



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

Tuesday, 31 January 2022

Dear Councillor / Honorary Alderman,

Meeting of the Council – Wednesday, 2nd February, 2022

A summons was issued on 25 January 2022 for meeting of the Council which will be held at 10.00 am on Wednesday, 2nd February, 2022, in The Charter Room, Manchester Central Convention Centre, Windmill Street, Manchester, M2 3GX.

The following items marked as ‘to follow’ on the summons are now enclosed. This is a revised summons and includes the minutes of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 26 January 2022, that was not included on the original summons.

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| 7. Proceedings of the Executive | Pages |
| To submit the minutes of the Executive on 19 January 2022 | 3 - 14 |
| 9. Scrutiny Committees | Pages |
| To note the minutes of the following scrutiny committees: | 15 - 30 |
| Resources and Governance | 11 January 2022 |
| Children and Young People | 12 January 2022 |
| 10. Proceedings of Committees | Pages |
| To submit for approval the minutes of the following meetings and consider recommendations made by the committee: | 31 - 48 |
| Licensing and Appeals Committee | 24 January 2022 |
| Planning and Highways Committee | 20 January 2022 |
| Health and Wellbeing Board | 26 January 2022. |
| 12. Process for the Appointment of the External Auditor | Pages |
| To consider the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer. | 49 - 56 |

Yours faithfully,

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

Joanne Roney OBE
Chief Executive

Councillors:-

T Judge (Chair), Abdullatif, Akbar, Azra Ali, Ahmed Ali, Nasrin Ali, Sameem Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Andrews, Appleby, Baker-Smith, Bano, Battle, Bayunu, Benham, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Chohan, Clay, Collins, Connolly, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Y Dar, Davies, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Farrell, Foley, Flanagan, Green, Grimshaw, Hacking, Hassan, Hewitson, Hilal, Hitchen, Holt, Hughes, Hussain, Igbon, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, J Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Monaghan, Moore, Newman, Noor, Nunney, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reeves, Reid, Riasat, Richards, Robinson, Rowles, Russell, Sadler, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, Simcock, Stanton, Stogia, Taylor, Wheeler, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

Further Information

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

Andrew Woods
Tel: 0161 234 3011
Email: andrew.woods@manchester.gov.uk

This agenda was issued on **Tuesday, 31 January 2022** by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Manchester City Council, Level 2, Town Hall Extension (Library Walk Elevation), Manchester M60 2LA

Executive

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 19 January 2022

Present: Councillor Craig (Chair)

Councillors: Akbar, Bridges, Midgley, Rahman, Rawlins

Also present as Members of the Standing Consultative Panel:

Councillors: Butt, Karney, M Sharif Mahamed, Ilyas and Taylor

Exe/22/1 Minutes

Decision

The Executive approved as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 15 December 2021.

Exe/22/2 COVID19 updates - Population Health and Economic Recovery

The Executive considered a report of the Director of Public Health and the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure, which provided an update on the COVID-19 situation within the city and the progress that was being made with the city's economic recovery.

The Deputy Leader (Adult Care and Health) advised that over Christmas and New year there had been a significant increase in infection rates, with Omicron replacing Delta as the dominant variant. Infection rates within the city were now 937 per 100,000 of the population and Manchester was currently 6th amongst Greater Manchester's Local Authorities in terms of infection rates. The infection rate amongst the over 60's was 720 per 100,000, placing Manchester 4th across Greater Manchester. Hospitals and care homes continued to face severe pressure and as such all health partners were working tirelessly to aid the discharge process from hospitals. Rates had increased in school children following the Christmas break but the roll out of 12-17 vaccination programme was well under way. Further announcements were expected on vaccinations for 5 to 11 years olds.

The Deputy Leader commented that whilst it had been announced that Plan B measures would and as of 27 January 2022, the Council would consider what this would mean for staff and provide clear communication to all council employees and communities in advance of this date.

In relation to the city's economic recovery, the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure reported that the increase in inflation to 5.4% (as of the end of December 2021), which was the highest level for 30 years, coupled with the increasing cost in energy prices would have a detrimental impact on real living standards for Manchester residents, putting pressure on both lower and middle income families and creating greater levels of poverty and less spending power which would have a further impact on the economy and jobs in a number of key sectors.

Councillor Karney praised the dedication and work of all council staff, public health teams, care staff and NHS workers over the last 22 months alongside all Manchester residents who abided by the national restrictions in looking after the health of their families. He criticised the recently reported actions of the Prime Minister in the breaking the lockdown restrictions and recommended that the Council wrote to the Prime Minister seeking an apology and his resignation for failure to uphold his moral responsibility.

Decision

The Executive note the report

Exe/22/3 Our Manchester progress update report

The Executive considered a report of the Chief Executive which provided an update on key areas of progress against the Our Manchester Strategy – Forward to 2025 which 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 2016 – 2025.

The Leader reported that the Glade of Light memorial to those who lost their lives in the 22 May 2017 Manchester terror attack had a soft opening to the public on 5 January 2022. The garden space was designed as a living memorial and a place for quiet contemplation and remembrance. An official opening event for the memorial was being planned for this spring, ahead of the fifth anniversary.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment reported that the Manchester College had officially opened its new £25m state-of-the-art facilities for Construction and Engineering, Health and Social Care, Childhood Studies and Sport at its Openshaw Campus in East Manchester. The Campus was a key part of the Manchester College’s estates transformation project and will complement the forthcoming £95m City Campus. He advised on the completion of the two zero carbon social properties (the first of their kind in the UK) which had been passed over to the first residents as part of a wider 22 two and three bed low carbon homes for social rent on Blackrock Street in Beswick. He also reported on the work that had commenced to restore and redevelop what remains of Ancoats Dispensary, creating 39 new one and two-bed apartments for affordable rent. The plans looked to protect the heritage legacy of the building, incorporating its listed Old Mill Street and Lampwick Lane facades, while providing much needed affordable homes in the area.

The Executive Member for Environment reported on the launch of a fleet of electric cargo bikes, offering businesses and residents a viable and affordable emission-free alternative to cars. The scheme was part of the Council’s commitment to exploring and providing alternatives to polluting forms of transport to support the goal of the city becoming zero carbon by 2038. She also advised that the Council had published a range of sustainable events guides to help organisers of events whether large or small, commercial or community, outdoor or indoor, to reduce their carbon footprints. The guides were intended to help organisers in the city to review their approaches, share good practice and contribute towards the city’s aim to become zero carbon by 2038.

The Deputy Leader reported that since opening in March 2021, Apex House, a new Council accommodation located in Levenshulme, to support homeless families getting back on their feet had helped 75 families. A former office building, it had been converted to a high standard into 20 flats where families who had become homeless were given advice and assistance to enable them to move into their own homes, with support workers based on site.

Decision

The Executive note the report

Exe/22/4 Finance Settlement and Budget Position

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy City Treasurer, which provided and update on the main announcements from the provisional local government finance settlement 2022/23 announced 16 December 2021, with a focus on the impact on the Council and its budget for 2022/23. It also outlined the main budget assumptions behind the Medium-Term budget position 2022/23 to 2024/25.

The Leader commented that whilst the overall settlement announcement was towards the positive end of expectations, this did not constitute being a good settlement and the Council had lost over £400m from its budget since 2010. If the Council had received the average level of cuts in funding, this year it would have at least £85m in its budget. The Council was also still dealing with the legacy of the Covid pandemic and the promise from government that it would compensate local authorities with whatever they needed. She added that it was not possible to undo a decade of cuts with a settlement in one year that was not as severe as anticipated and looking beyond next financial year there was significant worries which meant that the Council needed to continue its call for fair and sustainable funding.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer commented that whilst the settlement was better than anticipated, the Council still faced a very challenging three year budget position. In 2022/23 the Council would be using the last of its commercial income reserve to help balance the budget and there was a remaining budget gap of approximately £37m in 2023/24 and £58m in 2024/25. As the settlement announcement was for only one year, the Council was facing increasing uncertainty with proposals around fairer funding reforms and the implications of these.

A full Medium Term Financial Plan would be presented to Executive in February and insofar as the savings required, It was expected that mitigations in the region of £7.7m, as previously identified, would be sufficient to balance the 2022/23 budget.

The Deputy Leader (Adult Health and Care) commented that the Adult Social Care (ASC) budget accounted for 35% of the Councils overall budget as it was required to provide statutory services and the settlement provided no additional funding for increased demand in ASC. A fair, sustainable plan was needed in order to plan effectively to provide essential services for Manchester residents as the raising of the Adult Social Care precept element of the Council Tax and increase in the rates of national insurance contributions were a regressive tax placing a heavier burden on low income earners.

The Executive Member for Housing and Growth highlighted the cuts in funding to deliver new affordable housing and called on government to redress this imbalance and provide appropriate funding to build social rent and affordable rent homes that were needed.

Councillor Karney commented on the increase in levels of poverty and inequalities in communities just outside of the city centre which had grown over the last ten years as a result of the austerity measures placed on the Council by the government.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools commented on the national increase in child poverty as a result of government policy, which was evident in Manchester by the increase in children receiving free school meals.

Decision

The Executive note the report.

Exe/22/5 Capital Programme Update Report

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which informed Members of requests to increase the capital programme. The report also sought approval for those schemes that could be approved under authority delegated to the Executive and asked the Executive to recommend to Council proposals that required specific Council approval.

The proposals which required Council approval were those which were funded by the use of reserves above a cumulative total of £2 million, where the use of borrowing was required or a virement exceeded £0.5m. These included the following proposed changes:-

- Neighbourhoods – Beswick Hub RFL. A capital budget increase of £2.577m was requested, funded by Waterfall Fund, to build a new rugby league coaching and educational facility on the existing rugby ground on land to the rear of The East Manchester Academy; and
- ICT – EYEs Phase 2. A capital budget decrease of £1.352m was requested funded from borrowing along with a corresponding revenue budget increase of £1.352m funded from Capital Fund to further embed the EYES system and improve business processes. It would also include a full review of reporting requirements and capabilities of the system to ensure data/workflows/systems and reports were aligned, accurate and efficient, enabling more proactive reporting

The report then went on to detail the proposals that did not require Council approval which were funded by the use of external resources, use of capital receipts, use of reserves below £2million, where the proposal could be funded from existing revenue budgets or where the use of borrowing on a spend to save basis was required. These included:-

- Highways Services – Levenshulme Burnage Active Neighbourhood. A capital budget increase of £3.586m was requested, funded by External Contribution to

- reduce traffic in the area, through interventions such as modal filters, one-way systems, and vehicle gates
- ICT – Ransomware Protection. A capital budget decrease of £0.383m is requested and approval of a corresponding transfer of £0.383m to the revenue budget, funded by Capital Fund, to implement a technical solution that could pro-actively detect and isolate malicious behaviour
- ICT - VEPS RPA (Verify Earnings and Pensions Service Robotic Process Automation). A capital budget decrease of £0.047m is requested and approval of a corresponding transfer of £0.047m to the revenue budget, funded by Capital Fund to eliminate a manual process of downloading daily files from Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) and manually updating current software with information for benefits, improving efficiencies in the service.

