

## **CABINET MEETING**

Meeting: 14 November 2017

At: 6.00 pm

### **PRESENT**

Councillor Alex Ganotis (Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Policy, Finance & Devolution) (Chair) in the chair; Councillor Wendy Wild (Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care) (Vice-Chair); Councillors Sheila Bailey (Communities & Housing), Kate Butler (Economy & Regeneration), Dean Fitzpatrick (Education), Colin Foster (Children & Family Services), Tom McGee (Health) and David Sedgwick (Reform & Governance).

### **1. MINUTES**

The Minutes (copies of which had been circulated) of the meeting held on 3 October 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillors and officers were invited to declare any interests they had in any of the items on the agenda for the meeting.

The following interest was declared:-

#### **Personal Interest**

<b><u>Councillor</u></b>	<b><u>Interest</u></b>
Wendy Wild	Agenda items 4 'Public Question Time' and 'A6 to M60 Relief Road' as a member of Cheshire Wildlife Trust.

### **3. URGENT DECISIONS**

No urgent decisions were reported.

### **4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

Members of the public were invited to put questions to the Cabinet on any matters within its powers and duties, subject to the exclusion set out in the Code of Practice.

Seven questions were submitted relating to the A6-M60 Relief Road draft Strategic Outline Business Case (DSOBC):-

- (1) The first question asked whether the SOBC claim that monitoring of traffic on major roads in Stockport indicated an approximately 15% increase since 2001 was misleading since this figure was influenced by growth of M60 traffic whereas traffic on the A6 north of Hazel Grove had actually declined by at least 12% and on the A627 by approximately 4%. The Cabinet was also asked whether the exclusion of these other

figures from the DSOBC was misleading the Cabinet to progress with through the scheme.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration stressed the transparency of the Council on the evidence gathered as part of DSOBC, including publishing the draft document on the website in advance of its consideration by the Scrutiny Committee. The statement referred to in the question was part of a summary statement at the end of a longer section relating to current context, including congestion and road safety and referenced the Department for Transport (DfT) traffic count data on which it was based, which was publically available to enable full examination of the detailed figures for individual roads.

It was further responded that when considering data this should be viewed in full context as the figures quoted in the question relate to an area the Council had been working hard to improve the public transport connectivity so a reduction in traffic flows was to be expected.

It was further stated that the purpose of the DSOBC was to examine whether there was an overall strategic case for the proposals. Should the DfT and the Council decide to seek funding to progress to the next stage of business case development, further work would be undertaken to look at the detailed case for the scheme and its potential impact on current traffic flows in Stockport.

- (2) The second question expressed concern about the impact a relief road would have on the Goyt Valley, asking whether the Cabinet had heard the discussion at the recent Scrutiny Committee at which members had commented that this area was an area of outstanding landscape and nature and therefore accepted that ruining the Goyt Valley would be a grievous loss to Stockport.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration replied that the greenspace and natural areas of Stockport were one of its great strengths, and the Goyt and Poise Brook Valleys were very dear and important to many in Stockport. She also stated that many residents in Stockport have said that congestion was having a significant impact on their lives. The reason for developing the DSOBC was to assess the overall strategic case for the scheme and to weigh up some of the issues raised in the question. It was stressed that if the decision was taken by the Council and DfT to progress the scheme to the next stage of business case development, further work would be undertaken to assess any environmental impacts, and the Council would undertake public consultation to ensure that all residents and businesses in Stockport were able to give their views.

- (3) The third question stated that the Scrutiny Committee was informed that the traffic modelling for the DSOBC had considered induced traffic. It was queried whether the DSOBC had actually used fixed-matrix modelling that cannot show induced traffic, and if it did model induced traffic details of how this was done were requested. It was further queried whether it was sufficient to proceed with the business case process without information on induced traffic.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration stated that the traffic modelling could be utilised to examine screen lines to understand changes in origin /

destination. Were the scheme to progress to a full business case, the traffic modelling and all other areas of the business case would continue to be developed. The traffic modelling undertaken for the A6MARR scheme concluded that there was very little induced traffic expected with that scheme and the after traffic surveys once that scheme opens would allow this to be monitored.

- (4) The fourth question asked whether the Cabinet should have received information necessary to make decisions about the DSOBC, namely the Business Case's Volume 2 and the comments made by members of the Scrutiny Committee. It was suggested that Volume 2 contained information about effect that the bypass would have on traffic, whereas the DSOBC contained very little information. The Cabinet was asked whether it agreed that this was inappropriate, why proper procedure had not been followed, and that the Business Case should be returned with Volume 2 to the Scrutiny Committee before it is considered by the Cabinet.

The Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration reiterated that the Council was being fully transparent on the evidence gathered as part of the DSOBC that had been published on the website well in advance. As a draft document, work was ongoing to finalise the document and any supporting documents, all of which would be made available on the website. Members of the Cabinet were aware of the helpful questions and comments raised by the Scrutiny Committee and would thank them for their assistance in reviewing this important document.

- (5) The fifth question expressed deep concern at the impression that the DSOBC dismisses Offerton as 'ordinary and lacking distinctiveness', questioning whether the authors had visited the green spaces in this area, and asking the Cabinet to repudiate the comment of the officer at the Scrutiny Committee who stated that the road would bring improvement to tranquillity in Offerton, as this would not be the consequence.

The Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration responded by stating that the reference quoted in the question related to the high level assessment of the impact the potential road could have on townscapes (i.e. the built environment) of Offerton, and was definitely not a comment on the landscape of the area that was recognised in the report as unique and special.

With regards to the officer's comments at the Scrutiny Committee, these referred to the expectation that the road would reduce traffic flows, and therefore noise and congestion in the Offerton area.

- (6) The sixth question referenced the DSOBC appendices and the indication of a significant increase in traffic forecast on Offerton Lane of 179% westbound in the morning peak, suggesting that the Bypass would not operate in the way the Business Case it was implied, and asking the Cabinet to pause to examine these figures?"

In response, the Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration stated that the appendices on the website were draft documents and in any modelling output it would be expected to find individual links with figures that needed further investigation as part of the ongoing development of the scheme design. Nevertheless the local model validation report demonstrated that the model met accepted standards.

A seventh question had been submitted by a member of the public who was not present at the meeting. The Chair reported that, in accordance with the Code of Practice, a written response would be provided to the questioner.

## **5. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST TEST**

RESOLVED – That in order to prevent the disclosure of information which was not for publication, the disclosure of which would not be in the public interest, would not be fair and would be in breach of Data Protection principles, the public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items:-

<u>Item</u>	<u>Minute</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Reason</u>
10	20	Strategic Investment – Manchester Airport Group	Paragraph 3 'Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority)' as set out in the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)
16	21	Market Place & Underbanks Update	Paragraph 3 'Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority)' as set out in the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)
17	22	Civic Estates	Paragraph 3 'Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority)' as set out in the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)

### Performance and Budget Monitoring

## **6. CORPORATE PERFORMANCE AND RESOURCES - MID-YEAR REPORTS 2017/18**

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Policy, Finance & Devolution submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) providing the Cabinet with a report on the delivery of the Council's Priority Outcomes and budget during the first half of 2017/18, with particular focus on activity in the second quarter.

The Leader of the Council highlighted a number of significant issues, including ongoing budgetary pressures, predicted deficits in cash limit budgets being offset by surpluses in non-cash limit budgets. It was also proposed to utilities reserves to support reform and budget resilience.

The report also summarised programmes to address some of these pressures and to reduce avoidable demand for services through inclusive growth, including: the recent launch of the Community Investment Fund pilot; proposals being developed on tackling poverty; ongoing work developing locality working and the Digital by Design programme; the establishment of Stockport Neighbourhood Care; and ongoing work to develop the Local Plan.

The Leader also paid tribute to Council staff and partners who had been worked hard to achieve a Good Ofsted rating for Children's social care services, particularly in the context of reducing budgets and increasing demand. Adoption Services were singled out for their Outstanding rating.

In relation to the Leader's Report for the second quarter, the Leader specifically highlighted the anticipation of the Autumn budget statement from the Government and the need for action to address funding pressures nationally on adult and children's social care; the proposal for GMCA to begin a second phase of consultation on a revised GMSF in June 2018 and releases of key analysis in advance of this; progress with Stockport Exchange redevelopment and bringing forward capital investment in school buildings.

The Leader also paid tribute to the Council for delivering the essential A6/Wellington Bridge maintenance work on time and budget, and for the way in which mitigation was managed.

Cabinet Members also highlighted particular issues within their portfolios, including the need for long term behavioural change to address the growing health and financial challenge of Type 2 diabetes; increasing costs of and demand for children's residential care; increased pressure on resources to respond to missing children reports; positive steps to make resources available to address school building conditions but the shortfall in what was available compared to the needs; proposals being prepared to address specific increasing demand for SEND provision.

