MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE GMCA OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY COMMITTEE HELD WEDNESDAY, 26 MARCH 2025 AT THE TOOTAL BUILDINGS - BROADHURST HOUSE, 1ST FLOOR, 56 OXFORD STREET, MANCHESTER, M1 6EU

PRESENT:

Councillor Nadim Muslim	Bolton Council (Chair)
Councillor Peter Wright	Bolton Council
Councillor Russell Bernstein	Bury Council
Councillor Imran Rizvi	Bury Council
Councillor Basil Curley	Manchester City Council
Councillor John Leech	Manchester City Council
Councillor Mandie Shilton – Godwin	Manchester City Council
Councillor Colin McLaren	Oldham Council
Councillor Tony Davies	Salford City Council
Councillor Helen Hibbert	Stockport City Council
Councillor Rachel Wise	Stockport Council
Councillor David Sweeton	Tameside Council
Councillor Brenda Warrington	Tameside Council
Councillor Jill Axford	Trafford Council
Councillor Ged Carter	Trafford Council
Councillor Shaun Ennis	Trafford Council
Councillor Mary Callaghan	Wigan Council
Councillor Joanne Marshall	Wigan Council
Councillor Fred Walker	Wigan Council

ALSO PRESENT:

Councillor David Molyneux	Portfolio Lead for Resources & Investment

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Karen Chambers	GMCA
Marie - Claire Daly	GMCA
Gillian Duckworth	GMCA
Nicola Ward	GMCA
Steve Wilson	GMCA

O&SC 78/25 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Lewis Nelson (Salford), Councillor Dylan Williams (Rochdale) and Councillor Terry Smith (Rochdale).

Apologies were also received from Councillor Neil Emmott, Portfolio Lead for Culture and Caroline Simpson, Group Chief Executive.

O&SC 79/25 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS AND URGENT BUSINESS

The Chair reminded members to keep questions to a maximum of 1 or 2 per agenda item, to ensure there was time for everyone to ask a question.

The Chair invited Councillor Helen Hibbert, Chair of the Task and Finish Group, to provide members with an update on the progress of the group who were looking at the safety of women and girls around travel and transport. Councillor Hibbert advised that the group have had a series of productive meetings to discuss issues such as current schemes in place, data analysis, behavioural change, positive masculinity and the holistic approach to the safety of women and girls. The group had met recently to consolidate information and to start to consider what the recommendations could look like. The process had been enlightening, and more sessions were planned such as a visit to Stockport Interchange to look at how spaces can be designed with the safety of women and girls in mind.

Officers advised that the draft Task and Finish report was due to be presented to the Committee at the meeting in June for their comments with a view to the final report being presented to the Committee and the Combined Authority in July. It was noted that although the Task and Finish Group was running beyond May, it was hoped that membership would stay in place until at least the Annual General Meeting in June. Officers confirmed that this was a joint Task and Finish Group with members from the Police, Fire and Crime Panel and the GM Joint Health Scrutiny Committee.

Members asked if male online radicalisation had been touched on as part of the discussions. Councillor Hibbert advised that although this had been part of the discussions there were so many different elements to consider, and that, in her opinion, it could require a separate piece of work to be undertaken to really consider this issue in detail.

RESOLVED /-

That the Chair's announcements be noted.

O&SC 80/25 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Mary Callaghan declared a personal interest in relation to item 6 on the agenda.

RESOLVED /-

That the above declaration be noted.

O&SC 81/25 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD 26 FEBRUARY 2025

RESOLVED /-

That the minutes of the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee held on 26 February 2025 be approved as a correct and accurate record.

O&SC 82/25 RETAINED BUSINESS RATES UPDATE

Councillor David Molyneux, Portfolio Lead for Resources & Investment introduced the report that provided the Committee with an update on the position in respect of the new 100% retained business retention scheme agreed as part of the Trailblazer Devolution Deal (TDD). He advised that it included the latest position on the current GM business rates funded schemes, the forecasts for 2024/25 expenditure and income and sought support for proposed 2025/26 schemes, funded from the income expected to be received in 2024/25.

The paper also considered the latest developments in relation to the future of business rates retention including the proposed national reset in 2026/27, the GM partial reset, the approach to the enhanced GM investment and growth zones and the impact of the wider GMCA funding landscape following the introduction of the Integrated Settlement.

