, at the present time, officers were working on the basis that the amount of money invested in the infrastructure contract was expected to be similar to that under the previous contract.

The Statutory Deputy Leader informed Members that the Council had an ambition to increase the number of Community Asset Transfers but wanted to ensure that the groups involved were able to manage the properties they were taking over and that the details of the support to be provided through this process was still being developed. She reported that there would need to be greater clarity in the final contract of the role of the infrastructure provider in facilitating the engagement of other suitable organisations in fora, where appropriate.

The Programme Development Officer reported that, if more than one provider was awarded the contract, it would be expected that the providers would work in partnership and that the work could be divided based on their expertise. The Statutory Deputy Leader clarified that the Council would consider bids from individual organisations and joint bids from more than one provider.

Decision

To note the report.

CESC/19/11 Overview Report

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit was submitted. The overview report contained a list of key decisions yet to be taken within the Committee's remit, responses to previous recommendations and the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to approve.

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme.

Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 7 February 2019

Present:

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair
Councillors Ahmed Ali, Andrews, Barrett, Clay, Davies, Lanchbury, Kilpatrick, Moore, B Priest, A Simcock, Watson and Wheeler

Also present:

Councillor Leese - Leader
Councillor N Murphy - Deputy Leader
Councillor Ollerhead - Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources

Apologies: Councillor Rowles

RGSC/19/8 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2019 as a correct record.

RGSC/19/9 Updated Financial Strategy and Directorate Business Plans 2019-20

Further to Minute RGSC/18/66, the Committee considered a report of the Chief Executive and the City Treasurer which provided a further update on the Council's financial position and set out the next steps in the budget process.

The Committee was invited to consider and make recommendations on the budget proposals which were within the remit of the Committee and to comment on the Directorate Business Plans, prior to their submission to the Executive on 13 February 2019.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources outlined the context of the reports, in particular the challenges presented by funding reductions from the national government. The Leader commented that the cuts made to the Council's budget were now £10million more than when the three year budget was first set in 2017/18, and what was clearly evident was that the impact of austerity was becoming ever more visible, particular in those areas of high deprivation.

In relation to the Corporate Core Business plan, some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- With the uncertainty of Brexit, what would be the impact of the withdrawal of European Regional Development fund to the Council and what were the €3 million of approved grants that the Council currently had access to;
- Further clarification was requested on the leadership role of the Core in influencing outside of the organisation to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and improve air quality and improve public transport and highways and make them more sustainable;
- Why had staff absence levels increased within the Core;
- There was concern that Council average days absence was 12.1 days when compared to the private sector absence average of 6.1 days;
- Had the Age Friendly Board been involved in the arrangements to ensure residents were supported to live at home for as long as possible;
- Was there a correlation between staff absence levels and efficiency savings;
- Was the annual leave purchase scheme working well and if so was there any scope to achieve further savings than the identified £150,000;
- Was it anticipated that the level of savings through ICT would be achievable; and
- Reassurance was sought that the savings identified through the deletion of vacant posts was achievable and that these posts were not definitely not required.

The City Treasure advised that there had been a lot of work undertaken at a GM level on the impact assessment on the risk of withdrawal of European funding as a result of Brexit. The removal of this funding would not impact directly on the Council's core services, however, it would have some impact on programmes of work such as work with other European cities and climate change, were we would have reduced access to funding. The Leader added that the removal of this funding was a bigger risk at a Greater Manchester than it was to just the Council. The City Treasurer also agreed to provide a breakdown to Members of the €3million approved grants that was currently received.

In terms of the leadership role of the Core, the City Treasurer explained that this referred to work undertaken by the Council's Policy Unit which provided information and support to these areas both in terms of bringing together the support from within the Council and links to where this work was carried out at a GM level.

The City Treasurer advised that sickness absence levels had remained at a similar level over the past one to two years, which reflected a considerable amount of work that had been undertaken to reduce this level and improve performance.

The Leader advised that in terms of enabling the MLCO to proactively triage, monitor and respond to residents' circumstances in order to ensure they were supported to live at home for as long as possible, this was restating what was existing and long term policy, which the Age Friendly Board had been consulted on many times over a long period of time.

The Committee was advised that there was no direct correlation between staff absence levels and efficiency savings. The Leader acknowledged that there would be some impact on the delivery of savings as there had been a 40% reduction in the

workforce over the last nine years and Elected Members needed to be conscious of this.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources confirmed that the annual leave purchase scheme was working well and had been well received by staff. He hoped that the policy could be enhanced further in the future. He also commented the Council had a comprehensive ICT strategy that would help to achieve the identified savings. In terms of staff vacancies, the Council's Senior Management Team had reviewed all current vacant posts to identify whether these were still required.

In relation to the Strategic Development Business Plan, some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- It was requested that that the word 'solutions', in reference to delivering housing for residents with additional needs, was removed from the Business Plan;
- More information was needed on how many income generating interests were run by volunteers as part of the Investment Estate and would the strengthening of this performance impact on these organisations;
- Why had there been a delay in the retendering of the repairs and maintenance contract and had this had any financial impact on the Council;
- How much funding was contained within the regeneration reserve;
- Could more be done in terms of the offer to apprentices from within the directorate; and
- Why was the Adult Education Budget (AEB) being devolved to the GMCA in the 2019/20 financial year.

The Deputy Leader agreed to provide Members with more information on the number of income generating interests that were run by volunteers and advised that the Council was looking to increase its income from its commercial arm as opposed to its voluntary arm. The Leader added that as part of the Council's Estates rationalisation, where properties had no operational use to the Council, community asset transfers would be supported where possible.

The Committee was advised that the delay in retendering of the repairs and maintenance contracts had occurred due to an effort to try and synchronise the renewal of these contracts in order to gain the most efficiency from the contracts and to also see what other organisations could provide. Existing contracts would continue until the bids for the new contracts had been received and evaluated. The Leader advised that the extension of existing contracts and the delay in the retendering of these contrast had not incurred any additional costs to the council.

The Leader advised that the it was national government who was devolving the funding from the Adult Skills Board to a Greater Manchester level and not Manchester's Adult Education budget that was being passed up to the GMCA. He advised that there was approximately £15m in the regeneration reserve, a third of which would be used for revenue purposes, with the remainder to be used for investment in housing purposes.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources advised that excluding schools, the Council was exceeding its targets apprenticeship levy targets. It was acknowledged that more needed to be done with the schools element of the levy and the Council's social value policy aimed to provide more opportunities for apprentices.

Decision

The Committee

- (1) Notes that this is the final year of a three year budget;
- (2) Requests that the Executive take into account the comments made by the Committee;
- (3) Requests the City Treasurer to provide a briefing note on the €3million European approved grants that the Council currently had access to;
- (4) Agrees that a report is submitted to a future meeting of the HR Sub Group on the management of absence across the Council; and
- (5) Requests that the word 'solutions', in reference to delivering housing for residents with additional needs, is removed from the Strategic Development Business Plan

RGSC/19/10 The impact of welfare reform agenda on the Council's finances and its ability to provide support to residents of Manchester

The Committee considered a report of the City Treasurer, which detailed the impact of the welfare reform agenda on the Council's finances and its ability to provide support to residents of Manchester.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- Budget implications, including the funding for temporary accommodation in connection to the rise in homelessness;
- The status of Universal Credit in Manchester, including details of the claim volumes of households;
- Details of Discretionary Housing Payment spend against agreed budget and associated budget pressures;
- The purpose and objectives of the Council's Welfare Provision Scheme;
- The impact of Universal Credit on the Council's Council Tax Support Scheme for 2019/20;
- The impact of Universal Credit on the Council's collection of Council Tax and rent collection;
- Detailed area analysis of the impact of Universal Credit on housing provider tenants, including feedback from Northwards, Grove Village and S4B; and
- The burden to the Council's Revenue and Benefits service to provide support for Universal Credit.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were:-

