

## **CABINET MEETING**

Meeting: 19 December 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 14 November 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

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

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

The following interests were declared:-

#### **Personal Interest**

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Interest</u>
Wendy Wild	Agenda item 8 'A6-M60 Relief Road' as a member of the Cheshire Wildlife Trust

#### **Personal & Prejudicial Interest**

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Interest</u>
Kate Butler	Agenda item 6 (ii) 'Medium Term Financial Plan Cabinet Response: Stockport's Growth and Reform Programme' and the proposals relating to Information, Advice and Guidance (appendix 7) as a Trustee of the Citizen's Advice Bureau. Councillor Butler left the meeting during consideration of these proposals and took no part in the vote on this item.

### **3. URGENT DECISIONS**

No urgent decisions were reported.

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

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

Seventeen questions were submitted.

- (1) Would any consultation on the possible A6-M60 bypass be similar to previous consultation by implying the bypass would alleviate congestion problems, rather than explaining the loss of greenspaces and projected increases in traffic, and would the Cabinet not agree that the consultation should be impartial?

The Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration responded that any public consultation on this matter would take place in the context of the full suite of current information that the Council had made available through the publication of the strategic outline business case and the supporting documents. By publishing this information the Cabinet was ensuring that all the information currently held about the scheme was available for everyone to view and consider, and the Cabinet's aim was always to ensure engagement with residents on any issue was done in a fair and open manner, and this consultation would be no different.

- (2) Would the Cabinet provide details of what the proposed technical appraisals of the A6-M60 bypass would cover; what would be done to overcome the inadequacies of the previous traffic modelling using origin-destination data, and whether further modelling should not wait until after the opening of the A6MARR as suggested in the Feasibility Study?

The Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration drew attention to the statements in the report, namely that the development of the business case for a major scheme of this kind evolved over time and information was updated as a scheme progressed from one business case stage to another to ensure that new and updated information (such as the impact of other new road schemes – e.g. A6MARR) was taken into account. This was essential given that it could take many years to develop a scheme's business case.

In terms of the technical appraisals needed for the Outline Business Case to be submitted to government for consideration, the Cabinet Member stated that for Large Majors funding in June 2018, these would include an environmental scoping report and continued review and refinement of the technical analysis of the scheme, including such areas as flood risk and air quality. Further work would also be undertaken to refine the traffic modelling.

- (3) Concern was expressed that the Council would not adequately reflect the views of those living along the proposed bypass route nor those signatories to the recent petition, so details were requested about how interested parties could contact the government's Investment Committee to submit evidence.

The Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration stated that it had been made very clear throughout the recent debates on this issue that a major public consultation would be held in the New Year as part of the next stage of business case development and prior to any scheme bid being submitted to government in June 2018. This would be an opportunity for all residents and businesses in the borough to express their views on the scheme. This was one of the major reasons that further funding was being requested from government before any bid was submitted, to ensure that this public consultation could take place and a full consultation report be produced.

- (4) Given the emphasis placed on openness and transparency by the Council, why had consultation on the proposed parking charges at Romiley Station only been via a statutory notice in the local newspaper and no efforts made to inform the public given the impact this would have on confidence from the wider community?

The Cabinet Member for Communities & Housing responded by stating that the statutory notice detailing the proposals was published in the Stockport Express on the 8 November 2017 through a full page notice. Outside of the statutory process the Council had canvassed opinion from local business forums, the Town Centre Business Improvement District Board and through the Council's Scrutiny process. A representative from the Friends of Romiley Station had been engaging with officers since the start of the statutory consultation however local groups were not contacted directly. Officers were meeting with residents and interested groups in January 2018 to discuss alternative proposals to achieve the forecast increase in parking revenues.

In response to a supplementary question, the Cabinet Member undertook to respond to the questioner in writing with details of the engagement with the Friends of Romiley Station.

- (5) What were the reasons for removing the 'lower cost alternative' bypass route from the Draft Outline Business Case, given reference to it in the appendices, and was removing reference to it the reason for the delay in the Business Case publication?

