



Joanne Roney OBE
Chief Executive
Telephone: 0161 234 3006
j.roney@manchester.gov.uk
PO Box 532, Town Hall
Extension, Manchester
M60 2LA

Monday 25 November 2019

Dear Councillor / Honorary Alderman,

Meeting of the Council – Wednesday, 27th November, 2019

A summons was issued on Tuesday 19 November 2019 for the meeting of the Council which will be held at 10.00 am on Wednesday, 27th November, 2019, in The Council Chamber, Level 2, Town Hall Extension.

The following items marked as 'to follow' on the summons are now enclosed.

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| 5. Proceedings of the Executive
Executive: 13 November 2019 | Pages
3 - 16 |
|
 | |
| 7. Scrutiny Committees

Resources and Governance: 5 November 2019
Health: 5 November 2019
Children and Young People: 6 November 2019
Communities and Equalities: 7 November 2019 | Pages
17 - 54 |
|
 | |
| 8. Proceedings of Committees

Standards Committee: (including the annual report of the Standards Committee) 31 October 2019 | Pages
55 - 72 |

(The minutes of the Planning and Highways Committee meeting on 14 November 2019 will be submitted to the next meeting of Council.)

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Joanne Roney'.

Joanne Roney OBE
Chief Executive

Councillors:-

Hitchen, Abdullatif, Akbar, Ahmed Ali, Azra Ali, Nasrin Ali, Sameem Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Andrews, Appleby, Battle, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Chohan (Chair), Clay, Collins, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Y Dar, Davies, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Farrell, Flanagan, Green, Grimshaw, Hacking, Harland, Hassan, Hewitson, Holt, Hughes, Igbon, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, T Judge (Deputy Chair), Kamal, Karney, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, Leese, J Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Madeleine Monaghan, Mary Monaghan, Moore, N Murphy, S Murphy, Newman, Noor, O'Neil, Ollerhead, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reeves, Reid, Riasat, Richards, Rowles, Russell, Sadler, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, A Simcock, K Simcock, Stanton, Stogia, Stone, Strong, Taylor, Watson, Wheeler, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

Further Information

For help, advice and information about this meeting please contact the Committee Officer:

Donald Connolly
Tel: 0161 234 3034
Email: d.connolly@manchetser.gov.uk

This agenda was issued on **Monday 25 November 2019** by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Manchester City Council, Level 3, Town Hall Extension (Lloyd Street Elevation), Manchester M60 2LA

Executive

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 13 November 2019

Present: Councillor Leese (Chair)

Councillors: Akbar, Bridges, Craig, N Murphy, S Murphy, Ollerhead, Rahman, Stogia, and Richards

Also present as Members of the Standing Consultative Panel:

Councillors: Karney, Leech, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Midgley, Ilyas and Taylor

Apologies: Councillor S Judge

Exe/19/91 Minutes

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 16 October 2019.

Exe/19/92 Manchester International Festival 2019

The seventh biennial Manchester International Arts Festival (MIF) was held between 4 July 2019 to 21 July 2019. A joint report submitted by the Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer and the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) presented an evaluation of the success of the festival. The report also explained the transition that would need to take place over the next two years, in anticipation of the opening of The Factory in 2021/22.

The objectives for the 2019 Festival had been:

- To continue to grow the international reputation of the Festival and the city – with artists, audiences, partners and media coverage from all five continents and from a wide variety of backgrounds – in turn driving reach for the festival, attracting people to the city and the best staff to our team.
- To bring the most extraordinary artists from around the world to Manchester to create diverse and inspiring new work – made in Manchester and shared across the globe.
- To connect in new and ever-deeper ways with the city and region of Manchester, increasing the range and diversity of those engaging with the Festival, with an ever-more visible and transformative presence in the city.
- To develop the brand, profile and awareness of MIF/The Factory locally, nationally and internationally in readiness for opening in 2021/22.

The report examined each of these in turn and set out the details of how well the objective had been achieved. The festival's financial performance was also explained. Arts Council England had supported the Festival as one of its National Portfolio organisations and invested £10.5m over the two-year cycle, of which £9m was their contribution to the running of The Factory and to build MIF's capacity to run the new facility. Box office income achieved during the Festival was on target at £1.1m. Co-commissioning income and co-producing value in kind support had made a contribution of just under £3m. The final amount raised from individual donors,

corporate partners for MIF19 was £2.37m, including value in kind. MIF19 had been supported by 65 corporate sponsors and media partners.

The meeting was addressed by the artistic director and chief executive of Manchester International Festival, John McGrath. He said he felt the report painted a very positive picture of both the economic and the social impact of the 2019 festival. He spoke of the long-term collaborations with homelessness organisations in the city, and the 2,700 free tickets that had been given to targeted community groups to further develop the ownership of the festival amongst the people of Manchester.

On international impact, he felt that the festival had been the most successful ever including the £3m income from co-commissioning with other international arts bodies. Nine of the shows at the festival were now touring elsewhere in the world. The invitations for other arts leaders from around the world to visit the city and to see the development of The Factory had also been very successful.

The report recognised the importance and the valuable contribution of the volunteer programme with 507 people contributing nearly 16,000 volunteer hours to the festival.

The calculated economic benefit to the city was £50.2m, which was £10m over the target that had been set and £8m more than had been achieved in 2017.

The report referred to the Council's financial support for the future of the festival and operation of The Factory. The budget for the two-year cycle ending 30 September 2019 had included the 2019 Festival and also some costs which were being incurred to ensure that the MIF organisation was well prepared to open and operate The Factory. In the future the budgets would need to recognise the Council's commitments to the year-round operation of The Factory, as well as the biennial festival that would next take place in 2021. That consideration would be part of the coming budget setting processes.

We noted that the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee had considered the report at a recent meeting and had endorsed the recommendations (Minute CESC/19/46).

Decisions

1. To note the substantial achievements of the 2019 Festival in overachieving its objectives, particularly in continuing to grow its international reputation, increasing co-commissioning partnerships, record attendance levels and increased involvement by Manchester emerging artists.
2. To support the importance of maintaining public sector funding commitments in order to attract significant match funding from other public and private sector partners.
3. To delegate authority to finalise the financial arrangements to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer with the Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods, and in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources and Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure.

4. To note that the future budget for the festival and the support for The Factory would be considered as part of the 2020/21 budget setting processes in the coming months.

Exe/19/93 Youth Strategy and Engagement

As a result of Manchester's participation in the Cabinet Office's Delivering Differently for Young People, we had supported the development of an independent Youth and Play Trust. That trust could then enter into a financial agreement that would see it develop, coordinate and manage the commissioning of youth and play services across Manchester (Minute Exe/16/014).

By supporting the establishment of an independent Youth and Play Trust, known as "Young Manchester", that independent charity was now able to attract additional investment into the City for young people's services in a way that the council could not.

A report submitted by the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) proposed the adoption of a new strategy that would be the framework for future partnership work between the Council and its partners and stakeholders, who all shared responsibility for making sure that young people had access to a high quality offer that addressed their universal and their specific and targeted needs.

The strategy put forward a proposed vision for these services:

"Ensure our young people have the opportunity to achieve their full potential and benefit from the economic prosperity of the city. They will contribute to, and benefit from, supportive and dynamic neighbourhoods with access to a wide range of youth, leisure and recreational opportunities.

Their voice and citizenship will continue to be placed at the heart of the city's current and future identity, recognising that our young people are the future of Manchester; economically, socially and culturally. They will come to define our city, and its relationship with the global community."

The strategy set of a set of proposed actions, referred to as 'we wills', divided up into four key themes:

- Thriving Young People
- Highly Skilled Young People
- Progressive and Resilient Young People
- Living Well, Healthy & Safe Young People
- Connected & Heard Young People

The vision, themes and proposed actions were all supported. The role that the Council's Youth Strategy Team were to have in implementing the strategy was explained in the report.

The report also examined the requirements for the Council's future financial contributions to the delivery of Youth and Play services. The intention was for investment by the council into the Youth and Play Trust to be used as leverage to secure additional third party investment which would support the sustainability of youth and play services across the city. The facilitate that the Council would be asked to considered setting a three-year budget for the service as part of the coming budget setting processes for 2020/21 and beyond.

We noted that the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee had considered the report at a recent meeting and had endorsed the recommendations (Minute CYP/19/47).

Decisions

1. To agree, subject to budget, the continuation of investment into Young Manchester for the next 3 years, on the basis that Young Manchester uses this as leverage to grow external investment to support the sector.
2. To consider and approve the adoption of the proposed vision, strategic themes and 'We Wills' to deliver the Strategy over the next 3 years.
3. To delegate authority to complete the production of the strategy document to the Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth), in consultation with the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure, for communication with young people, partners and the Youth Sector.
4. To delegate authority to finalise the contract value to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the City Solicitor, the Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure, following conclusion of the VAT assessment to ensure that the contract fee is delivered within the available budget.
5. To delegate authority to the City Solicitor to enter into, complete and execute any documents or agreements necessary to give effect to these decisions.
6. To note that the case for a three-year budget would be part of the budget setting processes in the coming months.

Exe/19/94 Housing Allocations Policy Review

The Allocations Scheme is used to assess the eligibility and priority of applicants for the social housing the Council has available. The scheme was revised in 2007 (Minute Exe/07/134) and again in March 2010 (Minute Exe/10/35), with the current version coming into use in 2011. Since 2011, and using delegated authority, officers had made further minor amendments to the details but the policy had remained fundamentally the same for eight years.

A report from the Strategic Director, Growth and Development, explained why it was now felt that the Allocations Policy needed to be reviewed. The report looked at how

the turnover of social housing had reduced whilst demand had increased. It described a process of engagement with stakeholders that had been used to develop a range of policy solutions, seeking to ensure that the proposals would not have a disproportionate effect on applicants with protected characteristics. It also described how the proposals were consulted upon with statutory organisations and with the wider public. The outcome of that work being a well-considered set of recommendations.

The report explained that city's housing situation had changed significantly since 2011. There had been a significant rise in homelessness. The associated cost to the Council of households in temporary and supported accommodation were becoming unsustainable. Welfare reforms and rising private sector rents were also proving to be major challenges for people seeking new social housing. The turnover and availability of social homes had reduced significantly. The number of households on the housing register had risen by 27% over the previous four years, but there had been a 21% decrease in the number of homes that had become available for letting over that same time period.

Part 6 of the Housing Act 1996 requires local authorities to have an Allocations Policy that describes how social homes should be allocated and to give "reasonable preference" to certain groups of applicants:

- people who need to move on welfare or medical grounds;
- people who need to move to a particular area of the borough to avoid hardship;
- people living in overcrowded, insanitary, or otherwise unsatisfactory housing; and
- people who are homeless within the meaning of Part 7 of the Housing Act 1996.

The current policy therefore used six bands to decide the relative priority to be given to applicants for social housing.

Band 1 - applicants in real housing need (reasonable preference) who are in very urgent or emergency need to be rehoused.

Band 2 - applicants in real housing need (reasonable preference) who make a contribution to their community.

Band 3 - applicants in real housing need (reasonable preference) who do not contribute to their community.

Band 4 - applicants not in real housing need but who make a contribution to their community

Band 5 - applicants not in real housing need and who do not contribute to their community.

Band 6 - applicants demoted from bands 1-5.

Given the recognised need for the policy to be reviewed, a set of policy objectives were established for the review. These were that the revised policy:

- continued to accord with legislation and statutory guidance;
- provides the means of managing the allocation of a scarce resource (social housing) in a fair and equitable manner assisting those in most need;
- be transparent and easy to understand;
- accounted for the need to manage neighbourhoods;
- accounted for the Homelessness Reduction Act, welfare reforms and the city's Homelessness Strategy;

- assisted the delivery of commitments in the “Our Manchester” Strategy and the Housing Strategy;
- complied with local authority equality duties; and
- had no unintended adverse impact on other housing practice.

The report described the process that had been used, and the partnership work that had been undertaken, to formulate the proposed revisions. The changes that had arisen from that work were detailed in a schedule of proposed changes appended to the report. The proposed changes related to the qualification rules within the policy, including introducing a two-year residency requirement; the relative priority for those who qualified, including the removal of the additional priority for community contributions; and revising the banding structure to be used, including changes to the application of ‘overcrowding’ assessments, reference to the council’s Homelessness Prevention duty, and accommodating ‘children at height’.

At the meeting it was confirmed that priority would continue to be given to needs that arose from cases of domestic violence and abuse.

Once the policy options had been identified there had been a 12-week consultation process with Registered Providers and the wider public, specifically including current applicants on the housing waiting list. The report explained that there had been over 2,500 responses to the consultation, from applicants, residents and organisations. A full analysis of the results was appended to the report as Appendix 1. Generally, the response to the proposed changes had been positive. The only proposed change where there was a mixed response related to the community contribution/working household priority. There was a relatively small majority in favour of removing this extra priority, as was being recommended.

The report also explained that an equalities impact assessment had been carried out to identify any unintended consequences of the proposed policy changes. The results of that assessment were detailed in the report.

The report concluded with an explanation of the timetable for further action, should the changes be approved, explaining when the revised policy would be fully in effect. That would be September 2020.

We noted that the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee had considered the report at a recent meeting and had endorsed the recommendations (Minute NESC/19/43).

Having noted the basis of all the proposed revisions to the policy, the outcome of all the consultations and the findings of the equality impact assessment, the recommended changes to the policy were agreed.

Decisions

1. To note the statutory and online consultation responses received.
2. To approve the changes to the Housing Allocation Policy (the Policy) recommended within the report.

3. To delegate to the Head of Housing Services and the City Solicitor authority to approve and complete the final and lawful version of the Policy.
4. To note that the Equalities Impact Assessment shows no unintended or disproportionate effects are likely to arise for applicants with protected characteristics.

Exe/19/95 Consideration of Policy H12: Purpose Built Student Accommodation Within the Changing Market Context

A report by the Strategic Director, Growth and Development, explained changes in the student accommodation market in the city. The report set out the context for consideration to be given to a review of the policies relating to purpose built student accommodation (PBSA). That review would be on an interim basis in advance of a review of Core Strategy Policy H12: "Purpose Built Student Accommodation", as part of an update of the Core Strategy.

Manchester has one of the largest student populations in Europe, with over 90,000 students at Greater Manchester's five universities, and over 380,000 students at the 22 Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) within an hour's drive. There were 74,164 students enrolled at one of Manchester's three HEIs in 2017/18, of which 48,393 had a term-time address in Manchester. Of the remaining c.25,000 students, a significant proportion live at home with their families across Greater Manchester and beyond.