The report highlighted that there had been increases to the programme totalling £0.599m as a result of delegated approvals since the previous report to the Executive on 17 November 2021 and if the recommendations in the report were approved the General Fund capital budget would increase by £4.381 across financial years which would also result in an increase in the prudential indicator for Capital Expenditure in corresponding years.

Approval had also been given for the following capital budget virements:-

- £0.679 from Strategic Acquisitions budget for Site Acquisition - The Yard, Vaughan St for the purchase of land adjoining Space Studios, making way for potential future expansion and continued economic development in West Gorton.
- £0.024 to ensure the bridge works at New Islington Marina could commence.
- £1.5m for Traffic Free Deansgate Permanent Works utilising the Highways Improvement budget.
- £0.451 from the Parks Development Programme for the Wythenshawe Cycling Hub project.
- £2.174 for Road Collapse Emergency Works across three sites funded by borrowing via the Bridges and Structures budget within Highways Services .
- £40k for Lincoln Square Public realm - Mulberry Street from the Sustaining Key Initiatives budget

Decisions

The Executive

- (1) Recommend that the Council approve the following changes to Manchester City Council's capital programme:
 - Neighbourhoods – Beswick Hub RFL. A capital budget increase of £2.577m is requested, funded by Waterfall Fund.
 - ICT – EYEs Phase 2. A capital budget decrease of £1.352m is requested funded from borrowing along with a corresponding revenue budget increase of £1.352m funded from Capital Fund.
- (2) Approves the following changes to the City Council's capital programme:

- Highways Services – Levenshulme Burnage Active Neighbourhood. A capital budget increase of £3.586m, funded by External Contribution.
 - ICT – Ransomware Protection. A capital budget decrease of £0.383m and of a corresponding transfer of £0.383m to the revenue budget, funded by Capital Fund
 - ICT - VEPS RPA (Verify Earnings and Pensions Service Robotic Process Automation). A capital budget decrease of £0.047m and a corresponding transfer of £0.047m to the revenue budget, funded by Capital Fund
- (3) Notes the increases to the programme of £0.599m as a result of delegated approvals.
- (4) Notes the virements in the programme of £4.867m as a result of virements from approved budgets

Exe/22/6 School Budgets report

The Executive considered a report of Strategic Director (Children and Education Services), which recommended changing the basis for the funding allocation across individual primary and secondary school budgets from 2022/23, in order to allow schools a longer adjustment period before introduction of the direct national funding formula (NFF).

The Dedicated School Grant (DSG) was a ring-fenced grant to support the education of children across the city. It was divided into four blocks, the largest of which was the Schools' Block element, used to fund individual school budgets in maintained schools and academies.

DSG arrangements for 2022/23 remained unchanged with the grant continuing to be allocated to local authorities in four blocks based on a national formula, but Local Authorities could continue to fund schools on the local formula. Manchester's Schools Forum had previously opted to maintain the local funding formula.

In the summer of 2021 the Government re-confirmed the intention to implement a National Funding Formula which meant that primary and secondary school funding longer term was likely to be determined by the Department of Education (DfE).

The school budget report normally formed part of suite of budget papers that were submitted to the Executive in February for approval prior to the financial year they related to, however, the Council had to submit school budgets to Department for Education by January 2022.

It was recommended that a 10% transition to NFF values in 2022/23. In addition to the NFF factor for Free School Meal (FSM) at the NFF rate, with larger capping to ensure affordability.

Decision

The Executive approve starting a transition to the National Funding Formula (NFF) in advance of submission of primary and secondary budget to the Department for Education in January 2022.

Exe/22/7 Administration of the Covid 19 Additional Relief Fund (CARF)

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that sought agreement on the proposed approach to the administration of the COVID-19 Additional Relief Fund (CARF) which was an additional fund available to support those businesses affected by the pandemic but that were ineligible for existing support linked to business rates.

The Council would receive £23.993m as part of a new discretionary relief that would be paid to the 2021/22 rates bill to reduce the rates payable. It was for all those businesses that had been affected by the pandemic but had not received any rates relief to date and had not been able to submit an appeal to the Valuation Office Agency to reduce their business rates because of the pandemic.

Subject to approval, the scheme would launch immediately with an indicative closure date for applications being 28 February 2022. The scheme would be reviewed on a weekly basis to consider the budget position and the status of the economy and the covid related local and national restrictions.

It was proposed that when the scheme closed the number of applications would be considered based on the available budget and credits were expected to be transferred into the business rates accounts during March and April 2022.

The decision to close the scheme would be made by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in liaison with the Leader of the Council.

Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Notes the funding of £23.993m that will be available and supports the development of the COVID-19 Additional Relief Fund scheme providing rates relief to reduce chargeable amounts for the 2021/22 financial year to businesses in the city.
- (2) Notes the challenges administering the grant and the limited funding which means that the Council will have to prioritise awards.
- (3) Notes that this scheme will be developed and delivered using only the government funding that will be fully reimbursed using discretionary relief powers under section 47 of the Local Government Finance Act 1988.
- (4) Grants delegated authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer to finalise and implement the scheme in accordance with the principles within this report and any further government guidance (in consultation with the Leader).

- (5) Grants delegated authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to develop and implement new or extended schemes involving further tranches of this funding that sit within the same government policy intention for the remainder of the municipal year. This will include decisions up to and including the May 2022 Executive meeting.

Exe/22/8 Grants to businesses in response to the Omicron variant

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which sought agreement on the proposed approach to the administration of a new business rates support scheme, Omicron Hospitality and Leisure Grants (OHLG) and an extension to the Additional Restrictions Grant (ARG) to support a discretionary element of the above scheme.

The schemes were announced on 21 December 2021 with the formal notification and guidance issued on 30 December 2021. The Council had received £6,090,174 for the OHLG scheme. This represented 90% of the Government's estimated requirement. When this had been fully allocated Government would top up funding to local authorities if required. For the ARG scheme the Council had received £999,017. This would not be enough to meet the demand in the city and the Council would have to prioritise applications.

It was reported that the Council would only be administering funds and budget identified by the government and would not be providing any funding from within Council resources to support these schemes.

The Leader placed on record her thanks to officers who had worked incredibly hard in relation to this scheme and the previous item in ensuring arrangements were in place for issuing funding as quickly as possible.

In addition, the Leader advised the Executive that Julie Price, Director of Customer Services and Transactions, would be retiring from the Council at the end of January and took the opportunity to place on record hers and the Executive's thanks for all her hard work, commitment and dedication to the Council and people of Manchester and wished her all the best for the future.

Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Notes the funding that will be available and supports the delivery of both the OHLG and the ARG top up schemes to provide grants to businesses in the city as detailed within the body of this report.
- (2) Notes the challenges of administering the grants and the limited funding which means that the Council will have to limit and prioritise awards.
- (3) Notes that the Leader has granted delegated authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Leader, to further develop

and implement both the core scheme and an extension to the additional restrictions grant (top-up).

- (4) Grants delegated authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to develop and implement new or extended schemes involving further tranches of this funding that sit within the same government policy intention for the remainder of the municipal year. This will include decisions up to and including the May 2022 Executive meeting.
- (5) Place on record its thanks to Julie Price, Director of Customer Services and Transactions, for all her hard work, commitment and dedication to the Council and people of Manchester

Exe/22/9 Culture in the City Levelling Up Fund Project

The Executive considered a report of the Director of City Centre Growth & Infrastructure, which informed Members of the details of the Culture in the City Levelling Up Fund project and the Council's successful bid to the Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities (DLUHC) for £19.8 million of grant funding. The report also sought approval to enter into an agreement with DLUHC for the grant, and an accompanying onward funding agreement for up to £17.5m with Allied London, in order to facilitate the delivery of the Campfield element of the project, and an increase in the capital budget to reflect the receipt of the external grant funding.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment and the Deputy Leader both welcomed the funding for the project. The Deputy Leader commented that the bid focused on nurturing new talent and providing skills and opportunities for Manchester residents. The Leader commented that the project embodied what Manchester was excellent at doing by having clear and coherent plans across the city and securing investment through national or its own means.

Decisions

The Executive

- (1) Approve the Council accepting a £19.82 million Levelling up Fund grant from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing & Communities (DLUHC) and entering into all necessary agreements in order to receive the funding;
- (2) Delegate authority to the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the City Solicitor to negotiate and agree the detailed terms of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and any other agreement necessary with DLUHC to secure this funding.
- (3) Approve the Council entering into an onward funding agreement for a maximum sum of £17.52m with Allied London, in order to facilitate the delivery of the Campfield element of the project;
- (4) Delegate authority to the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the City Solicitor to negotiate

and finalise the detailed terms of the onward funding agreement and any other necessary agreements with Allied London in respect of the Campfield element of the project.

- (5) Approve a capital budget increase of £19.82m (£17.52m for Campfield and £2.3m for the Arches), funded from the external grant funding, for the activities included within the Culture in the City application, noting that spend will not be incurred until the completion of the necessary agreements.
- (6) Authorise the City Solicitor or the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, as applicable, to complete and enter into all necessary agreements or documents to give effect to the above recommendations

Exe/22/10 Public Realm Strategy for the back of Ancoats

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided an update on activity that had been taking place to support the delivery of the Ancoats and New Islington Neighbourhood Development Framework (NDF), by bringing forward investment and development to deliver up to 1500 new residential units and the Ancoats Mobility Hub that would contribute to the sustainability of the neighbourhood and promote a modal shift towards cycling and walking.

The Leader commented on the fantastic emerging neighbourhood that Ancoats was becoming and the plans being brought forward addressed the concerns that had been brought forward

The Executive Member for Growth and Employment supported the Leaders comments on the Ancoats area of the city and whilst acknowledging some of the challenges faced by residents in this area, welcome the strategy and its aims.

Councillor Karney noted that the Sunday Times newspaper had ranked Ancoats amongst the coolest places you could possibly move to right now and there was a unique opportunity for a green and sustainable area that would garner more awards and accolades.

Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Endorse the draft public realm strategy as a basis for a consultation exercise with landowners, developers and local stakeholders, which will be undertaken in February 2022.
- (2) Note that the outcomes of the consultation and a final version of the Back of Ancoats public realm strategy will be reported to a future meeting of the Executive and that once adopted, the public realm strategy will be used as a material consideration for the City Council when considering all future planning applications relevant to the Back of Ancoats.

- (3) Note progress on the preparation of a full business case to Homes England for essential enabling infrastructure including the Ancoats Mobility Hub.
- (4) Delegate authority to the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) and the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer to finalise the business case for the Ancoats Mobility Hub.
- (5) Delegate authority to the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) and Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer to negotiate contractual terms for the delivery and operation of the Ancoats Mobility Hub.
- (6) Delegate authority to the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) and Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer to agree the detailed grant funding terms and conditions relating to the Homes England grant funding bid.
- (7) Delegate authority to the City Solicitor to finalise the terms and conditions of all contractual documentation to give effect to the above recommendations.
- (8) Note that, whilst the Council will seek to acquire the necessary land and property interests to deliver the Ancoats Mobility Hub and public realm strategy by agreement, this may not be possible and a future report may need to be brought back to the Executive in the future to seek authority to promote a Compulsory Purchase Order.