In response, the Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration stated that the 'lower cost alternative' case referenced in the Highways Forecasting and Analytical Services' report referred to the 'do minimum' scenario described elsewhere in the appendices and not to a different route alignment. This alternative scenario was used in the modelling as a comparison against the proposed scheme to demonstrate impact on overall network performance, broad re-assignment impacts, and changes in journey times. As set out on page 32 of the appendix documents, the 'do minimum' scenario was based on highways schemes which have been completed since 2015; were in construction; had funding in place; were part of a Highways England programme; or were likely to be completed by the forecast years used in the modelling.

The supporting documents made available on the SEMMMS website alongside the draft strategic outline business case had been made available in order to enable scrutiny to take place. The Council had been very clear from the start that all the available information had been published for complete transparency about the information on this scheme. This documentation had not been separated from the business case and it was worth nothing that it would not be commonplace for a council to publish this level of information at such an early stage in the business case development process.

- (6) What changes had been made to the current version of the Car Parking Strategy; who owned the NCP operated Merseryway Car Park and what was the current and projected income generation from this; who owned the Redrock car park; what measures were in place to protect current town centre car parking capacity from future pressure from further development plans; what mitigation measures were in place to support businesses affected by Town Centre redevelopment, and what lessons had been learned from the TCAP and Redrock redevelopment processes?

The Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration responded by stating that the changes to the document were set out in Section 5 of the covering report included in the agenda papers. Merseyway was referenced in appendix 1 of the Strategy as being owned by the Council but operated by NCP and was listed in the table of privately operated car parks. When reviewing income, the Council considered all car parks in the town centre, including Merseyway. Stockport Council owned Merseyway and Redrock Car Parks and they were managed by NCP.

The Cabinet Member emphasised that the Council had invested in Stockport Town Centre on an unprecedented scale over the last few years, with the recent opening of Redrock and high quality public realm adding to the success of the Exchange Square development. The Cabinet was continuing to be ambitious, this included support for the creation of a Business Improvement District, working with them to develop the Christmas offer; 500,000 people projected to visit Princes Street, the cinema and other attractions in the new Redrock development per year which was good news for all businesses, particularly those in the Town Centre.

The Cabinet Member recognised the difficulties for the retail sector, and whilst the development work would bring more people into Stockport it was recognised that the previous 12 months had brought upheaval for businesses on Princes Street, many of whom may already have been struggling with the challenging economy. The Council had worked to ensure that the work was complete well ahead of this Christmas. During the works, the Council had worked very closely with companies to provide mitigation, providing practical support such as increased signage, free car parking and access to expert business advisors. The Cabinet Member stated that she had asked that officers meet with businesses over the coming weeks to review how the project had been managed. It was important that the Council support the investment in Stockport by supporting businesses that were vital to the town centre.

The car park strategy had been developed to support the town centre's needs and to provide a high class offer for all users, a key element of which was to identify additional locations to provide more car parking as demand increased in the near future. This would only happen because Stockport was thriving and would be a consequence of success. The Council would need to keep reviewing the balance of car park spaces and tariffs to ensure the vibrancy of the town centre.

(7) Was it not the case that the environmental impact assessment for the proposed A6-M60 bypass would only be undertaken once the Council were totally committed to the building of the road, and how could the Leader of the Council justify this in light of his environment portfolio with the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and the GM Mayor's campaign pledged to protect and enhance green spaces?

In response, the Leader of the Council referred to the debate at the Council Meeting at which it was stated that further information was required to enable the Council to take an informed decision about whether or not to progress with the road. This includes further information about environmental impacts, hence the requirement for an environmental scoping report at the next stage. As had been set out in the report discussed at the Council Meeting, the development of these proposals and completion of the outline business case was at an early stage. Should a decision be taken on completion of the next

outline business case stage, further review of the environmental impact of the scheme would be undertaken in developing the final business case and in applying for planning permission for the scheme. In addition, the Council had committed that a full public consultation would be taken at the next stage to enable all residents and businesses in Stockport, including those who have already raised concerns via a petition, to give their views on the principles of the scheme.

