

MID DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

MINUTES of a MEETING of the CABINET held on 29 August 2023 at 5.15 pm

Present

Councillors

L Taylor (Leader)
J Buczkowski, S J Clist, S Keable, J Lock, J Wright and D Wulff

Apologies

Councillors

N Bradshaw

Also Present

Councillors

D Broom, E Buczkowski, G Duchesne, R Gilmour, C Harrower,
L Knight and S Robinson

Also Present

Officers:

Stephen Walford (Chief Executive), Andrew Jarrett (Deputy Chief Executive (S151)), Maria De Leburne (District Solicitor and Monitoring Officer), Paul Deal (Corporate Manager for Finance, Property and Climate Change), Matthew Page (Corporate Manager for People, Governance and Waste), Simon Newcombe (Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing), Darren Beer (Operations Manager for Street Scene), Luke Howard (Environment and Enforcement Manager), Andrew Seaman (Member Services Manager) and Sarah Lees (Member Services Officer)

31. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllr N Bradshaw.

Cllrs A Cuddy, G Czapiewski, M Fletcher, N Woollatt attended via Teams.

32. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Paul Elstone:

Question 1

Paragraph 2.7 on Page 169 of your papers says that the Council contracted to purchase the Post Hill Site for £410,000 in December 2017. But Land Registry shows the land was purchased for £492,000 in October 2020. Can these differences be explained?

Question 2

In a document dated December 2017 3 Rivers are shown as a Nominee as part of the commercial transaction to acquire the Post Hill site. Please explain the full reasons as to why this Nominee status was necessary?

Question 3

In papers presented to the Planning Committee on the 8th June 2016, as justification for the Council buying the Post Hill Land, for Affordable Homes the following is said. "Benefits in bringing forward the development more quickly". That was 7 years ago. Since then, David Wilson Homes, who were contractually required to build around 70 affordable homes before the Council took over this liability as part of the land purchase agreement, have now fully completed their Braid Park development with all homes occupied. Despite spending over £1 million, this Council has not put a single affordable home on the site. The Council wasted money and has effectively blocked the building of 70 Affordable Houses - how does this demonstrate the good governance that is both expected and required of a Council?

Question 4

According to the Land Registry, 3 Rivers paid £2.75 million plus taxes in December 2019 for land in Knowle Lane, Cullompton. The land had Outline Planning permission which had only been granted on appeal after this Council supported by Cullompton Town Council had refused it. Yet this Council lent 3 Rivers the money to buy this highly contentious plot of land. 3 Rivers has done nothing with it since and has allowed the outline planning approval to lapse. Any future development will have to apply for new Planning permission, which this Council should oppose again. The Council has allowed 3 Rivers to devalue this site, how does this demonstrate the good financial governance that is both expected and required of a Council?

The Leader thanked Mr Elstone for their questions and stated that a written answer would be provided.

Graeme Barnell**Question 1**

What is the strategy of this administration in addressing the availability of housing especially of affordable and social rented housing?

Answer

Cabinet Member for Housing and Property Services confirmed that the Council does currently have a clear Housing Strategy 2021-25, with an objective to increase the number of affordable homes and specifically to increase the Council housing stock of social and affordable rent accommodation. The report is consistent with this strategic position, nonetheless the draft Housing Revenue Account (HRA) target of 500 new Council houses in 5-years represents an acceleration and increase of the original strategy target of 160 homes.

Question 2

If such a strategy is being formulated, when can it be expected?

Answer

See above.

Question 3

When will regular performance data regarding the delivery of the various types of affordable housing become available? I asked many times for this KPI to be included in the regular performance updates during my time on the Council both as Cabinet member and as a member of Scrutiny and the Homes PDG but it has never happened. Perhaps you will be more successful?

Answer

The number of new Council houses built will be part of the new performance dashboard for Homes PDG provided on a quarterly basis.

Barry Warren**Question 1**

It is noted that under Section 3 of the report on Page 175 of the papers the heading Statutory Officer sign-off/mandatory checks that the S151 Officer and Monitoring Officer signed on the 15th August 2023. It is also noted that the Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing has signed on behalf of the Chief Executive/Corporate Director.