Policy H12 of the city's Core Strategy was adopted in 2012 and had been developed with the objective of managing the supply of student accommodation in the city. It set out the criteria to be used to guide planning applications for student accommodation and to manage the appropriate delivery of PBSA. The policy had helped ensure that housing had been developed in the city centre, prevented an oversupply of PBSA, and created a dynamic residential market. The Council, working with partners, had used Policy H12 to manage the controlled delivery of a limited but sustainable supply of new PBSA, in response to increasing student demand for accommodation in the city centre. A small amount of PBSA has also been developed in the south of the city, including the University of Manchester's plans in Fallowfield.

The report explained that whilst Policy H12 remained relevant, changes in the student accommodation market had created the need to review the interpretation and application of the policy. This primarily related to affordability challenges and the need to locate accommodation in close proximity to the HEIs.

The report described in detail the changes in the market and the pressures that were arising across the city. It explained the background and context that a review of the policy would need to take into consideration.

The meeting was addressed by Councillor Davies, a councillor in the Deansgate ward. She said that students were welcome and spoke of the valuable contribution that students make to the city. However, student accommodation demands and pressures could have a detrimental effect on other longer-term domestic residents. In

particular she said that student numbers correlated strongly with more use of delivery companies for packages and food, and that increased traffic was putting pressure on neighbourhoods. She hoped that the Executive, in approving the report, would ensure that city centre residents were a key stakeholder in the proposed consultation.

It was proposed that there should now be consultation with key stakeholders on the changing market context, with a view that the conclusions of that could be taken into account in determining planning applications, in advance of a full review of Policy H12. Following this interim step the implementation of the student accommodation policy would be considered and consulted on as part of the development of the revised Local Plan. That proposal was supported.

Decisions

1. To note the significant changes that have taken place in the student accommodation sector, and the impact this has had on the city centre context and adjoining communities.
2. To request that the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) undertakes an appropriate consultation process with key stakeholders on this changing context, and brings a report back to the Executive on the outcomes of the consultation.
3. Subject to the outcome of the consultation, to request that the Planning and Highways Committee takes these market changes into account as a material consideration when dealing with future planning applications for student accommodation.
4. To note the start of a review, consultation and revision of Policy H12 as part of the Local Plan process, to enable an updated approach to the provision of student accommodation in the city, based on the prevailing market context, the principles set out in this report, in particular the location of new student accommodation in close proximity to the University campuses, and in line with the Council's wider place making and growth objectives.
5. To support the longer term regeneration and growth objectives of the Council and partners on the Student Strategy Partnership and Oxford Road Corridor Board.

Exe/19/96 Acquiring Properties for Affordable Housing

A report by the Strategic Director, Growth and Development, put forward an approach to acquiring properties which were offered to the Council to increase the amount of affordable housing and to reduce the number of former Council properties entering the private rented sector.

Owners of former council owned properties were obliged to offer them to the Council if they wished to sell within 10 years of purchase. Other properties were also offered to the Council and this policy was intended to cover any properties so offered.

The intention was to establish a capital budget of £1.5m to be used over the next three years to provide both gap funding to Registered Providers and to purchase properties for City Council ownership. It was intended that the one-for-one Right to Buy capital receipts would be used in the first instance to establish that budget. Government guidelines on the one-for-one receipts meant that a receipt could support a maximum of 30% of any property acquisition. If acquisitions were to be made for City Council properties, then there would be a need for 70% of the funding to be identified from within the existing housing capital programme.

This proposal would be a similar approach to the larger property acquisitions proposals agreed in March 2018 (Minute Exe/18/041). Under that scheme the Council and Registered Properties had jointly purchased 19 four bedroom properties to provide homes for larger homeless households.

The proposals in the report were supported.

Decisions

1. To approve the principles outlined in this report.
2. To authorise the Head of Housing Services in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer and the City Solicitor to progress and formalise arrangements with the Registered Providers.
3. To authorise the Head of Housing Services in conjunction with the Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer and the City Solicitor to review and make minor amendments to this new policy during the next 3 years.
4. To note that a request for a budget of £1.5m for the acquisition of properties over the three-year period will be advanced through the City Council's capital approval process.

Exe/19/97 Capital Programme Update

A report concerning requests to increase the capital programme was submitted. We agreed to recommend two changes to the Council and to make a further four changes under delegated powers. These changes would increase Manchester City Council's capital budget by £2.143m across 2019/20 and 2020/21, funded partly from borrowing, the use of reserves and the Capital Fund, and external contributions.

We also noted two changes that had been approved by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, £200K for the Peterloo Memorial and £433K for CCTV improvements.

Decisions

1. To recommend that the Council approve the following two changes to the capital programme:

- a) ICT – Collaboration Platform Replacement. A capital budget allocation through transfer of £2.100m from the End User Experience budget is requested, funded by borrowing.
 - b) Neighbourhoods – Cremator and Mercury Abatement Plant Replacement Strategy. A capital budget increase of £1.551m is requested, funded by borrowing.
2. To approve the following four changes to the capital programme:
- c) Neighbourhoods – Hough End Master Plan – Strategic Football and Multi Sports Hub – Development Costs. A capital budget increase of £0.241m is requested, funded by £0.100m External Contribution and £0.141m Waterfall Fund.
 - d) Neighbourhoods – Range Stadium Capital Project. A capital budget increase of £0.465m is requested, funded by borrowing on an invest to save basis.
 - e) ICT – Income Management Solution. A capital budget decrease of £0.114m is requested and approval of a corresponding transfer of £0.114m to the revenue budget, funded by Capital Fund.
 - f) Highways Services - A6 Stockport Road. A capital budget allocation through transfer of £0.125m from the Highways Investment Programme is requested, funded by borrowing.
3. To note increases to the programme of £0.633m as a result of delegated approvals.

Exe/19/98 Capital Programme Monitoring 2019/20

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer's report informed us of the revised capital budget 2019/20 to 2024/25 taking account of agreed and proposed additions to the programme, profiling changes, and the latest estimates of forecast spend and resources for the 2019/20 capital programme. The report explained the major variations to forecast spend, and any impact that variations had on the five-year Capital Programme.

The forecast of expenditure for 2019/20 for the Manchester City Council capital programme was £292.7m, compared to a proposed revised budget of £290.4m. Spend up to the end of September 2019 was £78.0m. The forecast for the capital programme on behalf of Greater Manchester was £151.2m, compared to a proposed revised budget of £151.2m. Actual GM spending to the end of September was £28.1m.

Appended to the report was a schedule of projects within the overall capital programme where the allocations needed to be revised and funding allocations vired

between projects. The appendix showed the virement needed for each scheme and each project. We agreed to recommend to the Council the proposed virements greater than £500,000, as set out in the appendix to these minutes. The virements of less than £500,000 we approved.

Decisions

1. To recommend that Council approve the virements over £0.5m between capital schemes to maximise use of funding resources available to the City Council as set out in the appendix to these minutes.
2. To approve virements under £0.5m within the capital programme as set out in the appendix to these minutes.
3. To note that approvals of movements and transfers to the Manchester City Council capital programme, will reflect a revised total budget of £290.4m and a latest full year forecast of £292.7m. Expenditure to the end of September 2019 is £78.0m.
4. To note that approvals of movements and transfers to Capital Programme on behalf of Greater Manchester, will reflect a revised total budget of £151.2m and a latest full year forecast of £151.2m. Expenditure to the end of September 2019 is £28.1m.
5. To note the prudential indicators in Appendix C of the report.

Appendix – Capital Budget Virements

Project Name	2019/20 In yr virement proposed	2020/21 In yr virement proposed	2021/22 In yr virement proposed
Drainage	2,425	1,481	2,051
Large Patching repairs	1,796	30	531
Carriageway Resurfacing	-923	-1,511	-2,582
Carriageway Preventative	-3,263	-29	-1,049
Other Improvement works	722	1,710	2,487
Project Delivery Procurement	-757	-1,681	-1,438
Total Highways Programme	0	0	0
Asset Management Programme	420		
Ross Place Refurbishment	-420		
Total Strategic Development Programme	0	0	0
Charlestown - Victoria Ave multistorey window replacement and ECW	-12		
External cyclical works		-8	
External cyclical works Ancoats Smithfields estate	7		
ENW distribution network phase 4 (various)	80		
Dam Head - Walk up flats communal door renewal	13		
Newton Heath - Croyden Drive Security Improvements	100	88	
Various Estate based environmental works	100	100	100
Delivery Costs		369	124
2/4 Blocks Heating replacement with Individual Boilers		-108	
Lift replacement / refurbishment programme	-2		
Decent Homes mop ups ph 9 and decent homes work required to voids	30		
Whitemoss Road and Cheetham Hill Road Local Offices - Improvements		-3	
Ancoats - Victoria Square lift replacement	108		
Aldbourn Court/George Halstead Court/Duncan Edwards Court works	-3		
Boiler replacement programme	-17	-341	
Kitchen and Bathrooms programme	-693		
Harpurhey - Monsall Multis Internal Works		292	
Higher Blackley - Liverton Court Internal Works	845		
Various - Bradford/Clifford	104		

Lamb/Kingsbridge/Sandyhill Court Internal Works			
Charlestown - Rushcroft/Pevensey Court Internal Works	1,343	218	
Fire precautions multi storey blocks	-702		
Installations of sprinkler systems - multi storey blocks	-1,029		
Replacement of Prepayment Meters in High Rise Blocks		-20	
ERDF Heat Pumps	-55	-381	-17
Charlestown - Rushcroft/Pevensey Courts Lift Refurb			525
Multi Storey blocks door entry system renewal Sandyhill/Bradford Crts	5	31	
One off type work (rewires/boilers/doors)	100	300	
Delivery Costs	156	827	88
Various Locations - bringing bedsits back into use		21	75
Delivery Costs	2	4	10
Improvements to Homeless accommodation city wide		-164	
Improvements to Homeless Accommodation		164	
Delivery Costs		38	
Delivery Costs		4	
Public Sector Northwards Adaptations	200		
Adaptations	100	700	
Northwards Housing Programme	-780	-2,131	-905
Total Public Sector Housing (HRA) Programme	0	0	0
Holy Trinity Primary	47		
Lytham Rd	-100		
Co-op Academy expansion	-443		
Plymouth Grove Refurbishment	-285		
Beaver Rd Primary Expansion	-84		
Lily Lane Primary	-91		
St. James Primary Academy	-65		
Crossacres Primary School	-180		
Ringway Primary School	-77		
Webster Primary Schools	-87		
KS3/4 PRU Pioneer Street	70		
Basic need - unallocated funds	1,295		
Universal Infant Free School Meals - Unallocated	6		
Broad Oak Primary School Kitchen	553		
All Saints Prim Rewire	477		
Armitage Prim Windows	121		
Bowker Vale Prim Heating	262		

Buton Lane Prim Roof	192		
Cheetwood Prim Heating	126		
Crosslee Comm Heating	80		
Crowcroft Park Roof Repairs	146		
Grange School Sports Hall	163		
Higher Openshaw Rewire	849		
Lily Lane Prim Windows	53		
Moston Fields Joinery	221		
Ringway Prim Roof	231		
Sandilands Prim Windows	123		
St Mary's Junior Windows	43		
Alma Park Gas Improvement	1		
Schools Capital Maintenance -unallocated	-3,641		
Healthy Pupil Capital Funding	-6		
Total Children's Services Programme	0	0	0
Solaris	2		
PSN Windows 2003	-42		
Data Centre UPS Installation	-10		
End User Computing	69		
End User Experience	-69		
ICT Investment Plan	50		
Total ICT Programme	0	0	0
Total Manchester City Council Capital Programme	0	0	0
Total GM projects	0	0	0
Total CAPITAL PROGRAMME	0	0	0

Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 5 November 2019

Present:

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair
Councillors Ahmed Ali, Andrews, Clay, Davies, Lanchbury, Moore, B Priest,
A Simcock, Stanton, Wheeler and Wright

Also present:

Councillor Leese, Leader
Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader
Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources
Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport

Apologies: Councillor Battle and Rowles

RGSC/19/60 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on the 8 October 2019 as a correct record.

RGSC/19/61 Minutes of the Human Resources Sub Group

Decision

To note the minutes of the meeting held on the 15 October 2019 as a correct record.

RGSC/19/62 Annual Property Report 2018/19

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided an update on property activity since November 2018. The report reviewed activity across in Development and the Investment, Operational and Heritage estates. The report also included an update on the Council's Asset Management Strategy and governance of land transfers and Community Asset Transfers (CAT).

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- The delivery and operation of the Council's Digital assets which included The Sharp Project, Space Studios Manchester and Arbeta (previously One Central Park);
- The on-going development of Manchester Airport and Enterprise Zone;
- The development of City Centre schemes involving Council assets which included First Street, Jacksons Row/Bootle Street, St Johns, Heron House, Mayfield Regeneration Area, Circle Square, Portugal Street East and Bridge Street and Kendals;

- Details of other commercial and employment development, including Central Retail Park, Didsbury Technology Park, Central Park and New Smithfield Market;
- Work with Strategic Housing, Planning and other partners to deliver the Council's objectives for Housing;
- Involvement in a range of initiatives to improve the quality and offer in district centres
- Property input in relation to leisure, sport and education provision;
- The management of a programme of strategic acquisitions
- Income from the Council's investment estate, particularly from its property interests in the Airport
- The management of the Council's non-operational (investment) estate and transactional work;
- An overview of the Operational Estate activity and Asset Management Programme;
- Progress with the Council's Carbon Reduction programme; and
- Updates in relation to Community Asset Transfers and Voluntary Sector Support and the Council's Heritage Estate.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Had the process of Community Asset Transfers (CAT's) slowed down and if so what was the reason for this;
- It would be useful if all Members of the Council were provided with details of buildings across the city that were still available for CAT's;
- Why was it envisaged that there would possibly be a need to progress sales of Council assets quickly if demand from investors and occupiers particularly in the residential, office and leisure sectors within the city centre remained strong;
- Clarity was sought as to what was determined to be "affordable" in the context of housing development within the city;
- It would be helpful in future reports to have a breakdown of the different types of housing provision being provided across the city;
- In relation to the proposed housing renewal scheme in Beswick, what was meant by the reprovion of all existing social housing tenants;
- Given the Council's exposure to the retail sector, with specific reference to Kendals and the Arndale Centre, was there any concern in relation to the retail performance of the city;
- What was the timescale for actual movement on the proposals for the redevelopment of Wythenshawe Town Centre;
- Why had the Council paid £37million to acquire Central Retail Park site but was selling a site in close proximity (Pollard Street) to this for significantly less;
- There was concern that there appeared to be a significant change to the proposals for the future use Central Retail Park which were different to the initial proposals for mixed use residential housing provision;
- There was concern in relation to the change in use of some new developments from initially residential provision to commercial provision and the possible shortage of homes for owner occupation;
- There was concern in relation to the delay in progress with Upper and Lower Campfield Markets;

- Clarification was sought as to whether the requirement to absorb vacant business rates liability within the Head Lease with the Arndale Centre was contained in any other Head Leases that the Council had and was there a risk to the Council with the creation of other high value retail propositions across the city that the Council would potentially need to absorb more of these;
- It was suggested that the Council received a future report detailing its heritage assets and how these could be enhanced; and
- Was there anything that had not gone as well as anticipated.

