



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

**Monday, 11 July 2022**

Dear Councillor / Honorary Alderman,

**Meeting of the Council – Wednesday, 13th July, 2022**

A summons was issued on 5 July 2022 for meeting of the Council which will be held at 10.00 am on Wednesday, 13th July, 2022, in The Council Chamber, Level 2, Town Hall Extension.

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

- |   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>6. Proceedings of the Executive</b>            | Pages     |
| The minutes of the Executive on 29 June 2022.     | 3 – 12    |
| <br><b>8. Scrutiny Committees</b>                 | <br>Pages |
| The minutes of the following Scrutiny Committees: | 13 – 28   |
| <br>Communities & Equalities – 21 June 2022       |           |
| Children & Young People – 22 June 2022            |           |
| <br><b>9. Proceedings of Committees</b>           | <br>Pages |
| The minutes of the following meetings:            | 29 - 42   |
| <br>Health & Wellbeing Board - 6 July 2022        |           |
| Planning & Highways - 30 June 2022                |           |

---

Yours faithfully,

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

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

**Councillors:-**

Ludford (Chair), Y Dar (Deputy Chair), Abdullatif, Akbar, Azra Ali, Ahmed Ali, Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Amin, Andrews, Appleby, Baker-Smith, Bano, Bayunu, Bell, Benham, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Chohan, Collins, Connolly, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Davies, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Flanagan, Foley, Gartside, Good, Green, Grimshaw, Hacking, Hassan, Hewitson, Hilal, Hitchen, Holt, Hughes, Hussain, Igbon, Ilyas, Iqbal, Jeavons, Johns, Johnson, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, J Lovecy, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Moran, Newman, Noor, Nunney, Ogunbambo, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reeves, Reid, Riasat, Richards, I Robinson, T 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](mailto:andrew.woods@manchester.gov.uk)

This agenda was issued on **Monday, 11 July 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, 29 June 2022**

**Present:** Councillor Craig (Chair)

**Councillors:** Akbar, Bridges, Hacking, Midgley, Rahman, Rawlins and White

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

**Councillors:** Ahmed Ali, Butt, Douglas, Foley, Lynch and Stanton

**Apologies:** Councillor Igbon, T Robinson, Collins, Johnson and Leech

#### **Exe/22/48 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

The Executive approved as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 1 June 2022.

#### **Exe/22/49 Our Manchester Progress update**

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 made reference to the second reading of the HS2 Bill in Parliament. It was noted that the Council had concerns about the plans as they currently stood, including the proposed new six-platform overground station next to the existing Manchester Piccadilly Station to accommodate HS2 and improved northern links. She reported that the Council would be formally petitioning government, urging the to reconsider their approach and ambition for Manchester. Manchester's response would be shared with Members and discussed at a future meeting of the Executive.

The Leader also made reference to the Clean Air Plan Review of Greater Manchester. Transport for Greater Manchester, on behalf of the 10 GM local authorities, were preparing a response to Government setting out the case for a new GM Clean Air Plan which would be submitted to Government by 1 July 2022. Due to the tight timeframes to complete the review, the draft plan was being submitted to government on 1 July in order to meet the government deadline. Local Authorities would then have an opportunity to consider it before a final plan was submitted. There would also be a much wider participation and engagement process for a new clean air plan.

The Leader reported that Manchester had made a strong showing in an annual report rating the liveability of 172 prominent world cities, once again coming out as the highest ranked UK city. The city had risen 26 places to 28th position continuing to be placed above London, Barcelona, Los Angeles, Auckland, Madrid and Adelaide.

The Deputy Leader (Statutory) reported that plans for a new visitor experience in Manchester Town Hall telling the story of the iconic building and showcasing some of its civic treasures had taken a big step forward with the appointment of leading exhibition designers Mather & Co. The ground floor exhibition space, would have no admission charge and there would also be a chance to explore some of the Town Hall's hidden spaces which had rarely if ever been open to the public, such as the Victorian police cells, courtyard area and clock tower, on guided tours.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development reported on the launch of the Manchester Living Rent, which would be a rent level that people on housing benefit could access, meaning new housing – regardless of where it was built – would be affordable to anyone in the city. He advised that this would be part of the Council's strategy to deliver 10,000 new homes over the next 10 years. In terms of the Council's Selective Licensing Scheme, he reported that in addition to the existing seven schemes, a further eight schemes would be brought forward following an analysis of the Crumpsall scheme, which had now come to an end and had demonstrated a positive impact on improving private rental standards.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People commented on the success of Manchester Day, with over 1,300 participants from across the city. In keeping with the Our Year campaign to promote opportunities for those growing up in our city, young people played a key role in the day which included programming the day's activities in Piccadilly Gardens. In addition, it was noted that this year's parade was the most sustainable yet.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport reported that Keep Manchester Tidy – a partnership between Manchester City Council and Keep Britain Tidy – had delivered 70 community clean-ups across the city to mark the Queen's Platinum Jubilee, with Schools, community groups and local businesses amongst those participating. In keeping with the spirit of the Our Year campaign as well as taking part, young people had their say in which areas were cleaned up, and there had been a particular focus on parks and play areas to ensure they had a clean place to socialise.

## **Decision**

The Executive note the report.

## **Exe/22/50 Capital Outturn Report**

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which outlined the capital outturn position for 2020/21 including total expenditure and funding, confirmed that funding sources had been managed to best utilise resources available to fund the capital programme; and presented a revised capital programme for the 2022/23 financial year after taking into account the final outturn position as reported.

The main changes to the programme since the report to Executive in June 2021 were as follows:-

- £29m Highways – The Active Travel Fund and Northern Quarter Cycling scheme have reprofiled £5.1m and £3m respectively into futures years. In addition, inclement weather and capacity issues with third parties had delayed the Highways Maintenance Programme with £4.5m slipping into 2022/23;
- £16m Neighbourhoods – This included Beswick Hub Rugby Football League £2.6m reprofiling and £2.2m relating to Indoor Leisure - Abraham Moss. The Manchester Aquatic Centre would reprofile £4.5m into future years to reflect the fact the main contract was signed in April 2022, which had had an impact on the progress on site;
- £51m Growth and Development – £7.1m of the Housing Infrastructure Fund (HIF) funding for enabling works in Victoria North would move into 2022/23. There was also £9.3m reprofiling required for Hammerstone Road Depot, and £8.9m Carbon Reduction Programme/Public Sector Decarbonisation Fund With other major variances of £4.1m for House of Sport and £4.4m for Campfield Development;
- £21m Our Town Hall – This would now be spent in 2022/23 in line with the current programme of works which was agreed and revised after the budget was set;
- £17m Children's Services - £11.6m of this related to the revised start on site date for the Co-op Academy in Belle Vue;
- Expenditure was almost £36m lower than that forecast in the report to Executive in February 2022. The largest change related to the £8.2m reprofiling across the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme and the Carbon Reduction programme which had seen delays in designs and contract approvals linked to the supply chains.

Overall, the spend against the approved in year programme of £458.3m was £165m lower

It was reported that the programme had delivered over £293m of capital investment during the 2021/22 and whilst the outturn position was higher than the average spend over the past three years, it represented the continued significant investment in Manchester with over 220 live projects progressing during the year, a major achievement given the impact of the pandemic.

It was noted that there was no sign of inflationary pressures abating, with companies continuing to issue warnings on future cost increases. As such, in addition to a proportion of the contingent budgets for each major capital project earmarked for inflationary pressures, a further £28m had been profiled over a number of financial years to reflect the expected timing of any contract increases over the life of the programme.

Unlike the Revenue Budget the Capital Budget was subject to change as new schemes and /or external funding was received. The budget was prepared in February each year on the best estimate of the start date and spend profile for each scheme and was refreshed in June for the Outturn Position. Most capital schemes covered multiple years and as schemes developed the spending profile across financial years changed to reflect the agreed start on site date and delivery of the work packages. Based on the monitoring information, it was proposed that the capital programme budget was re-phased to reflect the planned delivery of projects in

2022/23 to 2025/26 which would be reviewed throughout 2022/23 to reflect changes to the proposed profile of spend.