In relation to his Greater Manchester Combined Authority portfolio, the Leader reiterated that he had never called for the A6-M60 to be built, and that he had been clear that there was insufficient evidence to persuade him that it should be built. He had also been clear that the current level of traffic congestion, car emissions and air pollution was unacceptable and that something must be done, as well as ensuring everyone had access to good quality green space.

- (8) Was the Director for Public Health correct when he stated at the Adult Social Care & Health Scrutiny Committee on 28 November 2017 that the proposed cuts to public health and social care budgets would have an adverse effect on the NHS, that 'they would damage the health of the public, and at later meeting that the cuts would diminish the base-line upon which the transformational programme was built upon. If so, should the Council be considering such cuts?

The Cabinet Member for Health responded by highlighting that there had been no additional resources from the government in the recent Budget Statement and that the Council was facing the single largest reduction in its funding. Given that the Council had already done most of what it could to raise income it was required to look at other options. The consultation of the budget proposals for adult services and public health remained open until 22 December and feedback was welcomed. The proposals would be considered by the Cabinet in due course when difficult choices would need to be made.

The Leader of the Council emphasised the difference between Stockport Together and the pooled budget, and that the proposals needed to be seen within the context of efforts to integrate further health and social care to mitigate the financial risks facing the Council. The Leader also stated that he would ensure the Director of Public Health wrote to the questioner to clarify his position.

- (9) Would the Cabinet Member for Communities & Housing agree that residents should be encouraged to visit district and town centres and whether she would work with councillors to abandon the proposed imposition/ increase in parking charges and maintain the free car park status to drive economic growth in Stockport instead of neighbouring authorities where parking remained free?

The Cabinet Member for Communities & Housing stated that she had already committed to discuss the issues with councillors in the New Year, but stated that the Council needed to find £18m in savings to set a balanced budget for 2018/19. She stated that she was willing to listen to any proposals for where the savings could be made, but the Cabinet was committed to protect front line services as far as possible.

- (10) Given the commitment of the Cabinet to consult further on proposed changes to car parking charges, would the Cabinet commit to meeting with Marple North councillors

to specifically in relation to Marple Bridge with a view to developing a proposal that would be acceptable to all?

In response, the Cabinet Member for Communities & Housing reiterated the response she gave to the previous question, namely she had already committed to discuss the issues with councillors in the New Year, but that the Council needed to find £18m in savings to set a balanced budget for 2018/19. She stated that she was willing to listen to any proposals for where the savings could be made, but the Cabinet was committed to protect front line services as far as possible.

The Leader of the Council reported that the questioners for the remaining seven questions were not present at the meeting so in accordance with the Code of Practice would receive written responses to their questions.

## **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:-

Minute	Title	Reason
19	Town Centre Regeneration – Merseyway (E&R21)	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**

## **6. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL PLAN (MTFP)**

- (i) MTFP Financial Landscapes and Forecasts 2018/19 to 2022/23 (update following 2017 Autumn Budget)

The Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Policy, Finance & Devolution submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) updating the Cabinet on the Council's 2018/19 to 2022/23 Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) forecasts and assumptions taking account of local and national changes since the completion of the Summer Review, including the Government's 2017 Autumn Budget announcements.

The Leader of the Council reported on the announcement made earlier in the day on the 2018/19 local government financial settlement. This announcement included the ability to raise Council Tax by a further 1% before triggering a local referendum and allowing a doubling of the Police precept up to £12. The government had also announced that councils could raise pay by up to 2%, but this would need to be funded through Council Tax increases. Given the lateness of the settlement publication, the Cabinet had not yet considered the implications of these announcements.

The Leader highlighted the challenge of the financial situation facing the Council.

RESOLVED – That in relation to the updated Medium Term Financial Plan Financial Landscapes and Forecasts 2018/19 to 2022/23:-

- the details of the report including the announcements made in the Government's 2017 Autumn Budget be noted;
- the financial forecasts for 2018/19 to 2022/23, and the key issues to be addressed in formulating a response to the financial challenges facing the Council be noted;
- the budget reduction requirement for 2018/19 of £1.221m and the indicative cumulative reduction requirement of £16.556m in 2019/20 rising to £47.101m in 2022/23 be noted; and
- the final steps necessary to propose a balanced budget for 2018/19 to the Budget Council meeting on 22 February 2018 continue to be taken.

