

## **The Executive**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 25 July 2012**

Present: Councillor R Leese – in the Chair  
Councillors J Battle, R Battle, Evans, Khan, N Murphy, S Murphy, Priest and Smith

Also present as Members of the Standing Consultative Panel:  
Councillors: Di Mauro, Hassan, Lone, Rahman, Royle, and Wheale

#### **Exe/12/078 Urgent Business**

##### **Decision**

To note that the Chair had agreed to have submitted as urgent business a report on the acquisition of land at Wilmott Street and disposal of buildings at 1396 Ashton Old Road, 120 Barmouth Street, 235 Broom Lane and 54 Every Street, in order to meet the timescales involved in the transactions. This would be considered later in the meeting with the public excluded.

#### **Exe/12/079 Minutes**

##### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meetings held on 27 June 2012 as a correct record.

#### **Exe/12/080 Enterprise Zone Framework**

Early in 2011 the Government had announced it would be creating 21 new Enterprise Zones within Local Enterprise Partnerships. In March 2011 the Government had announced that the Greater Manchester Enterprise Zone was to be located at Manchester Airport-City and public consultation on the boundary of the zone was agreed (Minute Exe/11/048). In September 2011 we endorsed and agreed to put forward to the Secretary of State the proposals for the preferred boundary which involved a group of linked sites comprising 116 hectares of land close to Manchester Airport, and within a broader enterprise area that generally followed the route of the new metrolink line to the Airport, including sites close to the University Hospital South Manchester (UHSM) (Minute Exe/11/103).

A further report from the Chief Executive provided us with an update on the establishment of the Greater Manchester Enterprise Zone. A development and planning framework had been developed to provide the context for the Zone (the Manchester Airport City Framework Plan). The report proposed that this framework be subject to public consultation, which we agreed.

The report explained that the framework's proposals for key roles of sites within the Enterprise Zone were:

- Airport City North – The core opportunity for high quality new business district, attracting global companies into grade A offices, high-tech manufacturing and research and ancillary facilities (leisure, hotels, retail).
- Medipark and Roundthorn Industrial Estate – health and biotech commercial development, related to the research strengths of UHSM. Roundthorn would provide affordable opportunities for ancillary business development.
- Airport City South – World Freight facility, supporting the operational growth of the Airport and providing opportunities to enhance its logistics role.
- Wythenshawe Town Centre – secondary and back office functions (also enhancing the vitality of the Town Centre) alongside retail and leisure development to serve the increased volume of visitors to the area.
- Atlas Business Park – Affordable secondary and back office functions, including business related to the primary operators in Airport City North (for example, support services or companies linked through supply chains).

The report also explained the Government's position on business rate discounts that would provide an incentive for business to locate in the zone. Discounts could be to a maximum of £55,000 per year (within state aid regulations), reimbursed by local authorities from government. Local authorities have the discretion to decide on the application of the discounts and the Greater Manchester authorities and their partners had agreed a policy for business development in the Enterprise Zone.

This policy was based on giving priority to jobs creation in the region so as to minimise displacement of jobs into the Zone from other parts of Greater Manchester. This was to be in part implemented through the application of business rates discounts. The growth of new businesses moving into and within the Zone was to be supported through business rates discounts, with existing businesses not normally qualifying for the discount. The policy also had to address cases where existing businesses decide to expand within the Zone, either on their existing site or by moving. It was proposed that the case for giving discounts to these businesses be assessed on a case by case basis.

## **Decisions**

1. To note the progress on establishing the Enterprise Zone, including Government approval of the boundaries proposed by Greater Manchester and endorsed by the Executive and the development of formal governance arrangements.
2. To endorse the draft development and planning framework and agree that it should be subject to public consultation.
3. To agree the policy proposals for applying business rate discounts for businesses locating in the Zone and authorise the City Treasurer to determine applications for discounts within this policy framework, following consultation with the Chief Executive and Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources.

