



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

Monday, 29 January 2024

Dear Councillor / Honorary Alderman,

Meeting of the Council – Wednesday, 31st January, 2024

A summons was issued on 23 January 2024 for meeting of the Council which will be held at 10.00 am on Wednesday, 31st January, 2024, in The Council Chamber, Level 2, Town Hall Extension.

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

7. Proceedings of the Executive 17 January 2024.	Pages 3 - 12
9. Scrutiny Committees <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Communities & Equalities – 9 January 2024• Children & Young People – 10 January 2024	Pages 13 - 30
10. Proceedings of Committees <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Planning and Highways Committee – 18 January 2024• Health and Wellbeing Board – 24 January 2024.	Pages 31 - 52

Yours faithfully,

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

Joanne Roney OBE
Chief Executive

Councillors:-

Y Dar (Chair), Andrews (Deputy Chair), Abdullatif, Akbar, Azra Ali, Ahmed Ali, Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Amin, Appleby, Bano, Bayunu, Bell, Benham, Brickell, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Chohan, Collins, Connolly, Cooley, Craig, Curley, Davies, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Flanagan, Fletcher, Foley, Gartside, Good, Green, Grimshaw, Hacking, Hassan, Hewitson, Hilal, Hitchen, Holt, Hughes, Hussain, Igbon, Ilyas, Iqbal, Johns, Johnson, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, J Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, Marsh, McCaul, McHale, Midgley, Moran, Muse, Noor, Northwood, Nunney, Ogunbambo, H Priest, Rahman, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reeves, Reid, Riasat, Richards, I Robinson, T Robinson, Rowles, Sadler, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, Simcock, Stogia, Taylor, Wheeler, Wiest, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

Further Information

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

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

This agenda was issued on **Monday, 29 January 2024** 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, 17 January 2024

Present: Councillor Craig (Chair)

Councillors: Akbar, Bridges, Hacking, Igbon, Midgley, Rahman, T Robinson and White

Also present as Members of the Standing Consultative Panel:

Councillors: Ahmed Ali, Butt, Chambers, Douglas, Foley, Johnson and Moran

Apologies: Councillor Rawlins, Leech and Lynch

Also present: Councillor I Robinson (MInutes Exe/24/9 and Exe/24/11 only)

Exe/24/1 Minutes

Decision

The Executive approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 13 December 2023.

Exe/24/2 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 reported on the success of Manchester winning further accolades as an outstanding place to visit, featuring on two prestigious lists of the best places to visit in 2024. The city was named at number 12 in the New York Times’ 52 Places To Go In 2024 list – the only place in England to feature. Major new venues such as Aviva Studios, the home of Factory International, and Co-op Live were cited as reasons to visit as well as smaller established venues such as Band On The Wall and New Century Hall. Manchester also featured in Time Out’s 15 Best Places To Visit in 2024 list for destinations in the UK. The publication described Manchester as “a cultural banquet”, again citing Aviva Studios and Co-op Live among the factors making the city a must-visit.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care reported on the establishment of a new multi-agency team called the Adults Early Support Team (AEST) to work alongside the Contact Centre. The Team would identify appropriate short-term interventions to enable residents to live well, providing low-level technology or equipment, signposting to information, advice, guidance and community assets, or referring to appropriate services and had been established as part of developing the Adults Early Help offer in the city.

The Executive Member for Skills, Employment and Leisure reported on another successful programme of events and attractions over the festive period 2023 as the city reinforced its reputation as a place to enjoy the season. The Christmas Markets celebrated 25 years since they were first introduced in 1998 in style with 225 stalls over nine sites and record visitor numbers. The markets also won numerous accolades including being named as the best in the UK in research by cinch and the best in Europe by Heald's. In addition, a New Year's Eve fireworks display took place for the first time since before the Covid pandemic and attracted 10,000 people to Castlefield Bowl to welcome in 2024.

The Deputy Executive Member for Skills, Employment and Leisure reported that Manchester Libraries had secured funding to create 3D walkthrough tours of all 22 city libraries. The £20,250 grant was awarded by the Library On programme, and funded by Arts Council England, to allow the creation of virtual tours of all the venues for the first time. Viewers would be promised an immersive experience, enabling them to explore our libraries' broad and diverse sections, historical nuances and architecture from the comfort of their own screens. The project was rooted in the need to make Manchester Libraries' 22 sites easier to discover and access, physically and online.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development reported that the Council had shortlisted six multi-disciplinary teams to submit tenders to develop a new Neighbourhood Development Framework for Holt Town. Teams would have until the end of the month to put forward their submissions for an area which had been described as the 'missing piece of the jigsaw' between major investment in the city centre and East Manchester. The Council was seeking to create an ambitious mixed-use city centre neighbourhood. It was anticipated the successful team would be announced in the spring, with work to deliver the proposals commencing immediately once consultation and the necessary planning approvals had been completed.

Decision

The Executive note the updates.

Exe/24/3 Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement 2024/25 and Budget Assumptions

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which set out the main announcements from the provisional local government finance settlement 2023/24 announced 18 December 2023, the impact of this on the Council's budget for 2024/25 to 2026/27 and the next steps in the 2024/25 budget setting process.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources reported that in 2023, local authorities had faced unprecedented financial stress. There had been three s114 notices in six months, taking the total to 7 since 2018, a notable increase from the previous five years, and many more had now publicly indicated that they might need to make the same announcement in the next few months.

Disappointingly there had been no new funding for public services announced in the Autumn Statement or Provisional Finance Settlement. As such, political and financial uncertainty continued into 2024/25 and evidence nationally and locally was that the pressures on social care and homelessness were continuing to grow.

The Provisional Settlement yet again covered a single financial year, Most details were pre-communicated in previous finance and policy statements, however, the exception was the scale of the cut to Services Grant at £329m, (84.1% nationally). For Manchester this was a reduction of £6.1m leaving a grant of just £1.1m. Whilst some redistribution of services grant had been anticipated, it was not expected at this scale.

The impact of the settlement on the Council budget position was a net reduction of c£1.6m next year. This reflected a £0.8m increase to Adult Social Care (ASC) grants which had to be passported to Adult Social Care. Therefore, the budget impact was a £2.4m worsening of the position rising to £5.3m in 2025/26. In addition to the settlement announcements, Manchester was seeing growing pressures in social care and homelessness and it was unlikely that these would be contained within the budget assumptions. Recently there had been an increase in children's placement numbers and costs, further significant pressures across ASC budgets and some worrying trends in asylum seekers/migrant policy/homelessness. This was in line with national trends and core cities and other GM authorities were all reporting similar issues.