As the recommendations within this report have major implications for the council on a number of issues why hasn't the Chief Executive been personally involved to safeguard the reputation of the Council?

Answer:

The Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing responded and stated that the report has been fully reviewed and approved by the Leadership Team including the Chief Executive. Nonetheless, following the retirement of the former Corporate Director responsible for Housing (Jill May), the Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing has been appointed to act as an interim Director for all Housing functions from 1 June 2023, therefore has authority to sign-off the report.

Question 2

Why have the relevant elements of this report in relation to acquiring housing and the expenditure of HRA monies not been referred to the Homes PDG (HPDG) in the first instance so that they could consider the proposals and make recommendations to Cabinet?

Answer:

The HPDG (and Cabinet) have already approved a policy position to build more Council Housing under the Housing Strategy 2021-25. This report does not represent a new policy approach but puts forward recommendations aligned with policy that are financial decisions relevant for Cabinet.

Question 3

Recommendation 1 refers to 'subject to and agreed valuation'. Who is to set the valuation and who is to agree it? Will it be a genuine independent valuation?

Answer:

Should Cabinet agree to take the recommendation forward, the final amount that the HRA pay for St George's Court will be informed by an independent valuation. Who will provide this valuation has not been determined at this stage. This will be further informed by a valuation for the purposes of HRA rent setting for this site which legally has to be provided by the District Valuer.

Question 4

A potential purchase price for St George's Court is set out in the body of this report and is given as £8.65M. What is the basis for this amount?

Answer:

This is the impaired value of the outstanding loan to 3RDL for St George's Court and has been used for the basis of the appraisal of potential value for money and viability of this site to the HRA. This figure is allowed for in the draft MDDC Statement of Accounts 22/23.

Question 5

In the light of many concerns expressed as to the quality of workmanship on the site of St. Georges Court will there be an independent survey and report commissioned before any final valuation or agreement to purchase?

Answer:

The Council continues to work with 3RDL to ensure that the site meets the relevant standards of workmanship. Furthermore, the HRA would not be in a position to complete the potential acquisition of the site until full Building Control sign-off has been provided for every dwelling and all other regulatory approvals are in place.

Roger Davey**Question 1**

Given the projected scale of losses incurred by 3 Rivers, in particular the town hall development. Will the council commit to finishing this project including the landscaping to as high a standard as possible and then to place it on the open market and market it aggressively in order to maximise the monies returned to the public coffers?

Answer

The Cabinet Member for Finance stated that the Council has committed a number of times to fund to completion both the St George's Court and Haddon Heights projects. This remains our firm commitment.

Question 2

Will the council arrange a public enquiry into the whole 3 Rivers debacle where all of the information held by the council and 3 Rivers is released to the public?

Answer

The Council has discussed the potential of a "lessons learned" piece of work. This was discussed only last week at a meeting of our Scrutiny Committee.

Question 3

Will the council release the cost analysis report prepared by Randell Symonds LLP for this development given that all the reasons for the original decision to withhold the report i.e. that disclosure would damage 3 Rivers ability on future contracts and would give competitors insight into the costing and procurements methods used by this company etc., are now irrelevant as the company is to be wound up?

Answer

The company is still trading and a formal decision on the future of St George's has not yet been finalised. Therefore the Council will not be releasing any commercially sensitive information regarding this development at the current time.

33. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST UNDER THE CODE OF CONDUCT

No interests were declared under this item. Members were reminded of the need to make declarations of interest where appropriate.

34. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting, held on 1 August 2023 and 16 August 2023, were approved as a correct record and **SIGNED** by the Leader.

35. CORPORATE PERFORMANCE REPORT

Cabinet had before it and **NOTED** a report* of the Corporate Manager for People, Governance and Waste which provided Members with an update on performance against the corporate plan and local service targets for quarter 1 (2023/24).

It was highlighted that with regards to complaints, performance had been higher than what was detailed within the report presented.

Note: * Report previously circulated.

36. CORPORATE RISK REPORT

Cabinet had before it and **NOTED** a report* of the Corporate Manager for People, Governance and Waste which provided Members with a quarterly update on the Corporate Risk Register.