The paper also referenced further work proposed to consider the future approach to business rates growth stimulated directly or indirectly through GM investment

Officers advised that the original 100% business rates retention pilot was introduced in 2017/18 as part of the Greater Manchester Devolution Deal. This meant that whereas elsewhere in the country 50% of the growth of other baseline and business rates was retained locally for new investment in areas that participating in the 100% pilot, 100% of growth was retained locally in GM for investment. Officers added that when proposing what to do with funding and how split funding between local authorities and the GMCA it was the extra 50% being referring to. Officers advised that from 2017/ 18 this extra 50% was split 50/50 between local authorities and the GMCA. During the pandemic, to recognise the pressures local authorities were facing, 100% of the extra benefit was given to local authorities. Following the pandemic, from 2022/23 this was changed to 75/25 in favour of local authorities. For context this was around £100m for GM.

Officers advised that the Government's commitment to the funding approach and the intentions behind the pilot had been strengthened with the inclusion of a new 10-year business rates retention scheme as part of the 2023 GM Trailblazer Devolution Deal, it was noted that this was broadly the same as the original pilot and that principle of sharing the benefits of the scheme 75/25 had continued.

Officers added that alongside the 100% business rates retention arrangements which operated across the whole of GM there were five sub-GM geographically specific areas that benefited from enhanced business rates retention arrangements and that would not be subject to the national reset. Officers advised that through the national reset, growth goes back to zero. That means that GM is unable to make long term decisions on some of the funding but the enhanced zones were able to as they were not subject to the national reset, meaning their retained business rates would keep growing for 25 years with the potential for significant growth. Members urged that some of this funding was specifically set aside for the development of work and skills in these areas.

Officers advised that a decision on the investment proposals for 2025/26 would be given at the Combined Authority meeting later in the week. This would outline the spending plans for the GMCA's allocated share, which is 25%. Officers added that they were adopting a different internal approach by using business rates as a preliminary test bed to inform future decisions regarding the integrated settlement.

Officers advised that the paper provides a multi-year perspective on investments, and detailed that approximately £100m had been invested so far. Table 2 outlined specific measures for 2025/26, and estimated that there would be around £30m available for allocation. It was noted that that figure was based on higher-than-expected final income from last year, projected growth between Q3 and Q4, and interest generated from bank deposits. Therefore, if the final numbers were to be slightly lower than forecasted, it would not pose an immediate issue.

Looking ahead, officers advised that the most significant factor was the upcoming national reset of business rates, confirmed for 2026/27 after multiple delays. That reset would adjust the baseline to the latest year, meaning that the £100m remains within the local government funding settlement but is redistributed according to a national formula, rather than staying where it was accumulated. It was expected that the national reset would see the GMCA funding pot go from £25m to zero. It was noted that in order to mitigate that the GMCA would have a partial reset which meant that it would be compensated with £23m in recurrent funding allocation. Officers advised that work was ongoing with Treasurers and Chief Executives to look at how to manage those challenges and associated uncertainties.

For 2026/27, officers advised that GM was aiming to adopt a comprehensive approach to funding, moving away from viewing business rates as a separate source. That would involve making multi-year decisions on total funding and integrating various sources. GM plans also included leverage enhanced zones to maximise income, ensuring no district was disadvantaged. By borrowing against future business rates, GM could make long-term investments now to generate future growth, creating a robust investment pipeline for transport and other opportunities. It was expected that this strategy would help GM turbocharge investment efforts.

Members noted that the spending was supposed to align with the Mayoral priorities which seemed to differ slightly from the ones in the table in the report. Members asked what the process for scrutinising these priorities were and added that it would be beneficial to see a priority aimed at work and skills to ensure GM was focusing on providing residents with opportunities to acquire the skills needed in GM. Members also noted that the climate crisis was not listed as a Mayoral priority but acknowledged that workstreams were detailed in the work programme.

Councillor Molyneux advised that this was an ongoing process, and priorities would change as the work progressed. The goal of business rate retention was to maximise benefits, particularly in the five zones mentioned, which promised the best returns. There would be opportunity for political and scrutiny challenges, but there were not expected to be any concerns with any slight adjustments to priorities going forward. Officers advised that there were a number of different schemes that related to climate change although it was not drawn out as a specific priority in the way it was in previous years. This was reflective of the proposed change to the updated GM Strategy.