- The Committee was disheartened to see the compound effect that the removal of government funding to families, Schools and the Council itself was having on

- the city, and felt that the Government was in denial of the true impact austerity measures were having on Manchester's most vulnerable residents;
- The work of the staff in the Revenue and Benefits team was commended and it was asked whether staff within these teams were offered any form of support due to the distressing nature of some of cases they had to deal with;
 - To what level was the Council relaying to Government the serious challenges it was now having to face due to the continued cuts in funding;
 - It was suggested that the issue of rental arrears of tenants of Manchester's six housing providers, who were subject to Universal Credit, was referred to a future meeting of the most appropriate Scrutiny Committee for consideration; and
 - There was concern as to whether there would be enough funding in future years to support the level of demand

The Director of Customer Services and Transactions shared the Committee's concerns about the reduction in funding from Government and its impact on Manchester residents. She advised that staff within the Revenue and Benefits Team received comprehensive training prior to starting their roles. Staff had flexible working arrangements and were able to ask for support at any time. It was also reported that the ratio of Team Leaders to staff was 1:12 in order to ensure appropriate line management support and foster close working relationships.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources echoed the Committee's praise of staff and commented that the work and support of the Director of Customer Services and Transactions and her managers had resulted in an improvement in the B'Heard 2018 survey results. He also suggested that Committee Members might benefit from undertaking a site visit to the Revenue and Benefits Team to get a true appreciation of the work undertaken by staff.

The City Treasurer advised that the Council had relayed its concerns as to the challenges Manchester faced in the responses to the consultations to the Fairer Funding Review and Business Rates. She confirmed that these responses would be submitted to the next meeting of the Committee for consideration.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report
- (2) Request that the Scrutiny Team Leader liaises with the Director of Customer Services and Transactions to arrange a site visit to the Revenue and Benefits department at a suitable time; and
- (3) Agrees to refer to the appropriate scrutiny committee consideration of rental arrears of tenants of Manchester's six housing providers, who were subject to Universal Credit

RGSC/19/11 Changes to the Council Tax charges levied for tax on empty properties

The Committee considered a report of the City Treasurer, which detailed the final proposals, following a consultation exercise, about whether to adopt these new discretionary powers, and whether to retain or remove the discounts relating to properties empty for one month or undergoing major works.

The Director of Customer Services and Transactions referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:-

- Background as to how the Council currently applied council tax charges to long term empty (LTE) properties;
- Government proposals for changing how Council could apply council tax charges to LTE properties;
- The financial impact of these proposed changes, including how it affected the New Homes Bonus;
- The impact of removing the current 100% discount (for up to one month) when a property became empty and unfurnished and the 50% discount (for up to one year) when a property was undergoing major repairs or structural alterations;
- The outcome of the consultation and engagement plan with Manchester residents; and
- Key policies and consideration in relation to risk management and legal considerations.

The Committee had been invited to comment on the report prior to its submission to the Executive on 13 February 2019.

The Committee unanimously supported the proposed changes to increase Council Tax charges relating to empty domestic properties, as this would have a positive impact for the Council by offering a financial incentive to avoid properties being empty and unoccupied and would increase revenue to the Council.

Decision

The Committee endorses the recommendations contained within the report that the Executive:-

- Note the outcomes of the consultation exercise and the Equality Relevance Assessment, both of which have informed the final recommendations;
- Adopt the discretionary powers to charge higher levels of Council Tax on properties that have been unoccupied and unfurnished for two, five and ten years;
- Remove the 100% discount currently available for up to one month when a property first becomes unoccupied and unfurnished; and
- Remove the 50% discount available for up to one year when a property is unoccupied due to major works or structural alterations.

RGSC/19/12 Changes to the Council's Council Tax Support Scheme - results of consultation and final proposals

The Committee considered a report of the City Treasurer, which detailed the final proposals for the Council's Council Tax Support Scheme (CTSS) from April 2019. The report proposed changes to ensure that the scheme remained fit for purpose as working age residents in receipt of welfare benefits were moved onto Universal Credit.

The Director of Customer Services and Transactions referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:-

- The background to the current local Council Tax Support Scheme for the Council;
- The impact of Universal Credit on Manchester residents and its impact on Council Tax Support;
- What impact the proposed changes would have on Manchester residents;
- The cost of the proposed changes;
- Financial modelling and impact of a banded scheme;
- The outcome of the consultation exercise with Manchester residents; and
- Key policies and considerations, including any legal considerations in relation to the proposed changes.

The Committee had been invited to comment on the report prior to its submission to the Executive on 13 February 2019.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Members unanimously supported the proposed changes to the Council's CTSS in order to continue to deliver a scheme that was cost effective and provided optimum support to low income households within the available budget;
- How much additional funding would be required to deliver the proposed changes to the Discretionary Council Tax Payment Scheme in order to support those families where the government changes have had the most significant impact;
- How would these additional families who required support be identified;
- How will the Council standardise this support and incorporate it into Council policy;
- What opportunity was there to present a case to the DWP to change their ICT system to flag those individuals and or families that were entitled to Council Tax Support;
- Was there a trend of larger families moving into Manchester;
- It was pleasing to see that the number of Band H properties in the city had doubled in number and only eight of these were empty, which would result in more Council Tax income for the Council; and
- Was it possible for the Council to ask the DWP to advise claimants to always claim Council Tax support.

The Director of Customer Services and Transactions advised that an additional £150,000 was being invested into Discretionary Council Tax Payment Scheme to provide support to those additional families where the government changes had had the most significant impact and that this funding would be requested to be maintained in future budgets. The Council will identify those households affected by the Government's two child limit legislation and the impact of moving to a banded scheme. It was estimated that the cost to provide this additional support would be £125,000 and a further £25,000 had been set aside to deal with any other cases that occurred which would be considered on their own merits. Everything that had been mapped had been based on the affordability of the scheme and the support available. Officers would identify cases from their systems and where households were identified as losing a set weekly amount, an adjustment would be made to make up their Council Tax Support. Residents would not be expected to apply for this support. Eligibility for the funding would be for those families that had a weekly loss of £1 or more in the new banded scheme and anyone who lost £2 or more in the two child limit. An initial number of families would be identified for receipt of this support from April 2019 and then officers would run regular reports throughout the year to identify other families who would be affected by the two child limit. It was also reported that the Council had updated its policy document relating to the Discretionary Council Tax Payment Scheme so that it specifically referenced these groups of people.

Officers advised that at a local level, there was a Universal Credit Partnership Manager who the Council was able to raise its preferences through. The Council had regular communication with the DWP, however, getting views considered by the DWP at a national level was challenging and there was also an issue of data sharing and data protection limiting the personal information of claimants the DWP can share.

It was reported that the Council's Revenues and Benefits team did not monitor where families moved into Manchester from and just dealt with families that they were presented with.

The Committee was advised that the Council could ask the DWP to advise claimants to always claim Council Tax Support but there was no guarantee that they would deliver this on a consistent basis.

Decision

The Committee endorses the recommendations contained within the report that the Executive:-

- Note the outcomes of the consultation process and the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) both of which have supported and informed the final recommendations.
- Agrees to make the following changes to the Council Tax Support Scheme from 1 April 2019 in respect of people entitled to Universal Credit.
- A person for whom the Council receives both an electronic notification of a new claim for, and subsequently a related first payment of, Universal Credit from the

Department for Work and Pensions shall be deemed to have made a claim for a reduction under this scheme on the first day of entitlement to Universal Credit to which that notification of first payment refers.