Work was underway to confirm the position and identify further measures to close the budget gap. These would include looking for further cost reductions and mitigations as well as some potential one off sources of income which would support the budget position. The increasing pressures would mean that the gap in 2025/26 and beyond would widen with the full year effect of the increased numbers of residents requiring care and support this year (£5m in 2024/25, £36m in 2025/26, increasing to £55m by 2026/27). Whilst extremely challenging it was important that a realistic and deliverable budget was set. The final budget proposals would be developed in January and reported to scrutiny committees for consideration in February.

Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Endorse the report
- (2) Note that officers will identify the £5m of savings needed to close the budget gap

Exe/24/4 Changes to Council Tax Support Scheme from April 2024

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which proposed changes to the Council's Council Tax Support Scheme (CTSS) in order that the scheme remained fit for purpose in response to the cost-of-living challenges and the transition of most working age residents in receipt of welfare benefits onto Universal Credit.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources explained that most of the changes only affected working age claimants in receipt of Council Tax Support. Non-working age claimants (pensioners) were only affected by the proposed changes to increase the maximum length of time the Council could backdate Council Tax Support.

The main change proposed would make the Council's CTSS more generous for working-age households. The current CTSS paid up to 82.5% of the Council Tax bill leaving 17.5% to pay. The proposed change would pay up to 85% of the Council Tax bill leaving 15% to pay. In addition it was proposed to extend the backdating period for working-age claims from six-months to 12 months to allow greater flexibility to support vulnerable residents and reduce avoidable requests for reconsiderations and appeals.

The estimated additional cost to the Council, based on current caseload figures, of moving to a CTSS in 2024/25 with a maximum award of 85% for and adjusting the UC excess income bands upwards by 2.5% to maintain parity, was £699,682. After applying the assumed 4.99% increase in Council Tax across the working-age and pension-age caseload indicated a total additional cost to the Council in 2024/25 of £734,596. In addition, extending the backdating period from six-months to 12 months carried an estimated cost to the Council of £35k in 2024/25.

The proposals had been considered by the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 11 January 2024, where the recommendations were fully endorsed.

Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Note the outcomes of the consultation process and the Equality Impact assessment (EIA) both of which have supported and informed the final recommendations.
- (2) Approve the following changes to the Council Tax Support Scheme from 1 April 2024:
 - (i) Increase the maximum Council Tax Support Award from 82.5% to 85% for working-age households.
 - (ii) Adjust the Universal Credit excess income bands upwards by 2.5% to maintain parity with the 85% maximum award.
 - (ii) Extend the maximum backdating period from six-months to 12months

Exe/24/5 Increasing Council Tax Premiums on Empty Properties

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which proposed changes to the Council Tax premium charged on empty unfurnished and furnished properties.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources explained that from April 2013, the Council had been allowed to charge an additional premium on homes that had been empty and unfurnished for more than two years. Initially the premium was 50%,

but in 2019, after further legislation, the current regime was introduced where the Council charged a 100% premium after two years, a 200% premium after five years and a 300% premium after ten years. Also from April 2013, the Council removed the 50% open ended discount on empty, furnished properties, replacing it with a one month, 100% discount to allow landlords time to do necessary repairs between tenancies. This was removed by the Council in 2019, meaning no discount was available to owners of empty, furnished properties.

In February 2023 the decision was taken to adopt the new powers made available in the Levelling up and Regeneration Act 2023, which would come into force as of April 2024 and would allow the Council to charge the long-term empty premium of up to 100% after one year instead of the current two-year timespan, from 1 April 2024. It also allowed the Council to charge a premium of up to 100% on empty, furnished properties from April 2025, including second homes.

The focus and rationale behind these changes was to encourage owners to bring properties back into use more quickly to address housing shortages that have been well reported.

In February 2023, there were 733 properties that had been empty and unfurnished for between one and two years. It was estimated that applying the premium after one year instead of two would create additional Council Tax liabilities of £1.3 million. By September 2023, the number of empty properties in this category had reduced to 604 properties reducing the estimated increase in Council Tax liabilities to £1.1 million, of which an estimated £0.8m would be retained by the Council. In addition, in February 2023 there were 5,371 properties that were empty and furnished, split almost 50/50 between those empty for more than a year and those empty for less than a year. By September 2023, the 12 month average number of empty properties in this category had reduced to 5,057 properties producing an estimated increase in Council Tax liabilities of £7.2 million, reflecting the Council's share only. However, this would be significantly reduced because properties owned by Registered Social Landlords would be exempt from this premium.

The proposals had been considered by the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 11 January 2024, where the recommendation was fully endorsed.

Decision

The Executive agree that the Council will adopt the new powers allowed by the Levelling up and Regeneration Act 2023 in order to:

- Charge the long-term empty premium after one year instead of two years from 1 April 2024.
- Charge a 100% premium on empty furnished properties, subject to any future guidance or regulations from Central Government from 1 April 2025.

Exe/24/6 Joint Targeted Area Inspection

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Children and Education Services), which informed Members of the findings from the recent Joint Targeted Area Inspection (JTAI) in respect of Serious Youth Violence and next steps.

The Deputy Leader (Statutory) advised that the inspection took place between 25 September 2023 and 13 October 2023. The inspection was led by Ofsted and involved a total of 12 inspectors from CQC (Health and Care), Ofsted (Schools and Social Care), HMPI (Youth Justice) and HMICFRS (Police, Fire and Rescue). In addition, the Violence Reduction Unit (VRU) were also engaged as a key partner. The inspection considered 3 broad areas.

- Strategic Partnership responses to serious youth violence;
- Intervention with Individual and groups of children affected by serious youth violence and criminal exploitation; and
- Intervention in places and spaces.

The inspection identified the governance arrangements for Serious Violence in the city to be a strength and Inspectors described the work of Manchester's Complex Safeguarding Hub as strong and effective. There was also recognition for the work undertaken by and in partnership with Manchester Youth Zone.

Whilst recognising the strength of Manchester's partnerships and eight areas of strength, the report also identified six areas for improvement. These included enhanced multi-agency evaluation of projects to understand better how they work together as part of an overall system and more consistency in information recording and sharing between partners. A requirement of the inspection was for a multi-agency action plan to be developed in response to the six areas identified for improvement and work had already begun on this.

