



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

**Tuesday, 26 January 2021**

Dear Councillor / Honorary Alderman,

### **Meeting of the Council – Wednesday, 3rd February, 2021**

A summons was issued on 26 February 2021 for meeting of the Council which will be held at 10.00 am on Wednesday, 3rd February, 2021, in Virtual meeting - <https://vimeo.com/event/608899>.

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

#### **The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020**

Under the provisions of these regulations the location where a meeting is held can include reference to more than one place including electronic, digital or virtual locations such as internet locations, web addresses or conference call telephone numbers. To attend this meeting it can be watched live as a webcast. The recording of the webcast will also be available for viewing after the meeting has ended.

- |  |                 |
|--|-----------------|
| <b>5. Proceedings of the Executive</b>   | Pages           |
| To submit the minutes of the Executive on 20 January 2021.   | 3 - 14          |
| <b>7. Scrutiny Committees</b>  | Pages           |
| To note the minutes of the following scrutiny committees:  | 15 - 40         |
| Resources and Governance   | 12 January 2021 |
| Economy  | 14 January 2021 |
| Communities and Equalities   | 14 January 2021 |
| <b>8. Proceedings of Committees</b>  | Pages           |
| To submit for approval the minutes of the following meetings and consider recommendations made by the committee: | 41 - 62         |
| Audit - 19 January 2021  |                 |
| Health and Wellbeing Board – 27 January 2021   |                 |
| Planning and Highways - 21 January 2021  |                 |

Yours faithfully,



**Joanne Roney OBE**  
**Chief Executive**

---

**Councillors:-**

Abdullatif, Akbar, Azra Ali, Ahmed Ali, Nasrin Ali, Sameem Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Andrews, Appleby, Battle, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Chohan, Clay, Collins, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Y Dar, Davies, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Farrell, Flanagan, Green, Grimshaw, Hacking, Hassan, Hewitson, Hitchen, Holt, Hughes, Igbon, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, T Judge (Chair), Kamal, Karney, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, Leese, J Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Madeleine Monaghan, Mary Monaghan, Moore, N 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 meeting Clerk:  
Andrew Woods  
Tel: 0161 234 3011  
Email: [andrew.woods@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.woods@manchester.gov.uk)

This agenda was issued on **Monday, 1 February 2021** 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, 20 January 2021

**Present:** Councillor Leese (Chair)

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

**Also present as Members of the Standing Consultative Panel:**

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

**Apologies:** Councillor Ollerhead

**Also present:** Councillors: Mary Monaghan, Stanton and Wilson

**Exe/20/1      Minutes**

#### Decision

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 9 December 2020.

#### **Exe/20/2      Statement on the imminent risk of serious flooding risk to Mersey Valley area, Didsbury and Northenden**

Officers provided the Executive with a report on the flood defences being established in the Didsbury and Northenden areas, either side of the River Mersey, after the Environment Agency had issued a Severe Flood Alert as a consequence of the rainfall associated with Storm Christoph.

It was reported that an unprecedented multi-agency response was underway to prepare defences and to give information and advice to residents who might need to be evacuated from the homes most at risk of flooding. Those living in the severe risk areas were also being advised to move their cars to higher ground. The situation on the ground was ever changing, and the highest risk was expected to be in the early hours of the following morning, when the Mersey was predicted to be at peak height.

The Executive passed on its thanks to all of the council's staff, and those from other services and agencies, who were involved in this joint response. At the meeting the Chief Executive confirmed that the Council's decision making delegation arrangement would allow for any urgent decision to be made as necessary, and funds to be spent, to best protect the residents and their property.

Councillors Wilson, Monaghan and Stanton, as councillors for the Didsbury East, Northenden and Didsbury West wards respectively, each addressed the meeting to report on the preparations being made in their neighbourhoods, and the concerns of the residents that would potentially be affected by the flooding.

### **Exe/20/3 Manchester Aquatic Centre Investment**

A report from the Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods explained that the Manchester Aquatic Centre had been experiencing a number of building, mechanical and electrical end-of-life failures over recent years. In 2016 a stock condition survey had reviewed the maintenance liabilities of the centre up to 2036. That survey had identified that some parts of the building's plant, equipment and infrastructure were approaching 'end of life', or were 'life expired', and so would need investment to maintain the asset for the remaining 20 years of the lease. The report now sought authority and funding to proceed with the full refurbishment to make the Centre a compliant venue for all current uses.

Three investment options were presented in the report:

1. a full refurbishment which was estimated at £31.39m to deliver all identified essential works, refurbishment works, and carbon technology upgrades;
2. a delayed refurbishment, with essential works only being undertaken at this time. The cost of this had been estimated at £22.7m and there would then be an ongoing increased maintenance liability each year estimated to be around £1.5m; or
3. do nothing and allow further deterioration in the condition of the centre.

The report also explained that a scheme would ensure that modern disability access standards were being met, water treatment was brought up to modern standards and carbon emissions reduced. This would present an opportunity to replace the end-of-life items with carbon reduction technologies such as ground source and air source heat pumps, LED lights and solar PVs on the roof.

The report examined the advantages and disadvantages of each option, and option 1 was the favoured solution as it would ensure that the Centre was a sustainable community asset for 20 or more years, continuing to contribute to health, economic and social outcomes, as well as reducing the overall carbon footprint. That was supported.

#### **Decisions**

1. To note the options presented in the report and to approve proceeding with Option 1, a full refurbishment.
2. To recommend that the Council approve an increase the capital budget by £0.7m in 2020/21, £8.5m in 2021/22 and £21.2m in 2022/23, funded by £29.2m borrowing, and a capital budget virement of £1.3m funded by capital receipts via the Asset Management Programme Budget.

### **Exe/20/4 COVID 19 Monthly Update Report**

The written report from the Chief Executive and the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer took the form of three "situation reports", one each for the work on the city's economic recovery, work with residents and communities, and work on the

future of the Council itself. The report also presented the most up to date version of the “Manchester’s 12 Point COVID-19 Action Plan”, that had been produced on 18 January 2021.

The report also explained that the Council was being allocated additional tranches of business support funding. The funds were for Government schemes to provide additional support to businesses, along with the smaller elements of discretionary business funding. These being the Local Resource Grant funding and Additional Resource Grant funding as described in the situation reports. In order to allocate the funding in timely way it was recommended that the necessary authorities be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive and City treasurer. The two recommended delegations were supported.

At the meeting the Director of Public Health reported the prevalence in the city as being 445 cases per 100,000 people, with the rate for the over-60s as being 368. There had been a slow and steady decline in the infection rates but the pressures on the local hospitals remained extraordinarily high.

The Executive Member for Adult Services told the meeting that current situation was very serious, with hospitals under immense pressure, and asked that everyone continue to follow the rules to help cut down the spread of the disease. There had now been more than 29,000 at-risk people vaccinated in the city, with over 3,500 being treated the previous day. Another mass-vaccination site was to open on the day of the meeting, to help speed-up the overall programme.

The Executive Member for Member for Neighbourhoods reported to the meeting the steps that were being taken to enforce the COVID restrictions for non-complaint business in the city.

Thanks were also given at the meeting for the excellent response there had been from members of the local community who were volunteering to help operate and marshal the vaccination centres in the city.

## **Decisions**

1. To delegate authority for the design and allocation of BEIS Business Support Funding for the remainder of 2020/21 financial year to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Leader of the Council
2. To delegate the authority for any decisions to update the Council's Revenue Budget for the discretionary Additional Resource Grant funding, and the associated decisions to spend the funding, to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Leader of the Council.

## **Exe/20/5 Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement 2021/22**

A report from the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer explained the main announcements from the provisional local government finance settlement for

2021/22, and their implications for the city and the Council. The settlement announced had been just for one year: 2021/22.

At the national level the settlement had confirmed an increase in Core Spending Power for local authorities of 4.5%, with the increase for Manchester being 5%. The Core Spending Power calculation assumed that all Councils would take up the maximum Band D Council Tax increases. The assumptions for 2021/22 were that Councils would apply a 1.99% Council Tax increase in general, and a further 3% increase to provide extra funding for Adult Social Care, so a 4.99% Council Tax increase overall. Given the impact of the pandemic on the Council's budgets, and the strains on the Council's financial position, it was felt that the Council's budget calculation would have to assume that level of increase was going to have to apply in 2021/22.

The report detailed all the elements of the overall funding settlement announcement and the way that each would affect the Council's finances in 2021/22. The summary of all the changes was

	<b>2021 / 22 £'000</b>
<b>Spending Power Changes:</b>	
Revenue Support Grant inflation	320
Business Rates Adjustments	752
New Homes Bonus Scheme	4,104
Lower Tier Services Grant	1,236
<b>One off COVID-19 support:</b>	
COVID-19 Emergency funding - Tranche 5	22,229
<b>Collection Fund Announcements:</b>	
Local Council Tax Support grant	5,709
Local Tax Income guarantee scheme	8,637
Continuation of the 100% Business Rate Pilot	5,131
<b>Other Announcements:</b>	
Remove pay award assumption in 2021/22	7,500
Reduced contract cost of min wage	2,529
Homelessness Prevention Grant	723
<b>Total Impact on council budget</b>	<b>58,870</b>
<b>Additional contribution to Adults pooled budget:</b>	
Adult Social Care 3% precept	5,077
Social Care Grant (£300m)	6,313
<b>Total impact on Adults pooled budget</b>	<b>11,390</b>

With the overall settlement announcements not as bad as had been feared it was now predicted that savings in the region of £50m, as previously identified and as set out again in the subsequent items of business, should allow the Council to set a balanced budget for 2021/22. The council's financial position beyond then remained very uncertain.

It was noted that the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee had also considered the report at a recent meeting, and had noted its content (Minute RGSC/21/02).

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **Exe/20/6 Council Tax Consultation Results 2021/22**

A joint report from the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, and the Head of Strategic Communications provided a summary of the results of phase one of the consultation on the potential increases to council tax for financial year 2021/22, as well as a summary of the responses received.

The report explained that due to the timing of the 2021/22 Spending Review and Finance Settlement the budget consultation for 2021/22 had been planned as a two-phase approach:

Phase 1 - Council tax and adult social care increase consultation (8 December 2020 – 24 December 2020), seeking view on the likely 5% overall increase in Council Tax  
Phase 2 - Budget consultation (20 January 2021 – 21 February 2021)

The report set out a detailed analysis of the 2,090 responses there had been to the phase 1 questionnaire, as well as a demographic analysis of the respondents who had provided those data. In general, the results showed mixed levels of support for the 1.99% increase in Council Tax, and the 3% extra increase for adult social care.

### **Decision**

To note the report

### **Exe/20/7 Directorate Budgets - Children and Education Services Budget 2021/22**

In November 2020 the Directorate's first suggestions for 2021/22 budget cuts and savings had been considered and noted (Minute Exe/20/118). A report now presented set out the revisions and updates there had been since November, and outlined the further work that would be undertaken before the final budget proposals for the directorate were presented to the Executive meeting on 17 February.

It was noted that the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee had also considered the report at a recent meeting. The committee had endorsed many of the savings proposals had been unable to support the proposal for the revised parenting commission, nor the proposed cut to funding for interventions to support the improvement of maintained schools (Minute CYP/21/02).

In considering the advice of the Committee it was proposed and agreed that the £300,000 savings proposed from cuts in the budget of the Parenting Commission

should not now be made, with commensurate savings being made from elsewhere in the Council.

### **Decision**

To note the report and endorse the savings proposals within it, with the exception of the proposed £300,000 saving from budget of the Parent Commission, which would not now be taken forward in February.

### **Exe/20/8     Directorate Budgets - Health Budget Options for 2021/22**

In November 2020 the Directorate's first suggestions for 2021/22 budget cuts and savings had been considered and noted (Minute Exe/20/119). A report now presented set out the revisions and updates there had been since November, and outlined the further work that would be undertaken before the final budget proposals for the directorate were presented to the Executive meeting on 17 February.

It was noted that the Health Scrutiny Committee had also considered the report at a recent meeting, and had endorsed the savings proposals (Minute HSC/21/04).

### **Decision**

To note the report and endorse the savings proposals within it.

### **Exe/20/9     Directorate Budgets - Homelessness Directorate Budget and Savings Options 2021/22**

In November 2020 the Directorate's first suggestions for 2021/22 budget cuts and savings had been considered and noted (Minute Exe/20/121). A report now presented set out the revisions and updates there had been since November, and outlined the further work that would be undertaken before the final budget proposals for the directorate were presented to the Executive meeting on 17 February.