- The amount of an award in respect of a day under this scheme for a person entitled to Universal Credit shall be a percentage of the amount set by the authority as the Council Tax for the relevant financial year in respect of the dwelling in which he is a resident and for which he is liable. This is subject to any discount which may be appropriate to that dwelling under the 1992 Act, divided the number of days in that financial year, less the daily rate of any deductions in respect of non-dependants which fall to be made. That percentage shall be the percentage specified in the following table according to the band in which their excess income falls.

Excess weekly income greater than	Excess weekly income no more than	% reduction of Council Tax liability
£80.01	-	Nil
£75.01	£80.00	12%
£50.01	£75.00	30%
£25.01	£50.00	45%
£0.01	£25.00	70%
-	£0.00	82.5%

- People who have a temporary break in their Council Tax Support (up to six months) because an associated award of Universal Credit has ended or the amount of Universal Credit in payment rises to a level that ends entitlement to Council Tax Support and that award of Universal Credit is subsequently reinstated (whether at the same rate or at a different rate) or drops to a level that triggers eligibility for Council Tax Support, are required to make a new claim for Council Tax Support. A new claim in these circumstances shall be treated as made on the date on which entitlement to Universal Credit resumed / reduced or six months before the day on which the claim is actually received, whichever is the later.
- The Council will monitor and review the Council Tax Support Scheme to ensure that it continues to support the Council's policies. The Council Tax Support Scheme may be amended for subsequent years, but should this happen there will be further consultation. If no revised scheme is published, this scheme will continue to apply to subsequent years. However, the figures set out in the scheme in respect of applicable amounts, income and capital disregards and non-dependants deductions may still be uprated to allow for inflation. Any such uprating will take effect on 1 April each year. If the figures provided in the prescribed requirements change, the Council reserves the right to amend the figures quoted in the scheme without further consultation.
- Where the Council receives notification from the Department for Work and Pensions of a change to Universal Credit and the changed assessment does not result in an alteration to the amount of a reduction under this scheme, the Council is not required to notify the claimant of its recording of that change.

- Agree that the Council's Discretionary Council Tax Payment Scheme is used to support households during the transitional period of moving to the banded scheme and Universal Credit. The scheme would cover the current anomalous and exceptional circumstances as well as supporting those households disproportionately impacted by Universal Credit transfer including families with children.

RGSC/19/13 Overview Report

The 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.

The Chair noted that the section of the report relating to Key Decisions included decisions that had already been taken. The City Solicitor advised the Committee that work was currently underway to review how these decisions were recorded and reported to the Committee. The Chair welcomed this development and requested that additional detail was incorporated within the Register of Key Decisions to make the nature of the decisions more apparent.

Decision

The Committee notes the report and approve the work programme.

RGSC/19/14 Exclusion of Press and Public

A Member moved a motion that agenda item 12 (Management of staff performance and misconduct) be taken as an open item. The motion did not receive a seconder.

A motion was then moved and seconded that the public be excluded during consideration of the next items of business.

Decision

To exclude the public during consideration of the following items 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

RGSC/19/15 Call In: The appointment of a Provider to deliver City Wide Advice Services (Public Excluded)

The Committee considered a call in of the decision taken by the Acting Executive Director Strategic Commissioning (with DASS responsibilities) relating to the appointment of a provider to deliver city wide advice services. The call in had been proposed by Councillor Clay and supported by Councillors Azra Ali Curley, Hughes, Reid and Wheeler.

Councillor Clay outlined to the Committee the reasons as to why he had called the decision in and the concerns he had, which centred around the contracting process and whether when only one bidder submits a tender, how could the process be seen as a robust test of efficiency and value.

The Acting Executive Director Strategic Commissioning (with DASS responsibilities) responded to comments and questions raised by the Committee.

After all questions were asked, the Chair invited Councillor Clay and the Acting Executive Director Strategic Commissioning (with DASS responsibilities) to add anything further to their presentations. No further information was added from either party.

The Committee then considered all the relevant matters.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Supports the decision taken by the Acting Executive Director Strategic Commissioning (with DASS responsibilities).
- (2) Recommends that the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee establishes a Task and Finish Group to consider the availability of advice services across the City as soon as possible, with a view to producing recommendations to be considered in the budget in the next financial year.

RGSC/19/16 Management of staff performance and misconduct (Public Excluded)

The Committee considered the report of the Director of HROD, which provided Members with an overview of the Council's approach to managing staff performance and misconduct in line with the organisation's agreed policies. The report further provided case numbers, key issues and trends in relation to the Council's Disciplinary and Capability policies as well as broader information on the work of HROD to strengthen the organisation's approach to people management.

The Director of HROD referred to the main points and themes within the report and responded to questions from the Committee.

The Committee had considerable concerns about the amount of time it is taking to go through misconduct processes, and the relatively low numbers that are resulting in formal action of any type. They were also worried by the apparently very low numbers of active capability management processes.

The Committee had considerable concerns about the amount of time it was taking to go through misconduct processes, and the relatively low numbers that were resulting in formal action of any type. They were also worried by the apparently very low numbers of active capability management processes.

The Committee was very worried by the apparent disproportionate representation of the BAME population in the misconduct figures, although were reassured that further analysis was being done on these figures to understand them more fully. The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources confirmed that there was going to be an independent review of the number of BAME staff who were subject to misconduct processes which would be carried out by the Head of Equalities at Manchester Foundation Trust.

Decision

The Committee: -

- (1) Notes the report; and
- (2) Places on record its thanks and appreciation to the Director of HROD for all her dedication and hard work over the years and wished her every success in her new role.

Audit Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2019

Present:

Councillor Ahmed Ali - In the Chair
Councillors Connolly, Lanchbury, Russell, A. Simcock and Watson
Mr S Downs (Co-opted member) and Dr D Barker (Co-opted member)

Apologies: -

Also in attendance:

Councillor B Craig (Executive Member for Adults Health & Wellbeing)
Mr Chris Jeffries (Chair, Audit Committee – Manchester Clinical Commissioning Group)

AC/19/01 Minutes

The minutes of the Audit Committee held on 10 December 2018 were submitted for approval.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2018 as a correct record.

AC/19/02 Audit Strategy Memorandum

Members considered the report of Mazars, the Councils appointed external auditor, which provided the Committee with the Audit Strategy Memorandum for the City Council for the year ending March 2019. The memorandum provided a summary to:

- Set out the audit approach;
- Identify significant audit risks and areas of key judgements
- Provide details of the audit team.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member requested an explanation of misstatements, referred to in the memorandum, regarding the material threshold level of triviality (£1.5m) and the potential that a number of errors occurring below the threshold could result in a significant amount.

It was reported that items below the material threshold would not be reported as a matter of course however, a number of errors in the same area of service would be highlighted. Members were informed that the practice of not reporting matters with no material impact is within the scope of national audit work.

A member asked for a position regarding the preparations in place for the completion submission of council's accounts by the July 2019 deadline.

It was reported that the preparations for the council's annual accounts were in place with the required information expected by the May deadline. An exercise would be undertaken to consolidate the Airport Group accounts and formalise accountancy practices. Work had also been undertaken to trial an earlier accounts deadline for the Airport Group using draft accounts in May to achieve a final version in July.

Decision

To note the report submitted.

AC/19/03 Internal Audit Assurance Report

Members considered the report of the City Treasurer and the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management which presented a summary of audit work being undertaken and opinions issued for the period April to December 2018, as part of the annual programme of audit work across the Council.

The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management introduced the report and provided an update on audit work and changes made within the audit plan.

The Committee was also informed that the Council would continue to issue press releases to public raise awareness of counter fraud investigations resulting in convictions.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member made reference to the requirement of three quotations for goods and services over the value of £2000 and asked officers how the level is set in view of the difficulties for schools in obtaining three quotations for such a low level of spend. Officers were also asked what impact the introduction of General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) has had on the volume of Data Protection work within schools.