In November 2010 we endorsed the principles of an updated Development Framework for the First Street area and had requested the Chief Executive to undertake a public consultation exercise with local residents and businesses (Minute Exe/10/118). The outcome of the consultation had been reported to us in March 2011 (Minute Exe/11/035) and we then endorsed a revised Framework for the area. Also in November 2010 we approved the principle of developing a new cultural facility at First Street to provide a new home for the Library Theatre Company and Cornerhouse (Minute Exe/10/119).

The Chief Executive now submitted a report on progress with the development and delivery of the First Street Cultural Facility in the context of the development at First Street North. The report sought approval for additional funding to enable the integration of four railway viaduct arches immediately adjacent to the Cultural Facility into the development in order to provide a new access to the building and enliven the street scene on Whitworth Street West.

Progress had been good. Planning applications had been approved for a 208-bed 4-star hotel, a 700-space multi-storey car park incorporating retail outlets on the ground floor, small-scale retail and food/beverage units, the Cultural Facility, and public realm developments including a new public square. A Joint Venture Board had been established to oversee the delivery of the developments and a Strategic Project Manager had been appointed to assist the partnership in the planning, management and procurement of the First Street North Development site.

The proposals for cultural facility included a 500-seat drama theatre, 150-seat flexible second theatre space, 550m<sup>2</sup> double-height gallery space, up to 5 cinema screens, learning spaces, digital production and broadcast facilities, café bar, restaurant, offices and other ancillary spaces consistent with a production centre. A full design team led by Mecanoo Architects had been appointed including Wates Construction as the construction partner for the new Cultural Facility. The RIBA Stage D of the design had been signed off on the 22nd June. The Arts Council for England had given Stage One approval for £5m funding from Lottery capital funding for the project. The Personnel Committee had approved the transfer of the Library Theatre Company staff into the operating company for the facility, Greater Manchester Arts Centre Ltd (GMAC).

The report also explained a further element that had been introduced into the scope of the project. In order to improve access to the building and enliven Whitworth Street West consideration had been given to integrating into the scheme the four adjacent railway arches. This would achieve a more visible presence and secure access from Whitworth Street West. This proposal was seen as being an integral component of a concept masterplan for a creative quarter along Whitworth Street West, between Oxford Road and Knott Mill.

It was proposed that one arch would be developed to include the Stage Door entrance, meeting room and multimedia education and learning suite. The building would provide GMAC with additional accommodation and would form an important entrance for GMAC staff and personnel, education participants and backstage visitors. It was further proposed that the other three arches are glazed to enliven the

street scene, improve security and provide future expansion space for GMAC.

The additional budget required for the incorporation of the arches into the scheme was estimated £1.95m. A further funding requirement £0.45m was also sought for site-wide enabling works including cut and fill to level the site, an Environment Agency access ramp to the River Medlock, remedial works to the culvert, site hoardings, surface water drainage and attenuation works. We supported those requests.

### **Decisions**

1. To note the progress made on delivering the overall First Street North scheme, including a 4-star hotel, new public space, retail units and multi-storey car park, and that Planning Consent was granted at the Planning and Highways Committee on the 28th June.
2. To note that Personnel Committee on the 15th February 2012, approved the transfer of LTC staff from Manchester City Council to Greater Manchester Arts Centre Ltd (GMAC) from 1st April 2012 (GMAC being the legal entity operating under the name "the Cornerhouse") (Minute PER/12/03).
3. To note the progress in developing the design for the Cultural Facility to Stage D, detailed design, incorporating the functional requirements of GMAC.
4. To welcome the Stage One approval by the Arts Council England of Lottery capital funding of £5m earmarked for this project.
5. To approve a revised project budget for the Cultural Facility of £24m, which includes the £5m funding from Arts Council England Lottery capital funding, in addition to the Council's previously approved funding contribution of £19m.
6. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive and the City Treasurer to oversee the detailed financial arrangements and project spending.
7. To recommend to Council approval of an additional budget of £2.5m funded by the Capital Fund for the integration of four Viaduct Arches and independent access from Whitworth Street immediately adjacent to the Cultural Facility and a contribution to the First Street North Enabling Works.
8. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive, City Solicitor and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Culture and Leisure to negotiate and agree the terms of the Agreements with ASK Property Development and GMAC, and for the City Solicitor to execute the documentation.