Exe/22/11 Large Scale Renewable Energy Generation

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which sought support for a proposal to secure a delegation from Executive for the Council to enter commercial negotiations to progress the purchase of a suitable solution with options being a solar asset and / or a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA).

In October 2021, Executive approved a recommendation for the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer to establish a delivery team to develop the options, with a view to returning to the Executive with a proposal to progress the work. This included updating the findings of the feasibility study to reflect current prices and market availability, to carry out future energy demand analysis and to further explore financing options.

There were several potential sites currently available to purchase. At this stage there was sufficient information to model two different scenarios, both located in the south of the country as there were no potential schemes identified within the Council boundary or local surrounding areas:-

- Option 1 – 45.3 MW scheme (south of England). would provide sufficient CO₂e savings above the Council's demand in the early years and would meet the 2025 target. However, from 2035 onwards, the Council's forecast Scope 2 emissions exceeded the available CO₂e savings from the asset. It would offer 95% of the 2038 target.

- Option 2 – 58MW across two sites (southern England) offered additional capacity for CO2e savings above the Council's demand in the early years. The 2038 target would be met in full. Whilst production meant the supply and demand become closer in the later years, the assets always produced more electricity than the forecast demanded and surplus could be supplied to third parties locally (e.g. schools) or traded directly.

Other options would be considered as discussions moved forward with Developers.

Based on the Council's projected future energy demand, Local Partnership's assessment of the Council's needs was a solar generation asset of between 45MW and 60MW at current market rates costs of c. £30m to £39m. This would be sufficient to meet the Council's current target to reduce emissions by 7,000 tonnes CO2 by 2025 and to contribute to its overall target to be Zero Carbon by 2038.

The feasibility study and business case development work to date demonstrated that the direct purchase of the solar generation asset delivered a stronger Net Present Value (NPV) than a PPA, although all options demonstrated a positive return versus do nothing. Both an asset purchase and a PPA should also deliver revenue savings. As negotiations moved forward and actual costs became known, a full financial model would be constructed and the NPV calculations updated accordingly.

Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Note the options in Section 4 of the report.
- (2) Note that should the direct purchase of a solar asset be pursued this will be funded via borrowing and require Council approval.
- (3) Agree to grant delegation for the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Leader and the Executive Member for Environment to negotiate for the purchase of a solar asset / PPA and any associated corporate documentation to establish a Special Purpose Vehicle if required, to meet the Council's 2020-25 CO2 emissions reduction target and contribute positively to our longer term zero carbon 2038 target through:-
 - The development/purchase of a suitable large-scale solar PV facility; or
 - a suitable direct PPA of renewable energy.

Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 11 January 2022

Present:

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair
Councillors Ahmed Ali, Andrews, Clay, Davies, Hacking Hitchen, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, B Priest, Robinson, Simcock, Wheeler and Wright

Also present:

Councillor Craig, Leader

Apologies: Councillor Rowles

RGSS/22/01 Minutes

Decision

The Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2021 as a correct record.

RGSS/22/02 Provisional local government finance settlement 2022/23 and budget assumptions

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update on the main announcements from the provisional local government finance settlement 2022/23 announced 16 December 2021, with a focus on the impact on Manchester City Council and its budget for 2022/23. It also outlines the main budget assumptions behind the Medium-Term budget position 2022/23 to 2024/25.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Describing the key elements of the Provisional Finance Settlement and confirmed that the c£7.7m savings and mitigations, as reported to Resources and Governance Committee on 9 November, were sufficient to deliver a balanced budget next year;
- The implications for the Manchester Local Care Organisation budget;
- Describing the implications for the Council's budget, including the Strategy to close the remaining budget gap; and
- Conclusions and next steps, noting that Officers had estimated the future resources available based on the information available with the resulting forecast gap of £37m in 2023/24 increasing to £58m in 2024/25;

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

- The fair funding proposals did not reflect a fair approach to funding for local government;

- The Council's budget position was not one of choice and was something that government had enforced on Manchester through ten years of austerity measures and the people of Manchester deserved better;
- How confident were officers with the integrity of the projected levels of savings that the Council would need to make for 2023/24 and 2024/25;
- In considering the variations amongst Local Authorities in the effective operation of care markets in their areas, how well placed was Manchester in relation to the payment to residential and domiciliary care providers for carrying out the range of activities at appropriate rates and had consideration been given to working with other local Authorities to address this;
- How were the NHS reforms going to be integrated with the Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO) and what would be the potential impact of these reforms on the Council's Adult Social Care provision;
- How had the budget mitigation of £2.5m for Adults Homeless demand management been determined;
- Assurance was sought if as part of the savings £2m associated with staff budgeting and vacancy factors would not be as a result of a reduction in the staff;
- What was the underlying figure of actual use of 'classic' reserves, setting aside the additional funding that had been provided to tackle covid, which was inflating the appearance of both the reserves and use of reserves figures; and
- Had previous funding to tackle domestic violence and abuse now been incorporated into mainstream funding.

The Deputy City Treasurer advised that a multi-year model was used to determine the level of savings required. This was refreshed during the course of the year as more information became available and the level of savings proposed for 2023/24 and 2024/25 were best estimates at present. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer added that as well as the Council's own internal assumptions on demand and the delivery of savings, a number of projections in regards to income needed to be made and the level of future government funding. Given it was only a one year settlement, the future of Business Rates retention and the potential impact of the Fairer Funding Review, it was very difficult to do this with great accuracy.

The Deputy City Treasurer explained that there was a national issue around appropriate payment in the care market. For Manchester, those who required some form of residential and or domiciliary care tended to be fully funded by the Council and closer to the true cost of running a care home and the issue raised by care providers around appropriate levels of funding tended to be in areas where there was a higher percentage of self-funding residents requiring care. The Council was undertaking market sustainability work and £1.8m had been made available from the Social Care levy to help support the sustainability and work with providers. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer commented that the Council was also committed to being a Real Living Wage employer and had signed up to the Unison Ethical Care Charter with additional investment to ensure all home care providers were paid at the real living wage as a minimum. In terms of working with other Local Authorities there was an active group of Greater Manchester Social Care Directors who collaborated on this type of work.

The Deputy Treasurer advised that the NHS was still awaiting their settlement figure from Government and the commencement of the new Integrated Care Organisations

would now be delayed until July 2022. This, along with the impact of tackling Covid meant it had been difficult to undertake any long-term planning. He added that that both the Council's and the NHS budgets' were aligned, and the Council and MLCO were working through the 'Better Outcomes, Better Lives' workstream to put plans in place to best use available funding streams.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that the savings in Homelessness and Adult Social Care were not savings and resulted from an over estimate of the impact of covid on the the demand for delivering services in 2021/22 and as a result the funding amount had been corrected.

It was explained that the savings projected in relation to staff budgeting and vacancy factors had been determined using two factors. The first being that Council budgeted at top of grade for all staff and as in previous years, the Council often underspent on staffing cost as not all staff were at the top of their grade. Secondly there was often a time lag between someone leaving their post and being able to recruit to the vacancy that occurs, so rather than having to take difficult decisions around budget cuts in other service areas, aligning staffing budgets would be more appropriate.

The Leader commented that the budget papers that would be presented to Scrutiny in February would provide greater clarity around the details of the proposed savings.

The Deputy City Treasurer advised the use of £184m Reserves was as a result of receiving Business Rates funding a year in advance as opposed to a year in arrears. This equated to approximately £145m of the £184m. The other use of Reserves was planned commitment from previous years. The Council did have a Reserves strategy to support the budget over the medium term which would be included in next month's suite of budget reports.

Decision

The Committee note the report.

RGSS/22/03 Revenue Budget Modelling – budget assumptions focussing on inflation and demand growth

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update on the latest inflation and demand growth estimates which are included in the Medium-Term Financial Plan.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background, noting that the assumptions take into the account the likely resources that will be available to fund the budget, including government grant funding, council tax and business rates income;
- Consideration of inflationary pressures, noting the provisions that had been made within the draft Revenue Budget;
- Consideration to demand and demographic pressures, noting the assumed levels of demographic and demand growth for 2022/23 to 2024/25; and
- Conclusions.

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

- How much thought had been given to flexibility in the modelling, insofar as support to asylum seekers and refugees placed within Manchester, free school meals during school holidays and the use of private rented temporary accommodation for those who were homeless;
- Had the trajectory of demand in Adult Social Care and how Manchester could manage the funding deficit been considered;
- What work had been undertaken at a GMCA level to address the rapid increase of residents housed in temporary accommodation within the region compared to the national increase;
- The longer term projections for the growth of the city and demand on services would be helpful;
- What proportion of the Council's Social Care contracts had the requirement to pay staff the Real Living Wage; and
- Did the additional £2.3m for the investment in edge of care and early intervention in 2022/23 reflect the growth in these areas, the 3% demographic growth assumption or both.

The Deputy City Treasurer advised that the Council had received a number of one-off funding packages of support and all options were being considered as part of the 2022/23 budget setting process. Concerns did exist around inflation and over the increasing cost of energy prices which would impact on the modelling of the revenue budget. It was reported that a significant sum of funding had already been put in place this financial year to help address homelessness and improvements had and continue to be made.

The Leader added that there were only certain things that the Council now knew about due to experience which could not have been modelled for in previous years, such as the need and cost of free school meals in school holidays.

The Deputy City Treasurer reported that the Council had employed an organisation Impower to help with the implementation of the Better Outcomes Better Lives workstream and support on the financial modelling for Adult Social Care.

The Leader advised that there would be a report to next month's Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee that would look at the issue of the increase of residents housed in temporary accommodation which could be shared with Members of this committee.

The Deputy City Treasurer advised that the work of the GMCA had been around tackling rough sleeping, whilst the bulk of the pressure faced by the Council centred around homelessness in families and no-fault evictions and the associated cost of finding temporary accommodation. He also advised that in relation to the Council's Adult Social Care contracts, homecare workers received the Real Living Wage as a minimum, which was a higher rate than the national living wage and in terms of care home workers they were in receipt of the national living wage at present. As a Council, its minimum payment level to staff was above the Real Living Wage.

The Committee was advised that the additional £2.3m for the investment in edge of care and early intervention reflected both the growth in these areas and the 3% demographic growth assumption.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

RGSS/22/04 Funding of the Capital Programme

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

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Describing the development of the Capital Strategy
- Describing the approach to borrowing;
- Describing how capital financing costs were funded; and
- Capacity for additional borrowing.

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

- Whilst it was reported that the capital financing reserve could support approximately a further £100m of borrowing over the next three to five years to support capital schemes, would Officers not recommend this; and
- Did increasing inflation in construction costs make it more or less attractive to borrow money from the Public Works Loan Board as opposed to using internal reserves.