It was reported that the financial regulations used by schools is the same as that used by the City Council which also requires three quotations for services with a value of £2000 and over. The Committee was informed that the introduction of GDPR had raised the profile of Information Rights, which had resulted in increased activity and this had involved support and advice provided through the Internal Audit Data Protection Officer service to schools

A member referred to the limited assurance opinion in relation to the Mental Health Casework Audit and asked officers how the issues arising from the audit were being addressed.

It was reported that a holistic approach would be taken in addressing the issues as part of the Adult Services Directorate Business Plan and Improvement Plan which

had been shared with Internal Audit.

A member expressed concern regarding assurance findings within Adult Services, in particular, the issues relating to:

- mental health casework audit findings;
- limited assurance for arrangements in place for management oversight and supervision;
- outstanding recommendations from the audit of homecare contracts and transitions to adulthood;
- importance of a successful Liquidlogic system implementation

A member proposed that the Health Scrutiny Committee be made aware of the issues highlighted and to refer the report submitted for Scrutiny ensure that the improvement plan is addressing those areas of concern.

Officers were asked to provide further explanation of the issues relating to limited assurance of the Highways Framework TC886. Officers were also requested to check to ensure that the recommendation had been completed by management to address the issues raised by the end of the financial year 2018/19.

The Committee was informed that TC886 is a highways repair contract where concern had been raised on the operation of the contract framework which is not operating as was original proposed.

A member referred to the limited assurance relating to frameworks agreements, in particular, taxis, highways and financial services as referred to in the report and asked if this would be extended to other areas.

The Committee was informed that the audit of other framework agreements could be extended across the Council and will be included in the planning of the work programme based on the internal audit findings as outlined.

Decisions

1. To note the report submitted.
2. To note with concern the comments raised relating to Adult Services, in particular, the length of time that particular areas of the service have not shown improvement in the level of assurance given.
3. To refer the report submitted to the Health Scrutiny Committee for information and to draw the Committee's attention to the concerns raised regarding Adult Services.

AC/19/04 Internal Audit: Manchester Support for Independent Living (MSIL) Risk Assessment and Audit Plan

The Committee considered the report of the City Treasurer and the Head of Internal

Audit and Risk Management which presented a summary of the rationale for deferring an audit of Manchester Support for Independent Living until 2019/20 and replacing it with an audit of Deprivation of Liberties and Safeguarding. The report provided an explanation of the basis of the risk assessment and alternative means of assurance.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member expressed concern on the Audit Plan regarding the level of focus given on service areas supporting individuals that should be allocated a higher level of importance. Reference was also made to the length of time taken to make an assessment, which had an average of seven months and asked, in view of this delay, how long did the work identified take to complete.

The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management noted the comments made and reported that the Audit Plan provides a rounded audit assurance across the breadth of all activities of the Council. This would include the audit of services concerned with the health and wellbeing of residents as well as other services. The point raised regarding assessment time within MSIL would be considered as part of the planning for the audit of this service within the Audit Plan Quarter 1 - 2019/20.

The Committee discussed the preparation of the Annual Internal Audit Plan and the involvement of the Audit Committee in that process. The Committee was informed that preparations for the Audit Plan 2019/20 were ongoing and a report would be submitted to the April meeting of the Audit Committee. Members commented that the Committee should have opportunity to input earlier in the process rather than just at the approval stage and it was suggested that a report containing proposals be available before the beginning of new financial year.

Arising from the discussion the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management reported that there would be difficulty in providing the Committee with a draft version of the Audit Plan prior to the April meeting. The Committee was informed that the preparation of the Audit Plan 2020/21 would be addressed within the Audit Strategy report and this would include input from other sources including issues arising from member casework for potential areas of service to audit. A draft 'visioning' document would be produced for consideration at the December 2019 meeting of the Committee.

Decisions

1. To note the report submitted and the comments made.
2. To request the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management to include a draft Annual Audit Plan Visioning report item in the Annual Work Programme 2019/20 for submission to the December 2019 meeting of the Committee.

AC/19/05 Outstanding Audit Recommendations

The report of the City Treasurer and the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management was considered which presented a summary of the current implementation position in respect of the high priority Internal Audit recommendations.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member referred to the outstanding audit recommendations relating to Transitions to Adults Services, Homecare Contract and Liquidlogic implementation and the reasons for this. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management was asked if there was confidence that the audit recommendations would be completed by March 2019 and if not would the Director of Adult Services be invited to attend the next meeting of the Committee. A member asked if officers were aware of other potential knock on effects of ICT related issues in other services areas.

The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management explained that the timing of the process involving the circulation of reports to members and officers had been a factor in the delay. There was a potential risk that the recommendations may not be fully implemented relating to the Homecare Contract work and Transition to Adult Services.

The City Treasurer stated that it would be helpful to have the relevant officers present at the next meeting to explain the current audit position to the Committee. In addition, consideration would be given to other potential areas of high risk.

Decisions

1. To note the report submitted and the comments received.
2. To invite the Director of Adult Services to attend the next meeting of the Committee to provide a service wide report, that is supported by Children's Services, to respond to the concerns raised regarding the overdue audit work relating to:
 - Transition to Adult Services;
 - Homecare Contract.

AC/19/06 Register of Significant Partnerships

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive containing the Register of Significant Partnerships 2018. The report presented the format and review and assurance process associated with the register. The report also focussed on partnerships which have been added to the Register during 2018 and those where the governance strength rating had changed or where the rating remains 'Medium' or 'Low' following completion of the latest self-assessment.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member referred to the level given to the governance rating given the Manchester

Safeguarding Adults Partnership Board (MSAPB) and the process used to assess and determine the rating. Officers were asked how the disparity of a 'high' rating is addressed where there were issues of concern identified on the operational delivery of a service and was this replicated across the Partnership Register.

It was reported that there is a three stage process involving production of a self-assessment that in turn is assessed by an experienced panel to justify the governance strength applied. The governance assessment is then either confirmed or revised if it is not considered appropriate.

The Executive Member (Adult Health and Wellbeing) addressed the Committee and explained that changes introduced from the lessons learned had helped to strengthen the governance arrangements of the MSAPB. The point was made that audit work is based on a snapshot of the subject area at a point in time, however the issues identified may reduce as a result of recommended changes for improvement.

A member referred to Brunswick PFI (entry 50 on the Register of Significant Partnerships) and proposed that, in view of the concerns expressed within the report on refurbishment programmes not being achieved, the matter be referred to the Resource and Governance Scrutiny Committee.

A member made reference to the Northern Gateway (entry 15 on the Register of Significant Partnerships) and questioned the 'Medium' Governance Strength rating in view of the significance of the partnership and what this will deliver to Manchester. It was reported that from the comments raised, the significance rating of the Northern Gateway would be reassessed.

A member referred to the Factory Project (Manchester International Festival) and asked if this was a significant enough partnership to be included on the Register of Significant Partnerships.

The Committee was informed that the Factory Project would be subject to an assessment to determine its inclusion on the Register.

Decisions

1. To note the report submitted and comments received, in particular, the concerns raised regarding Brunswick PFI and Northern Gateway.
2. To refer the Brunswick PFI for consideration by the Resource and Governance Scrutiny Committee.

(The Chair adjourned the meeting: 11:30am – 11:40am.)

AC/19/07 Health and Social Care Assurance Framework

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management, which provided the key elements of the current health and care

assurance framework with a focus on governance and assurance from a Council perspective.