### **Exe/12/082 First Street Development Framework Update**

In November 2010 we endorsed the principles of an updated Development Framework for the First Street area and had requested the Chief Executive to undertake a public consultation exercise with local residents and businesses (Minute

Exe/10/118). The outcome of the consultation had been reported to us in March 2011 (Minute Exe/11/035) and we then endorsed a revised Framework for the area.

A report was submitted by the Chief Executive to obtain our endorsement of an updated Development Framework for the area. The revised Framework would help guide development in the area and provide the economic and spatial context to support future growth.

The report explained that the updated Framework now identified four key areas within the overall First Street area. Each key area was described in detail.

**First Street North** - the major new cultural facility incorporating the merged Library Theatre and Cornerhouse.

**First Street Central** - a new office destination targeted at a range of commercial occupiers, particularly those seeking the benefits of a central and highly accessible city centre location, but competitively priced to help distinguish the accommodation from other locations in the city centre.

**First Street South** - the area identified as providing a significant opportunity for larger format retail units, including new food retail. This has been informed by the city centre retail analysis which we last considered in March 2012 (Minute Exe/12/039).

**Creative Ribbon** - the area from Oxford Road along Whitworth Street West and through the First Street site to Knott Mill and Castlefield contains a number of cultural and creative facilities and business, from large cultural attractions such as the Palace Theatre to a range of smaller independent businesses. The wider First Street area provides a number of sites where low cost creative hubs could be developed to further grow the creative business sector, and establish First Street as a new distinctive and vibrant cultural district within the city centre.

We were asked to authorise further analysis of the Creative Ribbon proposals to help determine its long-term development potential, which we agreed.

## Decisions

1. To endorse the updated First Street Development Framework.
2. To agree that further work be undertaken to develop the Creative Ribbon into a fully defined concept for future consultation at the appropriate time with local residents and businesses.
3. To note the progress made on delivering the First Street regeneration scheme.
4. To note the development principles that have been agreed by the parties and captured within the Development Agreement and the Commercial Plan.

**Exe/12/083 SEMMS A6/Manchester Airport Relief Road Scheme – Submission of Business Case**

A report was submitted to provide an update on the progress of the A6 to Manchester Airport Relief Road. This scheme was being funded by the Combined Authority from the Greater Manchester Transport Fund with some additional third party contributions. While the majority of the scheme lay outside the city, with no direct City Council financial exposure to the scheme, the Department for Transport required formal confirmation that they support the proposals from all three local highway authorities affected (Manchester, Cheshire East and Stockport). Our approval was therefore sought to submit the business case to the Department for Transport in order that the Scheme can be granted programme entry status. The report also updated us on proposals for consulting on the scheme. A similar report was being presented to Stockport Council which has agreed to adopt similar resolutions. Cheshire East Council was also expected to receive a similar report shortly.

### **Decisions**

- 1 To approve the submission of a business case for the scheme to the Department for Transport and that the approval of the final document for submission be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Executive Member for Neighbourhood Services.
- 2 To delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Executive Members for Environment and for Neighbourhood Services, to agree the consultation material regarding the scheme for distribution to Manchester households.
- 3 To delegate to the Chief Executive authority to negotiate the terms of and to approve the entering into of an agreement under Section 8 of the Highways Act 1980 with Stockport and Cheshire East Councils and (if appropriate) the Greater Manchester Combined Authority to secure the efficient delivery of the scheme and to report back as necessary.
- 4 To authorise the Chief Executive to take any further action he considers appropriate to enable the delivery of the Scheme.