Members sought clarification on the new multipliers being introduced to support the high street. Officers advised that the retention scheme focused on business rates, with ongoing work to address relief supplies, especially in retail, hospitality, and leisure sectors. Efforts were also being made to balance the impact on High Streets versus online businesses ("clicks versus bricks"). The task force was considering broader issues, but significant changes to business rates were unlikely. Instead, adjustments to multipliers might be used to ensure fair weighting across industries.

Members asked if local authorities had a say in the GM funding allocations. Officers confirmed that proposed investments were discussed with all local authorities. Each district would have a say both at an officer level and a Leader level via the Combined Authority.

Members asked whether, during the funding crisis, local authorities' percentage could be increased to 100%. Officers advised that the business rates retention deal only existed due to Combined Authority arrangements and legislation stated that a percentage had to be retained by the CA. The purpose of the deal was to promote investment across GM and recycle funds through increased business rates. Officers advised that the 100% allocation during COVID was a one-off. The shift from a 50/50 to a 75/25 funding split acknowledged the challenges local authorities were facing and aimed to mitigate the impact of the national reset through collective efforts with Treasurers. Part of the discussions ahead of the national reset would be how GM could use the one year in reserves that it holds and the benefit of the partial reset to help continue critical GM workstreams and also provide support to local authorities.

Members commented that the report appeared to include a lot of comments about uncertainty and asked in relation to the 25-year schemes, was there a scenario where the government could enact primary legislation to alter this timeframe. Members further questioned if the GMCA had identified potential scenarios and determined which were to be advocated for and how GM were ensuring it was effectively communicating its priorities to the Government. Officers agreed that it was an uncertain time, the threat of a national reset had been around for a few years and GM would prefer no reset, however in order to prepare, several model options had been created and modelled on factors that were in GM's gift to decide in order to be ready to understand what the changes would entail.

Members asked regarding the 25% retained by the GMCA, which amounted to £24.5m for 2025/6, which areas would benefit or be disadvantaged by its allocation. Officers advised that it would be difficult to say which district the investment goes to as the majority funding was allocated to GM wide schemes. Officers advised that they would investigate whether any investment information could be broken down into districts, but believed that 80% would be GM wide to attract inward investment.

Members asked what the GM Culture Fund had specifically funded and what connection that had to Town of Culture and whether or not there was evidence in terms the impact it had had on places. Officers advised that £3.3m of the GM Culture Fund funding was from district contributions and then £1.25m was received via retained business rates. In relation to the Town of Culture, officers stated that each place had defined what success looked like to them, so would be different in each area. Officers advised that it would be difficult to have an overarching framework to standardise it as there were so many local contributing factors.

Members noted the priority on gender-based violence and commented that education should involve co-designing programs with young people to address their needs and promote healthy living. While initiatives aimed at empowering girls in sports, science, and technology were valuable, there was a concern that the approach may be too focused on girls and asked that this also be targeted to supporting boys and reducing risk of radicalisation. It was crucial to ensure comprehensive efforts in addressing gender-based violence, as significant work remains to be done in this area. Officers advised that this work was being led by the Deputy Mayor and the Safer and Stronger Communities Directorate and advised that the work being completed would encompass the wider vision in relation to gender based violence.

Members asked for clarity on how the £0.5m had been spent on flood risk management. Officers advised that the ask for flood management was picked up elsewhere but whether this was sufficient would be something officers would need to direct to the environment team and would also ask what the £0.5m funding awarded previously was spent on and the adequacy of their funding going forward. Members requested that this information be shared with the Committee.

Members asked what opportunities there were in relation to procurement for local businesses. Officers advised that there was nothing directly relating to business rates in the procurement model but added that GM were in the process of updating procurement procedures in relation to social value in order to have a more consistent approach in the future.

Members asked if the business rates reset worked the same as the reset for housing evaluations. Officers advised that business rates reset and revaluation of properties were different. Prior to the reset, any growth in business rates above the 2013 baseline in GM stayed within GM, with 50% of it remaining with the individual authority where it was raised. At the point of reset, the baseline would be recalibrated, and the excess put into a central pot. Officers advised that the aim was to link the ability to raise business rates with the benefits of increased business rates. This had led to the growth retention pilot, which allowed all business rates to stay locally instead of going to the national pot. However, this was cost-neutral as grants were reduced accordingly. At the reset, any growth above the new baseline would be recalibrated, and the excess redistributed, starting the process anew.