(i) Medium Term Financial Plan Cabinet Response: Stockport's Growth and Reform Programme

A joint report of the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Policy, Finance & Devolution and the Cabinet Member for Reform & Governance submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) updating the Cabinet on the Council's 2018/19 to 2022/23 Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) forecasts and assumptions taking account of local and national changes since the completion of the Summer Review, including the Government's 2017 Autumn Budget announcements.

Cabinet Members summarised and highlighted key issues relating to the proposals within their portfolios.

The Cabinet Member for Children & Family Services stated that in light of the consultation it was now proposed to include an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) as part of the KITE proposals. As this document had not been considered by the Scrutiny Committee it was proposed to defer a decision on this proposal until the Scrutiny Committee had been given the opportunity to comment on the EIA. The Leader of the Council stated that the Cabinet nevertheless had confidence in the proposals, and improved provision in certain respects.

Cabinet Members reiterated earlier statements in relation to the challenging financial situation facing the Council and the need to make decisions that could be controversial, but emphasised the openness of the process and the responsiveness of the Cabinet to feedback received.

RESOLVED – (1) That report and the progress on the growth and reform programme outlined within the Medium Term Financial Plan Cabinet Response report and the considerations outlined within section 3 in relation to consultation, workforce implications and equality implications be noted.

(2) That in relation to the following specific proposals set out in appendices 4-7 of the report:

(i) Children and Young Peoples Proposals (appendix 4)

- the consultation responses be noted and the updated proposals be approved for implementation;
- the commitment in relation to the Free School Bus Passes proposal to review existing arrangements and return to Cabinet in February with further detail on mitigating actions be noted;
- the intention to consult with the Children & Families Scrutiny Committee on the Equality Impact Assessment for the KITE service proposal prior to consideration by the Cabinet in February be noted.

(ii) Parking Charges (appendix 5):

following consideration of the responses and concerns raised through the consultation process it be agreed to:

- Arrange for officers to meet with the groups and individuals who have contacted the council to review detailed proposals and alternatives before implementation, assessing potential alternatives which will generate similar levels of savings;
- review tariffs annually to assess income levels and impact upon car park usage and displacement onto residential streets;

(iii) Income Recovery and Cost Recovery (appendix.6):

- Approval be given to the updated proposal for implementation

(iv) Information, Advice and Guidance (appendix 7):

- the consultation responses be noted and the updated proposal be approved for implementation.

(3) That the commitment to submit a further report to Cabinet in February 2017 relating to proposal for Adult Social Care and Public Health be noted.

**7. STOCKPORT BILLING AREA - 2018/19 COUNCIL TAX TAXBASE AND NON DOMESTIC RATES FORECAST**

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 the forecast Collection Fund outturn position for 2017/18, the setting of the Council Tax Base for 2018/19 and providing a forecast for Business Rates income for 2018/19.

The Leader of the Council emphasised the volatility in business rate forecasting, and the benefits of mitigating some of that risk through the pooling of business rate income through Greater Manchester.

RESOLVED – That in relation to the Stockport Billing Area -2018/19 Council Tax Taxbase and Non Domestic Rates forecast:

- a forecast Collection Fund deficit of £1.941m in 2017/18 relating to a



- Council Tax surplus of £1.287m and Business Rates deficit of £3.228m be declared;
- the 2018/19 Council Tax Taxbase for budget setting purposes of 93,361.2 Band D equivalent properties be approved;
- the 2018/19 forecast for Business Rates income of £83.135m be provisionally approved; and
- the use of the Collection Fund 2016/17 growth funds and 2017/18 forecast position declared to support the Council's MTFP and to increase the Council's Capital Programme Investment Reserve as part of the Reserves Policy be approved.

(2) That the decision to vary the Business Rates forecast presented in Table 6 be delegated to the Borough Treasurer in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Reform and Governance.

### Key Decisions

#### **8. 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 referred to the three hour debate during the Council Meeting, at which 37 councillors spoke after which the Council Meeting recommended to the Cabinet that it proceed to the next stage of Business Case development.