### **Exe/12/084 Business Improvement District (BID) for the City Centre**

A Business Improvement District (BID) is a specific area where businesses work together and invest in agreed services, projects and special events. A number of cities within the UK and around the world operate BID models.

A report submitted by the Chief Executive explained that Cityco, Manchester's City Centre Management Company, had been working with Corporate Services and the City Centre Regeneration Team in the Council to develop proposals for Business Improvement District for the retail core of Manchester city centre. The proposal was that this would run initially for five years from April 2013. It would be retail focused and designed to further develop Manchester's retail performance. It would provide for investment within the retail centre through an additional levy on the business rates, which would be controlled by the retail businesses through a dedicated, not-for-profit

BID company. The Revenue and Benefits service within the Council would administer the levy and pass it onto the BID company.

The BID would cover all retailers and associated businesses that trade or interact with their customers and operate, in normal circumstances, during daytime trading hours (9am-9pm). Only those businesses that have a rateable value of £50,000 or over would be members. This definition covered 380 businesses from King Street to Manchester Arndale. The objectives would be:

- to attract increased retail-focused footfall to the retail core of the city centre;
- to drive increased spend with a higher number of higher income bracket shoppers visiting the city;
- to drive repeat shopping visits from customers throughout the year;
- to drive additional spend between 5-8pm;
- to increase the size of Manchester's immediate catchment; and
- to ensure Manchester city centre remains a leading retail destination.

It was estimated that the levy would raise about £1m each year, based on:

- 1% for businesses within Manchester Arndale (businesses within the Arndale already pay a management service charge);
- 1.25% for businesses based outside of Manchester Arndale; and
- an annual limit of £25,000 from a single trading entity.

Before a BID can be launched a ballot must be held of all businesses in the proposed area that would be required to pay a levy under the proposals, with the majority of the businesses voting in favour. The responsibility for running the ballot lay with the Ballot Holder, the City Council's Chief Executive by virtue of his position as Returning Officer. The process for running the ballot was being drawn up by the Head of Democratic Services. The report explained the consultation that had already been undertaken with business in the city centre.

If the BID was approved in the ballot a not-for-profit company would be established to manage and administer it. The Board of this company would consist of retailers and a number of representatives from associated businesses and other stakeholders.

## **Decisions**

1. To note the receipt of the BID proposals from Cityco.
2. To endorse the proposals for a Manchester city centre retail BID included within the report.
3. To confirm that the proposals do not conflict with any policy formally adopted by and contained in a document published by the Council.
4. To delegate to the City Treasurer the authority, upon receipt of notice in writing from Cityco requesting the Council to instruct the Ballot Holder to hold a BID ballot, to give such an instruction.
5. To note that if the BID is approved, the City Treasurer will be responsible for collecting the BID levy in accordance with the BID arrangements.

## **Exe/12/085 Localism of Council Tax Support**

Reforms to state-funded welfare benefits included plans for the Government to cease funding the current Council Tax Benefit scheme from 1 April 2013. Instead the Government would be allocating a fixed sum to each billing and precepting authority for it to disburse locally. The fixed sum had not yet been set but was going to be based on 90% of the Government's estimate of that authority's share of the total projected notional spend in 2013/14. The Local Government Finance Bill that was currently before parliament proposed the imposition of a duty on billing authorities to make a localised Council Tax Reduction Scheme by 31st January 2013, with a duty on the Authority to consult with major precepting authorities (Police and Fire) and such persons it considers likely to have an interest in the scheme.