The following was discussed:

- It was asked whether the risks titled Culm Garden Village and Cullompton's Town Centre Relief Road, should be considered at the same level of risk. To which the Deputy Chief Executive (S151) acknowledged that these were linked, but the reason for a difference in risk was due to the long term funding received for the Culm Garden Village and that it was appropriate to treat these as separate risks. The relief road was considered higher, which was also agreed by the Audit Committee.

Note: * Report previously circulated.

37. QTR. 1 BUDGET MONITORING

Cabinet had before it a report* which presented the forecasted outturn position for the General Fund, Housing Revenue Account and Capital Programme for the financial year 2023/24, covering the period between April 2023 to June 2023.

The following was highlighted:

- The General Fund faced a £527k overspend at year end, which was significantly better than initial projections. The previous administration set a budget with a projected yearend overspend of £625k. Along with this, there was a £400k salary saving target which meant that a balanced budget required over £1m to be delivered in year.
- Planning and Building Control income was lower than forecasted due to stagnation of the housing market. Recycling income prices had dropped since the budget was set. However these were offset by higher income from Garden Waste and Leisure Services.
- HRA was projected to have a £346k underspend due to slippage of projects.

The following was discussed:

- Whether vacancy targets had put pressure on the use of agencies and it was asked how this was managed. The Corporate Manager for Finance explained that agency costs were included within the savings target presented which was above £400k.
- It was highlighted that many organisations and Local Authorities were struggling with sickness rates and turnover.

RESOLVED that:

1. The Cabinet are asked to:

- a) Note the financial monitoring information for the income and expenditure for the three months to 30 June 2023 and the projected outturn position;

- b) Agree the amendment to the Capital Programme of £3,733k reflecting the inclusion of Leasing costs in line with amended regulations and other additions since the budget was set;
- c) Note the updated Treasury Management reporting as required by regulation, and recommend that Council approves the changes to the treasury and prudential indicators in tables 6.3.1 and 6.3.2;
- d) Note the use of Waivers for the Procurement of goods and services as included in Section 9.

(Proposed by J Buczkowski, seconded by S Keable)

Reason for the decision:

The financial resources of the Council impact directly on its ability to deliver the Corporate Plan prioritising the use of available resources in 2023/24. The Monitoring Report indicates how the Council's resources have been used to support the delivery of budgetary decisions.

Note: * Report previously circulated.

38. **PERFORMANCE UPDATE - PERFORMANCE DASHBOARDS**

The Cabinet **NOTED** a verbal update from the Corporate Manager of People, Governance and Waste in which it was outlined that the development of performance dashboards were delivered to each Policy Development Group (PDG), with Homes PDG having two. There was also a planning and corporate dashboard and that the Corporate Dashboard would be circulated to Cabinet.

39. **ENVIRONMENT ENFORCEMENT YEARLY REVIEW REPORT**

Cabinet had before it and **NOTED** a report* of the Corporate Manager for People, Governance and Waste which provided Members with an overview of the Environment and Enforcement service for the financial year 2022/23.

It was highlighted that there were no outstanding abandoned vehicles from the 22/23 financial year.

The following was discussed:

- An explanation was sought on the process followed when abandoned cars were removed by the Council. An officer explained that they were kept for up to for 14 days, after that, they were crushed. If someone claimed the vehicle, they would have to pay the removal costs as well as a fixed penalty notice for abandoning a vehicle.
- Parking Outturn 2016 – 2023 was raised and it was noted that costs had increased. But so had the variance. An officer explained that due to increased costs the income generated had reduced.
- The Council's fleet of electric vehicles was welcomed.
- The Enforcement team were due to undertake Police and Criminal Evidence Act training.

Note: * Report previously circulated.

40. REVIEW OF 3 WEEKLY BIN COLLECTIONS

Cabinet had before it a report* of the Corporate Manager for People, Governance and Waste which outlined the effectiveness of the council's waste and recycling scheme, known as the Bin-it 123 scheme, as implemented in October 2022. It also highlighted the improvement of operational efficiency of collection crews, increased recycling rates and limiting CO2 emissions. It also provided a review of recycling frequency following the Cabinet decision on 29 Nov 2022 to complete a weekly recycling trial in the District during the financial year 2023-2024.