It was noted that the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee had also considered the report at a recent meeting, and had endorsed the savings proposals (Minute NES/21/03).

### **Decision**

To note the report and endorse the savings proposals within it.

### **Exe/20/10    Directorate Budgets - Corporate Core Budget Proposals 2021/22**

In November 2020 the Directorate's first suggestions for 2021/22 budget cuts and savings had been considered and noted (Minute Exe/20/123). A report now presented set out the revisions and updates there had been since November, and



outlined the further work that would be undertaken before the final budget proposals for the directorate were presented to the Executive meeting on 17 February.

It was noted that the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee had also considered the report at a recent meeting, and had endorsed the savings proposals (Minute RGSC/21/03).

### **Decision**

To note the report and endorse the savings proposals within it.

### **Exe/20/11 Directorate Budgets - Neighbourhoods Directorate Budget Proposals 2021/22**

In November 2020 the Directorate's first suggestions for 2021/22 budget cuts and savings had been considered and noted (Minute Exe/20/120). A report now presented set out the revisions and updates there had been since November, and outlined the further work that would be undertaken before the final budget proposals for the directorate were presented to the Executive meeting on 17 February.

It was noted that the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee had also considered the report at a recent meeting, and had endorsed the savings proposals (Minute NESC/21/02). Similarly, the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee had considered the report at a recent meeting, and had likewise endorsed the savings proposals (Minute CESC/21/02).

### **Decision**

To note the report and endorse the savings proposals within it.

### **Exe/20/12 Directorate Budgets - Growth and Development Directorate Budget Proposals 2021/22**

In November 2020 the Directorate's first suggestions for 2021/22 budget cuts and savings had been considered and noted (Minute Exe/20/122). A report now presented set out the revisions and updates there had been since November, and outlined the further work that would be undertaken before the final budget proposals for the directorate were presented to the Executive meeting on 17 February.

It was noted that the Economy Scrutiny Committee had also considered the report at a recent meeting, and had endorsed the savings proposals (Minute ESC/21/02).

### **Decision**

To note the report and endorse the savings proposals within it.

### **Exe/20/13 Capital Programme Update**

A report concerning requests to increase the capital programme was submitted. We agreed to recommend three 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 £ by £2.142m over this year and the next two, funded by borrowing, external contributions and government grants.

The report also explained that acting under delegated powers the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer had approved a further £2.06m of Capital expenditure approval for eight different schemes and proposals. Those were:

<b>Scheme</b>	<b>Funding Released</b>
Green Homes Grant	£500,000
Emergency Active Travel Fund T2 Development Costs	£200,000
Auto Bollards Additional Funding	£132,000
Bee Network Junctions & Crossings Development Costs	£53,000
TFGM Bus Stop Enhancements - Development	£38,000
Three separate releases for the Medieval Quarter and Glade of Light Memorial – total	£1,137,000

The report also sought approval for a change in the funding approval processes for highways works, in order to enhance the decision-making processes without creating any additional risks. This would see early works for schemes in 2020/21 funded through use of borrowing via the Highways Development Fund. The Development Fund would then be reimbursed from the Capital Fund as funding was claimed. That approach was supported.

In July 2020 the Chancellor had announced £1bn of grant funding would be made available as part of a range of measures to support economic recovery in response to COVID-19 for investment in decarbonisation of public estates. The report explained that an overall Greater Manchester bid had been collated by GMCA for a total value £80.7m. The City Council's bid as part of that had been for £22.9m.

The Glade of Light memorial was to become the city's permanent memorial to those killed in the Manchester Arena bombing of May 2017. It was to be part of the public realm of the Northern Quarter in the city centre. The report explained that external funding has been secured for the scheme and £1.137m had been approved for work to be completed by November 2021.

It was also reported that Council had been successful in its application to the Cultural Capital Kickstart Fund for the Factory Project, the application had been for £21m.

## **Decisions**

1. To recommend that the Council approve the following changes to Manchester City Council's capital programme:

- (a) ICT – End User Devices. A capital budget virement of £3.615m is requested, funded by Unallocated ICT Investment Budget.
  - (b) Children’s Services – Our Lady’s RC High School – Permanent. A capital budget virement of £2.4m is requested, funded by Unallocated Education Basic Needs Grant Budget.
  - (c) ICT – Network Refresh Programme. A capital budget virement of £3m is requested, funded by Unallocated ICT Investment Budget.
2. Under powers delegated to the Executive, to approve the following changes to the City Council’s capital programme:
- (d) Children’s Services - Special Capital Fund – Grange School Expansion. A capital budget virement of £0.195m is requested, funded by Unallocated Special Education Needs Grant.
  - (e) Highways Services – Northern Eastern Gateway Walking and Cycling Scheme Accelerated Works. A capital budget increase of £1.746m is requested, funded by External Contribution.
  - (f) Highways Services – Manchester Cycleway Early Works. A capital budget increase of £0.450m is requested, funded by External Contribution.
  - (g) ICT - Resident and Business Digital Experience Platform Additional Funding. A capital budget decrease of £0.054m is requested and approval of a corresponding transfer of £0.054m to the revenue budget, funded by capital fund.
3. To approve Highways funding strategy to progress accelerated works
4. To note increases to the programme of £2.060m as a result of delegated approvals.
5. To note update on Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme Bid
6. To note update on Medieval Quarter and Glade of Light Memorial project
7. To note update on The Factory Cultural Recovery Fund Grant

### **Exe/20/14 Affordable Housing Delivery Update**

A report from the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) provided a progress report on the achievement of the target to secure a minimum of 6,400 new affordable homes from April 2015 to March 2025. The report provided a detailed assessment of each of the current house building schemes that were making a contribution towards that overall target, or were expected to be able to make a contribution in the near future.

It was noted that the Economy Scrutiny Committee had also considered the report at a recent meeting, and had noted its content (Minute ESC/21/04).

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **Exe/20/15 Housing Revenue Account Delivery model- Northwards ALMO Review**

Councillor Midgely declared a prejudicial interest in this item of business and left the meeting prior to its consideration.

In June 2020 the Executive had approved consultation on a preferred in-house option for the future management of the Council's Arm's Length Management Organisation (ALMO) that had been identified as part of the Housing Revenue Account review. The same meeting had also approved a due-diligence exercise of the Northwards ALMO, including consultation with staff, unions, tenants and local stakeholders, to review the costs of options (Minute Exe/20/66). In September 2020 the Executive had examined the outcome of the due-diligence exercise and had concluded that insourcing the service remained the preferred option with the intention to take over direct management of the Housing Service into the Council from 5 July 2021 subject to a "test of opinion" involving all tenants and leaseholders (Minute Exe/20/97). A report now submitted by the Chief Executive set out the results of that "test of opinion".

The test of opinion had run from 3 December 2020 to 4 January 2021. In that time 1633 people had voted: 1572 tenants and 54 leaseholders. That represented 12.52% of those able to participate. In response to the question "Do you support the proposal to bring the management of your council home into direct management by the council?" - 93% of the respondents has supported the proposal. With that clear expression of opinion amongst the tenants and leaseholders, the report described the next steps and decisions that would be needed to progress this idea, as well as setting out the potential contractual implications for the present employees of Northwards.

It was noted that the Economy Scrutiny Committee had also considered the report at a recent meeting, and had endorsed its recommendations (Minute ESC/21/03).

The Executive put on record its thanks to Robin Lawler, who had recently retired as the Chief Executive of Northwards, for all his service to the residents and to the city as a whole. He was wished well in his retirement.

### **Decisions**

1. To note the outcome of the "test of opinion" consultation and the support for the council's proposals.

2. To note the proposals contained within the report about how the new council-controlled service governance is being developed and how tenants will be involved and empowered in the decision making about services to homes and communities.
3. To note the appointment of a project lead, and the indicative project stages and timetable for the delivery of the insourcing project.
4. To confirm support for the retention of “Northwards” as a brand identity for the council housing service.

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 12 January 2021**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

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

**Also present:**

Councillor Leese, Leader  
Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader  
Councillor Richards, Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration  
Councillor H Priest, Chair of Economy Scrutiny (items RGSC/21/03 and RGSC/21/04 only)

**Apologies:** Councillor Ahmed Ali

#### **RGSC/21/1 Minutes**

##### **Decision**

The Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2020.

#### **RGSC/21/2 Provisional local government finance settlement 2021/22**

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which provided details of the main announcements from the provisional local government finance settlement 2021/22 announced 17 December 2020, with a focus on the impact on Manchester.

Key points and themes in the report included:-

- The provisional local government finance settlement 2021/22 was slightly better than expected and confirmed that the c£50m savings options was sufficient to deliver a balanced budget next year;
- At the national level the settlement proposals confirm an increase in Core Spending Power (CSP) for local authorities of 4.5% (£2.2bn). The stated increase for Manchester was 5%, but this was dependent on the Council increasing Council tax;
- Details of the funding streams included within Core Spending Power;
- An additional one off, un-ringfenced allocation of £22.2m grant funding would be provided to meet additional expenditure pressures as a result of Covid-19;

- Details on Collection Fund allocations, including Local Council Tax Support Grant, Local Tax Income Guarantee Scheme and Business Rates 100% retention pilot;
- Other announcements from the Spending Review and settlement affecting the budget available to Local Government (ie pay award and homelessness prevention grant); and
- Due to the fact this was a one-year settlement and many of the announcements were for one-off funding the position for 2022/23 as still extremely challenging with an anticipated gap remaining of c£40m if the proposed savings were taken forward.

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

- Whilst the settlement was better than expected, it was felt that Government still had an opportunity to provide additional funding to ensure that the Council was not facing a £50m deficit or funding to prevent a 5% increase in Council Tax;
- It was felt that with the lowering of the anticipated savings from the cessation of the Car Park Joint Venture it was no longer appropriate to rate this risk as “green” in the RAG rating.

The Chair advised that she would write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer expressing the Council’s views and dissatisfaction on the Government’s failings to provide appropriate financial support to the Council in light of the response it had made to the COVID19 pandemic.

## Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report..
- (2) Agrees that the Chair writes to the Chancellor of the Exchequer expressing the Council’s views and dissatisfaction on the Government’s failings to provide appropriate financial support to the Council in light of the response it had made to the COVID19 pandemic.

## **RGSC/21/3 Corporate Core Budget Proposals 2021/22**

Further to minute (RGSC/20/46), the Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and City Solicitor, which provided a further update on the savings proposals being proposed as part of the 2021/22 budget process which reflected any feedback from the November 2020 meeting.

Key points and themes in the report included:-

- There had been 196 applications from across the Core in relation to the voluntary efficiency scheme, and these were currently being considered as part of each service areas proposed reductions, with decisions expected mid January;
- The reduction to the City Council contribution towards Discretionary
- Housing Payments would be £1m rather than the £1.5m initially proposed;



- The proposed cuts within Revenues and Benefits had been reduced by £340k to protect core capacity, leaving proposed savings of £160k, which would require a reduction of 5.5fte rather than 16.5fte that had originally been proposed;
- The original savings proposal of £4.5m in relation to car parks had been revised down to £4.1m due to higher than anticipated costs;
- As at October 2020 the Directorate was forecasting a net overspend of
- £1.824m, this included COVID-19 related pressures of £5.377m, offset by in year savings and other mitigations of £3.553m; and
- In response to the pandemic and looking to identify additional opportunities for young people to access employment it was proposed that 28 trainees will be recruited as part of the Kickstart programme and paid the Manchester Living Wage which would require additional investment of c£50k. This funding was included within the proposed budget for the Corporate Core.

A key point that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Assurance was sought that financial support would be available for people who had accrued arrears in their rent due to the COVID19 pandemic who now might be facing eviction due to the Government's relaxation of the restriction on evictions in the Private Rented Sector

The Leader advised he had asked Officer to prepare a summary of all the direct and indirect measures the Council could take to be able to support people who were vulnerable in the city, including those who were experiencing financial hardship arising from the COVID19 pandemic.

## **Decision**

The Committee agree the savings proposals as described within the report and endorse these to the Executive.

## **RGSC/21/4 Capital Investment Priorities and Pipeline**

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which provided a summary of the Council's proposed capital investment priorities, which would be included in the Capital Strategy report to Executive in February 2021.