Decision

The Executive note the report and steps being taken to address the areas for improvement

Exe/24/7 Revisions to the Council's Corporate Policy and Procedures on the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA) and the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 (IPA)

The Executive considered a report of the City Solicitor, which sought approval to revisions to the Council's Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 (RIPA) and the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 (IPA) Corporate Policy and Procedures.

It was explained that the proposed revisions were to update the Council's existing Corporate Policy and Procedures only. There was no change to the Council's approach to use of the powers available to it under the RIPA and the IPA. However, the existing Policy and Procedures were not fully compliant with current legislative requirements which the revisions were intended to rectify.

In addition, assurance was given that the Council only very rarely used the powers available to it, but it still needed to have a robust and up to date Policy in place which officers could follow should the need arise. If the Council's Policy was not fully compliant with current legislative requirements this could lead to the Council to not meeting its statutory obligations, exceeding its powers and placing it at risk of legal challenge with its attendant reputational and financial consequences.

Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Approve the revisions to the Council's Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 ('RIPA') and the Investigatory Powers Act 2016 ('IPA') Corporate Policy and Procedures.
- (2) Note the information in paragraph 3.7 of the report regarding the Council's use of RIPA for the period 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2023.

Exe/24/8 Proposal for the Next Phase of Selective Licensing

The Executive considered a joint report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) and Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which sought approval to undertake public consultation for an additional nine Selective Licensing Areas.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development explained that Officers had used local data and intelligence and lessons learnt from previous selective licensing phases to identify nine potential areas across six wards that were experiencing issues which meet the criteria to justify a Selective Licensing designation in the area.

The nine areas identified were:-

- Whiteway Street – Harpurhey
- Leng Road / Melrose Street / Droylsden Road and Scotland Street – Miles Platting & Newton Heath
- Viscount Street and Heald Grove - Moss Side
- Enver Road – Crumpsall
- Heathcote / Sanby Road – Longsight
- Northmoor Road – Longsight
- Flats above shops and Esmond / Avondale

Despite a number of targeted efforts to address the issues faced in the proposed areas, the evidence indicated that significant progress had not been made in dealing with the problems that had led to the areas being considered for Selective Licensing. For example, latest local statistics demonstrated that all of the proposed areas were still experiencing higher than average levels of rubbish and fly-tipping for their wards. Given the lack of practical or beneficial alternatives, Selective Licensing therefore represented a justifiable tool for the Council to use in responding to issues with neighbourhood and property management, in conjunction with a range of other actions that were currently being undertaken or are planned.

Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Approve a public consultation with residents, private landlords, businesses and other stakeholders (as set out in Section 7 of the report) to designate selective licensing schemes within the nine geographical areas, across six wards, detailed in Maps 1 to 9 (set out in Appendix 1) and listed in Section 6 of the report.
- (2) Subject to the outcome of the consultation, delegate authority to the Director of Neighbourhoods, in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing and Development, to approve the designation of up to nine of the selective licensing areas identified in the report.

Exe/24/9 Former Central Retail Park (Part A)

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided an update on progress for the redevelopment of the Former Central Retail Park site.

The Leader reported that since the publication of the Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) for the former Central Retail Park (FCRP), the Council had been negotiating with the Government Property Agency (GPA) to secure the first phase of development on the FCRP site. An agreement had now been reached to secure the delivery of the first phase, a “Manchester Digital Campus”, consistent with the principles set out in the agreed SRF. This agreement showed a significant commitment to, and confidence in, the city, and was a big step towards achieving the objectives of the SRF to support regeneration and economic growth by securing regional investment, creating new high quality employment opportunities, providing new offices and creating pedestrian connections.

The development of the first phase would be for circa five acres and had the potential to accommodate up to 7,000 full time jobs, with a significant proportion being recruited locally in Manchester. Complementary ground floor commercial and amenity uses (e.g. shops and cafes) and surrounding public realm would also be provided. The delivery of the first phase would provide the catalyst to deliver the overall SRF, which would lead to significant socio-economic benefits, in line with the Council’s objectives, in particular those included within the Manchester Economic Strategy.

Alongside this, the Council had recently appointed a design team for the new park, demonstrating the commitment to deliver this major new local green space as soon as it was practical to do so. Concept designs for the park were currently being developed and would be subject to consultation at an appropriate stage.

The key terms of the agreement with GPA for the sale of the phase 1 land for redevelopment were outlined in the associated Part B report. The agreement was for the disposal of the Council’s freehold interest to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. Provision was included in the terms for the sale to

account for the development not commencing, or being partially completed, including arrangements for the Council to re-acquire the site if appropriate, to maintain control of its future development. It also set out the permitted uses of the site, the expected environmental standards and compliance with social value policies.

Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Note the progress made on bringing forward Phase 1 of the Former Central Retail Park development.
- (2) Note the terms of the arrangements for the disposal of the Phase 1 site to the Government Property Agency for the redevelopment of this part of the site.

Exe/24/10 Exclusion of Press and 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/24/11 Former Central Retail Park (Part B)

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which outlined the confidential commercial terms of the proposed land disposal of approximately half of the Former Central Retail Park (FCRP) for redevelopment by the Government Property Agency (GPA).

Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Approve the disposal of the part of the site to the Secretary of State for Levelling up, Housing and Communities, for the development of phase 1 of the Former Central Retail Park (FCRP) on the terms set out in the report.
- (2) Delegate authority to the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), in consultation with the Leader, to negotiate and finalise the detailed terms of the disposal together with such other ancillary property and commercial arrangements to support the disposal and development of the FCRP site.
- (3) Authorise the City Solicitor to complete and enter into any necessary contractual and/ or ancillary documents required to give effect to the above recommendations.

This page is intentionally left blank

Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 9 January 2024

Present:

Councillor Hitchen (Chair) – in the Chair
Councillors Good, Ogunbambo, Rawson, Sheikh, Whiston and Wills

Also present:

Councillor Rahman, Statutory Deputy Leader
Councillor Midgley, Deputy Leader
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People
Chief Superintendent Rick Jackson, Greater Manchester Police
Superintendent Chris Downey, Greater Manchester Police
Alison Lynch, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust
Ruth Speight, Assistant Chief Nurse (Safeguarding), Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust
Tom Hinchliffe, NHS Greater Manchester Integrated Care

Apologies: Councillors Azra Ali, Appleby and Doswell

CESC/24/1 Interests

Councillors Good and Ogunbambo declared personal interests in item 9 (Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) Infrastructure Contract Update).