**RESOLVED** – That in relation to the Corporate Performance and Resources 2017/18 Mid-Year Report:-

- progress against delivering Council priorities and capital schemes alongside budget and performance forecasts contained within the report be noted;
- the virements to the Revenue Budget set out in section 3.2.3 of the report be approved;
- the Portfolio cash limit forecast position for 2017/18 as set out in section 3.3 of the report be noted;
- the position on the 2017/18 budget savings programme set out in section 3.4 of the report be noted;
- the non-cash limit forecast position for 2017/18 as set out in section 3.6 of the report be noted;
- the Dedicated Schools Grant and Housing Revenue Account forecast positions as set out in sections 3.7 and 3.8 of the report be noted;
- the position on the Council's earmarked reserves and balances as set out in section 3.9 of the report be noted;
- the re-phasing of capital schemes during the quarter as set out in 4.1.4 be noted;
- the changes to the Capital Programme as set out in 4.1.5 of the report be approved; and
- the proposals for resourcing the Capital Programme as set out in 4.3 of the report be approved.

## **7. TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY AND ANNUAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY MID-YEAR REVIEW REPORT 2017/18 (LDR58)**

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Policy, Finance and Devolution submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) providing the Cabinet with a mid-year review of the Council's Treasury Management Strategy Statement and Annual Investment Strategy for 2017/18, and providing an economic update for the first six months of the year and how this may impact on interest rate predictions and the outlook provided in the initial Strategy.

The Leader of the Council highlighted the increase in interest rates announced by the Bank of England that had taken place since publication of the report, but stated that the Council's treasury management assumptions had included an expectation of such rises. The impact of these changes was likely to be that the Council considered borrowing over longer periods to improve cost effectiveness of its borrowing.

The Leader highlighted changes to CIPFA Code of Practice that would require the Council to report on non-treasury investments that provided financial returns, although this would have no effect on the Council's financial position.

The Leader of the Council also paid tribute to the hard work of those officers involved in Treasury Management.

RESOLVED - That the Council Meeting be recommended to receive the Treasury Management Strategy and Annual Investment Strategy 2017/18 Mid-Year Review Report and

- note the report and the treasury activity in the first half of the financial year;
- note the revised interest rate forecasts for PWLB rates over the short and medium term which will drive the Council's long-term borrowing strategies going forward; and
- note that investments with Local Authorities as identified in the original Treasury Management Strategy Report (TMSS), also includes Combined Authorities and other government public authorities, for example, Police, Fire and Waste authorities and as such the minimum credit criteria and investment limits will be applied in the same way.

## **8. Q2 2017-18 COMPLAINTS REPORT**

The Cabinet Member for Reform & Governance submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) providing the Cabinet with an overview of complaints received in the second quarter of 2017/18 and outlining any lessons learnt as a consequence.

The Cabinet Member highlighted that adult social care complaints were now reported to the Adult Social Care and Health Scrutiny Committee, drawing lessons from these where appropriate.

RESOLVED – That performance in relation to complaints received in the second quarter of 2017/18 be noted.

Key Decisions

**9. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN - ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND PUBLIC HEALTH TRANSFORMATION AND SPENDING PROPOSALS 2018/19 (LDR57)**

A joint report of the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Members for Adult Social Care and for Health submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to consider proposals for adult social care and public health to address funding pressures from 2018/19 onwards.

The Leader and Cabinet Members emphasised the difficulties associated with this area of the budget, and their overriding principal of seeking to minimise the impact on front line provision through service redesign, budget re-profiling, identifying alternative funding sources, maximising contractual opportunities and increasing income generation. Although the new models of care begin developed through Stockport Together would address a large part of the longer term funding gap in health and social care, it was acknowledged that no savings would be accrued from this programme until 2019.

Particular mention was made of the Improved Better Care Fund resources that would be used to invest in reform and transformation programmes, but the non-recurrent nature of these funds was regrettable and it was hoped adult social care funding would be addressed in the Autumn Budget Statement. The significant reductions being made to the Public Health Grant were also highlighted, and the difficulties of addressing in-year reductions in this funding.

RESOLVED – That the Adult Social Care and Public Health transformation and spending proposals for 2018/19 as set out in Section 5 of the report, and the commitment to share detailed proposals with the relevant scrutiny committees in November be noted.