In addition it was reported that there were schemes that had been developed or have received external funding that were now ready for inclusion in the Capital Programme. The proposals which required Council approval were those which were funded by the use of reserves above a cumulative total of £2million, where the use of borrowing was required or a virement exceeds £0.500m. These included the following proposed changes:-

- Public Sector Housing – Northwards Housing Capital Programme 2022/23. A capital budget increase of £2.475m in 2022/23, £21.047m in 2023/24 and £7.599m in 2024/25 is requested, funded by an RCCO from the HRA to deliver essential health and safety work, security improvements and environmental improvements across the Council's Housing estate.
- Corporate Programme - Elizabeth Tower GP surgery. A capital budget increase of £2.6m in 2022/23, funded by RCCO from Integration Reserve to support the fit out of the GP surgery and ancillary facilities to service the city centre's growing residential population.

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:-

- Neighbourhoods – Off Street Car Parks. A capital budget increase of £0.369m in 2022/23 requested, funded by Parking Reserve to carry out works to one of the Council's multi storey car parks, identified as part of the Fire Risk Assessment. This included internal fire doors and a new fire alarm. Electric works were also required to Bloom Street Car Park for a new power supply for lighting.
- Northwards ICT Work. A capital budget increase of £2.491m in 2022/23 and £1.599m in 2023/24 requested, funded from a revenue contribution from the HRA to finance a multi-disciplinary migration team as well as the required hardware, software and supplier fees to conduct the migration of Northwards ICT infrastructure in the City Council infrastructure in a fashion that protects live services to tenants.
- Private Sector Housing – Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG). A capital budget increase of £0.855m in 2022/23 and £7.628m in 2023/24 requested, funded by Government Grant for home adaptations for people with disabilities.

It was noted that the forecast budget for 2022/23 was ambitious compared to previous annual expenditure with a number of large scale projects due to begin in 2022/23 and that the budget would change as new schemes were added throughout the year, and specific projects funded through the contingent budgets were brought forward through the Council's capital approval process. Current funding assumptions

for the Capital Programme based on the current forecast were detailed and these would continue to be reviewed to ensure that optimum value for money was achieved. The current modelling forecasted that the programme remained affordable within the revenue budget available. The model was based on a number of assumptions however, including the timing of future borrowing and forecast future interest rates. As these assumptions changed, the capital financing model including use of capital financing reserves would be updated and reported back

## Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Recommend that the Council approve the virements over £0.5m between capital schemes to maximise use of funding resources available to the City Council set out in Appendix C.
- (2) Note the outturn of capital expenditure 2021/22 is £293.2m.
- (3) Note the changes to the outturn attributable to movement in the programme that occurred after the previous monitoring report to Executive in February 2022,
- (4) Approve virements under £0.5m within the capital programme as outlined in Appendix B, including those related to inflation.
- (5) Recommends that the Council approve the following changes to Manchester City Council's capital programme:-
  - Public Sector Housing – Northwards Housing Capital Programme 2022/23. A capital budget increase of £2.475m in 2022/23, £21.047m in 2023/24 and £7.599m in 2024/25 funded by an RCCO from the HRA
  - Corporate Programme - Elizabeth Tower GP surgery. A capital budget increase of £2.6m in 2022/23, funded by RCCO from Integration Reserve
- (6) Approves the following changes to the City Council's capital programme:-
  - Neighbourhoods – Off Street Car Parks. A capital budget increase of £0.369m in 2022/23 funded by Parking Reserve
  - Northwards ICT Work. A capital budget increase of £2.491m in 2022/23 and £1.599m in 2023/24, funded from a revenue contribution from the HRA
  - Private Sector Housing – Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG). A capital budget increase of £0.855m in 2022/23 and £7.628m in 2023/24, funded by Government Grant.
- (7) Note the decisions of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer regarding the funding of capital expenditure in 2021/22 including the use of £99.6m Grants and Contributions, £12.3m Capital receipts, £28.3m Revenue funding and £153.0m Borrowing.
- (8) Note the revised capital programme for 2022/23 shown in Section 9 and Appendix F.

## **Exe/22/51 Integrated Care System and Place-Based Lead for Manchester**

The Executive considered a report of the Chief Executive, which informed Members of the Government's reforms to health and social care to establish Integrated Care Systems, including at the level of Greater Manchester

It was reported that Integrated Care Systems were being established nationally as part of the next phase of health and social care integration. This includes the establishment of Greater Manchester Integrated Care (NHS GM) and locality arrangements for Manchester.

These upcoming system reforms were an opportunity to accelerate the delivery of Manchester's ambitions to improve health outcomes and tackle health inequalities through further integration of health and social care.

The Manchester Partnership Board would lead the development of Manchester's future operating model for health and social care integration. Joanne Roney OBE, in addition to being Chief Executive of Manchester City Council had been appointed as the Place-Based Lead for Manchester.

### **Decision**

The Executive note the report and endorse the appointment of Joanne Roney as Place-Based Lead for Manchester.

## **Exe/22/52 Manchester Work and Skills Strategy 2022-27**

The Executive considered a report of the Director of Inclusive Economy, which sought approval of the adoption of Manchester's new Work and Skills Strategy 2022-27.

It was reported that Manchester's Work and Skills Strategy 2016-21 had reached the end of its life and work had been underway since last year to revise and update the Strategy to respond to the significant changes and challenges the city has experienced over the last five years.

In developing the new Strategy, the linkages and dependencies with and between other Manchester strategies had been mapped out, to ensure clear interfaces and avoid duplication. The new strategy used the Our Manchester Strategy themes as a structural framework, making it clear how the Strategy's priorities, outcomes and indicators would contribute to the delivery of the Our Manchester Strategy. The Strategy also responded to the recommendations made in the Marmot report 'Build Back Fairer in Greater Manchester', which made clear connections between work and health outcomes

The report provided additional background and context to the refresh as well as detailed overview of the consultation and engagement process that had taken place to support the Strategy's development.



As a strategy for the city, it was the responsibility of the Council and its partners to ensure it was delivered. The Strategy would be overseen by the Work and Skills Board, which included a range of partners involved in learning and employment, and progress against priorities tracked by the Council's Economy Scrutiny Committee.

## **Decision**

The Executive agrees to adopt the new Work and Skills Strategy 2022-27

### **Exe/22/53    LTE Group - Estates Strategy Delivery Update**

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Chief Executive, LTE Group, which set out progress to date against the LTE Group estates strategy programme to create new facilities for the Manchester college and align the location of facilities to the future needs of the city.

The estates strategy sought to reduce reliance on old, inefficient and listed buildings where the educational experience is significantly lower than the LTE Group would want to provide or is now being demanded by curriculum or qualifications evolving as part of the skills white paper. Despite the challenges of the pandemic and Brexit, the new construction and upgrade of facilities remained on target and on budget. A new £25m new extension to the Openshaw campus opened on time in December 2021 to very positive feedback from students, communities and stakeholders. The new City Campus Manchester was scheduled to open on time in September 2022. The upgrades to Harpurhey and Wythenshawe were also on track and the ambition to significantly reduce the carbon footprint of the college estate was also on track to be delivered, with the new City Campus Manchester comfortably achieving BREEAM excellent standard.

The project relied on some sites being disposed of so that the proceeds could be reinvested in the new facilities. Where possible LTE Group has sought to create a win-win with other strategies across the city such as affordable housing or helping support a better sense of place in a community. One such site that was now key to dispose of was the Fielden Campus (Didsbury West Ward). The majority of the site was held as a freehold by the College. The Council had a small property interest within the site that would be made available for disposal for market value to support the development.

The marketing period for the site had resulted in over a dozen initial bids which were analysed in detail by appointed property advisors.. Through a professional process of iteration, the bids were narrowed down to a final three bidders, with the preferred bid being from a Manchester based education provider to consolidate their existing educational provision at locations in Chorlton and Withington on to one site at Fielden, with the potential to provide new homes across the sites vacated in Withington and Chorlton or disposing of land for alternative uses such as new public healthcare facilities.

## **Decision**

The Executive note the report and progress to date in relation to the delivery of the LTE estates strategy

(Councillor Hacking declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in this item as he is a Board Member of the LTE Group. He left the meeting during consideration of this item).

### **Exe/22/54 Request for Hackney Carriage Fuel Surcharge**

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which sought approval for a temporary fuel surcharge of 80p to be applied to the Hackney Carriage Fares.

It was reported that representatives from the Hackney Trade have requested consideration of a fuel surcharge to be approved for the Hackney Fares as an urgent measure in response to the significant increases in fuel over the last 6 months. This was requested ahead of the wider Fare Review, given that that piece of work would not be reported to the Licensing and Appeal Committee, and in turn the Executive, until later this Summer.