CESC/24/2 Minutes

Decision: That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 5 December 2023, be approved as a correct record.

CESC/24/3 Crime and Policing

The committee considered a report of Greater Manchester Police (GMP) which provided an update on the City of Manchester division's journey to improvement.

Key points and themes within the presentation included:

- Improvements in communication between GMP and partners and the community;
- Improvements to prevent and reduce harm;
- Operations to tackle residential and business burglary; and
- Ambitions for future investment into emergency response resources and police student training.

Some of the key points and queries that arose from the committee's discussion included:

- Commending GMP officers and staff for their service to Manchester and its residents;
- Staff turnover and how greater consistency could be ensured;
- If neighbourhood patrol boundaries would be changed to align with ward boundaries;
- Poor communication of the decision to end university policing patrols;
- Suggesting that GMP devise individual ward plans and create dedicated email addresses for each ward for residents and members to report issues to;
- The rationale behind relocating or redeploying police officers;
- Noting a need for better direct communication and meetings with members in North Manchester;
- The need for better communication overall, citing that members sometimes received information on crime in their area through social media or word of mouth rather than directly from GMP;
- How GMP communicated with victims of crime;
- What changes residents could expect to see in the next 12 months; and
- Call-handling and police response times.

The Statutory Deputy Leader stated that the Council had a strong working relationship with GMP and the work, lines of communication and regular briefings which had been in place since the Chief Superintendent took up his post were invaluable. He recognised some challenges but reiterated the positive collaboration between the Council and GMP, particularly in neighbourhood policing.

The Chief Superintendent, GMP attended the meeting and stated that the force had strong communication methods with the Council but recognised that there may have been occasions where members did not feel fully informed. He recognised that it was important to understand different viewpoints, capacity and implications of decisions and explained that the Statutory Deputy Leader of the Council provided a quarterly forum for members, which he also attended, to give a broad overview of crime in the city and an opportunity to ask questions or raise concerns. He stated that GMP had committed to a neighbourhood policing structure consisting of an Inspector and Sergeant and that information on the responsible officers for each area was available online. He also updated the committee on the force's IT system, which he said was addressing some previous limitations.

He recognised that the nature of policing in addition to retirement and seeking other development opportunities led to staff turnover, but more vacancies would be filled as student police officers finished their studies in April 2024.

In response to queries regarding ensuring consistency between departing and new officers, the Chief Superintendent, GMP acknowledged the importance of structured handovers and communication with members and residents. He also recognised that there was a significant period in which most police forces did not recruit but this was now resuming, and people were moving between forces.

It was also confirmed that neighbourhood patrol boundaries would be aligned with ward boundaries from April 2024.

The Chief Superintendent, GMP took responsibility for the decision to disband Student Safe officers on university campuses and recognised that the communication of this was not as effective as hoped. He explained that the public, including students, were not receiving value-for-money through the structure of Student Safe officers and that alternative delivery methods were assessed to provide a more tangible service. He stated that communications were issued in advance of Christmas 2023, and he endeavoured to review this in more detail.

The Chief Superintendent, GMP noted suggestions for dedicated ward plans and ward-specific email addresses and endeavoured to look into the possibility of devising ward plans in more detail. He stated, however, that it would be impractical to have a dedicated email address for each ward as a reporting tool as it could create issues with accountability. He reiterated that contact details for the responsible officers in each area was available on GMP's website.

A member raised concern over a recent cancelled meeting between GMP officers and members in North Manchester and suggested improvements were required in direct communication between GMP and members. In response, the Chief Superintendent, GMP highlighted the need for the police, Council officers and members to work in partnership and that he would want Council officers to be involved in any meetings between the force and members.

In response to a query regarding why police officers were relocated or redeployed onto other projects, members were advised that resource was sometimes required elsewhere. He explained that officer abstraction rates were tracked through an internal app and that the City of Manchester division had the lowest abstraction rate in GMP.

The committee was informed that there was a common approach to communication across the city and that GMP would continue to work with the Council to learn and progress. The Chief Superintendent, GMP highlighted that requests for investigation updates were sometimes made by members or residents which were not appropriate to share. He stated that the force abided by the Victims' Code of Practice when communicating with victims of crime and that there were force-wide performance measures in place regarding contact with victims.

In response to a question regarding the changes that residents could expect to see, the Chief Superintendent, GMP reiterated that there had been a recent increase in recruitment so residents would see and feel an increased police presence. He also stated that call response times would continue to be quick and that there would be improvements in street and road safety. It was highlighted that the force was responding to the needs of a growing future population.

Members were informed that GMP had the best average speed of answer times in the country. Calls to 999 were currently answered between 1-3 seconds and calls to 111 within 30 seconds. Police response times to 999 calls was currently around 10 minutes and responses to crimes and incidents classed as “grade 2” or appointments was around 1 hour. The Chief Superintendent, GMP stated that this was phenomenal progress and the Chair asked him to pass on the committee’s thanks to call handlers.

The Statutory Deputy Leader commented that the police had experienced significant budget cuts in the previous 14 years, including a recruitment freeze and the reduction of over 2000 police officer in Greater Manchester which impacted the ability for neighbourhood policing. He acknowledged the improvements made by GMP, which he felt was testament to the partnership between the Council and the force and stated that it was reassuring that issues continued to be addressed.

Decision:

That the committee

1. note the report;
2. recognise and commend the improvements made by GMP;
3. continue to receive an annual update on crime and policing to better identify issues and areas for improvements going forwards;
4. encourages GMP to continue building consistent communication methods with elected members and residents; and
5. requests that the next annual crime and policing update includes statistics on crime levels in Manchester.

CESC/24/4 Joint Targeted Area Inspection (JTAI) Serious Youth Violence

The committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Children and Education Services) which presented the findings of a recent JTAI in respect of Serious Youth Violence, which took place between 25 September and 13 October 2023.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background to JTAIs;
- Manchester was the first authority in the country to be inspected under a new inspection framework;
- The scope of the Inspection;
- The overall findings of the inspection, which were positive; and
- 6 areas for improvement were identified and a multi-agency action plan had been developed in response.