The Deputy Chief Executive advised that there would be an element of borrowing required over the next three to five years to support the capital strategy but it was not possible to predict the levels of interest and inflation rate rises and as such could not give an exact figure of what this level would be at this stage. It was also reported that the key impact of inflation on the capital programme would be the rising costs for any future schemes and the need to attract more financing, whether that was government grant or borrowing. Whilst interest rates remained at their present rate, it was still appropriate to take a blended approach.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

RGSS/22/05 Budget Equality and Poverty Impact Assessments

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided details on how the approach to Equality Impact Assessments and Poverty Impact Assessments had developed over recent years and how these

would be further embedded and strengthened in the Budget setting and business planning processes in the future. The report also covered the budget setting process for 2022/23 and the limited impact this would have on equalities and poverty.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background, noting that the Council had a long-standing commitment to promote equality, celebrate diversity and advance inclusion;
- Describing the approach to equality and poverty impact;
- The budget proposals for 2022/23 were minimal and were largely budget adjustments which did not directly impact on service delivery;
- There was no direct impact on any protected characteristic and/or any aim of the general Equality Duty. As such Equality and Poverty impact Assessments would not be required for the 2022/23 budget proposals; and
- The future approach to Equality Relevance Assessments and Equality Impact Assessments as part of the budget setting process for 2023/24 and beyond

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

- Appropriate resources needed to be allocated to address and tackle poverty and deprivation in the city;
- Was the support committed to children centres driven through this methodology;
- Could the Committee be provided with more information on the brief Equality Relevance Assessment tool;
- An example of how the tool was used would help Members understand how it worked; and
- It was good to see Equality and Poverty Impact Assessments becoming more embedded in then budget setting process

The Deputy Chief Executive advise that the Council would need to look more fundamentally as to where it prioritised its resources in tackling poverty and deprivation. This came with the caveat that there was a lot of duties that the Council had to deliver and had committed spend to these, and it was not possible to mitigate all the impacts of poverty in the city. It was confirmed that the support to Children's Centres was in part driven by the importance of this agenda.

It was agreed that the Equality Relevance Assessment tool could be shared with Members of the Committee as long as it was understood that it was a work in progress.

The Strategic Lead Business Change, Reform and Innovation provided an example of how the Equality Relevance Assessment tool worked to the Committee.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

RGSS/22/06 Overview Report

The Committee considered the report by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which provided details of key decisions that fall within the Committee's remit and an update on actions resulting from the Committee's recommendations. The report also includes the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to amend as appropriate and agree.

Decision

The Committee notes the report and agrees the Committee's Work Programme.

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2022

Present:

Councillor Reid – in the Chair
Councillors Abdullatif, Bano, Benham, Foley, Hewitson, Lovecy, McHale, Nunney and Sadler

Co-opted Voting Members:

Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative

Co-opted Non-Voting Members:

Miss S Iltaf, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative
Ms L Smith, Primary Sector Teacher Representative

Also present:

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children's Services
Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for the Environment
Ruth Todhunter, Manchester resident
Lee Ormsby, Our Lady's RC High School
Kristian Cope, Our Lady's RC High School
Elaine Morrison, Education Consultant

Apologies:

Councillors Alijah and Collins
Mrs J Miles, Representative of the Diocese of Salford

CYP/22/01 Minutes

Decision

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2021.

CYP/22/02 Climate Emergency and the Education Sector

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education which outlined the work being undertaken by the Council to support the Education Sector in responding to the Climate Emergency declared by the Council in July 2019, with a focus on decarbonisation. It also outlined the plans to develop this as a theme of Our Year 2022 in response to feedback from children and young people. This would enable children and young people to have their say and contribute to achieving the zero carbon target for the city.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Planned conference;
- Carbon Literacy Training;

- De-carbonisation;
- Partnership working with the Department for Education (DfE) and Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA);
- Young People's Offer;
- Our Year;
- Green skills;
- Early Years settings; and
- Promoting active travel.

Manchester resident, Ruth Todhunter, addressed the Committee, telling them about her involvement in campaigning for clean air with other local mothers and the British Lung Foundation. She informed Members about the School Streets Initiative, where a road outside a school had a temporary restriction on motorised traffic at school drop-off and pick-up times and the benefits of this for children and young people. She encouraged the Council to work with schools and communities to identify where air quality could be improved to inform interventions and behaviour change. She advised that funding to support School Streets should prioritise those schools most affected by poor air quality. She reported that the British Lung Foundation was offering to meet with the Council to discuss how they could work together to monitor air pollution in the city.

Lee Ormsby and Kristian Cope from Our Lady's RC High School delivered a presentation on their Climate Action Roadmap.

The main points and themes within the presentation included:

- Background information;
- Climate action activities by area;
- Student voice; and
- The steps of the roadmap from emerging to established to being a leading school on combating climate change, which could be a model for others and share its resources and learning.

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

- To welcome the presentation from Our Lady's RC High School and the work they were doing and to ask whether they would be looking to move to using organic food;
- To what extent were other schools undertaking this kind of work, how would the actions taken by other schools be monitored and could Members be kept updated on this work;
- The need for safe walking and cycling routes to schools;
- Request from a Member for an Ardwick school to be included in the Street Schools initiative;
- How was the retrofitting of schools being addressed;
- To welcome the work that the Director of Education and Executive Member for Children's Services had done in this area and to ask that sufficient officer

capacity be made available to bring together best practice and progress this work in time for the planned conference;

- The importance of the new Climate Change Officers in each district engaging with schools and of ward-level and community engagement;
- The importance of a joined-up approach and sharing good practice between primary schools, secondary schools and colleges;
- The importance of involving children and young people in this work so that they felt they had agency, noting that this could help to reduce anxiety about climate change;
- What support was there from the Government and Council to support schools with carbon reduction; and
- The poverty faced by many families and that, when they were struggling to provide the basics of food and a warm home for their children, it was difficult to engage with issues such as where food was sourced from.

The Executive Member for Children's Services advised Members that this was a very high priority for the Council and that they were looking to increase capacity to support this work. He welcomed how much schools had been doing on this, despite the additional challenges they had faced due to the pandemic. He reported that every ward had a climate action plan and that schools were central to that and he recommended that Ward Councillors ensure that the link with schools was explicit in their own ward action plans. He advised that he would discuss with the Director of Education how schools' work on climate change would be monitored and then discussions would take place with the Chair about the most appropriate way for the Committee to continue to scrutinise this.

In response to the question about organic food, Kristian Cope advised that organic food was procured for use in food technology lessons but that for school meals it was difficult to buy sufficient volumes of organically produced food to feed nearly 1000 pupils, even before the cost was taken into account.

The Director of Education reported that individual schools were addressing climate change in different ways and that many did not have a single plan like Our Lady's had so this did create challenges in monitoring it. She advised that the Council would work with schools to share good practice and knowledge from schools which had done a lot of positive work on this to schools which had not started addressing this issue. In response to a Member's question, she advised that her service did already work with Neighbourhoods on some work relating to air quality but agreed that there was more to be done on this. She reported that a lot of schools had wanted to take part in the School Streets initiative but that it had to be done in line with Highways legislation and that it was important to evaluate the impact from piloting the scheme in a few locations first. She advised that, in terms of encouraging active travel, her service would focus on behaviour change, while also linking with Neighbourhoods on the local infrastructure. She informed Members that a condition survey would be carried out on all school buildings that the local authority maintained and that this would enable the Council to better prioritise spending on buildings maintenance where it was most needed.

The Executive Member for the Environment advised that some of the reports which were going to the Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee the

following day were relevant to this discussion so she would ensure that these were shared with Members of this Committee. She advised that the Council was looking at developing an improved criteria for how schools involved in the School Streets initiative were selected. In response to a Member's question, she confirmed that the location of planting of trees and hedges was co-ordinated and that this had massively increased. She informed Members how Biffa was engaging with schools, including an offer of an educational programme on waste and recycling, and about the learning centre at the Longley Lane Household Waste and Recycling Centre and she advised that she would ensure this information was re-circulated to schools.

Elaine Morrison, Education Consultant, advised that the Council was sending regular communications to schools about any funding they became aware of to assist with this work and that addressing funding issues would be a focus of the conference. She advised that working with the DfE on pilot projects was also bringing additional funding into the city. She reported that officers were working with local businesses to see if they would be interested in supporting schools on this work. She informed Members how links were being made with the Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise Sector (VCSE) to support this work. She advised that officers were monitoring the geographical spread of schools involved in climate action work so that they could focus on any particular wards where there was a lower uptake.

Decision

To note the report.

CYP/22/03 COVID-19 Update

The Committee received a verbal update of the Assistant Director of Education which outlined new developments and significant changes to the current situation, particularly in relation to schools.

The main points and themes within the verbal update included:

- Temporary changes to the guidance on face coverings in schools;
- Other measures schools were implementing to reduce the spread of COVID-19;
- Lateral flow testing and requirements for those testing positive;
- Support for schools, including the use of Outbreak Meetings;
- School attendance;
- The impact of staff absence; and
- Vaccination of young people.

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

- Support for young people's mental health;
- The impact of staff being able to self-certify as sick for 28 days, data on schools and areas which were worst affected by staff absence and whether any schools had had to close;
- To ask for more data on vaccination levels at next month's meeting; and

- That the Committee should look at the number of children being electively home educated.

The Assistant Director of Education outlined the work that had taken place to improve mental health support to children and young people, through Healthy Schools and Manchester Thrive and training for schools on other ways to access mental health support, advising that this support to schools had been increased during the pandemic. She advised that, as term had only just re-started, data was not yet available on staff absences but that four primary schools had been affected by a partial closure, for example, a particular class doing remote learning but with vulnerable pupils still coming on site.

The Executive Member for Children's Services praised the work of schools and the Council's Education Service during the pandemic, including the prioritisation of vulnerable children and young people.

Decisions

1. To ask for data on vaccination levels for young people in Manchester to be included in the next update.
2. That the Committee should look at the number of children being electively home educated.
3. That a letter should be sent to all schools congratulating them for their work during the pandemic.

CYP/22/04 Our Year 2022

The Committee received a report and presentation of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided an update on Our Year 2022.

The main points and themes within the presentation included:

- The feedback from engagement with children and young people on what was important to them and what Manchester could do better;
- Key themes identified from this;
- Events, activities and campaigns;
- UNICEF Child Friendly City submission; and
- How Members could support this work.

The Executive Member for Children's Services encouraged the Co-opted Members to watch the webcast of the Council meeting on 1 December 2021, at which young people from across Manchester had spoken about the issues that were important to them. He highlighted the last slide of the presentation on how Members could support Our Year and encouraged the Committee Members to get involved. He advised that support was available in doing this and that the Our Year Project Lead could circulate an information pack.