The following was highlighted:

- The Council had been flexible with the transition to the 'Bin it 123' scheme and that side-waste had been collected, but there was a need to stop collecting side-waste. It was noted that other top performing Authorities had a zero tolerance approach and did not collect side-waste.
- First few months were encouraging and that the recycling rate was just under 60%.
- A weekly recycling pilot was agreed to be undertaken but due to unclear funding and costs it was asked to defer until financially feasible.

The following was discussed:

- Concern was raised over stopping the collection of side-waste and of the length of time it would be left until dealt with. It was also asked how communal refuse points would be managed and how those that left side-waste would be identified. An officer explained that initially households would be contacted but if further breaches continued, Section 46 would be applied. This would be a formal warning that would last for 1 year and could then be escalated further if this warning was breached.
- The Corporate Manager for People Governance and Waste explained that the Council would not let the District become untidy and that they were asking for residents to comply with the scheme. The Council would ensure that residents had the appropriate containers and bins, it was also about working with residents and landlords, providing support if needed.
- That statistics and figures should be reported to the Environment PDG to ensure that the Council kept on track.
- That top performing authorities were collecting every 2 weeks, clarification was sought as to why the council was being compared to every 2 week collection models when the Council collected every 3 weeks. The officer explained that these authorities were identified as the top performers and that it was to highlight that none collected side-waste.
- It was raised that this Council should be compared to authorities that also collected every 3 weeks. To which the Corporate Manager for People, Governance and Waste agreed that this could be reported to the Environment PDG.
- It was noted that the increased recycling rates should be celebrated, and that recycling pots and pans should also be considered.
- Education on recycling was raised, to which the Corporate Manager for People, Governance and Waste explained that education was important and needed to be continual so that recycling awareness was maintained. In addition, it was also raised

that many people learn in different ways and that it was key to find the right medium of communication.

- School education on recycling was raised. To which an officer explained that Schools were already being engaged with.
- It was noted that all had a responsibility to keep wards within the Council clean and tidy.

RESOLVED that:

1. To cease collecting side waste from 1 October 2023 and deliver a comprehensive communications programme in advance of this to minimise the need for enforcement.
2. To postpone the trial scheduled for 2023-2024 to allow for an evaluation of the effectiveness of the current scheme against the metrics of recycling % achieved, residual tonnage reduction, and overall cost to the authority.

(Proposed by the Leader, Cllr L Taylor)

Reason for decision:

This report identifies with the 'Environment' priority area of the Corporate Plan for 2020- 2024 'increase recycling rates and reduce the amount of residual waste generated'. Supporting and enabling customers to recycle and reduce residual waste contributes to Mid Devon District Councils' commitment to the Devon Climate Emergency.

Note: * Report previously circulated

41. **NEIGHBOURHOOD MANAGEMENT POLICY**

Cabinet had before it a report* of the Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing which outlined that under the Neighbourhood and Community Standard, the Regulator of Social Housing (RSH) requires all registered providers to publish a policy setting out, how in consultation with their tenants, they will maintain and improve the neighbourhood's associated with their homes. This has been developed following an in-depth review of the policy in consultation with tenants and partner organisations.

The following was discussed:

- That there were no comments were received during the consultation. It was asked how the Council could engage more widely so that responses were received. The Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing explained that it was difficult getting responses for consultations, and that a new approach to improve engagement was due to take place, with other new always considered.
- The topic of vulnerable people was raised along with the safeguarding elements found within the report. The Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing explained that all vulnerable people were considered within Council policies.
- It was sought that a paragraph on vulnerable people/safeguarding be added to these policy reports, to which the Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing agreed that that this could be included in future policy reports.

RESOLVED that:

Cabinet adopt the updated Neighbourhood Management Policy and Equality Impact Assessment contained in Annexes A and B respectively.

(Proposed by S Clist seconded by J Wright)

Reason for decision:

A stated aim of the Council is to deliver sustainable communities.

Note: * Report previously circulated.