Some of the key points and queries that arose from the committee’s discussion included:

- That the action plan, policing and multi-agency approach should be child-centred and trauma-informed;
- The key areas that would be considered in a child's Education, Care and Health Plan (ECHP);
- Highlighting a recommendation made by a recent Task and Finish Group on crime and antisocial behaviour for the Council to encourage Youth Outreach Services across the city to adopt a consistent approach to tackling ASB and barriers to reporting experienced by children and young people, and whether this could be incorporated into the JTAI action plan;
- Highlighting issues with the use of jargon and acronyms in the action plan;
- Resources and capacity, with particular reference to Children and Adolescence Mental Health Service (CAMHS);
- Expressing concern over lack of timescales within the action plan with regards to CAMHS referrals;
- What work was undertaken to prevent children from being excluded from school;
- How child-centred policing would reduce the overrepresentation of BAME children in the criminal justice system;
- Noting that the Inspectors highlighted the underrepresentation of girls in referrals to the complex safeguarding hub (CSH), in relation to known levels of need, and that there was no reference in the action plan as to how this would be addressed;
- How these actions would be evaluated and the timescales for this;
- What programmes and interventions were in place to prevent young people from reoffending; and
- Whether the action plan was robust enough to deliver further improvements in addressing serious youth violence.

The Statutory Deputy Leader stated that the Joint Targeted Area Inspection was an important and positive piece of work and emphasised that the Council strived to ensure that improvements were made in regard to tackling serious youth violence. He explained that the Inspector's report highlighted a number of strengths, including partnership working, and some challenges which he stated were important to recognise in order to continuously improve. He also thanked officers who were involved in the inspection on behalf of the Executive.

The Strategic Director (Children and Education Services) advised that representatives from the Council, Youth Justice Service, NHS and GMP were in attendance. He explained that the JTAI was the first inspection held nationally and involved 4 inspectors from key statutory agencies undertaking a 'deep dive' into a particular theme or issue to assess the local authority area's response. He further explained that the inspection assessed strategy and partnership; interventions with individual children and groups; and intervention in places. He recognised that there were six areas for the Council and partners to improve on and informed the committee that an action plan had been submitted to Ofsted and work was being

progressed through the Community Safety and Violence Subgroup with support from the Manchester Safeguarding Partnership.

The Chair noted that this work also formed part of the remit of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee and she raised questions made representations on behalf of the committee's Chair, Councillor Reid. In response to these questions, the Superintendent, GMP stated that he had overall thematic responsibility for vulnerability and safeguarding across Manchester. He explained that good progress had been made with child-centred policing and that a strategy had been developed which focused on the systems and processes within GMP. This strategy was used to inform the necessity and consequences of arresting a child, entering a child into the criminal justice system and keeping a child in police custody or on bail. He stated that the police force needed to be trauma-informed in order to understand approaches to children and young people and this was being rolled out across all districts in Manchester.

The Deputy Strategic Director (Children and Education Services) stated that staff within the service were trauma-informed and that those working in the Complex Safeguarding Hub had particular skills in this area. He explained that officers were aware of the diverse issues affecting children and considered the causes presented through trauma. He noted that the Council worked with highly complex and exploited children and planning could be difficult as a result of this. Planning was undertaken by a range of agencies and the qualities and skills of officers helped to mitigate some issues with planning. He explained that Children's Services had recently revised the planning document, and this was a focus of the quality assurance framework. He recognised the need for greater focus on siblings' needs and improved consistency in information sharing, although good partnership working was acknowledged.

The Strategic Lead – Community Safety also advised that an appropriate response to trauma was a key component of the Council's Serious Violence Strategy. She stated that the Council also sought consideration of trauma-informed responses through the commissioning process with the voluntary and community sector, youth providers and organisations providing restorative justice. The Council's Public Health service also provided trauma-informed training for frontline staff and partners.

In response to a query regarding resources and capacity, the Strategic Director (Children and Education Services) explained that a profiling exercise was undertaken during the development of the Serious Violence Strategy to identify the scale of need. He stated that the inspection highlighted that early intervention and prevention was key and cited Engage panels, the voluntary sector, youth justice and CAMHS as avenues for this. The Strategic Lead – Community Safety advised that a lot of early intervention and prevention work was funded and that the Council had raised the lack of long-term, mainstream funding with the Inspectors.

The Youth Justice Manager highlighted that Youth Justice service users were three times more likely not to reoffend and that significant funding had been granted from the Ministry of Justice to continue interventions such as speech and language

therapy, CAMHS, drama therapy and relationship-building. He recognised that there was a small cohort of children who reoffended and advised that a specialist project, SHIFT, was underway with approximately 30 children who had been identified by the Manchester Safeguarding Partnership as having risk factors.

The Assistant Chief Nurse (Safeguarding), Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust advised that there had been considerable transformation of and investment into CAMHS with regards to community and preventative work, which was being undertaken alongside targeted core CAMHS work. She highlighted that there was ongoing scrutiny of CAMHS' work and the action plan would include steps to communicate the service's offer.

The Strategic Lead – Community Safety advised that consistency among Youth Outreach Services in tackling ASB and barriers to reporting could also be progressed through the Serious Violence Board in addition to the Community Safety Partnership.

In response to a question regarding children being excluded from school, the Strategic Director (Children and Education Services) explained that the inspection focused on children over the age of 10 years-old. He stated that Manchester was involved in the national pilot of the 'Support, Attend, Fulfil, Exceed' (SAFE) programme to deliver targeted interventions to reduce truancy, improve behaviours, and reduce the risk of individuals failing to enter education, employment or training and that it had an Alternative Provisions Taskforce which encompassed Pupil Referral Units (PRU). He explained that when an attendance issue was identified, a child would be offered mentoring as a form of early intervention and prevention. The Council also worked with schools to identify issues causing low attendance rates and the required level of support.

With regards to the overrepresentation of BAME children in the criminal justice system, the Superintendent, GMP acknowledged that the Child-Centred Policing Strategy would not resolve issues leading BAME children into criminality but it would help to provide the background and context to help the Community Safety Partnership identify the necessary appropriate support. The Youth Justice Manager noted that the overrepresentation of BAME children in the criminal justice system was a national trend and Manchester strove to address this issue. He explained that resources were in place to identify opportunities for interventions. The Strategic Director (Children and Education Services) stated that there was ongoing work with AFRUCA to protect and safeguard BAME children from abuse, modern slavery and exploitation.