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

were:

- To welcome this work;
- The number of children and young people across different settings who had been engaged through this work and whether they were representative of all children and young people across the city;
- The importance of the voice of children of all ages being heard;
- How Our Year would be promoted, including engagement with parents;
- That many teachers would welcome the opportunity to support this work and that it was important to ensure that this was communicated to them; and
- The lack of work experience placements during the pandemic and what could be done to encourage more organisations to take part, noting that Members might be able to offer work experience or shadowing opportunities.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services advised that the communication strategy was being refined and developed and the intention had been to start with a soft launch through a series of events with the website being fully up and running by mid-February. He also highlighted the briefing packs which were being produced. The Chair advised that empty billboards across the city should be used to promote Our Year as well as using social media. The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services emphasised the importance of Our Year not just being about the Council but involving the wider community, with a cultural shift and a legacy of children and young people being involved in the big decisions for their city. He advised that the Executive Member for Children's Services and the Director of Education were engaging with schools regarding Our Year. He outlined how children and young people had been engaged with across school settings, advising that pupils, for example, those who were part of the School Council, spoke on behalf of their peers so the views gathered reflected a wider range of pupils than just those who were directly engaged with. He informed Members that engagement with the business sector as part of Our Year was not just about getting a financial contribution from businesses but about time, accessibility and support, including work experience opportunities. The Chair advised that these issues should be considered as part of the social value element of contracts awarded by the Council. The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services assured Members that social value was being built into this work.

In response to a Member's question, the Our Year Project Lead outlined the work involved in the UNICEF Child Friendly City submission and suggested the Committee could be provided with an update at a later date, including information on how Members could support this. In response to a Member's suggestion about engaging with young people again in a year to assess the impact this work had had, the Our Year Project Lead advised that this would be part of the measures of success for the project.

Decision

To note the report and presentation and endorse and support Manchester submitting an expression of interest to become part of UNICEF's Child Friendly City and Communities programme.

CYP/22/05 The Quality of Practice in Children's Social Care

The Committee received a report and presentation of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which reflected the development and current position of the quality of practice being delivered to children and their families in Manchester, with a particular focus on Children's Social Care..

The main points and themes within the presentation included:

- Manchester's children and young people population;
- What was quality of practice and what sources did the service use to assess its quality of practice;
- What was known about the current position; and
- How the service planned to drive continuous improvement and learning.

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

- Whether the better quality of practice and the poorer quality were concentrated in particular service areas;
- How were young people's views and experiences captured and was any negative feedback received;
- The importance of addressing IT issues to enable social workers to work effectively; and
- To note that some issues would be looked at by the Ofsted Subgroup.

The Executive Member for Children's Services informed Members that the IT issues were being addressed, that a lot of progress had been made on this and that Children's Services were receiving top priority within the Council for new devices.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services advised that the service did not just rely on the auditing tool to understand where it was at in terms of quality of practice, noting the role that scrutiny played with Members visiting social work teams, asking questions of staff and then using what they had learnt on these visits to effectively question and challenge the service's senior leadership at its meetings. He outlined how areas were identified which would benefit from targeted auditing and observed practice and the work to drive up quality of practice, taking the learning from this into workforce development training. He advised that he would bring a report on Participation and Engagement to a future meeting which would provide additional information on how the views of young people were gathered. The Strategic Lead for Safeguarding and Practice Development outlined some of the ways that young people's feedback was gathered and advised that key issues young people raised were that they did not like being allocated a new social worker, when they had already built a relationship with the existing one, and that they wanted improved transitions to adult social services.

Decision

To note the report.

**CYP/22/06 IRO (Independent Reviewing Officer) Annual Report
2020/2021**

The Committee received the 2020/2021 Annual Report of the Independent Reviewing (IRO) Service for Cared for Children, which was required in accordance with the Children and Young Person's Act 2008 and subsequent statutory guidance published by the Department for Children Schools and Families in 2010 as set out in the IRO Handbook

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Service and legal context;
- Our Children and Young People data 2019/2020;
- Our Children statutory reviews;
- Participation and engagement;
- Quality assurance;
- Outcomes and impact of the service 2020/2021; and
- Key priorities 2020/2021.

In response to a Member's question about children placed outside the local authority area, the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services reported that the vast majority were placed within Greater Manchester. The Strategic Lead for Safeguarding and Practice Development advised that for most of those children they had been placed there because that was the best way to meet their needs and that the service still took the same responsibility for them as for children placed within the city, although she acknowledged that there were additional barriers to overcome.

Decision

To note the report.

CYP/22/07 Overview Report

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

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme.

Licensing and Appeals Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 24 January 2022

Present: Councillor Ludford – in the Chair

Councillors: Grimshaw, Evans, Flanagan, Hassan, Hewitson, Hughes and Reid

Apologies: Councillor Andrews, Connolly, Jeavons and Lynch

LAP/22/01 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 October 2021 were submitted for approval.

Decision

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Licensing & Appeals Committee meeting held on 25 October 2021.

LAP/22/02 GM Minimum Licensing Standards – Stage 2 Recommendations (Vehicles)

The Committee considered the content of the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing which concerned the proposed Greater Manchester Minimum Licensing Standards for Taxis and Private Hire. There were 10 Standards within the report, proposing that all the standards recommended to be implemented, are done so with immediate effect (or as soon thereafter where procurement or substantial changes to process are required).

The Licensing Unit Manager informed the Committee that the aim of the work is to harmonise standards across the districts, ensuring GM authorities work collaboratively on policies for these licensing functions that seek to support and not undermine each other, and are the preferred option for residents and visitors. This was due to an absence of a National Policy. The Licensing Unit Manager confirmed the breakdown from feedback, agreements presented to the 10 GM authorities and agreements reached with these authorities.

The Licensing Unit Manager presented the 10 standards to the Committee for consideration.

Standard 1 – Hackney Carriages to be Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles (WAVs).

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that this standard had been accepted by 3 local authorities that had not previously approved and requested that the Committee consider the proposal for use of side-loading access only or amend to allow the use of rear-loading access also.

During discussions, questions and considerations it was raised that rear-loading WAVs posed problems at Hackney Carriage ranks, requiring extra space at the rear of the vehicle as well as adding a safety risk to any wheelchair users/mobility

impaired customers. The Committee had concerns on whether disability groups had been consulted on this issue and felt that feedback should be considered.

The Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that TfGM had carried out consultations in this regard but expressed that there could be a more targeted approach.

In considering that more work could be done in consultation on this issue the Committee felt that the option to amend to allow side-loading vehicles should be revisited in the future.

Decision

The Committee agreed to retain the standard that all licensed Hackney Vehicles must to be side loading.

Standard 2 – Vehicle Age

The Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that it was proposed for consultation that all licensed vehicles are under 5 years old at first licensing and no more than 10 years old and that views were sought on consideration of a different age policy for electric and wheelchair accessible vehicles (PHV WAV – under 7 years on to fleet and 15 years off and Purpose built HVC – under 7 on to fleet and 15 years off).

During discussions, questions and considerations a concern was raised on whether vehicles over 7 years old could be sold and returned to another fleet. It was confirmed that this would not be allowed and that any vehicles over the age limit would be automatically barred from use.

Decision

The Committee agreed the Lead Officer's recommendation:

To implement the following as the minimum standard:

- PHV – under 5 years on to fleet and 10 years off
- PHV WAV – under 7 years on to fleet and 15 years off
- Purpose built HVC – under 7 on to fleet and 15 years off
- To remove the beyond the age limit policy

That the above policy be implemented for new to licence vehicles as soon as the policy takes effect.

That existing licences begin transitioning and are compliant with the new policy standard by 1 April 2024.

To remove the beyond the age limit policy.

Standard 3 - Vehicle Emissions

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that this proposal had changed considerably, adding that Manchester does not currently present an emissions problem due to the vehicle age limit. It was added that the Clean Air Policy would commence from May 2022 but new standards for taxis had been paused due to issues with the supply

chain. The Zero Emissions Policy, scheduled for 2028 had also been paused with no date set, but the Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that this date was still Manchester's aim.

Decision

The Committee agreed to implement the policy:

To require licensed vehicles to be compliant with the current emissions standard as follows:

- For all new to licence vehicles – from the date the policy is determined locally
For existing fleets – to begin transitioning as soon as the policy is in place and to complete transitioning by 1 April 2024 (vehicle must also be compliant with the age policy)
- To note the strong ambition to move existing fleets to Zero Emissions Capable as soon as possible

Standard 4 – Vehicle Colour

The Licensing Unit Manager presented information relating to vehicle colour policy, including exemptions (silver cars allowed for Private Hire Vehicles) and risks (potential for more instances of Ply For Hire due to uniformity of fleets). It was noted that Manchester was at the forefront of this policy and that this was undermined by other local authorities due to the de-regulation act. It was confirmed that customers with sight impairment disabilities and/or guide dogs find white taxis more difficult to notice. The Licensing Unit Manager expressed that retaining the all-white colour policy for Private Hire Vehicles (PHV) could see drivers move away from Manchester, adding that customers now have confirmation of the vehicle type, number plate and driver name via booking apps, adding that bogus drivers can potentially exploit the current policy. Final comments centred around no other local authorities in GM or nationally were upholding the policy for Private Hire vehicles.

During discussions, questions and considerations, comments were raised around passenger safety if the PHV policy was not retained, that Uber did not operate with this policy, the potential discrimination to visual impaired customers if the policy was retained, whether this proposal had been considered by the Executive Members and that vehicles licensing in other local authorities, allowed to operate in Manchester, did not have this standard implemented.

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that the MLS requested that all GM local authorities have stickers and plates, adding that there had been a noted trend in drivers ceasing to operate in Manchester due to this policy.

Decision

The Committee agreed to remove the requirement for Private Hire Vehicles to be of a specified colour and retain the policy standard that all Hackney Carriage Vehicles should be black in colour with the following exceptions:

- Purpose-built Taxis may be of the manufacturer's colour
- Advertising is allowed on London Style Taxis

Standard 5 - Vehicle Livery

The Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that Hackney Carriages should retain the requirement for Fixed plates to the front and rear and include stickers on the bonnet and that Private Hire Vehicles should carry stickers bearing the operators name, 'advanced bookings only', 'not insured unless pre-booked' and the licensing authority logo, display those stickers on both rear side doors and the back window and not use any magnetic stickers.

Decision

The Committee agreed to implement the standard as proposed.

Standard 6 - Vehicle Testing

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that this standard proposed that all vehicles more than 3 years old will be tested at least twice a year and that all vehicles will be tested against the DVSA MOT standard as a minimum. (This will be at cost to the vehicle licence proprietor/driver), adding that Manchester currently exceeds the proposal.

The recommendations for testing were outlined as:

0-3 years, 1 test per year

4-8 years, 2 tests per year

9-15 years, 3 tests per year

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that this could be retained or varied, adding that consideration should be given as to whether this standard was conducted in-house at MCC or handed to external providers and to consider any risks associated.

During discussions, questions and considerations it was expressed that in-house was preferable and clarification was sought on how tests were currently conducted.

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that improvements had been made in providing tests dates and reminders to licence holders and that there was no intention to look for an external provider for this service.

Decision

The Committee agreed to amend the age parameters as follows:

a. 0-3 years old = 1 test

b. 4-8 years old = 2 tests

c. 9-15 years old = 3 tests

Standard 7 – CCTV

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that CCTV was currently allowed but not mandated and that the full policy is in the process of being drafted.

Decision

The Committee agreed to approve the drafting of a CCTV policy for further consideration and consultation.

Standard 8 – Executive Hire

The Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that Manchester City Council was already compliant with this standard and stated that the recommendation was to retain this policy.