Officers advised that they would share more information on this with the Committee in due course.

RESOLVED /-

1. That the comments of the GM Overview and Scrutiny Committee on the Retained Business Rates Update be received and shared with the GMCA on the 28 March 2025.

2. That the Overview and Scrutiny Committee note the recommendations which will be considered by the GMCA at its meeting on the 28 March 2025 as below.
   The GMCA is recommended to:
   1. Note the forecast, as at the end of quarter 3, for 2024/25 business rates income
   2. Note the planned income for 2025/26.
   3. Approve the proposed 2025/26 GM use of the 2024/25 business rates income
   4. Note the position in respect of the future developments in relation to retained business rates, including:
      - National business rates reset
      - GM partial reset
      - Approach to the use of income secured through the enhanced business rates retention zones
      - Alignment of future business rates income with the GMCA Integrated Settlement

3. Officers to investigate whether any of the GMCA 25% retained business rates investment information could be broken down into districts it was awarded to or which local authorities benefited from specific schemes.

4. That information regarding past flood management funding was spent on and the adequacy of funding going forward be provided to the Committee.

5. That further information to explain the impact of the retained business rates national reset by provided to the Committee in due course.

O&SC 83/25 CULTURE PORTFOLIO UPDATE

Marie - Claire Daly introduced the report which provided the Committee with an update on the impact of GMCA cultural investment of £4,425,000 p/a as well as providing opportunity for the committee to discuss portfolio plans for the next twelve months, including the development of GMCA's Cultural Investment approach 2026-onwards and development of the Greater Manchester Creative Industries Sector Plan.

Officers advised that last summer, Greater Manchester launched its second culture strategy. The first strategy, published earlier, expressed cultural ambitions for each district. Since 2018, significant work has been done by individual authorities, resulting in each local authority in GM having its own culture strategy. The new GM culture strategy aimed to reflect shared ambitions across all the constituent authorities.

Officers added that the strategy had been designed to both protect and celebrate the region's cultural heritage. Moving forward by linking cultural initiatives to key areas such as residents' well-being and the vibrancy of town centres and high streets, the strategy would look at individual ambitions and how they could come together at the GM level, with a vision, mission, and foundational priorities. The priorities included being data-led, understanding the cultural landscape through both quantitative and qualitative data, ensuring representation in decision-making and resource allocation, and making sure cultural outputs and messaging represent all residents of GM.

Officers advised that Greater Manchester had been designated as one of six priority places for creative industries and that these priority places would receive additional investment, although the exact amount was still being negotiated between Department for Culture, Media and Sport and the Treasury. The announcement means that GM would benefit from increased funding for its creative industries.

Officers advised that currently GM's culture investment was funded to the amount of £3.3m from local authorities and £1.25m from retained business rates. Going forward GM would be consulting on the design and approach of future investment in culture. Officers added that the current approach to funding was split into five strands in order to support different types of culture in GM. They were, Inspire, Spirit, Sustain, Collaborate and Strategic.

Officers advised that these five strands of GMCA's cultural investment approach would come to an end in March 2026. Significant activity had and would take place since the funding model was originally agreed, including a new government, the Devolution White Paper, Integrated Settlement, development of a new Greater Manchester Strategy and associated local plans for growth and prevention. There had also been significant increase in prioritisation of the creative industries, and GM as a key focus for growth in this area, leading to the development of a Creative Industries Sector Plan for Greater Manchester. Officers added that GM needed to ensure that any future approach to cultural funding recognised and reflected the above changes, while evaluating efficacy of previous investment approaches and supporting the stability of the existing ecosystem, which would include significant local level and national investment from Arts Council England, National Lottery Heritage Fund and Historic England.

Officers advised that a paper would be taken to GMCA in June 2025 which outlined the preferred investment approach from 2026-onwards.