Any surcharge permitted at this time, will therefore be temporary in nature as these costs would be addressed properly alongside all wider information used within the full Fare Review formula.

The Council's Licensing and Appeals Committee, in its advisory capacity to the Executive, had considered a report with regard to this request and had recommended that a temporary fuel surcharge of 80p was approved to be applied to the Hackney Carriage Fares until the outcome of the wider Hackney Fare Review, or the October 2022 meeting of the Executive, whichever is sooner.

## **Decision**

The Executive approve a temporary fuel surcharge of 80p to be applied to the Hackney Carriage Fares and that this charge be permitted until the outcome of the wider Hackney Fare Review, or the October 2022 meeting of the Executive, whichever is sooner.

### **Exe/22/55 Acquisition of St Modwen's interest at Wythenshawe Civic Centre, Wythenshawe, Manchester (Part A)**

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which set out the rationale for the proposed acquisition of St Modwen's interest in Wythenshawe Town/Civic Centre by the Council.

Wythenshawe town centre has been subject to several masterplans, Strategic Regeneration Frameworks and policy documents in recent years which had not been delivered. The main obstacle to redevelopment had been that the existing shopping centre and adjacent Etrop Court were owned by St Modwen on a long leasehold (part

freehold) basis. The Council had attempted to acquire St Modwen's interests previously on several occasions however, at the time the metrics for the deal were unsustainable. This position had now changed with terms agreed for a disposal at a level which worked for the Council and could be supported on a red book valuation basis

The Executive was advised that time was critical as St Modwen had given the Council an exclusivity period to work through due diligence and complete the acquisition prior to them taking the asset to market.

It was explained that the acquisition would provide the Council with significant control of Wythenshawe Town Centre, together with a substantial rent roll. Furthermore, the acquisition would act as a catalyst for the wider regeneration programme for the centre and provide the Council with the ability to restructure the current legal arrangements which could then support the delivery of a programme of physical and place-making interventions linked to a Levelling Up Fund (LUF) bid which would provide opportunity to accelerate delivering on the long term ambition of regenerating the centre and catalysing a sustainable modern Town Centre that met the needs of its residents

It was also noted that was the Council to be unsuccessful in their LUF bid, contingency plans were in place and it was emphasised that, even if unsuccessful, the acquisition made commercial sense and unlocked wider opportunities.

In addition to the freehold of the shopping centre, the Council owned significant adjacent land that would benefit from the regeneration proposals. Through the acquisition and regeneration of the centre, it was considered that the value of these land parcels would improve and that they would be developed as part of the regeneration strategy.

The direct revenue and capital implications of the acquisition were set out in the report of the same title under Part B of the agenda

## **Decision**

The Executive note the contents of the report and progress made in relation to the wider regeneration proposals for Wythenshawe Town Centre.

## **Exe/22/56 Exclusion of the Public**

## **Decision**

The Executive agrees to exclude the public during consideration of the following item which involved consideration of exempt information relating to the financial or business affairs of particular persons and public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

**Exe/22/57 Acquisition of St Modwen's interest at Wythenshawe Civic Centre, Wythenshawe, Manchester (Part B)**

Further to Minute Exe/22/55, the Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which set out the financial implications of the proposed acquisition of the St Modwen interest in Wythenshawe Shopping Centre.

**Decision**

The Executive:-

- (1) Approve the acquisition of St Modwen interests in Wythenshawe Town Centre together with all necessary ancillary arrangements to ensure the ongoing operation of the centre.
- (2) Approve the proposal to fund the acquisition, rebranding of the centre and ancillary costs, as detailed in the report, to be funded from existing capital budgets.
- (3) Delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and the City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Resources, to negotiate and finalise the details and terms of the acquisition together with the property and commercial arrangements and any other such ancillary agreements (including TUPE) to ensure the ongoing management and operation of the centre.
- (4) Delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and the City Treasurer in consultation with the Leader and Executive Member for Finance and Resources to approve the capital expenditure in respect of the acquisition, rebranding of the centre and ancillary costs.
- (5) Delegate authority to the City Solicitor to enter into and complete all documents or agreements necessary to give effect to the recommendations in this report

## **Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2022**

#### **Present:**

Councillor H Priest - In the Chair

Councillors Azra Ali, Benham, Chambers, Connolly, M Dar, Evans, Hilal, Hussain, Iqbal, Johnson, Ogunbambo, Rawson, Whiston and Wills

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Midgley, Deputy Leader

Priya Chopra, Saheli

Charlotte Cooke, LGBT Foundation

#### **Apologies:**

Councillors Hitchen and Wilson

#### **CESC/22/19 Chair**

The Committee Support Officer informed Members that the Chair had sent her apologies for the meeting and asked for nominations for a Member to chair the meeting. A Member nominated Councillor H Priest, which was seconded by another Member and agreed by the Committee.

#### **Decision**

To appoint Councillor H Priest as Chair for the meeting.

#### **CESC/22/20 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2022 as a correct record.

#### **CESC/22/21 Domestic Abuse**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided a summary of recent and current work to address Domestic Violence and Abuse, including the implementation of the Domestic Violence and Abuse Strategy and the Domestic Abuse Act 2021.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Background information;
- The Domestic Abuse Act 2021- Safe Accommodation Duty and New Burdens Funding;
- Domestic abuse and the wider Violence Against Women and Girls agenda (VAWG);
- Conduct of Domestic Homicide Reviews; and
- Future funding and sustainability.

Charlotte Cooke from the LGBT Foundation informed the Committee about her organisation's work with the LGBT community, both specific services for survivors of domestic abuse and other services and support that they provided. She outlined how her organisation supported victims of domestic abuse in a holistic way, looking at all their different needs, using the Foundation's own services and referring them to other services, where appropriate. She informed Members how the New Burdens funding was being used by her organisation to provide casework support to low to medium risk survivors of domestic abuse, including supporting them into a range of housing options and providing group-based peer support. She outlined the increasing complexity of many of the referrals, such as mental health issues, substance misuse and issues with basic needs such as housing, employment and financial support. She informed the Committee how they worked with partner organisations, such as housing associations, and worked across different local authority areas, as an organisation based on a community of identity, rather than a geographical community.

Priya Chopra from Saheli informed the Committee about the work of her organisation, which had previously predominantly supported south Asian women affected by domestic abuse but was increasingly working with a more diverse group of black, Asian and minoritised women. She informed the Committee that this included refuge provision and about Saheli's recent acquisition of dispersed accommodation for survivors of domestic abuse, which had increased their capacity to support women fleeing from domestic abuse. She outlined how Saheli worked with women who did not speak English and who were far removed from the job market, including building their self-esteem. She highlighted a range of work that the organisation was doing including group-based work to help women identify signs of abuse and work with Afghani women, women with No Recourse to Public Funds (NRPF) and older women. She welcomed that the New Burdens funding had enabled Saheli to provide greater support to children affected by domestic abuse and to support women with more complex needs, including mental health issues.

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

- To request a breakdown of statistics by protected characteristics;
- Concern about whether the main domestic abuse service providers were able to meet the needs of minority groups;
- What was the pathway for male victims of domestic abuse;
- What was being done to reverse the trend of the perpetrator of domestic abuse remaining in the home, while the victim had to flee;
- What work was being done with schools; and
- To request that all acronyms in future reports be explained.

The Community Safety Lead informed Members that quarterly performance information was produced which provided a more detailed breakdown of the statistics and that this could be shared with Committee Members. She acknowledged the challenges of and importance of ensuring that services were accessible to and appropriate for the diverse communities within Manchester. In response to a Member's question about self-identification and the acceptance of trans women in single sex services, Charlotte Cooke confirmed that access to the LGBT Foundation's services was based on self-identification. She reported that finding

accessible refuge spaces for trans, non-binary and gender variant survivors of domestic abuse was a challenge and that work was taking place to issue guidance on this. In response to a Member's question, she reported that, while her organisation provided a range of services, including talking therapies, some individuals with more complex needs required support from elsewhere; however, she advised that mainstream organisations tended to immediately refer any LGBT individual seeking support to the LGBT Foundation without fully considering what services they provided, while there were also concerns about the cultural competency of mainstream therapeutic services and fears from LGBT individuals accessing mainstream services about having to come out, and about whether the people they were being supported by would be able to understand their experiences.