Decision

The Committee agreed to retain the standard as proposed.

Standard 9 – Vehicle Design

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that all vehicles were to conform to the categorisations in the report. If any vehicles were modified and/or retro-fitted vehicles they would then be checked for approval. It was noted that Manchester was compliant with most recommendations already with the additional option to allow written off vehicles with an engineer's report and for a swivel seat to be added to Hackney Carriages. Mention was given to window tint specifications and that there had been strong lobbying in support of this from the trade. There was an intention to move to CCTV which would mitigate the move to tinted windows (currently allowing for 20% light transmission). Other local authorities had approved the "written off" policy for implementation as of April 2022, adding that this was reliant on the outcomes of the Clean Air Policy and would, therefore, not require implementation prior to this policy being passed. The swivel seat policy would require further information on side/rear loading and the Licensing Unit Manager stated that there were some in the fleet already.

During discussions, questions and considerations it was expressed that a 20% light transmission tint was a safety issue for passengers and should not be allowed without a CCTV policy being implemented. It was suggested that this proposal should be deferred for further information.

The Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that checks had been made with GMP and no evidence on the compromise of passenger safety had been noted, also adding that the cost to replace tints would be at the operators cost, which was seen as an issue within the trade.

An observer from the trade agreed that there should be further examination conducted into the effect tints have on passengers and their feelings on personal safety.

Decision

The Committee agreed to defer the following proposal for further information:

To change the minimum light transmission specific for point c) remaining glass and specify:

- Remaining glass or rear side windows (exc. Rear window) – allow manufacturer's tint to a minimum 20% light transmission

The Committee agreed to otherwise retain the standard as proposed with the following minor amendments:

To change:

- No advertising other than Council *issued* signage on PHVs to: No advertising other than Council *approved* signage on PHVs

To amend the start date for non-renewal of licences with vehicles that have been previously written off and for this policy to take effect at a date to be agreed with the Chair of Licensing and Appeals Committee following the findings of the GM Clean Air Committee funding review.

To defer the decision on swivel seats at this time, but in the interim allow other purpose-built Hackney models that are not manufactured with a swivel seat onto the fleet for an agreed period of time.

Standard 10 – Vehicle Licence Conditions

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that there were two sets of proposed conditions in the report for this standard which had not yet been implemented. It was explained that improvements were proposed pre-pandemic and then adopted by 7 of the GM authorities. DBS checks were confirmed as now added which differed from the recommendations laid out in 2020.

Decision

The Committee agreed to implement the standard as proposed with the addition of the DBS requirement for vehicle proprietors who are not licensed drivers.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 20 January 2022

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

Councillors: S Ali, Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Kamal, Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat, Richards and Stogia

Also present:

Councillors Hilal, Hitchens and Johns

PH/22/01 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 131314/FO/2021 and 132069/FO/2021.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/22/02 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2021 as a correct record.

PH/22/03 131895/JO/2021 - Coleshill Street Manchester M40 8HH – Miles Platting and Newton Heath Ward

Permission was sought to remove condition no.44 attached to planning permission reference 125596/FO/2019 (approved subject to conditions and a section 106 agreement on 10 November 2020), which related to affordable housing.

The approved scheme for 410 new homes, was accompanied by an Affordable Housing Statement, which outlined that the viability of the scheme had been considered in line with best practice and as such a Viability Assessment was submitted for consideration. There are complex ground conditions on the site, which impact on viability, and it was demonstrated that the development could not support affordable housing. Through the involvement of a Registered Provider, however, 114 affordable dwellings are to be provided on the site through grant funding from Homes England.

Since the granting of the planning permission, Homes England has confirmed that the houses would not qualify for funding if they are subject to a planning condition. In this instance the affordable homes would be delivered and secured via the Development Agreement with the City Council and provisions in the leases (fulfilled by virtue of the City Council's landownership interest), rather than by way of condition no.44.

The application site covers an area of approximately 6.4 hectares and includes the former Manox site (chemical dye factory). It is bounded by the Rochdale Canal (and associated tow path), grassed brownfield land and commercial /industrial uses to the north. To the south is Iron Street; this area to the south is largely residential and includes a play area. There are further residential properties to the west and across Varley Street is Victoria Mill (Grade II * listed building) which has been converted to residential use. To the east across Alan Turing Way there are commercial /industrial uses.

The Planning officer had no further information or additional comments to make.

Councillor Hitchen addressed the Committee and requested that consideration of the application be deferred to allow the Committee to see a copy of the development agreement to ensure that affordable dwellings will be included in the application.

A member of the committee commented that the executive summary made reference to the removal of condition 44 and there was concern that by removing the condition there should be an undertaking within the development agreement to ensure the inclusion of affordable housing.

Councillor Andrews proposed that the application be deferred until the next meeting of the Committee to allow members to see the development agreement and be satisfied that a robust agreement is in place to ensure the 144 affordable dwellings will be included within the development.

The planning officer reported that he had spoken to both the applicant and colleagues in Corporate Property and they have advised that the development agreement does include the requirement for the provision of 114 affordable dwellings.

The Director of Planning advised that Committee that the development agreement contained commercially sensitive information and therefore checks would be made to ensure only non-sensitive extracts were presented to members of the Committee to confirm the inclusion of 114 affordable dwellings.

Councillor Flanagan seconded the proposal to defer consideration of the application until the next meeting of the Committee.

Decision

The Committee agreed to defer consideration of the application until the next meeting to allow members to be satisfied that the inclusion of 114 affordable dwellings is clearly stated within the development agreement for the proposed development.

(Councillor Richards declared a personal interest in the application having had an involvement previously as an Executive member and left the room during the consideration of the application.

PH/22/04 131708/FO/2021 - 87 Rochdale Road Manchester M4 4JD -

Piccadilly Ward

This application sought the erection of a part 11, part 13 storey building to form residential apartments (Use Class C3a) together with the erection of two blocks of 3 storey duplexes (Use Class C3a) to form 237 residential homes in total with associated commercial floor (Use Class E) (132 sqm), basement car parking, landscaping and public realm, and associated engineering and infrastructure works following demolition of existing buildings and structures.

The Planning officer had no further information or additional comments to make.

No objectors to the application attended the meeting or addressed the Committee on the application.

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

Councillor Lyons addressed the committee as ward councillor. Reference was made to the lack of affordable homes and he commented that this would a good location for development. It was noted that the planning report contained some errors regarding the inclusion of affordable housing. Councillor Lyons made reference discussions held with the developer and the people who may be attracted to living there and it was concerning that there is a lack of soft play areas within the public realm element of the development for families with young children. The suggestion was made that a condition be added to the application for the inclusion of soft play areas to be included as part of the development. (Councillor Lyons then left the meeting room and took no part in the consideration or vote on the application.)

The planning officer confirmed that the development does not include affordable housing. A clawback mechanism would review this. A condition could be included for assessment and evaluation of a soft play area.

Councillor Flanagan proposed that an additional condition for the inclusion of soft plays areas and that final designs be agreed by the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee. The councillor made the point that no reference is made in the application to the development of family homes but no reference is made to provision for families with children.

Councillor Richards in seconded the proposal commented that the application falls in the Northern Gateway SRF area, where developer partners already offer 20% affordable homes. In addition, the inclusion of local infrastructure needed to be included to help support the building of a community in the area and meet the needs of all residents instead of a one-sided approach. It is important that a contribution is made to help meet the cost of providing the infrastructure, if affordable housing is not achievable.

The planning officer reported that discussions are ongoing with key partners on the Victoria North area for the ongoing transformation of the area over the next 10-15 years. The area will see significant change that will include important infrastructure facilities such as schools and GP surgeries.

The Committee agreed the application with the inclusion of an additional condition for a soft play area with the design to be subject to approval by the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee and members of the committee.

Decision

The Committee agreed the application as detailed in the report submitted and with the inclusion of an additional condition for the assessment and evaluation of providing a soft play area, with the design of it to be subject to approval by the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee and local members.

(Councillor Lyons declared a personal interest in the application but addressed the Committee as a ward councillor before leaving the meeting and taking no part in the consideration or vote.)

PH/22/05 131314/FO/2021 - Speakers House 39 Deansgate Manchester M3 2BA - Deansgate Ward

This application sought the erection of a 17 storey building comprising office use (Use Class E(g)(i)) and flexible ground floor commercial units (Use Classes E(a), (b), (c) and sui generis 'drinking establishment'), new electricity substation, basement cycle parking and rooftop plant enclosure, together with access, servicing and associated works following demolition of the existing building.

The planning officer reported that late representations had been submitted from Councillor Johns (Deansgate ward Councillor) that referred to discussions held with the developer. The submission included a breakdown of the impact of the proposed development on the neighbouring residential property (No1 Deansgate), listed buildings and conservation area. The impact of the development on the townscape due to overdevelopment and concerns on the list of assumed benefits to the city to be provided by the development.

The planning officer stated that the responses to the concerns raised had been provided in the planning report.

The planning officer advised the Committee that the developer had provided a viability study of the scheme and alternative schemes for the site which had been independently assessed. The viability study had indicated that the scheme would not be viable in another or reduced form.

The Chair invited an objector to speak on the application. The Committee was advised that the planning application had been resubmitted with no changes. The development was not appropriate for the location due to its height and mass. The objectors were happy to engage with the developer to address concerns, although no agreement had been reached. The impact on the surrounding location, residential area, heritage area and assets are significant and the development would result in the loss of the low/mid roof lines of buildings in St Ann's Square Conservation Area and would dominate the Royal Exchange clock tower. The building would result in

the loss of views of heritage asset buildings. The Council appears to be moving away from its policy on tall buildings in a conservation area. Residents of No1 Deansgate will be impacted negatively with loss of privacy, amenity loss of light and will leave local residents in a less attractive position.

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

Councillor Johns (ward councillor Deansgate ward) addressed the application. The Committee was advised that the discussion held with the developer was positive but did not address the concerns of residents of No1 Deansgate regarding maintaining privacy. The application submitted appeared to be identical to the previous one apart from the inclusion of fritted glass and the Committee was asked to refuse the application, for the reasons that have been presented today and at previous meetings. A clear and compelling case has been presented through the Committee's consideration of the application, for the reasons that it impacts negatively the residents adjacent to the development and the important heritage assets and important buildings and features within the area.

The Planning Officer reported that the impacts would not be significant in a city centre context. The separation between the buildings is similar to distances agreed previously by the committee on other tall buildings and are not unusual. An assessment showed that wind condition would be improv. Historic England has indicated a 'less than substantial harm' to the buildings in St Ann's Square and the level of public benefit appeared to outweigh the level of harm to the area. The building is currently vacant and refurbishment is not viable.

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

A member asked if the application is a new application or an amendment of the previous application. The planning officer reported that the application was a new application involving a new consultation process and includes changes based on the Committee's previous comments.

A member referred to the loss of privacy for residents of No1 Deansgate and considered that to be significant due to the design and importance of the building which has an open aspect to the proposal. The impact on the local heritage assets would be detrimental to those buildings adjacent and stated they were minded to the refuse the application. The Council did not have a tall building policy and suggested that more detail is needed within the strategic framework for the city centre to help and inform developers on this kind of development.