Key points and themes in the report included:-

- The Capital Strategy would form part of the suite of budget papers to support the Council's budget for 2021/22;
- The Strategy would detail the existing approvals and governance, alongside the priorities for future investment and the potential projects;
- The level of resources that the Council had to invest in capital continued to be constrained and any investment had to be in line with the requirements of the Prudential Code;
- The outcomes of the recent Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) consultation included reducing the rate by 100 basis points which would increase the

Council's investment capacity but also include more stringent controls that would have to be adhered to;

- An overview of the potential capital projects which supported the Council in achieving its strategic aims; and
- As schemes developed, initial funding allocations would be allocated and finalised and included in the budget once the funding approval was in place, which would continue to be reported via the Capital Update Report.

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

- It was pleasing to see that the Council still had a high level of ambition, given the financial difficulties it faced;
- It was also welcomed that £12m was to be allocated for investment into the city's parks strategy; and
- It was reassuring to note that although there was currently no funding allocated to road safety past 2021/22, plans were being developed for further investment in future years.

## Decision

The Committee notes the report.

### **RGSC/21/5 Housing Revenue Account 2021/22 to 2023/24**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) and Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which presented Members with details on the proposed Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget for 2021/22 and an indication of the 2022/23 and 2023/24 budgets.

Key points and themes in the report included:-

- As at November 2020 the HRA was forecasting that expenditure would be £22.156m lower than budget, which would result in an in year surplus of £3.524m;
- In order to ensure a balanced budget it was proposed that reserves of £19.495m would drawn down;
- Key budget assumptions used in preparing the HRA budget included:-
  - Tenants' rents for all properties will increase by 1.5% in April 2021, which still remained well within the limits of local housing allowance levels;
  - There was also a proposed 1.5% increase in Garage rents in line with dwelling rents;
  - Other income was forecasted to be around £1.092m in 2021/22;
  - The current PFI reserve would continue to remain frozen at £10m as at 31 March 2021 and would be used to part fund the outstanding HRA debt;
  - The existing wholesale gas contract expired soon, and latest prices indicated that the current wholesale gas price would reduce by 10% with effect from April 2021;
  - The depreciation charge in 2021/22 was forecasted to be £18.435m and this would be used to fund capital expenditure;

- It was currently anticipated that the HRA reserves would fall below the £60m required to continue funding the proportion of debt in 2030/31, this would result in an increase in the interest costs charged to the HRA;
- The provision of bad debt would increase to 1.5% for 2021/22, and would then be increased annually by 0.5% until 2023/24 at which point it would peak at 2.5%, it was then planned to reduce by 0.5% per year until it levels out at 1.5% for the remainder of the plan;
- The amount payable for the management of stock currently managed by Northwards would change once the future arrangements had been agreed;
- Details of other expenditure; and
- Inflationary Assumptions.

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

- Had the figure of £1.5m earmarked for the Local Delivery Vehicle (LDV) been benchmarked and if so what had Salford City Council paid for their LDV;
- Was there a way to ensure that the capital investment underspend was invested in a way to ensure projects were delivered more efficiently;
- Did it matter if the future projected HRA would be in deficit and if so what would be the consequences;
- It was suggested the Members would benefit from future training/briefing on the HRA;
- Who was responsible for determining that the Council's HRA Business Plan was sound;
- If the Council was in a financial position to put additional money into the HRA to address the project deficit in future years, would it be permitted to; and
- Clarification was sought as to whether the Business Plan included figures for investment to contribute towards becoming a zero carbon city.

The Director of Housing and Residential Growth advised that the £1.5m for the Local Delivery Vehicle was an estimated figure based the likely professional cost and investigatory work that would need to be undertaken. Awareness of other LDV's around the country had been used as a framing for this cost but it was not benchmarked. He advised that he did not have the details of what it had cost Salford City Council but commented that he could ask but caveated this with the fact that the scale and nature of what Manchester was looking to deliver was different to that of Salford.

The Committee was advised that the Council was looking at bringing into the Council the management and delivery of the Capital Investment programme to ensure quality standards were being met and satisfaction levels of tenants improved.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasure advised that the Council had a statutory requirement to ensure that the HRA Business Plan was deliverable and sustainable over the 30 year period and whilst there was some margin for change, small changes in assumptions taken now could leave to huge changes in the future financial position. She agreed that future training session on the HRA could be arranged for Members.

It was clarified that it was not a requirement for DCLG to approve the HRA Business Plan. The Council's external auditors reviewed the Plan each year and the Council also had to complete a number of government returns that monitored the position against the Business Plan. It was also clarified that as the HRA was ringfenced it would not be possible for the Council to put further funding into it to address the projected deficit.

The Director of Housing and Residential Growth advised that in the projected capital programme for the HRA, there was in the region of £85m proposed to invest in low carbon related schemes in homes, however one of the challenges that existed was the increase in standards to meet zero carbon. Emerging grants for retrofitting were starting to appear and it was anticipated that these would help the overall picture but putting the issue into context, it was a city wide challenge and it was estimated that £4.5b would be required to address the issue of zero carbon across the whole housing stock of the city.

## Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the proposed HRA budget for 2021/2 and that the Executive will be requested to consider this at its meeting in February.
- (2) Requests that Officers arrange appropriate training on the HRA for Members.
- (3) Agrees that in writing the Chancellor of the Exchequer in relation to the Local Government Financial Settlement, the Chair also addresses the challenges the Council will face with its HRA in future years without additional government funding.

### **RGSC/21/6 The Council's HRA and Housing Investment Reserve and Governance of the potential work to bring Housing ALMO back in house and other Housing PFI schemes**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Housing and Residential Growth, which outlined the proposed governance arrangements that would be put in place should the Council decide to bring the Housing ALMO stock back under the control of the Council including any proposals for future tenant involvement and also governance arrangements of the other housing PFI schemes. The report also described the framework in which the Council manages its two Tenant Management Organisations.

Key points and themes of the report included:-

- An overview of the proposed Governance arrangement for Northwards Housing included establishing a committee to advise the Executive on relevant matters relating to the former ALMO, with membership of this committee including members from the relevant geographical areas, the relevant Executive Member and Tenants appointed as voting members;
- An overview of the governance arrangements of the Housing Private Finance Initiative schemes, which included:-

- Each project had a regular liaison meeting where officers from Strategic Housing met the contractors to discuss performance matters;
- Each project had a resident and councillor monitoring committee to review contractor performance and provide a genuine “sense check” on the performance data;
- Each project had a board of senior representatives from the Council and the contractor, which met at least twice a year, to deal with strategic issues and any matters referred to it from the liaison meetings.
- An overview of the performance management and monitoring of the Council’s Tenant Management Organisations; and
- In order to strengthen the Council’s scrutiny of its housing management contractors, (including Northwards Housing, the two TMOs and the three PFI-funded contractors) a new post had been created to respond to this increasing area of work.

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

- What options were available to ensure the principles of the Our Manchester Strategy were more effectively embodied in the governance arrangements of the PFI projects;
- What lessons have the Council learnt from previous PFI contracts, how far has the Council applied these lessons and how much has the Council evaluated what was now done differently;
- It was felt that a more detailed report on the final governance arrangements proposed for the ALMO should be considered by this Committee at an appropriate future meeting;
- There was concern in relation to the repairs and maintenance contract and the proposed increase spend due to inflation but no reference to an increase due to significant service delivery improvement and what impact this would have on the HRA budgeting;
- Reference to the potential model for oversight included in its membership the Executive Member with the relevant portfolio but the services currently being provided by the ALMO cut across multiple portfolios, so was there a way to ensure that parts of the current services provided were not absorbed into different parts of Council services;
- The work with Shelter in resident engagement and involvement had been welcomed and it was asked what could be done to ensure this engagement was sustained and meaningful;
- What work had been done to date to deal with the complex tripartite contract arrangements between the TMO’s the ALMO and the Council in relation to the proposal to bring the ALMO back in house;
- It was hoped that lessons from past PFI projects had been learnt in terms of social purpose to current housing partnerships; and
- It was felt that a unified service would be more responsive to tenants and drive efficiencies.

In respect of how options were available to ensure the principles of the Our Manchester Strategy were more effectively embodied in the governance arrangements of the PFI projects, the Head of Housing Services advised if it was

considered helpful, the Council could provide a continuity of Officers at meetings and would welcome any further ideas from residents and councillors as to how they could become more involved.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration added that it was within the Council's power to establish something at a local level that brought together partners, residents and local ward members which would reflect the Our Manchester approach of inclusivity.. A commitment was also given to review the matrix of meetings to ensure each meeting informed the other to deliver on the resident ownership concept enshrined in the Our Manchester strategy.

The Leader commented that the Council had only entered into previous PFI contracts due to the Councils housing stock requiring significant levels of investment to bring them up to decent standard and at the time these were entered into PFI was the only route available, but would not have been the choice the Council would have undertaken if other options had been available.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration commented that the governance structure of bringing the ALMO back into control of the Council was still very much subject to discussions with officers, members and tenants and did not want to pre-empt any conversations that were taking place with Members in the Northwards areas. In terms of tenant involvement, it was felt that the Council was in a good position following the Test of Opinion and the work undertaken over Summer 2020 around tenants' priorities for the service. She also added that in terms of the Exec Member that would sit in the governance structure was part of the ongoing discussions but would be the Member who had the most involvement and influence over the services.

The Director of Housing and Residential Growth advised that the projected increased costs of the Repairs and Maintenance contract was not solely due to inflationary pressures. In developing the contract there had been significant additional quality and social value requirements built into the contract, which were contributory factors to the higher estimates received from tendering contractor. He added that the contract had been written to give the Council strength in the event that some of the service problems that occurred previously were to reoccur and there was greater accountability and intervention now.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration reassured Members that Northwards' staff would be central to the discussions going forward in how tenant involvement and engagement could be maintained and empowered.

The Director of Housing and Regeneration advised that the TMO's were consulted as part of the Campbell Tickle review and conversations that had taken place since. He advised that they were not particularly affected by the proposal to return the ALMO back in to control of the Council as their right to manage had been exercised and would continue to be protected as it was the Council's obligation to support their right to manage.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration referenced the long term commitment the Council's partner had made in its development of the Northern

Gateway, highlighting that this was not purely on a financial basis but in the success of neighbourhoods in which they were working and the wider ambitions of the project and housing delivery.

## Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report.
- (2) Agrees that subject to the Executive agreeing that the ALMO is to be brought back into the control of the Council, this Committee receives a further report on the proposed final governance arrangements in due course.

## **RGSC/21/7 Our Manchester Strategy Reset**

The Committee considered the report of Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update on the draft Our Manchester Strategy – Forward to 2025 reset document. The Our Manchester Strategy – Forward to 2025, would reset Manchester's priorities for the next five years to ensure the Council could still achieve the city's ambition set out in the Our Manchester Strategy 2015 – 2025.

Key points and themes in the report included:-

- Describing the background to the Our Manchester Strategy reset;
- Providing an overview of the Our Manchester Strategy – Forward to 2025;
- Describing the final design and communications; and
- Next Steps.

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

- How did the strategy work in relation to operational decision making within the council;
- It was hoped that reference to the European Union would be updated following the UK's departure on the 1 January 2021;
- How would the Our Manchester approach be applied to the potential return of the ALMO to the control of the Council;
- It would be essential for residents to have their views and opinion taken into account when the Council makes decisions if the strategy to be successful

The Deputy Leader advised that the Our Manchester workshops that Members had been a part of demonstrated how the principles could be applied at an operational level. The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform also added that the Council was ensuring that its key decision processes linked back to the Our Manchester Strategy and work was being undertaken through the transformation programme to streamline the decision making process. Officers were also being trained in the Our Manchester approach, albeit virtual in the current climate.

The Deputy Leader advised that the Strategy was not a Council strategy but a city wide strategy and all partners would have a responsibility in ensuring that the

principle of being an equitable city was adhered to, no more so in relation to the issue of housing.

The Deputy Leader acknowledged the point raised about listening to residents voices and provided an example of the pedestrianisation of Deansgate as to how the Council was doing this at the present moment.

### **Decision**

The Committee endorse the recommendation that the final version of *Our Manchester Strategy – Forward to 2025* be taken for consideration by the Executive in February 2021.

### **RGSC/21/8 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.

A member suggested that as part of the Committee's future work programme it may want to look at the lessons learnt from previous PFI projects and other similar projects in relation to capital projects. The Chair agreed to discuss this with the Member outside of the meeting to develop the scope of this.