The Community Safety Policy and Performance Manager reported that the needs assessment carried out last year had identified the need to improve support for male victims of domestic abuse and that the pathway to accessing support was not obvious for male victims who were not from LGBT communities. He advised that work was taking place at a Greater Manchester level to address this, which Manchester had contributed to, and that Manchester was also looking at what it could do to improve this, rather than just waiting for the outcome of the Greater Manchester work.

The New Burdens Project Manager highlighted that 35 domestic abuse survivors had used the Sanctuary Scheme to safely remain in their own home and advised that there should be a push to increase the use of this scheme so that more survivors and their children remained in the family home, as well as perpetrators being dealt with appropriately. The Community Safety Policy and Performance Manager highlighted the role of Domestic Violence Protection Notices in enabling victims to stay in their own homes and advised that, while these had been under-used previously, Greater Manchester Police (GMP) were committed to improving this. In response to a Member's question about the percentage of domestic abuse survivors who, despite accessing the Sanctuary Scheme, ended up having to leave their home, the Community Safety Lead advised that she would look into this and respond to the Member.

In response to a Member's question, the New Burdens Project Manager informed Members that voluntary organisations had been attached to the hotels where refugees were being accommodated and that a small grant had been given to Safety4Sisters to work with people with NRPF but that the government had not clarified the position on providing funding to support victims of domestic abuse with NRPF.

The New Burdens Project Manager outlined a programme that Manchester Women's Aid had been running in schools called "Ten Dialogues" which looked at what a healthy relationship looked like and how to treat people with respect. She reported that the initial funding for this had ended but Manchester Women's Aid were trying to secure further funding to continue this. The Community Safety Policy and Performance Manager advised that there might be funding to do some further work with young people linked to the VAWG agenda. In response to a question from the Chair about the Respect Young People's Programme, he advised that this programme focused on children and young people who were abusive to their parents

and that the programme also addressed the impact of the abuse on siblings. In response to a question from the Chair about Looked After Children and peer on peer abuse in children's homes, the New Burdens Project Manager advised that her team would look into this.

## **Decisions**

1. To request that the most recent quarterly report which provides a further breakdown of the statistics be circulated to the Committee Members.
2. To ask for the percentage of domestic abuse survivors who, despite accessing the Sanctuary Scheme, end up having to leave their home.
3. To note the key issues which have arisen from the discussion, including proportionality and intersectionality and the relationship between mainstream and specialist support services, in particular, people from minority communities being referred to specialist organisations for their community, regardless of whether that was the most appropriate organisation for the type of support they required, and to note that the Committee may want to consider these issues further at a future meeting.

## **CESC/22/22 Homelessness Update**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which set out the position of Manchester City Council's Homelessness Service in terms of how it supported local residents and how the emerging transformation programme was seeking to increase the prevention of homelessness, continue the successful reduction in rough sleeping, reduce the use of temporary accommodation and support residents, with a wide-ranging variety of needs, including that of securing a place to call home. In addition, set out in the report, was a deep dive into the activity to increase prevention, the support provided to people when placed in temporary accommodation and the arrangements to ensure the quality of the temporary accommodation provided.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- National, regional and local context;
- Rough sleeping;
- Prevention;
- Accommodation, including its quality;
- Support for people in temporary accommodation; and
- Homelessness Strategy and Partnership.

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

- Concern that the average amount of time people were spending in bed-and-breakfast or temporary accommodation was too high and the impact of this on the individuals in this position;
- The importance of focusing on the services that the Council provided and the areas that were within its control, such as the Housing Solutions Team



working with the Private Rented Sector (PRS) Team to prevent people having to go into temporary accommodation or to reduce the time people spent in temporary accommodation;

- Questioning whether the rough sleepers headcount was accurate;
- To request a breakdown of table 2.3 in the report by protected characteristics;
- The factors leading to homelessness, including changes in legislation;
- That vacated social housing properties should have a quicker turnaround time for them to be ready for and matched with a new tenant;
- Noting that the PRS team had helped to secure 813 new private rented tenancies, to ask about the people they had not been able to help because Council systems were not quick enough to respond to the pace of the private rented sector;
- Concern about people living in overcrowded accommodation who were not classed as homeless;
- To welcome the focus on preventing homelessness and to ask for more information on the progress of this work to be included in the next report;
- To note that temporary accommodation was concentrated in some areas of the city and to ask for more information on this and what was being done to address it in the next report; and
- To ask that the next report include what support was provided to help people to settle into their new accommodation.

The Director of Housing Operations highlighted the significant increase in people presenting as homeless and recognised Members' comments about some of the factors affecting this. He outlined how the Transformation Programme was looking at how the service could be more creative to find alternatives to placing people in bed-and-breakfast accommodation. He agreed that the average length of time individuals were spending in bed-and-breakfast accommodation was too long and reported that, in particular, there was an issue with identifying suitable supported accommodation for individuals who required this. In response to a Member's question about eliminating the use of bed-and-breakfast accommodation for families with children, he advised that this work was challenging but that there was a commitment to expediting the work to address this. The Strategic Lead for Homelessness offered to share the plan for addressing the use of bed-and-breakfast accommodation with the Committee and outlined how this was being progressed and monitored. In response to a Member's question about what current address was used for people living in bed-and-breakfast accommodation who were applying for a private rented tenancy, she advised that she would check on this.

The Director of Housing Operations recognised the comments about the importance of turning around void social housing properties more quickly and advised that it was now taking an average of 60 days to turn around void properties in Housing Operations. In response to a Member's comments about homelessness and the shortage of affordable housing, he highlighted the report on the Manchester Housing Strategy, which was due to be considered at the next meeting of the Economy Scrutiny Committee, and advised that the Council recognised the inter-relationship between homelessness, inequalities and inclusive growth. In response to Members' comments, he advised that the next report on homelessness would include more information across equalities strands. A Member requested that this include information on LGBT young people and what work was being done with

organisations such as the Albert Kennedy Trust, the LGBT Foundation and the Proud Trust.

In response to a Member's question, the Director of Housing Operations advised that the success of Apex House related to its provision of intensive support to people on one site.

The Strategic Lead for Homelessness confirmed that officers could provide a breakdown of the figures in table 2.3 by protected characteristics. She reported that the headcount of rough sleepers was a snapshot of one night using best practice and she invited the Member who had raised this to join her staff when they were doing the headcount to see how this was carried out. In response to a further question about the purpose of the headcount, she advised that this was to provide a figure which could be compared across the country but that her team also had other data on rough sleeping in Manchester which she could provide. She advised that information on how the systems used by the Housing Solutions and PRS Teams were working to keep pace with the private rented sector would be provided in a future report. In response to a Member's question about property checks, she advised that, following the service redesign, there was now a team dedicated to property checks and repairs who were going out and undertaking inspections of properties and that more information on the work that was taking place to ensure that properties were of the required standard would be included in the next report on Homelessness provided to the Committee. In response to a question about how people could access support, she advised that a lot of people preferred to contact her service by telephone but that face-to-face appointments could be arranged and that telephone callers had the option to leave their details and be called back, rather than wait in a queue. The Director of Housing Operations advised that information on the accessibility of their services would be included in the next report.

The Chair advised that the Economy Scrutiny Committee had received a report on the Housing Allocations Policy Review at its meeting in March 2022, which provided some of the information that Members had asked for and she asked the Committee Support Officer to circulate this to the Committee. In response to a Member's suggestion that the Committee receive a separate report on the Transformation Programme, the Chair suggested that information on this could be included in the next report, including what milestones and targets had been met.

## **Decisions**

1. To ask that the items requested by Members during the discussion be included in the next report, including the Transformation Programme, work to reduce the use of bed-and-breakfast accommodation, void properties, how the Housing Solutions and PRS teams are working together and how their systems are keeping pace with the private rented sector, the imbalance in the geographic spread of temporary accommodation provision, support to help people settle into their new accommodation and information on equalities and how different communities are being served by this work.
2. To request a breakdown of the information in table 2.3 by protected characteristics.

3. To request information on what address people with no fixed abode can use when seeking accommodation through the PRS team.
4. To ask the Committee Support Officer to circulate the report on the Housing Allocations Policy Review which was submitted to the Economy Scrutiny Committee's March 2022 meeting to Committee Members.

[Councillor Whiston declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest as a service user of the Private Rented Sector Team.]