The report provided an outline of the assurance framework across the partnership involved in the coordination of health and care services to Manchester residents and how the partnerships interact with the Council's assurance framework.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member referred to paragraph 6.2 of the report and the issue of liaison between auditors of the Council and its partners and asked officers where had liaison proved to be less effected and when would the development of processes be completed. Reference was also made to the integration of health and social care with the purpose of empowering communities and officers were asked if governance arrangements were proposed to implement this at a local level.

The Committee was informed that the issue of liaison between auditors related to auditing work that had been undertaken which had not been notified to the Council's auditors or partnership auditors. Discussions had been held between auditors resulting in the production of a draft working protocols and joints plans document for introduction in 2019/20.

The Executive Member for Adults Health & Wellbeing reported that from a local governance perspective, neighbourhood working through the use of boards was ongoing and this would be included in the memorandum of understanding with the interested partners. This had helped to connect with groups with decision making into a very complex process.

In welcoming the arrangements and processes to introduce and develop local governance, the point was made that the importance of the strategic process was to effect positive outcomes for people at a local level. Officers were also asked that, in view of the separate nature of the audit work undertaken by partners, was it possible to meet at a joint level with the partner audit committees to better understand the breadth of the audit work involved. Also could the Audit Plan include an item that would involve a joint meeting with partnership audit members.

The Audit Committee Chair (Manchester CCG) addressed the Committee and welcomed the opportunity to meet with the Chair of the Committee to identify areas of overlap between the two committees and produce a joint planning paper.

A member stated that consideration needed to be given in the establishment of audit committees within the partner organisations to avoid the duplication of processes and create a streamlined integrated audit service.

The Executive Member (Adult Health & Wellbeing) made the point that in welcoming the opportunity for the two audit committee chairs to meet it was also important to consider that the Council already had planning and meeting structures in place where health and social care matters are reported, scrutinised and accountable.

A member commented that the Audit Committee could receive the minutes of the

Manchester Local Care Organisation Audit Committee to be made aware of the matters being audited.

Decisions

1. To note the report submitted and the comments received.
2. To note the current assurance framework, planned developments.
3. To note that arrangements will be made for a meeting of the Chair of the Audit Committee (Councillor Ahmed Ali) and Councillor Russell (as an Audit Committee Member) and the Chair of the Audit Committee (Manchester CCG) to identify and discuss areas of potential common interest between the two audit committees.
4. To request that the minutes of the Manchester Local Care Organisation Audit Committee be submitted to the Audit Committee for information.

AC/19/08 Work Programme and Audit Committee Recommendations Monitor

The report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

Decision

To note that the Work Programme and Recommendations Monitor will be updated for the next meeting of the Audit Committee.

Licensing Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 4 March 2019

Present: Councillor Ludford (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors: Grimshaw, Chohan, Evans, Hassan, Hughes, Jeavons, Lynch, McHale, Madeleine Monaghan, Reid, Stone and Paul

Apologies: Councillor Barrett and T Judge

LHP/19/10. Minutes

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held 22 October 2018.

Decision

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held 22 October 2018.

LHP/19/11. Compliance Report Qtr 1 2018/19

This item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

LHP/19/12. Compliance Report Qtr 2 2018/19

This item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

LHP/19/13. Compliance Report Qtr 3 2018/19

This item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

Licensing and Appeals Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 4 March 2019

Present: Councillor Ludford (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors: Grimshaw, Chohan, Evans, Hassan, Hughes, Jeavons, Lynch, McHale, Madeleine Monaghan, Paul, Reid and Stone

Apologies: Councillor Barrett and T Judge

Also present: Councillors:

LAP/19/31. Minutes

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2018.

Decision

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2018.

LAP/19/32. Taxi Compliance Update Report

The Principal Licensing Officer presented the report that provided the Committee with information in respect of compliance work undertaken by the Unit during April - June 2018 and where possible provided comparative data to demonstrate performance and change.

Table 1 in the report showed an increase in complaints received during Qtr 1 and Qtr 2 18/19 compared to the same quarters the previous years. As has previously been reported to the Committee, service improvements over the past 2 years included objectives to:

- Ensure the wider public are more aware of how to report issues and find it more accessible to do so – particularly with regards to disability related issues
- Improve response, investigation times and quality; thereby generating more complaints as people see more value in doing so

and therefore the general increase in complaints from residents and visitors to the City was anticipated and welcomed.

Qtr 3 18/19 shows a decrease in the number of complaints both from the previous quarter and against the same quarter the previous year. Qtr 3 is usually the busiest quarter for complaints with the City seeing peak numbers in visitors and journeys over the festive period; so this reduction could indicate improved levels of customer service and satisfaction.

The Committee questioned whether more could be done to improve the standard of driving for both Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Drivers, and officers confirmed that driving standards are constantly monitored. Officers also agreed to investigate the possibility of using technology to help improve standards where they fell below the expected level.

The Committee also asked about the issue of ply-for-hire offences, and asked for clarification as to how widespread this was. Officers said that the problems were widespread, and included both drivers licensed by Manchester, and drivers who had Hackney Carriage licenses issued by other authorities, which allowed them to work as Private Hire drivers in Manchester. Officers confirmed that routine checks are carried out on both day and night shifts at various locations across the City, including railway stations, the airport, hospitals and supermarkets. On night shifts interactions are targeted to hotspot areas causing congestion within the Night Time Economy, and locations where the risk of illegal activity is higher. Officers also confirmed that they regularly undertook operations such as Operation Aztec to identify drivers willing to ply-for-hire illegally, but that their resources, although improved, were limited. More recently, Aztec has expanded its focus and now regularly targets illegal plying for hire using specially trained Special Constables undertaking journeys as customers in licensed vehicles. The Operations use different sites to direct vehicles for questioning under caution or vehicle checks, and the system is flexible to enable a check site to be shut down and moved on any given operation.

The Committee asked whether drivers with Hackney Carriage licenses issued by local authorities could misunderstand the law that they could only ply-for-hire within the area covered by the issuing authority, but officers confirmed that they believed the drivers were fully aware of the illegality of their actions, but were willing to take the risk as the financial rewards were high. Officers also confirmed that they would consider changing the paperwork issued by Manchester to make the illegality of ply-for-hire explicit.

Decision

To note the report.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 14 February 2019

Present: Councillor Ellison (Chair)

Councillors: Shaukat Ali, Clay, Curley, Dar, Kamal, Kirkpatrick, J Lovecy, Lyons, Watson, White and Wilson

Apologies: Councillor Nasrin Ali and Madeleine Monaghan

Also present: Councillors: Hughes, Newman and Wheeler

PH/19/12. Supplementary Information on Planning Applications on this agenda.

To receive the supplementary information on Planning applications on this agenda.

Decisions

To receive and note the supplementary information on Planning applications on this agenda.

PH/19/13. Minutes

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 17 January 2019.

Decision

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 17 January 2019.

PH/19/14. 120302/FO/2018 - Heald Green House Irvin Drive Manchester M22 5LS.

This application was reported to the Committee on 17th January 2019. As Members resolved that they were minded to refuse the proposal, the application was deferred for the following reasons and asked that a report be brought back which addresses these concerns and provide for further consideration of potential reasons for refusal:

- Loss of visual amenity for local residents and loss of amenity relating to traffic and noise
- Loss of residential units
- Air quality – cumulative impact
- Pressure on the road network
- Sustainable Transport

The site measuring 0.9 hectares is currently occupied by a two storey residential apartment block known as Heald Green House.

The site sits to the south of a surface level airport car park consented under reference 072290/FO/2004/S2 for 640 long stay car parking spaces with associated landscaping and boundary treatment, access from Irvin Drive and 5 metre high lighting columns, operated by Peter Ashley.

Decision

To refuse to grant the application for the following reasons.