An update was asked on the progress with arranging training for Members on race awareness. The Deputy Leader advised that online training for this would be available for Members in the next few weeks

### **Decision**

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



## **Economy Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 14 January 2021**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

Councillor H Priest (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Green, Hacking, Johns, Noor, Raikes, Shilton Godwin and K Simcock

**Also present:**

Councillor Leese, Leader  
Councillor Richards, Executive Member for Housing and Residential Growth

**Apologies:** Councillor Stanton

**ESC/21/1 Minutes**

**Decision**

The minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2020 were approved as a correct record.

**ESC/21/2 Growth and Development Directorate Budget Proposals 2021/22**

Further to minute ESC/20/41, the Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided a further update on the savings proposals being proposed as part of the 2021/22 budget process which reflected any feedback from the November 2020 meeting.

Key points and themes in the report included:-

- As at August 2020 the Directorate was forecasting a net overspend of £3.86m, this included Covid-19 related pressures of £7.305m, offset by in year mitigation of £3.445m;
- The Covid-19 pressures were made up of a combination of £4.718m reductions in income and increased cost pressures of £2.581m;
- The main loss of income had arisen within the Investment estate due to tenants not being in a position to pay their rents because their business has been impacted by Covid-19;
- In addition to the income reductions, there had been increased costs with the main costs being in respect of supporting the Corporate response to supporting the City's most vulnerable residents,, this was forecasted to cost over £2m in the current financial year; and
- As part of the ongoing work seeking to mitigate the above pressures in year forecast savings of £3.445m had already been identified, this was largely due to

staff savings because of vacant posts and reduced running costs across all services.

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

- To what extent would the one year local government financial settlement have on the medium to long term economic recovery plan;
- It was saddening to see the impact that COVID had had on the Council's budget available to allocate to developing work and skills for adult learners;
- There was concern that with the inevitable reduction to staffing levels, it would be difficult to maintain an appropriate level of staffing to enforce building control across the city;
- How was the proposed income from increased rental going to be achieved;
- There was a concern that a reduction in the Council's employment and spending power will have a impact on the broader economy of the city and consequently Government needed to fund the Council appropriately to prevent this negative impact;
- There was concern that some of the cuts that the Council would need to make now to meet the £50m deficit in its budget would cost the Council more in the longer term and there needed to be a mechanism to revisit these decisions in future budget setting; and
- There was concern around digitising the planning process would result in there not being enough oversight by staff of what was being developed and that what was being developed was to an expected high quality.

The Leader advised that Government was investing a considerable sum of money into a variety of schemes, such as Kickstart, which were aimed at helping people get back into employment and develop new skills. There was also an expectation that Department for Education was going to increase funding for Adult Skills and retraining at Level 3. The only negative around this was the likelihood that these initiatives would be delivered by a small cohort of national contractors, and local elements would need retrofitting into these schemes. He also added that difficulties existed due to the fact that Government departments were not working in a joined up approach at a national level, reflecting that the employment programmes were disconnected for the skills programmes.

The Committee was also advised that robust arrangements had been put in place management and partnership arrangements for the medium to long term economic recovery of the city, however these arrangements would need to be adapted to the whims of national government in regard to funding that would be made available.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) confirmed that the Council had identified specific new income from its investment estate from the renegotiation of a lease.

The Executive Member for Environment Planning and Transport acknowledged the challenges that would exist by not filling the vacant posts with the Council's Planning Department especially in light of the major schemes and strategies that would be being implement in the future. It was commented that options such as a shared

service with another local authority were being looked at as apart of a service review of the Council's Planning function.

The Leader reminded the Committee that the proposals being put forward were due to the Council requiring to make £50m of savings to its budget and that the proposals being considered were the least worst options. It was hoped that in three to five years' time, with the return of commercial income some of these proposed cuts could be revisited and if required reintroduced.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) confirmed that it wasn't proposed to digitise the whole Planning Service, but rather use new technologies to improve aspects of the service.

### **Decision**

The Committee agree the savings proposals as described within the report and endorse these to the Executive.

### **ESC/21/3 ALMO - outcome of the offer to tenant's consultation**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Executive, which provided Members with the conclusion of the test of opinion of tenants and leaseholders as part of the Northwards ALMO review. The report provided a summary of the opinions indicated and recommended that the decision to insource the housing management and maintenance function was now confirmed. The report also include a summary of key actions and milestones, risks and process to develop post-transfer governance arrangements.

Key points and themes of the report included:-

- Tenants and leaseholders have been consulted on the proposal to take direct control of the management of the housing service from 5 July 2021;
- A total of 1633 people voted (1572\* tenants and 54 leaseholders). This was 12.52% of those able to participate (12.57% tenants 11.87% leaseholders);
- 1524 (93%) people voted in support of the proposal to bring the management of their council home into direct management by the Council;
- The response rate of 12.54% was consistent with other local authorities who are proposing to or have recently taken their ALMO services in-house;
- The result was not binding but was one of the factors that were to be considered in making the decision about the future management of the service;
- An outline of the practical steps for the delivery of the transition;
- Consideration of the governance and accountability arrangements; and
- Intended timescales, including critical actions and milestones.

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

- Whilst the response rate was in consistent with other local authorities, some members still felt that this was low;

- It needed to be recognised that the consultation had strongly implied that transferring the ownership back into the Council would improve the service offered to tenants and it was hoped that this could actually be achieved;
- There was a need to safeguard the successful rent collection that had been achieved to date and the welfare support and financial advice available to tenants from Northwards currently;
- It was felt that scrutiny of the final governance arrangements had been omitted from the milestones within the proposed timescales;
- More detail was needed on how returning control of the ALMO to the Council would improve community safety and anti-social behaviour within those communities in North Manchester and if these existed now, should be implemented now;
- More discussion was needed as to why the repairs and maintenance contract was proposed to continue to be outsourced

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration commented that the challenges identified by tenants existed as a result of the impact of cuts over many years. She advised that conversations with tenants would be honest around what would be achievable and it was envisaged that the proposals to bring the ALMO back into the control of the Council would improve joined up working with tenants at a local level. It was also acknowledged how successful rent collection had been under Northwards and a commitment to safeguard this was made alongside the welfare and financial support that was offered to tenants.

It was agreed that scrutiny of the final governance proposals would be factored into the timescale milestones.

In terms of the repairs and maintenance contract, it was explained that it would have been desirable for this to come back into control of the Council as well, but there was a need to remain realistic insofar as what was deliverable in the timescale of the wider management of the housing service returning to the Council. It was commented that this would be something that would be explored in the future with tenants.

The Director of Housing and Residential Growth advised that he would be looking to maximise the interaction and interrelationship with Neighbourhood Services and other agencies to tackle Anti-Social Behaviour and Community Safety, providing a single point of contact and clear accountability to tenants.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Endorses the recommendations to the Executive, those being:-
  1. Note the outcome of the "test of opinion" consultation and the support for the council's proposals.
  2. Note the proposals contained within the report about how the new council-controlled service governance is being developed and how tenants will be involved and empowered in the decision making about services to homes and communities.

3. Note the appointment of a project lead, and the indicative project stages and timetable for the delivery of the insourcing project.
  4. Members confirm support for the retention of “Northwards” as a brand identity for the council housing service.  
But in doing so request that the Executive take on board the comments made by members.
- (2) Welcomes the commitment by the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration to review the control of the repairs and maintenance contract at a future point.
- (3) Agrees to add to its Work Programme further scrutiny of Manchester Move and Yes

#### **ESC/21/4 Affordable housing delivery update**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided an update on how the Council and its partners would deliver a minimum of 6,400 affordable homes from April 2015 to March 2025.

Key points and themes of the report included:-

- Increasing the delivery of housing (affordable housing in particular) would be a key part of city’s recovery following the Covid-19 pandemic;
- The demand for housing from the most vulnerable in the city had not diminished following the crisis and if anything, the requirements of residents most in need had become even more acute with the numbers of people on the Housing Waiting List and in temporary accommodation continuing to grow;
- The Council was looking to significantly upscale the delivery of new affordable homes and to this end, the existing delivery platforms established with RPs – including use of our land assets – and working in conjunction with Homes England investment programmes remained key;
- The Housing Delivery Vehicle would soon begin to deliver new affordable homes, bolstering the pipeline and helping the city meet and exceed the 6,400-minimum target by 2025; and
- An overview of proposals as to how the Council intended to increase the future supply of Affordable Housing.

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

- It was felt that the Committee should proactively engage with the proposed pipeline of housing development in terms of its future work programme;
- There was concern that with the impact of the Covid pandemic and increasing financial restraints residents find themselves in, people may still affordable rents and shared ownership out of reach;
- How achievable was the target of 6,400 properties by 2025;
- It was pleasing to see the city centre developments moving forward as part of the housing delivery model;
- Was there an indication on how quickly progress would be made in the delivery of affordable housing; and
- Clarification was sought what was meant by the delivery of the developments would be fully funded through the PWLB via a simple company structure

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration agreed that it would be of benefit if Scrutiny kept an oversight on the future delivery of housing development as part of its future work programming. She shared concerns raised around affordability and advised that this was a reason why the Council was looking to establish its own housing delivery vehicle to allow for some flexibility in affordability. It was commented that based on the rate of current development, the Council was projected to surpass its target of 6400 properties by 2025, however, it was acknowledged that the long term impact of the Covid pandemic needed to be taken into account.

The Strategic Director commented that the Council had strong partnerships in the housing sector with Registered Providers that would drive the delivery affordable housing and the Council also had a series of meetings with Homes England to discuss accessing £12billion of additional government funding for 180,000 affordable homes. She also advised that the Council's housing strategy was subject to review in October 2021 and a revised strategy would be presented to the Committee.

The Director of Housing and Residential Growth explained that the PWLB, stood for the Public Works Loan Board and the Council was able to borrow money at advantageous rates which would fund some of the developments through a Housing Delivery Vehicle.

## **Decisions**

The Committee-

- (1) Notes the report.
- (2) Notes that the Chair will discuss with Officers and the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration the best way for Scrutiny to monitor the proposed pipeline of housing development in terms of its future work programme.

## **ESC/21/5 Our Manchester Strategy Reset - Draft Strategy**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update on the draft Our Manchester Strategy – Forward to 2025 reset document. The Our Manchester Strategy – Forward to 2025, would reset Manchester's priorities for the next five years to ensure the Council could still achieve the city's ambition set out in the Our Manchester Strategy 2015 – 2025.

Key points and themes in the report included:-

- Describing the background to the Our Manchester Strategy reset;
- Providing an overview of the Our Manchester Strategy – Forward to 2025;
- Describing the final design and communications; and
- Next Steps.

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

- It was important to remember the internationalism of the city and would it still be able to attract people from Europe and around the world post Covid and Brexit;

- The idea of a one-page summary document for the public to engage with was welcomed; and
- Whilst Members endorsed the output of the strategy, the impact of the pandemic had had significant impact on the city and this needed to be acknowledged.

The Leader acknowledged the impact that the pandemic had had on the city but felt that there were many initiatives still in place that would allow for the economic and social recovery of the city. He added that the Council also needed to take hold of the opportunities that arose from the crisis. In terms of internationalisation, there was a lot of uncertainty arising from Brexit – the perception of the UK and practicalities. He added that the Brexit deal would allow Universities to continue working with European Universities on research programmes and Manchester would continue to be a member of international networks.

### **Decision**

The Committee endorse the recommendation that the final version of *Our Manchester Strategy – Forward to 2025* be taken for consideration by the Executive in February 2021.

### **ESC/21/6 Economy COVID19 Sit Rep Report**

Further to Minute ESC/20/49 (Update on activity under COVID 19), the Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided a further update of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of the Committee.

The key points and themes included:-

- An economic overview at a national, regional and local level;
- A sectoral impact update, including the impact on footfall within the city, hospitality and visitor economies, aviation and universities;
- The steps needed to stimulate development and investor confidence in the city;
- Work being undertaken with TfGM to agree a broad overall transport plan to support the gradual opening up of the city with a focus on pedestrian movement and safe use of public transport;
- Work being undertaken around Skills, Labour Market and Business Support following on from the THINK report findings; and
- A progress update on the lobbying of government for additional funding.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) also provided a verbal update on the most recent developments since the publication of the report.