It was noted that the action plan did not make reference to how girls were involved in and affected by serious violence. The Deputy Strategic Director (Children and Education Services) further explained that significant work to raise awareness of the exploitation through and involvement of girls of all ethnicities in serious violence had been undertaken in the previous 9 months with staff and this was identified as an area of continued focus but recognised that this was not highlighted in the action plan.

In response to a query by the Chair regarding evaluation, the Strategic Lead – Community Safety advised that the Inspectors had noted the strong evaluation within projects but had suggested evaluation of the wider serious violence reduction programme. She stated that the Council was committed to developing a performance framework to sit alongside the Serious Violence Strategy and would include measures and statistics. This would be developed in the next few months.

The Strategic Lead – Community Safety explained that mentoring and restorative justice were key interventions in preventing children and young people from reoffending.

The Strategic Director (Children and Education Services) asserted his belief that the action plan, in addition to the recommendations made by the committee, was robust enough to deliver further improvements in addressing serious youth violence. He highlighted that a wider response to serious youth violence and its causes would continue to be undertaken with partners.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People reiterated the importance of partnership working in addressing serious youth violence and stated that the Council and its partners placed children at the centre of work.

In summarising, the Chair thanked the officers and partners who were involved in the inspection and developing the action plan. She stated that poverty played a significant role in criminality and that budget cuts by the government had exacerbated this.

Decision:

That the committee

1. note the report and the draft multi-agency action plan;
2. recommends that a glossary be created to provide further clarity on some of the work and organisations referenced in the action plan;
3. recommends that greater clarity on timescales for referrals to CAMHS be included in the action plan;
4. highlights that the action plan did not make reference to how girls were involved in and affected by serious violence and recommends that the action plan be amended to include detail on current and scheduled work to address the involvement of young girls in serious violence, crime and disorder and sexual exploitation; and
5. requests further progress updates on the actions.

CESC/24/5 Overview Report

The committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained a list of key decisions yet to be taken within the Committee's remit,

responses to previous recommendations and the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to approve.

Decision:

That the report be noted, and the work programme agreed.

CESC/24/6 Exclusion of Press and Public

Decision:

That the press and public be excluded 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 outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

**CESC/24/7 Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE)
Infrastructure Contract Update**

The Assistant Chief Executive and the Programmes and Policy Manager (Communities and VCSE) provided a confidential verbal update on the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) Infrastructure Contract.

The committee discussed a recent bidding process, monitoring requirements and the timescales involved in the contract. It was agreed to bring a quarterly update report to the committee.

Decision:

That the update be noted.

This page is intentionally left blank

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 10 January 2024

Present:

Councillor Reid – in the Chair
Councillors N Ali, Amin, Fletcher, Gartside, Hewitson, Judge, Lovecy, Ludford, McHale, Marsh, Muse, Nunney, Sadler and Sharif Mahamed

Co-opted Voting Members:

Mr G Cleworth, Parent Governor Representative
Mr Y Yonis, Parent Governor Representative

Also present:

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People
Alice Taylor, Adoption Counts

Apologies:

Councillor Bell
Canon S Mapledoram, Representative of the Diocese of Manchester
Ms L Smith, Primary Sector Teacher Representative

CYP/24/01 Minute's Silence - Wiktor Daron

A Member paid tribute to Wiktor Daron, the former Head Teacher of St Paul's Catholic High School in Wythenshawe who had passed away. He highlighted some of Mr Daron's many achievements, including improving the school's Ofsted judgement from inadequate to good with outstanding features, securing new sports facilities for the school, improved academic results and becoming one of the best schools in the country for pupil progress, as well as being awarded the Papal Medal for Services to Catholic Education.

The Committee held a minute's silence in his memory.

CYP/24/02 Urgent Business - Joint Targeted Area Inspection (JTAI) Serious Youth Violence

The Strategic Director (Children and Education Services) informed Members that this had been considered at the meeting of the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee the previous day and would also be considered by the Executive on 17 January 2024. He reported that, while the action plan was awaiting feedback from Ofsted and would also be adapted in light of Members' comments, the work stemming from this was already being progressed and he suggested that the Committee might want to scrutinise some elements of this work in future.

The Chair reported that she had submitted her comments to the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee, focusing on the need for child-centred, trauma-informed policing and for closer multi-agency working, and that this was likely to be something that the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee would consider at a future meeting.

Decision

To note the verbal update.

CYP/24/03 Minutes

Decisions

1. To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 6 December 2023.
2. To receive the minutes of the Ofsted Subgroup meeting held on 22 November 2023.

CYP/24/04 Fostering Service Annual Report 2022-2023

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Children and Education Services) which set out what the Fostering Service had achieved over the past year and what its priorities were for the coming year.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Background information;
- Successes for 2022-2023;
- Main issues; and
- Priority actions for 2023-24.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People reported that there was an improving picture in relation to fostering and he highlighted the role of Councillors in promoting fostering.

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

- Whether there were any particular communities where there was a shortage of foster carers;
- That some people were wary about the process to become a foster carer and how long it took;
- The management of allegations against foster carers, including allegations which were found to be unsubstantiated;
- Trauma-informed training;
- Roll-out of the Mockingbird Model;
- Placement stability; and
- Sharing experiences of being a foster carer.

The Service Lead (Fostering) informed Members that at present 18% of children in care were Black (including Black African, Black Caribbean and Black British) and 10% of foster carers (excluding kinship carers) were Black so this was the main group from which more foster carers needed to be recruited. In response to a further question, she reported that housing was a significant barrier, particularly for kinship

carers and people in central Manchester, including many black families, and that her service was looking at ways to address this. She acknowledged that trust of government institutions was also an issue in some communities and reported that her service was working to build relationships with those communities and help them to understand the process. She reported that her service took a trauma-informed approach across its work but also offered specific trauma-informed training. She informed Members that the first Mockingbird Constellation had been launched in south Manchester and that work was taking place to develop the next one in north Manchester, after which one would be developed in central Manchester. In response to a Member's question she reported that a lot of preparatory work had taken place to prepare for the refugees from Ukraine but that, as yet, no children from Ukraine had required fostering services. She informed Members that the process to become a foster carer took on average 12 weeks, stating that the service carried out regular information evenings for people interested in fostering and would be happy to come and speak to any groups that Members suggested. A Member stated that he would speak to officers outside of the meeting to arrange this.

The Assistant Director (Provider Services) advised Members that the process for recruiting foster carers needed to be rigorous to ensure that the people coming forward had the right motivation for fostering.

