Adjournments.

3 In terms of Standing Order No 17, the committee agreed to adjourn the meeting at 1115 hours until 1125 hours and at 1130 hours to 1200 hours.

Resumption of meeting.

4 The meeting resumed at 1200 hours, the sederunt was taken as follows:-

Present: Richard Bell (Chair), James Adams, Ken Andrew (substitute for Susan Aitken), Jill Brown, Christina Cannon, Allan Casey, Annette Christie, Chris Cunningham, John Daly, Greg Hepburn, Rashid Hussain, Ann Jenkins (substitute for John Carson), Ruairi Kelly, Elaine McDougall, Anne McTaggart, Jon Molyneux, Robert Mooney, Angus Millar, Cecilia O'Lone, Lana Reid-McConnell, Soryia Siddique, Catherine Vallis and Martha Wardrop.

Apologies: Susan Aitken and John Carson.

Attending: A Wyber (Clerk); S Millar, Chief Executive; R Emmott, Executive Director of Financial Services; G Gillespie, Executive Director of Neighbourhoods, Regeneration and Sustainability; C Edgar, Director of Communication and Corporate Governance; M Millar, Director of Legal and Administration; and K Rush, Director of Regional Economic Growth.

Allocation of Pride in Place Programme funding and Pride in Place Impact fund approved, after division – Instruction to Chief Executive

5 Councillor Kelly, City Convener for Housing, Development, Built Heritage and Land Use, presented a report regarding the proposed submission of 7 areas in the city aligning with 7 parliamentary constituencies identified by the UK Government in order that it could allocate Pride in Place Programme (PiPP) funding according to its criteria and the approach to the Pride in Place Impact Fund allocation, advising

(1) that the UK Government had launched the PiPP which was designed to provide funding and support to around 250 of the most in-need neighbourhoods across the UK over the next 10 years with the programme delivering up to £20m of funding;

(2) that the criteria for the PiPP was that all funding allocated to each neighbourhood should be spent for the benefit of the local community within the geographic area and intervention would not be limited to within this boundary and could span to key local assets, however the concentration of expenditure and activity must deliver on local priorities across the 3 strategic objectives, namely to build stronger communities, to create thriving places and to empower people to take back control, as detailed in the report;

(3) that Neighbourhood Boards would be appointed in partnership with the local authority and would be led by an independent chair appointed by the local authority following consultation with the local MP and must include the relevant local MP and at least 1 local ward member, the Board would be asked to create a vision for the future of their area, setting out a pathway to deliver that over the 10-year programme;

(4) that the UK Government had confirmed that Glasgow had been selected for 2 awards for 2 models and the Council was now required to submit areas in each of the 7 parliamentary constituencies identified by the UK Government by 7th November 2025 and 2 neighbourhoods would then be selected by the Government and awarded up to £20m each over 10 years which would be endowment-style funding that would include a circa of 37% revenue to support managing and delivering investment projects;

(5) that in-line with the programme objectives and the UK Government's allocation methodology, the criteria, as detailed in the report must be followed to create a neighbourhood;

(6) of the proposed 7 neighbourhoods which aligned with 7 parliamentary constituencies;

(7) of the number of risks associated with the allocation of this funding;

(8) that in addition to PiPP, the Scottish Government had announced an additional Pride in Place Impact Fund, which had 3 objectives, namely community spaces, public spaces and high street and town centre revitalisation and it had been confirmed that the Council would be in receipt of 1 of these 95 UK-wide funds; and

(9) that the Pride in Place Impact Fund would be a 100% capital allocation which would amount to £1.5m over 2 years with £750,000 being allocated for 2025/26 and 2026/27 with the funds being committed by 2026/27 or be returned.

Councillor Casey, seconded by Councillor Hepburn, moved that the committee

(a) approve the submission of 7 neighbourhoods aligning with 7 parliamentary constituencies identified by the UK Government in order that it could allocate Pride in Place Programme Funding according to its criteria;

(b) note that officers would submit a report to committee in due course with detailed proposals for approval for the allocation of the Pride in Place Impact Fund;

(c) agree in terms of Standing Order No 30 (7), that this decision would not be subject to the call-in process, in order for the submission for funding to be made to the UK Government by its deadline of 7th November 2025; and

(d) “expresses its deep concern about the announcement that the Pride In Place Fund was not new additional funding and the impact of that would in effect be a reduction in funding to the City of Glasgow through the Shared Prosperity Fund, and instruct the Chief Executive to write to the UK Government and all Glasgow MP’S expressing the Council’s deep concern and urgently ask them to reconsider this position.”

Councillor Adams, seconded by Councillor Vallis, moved as an amendment that the committee

(a) approve the submission of 7 neighbourhoods aligning with 7 parliamentary constituencies identified by the UK Government in order that it could allocate Pride in Place Programme Funding according to its criteria;

(b) note that officers would submit a report to committee in due course with detailed proposals for approval for the allocation of the Pride in Place Impact Fund;

(c) agree in terms of Standing Order No 30 (7), that this decision would not be subject to the call-in process, in order for the submission for funding to be made to the UK Government by its deadline of 7th November 2025; and

(d) “instruct the Chief Executive to write to the UK Government to seek clarification on the funding settlement, and budgetary implications and to ensure best value for Glasgow.”

On a vote being taken by calling the roll, 10 members voted for the amendment and 13 for the motion, which was accordingly declared to be carried.