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

- Could an update on the spend on discretionary grants be provided;
- It was felt that more detail around the impact of Brexit on the economic recovery of the city needed to be included in future reports; and

- There was concern in relation to the number of developments that included large amounts of commercial and retail space given the impact of Covid on these markets

The Leader advised that in terms of Brexit, at present, there was no discernible impact of the UK's exit on the city reported at the last meeting of the Economic Recovery Group and assurance was given that this would continue to be monitored. In terms of developments with large commercial and/or retail offers, he advised that, from feedback from developers, agents, and contractors, there was real optimism of the commercial market in the city centre once Covid restrictions were lifted. For the effective recovery of the city's economy, it was necessary for developments to be built and ready for occupancy or be in the pipeline for construction.

In relation to discretionary grants, it was reported that it had been agreed that the period of payment of these would be extended and Officers were looking at how the range of support to businesses could be extended, which would be considered at the next Economic Recovery Group.

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

### **ESC/21/7 Overview Report**

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

The Chair advised the Committee that she was awaiting an indication from Officers of when consideration of the Local Plan would be appropriate.

It was also suggested that the Committee looks at the role Higher Education Institutions play in the city's economy connected to internationalisation.

### **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Note the report.
- (2) Agree that the suggestion for additions to the Work Programme be considered at the work programme setting session in May 2021.



## **Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 14 January 2021**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

Councillor Hacking - In the Chair  
Councillors Andrews, Chambers, Collins, M Dar, Doswell, Evans, Grimshaw, Hitchen, Kirkpatrick, Moore, Rawson and Russell

**Also present:**

Councillor Murphy, Deputy Leader  
Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing  
Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure  
Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport

**Apologies:**

Councillors Battle, Douglas and Rawlins

**CESC/21/01            Minutes**

**Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2020 as a correct record.

**CESC/21/02            Neighbourhoods Directorate Budget Proposals 2021/22**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided a further update on the savings proposals being proposed as part of the 2021/22 budget process and reflected any feedback from the November scrutiny committees. The Committee was asked to consider and make comments on the savings proposals identified prior to these being considered by the Executive.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Neighbourhoods Directorate background and context;
- Neighbourhoods 2020/21 budget position;
- Current in year forecast position;
- 2021/22 onwards savings proposals;
- Workforce implications; and
- Equalities.

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

- Whether the projected returns from the parks investment programme were realistic within the first year;
- Subsidies to the leisure service providers during the pandemic and any progress in securing funds to cover this;
- Why the Equality Impact Relevancy Assessments had not been completed yet and when Members could expect to see them;
- Concern that funding to the Council had been reduced over a number of years and that the national government had not provided sufficient funding to the Council to fully mitigate the impact of the pandemic; and
- That the Council did not want to make cuts to services but that these were the least worst options and to thank officers for their work in identifying these.

The Head of Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events reported that it was not proposed to make any savings on indoor leisure facilities in the next financial year but that savings were proposed from 2022 onwards. He advised that the Council had submitted a return to the national government for assistance of £1.3 million in relation to the impact of the pandemic on leisure centres, covering the period from December 2020 to March 2021. In response to a further question, he advised that the Council was working on the assumption that there would be an in-year overspend within his service but it was expected that the application for government assistance would be successful. He advised that the government had not yet agreed financial support for the 2021/22 financial year, if COVID-19 restrictions impacted on leisure services beyond March 2021, but that Sport England was currently in discussions with the government about this. He reported that, if restrictions did continue into the new financial year and no further government funding was provided, the Council would need to work with its leisure operators on how that funding gap would be met and that this did present a risk in the current situation. He highlighted that there was a report on the Parks Investment Programme later on the agenda and that he would respond to the question on parks as part of that item.

The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) advised the Committee that the Equality Impact Relevancy Assessments, which were used to determine whether an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) was required, would have been undertaken by all of the services by this point. She informed Members that the Committee would receive an overview of the EIAs resulting from the budget proposals at its meeting on 11 February 2021. A Member questioned the timing of this in relation to the decision-making process. The City Solicitor advised Members that the Committee would be receiving this information at its next meeting which was prior to the final decision on the budget being made at the Budget Council meeting on 5 March 2021.

The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) clarified the proposals relating to Compliance and Enforcement, Highways, the Animal Welfare Service and charges for replacement bins, while advising Members that these areas fell within the remit of Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee (NESC) and referring Members to the discussions that had taken place on these issues at the previous day's NESC meeting.

## Decision

To note the report, subject to Members' comments, and to recognise that, under the financial situation the Council is placed in, officers have worked to identify the least worst options.

### **CESC/21/03            Our Manchester Strategy Reset - Draft Strategy**

The Committee received a report of the City Solicitor which provided an update on the draft *Our Manchester Strategy – Forward to 2025* reset document. A draft of the reset Strategy was appended to the report. The report stated that achieving Manchester's zero carbon target was reflected throughout the work on the Our Manchester Strategy reset and would be clearly captured in the final reset document.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Background to the Our Manchester Strategy reset;
- Our Manchester Strategy – Forward to 2025;
- Final design and communications; and
- Next steps.

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

- How successful had the consultation been in reaching different communities, particularly taking into account the impact of the pandemic and digital exclusion; and
- Was a breakdown of respondents by age, race and sex available.

The Policy and Partnerships Manager outlined the work undertaken to reach people who were digitally excluded when carrying out the consultation on the Strategy, despite the restrictions imposed by the pandemic. This included producing paper copies of the survey, which were distributed through a range of means including in the emergency food response parcels, through Age Friendly newsletters and through community hubs. She advised Members that it had also been translated into the top ten most common languages other than English spoken in Manchester and that targeted engagement had taken place with under-represented communities through community and voluntary organisations and that this had included face-to-face engagement under COVID safety guidelines. She reported that some community groups had also supported residents to engage with the consultation online. She advised the Committee that the Council would continue to build on this work to improve inclusion. The Deputy Leader highlighted that the number of respondents was twice the number who had responded to the consultation on the original Strategy.

The Policy and Partnerships Manager advised Members that a demographic breakdown of the respondents to the consultation had been included in a report to the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee on 3 November 2020 and she offered to share this with the Committee Members. She informed the Committee that this information was only available where respondents had provided it and that completing the demographic data had not been made a requirement as it could deter

some people from responding. She advised Members that about 70% of the respondents to the universal survey had provided this information and that work would be taking place to look at how this could be increased in future. She informed the Committee that the demographic data from respondents had been compared to the overall statistics for the city and, where certain groups or neighbourhoods were under-represented, targeted work had taken place to address this.

In response to a Member's question about the extent to which the Strategy had succeeded in addressing poverty, the Policy and Partnerships Manager advised that progress against the Our Manchester Strategy was reported on annually in the State of the City report. She also confirmed that the Council had engaged with the Poverty Truth Commission as part of the work on the Strategy reset.

In response to a Member's question about which sectors of the economy were expected to have job opportunities as the city recovered from the pandemic, the Chair advised that this had been discussed at that day's meeting of the Economy Scrutiny Committee and suggested that Members who were interested could watch the recording on that meeting.

## **Decision**

To thank the Deputy Leader and officers and to note the report.

### **CESC/21/04            Manchester's Park Development Programme 2021 - 2025**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided an update on the progress and future programme of investment for parks that would accelerate delivery of the Park Strategy and support the delivery of revenue savings beyond 2021.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- The background to the Programme;
- Framework for investment;
- Pipeline of projects;
- Deliverability; and
- Next steps.

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

- What was the reason for the decision to divide the £960,000 available in 2021/22 for capital projects in parks by ward, with each ward being allocated £30,000;
- How would value for money be achieved if different areas were individually buying a small number of items for a local park;
- That the larger investment opportunities should be spread across a number of parks;
- What support was the Council providing during the pandemic to small and independent businesses who normally operated within the parks;

- To thank the Parks team for the support they had provided to community groups in parks; and
- Some local residents could not afford to attend the commercial events being held in parks and how could they be supported to benefit from these events.

In response to the question that was asked under the Budget item about how realistic the projected returns were, the Parks Lead advised that the service had a good track record over the past four years of capital investment in parks leading to increased returns, with income from parks increasing by about 20% year on year. She advised that the projected returns were predicated on parks being able to host a programme of events and activities as they had in previous years, although this was likely to be towards the end of summer due to COVID-19 constraints. She advised that the projected returns were also the result of work in previous years, for example, changing contracting arrangements and the staffing structure. She also highlighted some of the investment projects which were currently in the pipeline over the shorter and longer term.

The Parks Lead advised that, following consideration of the options, it had been decided that the most equitable way to allocate the Parks in Partnership £960,000 funding was to align it with the Neighbourhood Investment Fund (NIF) and allocate £30,000 per ward. She advised that it also gave local areas the opportunity to seek match funding from other sources. The Head of Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events informed Members that this approach put decision-making in the hands of Ward Councillors and local areas. He advised Members that the money did not have to be spent in that ward and that neighbouring wards could choose to work together on a project that was beneficial for local residents. Committee Members expressed their support for this fund.

The Parks Lead informed the Committee that a small project team had been established to support the delivery of the investment and that part of this work would be to ensure the best value for money, for example where a number of different areas were each buying a bench for their local park. In response to a Member's question about whether the funds would be used to replace equipment which was in a poor condition or for new improvements, the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure advised that this was at the discretion of the Ward Councillors and other stakeholders in the ward.

The Parks Lead highlighted how some of the small and independent organisations which operated in parks had supported the local community during the pandemic, for example in the delivery of food packages. She confirmed that her team had been providing support to these organisations during the pandemic, including support in putting in place safe operating plans where they could continue to trade, directing them to grants they could apply for where they could not trade and facilitating the development of a network of these business so that they could provide each other with peer support.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure advised the Committee that the return from the commercial events held in parks, such as Parklife and Lightopia, was reinvested in parks for the benefit of all residents and that, while there were a few

premium commercial events, the majority of events in parks were free and accessible to all. He thanked Parks staff for their work during the pandemic.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **CESC/21/05 Update on COVID-19 Activity (Residents and Communities Recovery Situation Report Summary)**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided a summary of relevant sections of the Residents and Communities Recovery workstream.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Residents at risk;
- Mitigating the impact of COVID-19 on communities;
- Mitigating the impact of COVID-19 on children and young people; and
- Equality and inclusion.

In response to a Member's question about Free School Meals, the Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing advised Members that this had been discussed at the meeting of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee (CYPSC). The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) stated that the CYPSC had received a report which covered this and that she could provide Members with an update.

A Member expressed concern at the increase in domestic violence and abuse referred to in the report and asked whether the Committee could be updated after the Domestic Violence and Abuse Strategy Group meeting. The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) suggested that the Committee receive a report on the Strategy in May or June. She advised Members that it was proposed to hold a workshop for Members on where this work was up to, most likely in mid to late February. She also drew Members' attention to the Domestic Abuse Bill which was currently going through Parliament, advising that officers were awaiting the final version of the Bill and could update Members on this at a future meeting. A Member requested that the Committee receive a report on the Domestic Violence and Abuse Strategy at a future meeting. The Chair advised that this would be discussed under the next item.

In response to a Member's question about the impact of the restrictions on evictions being lifted, the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) advised that the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee had requested a report on this at its March meeting and that this report could be shared with Members of this Committee.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

## **CESC/21/06            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.

The Chair agreed to the Member's request under the previous item for a report on Domestic Abuse, including the Domestic Violence and Abuse Strategy, and advised that he would speak to officers about the timing of this. A Member commented that Members had not received an update since the last time this issue had been discussed and asked that this be provided.

In response to a Member's request for a report on spending on school meals, the Chair advised that this was likely to fall within the remit of either the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee or the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee and that he would discuss this with officers and the relevant Scrutiny Chairs.

### **Decision**

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

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Audit Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 2020**

**This Audit Committee meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Ahmed Ali - In the Chair  
Councillors Clay, Lanchbury, Russell and Watson

Independent Co-opted members: Dr Barker and Dr S Downs

#### **Also Present:**

Karen Murray (Mazars) - External Auditor  
Alastair Newall (Mazars) - External Auditor

### **AC/21/01 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2020 as a correct record.

### **AC/21/02 External Audit Update**

The Committee considered the report of Council's external auditors (Mazars) that provided the Committee with an update on audit work carried out. The Committee was reminded that the external audit of the Council's 2019/20 financial statements and value for money conclusion in November 2020 and the signing the audit report on 30 November 2020. An updated Audit Completion Report with the completed audit findings had been circulated to all members of the Audit Committee. The external auditors are currently waiting to receive the Council's Whole of Government Accounts (WGA) submission. This work will be carried out to instructions issued by the National Audit Office (NAO) and a report will be submitted to the NAO on the conclusions. Any significant findings from this work will be reported to the Audit Committee in a subsequent Audit Update Report. The process of audit planning for the 2020/21 audit will start in January/February 2021 and the Audit Strategy Memorandum will be submitted at the March meeting of the Committee.