A Member shared her personal experiences of being in foster care and the impact of this. She emphasised the importance of having a rigorous process to recruit the right people and thanked officers for the work they did to improve the experience of children in foster care. She expressed concern that some of the recruitment advertisements for foster carers could give a false impression of fostering, glossing over the challenges involved.

The Assistant Director (Provider Services) acknowledged the Member's point about advertisements. She drew Members' attention to the Fostering Unfiltered campaign across Greater Manchester which depicted the reality of fostering, although she stated that this had not produced the response that had been wanted and that the Greater Manchester local authorities would be working together further on this campaign. She stated that her service had worked hard on ensuring that foster carers understood how children with significant trauma communicated. She reported that only 8% of the children were in residential care, rather than living in families, which compared favourably to other local authorities.

The Assistant Director (Provider Services) explained the process for managing allegations against foster carers, differentiating between allegations of abuse and practice concerns. She stated that allegations of abuse were referred to the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) and that a Strategy Meeting would take place, attended by Greater Manchester Police (GMP). She reported that allegations were investigated to establish whether they were substantiated, that foster carers were provided with independent support during the process and that the safety of the child was central to decision-making, including whether it was safe for them to remain with the foster carer. She acknowledged the impact on foster carers who were subject to unsubstantiated allegations but stated that not many foster care arrangements broke down because of this, as foster carers received training to understand the impact of trauma on the child they were caring for, and that most foster carers who

experienced this felt supported. She reported that a small number of foster carers had been deregistered. She advised that it was important to take seriously anything that a child reported or that another professional raised as a concern and that, from the training they received, foster carers understood that this was a necessary process.

The Strategic Director (Children and Education Services) reported that his service had increased its family group conferencing approach, supporting children in their families and suggested that the Committee might want to consider a report on this at a future meeting. He recognised the importance of placement stability for the well-being of children in foster care and stated that the Mockingbird Model was a key part of this, enabling foster carers to support one another. He also highlighted the importance of family-based care, which provided a better environment for children than the large children's homes which used to be commonplace.

The Assistant Director (Provider Services) reported that the number of children who had had three or more moves was monitored and reported to the Department for Education (DfE) and that this year that figure had decreased from 10.4% to 9.6%.

The Chair informed Members about the improvement journey that Children's Services had been on since 2014, when it had been judged to be inadequate by Ofsted, and she welcomed that the service had significantly improved and was now judged to be good, while advising that there was always more that could be done. She reported that housing was a challenging issue which prevented people from becoming foster carers and advised that, where this was the case, it should be addressed at a ward level so that Ward Councillors could assist with resolving issues and she suggested that this could include moving them into Band 1 for housing priority. She highlighted that MP Andrew Gwynne had been raising issues relating to kinship carers in Parliament. She recognised the work of Alonzi House to keep children out of care. She also commented on the age profile of foster carers and the future implications of this.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People reported that Children's Services now worked closely with Housing in a way which it had not done previously, and which did not happen in a lot of other local authorities. He reported that all Looked After Children were classed as Band 1, as were foster carers, and that discussions were taking place about how some housing could be made available in cases where housing was a barrier to people becoming foster carers. He informed Members that the Council was using guidance from a national lobby group on kinship carers to assess how it was doing and ways it could improve in relation to this group.

Decisions

1. To note the progress and impact being achieved by the Fostering Service in Manchester and the goals set out for 2023-24 with regard to:
 - Recruiting more foster carers, and carers who meet our children's cultural needs.
 - Retaining the right foster carers and supporting them to 'stick with' our children and provide them with stable and loving homes.

- Developing our kinship offer to ensure our families and communities are offered the right support to care for the children in their networks and to provide them with a permanent home.
2. To additionally recognise the importance of ensuring sufficient provision of housing to enable families to care for these children.

CYP/24/05 Annual Adoption Report

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which outlined the progress in planning and placements for children, assessment, and approval of prospective adoptive parents, and in offering adoption support.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Performance (children);
- Quality of children's reports;
- Marketing recruitment and assessment of adopters;
- Practice developments;
- Adoption Panel; and
- Adoption support.

Alice Taylor from Adoption Counts delivered a presentation which outlined the highlights for Manchester from the Adoption Counts Annual Report. This included children's data, timescales, early permanence, report quality, adopter data, adoption support and achievements in 2023 beyond the service's core work.

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

- The quality of Child Permanence Reports (CPRs);
- Reasons for delays in adoption and what was being done to expedite the adoption process; and
- Staff retention and supervision.

The Deputy Strategic Director of Children's Services informed Members that the CPR was the profile and story of the child which could assist with the matching of a child for adoption and, although the quality of some CPRs presented at the first stage (Should Be Placed For Adoption – or SHO BPA - meeting) needed to improve, this did not indicate that poor decisions were being made in relation to the placement of a child for adoption as there was a lengthy, robust process in place. He reported that there had been delays in the adoption process in 2022 – 2023, partly as a legacy of the pandemic. He outlined some of the other issues which could cause delays, including relatives coming forward late in the process for alternative care arrangements which then had to be explored, lengthy care proceedings and the complexities of individual children and planning for them. He reported that the service was involved in the oversight and governance of the family court to influence improvements which could be made and in family group conferencing to identify family members at an earlier point in the process.

Alice Taylor reported that the Council and Adoption Counts held regular tracking meetings so Adoption Counts was made aware of any unexpected delays, for example if a family member had put themselves forward to be assessed, but that a lot of the background work would still be taking place so the agency was in a position to progress to matching with a family if it was then decided that adoption was the right path for that child. She outlined work that would be taking place over the next year to streamline the adoption process within the agency to minimise delays, while ensuring the process was robust.

The Chair expressed concern about the delays in the process, including court backlogs. She requested that the next time items on adoption and fostering were considered that adoptive parents and foster carers be invited to the meeting to speak about their experiences. The Strategic Director (Children and Education Services) requested that consideration be given to this outside of the meeting to ensure that the families and children involved were not compromised.

In response to a question from the Chair about Greater Manchester local authorities which were not part of Adoption Counts, the Deputy Strategic Director of Children's Services reported that all local authorities were linked with a regional adoption agency but some Greater Manchester authorities were aligned with a different agency. He highlighted the role of the Workforce Development Strategy and assured Members that the appropriate supervision of and support for staff at the Council and Adoption Counts was of the highest priority. In response to Members' comments about retaining links with birth families after adoption, he highlighted the importance of lifelong letterbox contact and reported that work was taking place to improve the quality and meaningfulness of this contact.