1. The development proposals would result in a large expanse of surface level car parking that would be visible from outside of the site to the detriment of the character of the area thereby causing harm to the visual amenity of neighbouring property, contrary to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The increase in comings and goings of vehicles and increase in the numbers of vehicles within the application site will lead to noise disturbance that would cause harm to the residential amenities of surrounding property, contrary to policy DM1 of the Core Strategy, saved policy DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

PH/19/15. 121709/FO/2018 - 111 Lapwing Lane Manchester M20 6UR.

The application site relates to a vacant retail/off-licence shop formerly known as Didsbury Food and Wine which occupies one unit within a parade of nine mixed units that includes, a bar, cafés, a post office and a pharmacy. In addition to the Edwardian parade there is also a Pizza Express restaurant and a former bank which fronts the corner of Palatine Road and Lapwing Lane. The property is three storeys in height and in 2017 permission was granted to create two, one bedroom apartments on the upper floors (117372/FO/2017). The property fronts Lapwing Lane, where there are eighteen car parking spaces directly in front of the parade, a bus stop and tram services from the West Didsbury Metrolink Stop.

Change of use from retail (Class A1) to restaurant (Class A3) with new shop front and extraction flue to rear.

Officers advised that should the Committee be minded to approve the application, an additional condition would be added to ensure that roller shutters would be opened in the morning and remain open throughout the day until the restaurant was open and trading.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee and said that the application would bring back to use a currently empty unit, and that the use would be as a Sushi Restaurant which was a unique food offering in the immediate vicinity. He added that Sushi requires very little cooking, which meant that they had been able to reduce the size of the extraction flue following discussion with officers. He added that the unit has not attracted any interest for use as a retail business, and that all enquiries had related to food use.

He also said that the proposed operator had a great deal of experience in running a business of this type, and that the conditions contained in the report would be sufficient to mitigate the concerns raised by local residents. He said that they had worked closely with officers to ensure that the issues raised by residents were fully addressed.

The Committee considered that on balance the proposed change of use would not give rise to unacceptable impacts to warrant refusal of the application. The use would introduce additional activity to a parade that has been subject of recent environmental improvements led by a local organisation and bring back into use a currently vacant unit. It is not considered that the proposed use would give rise to unacceptable impacts in terms of residential amenity either by way of noise, odours or an increase in comings and goings within a commercial parade.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation.

PH/19/16. 121410/JO/2018 - McDonalds 312-316 Barlow Moor Road Manchester M21 8AY.

The planning application site is located in Chorlton District Centre on Barlow Moor Road. The application relates to an established restaurant with the frontage to Barlow Moor Road, to the south there are established commercial uses, to the west are residential homes fronting Barlow Moor Road. To the immediate north of the existing building lies a commercial use fronting Barlow Moor Road, to the north east separated by a car park lies residential property at 324 Barlow Moor Road, beyond that lies Norbreck Avenue, immediately to the east separated by a car park lies residential property at Park Place.

Consent was granted under application 034033 for the McDonalds in 1989, the permission was subject to condition 8 which restricted the hours of opening to Sundays to Thursday: 8.00 a.m. to 11.30 p.m. Fridays and Saturdays: 8.00 a.m. to Midnight. This is the first application since 1989 to vary the hours of opening condition.

It is now proposed that the opening hours are extended as follows:
Monday to Sunday - 6.00 am to 12 midnight. This would have the effect of allowing the addition of two hours in the morning and half an hour of opening hours in the evening Sunday to Thursday.

The application was originally submitted requesting 5.00am to midnight Sundays to Thursdays and 5.00am to 01.00am Friday and Saturday, but following consultation responses McDonald's altered their planning application and a further consultation process was undertaken.

Officers confirmed that an additional condition restricting servicing hours to those approved under the original consent would be added, should the Committee be minded to approve the application.

The applicant spoke to the Committee and said that surrounding businesses of a similar nature, had similar or longer opening hours than those applied for. For example, Tesco Express opens 6am to 11pm, KFC restaurant opens 10.30am to 01.00am (12.30am on a Sunday), Marks and Spencers Food opens 7.00am (8.00am on a Sunday) to 10.00pm.

She added that customers during the morning hours typically accessed the site as part of their commute, so would be very unlikely to exhibit anti-social behaviour or to create noise nuisance. She also said that the site was on a busy main road, and the longer hours were designed to attract road users, so no increase in traffic was anticipated as the vehicles were already on the road.

The applicant also told the Committee that a comprehensive noise impact assessment had been submitted as part of the application process. This report was submitted on the basis of the hours originally applied for, the hours are now more restrictive and the impacts would therefore be less than those assessed.

The applicant also explained that McDonalds was committed to ensuring that there would be minimal impact on residents, and would work proactively to ensure that this was the case.

With regard to resident's concerns about increased litter, she explained that in addition to regular litter picks around the site, they work with local Councillors and undertake a wider monthly litter pick, often alongside the Chorlton Wombles, a voluntary community group, friends of Chorlton Park and volunteers from the restaurants in the area.

She added that the evidence submitted with the application and summarised in the report showed that the grant of permission would not impact on the amenity of local residents, and that the conditions would alleviate their concerns.

The Committee asked if the car parking arrangements, which had been sold on to a 3rd party organisation, could be improved as the current parking officer is very difficult to deal with. Officers advised the Committee that this issue was not a relevant concern with regard to the Planning application, but that officers would discuss this issue with McDonalds.

The Committee also asked for confirmation of the service hours, and officers advised that the standard condition was that servicing should not take place before 8am.

The Committee also commented on the proximity of the restaurant to local schools, and the possibility of an increase in anti-social behaviour with extended hours. Officers confirmed that they expected McDonalds to fully comply with the Noise Management Plan submitted as part of the application. In addition, Greater Manchester Police had no objections to the application. It is not considered that the addition of two hours in the morning and half an hour in evening Sundays to Thursdays would increase the probability of anti-social behaviours occurring on site.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation, and an additional condition restricting service hours to those approved in the original permission granted.

PH/19/17. 121380/FO/2018 - Swan House Swan Street Manchester M4 5DF.

The site measures 0.3 hectares and is bounded by Rochdale Road, Swan Street, Cable Street and Mason Street. It includes a two storey, red brick, warehouse building that was used as a fish processing factory but has been split into several units used for textile manufacturing, storage, double glazing sales and a furniture shop with garages at ground floor.

The development proposes 373 apartments, 12 serviced apartments and 408 sq m of commercial space (Use Class A1, A2 or A3). The building would have two taller elements with a 31 storey tower on the corner of Rochdale Road/Swan Street and 13 storey building on the corner of Cable Street/Mason Street which would be joined by a low rise section of building along Cable Street.

Officers advised the Committee that the late representations contained information about several additional conditions that should have been detailed in the report, but had been omitted in error.

The applicant's agent spoke in support of the proposals and said that the development would enhance the New Cross Neighbourhood Development Framework (NDF) which will become a dense residential area and contribute to the City's economic and population growth. The Framework proposes development at a high to medium density with a taller building at the corner of Rochdale Road and Swan Street.

He added that the development would include several residential amenity improvements, as detailed in the report. 19 units would be reserved for affordable rent at 80% local market rents, the units being spread throughout the development, and would include a mixture of different types of accommodation on offer. He also said that the units would be directly marketed at key workers in Manchester. He explained that there would also be a S106 contribution, as determined by the viability assessment, for improvements to the public realm in the area.

He added that the principle of development accorded with Manchester Policies for growth, in particular the The Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995). The construction phase would support over 700 new jobs, with a local labour agreement to be put in place. He added that this was a high quality, well designed development, and would accord with the highest architectural standards and positively connect to the surrounding area. The aim was to minimise car parking provision, but would include 1:1 cycle parking per unit.