Reference was made to the National Audit Office updated Code of Audit Practice that has now been applied from 2020/21. The new Code changes the work that auditors will be required to do, and the related reporting, on Councils arrangements to deliver value for money in their use of resources. The changes to the reporting requirements

will mean that from 2020/21 a value for money conclusion will not be included within the Financial Statements Audit Report. A commentary on the Council's arrangements to deliver value for money will now be included in a new Auditor's Annual Report (which replaces the Annual Audit Letter). The NAO Code requires that where auditors identify weaknesses in Council arrangements they should report recommendations to the Council promptly throughout the year.

The Chair invited questions from members of the Committee.

A member referred to point 8 of the report and requested further explanation of the five themes outlined in the MHCLG's response to Sir Tony Redmond's independent review.

It was reported that the themes had been produced in order to provide more central co-ordination by bringing together the various strands of government. The Committee was informed that it would be unlikely that a single regulator would be established and new more simplified process would be introduced to help local authority accounts to be more accessible. Other recommendations included the importance of appointing independent members to audit committees, member training and the processes used by auditors and the meeting of the responsible council officers at least once a year.

A member referred to the Value for Money opinion provided by the external auditor and asked what the arrangements will now require.

It was reported that the new arrangements would require greater engagement with the Council on the arrangements to deliver value for money rather than to present an opinion. A longer narrative report will be submitted to provide a balanced assessment of the arrangements and processes to highlight changes, to promote good practice or actions needed for improvement.

The City Treasurer reported that the impact of Covid19 would be addressed in the opinion provided by the Council's Internal Audit. The recommendations of the Redmond report were welcomed and work on those had already started in respect budget preparations, value for money opinion and the Council's financial resilience.

A member referred to the issues reported on by the external auditor including the valuation of property, pensions and other group audits and asked whether this is a common theme with other local authority audit work. Reference was also made to demise of the Audit Commission and the use of private audit companies providing services for the public sector and the challenge for companies to access this very specialist market. Reference was also made the deadline for annual accounts and if this may be amended and if so what would the likely outcome be to producing final accounts on time.

It was reported that this work was common to local authorities and auditors were addressing the work to find means to make improvements in those organisations. The public sector is reliant on the use of private external audit firms, however the PSA did provide a level of independence and controlled the appointment of auditors through a tendering process. The tendering process had drove down fees which was

helpful for local authorities but in doing so may have made the market for that work less attractive to private companies. The deadline for the completion of final accounts is something the external auditor works toward and the pressure to complete local authority/health service audits is considerable due to capacity issues. There were concerns that the pressure for external auditors to meet current deadlines is unreasonable and the issue of extending the deadline for completing audits had been raised. The Committee was advised that accounts will not be signed off until the external auditor is satisfied that the audit has been properly completed but work would be ongoing to ensure that deadlines are achieved.

### **Decision**

The report was noted

### **AC/21/03 Internal Audit Assurance Report 2020/21**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management that provided an update of progress on the agreed audit plan 2020/21, additional work assigned to the audit service and copies of the audit opinions issued in the period August to December 2020. The Committee was advised that audit work had been impacted during the year due to additional work taken on by Internal Audit. This included the provision of key support for the covid19 grant schemes to provide ongoing support to local businesses and the winter support for children and vulnerable families. The availability of resources has also affected the service and a 'reach out' had been undertaken to provide three additional posts and the subsequent recruitment to permanent posts following completion of a service and savings review. Members were informed that even with additional resources it will remain a challenge to complete all planned audit work by year end as a consequence of client availability due to the continued focus on the covid response and recovery which is acute across all areas of the Council and particularly within front line services in adults, health and care, children's services and schools.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to ask questions.

Members referred to work being done on fraud checks on business grants and the impact the involvement of audit staff in this work has had on the audit team for the reason that staff are running the checks rather than providing a consultancy and facilitating role. Also, what arrangements will there be if the grants system is extended past financial year end as it is likely that the pandemic would continue. Reference was made to resources available to the Audit team and the involvement of Salford Council to undertake audit work on the Council's ICT function in view of potential deletion of vacancies from the team structure. The Head of Risk and Internal Audit was asked to comment on the comparison of work undertaken in the previous year to this year and was it mandatory to provide an opinion if a sufficient amount of work had not been completed.

It was reported that there is not a mandatory requirement to provide an audit opinion, however there is a requirement under the current procedures to provide an opinion to those charged with responsibility for governance such as the Audit Committee. The

Committee was advised that heads of audit across the country were using outcomes from planned audits and other sources of assurance to inform the production of an opinion. Head of Internal Audit stated that other forms of assurance will include his own role and engagement in various governance and recovery groups. In providing the opinion it was important for the Audit Committee and stakeholders that there is clarity on the basis in which the opinion is taken. The CIPFA guidance would be used to inform the opinion on potential limitations and/or qualifications required and referenced. In noting that the amount of audit work had reduced it was reported that audit staff would still be obtaining assurances from planned audits and other work such as emergency grants and business recovery work undertaken during the year. The issue of using another authority to examine the Council's ICT work is a routine arrangement that is done as a matter of course to involve an outside authority to undertake a review. This work was not as a result of the availability of resources. The process of appointing staff from the outreach process would begin next week to help address the current resource shortfall within the Audit Team for the final quarter and into the following year. It was reported that due to the current working arrangements, there may be challenges in working with clients during audits in Adults and Children's Services and a degree of flexibility would be required to work with those clients to obtain assurances. The new improvement plan would help to obtain those assurances following discussions with the areas of services concerned. In response to the question on fraud checks it was reported that from the checks being undertaken, the majority of the work on business grants is system and process based and it was considered the work is valuable in gaining assurance for that area. The resource allocated to grant work will not be at the same level as it was previously because of confidence in the systems in place and the introduction of a post payment assurance plan and the provision of regular updates on their delivery. Further discussions will take place on the investigation of potential largescale fraud through the business grant scheme and this may impact on the fraud team's resources. Discussions would be held with the Committee on the way forward to priorities work. It was reported that in view of the current circumstances the Council faces, it will be necessary to decide on priorities for audit work to be undertaken and identifying other sources of information.

Members referred to the pressures on the Audit Team in particular, the additional responsibilities as a result of Covid19 and the importance of prioritising work to ensure that the audit of Children's and Adults Services and Mental Health Services were maintained. Officers were asked for an update on the PSN and what strategy is in place to prioritise what audit work will take place and what the issues are in accessing clients and if there were other means in obtaining information. Members also asked what the Committee could do to support the service to ensure work is completed in view that audit work is still a necessary and important function within the Council.

The City Treasurer responded and advised the Committee that the peak of the pandemic is now being faced by health and social care services and all non-essential work must stop to allow resources to be focused on maintaining hospital capacity and discharges. This relates, in particular to the point made on the capacity of clients to take part in audits of their service. In addition, it is necessary to maintain a working balance for the requirements of the Government, in order to avoid come back, in areas such as counter fraud assurance. Balance has also been maintained on

business grant work and this has been supported by the Business Support Team to process claims in a timely manner. With regard to Council finance it was reported that the monthly returns provided to the CLG has been essential for the Council to achieve a better financial settlement and the additional funding from the Government was on the basis of strong evidence- based work. It was reported that these examples demonstrate that there is a very fine line on the decisions taken on what priorities to pursue. The pandemic has provided a good demonstration of the strengths within the Council services. Reference was also made the administering of the school voucher scheme for school children in Manchester and the benefit and level of assurance this has provided which will be reflected in the opinion to be submitted to the Committee.

The Committee was informed that issue of capacity also related to auditor's ability to physically access documents to complete a sign off and the priorities of officers on more pressing issues such as vaccination work and testing. Officers were working to obtain information through other sources within the organisation. Discussion will take place on the priorities to focus on areas such as Mental Health Casework and Homelessness these will be based on the level of urgency and current arrangements to provide access to individuals and information.

The Committee was advised that to best support officers it should continue to discharge its function in obtaining assurances and ensuring that audit work is completed. It was reported that senior officers are aware of the need to complete audit work to maintain and improve the work of the Council services and that the findings will be submitted to the Audit Committee.

A member referred to outstanding audit work and asked if it was possible to collaborate with other officer colleagues to work smart to complete the work and if this was good practice.

It was reported that as an example of collaborative working, work in Adult Services would be monitored by audit staff and would involve sitting in on meetings rather than just receiving copies of minutes and be at a higher level to take part in checking and testing to gain assurance.

A member referred to changes within the staffing structure and what processes are in place to ensure that the level of senior management support for the City Treasurer will be in place.

It was reported that a suitably qualified member of staff is currently in place for the Deputy Treasurer position and interviews would be taking place for the permanent replacement in the following week. It should be noted that the corporate core would have a reduced function, however work would continue to ensure the best use of existing resources. This will enable the City Treasurer to maintain an overview of the work of the department.

## **Decision**

The Committee noted the report and the comments received.

## **AC/21/04 Outstanding Audit Recommendations**

Consideration was given to a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Head of Audit and Risk Management that provided a summary the current implementation position and arrangements for monitoring and reporting internal and external audit recommendations.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to ask questions.

A member referred to the Disability Supported Accommodation Services: Quality Assurance Framework and expressed concern that the recommendation from February 2018, for a register of all details including residents; staff and properties to be sent to Performance, Research and Intelligence team was yet to be implemented and the no further action was now required. The point was made that it is important that detailed records are produced and maintained to better protect vulnerable individuals the Council has responsibility for.

It was reported that the recommendation had been implemented from an audit perspective that quality assurance checks were in place, however a more accurate update on the keeping of accurate registers within properties would be provided to members of the Committee.

### **Decisions**

1. The Committee noted the report.
2. To request a report be submitted to provide a review of resources within Internal Audit.

## **Health and Wellbeing Board**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2021**

**This Health and Wellbeing Board meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Richard Leese, Leader of the Council (Chair)  
Vicky Szulist, Chair, Healthwatch  
Dr Tracey Vell, Primary Care representative - Local Medical Committee  
Dr Murugesan Raja, GP Member (North) MHCC  
Dr Vish Mehra, Central Primary Care Manchester  
David Regan, Director of Public Health  
Dr Denis Colligan, GP Member (North) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
Rupert Nichols, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust  
Dr Ruth Bromley, Chair Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
Paul Marshall, Strategic Director of Children's Services

#### **Apologies:**

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults Health and Wellbeing  
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services  
Mike Wild, Voluntary and Community Sector representative

#### **Also in attendance:**

Dr Manisha Kumar, Medical Director, MHCC

#### **HWB/21/01 Urgent Business**

The Chair agreed to the submission of an item of urgent business from the Director of Public Health relating to information regarding a Census.

#### **HWB/21/02 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2020 were submitted for approval.

#### **Decision**

To agree as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 9 December 2020.

#### **HWB/21/03 COVID-19 Update - Presentation**

The Director of Public Health and Dr Manisha Kumar, Medical Director MHCC, co-presented the latest COVID-19 Update.

The Director of Public Health referred to points in the presentation covering updates, data and intelligence specific to Manchester which showed how the various rates in confirmed cases, over 60s cases and detection had reduced consistently in the mid-January period. The Director of Public Health referred to five new testing sites across the city and a forthcoming test site due to open in February at the Rates Hall in the Town Hall Extension.