Members commented that they would be keen to see more of a focus on how creative industries could shrink the gap between those that have the most and those that have the least, for instance the creative offer in schools had reduced in the last 15 years. Officers advised that it was announced last week, that the Department for Education would do more work with the Department for Culture Media and Sport to integrate culture into the curriculum, reflecting positive national policy developments. GM aimed to go beyond national frameworks by investing in organisations that provide both in-curriculum and out-of-curriculum cultural education. The impact of these efforts aligned with GM's priorities, such as the Manchester Baccalaureate, would further emphasise culture and creativity. Local cultural education partnerships in each district already linked schools with cultural organisations, and future investments would focus on targeted interventions in different schools and areas. Overall, there was an improving national picture for cultural education.

Members asked what the purpose of the strategy was - was it about preserving where GM was already strong or was it about getting strength in areas GM that needed it. Members referred to the grants awarded and asked if the strategy was to spread investments and strength across the borders or was it to focus on areas of existing high excellence and density. A comparison was made in relation to £2m awarded to Manchester City Council and £25,000 awarded to Trafford Council, even when taking into account the high cultural offer that the city centre had, seemed to be a significant disparity and asked if it was a fair and equitable process. Officers advised that the purpose of the strategy was to ensure a balanced distribution of benefits and added that even though investment might be directed to an organisation in Manchester, it did not mean that only Manchester residents would benefit. For example, audience data shows that a significant proportion of attendees come from Trafford, indicating that Trafford residents gain more than just the £25,000 direct funding allocated to Trafford. Additionally, organisations like the Royal Exchange extended their reach by setting up projects in other districts, such as their Den project in Stalybridge. Therefore, investment in Manchester did benefit residents across various districts, not just those in Manchester. Officers added that the process of making investment decisions was complex. There were fewer applications from districts compared to the city centre, likely due to the concentration of large-scale organisations based there. When comparing the number of applications from different places to their success rates, Manchester was disproportionately successful. It was noted that there was still much to be done to balance investment across various types of organisations and officers welcomed suggestions on improving the process.

Members asked what support was in place for the creative sector to be able to apply for funding, particularly if they were new to the sector. Officers advised that GM worked with Salford CVS to provide support and advice to individuals. GM had also seen organisations funded through various strands holding sessions to help other organisations apply for funding. For example, Bury Met had been supporting freelancers and small businesses in Bury to access funding. Efforts had been made to simplify the application process, including options for video applications, which allowed applicants to present their case for investment in different ways.

Members asked whether there was anything in place to encourage the larger organisations to provide low income tickets for residents to access the creative sector and could this be tied to grant conditions. Officers advised that the sector was facing challenging times post-COVID, with a slow return to pre-pandemic audience levels. Organisations offering lower-priced tickets must balance this against their income profiles. While contracts do not currently mandate lower-priced tickets, it was noted that funded organisations were committed to their local communities and GM residents.

Members requested feedback from the sector-based engagement sessions being planned for 2025 to understand the current state of embedded sectors like the music industry and to help identify areas where our region may be lagging compared to others. Officers advised that they were happy to provide feedback from the sessions and added that having that opportunity for the industry to tell GM directly what their strengths were would be valuable.

Members asked what the entry process looked like for larger organisations who had received higher amounts of funding. Officers advised that organisations were asked to deliver against five priority areas: enhancing Greater Manchester's international reputation, tourism, health and well-being, skills and education, community engagement, and employment in the creative sector. Organisations were asked to provide a detailed annual plan outlining their contributions to GM residents and if that represented value for money the funding was released, if not, adjustments to better meet the needs of the sector and residents would be negotiated.

Members stated that many organisations relied heavily on this funding to survive. However, it was noted that there might be some established organisations who continued to apply for funding they don't necessarily require, resulting in newer or less experienced organisations missing out on the funding they genuinely need. Officers advised that funding for cultural organisations had been challenging for the past 15 years. Despite the size, all cultural organisations faced difficulties, especially with recent increases in operational costs like heating and lighting. The DCMS had recently announced increased funding for building-based organisations struggling to sustain themselves. Officers advised that there was an appraisal process in place to ensure organisations were not receiving funding they did not require as organisations must clearly demonstrate how investment would benefit GM residents.

Members asked what support was offered to those small organisations that had failed to get funding. It was recognised that as the GM funding model was designed and aimed at organisations whose cultural offer was pan Greater Manchester, that they may not always be best placed to support smaller community groups. Officers reflected that the support for such organisation could often be stronger from local partners and local authorities.