### **CESC/22/23 Overview Report**

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

The Chair proposed that any issues Members wanted to raise in relation to the work programme be discussed on Councillor Hitchen's return.

### **Decision**

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



## **Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2022**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Reid – in the Chair

Councillors Abdullatif, Alijah, Amin, Bano, Cooley, Gartside, Good, Hewitson, Lovecy, Sadler and Sharif Mahamed

#### **Co-opted Non-Voting Members:**

Miss S Iltaf, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People

Councillor Hussain, Lead Member for Race

#### **Apologies:**

Councillor Judge

Mr G Cleworth, Parent Governor Representative

Ms L Smith, Primary Sector Teacher Representative

#### **CYP/22/27**

#### **Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 25 May 2022.

#### **CYP/22/28 Youth and Play Update**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided an update on Manchester's Youth and Play offer and gave an overview of the activities that had been available across the city throughout the school holiday periods. This encompassed the offer from wider partners and stakeholders, including the Holiday Activities and Food programme (HAF) funded by the Department for Education (DfE) and targeted at children and young people who were eligible for Free School Meals.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Youth and Play commissioning;
- Youth Hubs;
- Youth participation and democracy;
- Staffing;
- Extra investment; and
- Holiday activity provision.

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

- To welcome the additional funding that the Council was investing in youth provision and the positive framework for moving forwards, noting the challenges facing young people in the city, including deprivation and gangs exploiting young people;
- Concern about young people getting drawn into anti-social behaviour or criminal activity and the importance of youth provision;
- That it would be useful to have more data, including the different proportions of children and young people in different wards and levels of deprivation, which would indicate where more focus was needed;
- That the new model should give opportunities to smaller, grassroots organisations who were doing positive work in wards, as it was felt that previously larger organisations who knew how to write grant applications well had been disproportionately awarded funding;
- The importance of both broadening the number of children and young people with access to support and activities and also providing targeted outreach work to engage with young people in difficulty;
- Territorial issues which deterred young people from accessing youth provision;
- Issues with the commissioning process, including short-term funding and organisations having to come up with new ideas to get funding when what they were already doing was good and should be sustained; and
- The value of providing activities with food to help families who were struggling financially, particularly during the school holidays.

The Lead Member for Race emphasised the importance of fairness and equality in relation to the provision of youth and play services. He asked what factors were taken into account in distributing resources, highlighting the number of children and young people from black, Asian and ethnic minority (BAME) communities in the city and that many deprived families with parents in work were not eligible for the HAF programme.

The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) reported that, after bringing the activity previously undertaken by Young Manchester back in-house, the Council had decided to continue the existing commissioning arrangements for 12 months while a detailed needs analysis was carried out. He advised that this work would provide the data that the Member had asked for, as at present the most recent data available was from 2018 and did not provide all the detail that both the Member and his service wanted. He advised that it was anticipated that the needs analysis would be completed by the end of the summer and that he intended to bring this information to the Committee. He acknowledged Members' comments about the challenges facing young people in the city, while highlighting the additional funding being invested in youth provision and the positive partnership work with Greater Manchester Police (GMP) and the Community Safety Partnership. He recognised the comments made by the Lead Member for Race and that there were areas which needed to be strengthened, including the need for more BAME-led organisations to be commissioned to provide youth services, and stated that this was a high priority for the service. He advised that, while the existing commissioning arrangements had remained in place this year, there was funding available for some pilot projects and that next year there would be significant opportunity for improvement. A Member commented that BAME-led organisations and organisations which worked with a diverse community were often asked to contribute to consultations and conversations

which took up a lot of their time but resulted in very little so it was important that this engagement was carried through into actions.

In response to a Member's question about localisation, the Head of Youth, Play and Participation emphasised the importance of place-based and ward-based work and stated that he would welcome the opportunity to do a walk round wards with Ward Councillors to gain a greater understanding of their wards and their needs. He also encouraged Ward Councillors to let him and his team know about groups in their ward who were doing great work but had missed out on getting funding so that they could support these small, grassroots organisations and help them to get to a position where they could successfully secure funding. In response to Members' comments, the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) advised that it was important to get the right balance between universal youth services and targeted provision and between centre-based provision and detached work and that, with the funding that had been secured, and through locality-level discussions, his service could identify where targeted intervention was needed, including work with GMP and the Community Safety Partnership to address anti-social behaviour.

In response to a Member's comments about the importance of young people influencing decision-making, the Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People advised that local young people would have a say in how money was spent in their area. He acknowledged Members' comments about issues with the commissioning process and outlined how the Council was addressing this, now that it had been brought back in-house. The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) advised that the revised commissioning approach would be brought to a future meeting.

In response to a Member's comments about the importance of having a stronger network across schools and a lead contact person in schools so that information was effectively communicated, the Head of Youth, Play and Participation informed the Committee that work was taking place to ensure there was a strong youth voice programme across schools and that an update on this would be included in a future report. The Chair suggested that a school representative could be included on the area panels.

The Chair emphasised the importance of play for younger children and of play equipment in parks. The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People highlighted events taking place for National Play Day on 3 August. The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) supported the Chair's comments on play equipment in parks, advising that this would not just be the responsibility of the Youth and Play Fund and that consideration needed to be given to how the Council allocated its funding and opportunities for funding from other sources, such as Sport England. In response to a question from the Chair, he advised that there had been a higher number of providers applying for HAF funding this year compared to last year and that there was not expected to be an underspend this year.

## **Decision**

To receive a further report later in the year.

[Councillor Alijah declared a personal interest as the Chair of the Hideaway youth project.]

[Councillor Abdullatif declared a personal interest in relation to her work on youth empowerment for the national organisation, the Anne Frank Trust.]

### **CYP/22/29 Ofsted Inspection of Children's Services**

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Strategic Director (Children's Services) which reflected on the recent Ofsted Inspection of Local Authorities Children's Services (ILACS) of Manchester's Children's Services. The report advised of the overall judgement and provided an action plan in response to the findings from Ofsted on what needed to improve.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- The Ofsted inspection and the judgement of the inspectors;
- Background information; and
- The Council's action plan in response to the findings of the inspection.

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

- The effects of domestic abuse on children, including the importance of raising awareness of this impact and ensuring that children were supported;
- Regarding the point on the action plan about the diverse needs to children, that different protected characteristics needed to be considered separately; and
- The importance of training, including in ensuring that staff were kept up to date with the latest Ofsted standards.

The Deputy Strategic Director (Children's Services) assured Members that Children's Services was actively involved in work on the Domestic Abuse Strategy and advised that consideration was being given to how partners could better work together to support children with the trauma they experienced due to domestic abuse in the family. He acknowledged the Member's comments about different protected characteristics and advised that, while it was difficult to convey the breadth of this in an action plan, the individual needs and identity issues of each individual child were prioritised. In response to a Member's comments about working with parents, he advised that the Council had an excellent co-production model and highlighted that Lyndene had been developed through co-production with parents and in consultation with children. He reported that almost 60% of the Council's social work staff had qualified within the last two years and outlined some of the plans to further develop the training for social workers as well as drawing Members' attention to the service's Workforce Development Strategy, which had been positively commented on by the Ofsted inspectors and by staff who had received training.

In response to a question from the Chair about Education Health and Care Plans (EHCPs), the Director of Education explained that item 4 on the action plan was an action from the local area Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) inspection in November 2021 which officers had decided to include in this action plan



because it related to social workers' role in EHCPs and training needed to improve this. In response to a Member's comments about the difficulties experienced by some parents whose children needed EHCPs but who did not understand the process or who had English as an Additional Language, the Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People suggested that this could be looked at in more detail at a future date.

The Chair congratulated everyone involved in this work, recognised that there was more work to be done and suggested that the Ofsted Subgroup could look at this in future.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

[Councillor Abdullatif declared a personal interest as a former employee of Women's Aid Federation England.]

## **CYP/22/30 Manchester Inclusion Strategy Update**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education which provided an update on the implementation of Manchester's Inclusion Strategy (2019-2022) and an overview of the key priorities and next steps for July 2022-July 2025.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Manchester Inclusion Strategy activity since 2019;
- Impact of the Inclusion Strategy; and
- The Manchester Inclusion Strategy beyond July 2022.