A report submitted by the City Treasurer set out the key issues facing the Council in the development of such a localised Council Tax reduction scheme. These included

- The funding to be provided for the new provision will be cut by 10%.
- Council Tax collection will be even more challenging.
- The government will not allow local authorities complete freedom in the design of their schemes and have stipulated that the elderly are to be protected.
- The risk of changing caseloads is transferred to local authorities.
- As the Government is also abolishing Housing Benefit, subsuming it gradually into Universal Credit from October 2013, and into Pension Credit from October 2014, local authorities will not be able to administer their new schemes more efficiently on the back of Housing Benefit and will retain the major part of the administrative burden of means testing for tenants.
- Timescales are very tight as a new scheme will need to be up and running by early March 2013, with existing cases assessed so that claimants receive rebated bills where appropriate.
- If no local scheme is in place then a default scheme developed by the DCLG will apply which will most likely lead to a budget shortfall for the Council and the Police and Fire Authorities.
- The scheme is being introduced in advance of the introduction of Universal Credit which will provide potentially reduced income for many of those also receiving Council Tax support, though the inter-action of the two benefits is still unknown.

Furthermore, the risk of in-year demand increases, higher take-up, increased numbers needing assistance, or existing claimants' incomes reducing, are all transferred from Central Government to the Council. The total level of funding will be cut but since the amount paid for people of pension age cannot be reduced the funding cuts would instead have a greater impact on working age claimants.

The report described the three main options that could fund the shortfall in Council Tax support to Manchester residents:

- fund the shortfall from elsewhere in the Council;
- increase revenue by changing the Council Tax charges levied to second homes and empty properties;
- change the benefits scheme so as to reduce the amount paid to claimants.



The problems and issues that that each of these options would bring about were examined in the report. Also set out in the appendices to the report were the proposed principles for a local scheme, and a draft scheme that had been drawn up based on those principles. We endorsed those and agreed that consultation on a local scheme should be undertaken.

We noted that the Finance Scrutiny Committee had also considered this report at a recent meeting and had supported its recommendations (Minute FSC/12/17).

### **Decisions**

1. To approve the proposals contained in the report and agree to the start of a formal consultation exercise.
2. To note that the outcome of the consultation will be reported to us in November 2012.

### **Exe/12/086 Blue Badge Consultation on Charging**

The Strategic Director for Adults, Health and Wellbeing submitted a report on changes to the Blue Badge scheme. The scheme enabled disabled people to retain their independence by allowing them to park close to leisure, employment or shopping facilities.

In 2011 the Department for Transport (DoT) had announced a major programme of reform to the Blue Badge scheme. Up to now local authorities could charge a £2 fee for the provision of a Blue Badge, but the Council had not made a charge. The badges have been produced in the council at a cost of £0.52p each for the materials, but excluding administrative costs.

As a consequence of the changes being made by the DoT all badges had to be personalised and printed and issued by a single national supplier. Local authorities could no longer make their own. The national badge supplier was charging authorities £4.60 for each badge printed including new applications, renewals or replacements. To enable authorities to cover their costs the legislation had been amended to raise the maximum fee for a badge from £2.00 to £10.00. This was to cover the £4.60 charge by the badge supplier as well as the authorities' own local administrative costs.

The report explained that consultation had been undertaken on the proposal to introduce a £10 charge for a badge. This would allow the Council to recover its costs from the badge supplier and its administrative costs. Questionnaires had been sent to 17,653 people with a Blue Badge issued by the Council, and to the 96 organisations that held one. There had been almost 9,000 responses to the consultation and the report described the key findings and conclusions. The report also described the key findings from national consultation undertaken by the DoT.

Taking into consideration the increased costs the council would have to meet and the

outcome of the consultation, we agreed that a £10 charge should be introduced, and to the administrative matters set out in the report in relation to the means of applying, sending badges to applicants, and replacement of stolen badges.

We noted that the Health Scrutiny Committee had also considered this report at a recent meeting and that the Committee had supported the proposals (Minute HSC/12/21).

### **Decisions**

1. That successful Blue Badge applicants be charged £10.00 (including new applicants, renewals and replacements for lost Badges) with effect from 1st August 2012.
2. That stolen badges be replaced free of charge if the theft has been reported to the police and a crime reference number is provided.
3. That all Blue Badges be posted by second class mail direct to the customer and that where the customer requests delivery by registered or first class post, the cost is to be met by the customer.
4. That applications for Blue Badges are to be made on-line or by a paper application form.