Dr Manisha Kumar referred to points in the presentation covering the vaccination programme stating that the first vaccination centre was set up in Wythenshawe two weeks following the approval of the Pfizer vaccine. Dr Kumar explained that a further seven sites have since been established covering South, Central and North Manchester. Dr Kumar confirmed that the programme had met the target of administering vaccinations in all 56 elderly care homes across the city by 24 January 2021. Supported accommodation and care homes for younger persons were confirmed as being the next target for the vaccination programme. Information was displayed on the ten age group cohorts and amounts of doses for each (approximately 500,000 first doses doubling to 1 million with the supply of a second dose). Dr Kumar confirmed that cohort four was undergoing current operations. Information was provided on the amount of vaccinations required to prevent one death for each cohort which had fed into certain age groups being targeted in the first instance and the ongoing likelihood of a yearly vaccination programme similar to the flu jab. Vaccination Delivery Models were displayed and referred to with comment on covering delivery to the housebound, vulnerable and rough sleepers as well as the care sector, including staff. An update was displayed on vaccinations completed from the previous week and mention given to a good amount of vaccinations being delivered for the coming week. A graph was referred to which displayed areas of the city having greatly increased their rates of first doses to patients aged 80+. The next phase was referred to in terms of second doses to be administered and moving down the ten cohorts to cover other age groups. A current update was displayed and referred to, which confirmed that over 51,000 vaccinations had now been administered, showing high percentages for both 80+ and 75-79 cohorts and the uptake of delivery in the 70 to 74 cohort. To close the presentation the Director of Public Health gave praise to the work being done by staff across Manchester's hospitals.

The Chair invited comments and questions.

Members of the Board also expressed their gratitude and shared praise of all staff involved in the ongoing care and roll out of the vaccination programme.

A question was raised concerning any declined vaccinations and the Chair invited Dr Kumar to comment.

Dr Kumar stated that there had been approximately 1000 people who had not opted in and that there was need establish reasons as to why people were declining the vaccine offer.

A Board member raised a question regarding the sharing of the information on the City Council website so that residents could take access local data.



The Chair stated that Health and Wellbeing Board meeting was helpful in this respect as the presentation was now in the public domain and could be accessed on the Council website.

Board members expressed concerns on contacting patients and those who are unregistered and further concerns on inequalities, in that the population being served across Manchester has a high ethnic mix and that this cohort isn't being matched by the turn out attending for vaccinations. Further comment was made on the spreading of disinformation across social media platforms and other methods.

The Chair invited Dr Kumar to comment.

Dr Kumar stated that there was a drive to have trusted figures involved in communicating on the safety and efficacy of the vaccine to all Manchester residents and that health centres would have to use a clear booking system that was easy for all to understand.

The Chair responded regarding anti-vaccination movements and COVID19 deniers who are active in spreading their beliefs and expressed that GPs are seen to be highly trusted among the population, adding that their credibility should be harnessed in this regard.

The Chair then commented on the targeting of current cohorts stating that these were being targeted early as it was the best method of saving the most lives. The Chair stated that the number of people opting out of having the vaccine would increase as the younger cohorts were targeted and that there would be individuals with occupational risks to consider, more so within other, younger cohorts. The Chair also referred to figures in the North West showing some abuse of the system with individuals effectively pushing in to get their vaccines earlier than in the current vaccine protocol and stated that that, any time this happens, a person in a higher priority category is put at further risk. The Chair commented on the increased non-compliance to the test and trace system and isolating under lockdown, stating that the recent national death statistics should convey the importance of these practices in should be adhered to take pressure off the NHS and save lives.

The Director of Public Health informed the Board that there would soon strong data and communications available to convey how Manchester is progressing with the pandemic and added that work is ongoing with key faith leaders and health professionals across Greater Manchester to establish key messages for the public. There would also be a drive to commit to all faiths and ethnic backgrounds as the programme progressed through the other cohorts.

The Chair stated that he was keen to receive the vaccine as soon as it was available to him and welcomed the scale and pace of the operation.

## **Decision**

The Board note the report.

### **HWB/21/04 Census update**

The Director of Public Health stated that he would send information to Board members and confirmed that the Census is going ahead and would be conducted digitally. The Director of Public Health stated that there was a great need for participation in this matter as City Council and NHS funding would be adversely affected if the figures were not accurate.

The Chair agreed with the drive for accuracy stating that this has a knock-on effect for funding, planning and many other aspects of the City Council's services.

The Chair thanked all participants for their time and the hard work undertaken in their response to the pandemic.

### **Decision**

To note the update.

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 21 January 2021**

**This Planning and Highways meeting was a meeting conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Kamal, Leech, Lovecy, Lyons, Madeline Monaghan, Riasat, Watson and White

**Apologies:**  
Councillor Hitchen:

**Also Present:**  
Councillors Jeavons (ward Councillor) and Wheeler (ward Councillor)

#### **PH/20/69      Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications (128189/FO/2020 and 121252/FO/2018), since the agenda was issued.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/21/01 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2020 as a correct record.

#### **PH/21/02      128189/FO/2020 - 39 Daisy Bank Road, Manchester, M14 5GP**

This application relates to a change of use to a residential care home providing accommodation for up to 6 people (Class C2). The application relates to a relatively large vacant 2-storey, semi-detached dwelling house with an existing two storey side and rear extension. The application property is unoccupied but has a current licence for use as an 8 person house in multiple occupation (HMO); a use that appears to have first commenced in 1997. The proposed development would relate to the care of up

to 6 adults with mental health needs or learning difficulties requiring 24-hour support over short and longer-term periods.

The Planning Officer provided an update including drawing Members attention to the late representation report. The update referred to the submission of a staff travel plan that has been assessed by Highways officers. Further details are required in relation to implementation and future monitoring however, the submission gives assurance that the details of the recommended staff travel plan condition are capable of being delivered as part of the development. The Committee was informed that if the application is agreed there would be an amendment made to Condition 3 regarding the Permitted Management Plan on the number of residents who could be cared for at the residence.

The applicant or agent did not address the Committee on the proposal.

There was no objector present at the meeting.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to ask questions and comment of the application.

A member noted that objections had been submitted by local residents on the possible loss of amenity but considered that the proposed application will provide much needed residential care provision and welcomed the application.

Councillor Lovecy moved the recommendation to approve the application, subject to an amendment to Condition 3 to amend the Permitted Management Plan to limit the number of residents who can be cared for at the residence at one time. Councillor Watson seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee approved the application subject to the Conditions detailed in the report submitted and subject to the amendment of Condition 3 to amend the Permitted Management Plan to limit the number of residents who can be cared for at the residence at one time.,

### **PH/21/03 121252/FO/2018 - Great Marlborough Street Car Park, Great Marlborough Street, Manchester, M1 5NJ**

This application is for the partial reconfiguration of existing Multi-Storey Car Park (MSCP), including temporary access off Great Marlborough Street, construction of 5 storey external ramps, closure of vehicular access to top level; and construction of new facade; and partial demolition of the surplus part of existing MSCP and erection of a part 55, part 11 storey, part 4 storey mixed-use building comprising 853 Purpose Built Student Accommodation units (sui generis), ancillary amenity space and support facilities, and 786sqm (GIA) SME incubator workspace (Use Class B1), including public realm improvements and other associated work.

The Planning Officer provided an update including drawing Members attention to the late representation report. The update referred to further comments received from

the Macintosh Village Residents Company and the responses to the comments from the Director of Planning as follows:

- The objection to the third notification was on behalf of 425 individual objectors;
- Members should receive a copy of their legal advice, and a more professional and accurate record of the impact for the developer, given residents would be successful in injunction (the possibility must be understood by Members);
- A 6-year construction plan has been communicated to residents. The 3 years within the report was a fictional plan and is misleading
- The price point was issued in the consultation documents stating £275 per week so it needs to be in the document and link to profitability and a more transparent S106. The committee report suggests the applicant is borrowing £150 million but is yet to land on a business model or price point?
- A legal offer was made during the second consultation of a direct payment to Macintosh Village Residents after sharing street crime CCTV footage and the acknowledgement that anti-social behaviour will increase pro rata with the increase from student caste V1 before they sold it;
- The statement regarding the track record of the applicant is biased. They no longer own student castle and a balanced report would inform members know of their track record of selling every 3 years;
- There are deliverability challenges and highways have said no access nor use of Hulme Street for cranes. The applicant says they will not use a tower crane as HSE would not allow residents to use the car park. So where is the crane shown on the construction plan during residents' consultation 2 and 3 going to go?
- A miscalculation with the UNITE scheme regarding access for the crane and site was made and the whole road was closed for the duration. You cannot close Great Marlborough Street for the duration nor use or access Hulme Street so where is the evidence of deliverability?
- The report does not reference the previous planning refusals in the area for over dominance of a tall building not on a podium;
- The report does not reference the Manchester Residential Design Guide;
- The report does not reference Part L of the Building Regulations that does not allow the use of an energy tariff to pass sustainability.

Responses for the Director of Planning:

Whilst the proposal would create 853 units, the size of the units means that some could be shared and up to 934 students could live there. The applicant intends to offer room to single occupants with the larger studios reserved for those with disabilities. However, for the purposes of considering the impact of the development, the planning submission, including the Environmental Statement, has considered the maximum capacity of the building. The report notes that room sizes are larger than other nearby student accommodation. 97% of the studios exceed 18 sqm.

The response of the Macintosh Village Residents Company (third notification) was supported by 425 individual objectors. The third notification was subject to a 30-day consultation, and publicised in the form of a press notice, due to information being

received under the EIA Regulations. In addition, this information was the subject of a 21 days re-notification was undertaken with local residents.

The construction period is expected to be 5 years with the build lasting 3 and half years and the remainder for fit out.

The constrained nature of the site and the need to ensure that the MSCP remains operational throughout, creates construction and highway management challenges together with disruption to the surrounding residential area from noise, dust and traffic. The specific logistical requirements are still being considered with Highway Services and indicative details are provided in the report. The final location of the tower crane(s) has yet to be agreed, but Hulme Street would not be used for its erection or dismantling. A tower crane strategy would be required and condition 11 should be amended to make this more explicit.

Access to the MSCP would be managed when the crane is erected/dismantled in the interest of safety and access would be restricted/supervised during this time. The users of the car park would be given prior notification of any restrictions. In any instance where access is required without prior notice, or in the event of an emergency, the car park areas would be made safe in order to facilitate the request for access at the earliest opportunity. It is envisaged that this will be for short periods of time only during the lifting operations.

Once the crane has been erected, general construction exclusions zones would only apply to specific construction areas of the MSCP which include the roof of the car park. As detailed within the report, the car park would remain in use with appropriate protection measures in place to ensure segregation from the construction site. Use of the lifts and main stair core would remain accessible. Any changes to access routes will be communicated in advance and clearly sign posted.

The applicant's contractor has developed management measures to minimise localise impacts on residents and the local highway network. This includes air quality monitoring measures and Just In Time (JIT) delivery systems which ensures that waggons do not idle on the surrounding road network.

The construction impacts of this development can be managed and mitigated so that amenity or highway impacts would not warrant refusal. Condition 11 would ensure that construction impacts are mitigated and agreed to maintain the operational effectiveness of the highway network and pedestrian safety and minimise impact on residential amenity.

Officers are in receipt of a legal opinion obtained by Macintosh Village Residents Company with regards to the impact of the redevelopment of the site on the leaseholders car parking spaces within the MSCP. It notes that the Residents Company oppose the redevelopment of the car park and that the purpose of the legal opinion is to determine whether the redevelopment of the car park is allowed within the confines of the leases and whether the redevelopment would result in an actionable interference with the rights of leaseholders.

The legal opinion states that the redevelopment of the car park, insofar as it would

reduce the number of spaces available, is not permissible by the lease in or of itself and that the development of the car park (both during the 6 year construction phase and upon the completion) would likely result in actional interference with the rights of tenants with the benefit of the right of way and the right to park. The legal opinion concludes that the tenants with the benefits of the rights would be able to seek restrain such interference by injunction.

Members are advised that there are private third-party property rights relating to the right to park in the MSCP. Such rights are protected and enforced through other legislation and are not material planning considerations.

It is noted that Macintosh Village Residents Company disagree with this position and state that the presence of such rights effect the deliverability of the scheme which they believe is material to the planning decision.

Increasing the supply of purpose-built student accommodation would help to relieve pressure on existing homes in the city centre which drives up rents and are Council Tax exempt. There are also known issues, particularly at Manchester Metropolitan University, who is unable to offer all first-year students' accommodation in purpose built student accommodation.

The scheme on New Wakefield Street was promptly delivered upon the grant of planning permission and is now ready for occupation.

The applicant has a track record of delivering student accommodation schemes. It is not material to the determination of this planning application whether the applicant chooses to then sell their interest in a site and all obligations are attached to the land and not the applicant.