Members stated that there was a large gap between £2000 and £20,000 and enquired as to how many organisations were missing out because the funding that they would require is somewhere between those amounts. Officers recognised this and advised that £20,000 was set as it would be extremely challenging for an organisation to achieve GM-level impact with a smaller amount of funding.

Members stated that it was not apparent that any funding had been awarded to local amateur groups and organisations and added that they could not recall being asked by culture officers to put forward any organisations that might meet the criteria in terms of funding. Officers advised that this was challenging as the GMCA could not support the whole ecosystem within its limited budget. Whilst acknowledging the incredible work done by amateur organisations across GM, it was not possible to support all of them. Instead, GM needed to adopt an investment approach that supports organisations which collaborate with these amateur groups. Officers advised that information was shared through cultural officer networks and noted that there were other avenues explored in order to access networks within councils and town halls to ensure information is shared.

Members asked if there was an evaluation process in place to measure the effectiveness of funding awarded. Officers advised that GM had engaged an external organisation to evaluate the impact of the GM-wide investment approach. That evaluation would not only assess the impact on individual organisations but also the broader effects of the approach. That evaluation would be added as a companion piece to the paper being submitted to the Combined Authority meeting in June.

Members asked whether officer time spent evaluating funding applications was balanced with getting the best value for GM. There was currently an external organisation reviewing the evaluation stages in order to ensure a GM wide approach. This was planned to accompany the report to the GMCA in July.

The Committee reflected on the importance of the creative industries to Greater Manchester. Officers were urged to use the limited resources to focus on the strengths of the sector to ensure added value for the city region. It was recognised that the administrative task must be proportionate but that there remained routes in for all types and scales of organisations. The process for accessing the collaborative fund had been simplified in that organisations were invited to make a short expression of interest to identify whether they met the criteria to move forward to formal applications and in doing so the amount of time required to undertake the first stage of the process had significantly reduced.

Members praised the work set out in the report and commented on the outcomes that they had seen for the cultural sector, specifically how this funding had strengthened the position of organisations to access further funding. However, in recognition of increasing supply and running costs, members asked whether once awarded the grant, whether there was any capacity to increase the requirements. Officers recognised the challenge of increasing costs but confirmed that the GMCA did not hold any further funding for such requests, however, did have strong relationships with partner co-investors who had been able to support the financial resilience of some organisations previously. Multiple investors also creates a diverse portfolio of supporters and de-risks investment.

In relation to the task and finish group's work on the safety of women and girls, members suggested that many of these cultural offers could also be seen as safe spaces which would further increase their reach to wider audiences.

The Committee recognised the necessity for long term funding for the cultural sector to enable growth and sustainability. Short term funds into specific projects could sometimes be counter to this objective and so members asked whether consideration could be given to projects that helped the sector to build their business growth models and make their organisation less reliant on small funding pots. Officers agreed that the current national funding model could leave organisations in precarious financial positions, however the GM model looked to include business support and develop resilience through effective partnerships with other parts of the GM system. To do this, the GMCA facilitate peer support and invites partners to share their expertise and innovation to develop networks of best practice which attempts to mitigate the impact of factors outside their control.

RESOLVED /-

1. That officers would provide feedback from their engagement with clusters of sub-sector specialities to give the Committee a greater sense of the current status, achievements and challenges faced by each sector.

2. That members had been given the opportunity to comment on the impact of GMCA cultural investment and consider on development of GMCA's Cultural Investment Approach 2026-onwards, ahead of GMCA approval of process in June, 2025

3. That members had been able to consider and comment on development of Greater Manchester's Creative Industries Sector Plan, ahead of publication in Summer, 2025 and would feedback their specific comments to the GMCA as appropriate.

O&SC 84/25 OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME & FORWARD PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS

RESOLVED /-

1. That the proposed Overview & Scrutiny Work Programme for February 2025 to April 2025 be noted.

2. That Members use the Forward Plan of Key Decisions to identify any potential areas for further scrutiny.

3. That consideration be given to the next task and finish review being focussed on employment, training and apprenticeships.

O&SC 85/25 FUTURE MEETING DATES

RESOLVED /-

That the following dates for the rest of the municipal year be noted:

- 9 April 2025 – 1pm to 3.30pm
- 25 June 2025 - 1pm to 3.30pm