### **Exe/12/087 Prescribed Alterations for Expanding Primary Schools**

The Strategic Director of Children's Services submitted a report seeking authority to initiate the appropriate statutory change process to formally expand a number of primary schools; and also to re-designate Abraham Moss Community High School as a 5-16 community through-school so as to allow it to offer primary provision in addition to secondary provision.

The report explained how demand for primary school places in the city had been growing for a number of years and was projected to continue growing for the next four years. It was explained that significant steps had been taken to meet this growing demand including reinstating mothballed teaching accommodation, re-commissioning former school premises, the use of high quality temporary accommodation, and the creation of additional permanent accommodation.

Details of the past expansions and future proposals were set out in detail in the report, setting out the changes to each school affected and expanded. We agreed the statutory processes to formalise these expansions needed to begin, and authorised the Director of Children's Services to commence those processes.

We noted that the Young People and Children Scrutiny Committee had also considered this report at a recent meeting and that the Committee had supported the proposals (Minute YPC/12/14).

### **Decisions**

1. To note the report.
2. That the Director of Children's Services should initiate the relevant statutory processes to formalise expansion of the 32 identified community / voluntary-controlled primary schools.
3. That the Director of Children's Services should initiate the relevant statutory change processes to re-designate Abraham Moss from a 11-16 community high school to a 5-16 all through community school.
4. That further reports be produced in due course, about the outcome of statutory consultation on the above proposals.
5. That further reports be produced as necessary, on any new proposals to create extra primary accommodation.

### **Exe/12/088 The Secondary In Year Fair Access Protocol for the School Year 2012/13**

A report on the outcome of a review of the 2011/ 2012 Secondary In-Year Fair Access Protocol was submitted by the Strategic Director of Children's Services.

The purpose of the In-Year Fair Access Protocol (IYFAP) was to ensure that children who change school mid-year (including those with additional needs or challenging backgrounds) are not out of education for too long. The protocol had been kept under annual review since it had been introduced, and the report described the most recent review, consultation with stakeholders, and the issues that had been raised. The key issues had been:

- a perceived failure to reflect the extent of collaboration and co-operation between schools and Academies, in making the IYFAP a success;
- a lack of clarity about the status of the IYFAP and the binding nature of IYFAP Panel decisions including whether "own admission authority" autonomy can override IYFAP Panel decisions to admit, if IYFAP Panel decisions are not valid when the receiving school perceives that it has a shortage of accommodation, and whether IYFAP Panels should not make decisions to admit if the receiving school or Academy is not represented at the Panel meeting when the decision is made;
- ensuring equity and whether all schools get an equitable number of IYFAP children;
- the Management and Administration of IYFAP Panel Meetings; and
- suggested drafting improvements to the wording in the Protocol.

On each of these the response of the Strategic Director of Children's Services was set out in the report.

A copy of the proposed protocol for 2012/13 was appended to the report and we agreed that it be adopted.

We noted that the Young People and Children Scrutiny Committee had also considered this report at a recent meeting and had recommended we adopt the proposed protocol (Minute YPC/12/15).

### **Decisions**

1. To note this report.
2. To approve the proposed Secondary In-Year Fair Access Protocol for the school year 2012/ 2013.

### **Exe/12/089 Global Revenue Budget Monitoring Report to the end of May 2012**

A report was submitted providing a summary of the position of the 2011/12 revenue budget at the end of May 2012. The report gave details of the projected variances to budgets, the position of the Housing Revenue Account, the capital financing requirement, Council Tax collection, revised prudential borrowing indicators, and the state of the Council's contingency funds.

The report explained that with the implementation of new accounting requirements grants that have been received, but where the expenditure of that money was planned to cover more than one financial year, have to be shown in the accounts as a reserve. Section 1 of appendix 2 of the report set out in detail the effects of this change in accounting treatment.