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

- although councillors had expressed a wish for more information on the impact and viability of the road, there was already significant evidence available on the impact of road building, particular the relatively quick loss of benefit, spread of congestion and air pollution, and the expansion of ancillary development;
- much of the evidence of the impact would only be available after a road was built, but existing studies demonstrated the limited benefits similar schemes actually accrued;
- the environmental and ecological damage of the road would be significant and could not be mitigated against;
- the SEMMMS Strategy had emphasised the need to change travel patterns and habits, including away from cars, and this needed to happen before new roads were considered;
- collecting more evidence would allow the matter to be settled more finally than just making a decision based on the current draft outline business case;
- by moving the next stage this would allow a more comprehensive engagement and consultation with the public and give an opportunity for those residents not previously engaged by the public campaigns;

- it was a concern that many of the assessments of the impact of the road would not be available before a public consultation;
- it was important that any consultation be clear about the information that the Council has and does not have.

The Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration emphasised that no decision was being taken on whether to build a new road, only whether to proceed to a further stage of business case development.

RESOLVED (5 in favour, 3 against) - That in light of the recommendation of the Council Meeting on 30 November 2017, that approval be given to progressing to the next stage of Outline Business Case development of the A6 to M60 Relief Road as set out in Section 6 of the report, and to seek funding from the Department of Transport for this work.

## **9. CAR PARKING STRATEGY (E&R16)**

The Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to consider a revised Car Parking Strategy for the Town Centre that had been reviewed in light of changes to have taken place and to ensure it supported the longer term aspirations, future developments and demands for parking in the Town Centre.

The Cabinet Member emphasised the need for the existing Strategy to be reviewed, given the significant changes taking place in the Town Centre, and the importance of keeping its provisions under review to ensure it supported and enhanced the vitality of the Town Centre.

The Cabinet Member also supported the proposal from the Environment & Regeneration Scrutiny Committee that a similar review and strategy was needed for district centre parking.

RESOLVED – That in relation to the Car Parking Strategy

- the feedback received from stakeholders and the changes made to the draft strategy as a result be noted;
- the adoption of the revised strategy be endorsed;
- approval be given to the suggestion of the Economy & Regeneration Scrutiny Committee for a similar review of current parking policy for the district centres be undertaken.

## **10. TOWN CENTRE ACCESS PACKAGE (TCAP) COMPULSORY PURCHASE ORDER (CPO) 601 (E&R19)**

The Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to consider a proposal (scheme 601) for a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) to support a scheme within the Stockport Town Centre Access Plan that would provide for the widening of existing footways and the creation of share use path for pedestrians and cyclists on New Bridge Lane. Although negotiations with landowners had been undertaken it was considered that the use of CPO would ensure the implementation of the scheme within a reasonable timeframe.

RESOLVED – (1) That the Town Centre Access Package Compulsory Purchase Order 601 report be agreed together with the drafts of the Order front sheet, the Order Schedule, the Order Map and the Statement of Reasons provided herewith, and having done so, to resolve to make the Order (under the Highways Act 1980) for the reasons set out in the draft Statement of Reasons and to assemble the land and secure the rights required to deliver the TCAP 601 Scheme, and to submit the Order to the Secretary of State for Transport for confirmation.

(2) That the Corporate Director for Place Management and Regeneration be authorised to:

- a) make minor amendments and/or modifications, as required, to the Order front sheet, the Order Schedule, the Order Map and the Statement of Reasons, and to approve the said documents, prior to the Order being made and submitted to the Secretary of State for Transport for confirmation;
- b) if authorised by the Secretary of State, to confirm the Order;
- c) continue to engage in negotiations and, where possible, to agree terms for the Council to acquire by voluntary means all of the land and interests comprised within the Order Land where such land and interests are in third party ownership;
- d) in the event that objections are made to the Order, take all necessary steps to address and, where possible, resolve those objections and, if necessary, to prepare for and participate in any public inquiry convened by the Secretary of State for Transport to consider the Order.