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

- To welcome the progress made with this work and that exclusion was now the last resort;
- What were the opportunities for children who had been excluded to get back into mainstream education;
- The adultification of black children and a request for a breakdown of exclusions by ethnicity;
- Increasing numbers of families choosing Elective Home Education and statutory changes in relation to this; and
- Resource provision in mainstream schools for children with emotional and behavioural needs and the need for a trauma-informed approach.

In response to a question about support for homeless families, the Director of Education advised that children from these families were not a specific category within school data and that families did not always inform school of their circumstances; however, she advised that work was taking place to address the impact of poverty and to poverty-proof the school day and she reported that she would give further consideration to how this particular group could be supported. The

Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People informed Members that his Deputy Executive Member was undertaking work in relation to poverty, schools and inclusion and that he would discuss this further with her. The Chair highlighted the issue of homeless families being placed in accommodation in a different area, with the children being a long distance from school and separated from their friends.

The Director of Education advised that there was resource provision for children with social, emotional and behavioural needs in three mainstream primary schools in the city. She highlighted work to change the way children in secondary schools accessed Alternative Provision, including attending Alternative Provision part time, while still attending their own mainstream school. She outlined how the range of options available for schools could be used as an early intervention to prevent children from being excluded and keep them in their mainstream school.

The Virtual School Head reported that the Virtual School had been promoting a trauma-informed approach with schools and would be working with them on relationship-based behaviour policies. She informed Members about the work to re-purpose the Pupil Referral Unit to ensure that, where a young person had to be excluded from school, this was done well and led to a positive trajectory for the young person.

In response to a Member's comments about difficulties in getting places at nearby schools, particularly for refugee families arriving in-year, the Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People suggested that this be focused on in a future report on School Admissions, to which the Chair agreed. In response to a Member's question, the Director of Education advised that she would circulate the details of the point of contact within her service for refugee families.

The Director of Education advised that her service did have data on exclusions by ethnicity and that this could be included in a future report on Attendance and Exclusions. In response to the comments about Elective Home Education, she informed Members of a requirement within the Schools White Paper for families to notify the Local Authority of their intention to home educate their child. The Chair expressed her concerns about Elective Home Education and requested a report on this to a future meeting.

## **Decisions**

1. To receive a report on School Places and Admissions, including a focus on in-year admissions and refugee families.
2. To receive a report on Elective Home Education.
3. To receive a report on Attendance and Exclusions, including a breakdown of exclusion data by ethnicity.

## **CYP/22/31 COVID-19 Update**

The Committee received a verbal update from the Education Business Partner 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:

- The latest figures on COVID-19 cases in schools;
- Positive feedback from school leaders on the new model, which provided support in relation to all infectious diseases;
- How the Council was continuing to support schools; and
- Supporting schools in relation to staff and pupils affected by Long Covid.

Members discussed that some schools had not returned to the ways of working they had had before the pandemic, for example, in some schools different year groups were still starting and finishing school at different times, which could be difficult for parents. The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People reported that some schools had found that some of the practices they had adopted due to the pandemic worked well for them and they had decided to retain them; however, he asked Members to contact him if there were any practices in individual schools that a large number of parents in the community were unhappy about. The Chair expressed concern that some schools might not be meeting the requirements for the number of school hours. The Education Business Partner highlighted that COVID-19 cases were rising and that some schools could be keeping these measures in place to protect staff and pupils but agreed that conversations could be had with individual schools where needed and that a balance needed to be found.

In response to a Member's questions about doctors' appointments and vaccinations, the Education Business Partner advised that she would communicate these to the Health Team and ask them to respond to the Member.

The Chair advised that this was the last time that the Committee would have a regular monthly update on COVID-19 but that the Committee would look at aspects of this in future, for example the impact of the pandemic on children and young people's mental health.

## **Decision**

To note the verbal report.

## **CYP/22/32 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, noting the reports requested under the previous agenda items.

## **Health and Wellbeing Board**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2022**

#### **Present:**

Councillor T Robinson, Executive Member for Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care (MCC)  
Rupert Nichols, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust  
David Regan, Director of Public Health  
Neil Walbran, Healthwatch  
Dr Murugesan Raja Manchester GP Forum  
Dr Doug Jeffrey, Manchester GP Forum

#### **Apologies:**

Vicky Szulist, Chair, Healthwatch (substitute attended)  
Councillor Bev Craig, Leader of the Council  
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools Services (MCC)  
Katy Calvin-Thomas - Manchester Local Care Organisation  
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Paul Marshall, Strategic Director of Children's Services  
Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services  
Dr Geeta Wadhwa Manchester GP Forum

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

Tim Griffiths, Director of Corporate Affairs (MCC)  
Paul Teale, Head of Supported Accommodation (MCC)  
Ed Dyson, MHCC  
James Binks, Assistant Chief Executive (MCC)  
Jamie Higgins, Senior Medicines Optimisation Adviser (NHS)  
Lauren Haworth, NHS  
Dr Cordelle Ofori, Assistant Director of Public Health (MCC)  
Jenny Osborne, Manchester Vaccination Programme (MCC)  
Barry Gillespie, Assistant Director of Public Health (MCC)

### **HWB/22/13 Appointment of Chair**

The Committee Support Officer informed members that the Chair had sent apologies for the meeting and asked for nominations for a Chair for the meeting. David Regan nominated Councillor T Robinson, which was seconded by Dr Jeffrey and agreed by the Board.

#### **Decision**

Councillor T Robinson was appointed Chair for the meeting.

### **HWB/22/14 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 23 March 2022 as a correct record.

### **HWB/22/15 Integrated Care Systems**

The Board considered the report of the Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care that described that Integrated Care Systems are being established nationally as part of the next phase of health and social care integration. This included the establishment of Greater Manchester Integrated Care (NHS GM) and locality arrangements for Manchester. The Manchester Partnership Board would lead the development of Manchester's future operating model for health and social care integration. The Board further noted that Joanne Roney OBE had been appointed by NHS GM as the Place-Based Lead for Manchester in addition to being Chief Executive of Manchester City Council.

The Director of Public Health stated that a report on the role of the Health and Wellbeing Board in the context of the new arrangements would be submitted to the next meeting of the Board.

#### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **HWB/22/16 Manchester Vaccination Programme Update and Autumn/Winter Planning 2022/3**

The Board considered the report and accompanying presentation of the Director of Public Health provided an update on performance of the Manchester Covid-19 Vaccination Programme and planning to date for Autumn/Winter Vaccination 2022/3.

The Board discussed the importance of maintaining public confidence in the booster programme, further noting the additional challenges that the winter flu could present.

The Director of Public Health stated that the Communications message in relation to the vaccination programme would continue.

#### **Decision**

To note the report and presentation.

### **HWB/22/17 Manchester Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment**

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health that described that the provision of pharmaceutical services fell under the National Health Service (Pharmaceutical and Local Pharmaceutical services) Regulations 2013. The regulations covered the production of this Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment (PNA). The responsibility for producing the PNA is that of the local Health and Wellbeing Board (HWB).

The PNA steering group had been leading the development of the next PNA for 2023-2026 on behalf of the HWB Board. This report included the Executive Summary of the draft PNA.

The regulations stated that the HWB must undertake a consultation on the content of the PNA and it must run for a minimum of 60 days. It was therefore proposed that that the consultation period for the Manchester PNA ran from Monday 5 September until Friday 4 November 2022.

In response to a question from the Chair, officers stated that the governance arrangements for the PNA steering group were established in accordance with the Pharmaceutical Regulations 2013.

### **Decision**

The Board agree to the Manchester Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment consultation starting on 5 September 2022 and receive the final version of the Pharmaceutical Needs Assessment in January 2023.

### **HWB/22/18 Building Back Fairer - Tackling Health Inequalities in Manchester**

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health the described the 'Building Back Fairer – Tackling Health Inequalities in Manchester 2022-27' articulated the actions that the city would take to reduce inequalities, with a focus on the social determinants of health. It had been produced by Manchester's Marmot Health Inequalities Task Group along with insights from trusted organisations that represent or work with people with lived experience of health inequalities who tended to be marginalised or seldom heard. Engagement of the workforce and services across the social determinants of health, and ongoing community and resident involvement would be critical to developing the detail and successful delivery of the plan.

The Chair, on behalf of the Board paid tribute to the officers involved in this important area of work, noting the breadth of work described to address inequalities. The Chair further commented that the values of the report were embedded in the Integrated Care System that had been discussed earlier on the agenda.

The Board discussed the need to meaningfully monitor progress of the work described, noting the challenges presented by funding to deliver the ambitions described.