The Head of Estates and Facilities confirmed that the process of CAT's had slowed compared to previous years and this had been as a result of less stock being available now and the stock that remained, was complex and required more work in terms of developing the businesses cases. The Deputy Leader commented that information was available on CPAD in relation to buildings that were available to a CAT but agreed to send this information directly to all Members of the Council.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) advised that in terms of the development cycle and the disposal of land and property, there was a clear view within the market that difficult times were approaching, which was being reflected in terms of land values in the city resulting from the uncertainty of Brexit and the country's global trading position. There was also evidence of land traders offloading land which was a concern. Taking a wider perspective, he reported that demand was still strong within the city for commercial space.

The Committee was advised that the Council had realigned its policy framework on housing and affordability so that this was now in line with the Council's new Affordable Housing Policy which was approved by the Executive in September 2019. In essence this meant that future disposal of land needed to promote properties for social rent, affordable rent and shared ownership. The Leader commented that the term affordable had been coined by Government and was used in a specific way and was a definition of affordability never accepted by the Council. Instead the Council determined affordability in the context of a family at or below the mean income for the city, where a maximum of 30% of income was spent on housing costs. He suggested that an alternative description of affordability should be adopted.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) advised that he would seek clarification from One Manchester in relation to the proposed re-provision of all existing social housing tenants in connection to the proposed housing renewal scheme in Beswick and provide a response to the Committee.

The Leader advised that the Council was due to meet with representatives of Kendals to discuss the future plans for the department store. In terms of retail in general, there were numerous national and international chains that were struggling, however, independent retail in the city was flourishing and there was also an increase in online businesses establishing a physical presence within the city, with reference to Amazon Market Place and the H&M Group being given. Taking all this into account, it was considered that Manchester was able to offer a thriving retail offer. The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) commented that the impact of what was happening at a national level in the retail market was having an impact on the Council's income from the Arndale and Wythenshawe Town Centre. In terms of

movement on the proposals for the redevelopment of Wythenshawe Town Centre, there was imminent discussion to take place with local members on the proposals.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) reported that both Central Retail Park and Portugal Street East schemes had been subject to independent valuations by agents and were very different schemes. The Pollard Street scheme had a major challenge in terms of development due to an operational tram line running through the centre of the scheme which placed a considerable impact on the valuation of the land in terms of development which was reflected in its valuation. It was also a low density scheme, whereas Central Retail Park did not have the same type of development challenges and was a higher density scheme. It was also commented that the value of Central Retail Park had been based on its current use as a retail park. In terms of the proposals of Central Retail Park, he advised that the Council was in the final stages of preparing a strategic framework for the use of Central Retail Park which would be submitted to a future meeting of Economy Scrutiny and that the Council had other land interest around Central retail Park which might be more suitable for future affordable housing provision.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) advised that the broad numbers of proposed housing at a city level that were forecasted to be built as part of the Council's Local Plan and within the GMSF had not changed but acknowledged that the provision of owner occupied properties was an issue that needed to be looked at. The Leader gave an assurance that Deansgate Ward Councillors would be kept updated on the progress with Upper and Lower Campfield Markets and St Johns as they developed.

It was reported to the Committee that the requirement to absorb vacant business rates was bespoke to the Head Lease with the owners of the Arndale. It was acknowledged that if there was another major retail development in the city centre there would be a need for the Council to be cognisant of the potential impact this would have.

The Deputy Leader reported that a lot of heritage buildings in the city were not owned by the Council and therefore it was not possible for the Council to enhance these. The Chair advised that she would consult with the Chair of Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee about a future report on the governance structure of how heritage assets were looked after.

In terms of what had not gone so well, the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) advised that there will still be outstanding issues around the Investment Estate over and above the issues in relation to the Arndale and Wythenshawe Town Centre and gave reference to complex issues around 103 Princess Street and Heron House which impacted on the Investment Estate.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report; and

- (2) Notes that the Chair will consult with the Chair of Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee about a future report on the governance structure of how heritage assets were looked after.

RGSC/19/63 Annual Section 106 Monitoring Report

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided information on the 2018/19 municipal year's activity in relation to S106 Agreements and specifically on associated financial obligations. The report also set out the legislative framework for negotiating S106 agreements, and updates on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and viability assessments.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport provided a brief summary of the report. The main points and themes included:-

- During 2018/19 year, 16 S106 agreements were signed. Of these, seven related to the provision of affordable housing;
- A total of £966,865 had been received in S106 financial contributions and to date income collected in the current fiscal year was £907,878;
- There was currently £6.5 million held through received S106 contributions. Of this around £500,000 was awaiting to be reserved to projects;
- No refunds had been made during this period in relation to any financial obligation, however, there was one case where the financial obligation was now required and this was being pursued;
- Viability assessments were now submitted as part of the planning application and were publically available for inspection;
- The ability of Member engagement in the context of planning agreements;
- S106 governance arrangements, which included the establishment of a dedicated S106 Advisory Group to review spend, track process and help unblock any issues; and
- The Council continued to not implement CIL in Manchester at the current time. As part of the review of the Core Strategy (the development plan), consideration would be given to the introduction of CIL which would include assessing, if it is possible to establish an economically viable CIL rate and/or whether these could differ in different geographical areas.

The report also contained a breakdown of S106 agreements on a ward by ward basis.

Some of the key points that arose during the Committees discussions were:-

- Would it be possible for all Councillors to have access to the new viewing portal for S106 agreements;
- What was the exact process for Member engagement in the context of S106 agreements secured through the planning process;
- It was felt that on some occasions, Ward Councillors were not being made aware of potential S106 monies within their wards and clarification was sought on the co-ordination between the Planning Department and Neighbourhood Teams;

- It was suggested that some Members felt that S106 agreements had been determined by the time pre-application discussions were taking place and that due to this, they had little influence;
- It was queried as to how local residents could contribute ideas to S106 spend;
- Could the amount of S106 contribution increase if a development became more profitable than anticipated;
- Was there any timescale around a future decision on the possible implementation of a CIL;
- There was concern about assumptions being made between the S106 agreement and the source of spend as well as the length of time it was taking between a S106 agreement being made and the its implementation;
- It was suggested that it was not clear to Members who was responsible for ensuring the spend of S106 once an agreement had been secured through the planning agreements
- It was suggested that the Council's Member Development Working Group considered arranging refresher training for all Councillors on the S106 agreement process;
- Was there anything more the Council could do to achieve more S106 contributions from developers; and
- Had there been any instances where the Council had proposed a small S106 contribution than that identified from the viability assessment.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing advised that it was the intention for the new viewing portal for S106 agreements to be accessible for all Councillors by the beginning of December 2019. In terms of Member engagement in the context of S106 agreements secured through Planning, it was reported that pre application engagement was key and although not mandatory, all developers were encouraged to undertake this. Once a planning application was submitted, every Member was provided with details of these applications relevant to their ward and were encouraged to contact Planning to discuss the S106 proposals in relation to these applications.

The Committee was advised that the dedicated S106 Advisory Group was led by the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing and had strategic leads from Neighbourhoods and Planning as part of its membership to ensure that appropriate governance arrangements were in place.

It was explained that when the Council entered pre-application discussions with developers it was inevitable that discussions around mitigation measures would take place and this would include whether this could be achieved by way of a planning condition or through a S106 agreement and at this stage, no final decision would be taken. Once an application was submitted, officers constantly reviewed, assessed and evaluated what may be required and up until the point of issuing a Planning committee report, Members and residents had the opportunity to make comments as to whether they felt a requirement for a S106 contribution was needed in relation to an application. This was caveated with the point that there would be some limitations as to what a S106 agreement could be used for.

In terms of the ability to increase the amount of S106 contribution from a profitable development, the Council now introduced a reconciliation process which enabled the

Council to retest the viability of every S106 agreement it entered into for a financial contribution and had embedded a claw back provision to enable the Council to seek further S106 contributions from a developer if there had been an uplift. In relation to CIL, the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing advised that at present there was no timescale for the introduction of CIL in Manchester but this would be considered as part of the development of Manchester's Local Plan. This would not be a straight forward decision and due to the complexity, it would take some time before a decision was taken as to whether to implement this in Manchester.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing acknowledged that there was a number of S106 agreements that were now quite old in terms of when these agreements had been made, however, over the last 12 months a risk review had been undertaken for these agreements and it was reported that none of the S106 agreements were in danger of the financial contributions being returned to the developer. It was agreed that in future reports dates would be included in the as to when consents were granted and dates S106 agreements were signed. The Chair asked that this information be added to the Ward Information data and circulated to all Members within the next month.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing acknowledge concerns raised and commented that the establishment of the S106 Advisory Group and new governance arrangements as detailed in the report sought to address these concerns. It was also reported that the Council's Internal audit had been asked to undertake a complete review of the new governance arrangements. The Chair suggested that the Committee received an update report following Internal Audit's review.

It was reported that at the present moment it was difficult to identify and further scope where the Council could seek further S106 financial contributions as all viability information was now published in the public domain and the Council already negotiated strongly with developers. Furthermore it was reported that the Council had been no instances where the Council had proposed a smaller S106 contribution than that identified from the viability assessment.

Decisions

The Committee

- (1) Notes the report; and
- (2) Requests an update report following Internal Audit's review of the new S106 governance arrangements and that this report includes the following information:-
 - An indication of affordable housing being provided from S106 contributions
 - How Developers are encouraged to mitigate any harm from their developments
 - Best practice and comparison of S106 arrangements with other GM local authorities; and
 - The S106 triggers for planning applications within the Deansgate Ward (Land Bounded By Chester Road, Mancunian Way And Former

Bridgewater Canal Offices and Land Bounded by Jackson Row, Bootle Street, Southmill Street and 201 Deansgate.

- (3) Requests that when the update report is considered, representatives from Neighbourhoods and Capital Programmes attend to help address the Committee's concerns around the rate of spend of S106 agreements.

RGSC/19/64 The Factory, St John's

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided an update on the construction progress for The Factory project, its significance in terms of cultural impact within the city, the projected social and economic benefits, legacy impacts and opportunities for Manchester residents generated by the project.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- To date progress had been good, with 11 of the 32 work packages having been let, the most visible of which were the steelworks;
- A number of key successes were highlighted including the substantial completion of the towers steelwork, the installation of the concrete stairs and the lift shaft erection. The truck lift enclosure and orchestra pit had also been 'topped out' and structurally completed;
- The project team were working to achieve the earliest, most cost effective completion date, with the Factory due to play a significant role in MIF 2021, however the most significant challenge remained the complexity of the project;
- Additional issues had been discovered on site including drainage issues due to incomplete data which had put some pressure on the project;
- The project was currently going through the next quarterly review with Arts Council England. A cost and design review had also been commissioned to underpin the next phase of delivery with the Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing (MEP) being the next major work package to be let;
- Details of social value commitments to date, including the number of apprenticeship starts, pre-employment schemes or placements focusing on long term unemployed groups and employability skills support activities;
- A broader piece of work was also being undertaken into the construction market and inflationary pressures within Manchester as this was a concern across the capital programme; and
- Whilst at this stage the project was reported as delivering to budget, the situation was being kept under careful review.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were:-

- Concern was raised in relation to the engagement by the Management Contractor in permitting access to the site for Unite and Trade Unions, in light of the Council's signing of the Unite Construction Charter;
- Members sought further detail in relation to the additional drainage issue identified in the report;
- What financial contingency existed within the total cost of the project to take account of these additional issues and inflationary pressures surrounding the construction market;

- In terms of apprentices, could the Committee be provided with information on how many had actually started working on the project and how many of these were Manchester residents; and
- Could Officers give an assurance that there would be no need for any further capital investment into the project

The Director of Capital Programmes advised that he met regularly with Unite, officers within Procurement and the Management Contractor's Project Director, to discuss protocols around site access for Trade Unions. It was reported that it had been agreed that the protocols for Trade Union access to the site would replicate those protocols applied to the construction of Liverpool Hospital (which was another development overseen by the same Management Contractor), however, he had been advised that negotiations around this between Unite and the Management Contractor had broken down and as a result he had contacted Unite to understand their issues and had committed to meeting with the Management Contractor and Unite to try and identify and agree a resolution.

In relation to the additional drainage issue, it was explained that following intrusive surveys of the site it was identified that drainage of an adjacent site (owned by Allied London) was actually coming on to the Factory site which had not been identified in any groundwork drawings. Consequently adjustments were needed and the Council had formally written to Allied London to suggest that the cost of these adjustments were borne by them rather than the Council. It was also reported that following ground excavation, contamination had been found, which was not unusual for a brownfield site, but required additional unplanned work to remedy.

The Director of Capital Programmes advised that the original contingency for the project was circa £4.1m and it was acknowledged that this was currently under some pressure. Reassurance was given that the agreed budget was being monitored regularly and all efforts were being made to deliver the project on budget. In terms of inflationary pressures, it was explained that at present, the demand in the Manchester construction market outstripped supply and as a result complex project such as the Factory were not as appealing to the supply chain as more simpler projects. As such some of the supply chain were less active in some of the key components of the factory.

The Chair suggested as well as information on apprenticeship starts being sent to Members of the Committee, a report should be submitted to the Ethical Procurement Sub Group on apprentices, including the gender breakdown and BAME background and the issues that had occurred between the Management Contractor and the Trade Unions.