(3) That the Head of Legal and Democratic Governance be authorised to:

- a) (providing the Order is confirmed by the Secretary of State), take all necessary steps to bring the Order into operation such that the Council's powers of compulsory acquisition, as secured by the Order, are exercised, and possession of the Order Land taken (including the making and service of one or more General Vesting Declarations and, where necessary, the preparation and service of Notices to Treat and Notices of Entry);
- b) approve agreements with affected parties setting out the terms of any withdrawals of objections to the Order, including, where appropriate, the exclusion of land from the Order; if considered acceptable having regard to scheme delivery, seek the consent of the Secretary of State for Transport to make modifications to the Order (including the Order Schedule and the Order Map); and, where appropriate, agree to refrain from compulsorily acquiring/vesting any land and/or interests included within the Order;
- c) defend any third party proceedings challenging the confirmation of the Order by the Secretary of State for Transport;
- d) commence or defend any proceedings in the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) concerning the determination of the compensation to which affected parties whose land and/or interests are acquired pursuant to the Order may be entitled, and to take all necessary steps to deal with, settle and/or dispose of those proceedings (as the case may be);
- e) do all things necessary or incidental to the implementation of the abovementioned resolutions.

## **11. RESILIENT NETWORK REVIEW (E&R20)**

The Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to consider an updated Resilient Network document, updated in light of new guidance from the government, to set out how the Council would ensure access to the highway network would be maintained in the event of extreme weather, major incidents and other local risks.

RESOLVED – That in relation to the Resilient Network Review:

- The proposed prioritisation process, network identified and the actions recommended for the different incident types be approved
- future approval of amendments to the network in line with the adopted guidelines be delegated to the Corporate Director of Place in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration.

## **12. OFFERTON HALL NURSERY AND DIAL PARK PRIMARY SCHOOLS PROPOSALS (EDU4)**

The Cabinet Member for Education submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to consider the outcome of a consultation on changes to Offerton Hall Nursery and Dial Park Primary School.

The Cabinet Member emphasised that the schools involved and most of the respondents to the consultation had been supportive of the proposals. He also stressed that while there was likely to be impacts of the proposals on staff, there was confidence that this could be managed effectively to minimise that impact.

RESOLVED – (1) That in relation to proposals for the future of Offerton Hall Nursery and Dial Park Primary School the feedback to from the consultation be noted and approval be given to the publication of related statutory proposals to:

- discontinue Offerton Hall Nursery School with effect from 31st August 2018; and
- reduce the lower age limit of Dial Park Primary School in order to accommodate nursery provision with effect from 1st September 2018.

(2) That authority for the final decisions on the proposals be delegated to the Corporate Director for People, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Education in the event that there were no significant objections received during the formal representation period.

### General Items

## **13. ANNUAL PAY POLICY STATEMENT**

The Cabinet Member for Reform & Governance submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to consider a proposal to increase the Living Wage Rate paid by the Council and to consider the Pay Policy Statement produced in accordance with requirements of Section 38 of the Localism Act 2011.

The Cabinet Member emphasised the proposed increase in the living wage. He also highlighted the inclusion within the report of information on the gender pay gap, and that while any such gap was not acceptable, the overall situation for the Council was positive.

Cabinet members emphasised the importance of ensuring that the Council's pay structure supported and encouraged staff to prevent high levels of turnover that was ultimately more costly to the Council and the quality of services.

RESOLVED – (1) That the Council Meeting be recommended to approve and adopt the Pay Policy Statement for the Council.

(2) That approval be given to the increase in the Living Wage rate paid by the Council, in line with current policy to £8.75 per hour, with effect from 1 April 2018.

(3) That agreement be given to publish the Council's Gender Pay Gap information.

#### **14. INTERIM AMENDMENT TO THE COUNCIL'S CONTRACT PROCEDURE RULES TO PERMIT IMPLEMENTATION OF A RISK-BASED SOURCING TRIAL**

The Cabinet Member for Reform & Governance submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to consider a proposal to temporarily amend the Council's Contract Procedure Rules to allow for the piloting of a risk-based sourcing approach for procurement.