The report also proposed the use of some of the Council's reserves, including some of those established at our last meeting when we dealt with the revenue outturn for 2011/12 (Minute Exe/12/073). The detail of what was proposed was set out in the appendices to the report. We supported those proposals.

### **Decisions**

1. Note the contents of the report.
2. Recommend that Council approve the use of reserves as set out in Section 9 of the report and listed in its appendix 2, including:
  - a. Grants applied over more than one year that are now held in reserves due to a change in accountancy treatment, as set out in section 1 of the appendix to the report.
  - b. Planned use of new reserves approved in the 2011/12 Revenue Outturn Report, set out in section 2 of the appendix to the report.
  - c. Changes to planned use of existing reserves, listed in section 3 of the appendix to the report.
  - d. The use of the Youth Unemployment Reduction Reserve of £952k to support the Greater Manchester Youth Commitment Scheme and that arrangements for finalising the agreement and payment schedule are delegated to the City Treasurer and Assistant Chief Executive

- (Regeneration).
- e. The increased contribution from the Bus Lane Reserve for Metroshuttle of £97k for 2011/12 and £160k for 2012/13.
  - f. The increased contribution from the Parking Reserve for Birley Fields Residents parking of £60k.

### **Exe/12/090 Capital Increases – Progress Report**

A report concerning requests to increase the capital programme was submitted. We agreed to recommend to the Council three changes, and to agree four other changes under delegated powers. Taken together these changes would increase the capital budget by £10,741,000, financed by £24,000 City Council resources, £268,000 government grant, £9,660,000 capital receipts, £60,000 Parking Reserve and £729,000 Section 106 contributions.

### **Decisions**

1. To recommend that the City Council approve:
  - a. Neighbourhood Services – Spring Clean – Waste & Recycling Service Changes: To increase the capital budget by £24k in 2012/13, funded by City Council resources.
  - b. Strategic Housing – Redrow Development Phase 2: To increase the capital budget by £9.66m (£4.83m in 2012/13 and £4.83m in 2013/14), funded by capital receipts.
  - c. Neighbourhood Services – Birley Fields Residents Parking: To increase the capital budget by £360k (£180k in 2012/13 and £180k in 2013/14), funded by £300k Section 106 contribution and £60k from the Parking Reserve.
2. To approve, under delegated powers, the following:
  - d. Neighbourhood Services – Harpurhey Reservoirs Remediation: To increase the capital budget by up to £328k in 2012/13, funded by £268k DEFRA grant and £60k Section 106 contribution.
  - e. Neighbourhood Services - Newcastle Street Residents Parking: To increase the capital budget by £49k in 2012/13, funded by Section 106 contribution.
  - f. Neighbourhood Services – Oldham Road/ Dean Lane/ Church Street Pedestrian Crossing and Junction Reconfiguration: To increase the capital budget by £270k in 2012/13, funded by Section 106 contribution.
  - g. Neighbourhood Services – Jackson Crescent Parking Restrictions: To increase the capital budget by £50k in 2012/13, funded by Section 106 contribution.

### **Exe/12/091 Approval of disposal of 65 Meldon Road to Eastlands Homes**

The Director of Housing submitted a report seeking approval of the disposal of 65 Meldon Road, Longsight, to Eastlands Homes Partnership Limited at below market value. This was a vacant Council-owned property. It had been intended that it would be transferred to Eastland Homes in 2009 as part of the transfer of 5,240 tenanted homes. However, it had been decided at that time it would be excluded from that transfer due to ongoing legal proceedings against the then tenants. Those legal proceedings had concluded with the tenants being evicted in March 2011. The property had remained empty since then.

Due to the nature of the case against the former tenants and the impact it had on the surrounding residents, it was considered important that the property was not disposed of on the open market but was retained with effective management.

The proposal was to transfer the property with vacant possession to Eastlands Homes for the consideration of £1. The property would then be brought up to Decent Homes Standard by Eastlands Homes and used for social rent to support access to housing for lower income families.

The report set out the legal and financial implications of the proposed transaction, as well as the proposed terms. We supported the proposal.