This planning application has to be determined on its merits. The scale, height appearance is considered in detail in the report particularly the impacts on the wider townscape and heritage. The images within the report, including cumulative impacts (shown in wire lines) comprehensively considers the local and wider impact on the City scape and concludes, that in most cases, the impacts are beneficial or commensurate with other nearby developments.

Where harm does arise, particularly to the setting of the conservation area and nearby listed buildings, this harm is suitability mitigated by the significant public benefits which would arise from a project of this nature. The proposal therefore accords with paragraphs 193, 194 and 196 of the NPPF and section 72 of the of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Localised impacts on the wind environment and impacts on daylight, sunlight and loss of privacy are also considered likely and the effects are outlined in some detail in the report. Such impacts are not unusual in a city centre context and would therefore not warrant refusal of this planning application.

The report does reference the Residential Quality Guide a summary of which is included in the policy section of the report.

The correspondence relating to a legal offer etc is not part of this planning application and is not a relevant planning consideration. Designing out crime is a key planning consideration and the application has been reviewed by Design for Security at GMP with recommendations in the Crime Impact Statement. The recommendations in their report have each been included in the design including increased CCTV.

The development exceeds relevant planning policies and those outlined within Part L of the Building Regulations without a specific energy tariff. Commitment to a zerocarbon energy tariff is one additional means, beyond Part L, that forms part of the low carbon strategy.

The objector's representative addressed the Committee and outlined the reasons for the objections submitted.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the proposal.

Councillor Jeavons (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to object to the application due to the potential impact on the surrounding area and the Mackintosh Village and requested the Committee undertake a site visit. The Committee was informed that the development would negatively impact the residential community and unbalance the area through influx of such a large number of students.

The Planning Officer reported that the points raised had been extensively covered in the planning report.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to ask questions and comment of the application.

A member raised five points in respect of the application and welcomed the proposal for a site visit. The points raised were:

- Is the development deliverable if it is open to legal challenge.
- The cumulative negative impact of the area with the increase in students living in the development.
- The lack of affordable accommodation within the development.
- The details on the infrastructure improvements and the importance of agreeing them before the application could be approved.
- The unacceptable visual appearance of the development.

Members of the Committee supported the request for a site visit

Councillor White moved the proposal for the Committee to undertake a site for the reasons of the size/massing of the proposed building and its potential impact on the surrounding area. Councillor Flanagan seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

To agree to defer consideration of the planning application to allow a site visit to be carried out by the members of the Committee.



(Councillor Nasrin Ali did not take part in the vote on the decision due to technical issues.)

**PH/21/04 126328/FO/2020 - Speakers House, 39 Deansgate Manchester, M3 2BA**

This application relates to an application for the erection of a 17 storey building comprising office use (Use Class B1a) and flexible ground floor commercial units (Use Classes A1 shop, A2 financial and professional services, A3 restaurant/cafe and A4 drinking establishment), new electricity sub-station, basement cycle parking and rooftop plant enclosure, together with access, servicing and associated works following demolition of the existing building.

The Planning Officer provided an update on the application. The Committee was advised that two reasons for minded to refusal had been included in the planning report. The Committee was informed that officers did not consider the first reason regarding a loss of amenity to be sufficient to refuse the application. The second reason referred to points raised by Historic England relating to the impact of the building on town houses located nearby but did consider the impact to result in less than substantial harm. The view taken by planning officers is that the benefit of the development to the area will outweigh negative impact.

The objector's representative addressed the Committee and recapped on the reasons for objection.

- The Height and mass and the development;
- Loss of amenity to local residents (loss of privacy and light, overlooking);
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Over development of the site.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the proposal.

Councillor Jeavons (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to object to the application. The committee was advised that the application does not work for the local area or that area of the city centre in terms of height and mass. The impact on local heritage assets is considerable and unacceptable in a city centre concept.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to ask questions and comment of the application.

The Planning Officer referred to the detailed responses within the planning report to the objections received and the application of planning policies and guidance. Reference was also made to the impact of the scheme which is not considered to be a substantial harm on the surrounding area.

Councillor Lyons moved the proposal for the Committee to refuse the application. Councillor Leech seconded the proposal.

Members of the committee considered that the issues relating to the negative and substantial impact of the proposal had not changed with the loss of amenity and impact on heritage assets and considered that the negative impact of the

development would not outweigh the potential public benefits and agreed that the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would be unacceptable due to the resultant loss of amenity for the residents of No. 1 Deansgate and therefore contrary to guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework and inconsistent with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.
2. The proposed development would represent overdevelopment of the site and would be unacceptable due to the negative impact on the heritage assets of St. Anns's Church, the Royal Exchange and the St. Ann's Square Conservation Area. Furthermore, the negative impact of the development on surrounding heritage assets would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to guidance with the National Planning Policy Framework and inconsistent with policies SP1, EN3, CC9 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved policies DC18.1 and DC19.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

## **Decision**

The Committee refused the application for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would be unacceptable due to the resultant loss of amenity for the residents of No. 1 Deansgate and therefore contrary to guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework and inconsistent with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.
2. The proposed development would represent overdevelopment of the site and would be unacceptable due to the negative impact on the heritage assets of St. Anns's Church, the Royal Exchange and the St. Ann's Square Conservation Area. Furthermore, the negative impact of the development on surrounding heritage assets would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to guidance with the National Planning Policy Framework and inconsistent with policies SP1, EN3, CC9 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved policies DC18.1 and DC19.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

**PH/21/05      128002/FO/2020 - One City Road, 1 City Road East, Manchester, M15 4PN**

This application relates to a full Planning Application for demolition of existing structures on site, erection of one 11-storey plus basement office building (Use Class E) and one 14-storey plus basement office building with ground floor commercial unit (Use Class E), landscaping, highways works, and associated works. The application includes 519 cycle parking spaces and on-street parking bays would be re-arranged to include two on-street parking bays for disabled people and a car club space.

The Committee undertook a site visit prior to the meeting.

The Planning Officer did not any further comments of the planning application submitted.

The objector's representative addressed the Committee and referred to the reasons for objection relating to:

- Amendment to the proximity of the development to City South residents;
- Loss of privacy
- Shadowing on City South;
- Loss of natural light;
- Noise concerns.
- Access to City South on Shawcross Street;
- Putting back the development date to 2024;
- Impact on selling of properties at City South development;
- Increase in pollution;
- Construction work impacts;
- Environmental pollution, litter during construction;
- Car parking for the office space;
- Increase in traffic;
- Loss of trees and green space
- Loss of visual amenity.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the proposal.

Councillor Jeavons (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to object to the application. Reference was made to the loss of amenity to the residents of City South as detailed in the planning report.

The Planning Officer reported that it was important that development continues in this area of the city centre to provide homes and places of work and a balance was needed to address resident's tensions with new developments in order to move forward. Officers considered that the design of the development provided an acceptable balance.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to ask questions and comment of the application.

A member referred to the reference 'bounce back' and made the point that many office workers are working from home and this may continue resulting in another office block becoming unnecessary. Reference was also made to the permeability of the site to pedestrians and the appearance of the access which looked like an entrance to the proposed building.

The Planning Officer reported that there is a belief by developers that there is a requirement for Grade A office accommodation within the city centre and this development would help meet that requirement. The new accessible walkway proposed would be similar to the walkway currently used as a public access between

the Town Hall Extension and the Central Library on Library Walk between St Peter's Square and Mount Street.

Members referred to the assessments made to determine acceptable levels of natural light for new buildings and the issue of noise for the properties with no alternative rooms to move to. The point was made that it is important to assess the impact of new developments on people in their homes. Reference was made to the construction management plan and the importance of the involvement and consultation with residents in process when producing the plan.

The Planning Officer reported that consultation with residents and contractors is at the forefront of any development and consultation on the construction management plan would be raised with the developer. Officers would also look at providing a new format for the presentation of information relating to the impact new development on light levels for residents.

Councillor Andrews moved the proposal for the Committee to approve the application. Councillor Shaukat Ali seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee approved the application subject to the Conditions detailed in the report submitted.

(Councillor Flanagan left the meeting took no part in the vote on the application or the remainder of the meeting.)

### **PH/21/06 127881/FO/2020 and 127882/LO/2020 - 109 -127 Market Street, Manchester, M60 1TA**

This application relates to development comprising erection of four storey roof-top extension (for use within Class E (Commercial, Business and Service Uses); for use of floors 1-7 for use within Class E (Commercial, Business and Service Uses) and change of use of the basement and ground floor to permit Use Class E (Commercial, Business and Service Uses) and Drinking Establishments and Hot Food Takeaway (Sui Generis) use, external works associated with the formation of new ground floor entrances, sub-division of the ground floor into 9 units; works to windows including replacements, creation of winter gardens on the 6th floor; creation of external roof top amenity spaces; installation of new rooftop plant; the provision of secure cycle parking (255 spaces) in sub-basement and other associated works.

There is also an application for Listed Building Consent: Internal and external alterations to include: the erection of four storey roof-top extension; partial demolition of the floor structure to create the atrium; installation of a lightwell; external alterations to form new entrances on the ground floor; sub-division of the ground floor into smaller units the refurbishment; works to windows including replacements; demolition of a staircase; partial demolition of kitchen and plant structure on Floor 7; creation of winter gardens on the 6th floor; creation of external roof top amenity spaces; installation of new rooftop plant; refurbishment of the interiors and other associated works.

The Planning Officer provided an update the application and reported that following discussions with the application regarding concerns raised by local residents on the issue of privacy and overlooking. Agreement had been reached that a dense frit would be added to the bottom level of each window to head height to increase privacy of the residential properties adjacent.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Wheeler (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to comment on the proposal. Reference was made to the extension planned on the top of the current building. Reference was also made on the loss of light to local properties adjacent to the building and impact this may have on the health and wellbeing of residents affected. Reference was made to the planning report that access to light in adjacent buildings it is unrealistic and asked if this could be addressed.

The Planning Officer reported that the planning report provided detailed responses to the points raised.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to ask questions and comment of the application.

A member referred to the roof top and extension and why the structure is hidden from view and designed in an out of touch manner and the lack of light for residents.

The Planning Officer reported that the building is iconic within the city centre and had come to the end of its useful life in its current use. The applicant has looked at potential uses and has produced a sustainable use for the building that protects its historical integrity and an office building is considered the best future use. The roof top extension was added and is the smallest financially, commercially viable structure and design for the building. This has been assessed independently on its impact and is considered acceptable.

Councillor Shaukat Ali moved the proposal for the Committee to approve the application. Councillor Riasat seconded the proposal.

## **Decisions**

1. The Committee approved the planning application 127881/FO/2020, subject to the Conditions detailed in the report submitted.
2. The Committee approved the application for List Building Consent 127882/LO/2020as detailed in the report submitted.

(Councillors Y Dar, Monaghan and Nasrin Ali left the meeting and did not take part in the vote on the application.)

**PH/21/07      128045/VO/2020 - Manchester Cathedral, Victoria Street.  
Manchester**

This is for a City Council Development - Public realm works to create a new public amenity space (Phases 1A, 1B and 1C) comprising the creation of a memorial feature to the Manchester Arena Attack, new entrance square in front of Manchester Cathedral (with potential use as events space), areas of new paving, amenity planting, raised lawns, tree planting, street furniture and lighting.

The proposals would create a public amenity space in 3 phases including the creation of a memorial feature to the Manchester Arena Attack (Phase 1A), new entrance square in front of Manchester Cathedral, paving, amenity planting, raised lawns, tree planting, street furniture and lighting.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the proposal.

There was no objector present at the meeting.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to ask questions and comment of the application.

A member asked officers if the area proposed would be classed as a public park and how many trees would be included in the design, what alternative arrangements would be made for cyclists to avoid using the area for access. Also, did the GMP Safety by Design team have any concerns on the design of the area.

The Planning Officer reported that the area is for the creation of a public realm, and there will be sixty-four trees included in the design. Alternative access arrangements for cyclists routes would be considered because the space would be for pedestrian access only and cyclists would be required to dismount. The GMP concerns had been addressed and the final design would require a Safety by Design accreditation before it could be proceeded with.

A member asked if the area would be fully accessible for people with mobility issues.

The Committee was informed that the area would be full accessible to the public and further negotiations would continue to with access groups to address concerns and ensure full accessibility.

Councillor Lyons moved the proposal for the Committee to approve the application. Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee approved the planning application, subject to the Conditions detailed in the report submitted.