Councillor Wheeler spoke regarding the proposals, and while he welcomed the fact that there would also be some on site affordable provision, was disappointed that this would only be 5% of the units developed. He also expressed concerns about eligibility for the affordable units, and questioned how key workers would be defined.

He said that the Council should have nomination rights to the affordable units, so that the Council would determine who was a key worker rather than the developer. He said that similar schemes in other local authority areas often used an ALMO or other local housing provider to determine who should occupy affordable units.

Officers confirmed that the issue of viability had been independently assessed on behalf of the Council, and that the independent assessment had concluded that a 5% provision was appropriate. Officers added that this was the first time that on site affordable housing would be provided in the City Centre for many years. The proposals had been fully tested against all local and regional benchmarks.

The Committee welcomed the provision of on-site affordable housing, but expressed disappointment that the scheme would not provide the Policy level of 20% affordable housing. The Committee also expressed some concern at the height of the Tower, and agreed that the Council, in conjunction with a local housing provider should retain nomination rights to the affordable units. The Committee also asked for more information regarding the proposed tree planting scheme, and asked for clarification as to how many trees would be planted.

Officers confirmed that the height of the tower was not unusual, and that the New Cross Neighbourhood Development Framework (NDF) actually required a tall building on this site. Officers also confirmed that the Policy required a contribution of up to 20% affordable housing, subject to viability. They added that the viability assessment had thoroughly tested the scheme, and the viable number of affordable units was 5%. With regard to the trees, officers said that there would be a minimum of 5, but that the number of trees planted would be limited by the constraints of the site itself.

While the Committee appreciated the provision of affordable housing, they also noted that consideration should be given to the provision of social housing in the city centre, as this was sadly lacking in the city centre environment. The Committee were satisfied that the affordable units would be of benefit to key workers, but commented that housing provision was also needed for the very poorest members of society.

The Committee also asked for clarification as to how the commercial units were assessed as part of the viability assessment, and officers advised that the commercial space is very small, but that this would have been factored in to the viability assessment.

The Committee asked for further clarification as to the provision of outside space and services that would be required for families living in the units. Officers confirmed that there were several green spaces within a short distance, and that further public realm being developed as part of the wider New Cross Neighbourhood Development Framework would add to this. In addition, there is a green roof on the development, which is designed as an amenity space. There is a school within a short distance of the site, and there will be ongoing dialogue with health providers to ensure that health provision is adequate.

Officers confirmed that the provision of disabled parking acceptable in light of the highly sustainable location. The level is in accordance with the Core Strategy and the

Residential Quality Guidance which states that the constraints of a site and the proximity of public transport should be a key consideration when considering onsite provision. Mobility scooters could be parked in safe and secure areas in the car park. In addition, there is a condition that will ensure that the developer will address any specific parking issues for residents that may arise.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation.

PH/19/18. 120893/FO/2018 - Land Bounded By Bengal Street, Primrose Street, Radium Street And Silk Street Manchester M4 6AQ.

The Committee received a request for a site visit. The Committee considered that the report did not show the full context of the proposed development in the setting of the area, so concluded that a site visit was necessary.

Decision

To defer the matter to allow a site visit to be carried out.

PH/19/19. 121806/JO/2018 - Cotton Field Wharf 4 New Union Street Manchester M4 6FR.

The application site is approximately 0.99 hectares and consists of three interlinked residential blocks known as 'Cotton Field Wharf' which were granted planning permission in 2015 under planning permission 108562/FO/2015/N1.

Planning condition 22 of planning permission 118030/JO/2017 restricts the opening hours of the 3 ground floor commercial units within this development. CASK which operates under their own planning permission has the same restriction to their opening hours.

Condition 22 states that the commercial premises shall operate under the following opening hours:

The commercial premises hereby approved (including external seating areas), as indicated on drawing P30000 Rev E stamped as received by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, on the 30 June 2015 and drawing SK-RB001 Rev A stamped as received by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, on the 26 October 2017 shall not be open outside the following hours:-

<i>Monday to Saturday</i>	<i>08.00hrs - 23.00hrs</i>
<i>Sundays</i>	<i>09.00hrs - 23.00hrs</i>

The external seating areas shall not allow for the use of amplified sound or any music at any time.

Reason - In interests of residential amenity in order to reduce noise and general disturbance in accordance with saved policy DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

The applicant originally applied to vary the operating hours within the above condition as follows:

*Sunday to Thursday 08:00 to 23:30
Friday and Saturdays 08:00 to 00:30*

The opening hours that were applied for were amended during the course of this planning application as follows:

*Sunday to Thursday 08:00 to 23:30
Friday and Saturdays 08:00 to 00:00*

These opening hours are on the basis which this planning application is being considered.

Officers recommended that condition 22 should therefore be altered as follows:

The commercial premises hereby approved, as indicated on drawing P30000 Rev E stamped as received by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, on the 30 June 2015 and drawing SK-RB001 Rev A stamped as received by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, on the 26 October 2017 shall not be open outside the following hours:-

*Sunday to Thursday 08:00 to 23:30
Friday and Saturday 08:00 to 00:00*

The external seating areas shall not allow for the use of amplified sound or any music at any time and shall operate in accordance with the following hours:

*Monday to Saturday 08.00hrs - 23.00hrs
Sundays 09.00hrs - 23.00hrs*

Reason - In interests of residential amenity in order to reduce noise and general disturbance in accordance with saved policy DC26 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester and policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report.

PH/19/20. 121537/FO/2018 - Land Bounded By Pottery Lane, Gorton Lane, Belle Vue Street And Polesworth Close Manchester M12 5JD.

The application site is comprised of two separate pieces of land located either side of Gorton Lane at the junction with Pottery Lane within the Gorton area of the City. The

two sites measure approximately 0.98 hectares in combined area, with Site 1 measuring 0.286 hectares, and Site 2 measuring 0.695 hectares.

Planning permission is sought through this application for a proposed residential development comprising 13 no. houses and 102 no. apartments across the two sites. The houses are either semi-detached or detached properties, and the apartments are provided within 4no. blocks ranging in height from 3 to 6 storeys.

The proposed housing will be of an affordable tenure, providing a mix of shared ownership and rent to buy properties increasing access to new affordable homes in the East Manchester area.

The applicant spoke in support of the proposals and said that the development would support the strategic aims for the City and this neighbourhood by delivering a high quality scheme in a priority location. The redevelopment of this site with a quality development will bring forward major environmental and regeneration benefits to the neighbourhood. The proposals would bring about the comprehensive redevelopment of the site and will be a major catalyst for further regeneration in this area. It is considered that the scheme would transform this junction on a main radial route in the City with the provision of quality residential accommodation close to existing employment opportunities and a range of locally available services.

The proposal will see the redevelopment of a brownfield site where the site is currently underused, within the heart of one of Manchester's key regeneration areas and positioned along a main radial route in the City. A total of 115 spacious residential units will be created which will contribute to the City's residential growth strategy and help support neighbourhoods of choice by introducing affordable accommodation.

He said that the applicant had worked closely with officers to ensure that the scale and design of the proposals were appropriate, and the clarifications within the report would address the concerns of current residents.

The Committee welcomed the proposals, and asked for clarification as to whether older people would be targeted to attract them to the apartment blocks, as there was a current focus on initial home buying rather than older people home buying.

The Committee also commented that they would like to see the Council having at least 50% nomination rights to the properties, and would like to see a mixture of affordable housing, private sale and social housing at social rent.

Officers confirmed that the scheme would be open to anyone to apply for any of the units, and not just targeted at younger residents. In addition, The land is subject to a development agreement, so the Council would not manage the list of nomination through the planning process, but officers would consult with colleagues as to how this could happen in the future.

The Committee asked for clarification as to the arrangements for Waste Management, and officers confirmed that there will be a full Waste Management

Strategy employed, and that the arrangements had been fully tested and found to be adequate.