The Assistant Director of Public Health recognised the comments made regarding the challenges of funding by advising that different services were working collaboratively to pool resources and budgets and maximise all opportunities to bid for sources of funding.

The Director of Public Health stated that the finalised plan would be launched at Council and the ambition was to maintain momentum across all parties to deliver this important area of work, adding that all partners had engaged and responded

positively with this work to tackle health inequalities. The Chair commented that the Health Scrutiny Committee would also be considering this item at their October meeting.

### **Decision**

The Board endorse Manchester's Tackling Health Inequalities Action Plan.

### **HWB/22/19 The Khan Review and Tobacco Control in Manchester**

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health that provided a summary of the work of the Manchester Population Health Tobacco Control Programme, including current and proposed projects, noting that the report had been written specifically in response to the publication of the Khan Review: Making Smoking Obsolete, published on the 9 June 2022.

The Board discussed the need to consider tobacco, including the chewing of tobacco and the smoking of shisha through the lens of inequalities. The Board further discussed the prevalence of vaping and e-cigarettes amongst children and young people.

Officers responded by advising that there was no evidence to suggest that vaping was a gateway to smoking tobacco, however recognised that this was an emerging issue amongst children and young people. Officers stated that one of the recommendations of the Khan Review was to regulate vaping and e-cigarette devices to protect young people, adding that such devices should only be used as a risk reduction tool to assist people stopping smoking. The Director of Public Health added that the Community Outreach Workers worked with any smoker aged 12 and over.

The Chair and the Director of Public Health paid tribute to the team for their work, especially in the context of the pandemic.

### **Decision**

The Board;

1. Support the ongoing activity of the Population Health Tobacco Control Programme.
2. Note the roll out of the CURE programme.
3. Support the extension of tobacco/smoking cessation provision for all MCC staff in line with latest National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)
4. Support a pilot project around Smoke Free Public Spaces in Manchester.



## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 30 June 2022**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

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

**Apologies:** Baker-Smith, Davies, Hitchen, Leech and Lovecy

**Also present:** Councillors Razaq and Wheeler

#### **PH/22/31      Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 132626/FO/2022 and 133465/FO/2022 & 133466/LO/2022.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/22/32      Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 31 May 2022 as a correct record.

#### **PH/22/33      Application for 133465/FO/2022 & 133466/LO/2022 – British Muslim Heritage Centre, College Road, Manchester, M16 8BP - Whalley Range Ward**

The British Muslim Heritage Centre (BMHC) is a grade II\* listed building, set in extensive landscaped grounds between College Road and Clarendon Road in the Whalley Range Conservation Area. Boundary treatment includes a stone wall and railings to College Road, and the gate posts and entrance are grade II listed. This entrance is, however, rarely used and the main vehicle access is currently taken from the north-east corner of the site on College Road. To the Clarendon Road boundary the wall is red brick with stone coping and patterns of slightly recessed panels, there is also an access to Clarendon Road. The building sits fairly centrally within the site with more formal gardens to the north and hard standing and grassed areas to the south. There is significant, mature tree cover around the site. The area surrounding the site is predominantly residential, mainly a mix of terraced and semi-detached housing but with some larger detached properties in spacious grounds.

In 2013 the British Muslim Heritage Centre obtained planning and listed building consent for the erection of a temporary marquee for use in association with the centre. This was renewed in 2016 and 2019 subject to conditions, which have been discharged. This report relates to the planning application to retain the existing

temporary marquee for a further 3 years and for associated listed building consent.

There had been 17 objections from 15 separate addresses received from members of the public. The late representations pack gave notice of 74 letters submitted in support of the application which requested that planning permission be extended.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee of the 74 letters of support and recommended additional controls to the management strategy relating to idling, revving of engines and training for security staff.

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

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

A Local Ward Councillor addressed the Committee in support of the application, stating that he has been a Ward Councillor for 11 years and is aware that the marquee has been made available for free use for many voluntary groups and that this is of vital use for the area. The Councillor stated that they had a family wedding in the marquee and noted that the BMHC had laid out lots of ground rules 1 week ahead regarding noise and music being kept at acceptable levels and mentioned that there was a manager present at all times. The Councillor concluded by stating that the site maintained a good service and there were further steps in place for any future issues too.

The Planning Officer gave mention of an ongoing dialogue with the BMHC to ensure that all aspects of the approved management strategies are adhered to.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments/ask questions.

A member stated that they had grown up in this area when it was in a much more run down state but praised the BMHC as putting Whalley Range on the international map. The site had been a great addition to the area and facilitated many charity events and the like. With regard to any complaints about the centre, the member stated that they required solid evidence and for complainants to contact the City Council directly.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation of Approve for the application with the replaced Condition 4 from the late representations agenda. Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to agree the recommendation of Approve with the replaced Condition 4 from the late representations agenda.

(Councillor Flanagan declared a non-pecuniary interest and took no part in the discussion or decision-making process on this item).

**PH/22/34      Application for 131859/FO/2021 & 131860/LO/2021 – 50 Fountain Street, Manchester, M2 2AS - Deansgate Ward**

The Committee deferred consideration of this proposal on 31 May 2022 to allow them to visit the site.

This proposal was for the demolition of a modern extension to the Grade II Listed building, the retention and refurbishment of the Victorian façade and the erection of a commercial building (Use Class E).

The façade of 49 Spring Gardens is Grade 2 listed and the remaining building was constructed in the 1970s and adjoins the Grade II\* listed Estate Exchange. The site is in the Upper King Street Conservation Area and there are 16 Grade II and II\* Listed Buildings within the 500m including 49 Spring Gardens, the Grade II\* Exchange House and the Grade II\* Former Midland Bank.

No objectors to the application attended the meeting. The applicant addressed the Committee and the Chair invited the Committee for comments/questions.

A member stated that this was a mix of modern and heritage styles in one building and questioned whether the more modern aspects of the scheme could be reduced. The member noted the loss of 2 trees and asked if they could be replanted/replaced.

The Planning Officer stated that all design related issues were contained within the report and noted the mix of heritage and modern styles prevalent in the area, adding that it was almost impossible to mimic the heritage designs. The Planning Officer stated that it was possible to add a condition to replace/replant 2 trees if the Committee wished.

Councillor Flanagan moved the recommendation to Approve planning permission and listed building consent for the application subject to the additional condition. Councillor S Ali seconded the proposal.

**Decision**

The Committee resolved to agree the recommendation to Approve planning permission and listed building consent for the application.

**PH/22/35      Application for 132489/FO/2021 - Port Street, Manchester, M1 2EQ - Piccadilly Ward**

The Planning and Highways Committee were 'minded to refuse' this proposal on 31 May 2022 on the basis of its size and scale and its impact on the conservation area.

This proposal was for 485 homes with two commercial units in a part-34, part-11, part 9 part 7 storey building with hard and soft landscaping. 211 letters of objection were received and 34 letters of support. Many did not object to the principle of the site being developed, supporting the creation of more housing with appropriate facilities and are keen to see it brought back to life but object to the form of development. The objections relate to design and scale, heritage and townscape,

affordable housing/ need and viability, privacy and living conditions of adjacent residents, provision of public realm, traffic, highways and parking, climate change / embodied carbon, compliance with Planning Policy, precedent and the consultation process.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there had been a late objection from a Ward Councillor which raised similar points to those in the report. The Planning Officer confirmed that the Piccadilly Basin SRF envisaged 2 buildings on the site at 33 and 20 storeys with the taller building on Great Ancoats Street, closest to the conservation area. The tallest building in this scheme would be 34 storeys and the next tallest building at 11 storeys. The 34-storey building was set back away from the conservation area with the closest building to this area being 9 storeys. Whilst officers have set out a reason for refusal, the Planning Officer felt that this could not be substantiated as the tallest building has been set back the furthest from the Ancoats conservation area with no concerns raised by Historic England.

An objector addressed the Committee. The objector requested that the Committee stand firm in their rejection, stating that the scheme had not changed since the previous hearing in May 2022. He stated that the development would impact on local communities. The tallest building would be 20 storeys higher than any local comparable towers and was excessive in height and scale and should be reduced, the effects of light, loss of privacy and shadowing would greatly affect nearby dwellings and a local primary school, it would cause issues within the public realm with associated parking and highways issues plus increased pollution, consultation showed that 81% of those contacted were opposed to the development and that the developer will have noted concerns around the height of the tallest building but then increased it by one storey.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee.