RESOLVED – That the Council Meeting be recommended to approve the proposed changes to the Council's Contract Procedure Rules detailed in the report, to allow for the Council to participate in a risk-based sourcing procurement pilot.

#### **15. CLOSURE OF THE SECTION 48 AGMA GRANTS SCHEME**

The Leader of the Council submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to consider the outcome of a consultation on the possible closure of the AGMA Section 48 Grant scheme and the development of a new funding programme for culture and social impact under the Greater Manchester Combined Authority.

The Leader of the Council emphasised that although the current scheme funded few organisations or schemes in Stockport, local residents benefited more than any other in Greater Manchester from the projects. It was hoped that the proposed new scheme would encourage interest from smaller organisations and a more diverse cultural offer, while supporting the longer term strategic priorities of the Combine Authority.

RESOLVED – That in relation to the AGMA Section 48 Grant Scheme:-

- the outcome and mitigating actions of the completed consultation on the proposed closure of the grants programme be noted;
- authorisation be given to the closure of the Section 48 Grants scheme, noting that it would be replaced by the Greater Manchester Combined Authority Culture and Social Impact Programme.

## **16. 2017 GREATER MANCHESTER STRATEGY AND IMPLEMENTATION PLAN**

The Leader of the Council submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) providing the Cabinet with the recently approved Greater Manchester Strategy and associated Implementation Plan.

The Leader emphasised that the Strategy had been subject to extensive engagement prior to its launch in October 2017, and would provide something against which the performance of the Combined Authority could be judged. Relevant elements of this Strategy would also be incorporated into the next Council Plan.

RESOLVED - That in relation to the Greater Manchester Strategy and Implementation Plan:

- the launch of the new Strategy be noted;
- the publication of the Implementation Plan and the intention that this will be updated 6-monthly and progress monitored against a performance dashboard be noted;
- agreement be given to receive regular updates on the Strategy Implementation Plan given the Council's key role in delivering the actions set out in this document.

## **17. GMCA AND AGMA DECISIONS - 24 NOVEMBER 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) and AGMA Executive Board on 24 November 2017.

The Leader highlighted decisions relating to:-

- The signing the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise Accord.
- Agreement to use £1.8m of Warm Homes Funds to supplement the Local Energy Advice Programme.
- Agreement on the use of retained resources from growth in the Business Rates pool.

RESOLVED – That the report be noted.

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

There were none.

Item not for publication

## **19. TOWN CENTRE REGENERATION - MERSEYWAY (E&R21)**

The Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration submitted a report (copies of which had been circulated) inviting the Cabinet to consider a proposed strategic approach to the future management and redevelopment of Merseyway Shopping Centre as part of the Council's overall approach to town centre regeneration.

(Note: the report contains information 'not for publication' in its appendices that had been circulated to cabinet members only)

RESOLVED – That in relation to Merseyway and Town Centre Regeneration:-

- the progress to date with regard to the Council's approach to managing Merseyway Shopping Centre be noted;
- the strategic approach to the regeneration of Merseyway as outlined in the report be approved;
- approval be given in principle, and subject to further feasibility works, to a first package of works which comprised:
  - The creation of a Food Court at Arden Walk;
  - The creation of semi-permanent retail and leisure 'pods' at suitable points along Merseyway;
  - Design works aimed at ensuring the former Next unit can be let at the earliest opportunity;
  - The property transaction as outlined in the report;
- authorisation be give to further feasibility work on the packages of work in line with the delegated authority and approved funding as described in the confidential report;
- with regard to the structural and public realm works described in the confidential report, and subject to further Cabinet and / or Cabinet Member approvals if required, authorisation be give to the submission of a business case to Transport for Greater Manchester for Local Growth Fund resources and the signing of the appropriate delivery agreement;
- approval be given to the proposed change to the delegated authority for approving property transaction set out in the confidential report so that responsibility for Estate Management is delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director for Place Management & Regeneration.
- authorisation be given to the Corporate Director for Place Management & Regeneration and Borough Treasurer in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Economy & Regeneration to take all necessary steps to implement the strategy in this report reporting back as necessary and appropriate to Cabinet.

The meeting closed at 8.45 pm