42. **3 RIVERS OPTIONS APPRAISAL REPORT**

No recommendations from the Scrutiny Committee were received

43. **HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNTS - LARGE SITES OPTIONS APPRAISAL**

Cabinet had before it a report* from the Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing which provided options for potential large sites within the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) development programme. The sites considered are Post Hill, Tiverton, St Georges Court, Tiverton and Knowle Lane, Cullompton. These sites are presently within the control of the Council with Post Hill held within the HRA.

The report aimed to obtain agreement for the 5-year HRA development programme (2023/24 to 2027/28) in respect of these large potential sites for new social housing within Mid Devon Housing (MDH) stock taking into account the options analysis presented.

The following was discussed:

- Clarification was sought over the costs to adapt housing as it seemed like quite a round number. The Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing explained that this was an estimated cost, but there was data to support this estimated cost.
- Asked why this accommodation was appropriate for those over 60. The Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing explained that the accommodation had ground floor and lift access and with more adaption work it would be suitable for over 60s. In addition, the location was central to town and had good transport links and good accessibility to medical sites. It was also noted that there was not a similar site within the vicinity of Tiverton.
- Some over 60s occupied family homes and that this could generate some healthy movement within the council's stock.
- Asked if this accommodation would be available for the whole of Mid Devon. The Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing reassured that there was flexibility with this, but the initial focus was for Tiverton tenants.
- Asked if there would be any flexibility in terms of the age of the targeted tenants. The Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing explained that there would be flexibility but the focus was to target over 60s. In addition, that there was no perfect age to choose and that other tenants would still be considered.
- Asked how tenants would be encouraged to downsize and whether this would be managed by Devon Home Choice. The Corporate Manager for Public Health,

Regulation and Housing explained that the aim was to invite tenants to free up family homes and that it would sit outside of Devon Homes Choice.

- Asked if there would be an option for right to buy, if covenants would be set and whether ground rent and service charges would apply. The Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing explained that details would be introduced to the Homes PDG and that in terms of right to buy a certain percentage could be exempt from this and that all details would be made aware to incoming tenants. There was an aim to build a community and that policies would be made clear outlining any service charges.
- Concern was raised over the cost of £100k and felt that this report was good enough for tax-payers. In addition, it was felt that the data and evidence provided in this report was poor. It was raised that those over 60 leaving their homes would be when medical support was needed and often already had established communities and families to support them and so felt it was unlikely to convince these individuals to move.
- That St George's court was not appropriate accommodation and that clarification was sought as to how the upkeep costs would be maintained with social housing charges.
- The rent plus model was raised as an idea that could be used by the Council.
- The Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing reassured that tenants would not be recharged and that the HRA would maintain those properties and would only apply to those who had a right to buy. No tenants were charged to maintain their properties. A local letting approach should not be compared to the decanted example provided as these were two very different things. The HRA does not use the rent plus model because it does not work with the long sustainability of the HRA's stock. Other providers could use the rent plus model and it had been known to work well. For Post Hill better suited providers would be sought and where the rent plus model could be applied.
- There was a need to make difficult decisions quickly to avoid further costs and that other ways to recuperate costs should not be discredited.
- There were two main benefits of this report, firstly it made more social housing available within the district, and secondly, it provided the Council 38 new properties.
- Disappointment was raised that this report had not thought wider and that there was concern of what would happen to aging tenants when the accommodation was no longer appropriate. The Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing explained that specific needs of individuals would be identified and that a move through to the adult social care sector would be needed. Many properties were already suitable but would consider individual needs.
- It was noted that this report was in the interest of the HRA and not 3 Rivers Development Ltd.
- Raised whether better options for St George's Court could be considered and that this decision was not eliminating potentially better options. The Deputy Chief Executive explained that was a binary decision and that the HRA had considered other options. In addition, options for St George's could not be maintained indefinitely.
- This would be a community asset, and that housing was a big issue within this community and that community needs outweighed commercial needs.