#### **Decisions**

1. To approve the disposal of 65 Meldon Road in the Central Manchester SRF Area to Eastlands Homes at below the market value.
2. To authorise the City Solicitor to complete the documentation in order to complete the transfer of the property to Eastlands Homes.
3. To delegate authority to the City Treasurer to negotiate and agree the final terms for disposal of the land.

### **Exe/12/092 Greater Manchester Combined Authority**

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the Decision Notice of the meeting of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority on 29 June 2012.

### **Exe/12/093 AGMA Executive Board**

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the Decision Notice of the meeting of the AGMA Executive Board on 29 June 2012.

**Exe/12/094 2nd battalion, the Royal Regiment of Fusiliers**

The Council had received a request from a member of the public to support a petition to ask the Ministry of Defence to reconsider its plans to disband the 2nd Battalion, Royal Regiment of Fusiliers. A report from the Chief Executive described the history of the Battalion and its strong links to Greater Manchester.

**Decision**

To support the campaign to oppose the disbanding of the Battalion.

**Exe/12/095 Exclusion of the Public**

A recommendation was made 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, or involved information in respect of which a claim for legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings, and public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

**Exe/12/096 First Street**

(public excluded on the grounds the report contain exempt information about the financial or business affairs of a particular person and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information)

A report submitted by the Chief Executive set out the commercial terms that had been agreed between Ask Developments and Manchester City Council in order to facilitate the proposals relating to the updated Development Framework that we also considered at this meeting (Minute Exe/12/082).

The Council and Ask Developments were party to a Development Agreement dated 18<sup>th</sup> December 2009, which set out the legal obligations upon each party to deliver the original First Street Development Framework. In light of the newly updated Development Framework additional obligations had been agreed between the parties and it was proposed that a Supplemental Deed to the Development Agreement be entered into to formalise that agreement. We supported that proposal.

**Decisions**

1. To note the recommendation in the First Street Development Framework

report in Part A of this agenda (Minute Exe/12/082), that requests the Council notes the development principles that have been agreed by the parties and captured within the Development Agreement and Commercial Plan.

2. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive, City Solicitor, and City Treasurer in consultation with the Chair of the Executive and Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to approve the final terms of the Development Agreement and Commercial Plan and necessary legal documentation, based upon the terms set out in the report and for the City Solicitor to execute the documentation.

**Exe/12/097 Acquisition of Land at Wilmott Street and disposal of buildings at 1396 Ashton Old Road, 120 Barmouth Street, 235 Broom Lane and 54 Every Street**

(agreed as urgent business - public excluded on the grounds the report contain exempt information about the financial or business affairs of a particular person and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information)

A report by the Chief Executive, the Director of Housing, and Strategic Director of Adults, Health and Wellbeing described the proposal for a land swap transaction, whereby the Council will acquire the Salvation Army Hostel at Wilmott Street and dispose of four shared houses as part of a wider review of the current service model for supporting homeless people. The report described the limitations and constraints of the existing Salvation Army facility at Wilmott Street, and how that affected the support to homeless people using that facility. It explained how the move to new premises through that land swap would enable service delivery to be improved. Revenue funding for the homeless service provided by the Salvation Army came from the Supporting People programme and we noted that a waiver was being consider to extend that funding in order to embed the new delivery service elsewhere within the City after the move out of Wilmott Street was complete. The report set out the details of the land swap and how the new service model for homeless people would operate from the new locations.

### Decisions

1. To note the progress to date in agreeing a new service model with the Salvation Army, and the requirement for fit for purpose accommodation.
2. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive, the City Solicitor, and City Treasurer to finalise and approve the detailed terms of the transaction and prepare and execute the necessary legal documentation based upon the terms set out in the report.
3. To delegate authority to the Head of Corporate Property in consultation with the Executive Member for Adults and the Statutory Deputy Leader (Councillor J Battle) to dispose of the Freehold interests in four MCC owned shared houses.