Furthermore, the Director of Capital Programmes advised that it was not possible to give an absolute assurance there would be no need for any further capital investment due to the nature and complexity of the project. Only 11 of the 32 works packages had been let so far and the Council was still in design and negotiation with the supply chain on some of the remaining packages of work. He did advise that this was being monitored closely and steps had been taken to reduce some of the cost and inflationary pressures.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

RGSC/19/65 Progress of Expenditure - Northern and Eastern Gateway Programmes

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided a progress update in relation to investment being made by the Council in delivering the Northern and Eastern Gateway programmes, which in total were anticipated to deliver in excess of 21,000 new homes over a 15 – 20 year period and create or safeguard 2,200 jobs.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- Budgetary allocations of £25m (Northern Gateway) and £47m (Eastern Gateway) had been made available from the Capital Programme 2017 – 2022 to help unlock and maximise the potential of these areas;
- The scale of the Northern Gateway opportunity and associated challenges;
- Details of the investment to support both the Northern Gateway and Eastern Gateway initiatives, including co-investment with joint venture partners;
- Progress to date in terms of expenditure, including the acquisition of Central Retail Park and The Courtyard at Royal Mills; and
- Detail of remedial works undertaken around New Islington Marina.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- What would be the consequence to the Council should the bid for £51.6m from the Government's Housing Infrastructure Fund, to tackle constraints to development in the Lower Irk Valley neighbourhood, be unsuccessful;
- Clarification was sought as to whether the bid for £51.6m from the Housing Infrastructure Fund was by Manchester City Council or whether this was a bid on behalf the Combined Authority;
- Was there still a proposal for a new tram stop within the Northern gateway programme; and
- If the bid to the Government's Housing Infrastructure Fund was unsuccessful, would this impact on the ability to deliver the target of 20% affordable housing (equating to 3000 properties) within the Northern Gateway programme.

The Committee was advised that the Council was remaining optimistic in terms of the outcome of the bid submitted. The Council had been in detailed negotiations with Homes England for a significant period of time and had been through a detailed process of due diligence in relation to the bid. However, should the bid be unsuccessful in part or whole, the Council had identified a range of scenarios as to how the Council would intend to progress with both programmes. The Leader added that in the event of the bid being unsuccessful the likely impact would be that the development programme would be lengthened in terms of completion rather than scaled back or abandoned.

The Leader advised that the £51.6m bid was originally a joint between Manchester Council and Salford Council, supported by the Combined Authority, but having taken advice from Government, the Council had separated its bid from Salford's bid, as it was suggested that this would result in a higher chance of both bids being successful.

Officers explained that the Transport Strategy for 2040 still proposed a new tram stop within the Northern Gateway programme and the Council was in discussions with TfGM around a pre-feasibility study.

The Leader explained that within the Strategic Framework for the Irk Valley and Collyhurst area of the Northern Gateway, the Council expected that at least 3000 properties would meet the Council's definition of affordability. There would be a number of controls in relation to this, the most important being approval by the Executive of the Business Plan, which would be required to provide detail on how the Council intended to deliver this number of affordable homes.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

RGSC/19/66 Capital Requirements and Anticipated Borrowing

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which informed Members of the Council's capital financing position, forecast borrowing, and the impact on the Council's balance sheet and revenue budget. The report also reviewed the changes to Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) borrowing rates announced in October 2019.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- The context of the Council's approach to managing its debt, which had been to minimise cash balances by delaying taking external debt;
- Changes in internal borrowing to create revenue savings compared to the cost of externalising the debt and holding cash;
- Interest rate expectations over the next three years;
- An overview of the Council's borrowing strategy, which was based on aggregating the debt needs of the Council to achieve the optimum risk balance in debt management;
- The forecast borrowing requirements from 2019/20 to 2023/24;
- Revenue implications of new debt for the medium term; and
- The impact and potential future implications to the Council in relation to the PWLB rate policy change.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Rather than increase the PWLB rate, could Government not have tightened the rules up in regards to public sector borrowing;
- As the PWLB rate had historically been low, had the Council and other local authorities simply become accustomed to borrowing at a low rate of interest;

- How was the Council lobbying Government to review the change in the PWLB rate;
- Which regeneration schemes, where a return on investment was expected, were likely to be affected by the change in the PWLB policy;
- What was the Council's borrowing cost in terms of the potential impact on the revenue budget;
- Had any potential equalities impact been taken in to consideration in connection to borrowing costs and the increased impact on the Council's revenue budget, which was largely spent on groups with a protected characteristic; and
- What were the benefits and potential drawbacks for potentially borrowing from the private sector in the future.

The Leader advised that the 1% increase of the PWLB borrowing rate was unlikely to stop local authorities investing in certain ventures, but more likely it would have an impact on more marginal schemes such as affordable housing taking place and as such he felt this was a counterproductive measure.

The Deputy City Treasurer advised that the Council had become used to borrowing money at a low rate of interest, however, she provided an assurance that when the Council set its capital programme, it was set against the slightly higher PWLB rate towards the end of 2018, to ensure that the existing capital programme was predominantly budgeted for at that time, meaning that the programme remained affordable. The consequence of the increase in the PWLB rate was the impact on the viability of any future schemes.

The Committee was also advised that in terms of lobby government, the City Treasure had contacted a number influential organisations, including a number of other Local Authorities and the LGA, to enable a concerted response to the proposed increase. As well as this the City Treasurer had spoken to HM Treasury and the Department for Communities and Local Government to seek an explanation and the reasons for the increase.

The Leader advised that in terms of regeneration schemes likely to be affected, this would likely relate to any future schemes where the Council was required to invest. He also advised that in terms of borrowing costs, there were two elements that needed to be taken into account, the minimum revenue provision and interest. The totality of this was that in any given year the Council repaid approximately 4.5% of its total borrowing. Due to the way the Council set the interest when it fixed its capital budget, it meant that the Council would likely need to increase its revenue provision in 2021/22.

The Deputy City Treasurer reported that as part of the business cases for capital investment, a number of factors would be considered, including strategic fit, economic case, social value outputs and carbon implications and the impact on equalities would be built into part. It was suggested that going forward this could be something that was looked at more explicitly in future business cases for investment proposals.

Furthermore, the Committee was advised that the Council had always borrowed from the PWLB due to the ease of which loan funding could be accessed and good

interests rates. At the present moment the Council was waiting to see how the other market participants responded to the PWLB increase in relation to how local authorities could access borrowing and associated restructure payments.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

RGSC/19/67 Overview Report

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit, responses to previous recommendations. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

Health Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2019

Present:

Councillor Farrell – in the Chair
Councillors Clay, Curley, Holt, Mary Monaghan, Newman, Riasat and Wills

Apologies: O'Neil

Also present:

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing
Nick Gomm, Director of Corporate Affairs, Manchester Health and Care
Commissioning (MHCC)
Michelle Irvine, Director of Quality & Performance, MHCC
Neil Walbran, Chief Officer, Healthwatch Manchester
Vicky Szulist, Chair, Healthwatch Manchester
Tony Ullman, Deputy Director, Primary Care Integration, MHCC
Dr Manisha Kumar, Medical Director, MHCC
Mark Edwards, Chief Operating Officer, Manchester Local Care Organisation
Marie Rowland, Associate Director Performance, Manchester University NHS Trust
Dr Sarah Follon
Dr Craig Ferguson

HSC/19/39 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 8 October 2019 as a correct record.

HSC/19/40 Primary Care Access in Manchester

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Director, Primary Care Integration, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC) that provided Members with an update on access to Primary Medical Care in Manchester; both in core and also extended hours.

The Deputy Director, Primary Care Integration, MHCC referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Access to General Practice during core hours;
- Information on the 9 Primary Care Standards;
- Extended hours population coverage and Primary Care Networks;
- Patient and public perspectives of Primary Care access;
- An update on the enhanced 7 day access service;
- National review of Access;
- Developing a model for integrated urgent and enhanced access;

- Digital access and Manchester's Strategy for Primary Care Information Management and Technology; and
- Inclusion Health – Safe Surgeries designed to ensure that Manchester's Primary Care system is properly inclusive to all groups and communities.

Members discussed the difficulties they had experienced in securing GP appointments, commenting that the requirement to call at a specified time, often to find that there were no appointments left and was asked to call back the next day was not acceptable. Members commented that there was no triage of patients applied and there was a first come / first served system and further questioned the findings of the patient survey that reported that 69% of patients found it fairly to very easy to get through to someone at their GP surgery on the phone, slightly above the national average of 68%.

Dr Kumar described that Primary Care was experiencing significant pressures due to an ageing population with complex health needs. She said that whilst it was recognised that some patients still required face to face consultations, the options of providing online consultations and telephone consultations, where appropriate were being considered. She described that consideration would be given to understand what patients required from this offer, adding that it needed to be appropriate for patients. She stated that this would also reduce the demand at GP surgeries for appointments and help alleviate the experiences described by Members when telephoning surgeries.

Dr Kumar responded to a question from a Member by explaining that GPs were required to review patients' medications, even if they had been prescribed by a Consultant as responsibility was with the GP. She stated that it was correct and appropriate to undertake periodic health checks, such as blood pressure monitoring to ensure patients remained safe and healthy.

A Member commented that the closure of Walk In Centres had a detrimental impact on residents ability to access GP appointments, with the result that patients presented at Emergency Departments that resulted in additional pressures on these services. The Member further commented that more needed to be done to publicise the availability of the extended hours and enhanced offer provided through the Primary Care Networks. He said that leaflets and posters needed to be prominently displayed in GP surgery waiting areas, in addition to reception staff informing their patients.

The Deputy Director, Primary Care Integration, MHCC stated that there were three Walk In Centres in Manchester and the intention was to incorporate this model to complement and support other offers.

In response to a question regarding the number of Did Not Attends at extended hour appointments Dr Kumar reported that they were currently at 10%, and this reflected the number of Did Not Attends at GP practices. She said that the system had been improved so that patients could now cancel appointments using a text message service. Members recommended that consideration should be given to sending appointment reminder messages also.

Members welcomed the Inclusion Health programme, a range of initiatives and programmes to ensure that Manchester's Primary Care system is properly inclusive to all groups and communities.

The Deputy Director, Primary Care Integration, MHCC informed the Committee that the introduction of Primary Care Standards provided a better offer to patients and addressed the issue of variation that had previously been evident in GP Primary Care. He stated that mystery shopping exercises would be undertaken to assess how these standards were implemented. In response to a specific question regarding the number of single or two doctor Practices in Manchester, he said these were extremely low and he would circulate this information following the meeting. He further informed the Committee that Surgeries could close for training and development purposes only when reasonable alternatives and satisfactory arrangements had been agreed for their patients.

Decision

To note the report.

HSC/19/41 Healthwatch: Primary Care Access in Manchester

The Committee considered the report submitted by Healthwatch Manchester that assessed the impact of their report 'Week Spot?' a Review of Access to the 7 Day GP Service published in 2017.

The Chief Officer, Healthwatch Manchester referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Describing the objectives and rationale of the report;
- The methodology employed to undertake the review;
- Describing the key findings, including comparative data; and
- Conclusions.

The Chief Officer, Healthwatch Manchester commented that he recognised that improvements had been made in regard to access to Primary Care however more could be done to promote and publicise the extended appointment offer to patients. In response to comments from Members regarding the subjectivity of the findings provided within the report, in particular in regard to levels of politeness, the Chief Office, Healthwatch Manchester informed the Committee that there was a third person listening into the call who could offer an opinion also.

A Member commented that more needed to be done to publicise the availability of the extended hours and enhanced offer. He said that leaflets and posters needed to be prominently displayed in all GP surgery waiting areas, in addition to reception staff informing their patients and online information.

In response to a comment from a Member regarding potential barriers to patients accessing online appointments and other online support, the Chair, Healthwatch Manchester commented that their studies had indicated that this did not present as

much of a barrier as had been suggested.

In response to comments made regarding postcode barriers to registration in central Manchester experienced by homeless people and temporary residents, the Director of Corporate Affairs, MHCC informed the Chair that he would provide a briefing note to Members.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing acknowledged a comment from the Chair, Healthwatch Manchester regarding the confusion created regarding the different wording used to describe the extended offer. She stated that a preferred description would be 'evening and weekend access' to avoid any confusion or ambiguity.

Decisions

1. The Committee welcome the report produced by Healthwatch Manchester and fully endorse their recommendations.
2. The Committee recommend that the Deputy Director, Primary Care Integration, MHCC ensures that leaflets and posters promoting evening and weekend appointments are prominently displayed in all GP surgery waiting areas, in addition to reception staff informing their patients and online information.

HSC/19/42 Winter Pressures

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Performance and Quality Improvement, MHCC and Trafford Clinical Commissioning Group and the Director of Adult Social Services which provided an overview of urgent care winter planning for 2019/20. It contained information on the joint system-wide planning taking place across the Manchester urgent care system, the surge and escalation approach taken in order to manage periods of pressure and the resulting impact on key performance targets.

The Director of Quality & Performance, MHCC referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- The approach to winter resilience planning;
- Describing a range of key interventions and processes that outline the Manchester approach to winter planning;
- An update on the Integrated Discharge Team; and
- Information on the Manchester Community Response.

Members welcomed the report and recognised that it was a system wide response to the challenge of winter pressures. A Member commented that he recognised that the system experienced pressures year round.

The Chair sought an assurance that similar winter planning preparations were underway at the North Manchester General Hospital site. The Director of Quality & Performance, MHCC reassured the Committee that detailed plans had been

developed by the Pennine Acute Hospital Trust. Members requested that further information on the Winter Planning activity for the North Manchester General Hospital site be provided to the Committee following the meeting.

In response to a question from a Member regarding the additional capacity at MRI the Director of Quality & Performance, MHCC advised that 12 beds had been secured for winter pressures and 8 beds for major trauma. In response to whether this would be enough to meet the demand, Members were advised that there was always an issue of capacity and safe staffing levels also had to be taken into consideration.

The Director of Adult Social Services responded to a question regarding resilience of the care home market by stating that commissioners were working closely with providers to ensure there was enough capacity to meet demand on a long term basis. She further commented that homeless people were being discharged from hospital into high quality accommodation in community settings.

The Chief Operating Officer, Manchester Local Care Organisation further commented that the integrated discharge service, that brought medical and social care staff together in a team that had been developed in north Manchester would be rolled out across the city. Members requested that they be kept regularly updated on the Delayed Transfer of Care figures across Manchester. The Director of Quality & Performance, MHCC confirmed that these figures were collated and could be provided to the Committee. She commented that the main reasons for Delayed Transfer of Care were; awaiting assessment by Social Worker, awaiting a place in a care home and patient/family preference as to where to be discharged to.