Officers confirmed that there would be retention of existing trees and additional tree planting, to assist with reducing noise as much as possible, but that the location of the site was already on a busy road, so the increased levels of noise were within acceptable limits.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation.

Personnel Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 13 February 2019

Present: Councillor Ollerhead (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors: Akbar, Bridges Craig, Leech, S Murphy, Rahman, Richards and Stogia

Also present: Councillors Ilyas and Sheikh

Apologies: Councillors Leese and N Murphy

PE/19/06 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 29 January 2018 as a correct record.

PE/19/07 Senior Management Capacity

The Chair informed the Committee that this item had been withdrawn from the agenda.

PE/19/08 Senior Management Arrangements for the Homelessness Service

The Committee considered a report of the Acting Director of Adult Social Services (DASS) which sought approval for the establishment of a role of Director of Homelessness Services to take strategic and overall responsibility for the delivery of the Homelessness Strategy within the city.

The Acting DASS explained that currently a temporary resource was in place but in recognition of the growing challenges and demands within the service a permanent Director of Homelessness was required. The Committee acknowledged that a key driver for homelessness was the impact of welfare reform alongside increasingly high private sector rents which had increased three times faster than wages nationally. It was therefore anticipated that demands on the service would continue to increase and would be a significant challenge for the city. In addition, the Homelessness Reduction Act had placed new duties on the Council to prevent homelessness which had widened the application of the assistance and support that the Council is required to give, at the same time had significantly increased the bureaucracy. The Acting DASS then spoke about the vision for homelessness in the city which would be taken forward through the Homelessness Partnership and Strategy which was aligned with the following priorities:

- **Homelessness as a rare occurrence:** increasing prevention and earlier intervention at a neighbourhood level.
- **Homelessness as brief as possible:** improving temporary and supported accommodation to be a positive experience
- **Experience of homelessness to be a one-off occurrence:** increasing access to settled homes

It was asserted that the establishment of the post would enable strategic and overall responsibility for the delivery of the Strategy, address the challenges, champion interventions to support the prevention of homelessness and develop and strengthen the partnerships across the broad range of organisations that are involved.

No comments from the Trade Unions were submitted for consideration at the meeting.

It was acknowledged that tackling the complex issue of homelessness in times of austerity was a significant priority for the Council. The Committee commended the establishment of the post, recognising that dedicated strategic leadership would enable the Council to carry out a key part of the Strategy's pledge and agreed the recommendations.

Decisions

1. To approve the establishment of a post of Director of Homelessness Services to take strategic and overall responsibility for the delivery of the council's statutory functions and in relation to the city's Homelessness Strategy. The post will be part of the Senior Management team within Adults Services.
2. To recommend to Council that the Director of Homelessness Services post is remunerated at Grade SS4 (£94,072 - £103,863).

PE/19/09 Flexible Working Policy Framework

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Human Resources / Organisational Development (HROD) which sought approval of a number of policy and guidance developments in relation to flexible working practices that support the Our Ways of Working (OWOW) programme and the broader aspirations of the Our People Strategy.

It was explained that a significant piece of work had been undertaken to look at flexible working arrangements across the Council with the aim of taking advantage of new technologies, learning from best practice elsewhere and modernising the workforce approach. The Head of Workforce Strategy said that there was a clear evidence base which showed a link between improved flexible working practices and ultimately productivity and organisational performance. There had been a significant programme of engagement with the Council's services in recognition that any policy changes should be flexible and take into account the contrasting nature of services of across the Council – this had ultimately led to the development of a robust policy and guidance framework. The policies had been strengthened to reflect best practice, had used clear user-friendly language and took into account feedback from engagement with staff. As a result, changes were proposed to the Council's Special Leave and Flexible Working policies as well as clearer guidelines for Flexitime and Working From Home.

The Committee acknowledged the importance of leading by example as an employer by removing barriers to employment through a flexible workforce approach. It also particularly welcomed the reference within the Special Leave policy the role of carers,

which aligned with the Greater Manchester Carer's Strategy in which there is an explicit ambition to be an exemplary employer of people who are carers. The Committee noted that this specific area was supported by a detailed piece of guidance which had been developed in consultation with the Greater Manchester Health and Social Care partnership and the City Council's own Staff Carer's Network.

There was a discussion about the proposed arrangements within the Special Leave policy that related to IVF treatment of Gender Reassignment. A member felt that requests for leave that related to either of these matters ought to be considered in the same way that disability related special leave. It was felt that robust training and guidance for managers should underpin this specific policy area and be considered on a case by case basis. Officers were subsequently asked to undertake further work to strengthen guidance and training for managers where leave is required in relation to issues that concern these two matters. Officers were also asked to bring back a further report on this to a future meeting of the committee.

No comments from the Trade Unions were submitted for consideration at the meeting.

Decisions

1. To approve the revised Special Leave Policy (attached as Appendix A) with the exception of the approval of the arrangements within the policy that relate to special leave for IVF treatment or Gender Reassignment. Officers are asked to undertake further work to strengthen guidance and training for managers where leave is required in relation to issues that concern these two matters. A further report on this will be submitted to a future meeting of this committee
2. To approve the revised Flexible Working Policy (attached as Appendix B)
3. To note the proposal to strengthen guidance in relation to flexitime and ad-hoc working from home in line with existing policy provision.
4. To note the intention to proactively communicate these developments and the Council's broader suite of support for flexible working as a new Flexible Working Policy Framework.

**Manchester City Council
Report for Information**

Report to: Council – 27 March 2019

Subject: Urgent Key Decisions

Report of: The City Solicitor

Purpose of report

To report those key decisions that have been taken in accordance with the urgency provisions in the Council's Constitution.

Recommendation

To note the report.

Wards affected: All

Financial consequences for the Revenue budget

None

Financial consequences for the Capital Budget

None

Implications for:

Antipoverty
No

Equal Opportunities
No

Environment
No

Employment
No

Contact officers:

Fiona Ledden
City Solicitor
0161 234 3087
f.ledden@manchester.gov.uk

Donna Barnes
Governance Officer
0161 234 3037
d.barnes@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents:

None.

1. Background

- 1.1 The Constitution (Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules) establishes a procedure for dealing with key decisions where action needs to be taken immediately for reasons of urgency, and is therefore not subject to the normal call in arrangements.
- 1.2 The procedures states that the chair of the appropriate scrutiny committee must agree that both the decision proposed is reasonable in all the circumstances, and to it being treated as a matter of urgency.
- 1.3 Such decisions are to be reported to the Council.

2. Urgent Key Decisions taken since the last meeting of Council

2.1 Urgent key decisions requiring exemption from the call in procedure are set out below.

Date	Subject	Reason for urgency	Decision Taken by	Approved by
31 January 2019	Council Tax balance – to determine the Council Tax element of the estimated Collection Fund 2018/19 year-end surplus or deficit	The calculation of the estimated surplus or deficit uses the most up to date information (i.e. end of December 2018) which is not available until the end of the first week in January. Due to the statutory requirement to notify precepting authorities in January 2019 it is requested the decision is exempt from call in. Following a report to Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee on 6 December 2018 the chair of the committee has agreed to exempt this decision from call in	City Treasurer	Councillor Russell – Chair of Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee
31 January 2019	Business Rates balance - The calculation of the Council's business rate income.	The calculation uses information from the Business Rates system to support the key decision. This is available mid to late January. Due to the statutory requirement to notify Central Government and the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (for the Fire and Rescue element) by 31 January 2019 it is requested the decision is exempt from call in. Following a report to Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee on 6 December 2018 the chair of the committee has agreed to exempt this decision from call in.	City Treasurer	Councillor Russell – Chair of Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

This page is intentionally left blank