A Ward Councillor opposed the scheme, stating that he could not see why there was no on-site affordable housing, adding that the developer does not want Manchester residents living there, that putting a local primary school in shadows is immoral, with regard to the national benchmark and viability this is an assessment of risk and that there was no associated risk with regards to building in the city centre. He noted that the scheme had not changed since the Committee was minded to refuse at their May meeting, and exceeding the SRF by any amount would cause harm and added that the developer stood to make a profit of approximately £30m and added that it is unlikely that they would cease the project if requested to reduce the scheme and/or make a greater S106 contribution.

The Planning Officer stated that all issues were addressed within the report.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions/make comments.

A member stated that they had considered the scheme since the last meeting in May and felt that balancing the extra storey against the creation of 600 jobs in a cost of living crisis was making the scheme appear more acceptable, adding that there was a £1m contribution towards affordable housing and that construction costs are also rising.

The Planning Officer referred to the balance between values and costs, stating that the planning team ran an exercise with a nil value on the land to test if this scheme would be viable. The results showed that the developers profit would be 17% which is below the Government advice target and added that the S106 contribution would decrease profits by a further £1m.

A member commented, stating that the contribution was not of major concern when considered next to the breach of the SRF. The SRF had been agreed between the Executive of the City Council and sets out acceptable and defensible building scales. The member stated that this posed a problem for them in supporting the project as well as Historic England's assessment stating an associated significant impact, that if the scheme was 30 storeys high he would have to accept it but concluded by stating that he would be minded to refuse this application.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the SRF recommendation for the site was 33 storeys. Historic England considered the impact of the harm would be "less than substantial" and added that the scheme's public benefit outweighed any potential harm caused.

The member noted that the height was 1 storey more than had been agreed and referred to Historic England's comments that the scheme would "negatively contribute" with "considerable impact." The member stated that he would accept the proposal if it met with the aims of the SRF. The Planning Officer confirmed that Historic England considered the harm to be less than substantial.

A member noted that tall buildings are always difficult but that the whole context needed to be kept in focus. The member expressed that, at only 1 storey over the SRF and with a contribution of £1m and associated construction jobs during tough economic times, the application was another example of the success of the city centre and the difficulty in negating any impact on nearby residents etc. and noted that she would support a motion of Minded to Approve.

A member asked if there had been any further dialogue with the developer to keep the tower within SRF guidelines. The Planning Officer confirmed that discussions had taken place and that it was not possible to alter the scheme. He noted that the material impact of 1 extra floor had to be assessed when the tower was to be set back from Great Ancoats Street.

The member stated that the scheme had moved towards another conservation area in Stevenson Square and that there could be an impact on this and the Ancoats conservation area. The Planning Officer referred to the report, stating that impacts to all heritage sites had been confirmed as resulting in no substantial harm.

Councillor Richards moved the recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement in relation to an initial off site affordable housing contribution, with a future review of the affordable housing position. Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

This motion was not carried by the Committee and Councillor Flanagan moved that the Committee were Minded to Refuse due to the scheme exceeding

recommendations set out by the Strategic Regeneration Framework and requested that further dialogue take place with the developer in this respect ahead of bringing the application back to Committee.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Refuse decision for the reasons detailed.

### **PH/22/36      Application for 132626/FO/2022 - 48 Store Street, Manchester, M1 2WA - Piccadilly Ward**

The Committee deferred consideration of this proposal on 31 May 2022 to allow them to visit the site.

This proposal was for a 15 storey building comprising 54 apartments (Use Class C3) with associated residential facilities (residents lounge and terrace and office space), 2 car parking spaces and 57 cycle parking spaces, landscaping, access and associated development.

There were 31 objections and 1 letter of support. The objections related to: design and scale, townscape, affordable housing, amenity including sunlight and daylight, privacy and living conditions of adjacent residents, traffic, highways and parking provision, loss of trees and biodiversity and the consultation process.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there had been a late representation from a Ward Councillor and 2 others from local residents, stating luxury accommodation, corporate greed, and the units would likely remain empty." Further comments expressed that this was an "amazing green area of Piccadilly" and that this "hideous tower will disrupt" the area.

No objectors attended the meeting.

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

A Ward Councillor explained that the Committee had already gone through the major points last month, adding that the developer mentions trees as "low value," which the Councillor stated was incorrect as they are of ecological value. The developer had already cut down 30 trees ahead of the application expressed disdain at this. It was agreed that something should be built on the site and noted that the previous application was one third of the massing of this application, adding that the proposal was aesthetically unappealing and would be a disruption to homes in there area, some of which have been there since 1991. This tower would change the housing type of this area and none of these concerns had been addressed. The Ward Councillor stated that the scheme was too large with no decent amenity, could make a profit whilst making a contribution and requested that the Committee vote as Minded to Refuse.

Councillor Lyons addressed the Committee as Local Ward Councillor and thanked the Committee for agreeing to a site visit. Councillor Lyons mentioned the removal of 30 trees, the small site on a slope and potential placing of a 15 storey tower within a

community and zero on-site affordable housing as major detracting factors. The tower was too tall and would dominate the area, the gold cladding was not in keeping with the red brick feel of the area. In conclusion, Councillor Lyons stated that there were 4 reasons for a refusal set out in the report and hoped that the developer could return with something more suitable.

The Planning Officer stated that this was only 2 storeys taller than the previous scheme considered for this site with a similar impact. There are other glass, steel and stone buildings in the area and this was a high quality material of good design. The figures in the report are clear and from an independent source, stating that the scheme cannot support on-site affordable housing. The cost of replacing the trees would have to be taken from the affordable housing contribution due to the viability assessment concluding that the scheme would be less than 20% profit.

A member stated that they accepted the assessment and were happy to see the disable parking issue now dealt with but felt that the loss of trees was significant. The member could agree the recommendation in the report with 2 additional conditions to replace trees at the developers own cost somewhere in the city and to have a discussion around colour of the cladding.

The Planning Officer stated that colour is a subjective issue and that if members require the replanting of trees in the highway, the cost would be around £7k per tree but felt certain there could be a contribution towards this.

Councillor Flanagan moved the officer's recommendation of Mind to Approve with two additional conditions; to replace the 30 trees somewhere in the city, but not in the footway and that the Director of Planning agree the colour in consultation with the Chair. Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to agree the recommendation of Mind to Approve for the reasons outlined within the report with conditions as stated.

(Councillors Lyons addressed the Committee as a Local Ward Councillor and did not take part in the decision-making process).

### **PH/22/37      Application for 131795/FO/2021 - 60A Oldham Street, Manchester, M4 1LE - Piccadilly Ward**

This unit is in the Northern Quarter. The proposal is acceptable in this location subject to there being no unacceptable impacts on residential amenity.

This application was for the creation of a bar/music venue (Sui Generis) together with associated elevational alterations following subdivision of existing commercial unit into two units

7 objections had been received.

The applicant addressed the Committee.

No objectors attended the meeting.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments/ask questions.

A member stated that this application fits the nature of the Northern Quarter well but wanted assurances on sound proofing so as not to set the applicant up to fail.

The Planning Officer confirmed that a post completion verification would be required by a condition.

Councillor Flanagan moved the recommendation to Approve subject to the conditions within the report. Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to agree the recommendation of Approve for the application subject to the conditions within the report.

#### **PH/22/38      Application for 133613/FH/2022 - 10 Ruabon Road, Manchester, M20 5LW - Didsbury East Ward**

This application was for the erection of a two storey front extension, and part single, part two storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation. The property is not listed or in a conservation area and is typical of the type and style of properties within the immediate area.

The main issues from the proposals were the impacts on residential and visual amenity. Most objections concerned the footprint and scale of the front and rear extensions and the protection and retention of trees situated to the rear of the curtilage. 9 neighbouring occupiers were notified of the application proposals. As a result of this process objections had been received from neighbouring occupiers.

The Planning Officer did not add anything by way of comment to the application.

No applicant attended the meeting or addressed the Committee on the application.

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

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments/ask questions.

Councillor S Ali moved the recommendation to Approve subject to the conditions within the report. Councillor Lyons seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to agree the recommendation of Approve for the application subject to the conditions within the report.



(Councillor Flanagan declared a pecuniary interest and took no part in the discussion or decision-making process on this item)

This page is intentionally left blank