A Member commented that following the implementation of the Single Hospital Service there had been a decrease in engagement with local ward Councillors in the Wythenshawe area. The Associate Director Performance, Manchester University NHS Trust acknowledged these comments and stated that these would be fed back. She further commented that the delivery of the Single Hospital Service had allowed for the better deployment of staff across sites to best respond to demand. She commented that this had also been welcomed by staff as they were able to obtain a range of experiences and skills by working across the sites footprint. She further commented that the Wythenshawe site had seen increased presentations from Stockport residents as it was perceived by them to be a better environment to be treated.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing stated that the report demonstrated a coordinated system wide response to the challenge of winter pressures. She commented that community and social services were recognised as important contributors to this model and they remained committed to delivering the best services for the residents of Manchester. She stated that despite this Social Care funding remained inadequate. She stated that there had been no increase in Social Care funding in real terms since 2010 when taking into account inflation, the increase in population and an ageing population.

Decisions

1. To note the report.
2. Members requested that the Director of Performance and Quality Improvement, MHCC provide a regular update on the Delayed Transfer of Care figures across Manchester.
3. Members requested that information on the Winter Planning activity for North Manchester General Hospital be circulated to Members.

HSC/19/43 Overview Report

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

Decision

To note the report and approve the work programme.

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2019

Present:

Councillor Stone – in the Chair

Councillors Alijah, Cooley, Hewitson, T Judge, Kilpatrick, Lovecy, Reeves and Reid

Co-opted Voting Members:

Mr A Arogundade, Parent Governor Representative

Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative

Ms Z Stepan, Parent Governor Representative

Co-opted Non Voting Members:

Mr L Duffy, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools

Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure

Councillor Igbon, Ward Councillor for Hulme

Jeff Seneviratne, Supporter of Ghyll Head Outdoor Education Centre

Justin Watson, Young Manchester

Toni Good, Barlow Moor Community Association

Apologies:

Councillors Madeleine Monaghan and Wilson

Mrs J Miles, Representative of the Diocese of Salford

Mr R Lammas, Primary Sector Teacher Representative

CYP/19/44 Minutes

The Chair informed the Committee that this was the last meeting for Ms Stepan, Mr Arogundade and Mr Lammas, due to their terms of office as Co-opted Members finishing, and thanked them for their contributions.

Decision

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2019.

CYP/19/45 Update on the Planned Manchester Healthy Weight Strategy to Tackle Obesity and Update on Progress in Delivering the Manchester Reducing Infant Mortality Strategy

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Public Health/Population Health Consultant in Public Health which provided an overview of the health data for Manchester children in relation to childhood obesity and infant mortality. Information was provided on the causes and impact of obesity and the work taking place to develop a Manchester Healthy Weight Strategy 2020-2025, which would take a whole system, partnership approach to tackling obesity in the city. The report included an update on new service models being commissioned to reduce obesity in children and their families. It also summarised the progress that had been made in

delivering the Manchester Reducing Infant Mortality Strategy following its publication in March 2019.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Childhood obesity;
- Measuring obesity in children;
- Cause and impact of obesity;
- Developing a new Healthy Weight Strategy to tackle obesity;
- Commissioned Services - Healthy Weight;
- Obesity and safeguarding;
- Reducing infant mortality;
- Patterns and trends in infant deaths;
- Summary of Manchester Reducing Infant Mortality Strategy; and
- Progress on delivering the Reducing Infant Mortality Strategy.

The Consultant in Public Health reported that there was an error in table 2 (Infant Mortality Data for 2018 - Manchester and England) under point 9.2 and clarified that the neonatal period was 0-28 days, not 7-28 days, as stated in the table.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- What could be done to address the increase in obesity between reception and Year 6, noting that this was above the national average;
- The impact of poverty and deprivation;
- Reasons behind the increase in infant mortality;
- Drinking during pregnancy and whether the Committee could consider Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder at a future meeting;
- The impact of takeaways, particularly those close to schools, and whether there should be more regulation of this;
- The impact of smoking on infant mortality; and
- Why stillbirths were not included in the infant mortality figures.

The Consultant in Public Health advised the Committee that tackling child obesity required working not just in schools but also with families and in the community. The Commissioning Manager (Starting Well) reported that the Population Health Team had reviewed their approach to tackling child obesity, advising that Public Health England had advocated a whole system approach. The Consultant in Public Health explained that this involved a range of partners such as the Early Help Hubs, Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO) and Licensing working together to tackle obesity and advised that a workshop was being planned to bring different partners together to develop a shared approach. The Manchester Healthy Weight Strategy Lead author informed Members that the Healthy Weight Strategy was due to be published in Spring 2020 and informed Members of some of the other partners to be involved in this including businesses, transport and the Food Board.

The Commissioning Manager (Starting Well) reported that the Healthy Schools Team had a dedicated weight management project. He advised that his service had

recently commissioned this team to do some additional work focusing on reception age children and that work was also starting to take place with the 0 – 5 year age range.

The Consultant in Public Health noted the relationship between deprivation and both childhood obesity and infant mortality rates and advised that this could explain the increase in infant mortality in the city. She highlighted that poverty was linked to poor housing conditions and other factors which impacted on infant mortality rates and informed Members that this was incorporated into the strategy. The Executive Member for Children and Schools advised Members that poverty also led families towards poor food choices such as cheap takeaway meals. He informed Members about the midwife-led smoking cessation programme at St Mary's Hospital and suggested that the Committee might want to look at this in future.

In response to a Member's question, the Consultant in Public Health reported that she would contact the Member outside of the meeting to provide him with more detail on the data and analysis behind the information in the report. The Chair supported this and commented that, if there was any additional information for circulation to the wider Committee, to do this via the Scrutiny Support Officer.

The Programme Lead reported that the infant mortality rate was a national measure so officers could not change it to include stillbirths; however, she advised that the work being done in Manchester to reduce infant mortality, for example work to reduce smoking in pregnancy and to raise public awareness about changes in foetal movement, should also reduce stillbirths. She advised Members that her team was monitoring stillbirth rates, despite this not being included in the infant mortality rate figure.

Decisions

1. To support the proposed Manchester Healthy Weight Strategy to reduce obesity.
2. To receive a report on Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder at a future meeting.

[Councillor Alijah declared a personal interest as a member of the steering group of the charity Safety4Sisters.]

CYP/19/46 Ghyll Head Outdoor Education Centre

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education and the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which set out the work that had been undertaken to examine the option of progressing a new operating arrangement for Ghyll Head as part of the Council's wider leisure contract.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Background information;
- The current situation;
- The capital proposal;

- Controlling risk; and
- Next steps.

Jeff Seneviratne outlined his involvement with Ghyll Head, including as a member of the Friends of Ghyll Head. He emphasised the value of outdoor education and welcomed the work outlined in the report. He noted the references in the report to the 50% occupancy rate at Ghyll Head and informed Members that it was unrealistic to expect a 100% occupancy rate because, for example, a school could book the house for one class which would not require all the beds. He advised that the Council should consider how usage of the centre could best be measured. He commented that he hoped the centre could be used to provide outdoor education not only to children but also to families to improve their health and well-being.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- That Ghyll Head was a well-loved and valuable provision;
- Members shared positive experiences of Ghyll Head from themselves, their family members and other Manchester residents, including Our Children (Looked After Children);
- That the centre could also be used by families whose children were on the edge of care;
- That, with capital investment, Ghyll Head could be marketed commercially, at a higher rate, at weekends;
- Concern that some parents could not afford to send their children to Ghyll Head, while noting that some schools used their own funds to subsidise places;
- The importance of not changing the ethos of the centre; and
- That some schools did not use it.

The Director of Education reported that the intention for the future was that Ghyll Head would not be just a one-off positive experience but something that introduced children to an activity which they could then continue to take part in once they were back in Manchester, for example, at Debdale Outdoor Centre. She confirmed that a number of schools did subsidise places at Ghyll Head for their pupils, advising that schools could use their Pupil Premium, money given to schools to improve the attainment of disadvantaged pupils, on this. The Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events) advised that the contracting arrangements would allow the Council to control the prices and protect prices for Manchester schools. The Director of Education commented that some schools did take their pupils to other centres which also offered similar activities but that this investment would enable Ghyll Head to compete with them.

The Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events) reported that Ghyll Head did not currently have a dedicated website and that this was something that would need to be invested in in order for the centre to be able to attract commercial bookings. He advised Members that the ethos and values of Ghyll Head were due to its workforce and that the Council intended to protect the current workforce through this transition period while also giving the centre an element of commercial focus.

The Ward Councillor for Hulme expressed her support for the proposals in the report. She emphasised the importance of recruiting experienced staff, commenting that the centre currently had high quality, experienced staff. She reported that play and youth services and colleges also used Ghyll Head and that they should be encouraged to use it more. She also noted the proposal to establish a Stakeholder Board to oversee and govern the management of the centre and suggested that representatives from the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee and the Friends of Ghyll Head could be involved in this.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure commented that the Council wanted to increase the use of Ghyll Head by Manchester residents and that this included encouraging play and youth providers to use the centre. He reported that consideration would be given as to how to engage Members in the work of the Stakeholder Board.

Decisions

1. To support the proposals in the report wholeheartedly and to recommend to the Executive that the Council invest £1.1 million in capital to achieve this.
2. To recommend that officers look into how Ghyll Head could be used by families whose children are on the edge of care.
3. To request that consideration be given as to how Members and the Friends of Ghyll Head can be engaged in the work of the Stakeholder Board.

CYP/19/47 Youth Strategy and Engagement

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided a summary of the Our Manchester Youth Offer Strategy which replaced the Valuing Young People Strategy 2016 - 2019. It was the city's multi-sector strategic framework jointly owned by Manchester City Council, its partners and stakeholders, all of whom were responsible for making sure that young people had access to a high quality-driven youth offer that addressed both universal and targeted needs and which directly contributed to and enabled young people to grow into responsible, independent and successful adults. The Committee was invited to comment on the report prior to its submission to the Executive on 13 November 2019.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Our Manchester Youth Offer Strategy 2019 – 2025;
- Workshops and engagement events;
- Outcomes and success;
- Strategy document production;
- Delivery of the strategy; and
- Next steps.

The Committee watched a video produced by Members of Manchester Youth Council (MYC). The video included Youth Council Members talking about the MYC, its new election model and how MYC had helped to shape the Youth Strategy.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- To thank the young people for their contribution;
- To welcome the report;
- That Stockton Council had adopted a similar approach which had been very effective, that they had developed an action plan from this work and that it would be useful to look at some of things they had done;
- The importance of play provision;
- To request demographic information on the young people accessing youth services, particularly the youth hubs, including by ward; and
- The importance of universal youth services and of reaching out to young people who were not currently accessing youth services or communicating their views through MYC.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure informed Members how MYC was being developed as a membership organisation which all young people could join and get involved in to different levels. He advised that it was important for all young people to have a mechanism to raise any issues that concerned them and that the Council was creating a website through which any young person could raise an issue.

The Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth) agreed that play provision was important, informing Members that there were over 100 play areas in Manchester parks. He reported that over the previous 12 months approximately £1.3 million had been invested in commissioning play activities across the city and it was hoped that this could be increased, with Young Manchester playing a key role in bringing in additional funding.

The Head of Youth Strategy reported that Manchester had a higher level of youth engagement than other areas of the country, citing that 50.3% of Manchester young people had taken part in the Make Your Mark ballot, compared to 18.6% nationally, but that the Council wanted to improve this further. She advised Members that her service was working to reach young people who did not currently access youth services or visit other facilities such as libraries by using detached youth workers to talk to young people where they were. She agreed that Stockton Council had a good reputation for their Youth Strategy work and informed Members that her service was working to put together an action plan for the Youth Strategy, which would be wide-ranging and involve work with other services.

Decisions

1. To request demographic information on the young people accessing youth services, particularly the youth hubs, including by ward.
2. To endorse the recommendations to the Executive that:

The Executive is recommended to:

1. To agree, subject to budget, the continuation of investment into Young Manchester for the next 3 years, on the basis that Young Manchester uses this as leverage to grow external investment to support the sector.
2. To consider and approve the adoption of the proposed vision, strategic themes and 'We Wills' to deliver the Strategy over the next 3 years.
3. Delegate authority to the Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth) in consultation with the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure to complete the production of the strategy document for communication with young people, partners and the Youth Sector.
4. Delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer in consultation with the City Solicitor and Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure to finalise the contract value following conclusion of the VAT assessment to ensure that the contract fee is delivered within the available budget.
5. Delegate authority to the City Solicitor to enter into, complete and execute any documents or agreements necessary to give effect to the recommendations in this report.

[Councillor Stone declared a personal interest as a trustee of HOME.]

[Councillor Alijah declared a personal interest as chair of the Hideaway Youth Project.]

CYP/19/48 Youth and Play Services - Young Manchester

The Committee received a report of the Director of Neighbourhoods which provided an overview of the progress of Young Manchester, an independent youth and play charity, and its contract with the Council to commission the city's Youth and Play Fund Programme. It presented an update on progress made since the establishment of the fund in April 2018, focusing on outcomes for children and young people and the growth and development of the city's youth and play sector.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Background to the Youth and Play Fund;
- Impact and outcomes;
- Feedback from children and young people;
- Further investment in children and young people;
- Building a national platform for Manchester; and
- Youth and Play Fund 2020.

The Ward Councillor for Hulme welcomed what had been achieved despite the budget cuts. She emphasised the importance of tackling knife crime and requested further information on the next commissioning round.

Some of the key points and themes that arose from the Committee's discussions

were:

- The importance of universal youth services;
- That a lack of facilities such as toilets and changing facilities in parks presented a barrier for parents and grandparents wanting to take children to the park, that better information could make people aware of facilities in park cafes but that, where available, these were still only open for limited hours;
- How funding could be identified for work such as repairing swings in parks; and
- How smaller organisations which did not have expertise in writing bids could be supported to obtain funding.

The Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth) informed Members about a new website which was being developed which would provide information on all youth and play services across the city and which would be integrated with the MCR Active website. He advised Members that this would enable the Council and Young Manchester to have a better understanding on where there were gaps in provision. The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure outlined how this information would be gathered at a local level.

The Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth) reported that individual park plans were being developed for each park to identify the highest priority work that needed to be done in that park, following which sources of funding could be identified. He advised Members that the Council was releasing £12.5 million to invest in its parks and that his service was looking at ways to reduce demand on the parks budget and to generate income.

Justin Watson from Young Manchester reported that part of his organisation's role was as an infrastructure organisation, supporting organisations, particularly smaller community organisations, so that they were in a better position to access funding, not just from Young Manchester but from other sources. He informed the Committee that Young Manchester had just launched the new Youth and Play Fund 2020 and he offered to share information on this with Members, as well as more details of the rationale for previous decisions which had been made about funding.