The planning officer reported that No1 Deansgate is similar to existing buildings in the city centre that are constructed from steel and glass and is therefore not significantly different. The decisions made by the Committee must be considered in the context of current policy, guidance and legislation.

A member of the Committee referred to the potential income from the proposed development and the existing business rates received from the empty building to compare the benefits of a new building. The statement that the council would receive an level of business rates from the building is incorrect and the public benefit

does not outweigh the damage to the heritage assets and conservation area and the application should be refused.

The Planning officer reported that the assessed benefits provided to the public were significant and included the jobs provided, the impact on the economy and the replacement of a derelict building to improve the area.

A member referred to the impact on residential and the investment made by residents in choosing the city centre to make their lives and staying for a number of years. Reference was made to the cost paid for the existing building and how this could influence the economic viability of the proposal. Reference was made to the design of No1 Deansgate and the choice of not including the need for window coverings. The proposal would result in the loss of privacy and would be intrusive due to the close proximity. Some of the city centre residential blocks have an enclosed balcony which are used as a living area, such as No1 Deansgate. No1 Deansgate is unusual in its style and design and the damage caused should be considered in the balance of the building proposed.

The planning officer stated that No1 Deansgate has an enclosed glass balcony. The planning report provides a viability assessment and the cost of the land value is tested against other comparable sites. This had been validated. The city centre requires more grade A office space.

A member questioned the validity of the height in this location and whether it complied with current council policy and whether the building should be located within a heritage or conservation area.

The planning officer stated that the proposal had been tested in the context of current policy. The tall buildings policy suggests that tall buildings may be more appropriate outside of a conservation area however, the merits of an application must be considered on the appropriateness of a location.

A member suggested that more information is required to provide greater clarity on the siting of tall buildings within the city centre and in particular, conservation areas. This would help developers when assessing the viability of a location and related land costs.

The Director of Planning stated that core strategy was developed using the English Heritage/CABE guidance on tall buildings. The review of the core strategy would need to consider if there is an alternative or more appropriate approach. The current planning application must therefore be considered under the existing guidance.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation to approve the application.
Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee approved the application including the conditions, as detailed in the report submitted.

**PH/22/06 132069/FO/2021 - Former Police Station Car Parking Area
Davenfield Grove Manchester M20 6UA - Didsbury West Ward**

This application sought the temporary change of use of car parking area to form a builders compound (installation of welfare unit, WCs, car parking spaces and storage area) for a period of 12 months to be used in connection with the redevelopment of the former Didsbury Police Station.

This application related to a rectangular plot of land located at the southern end of Davenfield Grove. To the south of the site lies a terrace of dwellings, namely nos. 12 to 26 Whitechapel Street, while to the north there are further residential properties, namely no. 2 Davenfield Grove and nos. 10 to 16 Davenfield Road. To the east there is a car park and servicing area associated with several commercial properties on Wilmslow Road. To the west there are a number of terraced dwellings on Crossway.

Objections had been received from six local residents and Councillor Hilal. Objections have been raised in respect of the impact on residential amenity, resulting from noise and general disturbance; the impact in visual amenity; insufficient parking; and the impact on pedestrian and highway safety due to the comings and goings of contractors' vehicles and delivery wagons.

The planning officer referred to the late representation received from Councillor Hilal (ward councillor) that included photographs of rubble at the site. It was confirmed that the rubble will be removed today. The Committee was advised that if the recommendation is agreed it would be appropriate to amend condition 5 of the application, to state that no activity take within compound the place outside of the hours stated.

The architect attended the meeting but did not address the committee.

Councillor Hilal (ward councillor Didsbury West) addressed the Committee. The committee was informed that following her visit to the site issues had been raised by residents living next to the compound regarding disturbance due to generator noise and work taking place early in the morning, late evening and weekends. The use of the car park as a compound has been recommended by officers, however the residents believe the site management rules are not being followed by the contractors. The pavement has been damaged and residents are being inconvenienced by vehicle movement, engine noise, storage of building materials and breaking down of items on the road. The cottages adjacent to the compound are small and sited directly on the pavement. The Committee was asked to ensure that any future rule beaches of the site management rules are enforced by the compliance team.

The planning officer reported that if the application is agreed, officers will consult with the site management to ensure that the construction management conditions are followed to control the use of the generator, hours of use and the other issues raised. The planning compliance team will work with the site management to address the concerns if necessary.

A member stated that contractors could unload their vehicles within the compound and then park their vehicles away from the compound and reduce the congestion on the road. The Councillor proposed that an additional condition be added to the application requiring that all materials are unloaded within the compound area.

The planning officer confirmed that an additional condition could be added for a site management plan to require loading and unloading of materials takes place within the compound.

A member asked officers if other measures could be included to help relieve the difficulties of using the small access road on Davenfield Grove to the site in view of the disturbance and inconvenience being caused to local residents.

The planning officers reported that the proposed addition condition for the use of the compound for loading and unloading materials would provide the best solution to the concerns expressed and would allow enforcement action to be taken in the event of breaches to the conditions.

Councillor Flanagan moved approval of the recommendation with the inclusion of an additional condition to require the loading and unloading of materials take place within the compound.

Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee approved the application including the conditions, as detailed in the report submitted, with the inclusion of an additional condition to require that contractors load and unload materials only within the compound.

Health and Wellbeing Board

Minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2022

Present:

Councillor Midgley, Deputy Leader - In the chair
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools Services
David Regan, Director of Public Health
Rupert Nichols, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust
Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services
Dr Geeta Wadhwa, GP Member (South) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Dr Murugesan Raja, Manchester GP Forum
Dr Doug Jeffrey, (South) Primary Care Manchester Partnership
Katy Calvin-Thomas, Manchester Local Care Organisation
Dr Denis Colligan, GP Member (North) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust
Vicky Szulist, Healthwatch
Mike Wild, Voluntary and Community Sector representative

Apologies:

Councillor Craig, Leader of the Council
Dr Tracey Vell, Primary Care representative - Local Medical Committee

Also in attendance:

Sarah Broad, Deputy Director Adult Social Services
Paul Marshal, Strategic Director of Children's Services
Barry Gillespie, Consultant in Public Health, Chair of the Manchester CDOP
Stephanie Davern, Child Death Overview Panel Co-ordinator

HWB/22/01 Appointment of Chair

Councillor Midgley was nominated to Chair the meeting. This was seconded and approved by the Board.

Decision

Councillor Midgley was appointed Chair for the meeting.

HWB/22/02 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2021 as a correct record.

HWB/22/03 COVID-19 – Update

The Board considered the report and presentation of the Director of Public Health that provided an update on the latest COVID-19 data and progress on the implementation of the Manchester Vaccination Programme.

In response to comments from Board members the Director of Public Health advised that despite the lifting of the national plan B measures, local schools and Universities were being supported to maintain the wearing of face masks in communal areas as a measure to reduce infection rates. He described that both himself and the Director of Education had written to all Head Teachers in Manchester to offer support and guidance on this issue. The Executive Member for Children and Schools Services informed the Board that the feedback from schools was very positive and had welcomed this continued support.

In response to a comment raised regarding the national advice given regarding the symptoms to be aware of for the variants, noting that this was generic advice with no differentiation between the variants, the Director of Public Health stated this had been raised nationally as a concern. He said that this had been acknowledged locally and local bespoke advice and information had been issued but noted the comment from the Board.

The Director of Public Health responded to a question relating the issue of the removal of free Lateral Flow Tests (LFT) by stating that this was an equalities issue and stated that Manchester continued to make the case for free LFTs, adding that there was a need for an effective, equitable national testing policy.

The Chair on behalf of the Board paid tribute to all staff involved in the vaccination programme and the directed approach to address equity in the programme to protect as many residents as possible. The Chair also paid tribute to the teams working in Adult Social Care who were working to safely discharge patients from hospital settings into alternative, appropriate and safe care pathways.

The Board reiterated the importance of the COVID-19 vaccination and encouraged all who had not come forward to receive the jab to do so.

Decision

To note the report and presentation.

HWB/22/04 Better Outcomes Better Lives

The Board considered the report of the Executive Director of Adult Social Services that provided an update on the delivery of Better Outcomes, Better Lives, the adult social care transformation programme. Noting that this was a long-term programme of practice-led change, which aimed to enable the people of Manchester to achieve better outcomes with the result of less dependence on formal care.

The report provided an introduction and background, describing that Better Outcomes Better Lives was the Manchester Local Care Organisation's programme to transform the way that we deliver adult social care so that it meets the needs of our most vulnerable residents and makes best use of the resources that we have. The programme is key to delivering the savings set out in the 2021/2022 budget agreed by the Council in March 2021.

The report described that the programme was structured around six key workstreams, noting that four of the workstreams had started in January 2021. The report further described what would feel different for residents who received our adult social care services in the future; what would feel different for families and carers; and what would feel different for staff.

The Board were provided with an overview of the programme that were accompanied by case studies to illustrate what these changes meant in practice.

The Board welcomed and endorsed the approach described, in particular the assurance provided that activities and progress would be reported and regularly reviewed by the MLCO Accountability Board. The Board further noted and welcomed the assurance given that this approach also informed the work and planning of the MLCO. The Chair stated that she had taken the opportunity to meet with the teams and had received very positive feedback from the staff. The Executive Director of Adult Social Services welcomed the positive feedback from the Board and assured those present that this would be relayed to the staff and practitioners working across the teams.

Decision

To note the report.

HWB/22/05 Integrated Care System arrangements and Manchester Locality Plan Refresh

The Board considered the report of the Deputy Leader (with responsibility for Health and Care), Manchester City Council and the Vice Chair, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning that provided an update on the establishment of a Greater Manchester Integrated Care System/Integrated Care Board and Manchester Locality Board. The report further provided an update on the refreshed Manchester Locality Plan, noting that the refreshed Locality Plan for Manchester, which recommits to the strategic intent to improve the health and care outcomes for the people of Manchester and recognised the significant change in context following the COVID-19 pandemic.

The report described that subject to legislation passing through parliament, Integrated Care Systems (ICS) would be established in England from 1 July 2022. This change was originally planned for 1 April 2022 but had been delayed allowing sufficient time for the legislative process to conclude. The report described the four aims of the ICS and the national core building blocks of an ICS.

In Greater Manchester this would mean a shift from the Greater Manchester Health & Social Care Partnership (GMHSCP) arrangements to a new Greater Manchester ICS and ICB. Work is underway to prepare for this shift, determining the future role and governance of the GM ICS and ICB and the 10 localities in the new structure. Noting that Manchester's Local Authorities and NHS leaders had both contributed to the

development of the GM ICS and ICB arrangements and had worked to develop locality arrangements for the City of Manchester.

The Board noted that Sir Richard Leese had been appointed Chair designate of the Greater Manchester ICB along with two non-executive directors. The Chief Executive Officer recruitment was currently in progress, with a planned interview date in February, and recruitment to the Chief Finance Officer, Medical Director and Chief Nurse roles had also commenced.