**10. GM WASTE DISPOSAL AUTHORITY LEVY - CONSIDERATION OF THE GREATER MANCHESTER WASTE DISPOSAL LEVY ALLOCATION METHODOLOGY AND APPROVAL OF A REVISED LEVY ALLOCATION MODEL AGREEMENT (LDR61/CH23)**

A joint report of the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Communities & Housing submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to consider a new Inter Authority Agreement for waste and recycling collection and disposal and for a revised methodology for the allocation of the waste Levy. These revised arrangements had become necessary due to the intention of the GMWDA to terminate the existing agreement with Viridor Laing.

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Communities & Housing highlighted the complexity of the agreement and methodology, and tribute was paid to officers and members involved in its development.

The improvement to the finances of the GMWDA and Council as a result of the new agreement were highlighted, and the intention to freeze the Waste Levy for the next year prior to the implementation of the new arrangements. It was projected that as a result of this new arrangement the Council would reduce the waste disposal costs by £1m per year,

and restricting the Levy increase to £200k in 2019/2020 as opposed to £1m under the previous contractual arrangements.

The Cabinet Member for Communities & Housing emphasised that despite the improvement this agreement would bring, including the improved incentives for recycling large quantities of waste, the Council nevertheless would be spending £21m per annum to dispose of waste and implored the public, partners and local businesses to do what they could to reduce their waste.

RESOLVED – That in relation to the GM Waste Disposal Levy Inter Authority Agreement:-

- approval be given to the revised Levy Apportionment Methodology Agreement, to be applied in full from 2019/20 with transitional arrangements in place during 2018/19, and the endorsement of the Council Meeting be sought on this course of action; and
- authority be delegated to the Corporate Director for Place Management and Regeneration, the Borough Treasurer and the Head of Legal & Democratic Governance Services in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Communities & Housing to approve and/ or make any minor amendments to the final Levy Apportionment Methodology Agreement, a current draft of which was appended to the report, and to enter into and finalise the Agreement, the transitional arrangements, and any associated documentation relating thereto.

#### **11. YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN 2017-18 (C&FS2)**

The Cabinet Member for Children & Families submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to consider the updated Youth Justice Plan. The Council was required to update and adopt annually a Youth Justice Plan that set out performance against the previous year's Plan and outlined priorities for the forthcoming year.

The continued improvement in performance was highlighted, as was the increasing range of activity undertaken by the Youth Offending Service, including Targeted Youth Support and children missing from home.

RESOLVED - That the Council Meeting be recommended to adopt the Youth Justice Plan.

#### **12. LEISURE ARRANGEMENTS IN BRINNINGTON (C&H21)**

The Cabinet Member for Communities & Housing submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to approve a grant funding agreement with Life Leisure to support efforts to improve physical activity in Brinnington as part of the management of the new Leisure Centre in Brinnington due to open in February/ March 2018.

The Cabinet Member emphasised the requirements attached to the grant to improve overall levels of physical activity and health in Brinnington, particularly of those who were not predisposed to use gym facilities, and the success of similar projects undertaken by Life Leisure elsewhere in the borough. Other cabinet members welcomed this type of initiative.



RESOLVED – That in respect of the new Leisure Centre in Brinnington:-

- approval in principal be given to proceed with a grant funding agreement and lease arrangements in respect of the new leisure centre in Brinnington.
- the Corporate Director for Place Management and Regeneration and Borough Treasurer be authorised, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Communities & Housing to agree all necessary terms to the aforementioned agreements, together with any ancillary documents, agreements or arrangements.

### **13. SEMMMS REFRESH ISSUES AND OPTIONS – UPDATE FOLLOWING THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION (E&R14)**

The Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to consider the outcome of the consultation undertaken on the refresh of the South East Manchester Multi-Modal Strategy (SEMMMS), and to consider the emerging themes and priorities.

The Cabinet Member emphasised the changes to the transport context since the publication of the original SEMMM Strategy in 2001, and that the Strategy covered the whole of the south east quadrant of Greater Manchester, not simply Stockport.

Cabinet Members highlighted the clear message to emerge from the consultation of the need for a modal shift to more sustainable forms of transport to combat congestion, and the clear support for improvements to public transport, including to the airport, and the expansion of Metrolink to Stockport and Marple in particular. Cabinet Members also discussed the transport needs of an ageing population and the need to ensure the transport infrastructure was able to cope with this demand, not least to prevent social isolation.

RESOLVED – That in relation to the SEMMMS Refresh:-

- the consultation response be noted;
- the next steps for the delivery of the Strategy be noted; and
- the priorities identified in the report be endorsed.