Toni Good, a Youth Worker from Barlow Moor Community Association, outlined what her organisation delivered and how it and the young people she worked with had benefited from working with Young Manchester. She informed Members that the Youth and Play Workers in her organisation did not have expertise in areas such as art and drama but that through the network meetings organised by Young Manchester they had been able to make links with people with that expertise and provide new opportunities for their young people. She also informed Members about a social action project their young people had taken part in through which they had been able to achieve some of the improvements they had wanted to see in their local area. She reported that this had made them feel that they were being listened to and keener to make their voices heard in future.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure reported that this year's Make Your Mark ballot had identified youth violence as the top priority for young people. He advised the Committee that this needed a multi-agency approach and assured

Members that the Council would play its part in this.

The Chair noted that the report recommended that the Committee receive a further report in November 2021 but requested that this be received in November 2020 instead.

Decisions

1. To recommend that a further report be brought back to Members in November 2020, which focuses on qualitative and quantitative data, evidence of impact, outcomes and young people's feedback relating to the Youth and Play Fund 2020/2022.
2. To note the offer from Justin Watson from Young Manchester to share information on the new Youth and Play Fund 2020 with Members, as well as more details of the rationale for previous decisions which had been made about funding.
3. To request that clear information on the availability of toilet facilities, for example, in park cafes, be included on signage in parks.

[Councillor Alijah declared a personal interest as chair of the Hideaway Youth Project.]

CYP/19/49 Overview Report

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit was submitted. The overview report contained key decisions within the Committee's remit, responses to previous recommendations and the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to approve.

A Member asked for information on concealed pregnancy to be included in a future report. Another Member noted that the Committee had requested a report on Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder under an earlier agenda item.

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme, subject to the above amendments.

Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 7 November 2019

Present:

Councillor Hacking - In the Chair

Councillors Andrews, Chambers, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Grimshaw, Hitchen, Kirkpatrick and Rawson

Councillor Leese, Leader of the Council

Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader

Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure

Councillor Kilpatrick, Deputy Leader of the Opposition

Councillor Davies, Ward Councillor for Deansgate

Councillor Johns, Ward Councillor for Deansgate

Councillor Lyons, Ward Councillor for Piccadilly

Councillor Whiston, Ward Councillor for Sharston

Kathy Cosgrove, Greater Manchester Law Centre

Dr Morag Rose, University of Liverpool

John McGrath, Manchester International Festival (MIF)

Ciaron Wilkinson, MIF

Apologies:

Councillors M Dar and Rawlins

CESC/19/43 Minutes

Decisions

1. To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 10 October 2019 as a correct record.
2. To receive the minutes of the meeting of the Review of Advice Services in Manchester Task and Finish Group held on 30 September 2019.

CESC/19/44 Our Manchester Disability Plan

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Adult Services which provided an update on progress with the Our Manchester Disability Plan (OMDP), including the recent refresh of the Plan and the new Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) for the Social Model of Disability. It also included updates from each of the current OMDP workstreams as well as a progress report on the Council's Disability Confident Scheme.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:

- An update on the Health and Social Care Workstream;
- Children and Young People update;
- Work and Skills update;

- Transport update; and
- The Disability Confident Scheme.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- Educational attainment of young people with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND);
- Delays in pupils with SEND receiving an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) and what support was available to parents of disabled children;
- The importance of considering mental health as part of the work on long-term health conditions and the social model of disability; and
- The problems some disabled people faced in accessing their own local area, for example, due to people parking cars across dropped kerbs and pavements and that work should take place with the Highways Team to address this.

The Chair commented that the Lead Member for Disability had been unable to attend the meeting but read out some comments she had wanted to make. These highlighted the breadth of the work taking place outside of the Board structure and through all the workstreams. Her comments also highlighted the work taking place to improve the accessibility of the Peterloo Memorial and to improve the Council's internal systems as well as initiatives taking place across the city such as Purple Tuesday the following week where the Christmas markets would open earlier and district centres like Wythenshawe would be supporting a quiet hour where loud instore music would be turned off and there would be more visible support for disabled shoppers.

The SEND Lead outlined the work taking place to improve educational outcomes for pupils with SEND, advising that her service reported regularly to the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee on this. She informed Members that there had been a significant increase in application for EHCPs so the Statutory Assessment Team which dealt with these applications was being re-designed to meet the demand. She suggested that progress on this be included in a future report. She informed Members that parents could access an impartial information, advice and support service and could also receive support from volunteer Parent Champions. A Member commented that he would welcome updates on the timescales for the EHCP along with examples of any cases where the process had not worked well for the young person so that the Committee could identify areas for improvement.

The Public Health Specialist advised that other Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) topic papers were being worked on which focused on mental health and that these were documents which were being updated and would be cross-referenced.

The Strategic Lead (Commissioning) reported that the problem of obstructions on pavements was something that had been raised by many disabled people as an issue for them. She advised that a public awareness campaign was needed to highlight to the general public how this impacted on disabled people but that this would require some resources. She confirmed that her team would engage with the Highways Team on this issue.

Decision

To note the report.

CESC/19/45 Proposed City Centre Public Spaces Protection Order

The Committee received a report of the Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety which provided an update on the outcome of the consultation for the city centre proposed Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO).

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:

- Background information;
- Supporting people with vulnerabilities;
- Evidence of issues of concern in Manchester city centre;
- The consultation and consultation responses;
- Consideration of the articles for a PSPO;
- The proposed PSPO;
- Enforcement;
- Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) and Human Rights; and
- Next steps.

Kathy Cosgrove from Greater Manchester Law Centre expressed concern about the lawfulness and fairness of the consultation. She advised that it did not include enough information, for example, on existing powers, to enable respondents to make an informed decision. She also stated that it was not balanced and that the way it was carried out as an online consultation meant that it did not target and was not accessible to some of the people who would be most impacted by the proposal, particularly homeless people. She also advised that the consultation responses were not presented fairly, not showing the full range of responses to the open text questions. She reported that the evidence presented did not demonstrate justification for the proposed PSPO, stating that it did not demonstrate that it would achieve its aims and that the benefits would outweigh the risk of harm. She expressed concern that the PSPO would indirectly discriminate against homeless people who could not avoid breaching it and were often members of other minority groups. She outlined the significant challenges facing homeless people and stated that the report did not address the additional risk of harm to this group which, she advised, the proposed PSPO would present. She stated that many professionals in this area of work and related fields were opposed to the proposed PSPO. She also reported that some other local authorities had introduced similar measures which had not been successful. A Member supported her comments.

Dr Morag Rose from the University of Liverpool outlined her concerns about the consultation, stating that it included leading and ambiguous questions, that it had received very few responses from homeless people, that some shop workers in the area had been coerced by their managers to complete it and that the analysis was flawed. She advised that there was academic evidence against the use of PSPOs to address the behaviours outlined. She also expressed concern that the proposed

PSPO could criminalise protest and that it sent a negative message about attitudes towards homeless people.

The Ward Councillors for the city centre wards of Deansgate and Piccadilly were invited to comment on the proposals. They provided a number of examples of the negative effect of the current situation on local residents, including repeated instances of people urinating and defecating outside their homes, alcohol consumption and associated litter and fighting, drug dealing and drug paraphernalia, receiving abuse and blocked entrances to residential buildings, which made residents feel intimidated going into and out of their home. A Ward Councillor for Deansgate noted that it was important not to penalise vulnerable people for unavoidable behaviour, that this had been given consideration in the proposals, and that this was the reason they had requested and obtained 24-hour access to the public toilets on Lloyd Street. He advised that it was important to provide support to people experiencing this issue from both sides and to find a solution that worked for everyone. Another Ward Councillor for Deansgate reported that begging in the city centre had increased and this was often not by people who were rough sleeping. She reported that local residents were sympathetic to the situation of vulnerable people but that the issue needed to be addressed. She reported that the police and Council officers did not just take enforcement action against vulnerable people but assessed their vulnerabilities and offered support to them. She outlined the dangers of people sleeping in tents and in doorways, which were often fire escapes.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition reported that, while he accepted the points in the report about commercial waste and anti-social behaviour related to drinking and drug-taking, he was concerned about how the proposed PSPO would impact on vulnerable people living on the streets. He advised that the proposed PSPO would be a blunt tool to deal with complex issues and, in his opinion, it was the wrong approach. He commented that more 24-hour toilets were needed across the city. He highlighted that article 8 of the proposed PSPO required the individual to provide their address to the Authorised Person, which a homeless person could not do. He questioned how the Committee could consider the proposals without knowing the enforcement protocol. He emphasised the need to consider the disproportionate impact on those living on the streets and the necessity and proportionality of the proposals.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- Recognition of the issues being experienced by city centre residents;
- The need to provide support to vulnerable people with complex needs;
- The importance of providing facilities such as 24-hour toilets and sharps bins for disposing of needles so that vulnerable people could avoid breaching the articles in the proposed PSPO;
- To ask what difference the PSPO would make and why this was preferable to using existing powers to tackle these issues;
- To question the appropriateness of fining vulnerable people with no means to pay a fine and the impact this would have on the relationship that Council officers were trying to build with these individuals to encourage them to engage with support services;
- Whether there was evidence that this would be effective;

- Whether a PSPO would just displace people outside the city centre rather than address the problem;
- That a significant number of the respondents to the consultation said the issues identified did not impact on their quality of life;
- How much money had been spent so far on the process for this PSPO, how much would it cost to implement and whether this money could be better spent on the valuable work the Council was already doing in this area; and
- That the Vagrancy Act 1824 should be reviewed.

The Deputy Leader commented that the main focus of Council officers engaging with these vulnerable groups was to encourage them to access support. He reported that the Council was engaging with pharmacies and other organisations over the provision of sharps bins. He advised that a review of the Vagrancy Act 1824 was underway.

The Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety reported that the PSPO was not intended to replace existing powers but to be an additional power and that the most appropriate power would be used in each case. She gave examples of how a PSPO would enable the Council to address issues in relation to waste which it was not able to do at present. She advised that it was hoped that the PSPO would have a deterrent effect and encourage vulnerable people to engage with services and that it would also reassure residents that these issues were being addressed.

The Community Safety Lead reported that, of the councils which had introduced similar PSPOs, some had revised them at the end of the initial period, some had extended them and some had terminated them; however, there were no published evaluations nationally about this use of PSPOs. She commented that, for Manchester City Council, the proposed PSPO was an opportunity to seek compliance and engage with individuals.

The Community Safety Lead reported that the analysis of the consultation responses had taken into account the responses to all the questions, including the open text responses, to determine how big a problem a particular behaviour was and what should be included in the PSPO. She outlined the current multi-agency approach, involving different Council teams, GMP and the voluntary sector, to encourage and enable vulnerable individuals to access support and that, where appropriate, they chose from a range of existing powers to address behaviours. She reported that the same approach would be used if the proposed PSPO was introduced. She advised the Committee that she could identify the costs of the consultation and the costs of implementation if the PSPO went ahead and share this information with Members.

Decisions

1. To thank everyone for sharing their views.
2. To ask the decision maker and Deputy Leader to take into account all the views raised when making their decision.
3. That if the decision maker wishes to respond to the Committee on any of the points raised, they are welcome to do so.

4. To note that the Community Safety Lead will share information on the costs of the consultation and the costs of implementation, if the PSPO goes ahead, with the Committee Members.

[Councillor Doswell declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as Secretary of the Tenants' Union and withdrew from the room for this item.]

CESC/19/46 Manchester International Festival 2019

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided information on the outcomes of the evaluation of the Manchester International Festival (MIF) 2019 and re-confirmed the funding arrangements for the 2021 Festival as approved by the Executive on 18 October 2017. The Committee was invited to comment on the report prior to its submission to the Executive on 13 November 2019.

John McGrath, Artistic Director and Chief Executive of MIF, referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:

- An assessment of the delivery of objectives for 2019;
- Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), sustainability and financial performance;
- The zero carbon agenda;
- Staffing; and
- Future planning.

The Leader highlighted the opening in 2021 of The Factory, which would be the new hub for the Festival, and reported that it was proposed to maintain the level of funding from the Council, supported by a significant investment from the Arts Council England towards the running of The Factory and to build MIF's capacity to run the Factory. He informed Members that the biennial MIF had previously been awarded funding from the Council every two years for the next Festival but that he would be recommending to the Executive that longer-term funding arrangements be put in place for MIF and The Factory.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- That this was a fantastic event and Members wanted to ensure that it was accessible to all residents;
- To request a ward breakdown of volunteers from Manchester;
- To request further information on what was being done to encourage people in areas with lower levels of engagement to access, participate in and volunteer at MIF, noting that some people could not afford even the discounted £10 tickets;
- What was being done to promote employment opportunities to local people;
- Whether 30% of attendees being from Manchester was sufficient and could more detailed information on where attendees were from be provided; and
- How the figure on the economic impact of MIF had been arrived at.

Ciaron Wilkinson, MIF's Cultural Connector, outlined the work he had undertaken over the previous 18 months to work with communities which were less likely to access arts and cultural activities, engaging with local partners such as Ward Councillors and the Council's Neighbourhood Teams and holding events and activities within the local area in order to increase residents' awareness of and willingness to participate in MIF.

John McGrath reported that a lot of outreach work had been carried out to recruit a diverse range of volunteers for this year's Festival and that this had been successful in recruiting volunteers from diverse backgrounds and, to a degree, in recruiting volunteers from a range of locations. He informed Members that the work that Ciaron Wilkinson had been doing had aimed to encourage residents in those wards to engage with MIF in a range of different ways, as audience members, as participants, as volunteers and as employees. He acknowledged that some people could not afford the discounted £10 tickets but reported that some free tickets were made available through local organisations and there were also a number of free events which were part of the MIF programme. He reported that his organisation was also working to address other barriers to people's attendance, for example, working with Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) regarding transport to events.

John McGrath outlined the range of methods his organisation had used to encourage local people to apply for jobs with MIF. He also informed Members about the traineeships which MIF had offered this year which had led to all seven apprentices going on to employment. He advised Members that the proportion of MIF employees from BME (Black and Minority Ethnic) communities had increased considerably and his organisation was aiming to increase recruitment from a range of wards across the city. He reported that his organisation was in a period of expansion and informed Members about the training programme which was being developed, stating that it would increase people's awareness, particularly young people's awareness, of the range of jobs available within the creative industries.

The Leader advised the Committee that there needed to be a balance of attendees from Manchester and people from further afield as the event was used to promote Manchester on the international stage. He highlighted that audience attendance was increasing overall, which included an increase in Manchester residents, and that Manchester residents were increasingly participating in the Festival in different ways, not just as audience members.