- It was asked how this report fitted in procedurally and whether it was valid, it was felt that this report verged on predetermination. The District Solicitor & Monitoring Officer explained that this decision was subject a valuation and would not impact any upcoming decision due to go to Full Council.
- In addition, it was raised that regardless of what the Council agrees at Full Council on 3 Rivers Development Ltd, these properties would still be for sale and were therefore not linked.
- It was raised that the delegated authority given should be closely monitored and that Cabinet should consider implementing a deadline. To which the Leader reassured that he was confident that the Cabinet members involved would work closely with officers. In addition the Deputy Chief Executive explained that regular financial updates were provided at meetings of the Cabinet.
- The Knowle Lane viability was raised, to which it was explained that the option presented and the circumstances within the HRA were different to the 3 Rivers Development Ltd business plan previously presented to the previous administration.
- The Post Hill site was raised, with reassurance sought that this would not proceed. It was also asked how likely it was to pass this site onto another provider. The Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing explained that the cost of Post Hill was too expensive and that grant funding was unavailable for this site. However, other providers might be able to obtain funding due to differing restrictions and that the rent plus method could be applied in this instance, but was not viable for the HRA.

RESOLVED that:

1. That Cabinet approve the acquisition of St Georges Court, Tiverton by the HRA subject to an agreed valuation.
2. Delegated authority be granted to the S151 Officer and the Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing (in consultation with the Cabinet Members for Finance and Housing & Property Services) to complete the purchase of St Georges Court, Tiverton.
3. Subject to Recommendations 1 and 2, that Cabinet approve a local lettings approach for the allocation of social housing at St Georges Court as primarily over-60 years accommodation with a mix of 28 social rent and 11 affordable rent units.
4. That Cabinet approve the HRA undertaking a feasibility study into the acquisition and development of Knowle Lane, Cullompton as social housing for potential inclusion later in the HRA 5-year development programme.
5. That Cabinet agree the HRA will not progress its proposed development and relevant tender for Post Hill, Tiverton.
6. Subject to Recommendation 5, that Cabinet grant delegated authority to the S151 Officer and the Corporate Manager for Public Health, Regulation and Housing to explore alternative options for the delivery of affordable housing at Post Hill, Tiverton including potential sale or transfer of the site. This is to be brought back to Cabinet for consideration in due course.

(Proposed by S Clist, seconded by J Lock)

Reason for decision:

Homes and the Environment are a priority for the Council and this includes increasing the supply of affordable homes in the District.

Note: * Report previously circulated.

44. NOTIFICATION OF KEY DECISIONS

The Cabinet had before it, and **NOTED**, the notification of Key Decisions*.

The S106 Governance item had been postponed from the 19 September 2023 to the 14 November 2023.

Note: * Notification of key Decisions previously circulated.

45. ORGANISATIONAL RESPONSE TO THE NATIONAL CONSULTATION ON THE CLOSURE OF (STAFFED) TICKET OFFICES ON THE RAILWAY NETWORK

The Leader of the Council raised concern of the announcement made by the Rail Delivery Group that train companies were pressing ahead with plans to close up to 1000 rail ticket offices across England over the next 3 years.

It was highlighted that:

- Not all residents are able to use station ticket machines, or have the means to book a ticket in advance.
- Concern that the closure of ticket offices will disproportionately affect elderly and disabled residents.
- Concerns was raised over possible staff redundancies.

RESOLVED that Cabinet:

- Instruct the Chief Executive to write to Mark Harper MP Secretary of State for Transport, and the Chief Executive of the Rail Delivery Group, expressing this Council's opposition to the possible closure of staffed rail ticket offices – and in particular the offices across the Devon County Council area, including Tiverton Parkway.
- Instruct the Chief Executive to write to the rail operator(s) running local ticket offices, expressing the Council's opposition to any plans to close the staffed ticket office at Tiverton Parkway or within the Mid Devon area.
- Refer this issue to Scrutiny with the recommendation that representatives from the relevant rail operator(s) are invited to attend a Scrutiny Meeting at the earliest possible point to discuss future plans for ticket offices within Mid Devon.

Proposed by Leader, Cllr L Taylor)

Reason for decision:

That Staffed ticket offices provide a vital service to residents in Mid Devon.

(The meeting ended at 7.46 pm)

CHAIRMAN