The Board endorsed the work reported to date, noting the challenges presented by the pandemic and welcomed the priority given to post pandemic recovery across all settings and continued commitment to address health inequalities.

Decision

The Board note the report and support the refreshed Locality Plan.

HWB/22/06 Child Death Overview Panel (CDOP) Annual Report

The Board considered the report of the Consultant in Public Health, Chair of the Manchester Child Death Overview Panel that described that the Manchester Child Death Overview Panel (CDOP) was a subgroup of the Manchester Safeguarding Partnership (MSP) and reviewed the deaths of children aged 0-17 years of age (excluding stillbirths and legal terminations of pregnancy) that were normally resident in the area of Manchester City.

The report described that in line with the Child Death Review: Statutory and Operational Guidance (England) published October 2018, the CDOP had a statutory requirement to produce a local annual report which provided a summary of the key learning and emerging trends arising with the aim of preventing future child deaths.

The report provided a description of the Child Death Review Process, in term of both national and local arrangements, noting that national line of accountability had transferred from the Department for Education (DfE) to the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC).

The Director of Public Health paid tribute to the staff working within the Manchester Child Death Overview Panel, adding that the arrangements in Manchester were regarded nationally as an exemplar model. In response to a comment from a Board member who discussed the need to support families and align strategies, he stated that the approach and findings of the Manchester Child Death Overview Panel were regularly reviewed and refreshed to ensure they aligned with wider policies, such as Early Years and Early Help.

Decision

The Board note the report.

**Manchester City Council
Report for Resolution**

Report to: Council – 2 February 2022

Subject: Process for the Appointment of the External Auditor

Report of: Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer

Summary

This report sets out proposals for appointing the City Council' external auditor for the five-year period from 2023/24.

The Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 (the Act) at Section 7 states that a "relevant authority must appoint a local auditor to audit its accounts for a financial year not later than 31 December in the preceding financial year." The City Council's current auditor contract with Mazars LLP has run from 2017 and was arranged through Public Sector Audit Appointments Limited (PSAA). It expires on completion of the 2022/23 audit.

The Council has three options to secure an appointment: to run a local procurement; procure in partnership with other authorities; or opt into a national arrangement. Options have been assessed and the preferred solution as agreed at Audit Committee is to again opt into the national procurement being run by PSAA and supported by the LGA.

Legislation requires that the decision to opt-in to this arrangement must be made by Council.

Recommendation

Council is requested to approve the preferred option to opt into the sector-led option through PSAA for the appointment of external auditors to principal local government and police bodies for five financial years from 1 April 2023.

Wards Affected - All

Environmental Impact Assessment – there are no specific implications from this decision that link to the Council's zero carbon target for the City.

Our Manchester Strategy Outcomes – there are no specific Our Manchester Strategy Outcomes that link directly to this decision. The external audit is a statutory requirement and a key element of the Council's governance framework.

Equal Opportunities Policy – there are no specific implications from the decision that link to the Council's equal opportunities policy.

Risk Management and Legal Considerations – are referenced within the report.

Financial Consequences – Revenue

This decision is to confirm the proposed procurement process for the appointment of an external auditor. The actual costs of this service will be determined as part of the procurement process and confirmed to Audit Committee as part of regular progress updates.

Capital Consequences – None

Contact Officer:

Name: Carol Culley
Position: Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer
Tel: 0161 234 3506
E-mail: carol.culley@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

Documents used in the development of the assurance report include:

- 2017 reports to Audit Committee and Council
- Report to Audit Committee 23 November 2021
- Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 (the Act)
- Local Audit (appointing Person) Regulations 2015
- CIPFA Guide to Auditor Panels

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 (the Act) at Section 7 states that a “relevant authority must appoint a local auditor to audit its accounts for a financial year not later than 31 December in the preceding financial year.” The current auditor appointment arrangements cover the period up to and including the audit of the 2022/23 accounts.
- 1.2 In 2017 the Council opted into the ‘appointing person’ national auditor appointment arrangements established by Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA) for the period covering the accounts for 2018/19 to 2022/23.
- 1.3 PSAA is now undertaking a procurement for the next appointing period, covering audits for 2023/24 to 2027/28. During Autumn 2021 all local government bodies need to make decisions about their external audit arrangements for accounting periods from 2023/24.
- 1.4 The closing date to opt in to the PSAA arrangement is 11 March 2022. This enables procurement and award of contracts by the statutory deadline of 31 December 2022.
- 1.5 A report to Audit Committee on 23 November 2021 set out the options open to the Council and the basis of officers’ recommendation to opt into the national arrangement with PSAA. Audit Committee supported the this preferred option and confirmed that Council be asked to endorse and approve this approach.

2 Background

- 2.1 There is a requirement under the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014 for all local government and NHS bodies in England to locally appoint their external auditors.
- 2.2 There are three options open to the Council under the Act which are:
 - Option 1: Make a stand-alone appointment as Manchester City Council
 - Option 2: Establish local joint procurement arrangements
 - Option 3: Opt-in to a sector led body appointed by the Secretary of State under the Act - Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA) Limited.
- 2.3 New appointments for auditors need to be made by December 2022 regardless of which option is chosen.
- 2.4 In accordance with Regulation 19 of the Local Audit (Appointing Person) Regulations 2015, the decision on opt-in must be taken by Council (“full authority”).

3 Review of Options

- 3.1 A review of options was presented to Audit Committee and Council in 2017 to support the decision to opt in to the PSAA arrangements at that time. The November 2021 report to Audit Committee confirmed that the basis for that decision has not fundamentally changed in the intervening period and set out the pros and cons of the options:

Option 1: Make a stand-alone appointment as Manchester City Council

- 3.2 This option requires the Council to appoint an Audit Panel, separate in role and membership to the Audit Committee, to oversee the procurement and management of the external audit contract. It requires the whole or majority of the membership to be independent of the Council and this means that elected members will not have a majority input to assessing bids and choosing to which audit firm to award a contract for the Council's external audit.
- 3.3 This approach requires additional capacity and expertise to administer the process and to deliver the functions of the Panel. It will also result in the costs of tendering being borne solely by the Council.
- 3.4 The option limits the market influence that the Council has through the letting of a standalone contract and it is not guaranteed that firms will submit tenders for this work given widely reported capacity issues in the market and given they will also be competing as part of the PSAA arrangement. This presents a risk of being unable to make an appointment by the statutory deadline.
- 3.5 This option does enable the Council to determine cost, quality and social value weightings in its procurement process whereas opting into PSAA will require alignment with the scoring and appointment process agreed through their process.

Option 2: Establish local joint procurement arrangements

- 3.6 An option was explored to establish Greater Manchester level procurement arrangements. Whilst affording greater economies of scale this approach does largely present the same risks and opportunities as the stand-alone option. It also increases the risk that firms will not bid as they are at heightened risk of having a conflict of interest at one of the authorities. This option has been discussed with Greater Manchester Treasurers and the consensus is that this presents a high level of risk with relatively low benefits compared to option 3.

Option 3: Opt in to PSAA

- 3.7 PSAA was the option selected in 2017 for the reasons set out below. Given challenges and capacity in the market and the need to maintain quality of external audit provision, there is an even stronger case that this option will produce better outcomes and will be less burdensome for the Council than a procurement undertaken locally because:

- collective procurement reduces overall costs for the sector and for individual authorities compared to smaller local procurements and contract management arrangements;
- there is no required to establish a specific Council auditor panel with an independent chair and independent members to oversee a local auditor procurement and ongoing management of an audit contract;
- it is the best opportunity to secure the appointment of a qualified, registered auditor - there are only nine accredited local audit firms, and a local procurement would be drawing from the same limited supply of auditor resources as PSAA's national procurement; and
- supporting the sector-led body offers the best way of to ensuring there is a continuing and sustainable public audit market into the medium and long term.

3.8 Key features of the PSAA approach are:

- contracts let under the PSAA opt-in will run for five years;
- contracts between PSAA and the audit firms will require firms to deliver audits compliant with the National Audit Office (NAO) Code of Audit Practice;
- the number of firms eligible to undertake local public audit is regulated through the Financial Reporting Council and the Recognised Supervisory Bodies (RSBs). Only appropriately accredited firms will be able to bid for appointments;
- PSAA will manage current and potential future conflicts of interest rather than the Council having to re-procure contracts should such conflicts arise;
- opting into the PSAA will remove the need to set up an auditor panel in addition to the Council's Audit Committee;
- in addition to working with the LGA, a stakeholder advisory panel with representative organisations for councils, police and fire bodies ensures ongoing influence and engagement with PSAA;
- PSAA is a not-for-profit organisation whose costs are around 4% of the scheme with any surplus distributed back to scheme members;
- scale fees will vary in line with the additional work needed which reflects risk and complexity (scale is set following consultation with opted in bodies);
- PSAA will manage variation requests and approve where appropriate; and
- This approach is supported and endorsed by the LGA.

- 3.9 The main downside with this option is the inability to determine the evaluation criteria that will be used for procurement. Given that the audit approach is mandated through standards and guidance there is minimal flexibility in the scope of work requested. Nonetheless current stakeholder networks through Core Cities and the LGA will be used to encourage the application of appropriate quality, cost and social value weightings. We expect quality to constitute a high element of scoring and note that is unlikely that PSAA will apply the same weighting to social value as is used by the City Council and would expect this to be no more than 5% of the total score.
- 3.10 The PSAA route was adopted by 484 of 494 bodies in the previous exercise. Feedback from across Greater Manchester and North West authorities, as well as Core Cities, is that they will be adopting this same approach in 2022.

4 Current Issues in External Audit Provision

- 4.1 Whilst the PSAA arrangement is the preferred procurement route, it needs to be acknowledged that there are significant inadequacies in current external audit arrangements across local government. Notwithstanding the impact of Covid19, the timeliness of external audit completion and reporting on the accounts is a concern and reflects a national issue with the ability of the market to deliver on contracts and commitments.
- 4.2 There a range of factors contributing to these delays and to concerns over audit quality. These are referenced in the Redmond Review and include a reduction in fee levels; the increased focus in financial reporting standards and audits on estimates, assumptions and valuations; skills and capacity; the narrow focus of the audit approach; and the need for more effective contract management, oversight and accountability.
- 4.3 It is essential for the reputation of the Council and the sector that there is a credible external audit process so the planned procurement and contract management approach to be adopted by PSAA needs to be designed to help address these concerns.

5 Audit Committee Conclusion

- 5.1 Audit Committee considered the available options at their meeting on 23 November 2021. The Committee supported officers' recommendation to opt into the PSAA arrangement and to seek Council approval for this decision.
- 5.2 Committee also acknowledged that concerns over external audit quality and timeliness should continue to be raised with PSAA and requested assurance as to how the risk of capacity, standards and quality would be managed through the procurement and contract management process. Further updates will be provided to Audit Committee on these matters as the process develops.

6 Recommendation

- 6.1 Council is asked to approve the preferred option to opt into the sector-led option through PSAA for the appointment of external auditors to principal local government and police bodies for five financial years from 1 April 2023.

This page is intentionally left blank