Decisions

1. To request a ward breakdown of volunteers from Manchester.
2. To request more detailed information on where MIF attendees were from.
3. To request information on the methodology used to calculate the economic impact of the Festival.
4. To endorse the recommendations to the Executive that:

The Executive is recommended to: -

1. Note the substantial achievements of the 2019 Festival in overachieving its objectives, particularly in continuing to grow its international reputation, increasing co-commissioning partnerships, record attendance levels and increased involvement by Manchester emerging artists;
2. Recognise and support the importance of maintaining public sector funding commitments in order to attract significant match funding from other public and private sector partners;
3. Delegate responsibility to the Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources and Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure to finalise the financial arrangements.

CESC/19/47 2019 City Centre Festive Delivery Programme

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided an update on the 2019 City Centre Festive Delivery Programme.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:

- Christmas Markets;
- Family Focused Festive Attractions;
- Christmas Lighting Scheme; and
- Christmas Light Switch On and New Year's Eve Celebrations.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- Why MIF boosted the economy by a greater amount than the Christmas Markets, when the former ran over a shorter period; and
- That future reports which estimate the economic impact of an event should be clearer on the detail of this.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure reported that the MIF attracted international visitors, artists, organisations and media and resulted in increased hotel occupancy rates and spending in the local economy, whereas the Christmas Markets mainly attracted people from across the region so the economic impact was not comparable.

Decisions

1. To note the report.
2. To request that further detail of how estimates of economic impact have been arrived at be included in a future report.

CESC/19/48 Widening Access and Participation in Leisure, Libraries, Galleries and Culture - Update and Cultural Impact Survey Data

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided an update about Widening Access to and Participation in Leisure, Libraries and Culture. The purpose of the Widening Access work was to understand resident engagement and to explore routes to increase participation among groups or communities that might be less engaged. The report highlighted progress made and outlined the priorities proposed for future work.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:

- The background to the Widening Access and Participation work;
- Data improvement;
- Wider access for under-represented groups;
- Leisure;
- Libraries, galleries and culture;
- Communication; and
- Resident engagement.

Councillor Whiston, Ward Councillor for Sharston, informed the Committee that he was the substitute for Councillor Stone on the Board of HOME. He highlighted the invisible barriers people faced if they were not used to participating in arts and culture, for example, if they did not go to the theatre when they were growing up and felt uncomfortable and did not know the etiquette of these environments. He advised that more work should be done with schools to encourage them to take pupils to the theatre and other cultural activities to break down these invisible barriers.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions were:

- To welcome the work being done in this area;
- To support Councillor Whiston's comments; and
- What progress was being made in engaging women and girls in sport.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure supported Councillor Whiston's comments and advised that work was already taking place to address this. He informed Members about the development of the Manchester Cultural Education Partnership and outlined how this aimed to embed arts, culture and creativity across the curriculum.

The Head of Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events reported that a lot of work was taking place to engage women and girls in sport and physical activity. He informed the Committee that there was a national gap between male and female participation in physical activity; however, the gap in Manchester was much smaller than the national average because of the work which was being carried out. He highlighted the provision of women-only sessions in all the Council's leisure facilities in Manchester, securing funding two years ago to run the This Girl Can campaign through which targeted activities had been put on across the city and, recently, an additional £100,000 funding from Sport England which would enable the further development of

this work. He reported that more women than men used the Council's leisure facilities, particularly pre-paid gym memberships, but that in the private and third sector male participants greatly outnumbered female participants so the Council did need to do more to support female participation.

Decisions

1. To note the report.
2. To endorse Widening Access and Participation as a key priority to continue to be embedded in Leisure, Libraries, Galleries and Culture strategies and reporting going forward.

CESC/19/49 Overview Report

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit was submitted. The overview report contained a list of key decisions yet to be taken within the Committee's remit, responses to previous recommendations and the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to approve.

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme.

Standards Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 31 October 2019

Present

Independent Co-opted Member: N Jackson – In the Chair
Councillors Andrews, Lanchbury and A. Simcock
Ringway Parish Council: Councillor O'Donovan
Independent Person: A Eastwood

Apologies

Councillors Evans and Kilpatrick
Independent Co-opted Member: G Linnell

ST/19/16 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held 13 June 2019 were submitted for approval. Members discussed whether a Member/Member Protocol was required following confirmation from the Head of Governance that other authorities did not have one. The Chair commented that mechanisms should exist through the Group Officers and Party Whips to deal with such complaints and that a Member could make a complaint against another Member under the Code of Conduct if other avenues failed.

A Member commented that such a code would formalise any protocol through inclusion in the Code of Conduct. The City Solicitor stated that consideration could be given to this and that she would also consult with the Group Officers and Party Whips had arrangements to ensure that they dealt with Member/Member complaints appropriately and would offer any advice if required.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2019 as a correct record.

ST/19/17 Standards Committee - Annual Report

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that updated Members on the matters within the remit of the Committee since November 2018. The Head of Governance introduced the report.

In response to a question from a Member in relation to the number of DBS checks completed for Councillors, the Head of Governance reported that an additional drop in session had been arranged in October and that an up to date figure of the number completed would be provided at a future meeting. A Member commented that if any DBS checks were still outstanding Officers should inform Group Officers so this could then be followed up.

A Member commented that he had attended an Induction Programme that had been open to all Members following a request by Standards Committee in March 2019. He

commented that he had found this to be very informative and useful, however stated that there were a number of Members that had not attended the training despite being booked on, adding this was a waste of resources and enquired what could be done to address it. The Head of Governance stated that generally Members attendance at training had improved and this activity was reported to the Committee. She said if an issue was identified that needed addressing she would discuss this with the Group Whips to encourage Members attendance, noting the cost of non-attendance when external training had been arranged. The Chair commented that it would be beneficial if the Groups could resolve this issue informally as future reports to the Committee on the operation of the Member Development Strategy would identify the resources spent on Member Development, including costs wasted due to non attendance

Decisions

1. To note the work done this year since the last annual report in November 2018 by this Committee and the Council's Monitoring Officer to promote and maintain high standards of conduct by Councillors.
2. To recommend that this report should be forwarded to full Council for assurance on standards issues.

ST/19/18 Draft Code of Corporate Governance

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that proposed a revised draft Code of Corporate Governance which was in accordance with published guidance. Compliance with this Code would be monitored on an annual basis through the Council's Annual Governance Statement. The Performance, Research and Intelligence Officer introduced the report.

Members noted that the Code would be submitted to Audit Committee on 10 December 2019. The Code formed part of the Council's Constitution and would therefore then be submitted to full Council, prior to adoption and inclusion within a revised Constitution in 2020.

The Chair stated that she welcomed the Code commenting that it was a very accessible and informative document. In response to a comment from the Chair regarding referencing within the Code all key identity groups with whom the Council engaged, the Performance, Research and Intelligence Officer stated that the document would be reviewed and consideration would be given to this, in consultation with the Equalities Team.

Decision

To note the Council's draft governance standards as set out in the draft Code of Corporate Governance.

ST/19/19 Members' Update on Ethical Governance

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that sought Members comments and approval on the draft Members' Update for November 2019. A member of the Committee recommended that the document should also be circulated to all Independent Persons and Co-Opted Members. The Committee endorsed this recommendation.

Decision

To approve the content of the draft Members' Update for circulation to all Members, Independent Persons and Co-Opted Members.

ST/18/20 Work Programme

The Committee received the report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which allowed the Committee the opportunity to consider and revise its work programme for future meetings.

The Chair recommended that in addition to the items already listed that a report on Partnership Arrangements be submitted to the March 2020 meeting. A Member also recommended that the report on Member training be submitted to the March 2020 meeting to ensure that training, including the Members induction programme, was considered prior to the May elections

Decision

To agree the Work Programme subject to the above amendments.

Manchester City Council Report for Information

Report to: Standards Committee – 31 October 2019

Subject: Standards Committee – Annual Report

Report of: City Solicitor

Summary

The purpose of this report is to update members of the Standards Committee on the matters within the remit of the Committee since November 2018.

Recommendations:

1. To note the work done since the last annual report in November 2018 by this Committee and by the Council's Monitoring Officer this year to promote and maintain high standards of conduct by Councillors.
2. To seek the views of the Committee regarding whether this report should be forwarded to full Council for assurance on standards issues

Wards Affected All

Manchester Strategy outcomes	Summary of the contribution to the strategy
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities	Not directly applicable
A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city's economic success	Not directly applicable
A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities	This annual report provides an overview of the work undertaken by the Standards Committee from November 2018 to September 2019. This contributes towards promoting and maintaining high standards of conduct among members. The report sets out the procedure for complaints against members and lists the complaints received over the above time period. This contributes to promoting fairness by members in their conduct towards members of the public and other Members. This also contributes to fairness, transparency and accountability when allegations are made that a member's behaviour has fallen below the expected standard.

A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work	Not directly applicable
A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth	Not directly applicable

Full details are in the body of the report, along with any implications for

- Equal Opportunities Policy
- Risk Management
- Legal Considerations

Financial Consequences – Revenue

None directly.

Financial Consequences – Capital

None directly.

Contact Officers:

Name: Fiona Ledden
Position: City Solicitor
Telephone: 0161 234 3087
E-mail: f.ledden@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Poornima Karkera
Position: Head of Governance Legal Services.
Telephone: 0161 234 3719
E-mail: p.karkera@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

None.

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to summarise the work undertaken by the Council's Monitoring Officer and the Standards Committee since the last annual report in November 2018.

2. The Roles of the Standards Committee and the Council's Monitoring Officer

- 2.1 The role and functions of the Standards Committee and the Council's Monitoring Officer ('MO') are set out in the Council's Constitution and reproduced for ease of reference in Appendix 1 to this Report. This Appendix reflects a change made (following discussions at this Committee) by the Council which as part of its annual review of the Council's Constitution agreed that the Council's whistleblowing policy should rest with the Audit Committee as it is considered this policy aligns more closely with the remit of that Committee. The Standards Committee meets 3 times a year, in March, June and October /November.

3. Matters considered by the Standards Committee since its last Annual Report

- 3.1 The role of the Standards Committee under the Annual Governance Statement ('AGS') is to promote high standards of ethical conduct, advising on the revision of the codes of corporate governance and conduct for members.
- 3.2 The matters dealt with by the Standards Committee since last November are set out below. The Committee has:
- considered the draft Code of Corporate Governance
 - considered and approved the Ethical Guidance Update for members
 - reviewed the operation and efficacy of the Planning Protocol as well as amendments to the Protocol itself
 - considered the Whistleblowing Policy
 - made Recommendations to Council regarding DBS checks for members
 - considered a report by the Committee on Standards in Public Life (CSPL) on the Review of Local Government Ethical Standards, noting areas of current good practice in the Council where recommended actions are already in place
 - recommended the extension of terms of appointment of this Committee's Independent Members and the Independent Persons (who support in relation to member complaints) by a further 2 years
 - considered the operation and effectiveness of the Social Media Guidance for members and the feedback regarding the Social Media Training provided for Members; recommending the guidance be circulated to candidates standing for election as Councillors
 - noted a report on the outcome of a consultation updating the disqualification criteria for Councillors

- reviewed the operation and effectiveness of the process for updating the Register of Members' Interests.
- considered the new Member Development Strategy
- considered the operation and effectiveness and updates to the Use of Resources Guidance for Members, the Gifts and Hospitality Guidance for Members and the Member/ Officer Relations Protocol.
- considered the draft Annual Governance Statement
- reviewed the operation and effectiveness of the Arrangements for dealing with complaints about Members
- considered the operation and effectiveness of the process for granting dispensations

4. Update on matters discussed by the Committee.

- 4.1 As indicated above following recommendations of this Committee the Council agreed to extend the term of office of the Independent Members of the Committee and Independent Persons by a further 2 years. The Council's Social Media Guidance was circulated to candidates prior to the May local elections. The Government's response to the CSPL report is awaited as is primary legislation to implement the outcome of a consultation updating the disqualification criteria for Councillors.
- 4.2 As at the date of preparation of this report 40 Councillors had responded to the Council's DBS team in HR. Some of the Members yet to respond may have a DBS certificate from another role but have yet to supply a copy to the team. A further reminder was sent out to all members at the beginning of October and a drop in clinic for members on DBS is planned for October.

5. Operation of Codes and Guidance

- 5.1 As stated above the Committee reviewed the operation and efficacy of the Codes and Guidance for Members during the course of the year. It noted that whilst officers considered that the Planning Protocol (which together with the Code of Conduct for Members, Use of Resources Guidance for Members, Gift and Hospitality Guidance for Members and the Member/Officer Relations Protocol forms part of the Council's Constitution) was effective and continually kept under review, the provisions relating to discussions between Members and developers could be clarified. This was addressed as part of the annual review of the Constitution.
- 5.2 The Committee's review of the Member Officer /Protocol had identified no significant areas of required revision, accounting for both the Committee on Standards in Public Life (CSPL) recommendations and other feedback on the Protocol's relevance and operation. The Monitoring Officer's view is that any issues within the code are addressed within the framework of the Code. The Code of Conduct for Members, Use of Resources Guidance for Members, Gift and Hospitality Guidance for Members and the Member/Officer Relations Protocol were reviewed by this Committee as part of the annual review of the Council's constitution. The Monitoring Officer is of the view that these protocols and guidance and the Social Media Guidance for Members are well

understood by Members and is not aware of any queries or issues that have not been addressed through existing procedures. Additional changes to the Use of Resources Guidance mainly to clarify the procedures that apply when a member leaves the Council were approved by the Council on annual update of the Constitution. Further information on this is contained in the Ethical Guidance Update elsewhere on the Agenda.

6. Register of Interests and Gifts and Hospitality.

- 6.1 A report on Register of Members' Interests and Gifts & Hospitality was considered by this Committee at its March 2019 meeting. Members will be aware that whilst officers do provide advice to Members, if asked, on Members' interests it is the responsibility of individual members to comply with the requirements of the Code of Conduct. Reminders to Members regarding updating their Register of Interests are contained in the Ethical Governance Update sent to all Members and in email reminders sent to Members during the course of the year. A drop in session for Members was held in October 2019 to support and advise on any matters relating to interests. Since the last update to this Committee in March 2019 there have been 23 Member's registers updated and 6 registrations of gifts or hospitality (including the Lord Mayor). Members of the Committee will recall that the current threshold for reporting Gifts and Hospitality is £100. As indicated in the specific report on this topic in March it is the view of the Monitoring Officer that the Register of Interests requirements are understood by Members. As a matter of good practice specific guidance would continue to be provided to Members regarding declaration of interests at meetings where necessary.