### **14. A6 TO M60 RELIEF ROAD (E&R15)**

The Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to consider a draft Strategic Outline Business Case for a relief road between the A6 and M60 as part of a first phase of work to review the strategic case for such a road in light of contemporary evidence. A further phase of work, subject to Government approval, was needed to produce a full business case and detailed scheme prior any application for Government funding of the scheme construction costs and prior to submission of any planning application and associated public consultation.

The Cabinet Member stressed that in considering this document the Cabinet would not be making a decision on whether or not to proceed with the road scheme, only whether it wished to proceed to the next phase of development work on a possible scheme.

The Cabinet Member, echoing comments made during her responses to public questions earlier in the meeting, emphasised that the Council had gone beyond the usual practice of local authorities in publishing the draft Strategic Outline Business Case and the supporting documents because it was aware of the public interest in this matter.

Cabinet Members discussed and commented on the proposals. The issues raised included the following:-

- the proposal for a relief road would be a waste of public money as it would devastate the environment while only providing short term relief of traffic congestion;
- once constructed, the road would open up what remained of the Goyt and Poise Brook valleys to development as was almost universally the case with bypass scheme;
- the road would divide the Offerton community;
- the environmental impact of the scheme would be significant, damaging the habitats of a range of species, introducing noise and light pollution and reallocating air pollution;
- there was insufficient detail in the DSOBC on the cost of the scheme and the costs to the Council to progress this work, with no mention of mitigation costs nor spending to encourage alternative travel. The headline cost projection was double the projected costs to introduce Metrolink to Stockport and out to Marple, which should be a preferred aspiration;
- there were concerns about the modelling and underlying assumptions used in the DSOBC, not least the fact that the well-evidenced induced traffic effect of bypass schemes would erode the congestion relieving benefits of the scheme within a short time of its opening, and insufficient focus on induced traffic was included in the document;
- the assertion that congestion was a barrier to economic growth could not be substantiated given all the investment in Stockport and the statistics that showed the high quality of employment and high productivity of residents and businesses in the borough;
- congestion nevertheless remained a problem for many residents, and had been raised most recently during the SEMMMS refresh consultation events. There was sufficient evidence in the document to suggest that not investigating the matter further may let down residents;
- the impact of the activity of neighbouring local authorities needed to be taken into account, particularly the encouraging of significant house building, as the Council was not in a position to prevent people moving to or through the borough;
- there was a well established link between air pollution and health, particularly respiratory illnesses, and this needed to be considered as part of any decision to move forward;
- in developing any further the business case for this scheme there would need to be a thorough public consultation and full environmental impact analysis.

It was acknowledged that there was insufficient evidence in the document to answer all concerns about a possible scheme as this was not the document's purpose. In light of the strategic significance a relief road represented to the borough, it was suggested that the matter should be debated at the Council Meeting so that whichever approach was chosen this would have the broad support of all of the Council.

Cabinet members also suggested the need for greater clarity on the costs to the Council of moving to the next phase of development work, and the implications of this on other activity, as well as what options were available in the choice of consultants to support that work.

RESOLVED – That in the view of its strategic importance and long term implications, consideration of the draft A6 to M60 Relief Road Strategic Outline Business Case be deferred and the Council Meeting be invited to make a recommendation to the Cabinet on whether to proceed to the next phase of development work.

## **15. ADJOURNMENT**

*At 8.24pm the meeting adjourned.*

*At 8.30pm the meeting reconvened.*

### General Items

## **16. DIGITAL BY DESIGN PHASE 2 - IMPLEMENTATION PLAN - CHILDREN'S SERVICES**

The Cabinet Member for Children & Families submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) updating the Cabinet on the delivery plan for the second phase of the Digital by Design programme for the Children's Services work stream.

RESOLVED – That the update on the Children's Services work stream of the Digital by Design Phase 2 programme be noted and the funding for the delivery plans as set out in the report be approved.

## **17. CONSTITUTIONAL REVIEW - AREA COMMITTEE**

The Cabinet Member for Reform & Governance submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to consider the outcome of a consultation with the public on the possible change of name of the Werneth and Marple area committees. The feedback suggested a majority in favour of retaining the names as they currently were and the area committees themselves had recommended no further action be taken.

RESOLVED – That no further action be taken in respect of the proposal to change area committee names.