7. Dispositions

- 7.1 A report on the operation and efficacy of dispensations was considered by this Committee at its June Meeting. No further dispensations have been sought since the date of that report. As indicated in that report It is the Monitoring Officer's view that the requests for dispensations that have been made have been sought in appropriate circumstances and that the level of requests for dispensations does not give rise to concern. As requested at its last meeting a note has been sent by the Monitoring Officer to all Members and co-opted members of the Authority to remind them (if they consider a dispensation is needed) of the requirement to submit a written request for a dispensation to the City Solicitor.

8. Councillor Training and Awareness

- 8.1 In line with one of the aims of the Member Development Strategy to ensure that training opportunities are well advertised and promoted all member development communications are sent out from a dedicated Member Development email address. Members are also able to access a training calendar which flags up training events within their own personal calendars. Work has also been undertaken to ensure that the relevance of each training activity is made clear to Members when bulletins are sent out.

- 8.2 A shared 'Our Members' team drive has been created which allows members to access a variety of useful information including a Handbook for Members and training materials, from any device.
- 8.3 A Training Programme has been circulated to all members outlining the training opportunities for the municipal year. In addition to detailing the course objectives there are also testimonials, where available, from members who have previously attended the training. The programme has a dedicated section promoting training provided by the Local Government Association, in line with the recommendation of Standards Committee in March 2019 when the Committee considered the Member Development Strategy that such training opportunities be increased.
- 8.4 The Member Development Working Group (MDWG) (comprising Members and Officers and chaired by the Deputy Leader) continues to review attendance at training and a summary report is provided to Group Officers of members within their group who have not attended training they had booked on. In addition, the group has also considered feedback from training and the training budget as standard items at its quarterly meetings.
- 8.5 Members Induction was held over 2 sessions following the Local Elections covering:
- the Code of Conduct for members including an interactive session where members worked through a case study
 - the Gifts and Hospitality Guidance for Members,
 - data protection,
 - the Member / Officer relations Protocol,
 - access to information/need to know,
 - the Use of Council Resources Guidance,
 - the Social Media Guidance
 - 'Our Manchester'
 - The Budget
 - key strategies,
 - Equality,
 - Health and Safety,
 - Member Development
 - Casework
 - practical arrangements
- 8.6 This year the Induction programme was opened up to all Members as requested by Standards Committee in March 2019. Feedback received from attendees gave the Induction Programme an overall satisfaction rating of four out of five. The more detailed feedback and comments are being considered by the MDWG and will inform the induction programme for next year.
- 8.7 It is the view of the Monitoring Officer that progress is being made in relation to Member Development and embedding the Strategy.

9. Complaints against Councillors

9.1 There are 3 potential stages through which a complaint may proceed:

Stage 1 - Initial Assessment stage where the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Council's Independent Person, will decide whether to reject the complaint, seek informal resolution of the matter or refer the complaint for formal Investigation.

Stage 2 - Where a complaint is referred for Investigation, the Monitoring Officer will appoint an Investigating Officer to investigate the matter.

Stage 3 - If the Investigating Officer's final report concludes that there is sufficient evidence of a failure by the Member to comply with the Code, the Monitoring Officer will consult with the Independent Person before either seeking a local resolution to the matter or sending the allegation before the Hearing Panel for determination.

9.2 The Monitoring Officer has received 28 complaints about Manchester City Councillors between 1 October 2018 and 30 September 2019. Of those complaints, 15 (including 3 which did not proceed either due to lack of response from the complainant or because they were withdrawn) related to one incident. 7 of these complaints are in the course of investigation. The complaints relating to this event which have been dealt with by the Monitoring Officer are highlighted by shading on the table below. Complaints made by the same complainant are marked with an asterisk.

9.3 Of the 28 complaints received:

- 2 were withdrawn by the complainant;
- 8 did not proceed as there was no response by the complainant to a request for further information;
- 10 have been concluded. All of these were rejected at Stage 1 as set out in the table below;
- 7 are in the course of investigation;
- 4 were made by the same complainant
- 1 complaint is outstanding

9.4 As indicated above the Committee reviewed operation and effectiveness of the Procedure for dealing with Member Complaints ('The Arrangements') at its meeting in June 2019. The timeframes in the Arrangements are as follows:

- (a) The Monitoring Officer will acknowledge receipt of the complaint within 10 working days of all required information being provided and at the same time, the Monitoring Officer will write to the Subject Member with a copy of the complaint
- (b) The Subject Member may, within 10 working days of being provided with a copy of the complaint, make written representations to the Monitoring Officer

- (c) A decision regarding whether the complaint merits formal investigation or another course of action will normally be taken within 20 working days of either receipt of representations from the Subject Member or where no representations are submitted 20 working days of the expiry of the period mentioned in paragraph (b) above.

9.5 As indicated in the report to this Committee referenced in the paragraph above for a variety of reasons there are some cases which have taken longer than this timescale. The process for handling complaints under the stage 1 phase is being reviewed by the MO to address this including for example ensuring that additional diarising and monitoring is undertaken. Issues such as grouping of complaints and consideration of anonymity on a number of complaints contributed in some cases to delays.

Complaints Summary: Decisions on Complaints made between 1st October 2018 and 30th September 2019

Complaint No.	Provision of the code alleged to have been breached	Outcome
2018 Complaints		
CCM2018.13	Alleged breach of all the obligations of the Code	Rejected at stage 1 following consultation with the Council's Independent Person (IP) - It would not be in the public interest to expend further resources on carrying out an investigation into this matter. The complaint was wide ranging raising miscellaneous issues dating back over a number of years
2019 Complaints		
CCM2019.03	Bringing office into disrepute; Cause the council to breach the Equality Act 2010	<p>Complaint rejected at Stage 1 following consultation with IP - Wholly disproportionate and not in the public interest to expend further resources on carrying out an investigation.</p> <p>The complainant alleged two members:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failed to respond to correspondence due to complainant's disability Blocked contact <p>Upon receipt of the complaint the subject members had provided the information requested by the complainant and apologised for the delay.</p>

CCM2019.05	Compromise the impartiality of those who work for the Council Bringing office into disrepute Failed to give reason for decision	Complaint rejected at Stage 1 following consultation with IP. Not appropriate to undertake an investigation in to the complaint. The evidence available did not support the allegation.
CCM2019.07	Bullying / Being Abusive Intimidating a complainant/ witness Bringing Office into disrepute. .	Complaint rejected at Stage 1 following consultation with IP. Wholly disproportionate and not in the public interest to expend further resources The conduct of the subject member was considered reasonable in the circumstances.
*CCM2019/15	Intimidate a complainant/ witness Bringing office into disrepute.	Complaint rejected at Stage 1 following consultation with IP. Wholly disproportionate and not in the public interest to expend further resources on carrying out an investigation. The evidence did not support the allegation.
*CCM2019/16	Intimidate a complainant/witness Bringing office into disrepute. .	Complaint rejected at Stage 1 following consultation with IP. Wholly disproportionate and not in the public interest to expend further resources on carrying out an investigation. This complaint alleged that the subject member allowed another Councillor to act in a way the complainant considered in appropriate. The Subject Member had no official responsibility to deal with the conduct of Members
*CCM2019/17	Bringing office into disrepute.	Complaint rejected at Stage 1 following consultation with IP. Not in the public interest to expend further resources on carrying out an investigation The Subject Member had no official responsibility to deal with the conduct of Members The Subject Member's actions were reasonable.
CCM2019/19	Bringing office into disrepute	Complaint rejected at Stage 1 following consultation with IP - Wholly disproportionate and not in the public interest to expend further resources on carrying out an investigation

		<p>The complainant alleged the Subject Member was dismissive of issues raised with them and failed to return the complainant's call</p> <p>The Monitoring Officer noted the correspondence sent by the Complainant to the Subject Member and is satisfied with the response provided by the Subject Member</p>
CCM2019/21	<p>Bullying/abusive behaviour</p> <p>Disclose information given in confidence</p> <p>Bringing office into disrepute</p> <p>Use position improperly to confer a disadvantage on a person</p> <p>Fail to give reasons for decisions</p>	<p>Complaint rejected at Stage 1 following consultation with IP on the basis the complaint is not serious enough to merit any action. There are no grounds for finding a breach of the Members code of conduct in the circumstances there is no overriding public benefit in carrying out an investigation.</p> <p>The complainant alleged the subject member:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> failed to allow the complainant a fair hearing at an appeal approached the complainant and discussing the application in the street thereby disclosing information given to him in confidence. <p>The MO following consultation with the IP noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The complainant was provided with a decision letter following the hearing giving reasons for the decision The subject member highlighted that CCTV footage showed that the subject Member clearly tried to assist and empathise.
CCM2019/22	Bringing office into disrepute	<p>Complaint rejected at Stage 1 following consultation with IP – Wholly disproportionate and not in the public interest to expend further resources on carrying out an investigation.</p> <p>The complainant alleged the Subject Member:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> did not respond to emails nor

		<p>return the complainant's numerous telephone calls and messages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • chose not to act nor respond to concerns raised about the financial management of a community organisation that received funding from the Council <p>Having considered the specific details of the complaint the MO following consultation with the IP decided the volume and frequency of the contact from the complainant was such that the subject member's position was reasonable. It was considered on balance that the matter should not be investigated as a potential breach of the Code</p>
--	--	---

9.6 There are no particular themes from the above as the majority of complaints related to one incident. It is noted that whilst 3 related to alleged delay these do not in the view of the Monitoring Officer raise issues that need to be addressed more widely.

9.7 As the Committee will be aware complaints about failure to register a DPI are subject to criminal sanction. The Monitoring Officer is not aware of any action having been taken by the Police in relation to DPI requirements regarding Manchester Councillors.

10. Recommendations:

1. To note the work done since the last annual report in November 2018 by this Committee and by the Council's Monitoring Officer this year to promote and maintain high standards of conduct by Councillors.
2. To seek the views of the Committee regarding whether this report should be forwarded to full Council for assurance on standards issues

Annex 1

The role of the Standards Committee

Promoting and maintaining high standards of conduct by Councillors, Co-opted Members and church and parent governor representatives;

Assisting Councillors, Co-opted Members and church and parent governor representatives to observe the Council's Code of Conduct for Members;

Advising the Council on the adoption, revision or replacement of the Council's Code of Conduct for Members and the Council's Arrangements for dealing with Complaints that Council Members and Co-opted voting members of the Health and Wellbeing Board have failed to comply with the Council's Code of Conduct for Members ("the Council's Arrangements");

Monitoring the operation of the Council's Code of Conduct for Members and the Council's Arrangements;

Advising, training or arranging to train Councillors and Co-opted Members and church and parent governor representatives on matters relating to the Council's Code of Conduct for Members and other issues relating to Standards and Conduct;

To take decisions in respect of a Council Member who is found on a hearing held in accordance with the Council's Arrangements to have failed to comply with the Council's Code of Conduct for Members ("the Subject Member") following referral by the Monitoring Officer for a Hearing conducted by a subcommittee of the Standards Committee.

To grant dispensations from section 31(4) of the Localism Act 2011 (after consultation with one of the Council's Independent Persons) if having had regard to all relevant circumstances, the Standards Committee:-

- considers that granting the dispensation is in the interests of persons living in the Council's area; or
- considers that it is otherwise appropriate to grant a dispensation.

To determine appeals against the Monitoring Officer's decision on the grant of dispensations;

To deal with any reports from the Monitoring Officer on any matter which is referred to it for determination;

To deal with reports of the Monitoring Officer regarding breaches of the protocols/guidance to Members accompanying the Council's Code of Conduct for Members which do not in themselves constitute a breach of that Code;

To report from time to time to Council on ethical governance within the City Council.

To consider the Code of Corporate Governance and the Annual Governance Statement.

The Responsibilities of the Council's Monitoring Officer

The Monitoring Officer role is to support the Standards Committee, to handle complaints about Members and promote and maintain high standards of conduct. She has delegated authority under the Council's constitution:

- To act as the Council's Proper Officer to receive complaints that Council members have failed to comply with the Council's Code of Conduct for Members.
- To determine, after consultation with the Independent Person and in accordance with the Council's Arrangements for dealing with complaints that Council Members have failed to comply with the Council's Code of Conduct for Members ("the Council's Arrangements") whether to reject or informally resolve or investigate a complaint.
- To seek informal resolution of complaints that Council Members have failed to comply with the Council's Code of Conduct for Members wherever practicable.
- To refer decisions dealing with a complaint against a Council Member to the Standards Committee in exceptional circumstances.
- To arrange for the appointment of an Investigating Officer to investigate a complaint where the Monitoring Officer (in consultation with the Independent Person) determine that a complaint merits formal investigation.
- To issue guidance to be followed by an Investigating Officer on the investigation of complaints.
- To determine, after consultation with the Independent Person and in accordance with the Council's Arrangements, to confirm an Investigating Officer's finding of no failure to comply with the Council's Code of Conduct for Members.
- Where an Investigating Officer's report finds that the Subject Member has failed to comply with Council's Code of Conduct for Members, to determine, after consultation with the Independent Person and in accordance with the Council's Arrangements, either to seek a local resolution or to send a matter for local hearing.
- To make arrangements to advertise a vacancy for the appointment of
 - i Independent Persons and
 - ii Co-Opted Independent Members;
 - to make arrangements, in consultation with the Chair of the Council's Standards Committee for short-listing and interviewing candidates for

appointment as Independent Persons and to make recommendations to Council for appointment.

- To prepare and maintain a Council Register of Member's Interests to comply with the requirements of the Localism Act 2011 and the Council's Code of Conduct for Members, and ensure that it is available for inspection and published on the Council's website as required by the Act.
- To prepare and maintain a register of Member's interests for Ringway Parish Council to comply with the Localism Act 2011 and the Code of Conduct adopted by Ringway Parish Council and ensure that it is available for inspection as required by the Act.
- To grant dispensations from Section 31(4) of the Localism Act 2011 if, having had regard to all relevant circumstances, the Monitoring Officer:-
 - (i) considers that without the dispensation the number of persons prohibited by section 31(4) of the Localism Act from participating in any particular business would be so great a proportion of the body transacting the business as to impede the transaction of the business; or
 - (ii) considers that without the dispensation each member of the Council's Executive would be prohibited by section 31(4) of the Localism Act from participating in any particular business to be transacted by the Council's Executive.
 - (iii) considers that without the dispensation the representation of different political groups on the body transacting any particular business would be so upset as to alter the likely outcome of any vote relating to the business.

This page is intentionally left blank