## **18. GMCA AND AGMA DECISIONS - 29 SEPTEMBER AND 27 OCTOBER 2017**

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Policy, Finance & Devolution submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) setting out decisions taken by the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) on 29 September 2017 and the GMCA and AGMA Executive Board on 27 October 2017.

The Leader highlighted decisions relating to:-

- £4m investment from the Housing Investment Fund for a housing development in Gatley;
- GM Employer engagement framework
- Significant progress having been made in implementing the GM Work and Health programme;
- Living Wage accreditation for GMCA;
- the launch of the Town Centre Challenge by the GM Mayor to highlight the challenges for local town centres;
- new GM scrutiny arrangements, and the fact Stockport had the best representation on these new bodies.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

## **19. TO CONSIDER RECOMMENDATIONS OF SCRUTINY COMMITTEES**

There were no referrals to consider.

Items not for publication

## **20. STRATEGIC INVESTMENT MANCHESTER AIRPORT GROUP (LDR60)**

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Policy, Finance & Devolution submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to consider investment proposals of the Manchester Airport Group to provide the airline capacity and standard of facilities required to secure future business plan growth and the longer term sustainability of the business.

RESOLVED – That in relation to the Strategic Investment for the Manchester Airport Group

- the proposals set out in the report, and in particular the recommendations for financial support to the Manchester Airport and Stansted Airport transformation project through the form of further shareholder loans be noted;
- that the transformation project outlined is fully aligned to the strategic economic and regeneration objectives of Greater Manchester be noted;
- the Chief Executive be authorised, in consultation with the Borough Treasurer, Borough Solicitor and Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Policy, Finance and Devolution to approve the funding package including the Council's shareholder loan;
- the Chief Executive, Borough Treasurer and Head of Legal & Democratic Services be authorised to negotiate and finalise the detailed arrangements in respect of the Council's shareholder loan, and to progress the financial and legal work associated with it; and
- the increase in capital expenditure supported by prudential borrowing be approved.

(2) Specifically in relation to the exempt portion of the report:-

- the extensive due diligence that has been completed and the conclusions of that exercise as set out in the section 4 of the exempt report be noted;

- the increase in capital expenditure within the range set out in the report (depending on the amount of the funding package) supported by prudential borrowing be approved;
- the proposals for the shareholder loan, subject to approval of the capital expenditure supported by prudential borrowing, be approved;
- the Borough Treasurer be authorised to determine the detailed accounting arrangements for the loan, including the classification between revenue and capital; and
- the Head of Legal & Democratic Services be authorised to enter into any necessary agreements or documents to give effect to the above resolutions.

## **21. MARKET PLACE & UNDERBANKS UPDATE (E&R17)**

The Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) updating the Cabinet on the continuing work around revitalising the Market Place and Underbanks area and seeking authority to enter into negotiations to agree the terms of leases for each of the Produce Hall and No 28/29 Market Place known as Blackshaw's.

RESOLVED – That in relation to the Market Place and Underbanks update:

- the progress made with procuring a new management operation for Market operation be noted;
- the setting aside of the capital from one-off resources to finance the likely capital spend set out in Appendix Two and the allocation and agreement of use of that resource be delegated to the Corporate Director for Place Management & Regeneration and the Deputy Chief Executive in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration;
- the Corporate Director for Place Management & Regeneration and the Deputy Chief Executive in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration be authorised to agree the terms of a lease with the preferred tenant(s) for the Produce Hall and Blackshaw's as set out in Appendix Two;
- the progress with the development of a markets and animation strategy that will contribute to the regeneration of the wider Town Centre be noted; and
- the Head of Legal and Democratic Services be authorised to do all things necessary or incidental to the implementation of the above resolutions.

## **22. CIVIC ESTATES (R&G14)**

The Cabinet Member for Reform & Governance submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to approve a proposal to convert the former canteen area of the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of Stopford House to accommodation to make it available to suitable occupiers to achieve a valuable rental income.

RESOLVED – That in relation to the 4th floor canteen area of Stopford House

- (i) it be declared as surplus to the Council's accommodation requirements and made available to suitable organisations to secure a valuable rental income, and
- (ii) the expenditure for the fit out works as detailed in exempt appendix to the report be approved, and

## Cabinet Meeting - 14 November 2017

- authority be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive and Borough Treasurer to enter into a lease transaction, as profiled in the tables in the exempt appendix to this report, and
- subject to negotiation with the incoming tenant on the length of the lease and deciding on the period of borrowing agreed through the delegation.

The meeting closed at 9.00 pm