A Member asked if Committee Members could visit the Council's social work frontline service and this was supported by the Chair.

Decision

To arrange a visit to the Council's social work frontline services.

CYP/24/06 Annual Virtual School Head's Report

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Education which provided an overview of the work that had been undertaken during 2022-23 to promote the education, employment and training of the Children and Young People overseen by the Manchester Virtual School. The report stated that this included Children and Young People in the care of Manchester, Manchester Care Leavers, Previously Looked After Children who attended education settings within Manchester, Children and Young People with a Manchester Social Worker and Young People supported by the Youth Justice Service.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- 2022-23 success headlines;
- Virtual School structure, duties, offer and summary of 2022-23;

- Overview of Children and Young People;
- Personal Education Plan (PEP) completion;
- Ofsted judgements of the schools attended by Our Children and Young People;
- The views, wishes and feelings of Our Children and Young People;
- The outcomes achieved by Our Children and Young People;
- The Virtual School work to promote the Education, Employment and Training of the children and young people it oversaw;
- The Virtual School work to promote inclusion;
- School attendance;
- Exclusions and suspensions;
- Workforce development overview; and
- Virtual school priorities for 2023-24.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People highlighted the achievements outlined in the report, including significant improvements in examination results and post-16 participation, and he recognised the positive work of the Virtual School team. He encouraged Members to attend the next Corporate Parenting Panel meeting to consider the new Corporate Parenting Strategy.

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

- To welcome the overall positive picture, in particular the improvement in GCSE results;
- What was being put in place to support younger children, who were not achieving as well; and
- Variations in PEP forms and processes between different local authorities, noting that schools and colleges often had children from different local authority areas attending their setting and were having to work with different PEPs.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People reported that a number of discussions had already taken place at previous Committee meetings about the impact of the pandemic on young children more broadly and that for children with any additional challenges the outcomes diverged further, both from where they had been previously and from the rest of the cohort. He reported that he had written to Government Ministers about this and that the Council was working hard to address this, including setting up a Kickstarter scheme to provide targeted support.

The Chair expressed concern at the impact that the pandemic had had on all babies and young children. She also highlighted the impact of the forthcoming expansion of the free childcare entitlement.

The Virtual School Deputy Head outlined some of the work taking place to support the progress of their younger children who had been disproportionately affected by the pandemic, working with Early Years and Key Stage 1 providers, closely monitoring progress through the termly PEP process, offering access to Educational

Psychologists, ensuring that children were accessing the Kickstarter programme, working with the Speech and Language Team and using Pupil Premium funding for literacy activities. In response to a Member's question on pre-pandemic data on Early Years development, reading, writing and mathematics, she advised that this was available in previous reports but that there was no national data on Good Level of Development (GLD) in Early Years prior to the pandemic.

The second Virtual School Deputy Head recognised the Member's comments about variations in the PEP across different local authorities and reported that this had been raised at a regional level; however, she advised that there were benefits to the secure electronic PEP system used by Manchester and that, while Manchester would be willing to engage in discussions with other Virtual Schools on standardisation of the PEP form, she believed that Manchester's version provided the level of detail that was needed.

The Chair advised that the Committee should consider an item on Early Years development and the progress of the cohort of young children affected by the pandemic, in relation to all children, as part of a future item. She shared her experiences as a Regulation 44 visitor, expressing concern about the young people who were not in education. She highlighted the work that Morgan Sindall had been doing with Care Leavers and advised that other employers could do similar education, employment and training work as part of the Social Value element of Council contracts. She also reported that Manchester Adult Education Services (MAES) could do more work with this group.

Decision

To consider an item on Early Years development and the progress of the cohort of young children affected by the pandemic as part of a future item.

CYP/24/07 Overview Report

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

The Chair reported that she was discussing with the Chair of the Health Scrutiny Committee an item on children's dental health.

Decision

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

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2024

Present: Councillor Lyons - In the Chair

Councillors: S. Ali, Andrews, Chohan, Curley, Davies, Gartside, Hassan, Hewitson, Hughes, Kamal, Lovecy, Riasat

Also present: Councillors Abdullatif, Muse, Bayunu, Igbon, Doswell and Ilyas

PH/24/01 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 137399/FO/2023, 137401/FO/2023, 130387/FO/2021 and 138302/FO/2023.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/24/02 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2023 as a correct record.

PH/24/03 137399/FO/2023 - Land bounded by Upper Brook Street, Cottenham Street and Kincardine Road, Manchester, M13 9TD - Ardwick Ward & 137401/FO/2023 - Land between Upper Brook Street, Kincardine Road and Grosvenor Street Manchester - Ardwick Ward

The Committee considered the reports of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding:

137399/FO/2023 - the erection of a 6 to 9 storey building for Sci-Tech use (Use Class E (g)(ii)) and 265sqm of a cafe/bar (Use Class E (b)), and a 9 to 23 storey building for Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) (Use Sui Generis), comprising 737 bedrooms and 293sqm of community use (Use Class F2 (b)) and 80sqm of commercial floorspace (Use Class E), alongside new public realm, access, parking, and associated works following demolition of existing buildings.

Consideration of this application was deferred by the Planning and Highways Committee on 14 December 2023 to enable a site visit to take place.

The Government published, an updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 19 December 2023. The assessment of the issues and matters arising from the application set out in the report remained valid as a result of the publication of the

updated NPPF and the recommendation set out at the end of the report remained unchanged as a result.

114 objections (from 78 households) had been received. Councillors Muse and Abdullatif object.

And:

137401/FO/2023 - Full planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of three 12/14/29 storey buildings to be used for Purpose Built Student Accommodation (Use Sui Generis), comprising 983 bedrooms in total and 506sqm of ground floor ancillary uses (café/commercial and convenience store - Use Classes E (a)/(b)/(c)), three buildings comprising 5/7/9 storeys for Science and Innovation uses (Use Class E (g)(i) & (ii)) and 834sqm ground floor community uses (retail/ cafés and medical facility (Use Classes E (a)/(b) and (e)), and the provision of new public realm, two new public squares, new access and parking, and associated works.

Consideration of this application was deferred by the Planning and Highways Committee on 14 December 2023 to enable a site visit to take place.

The Government published, an updated National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) on 19 December 2023. The assessment of the issues and matters arising from the application set out in the report remained valid as a result of the publication of the updated NPPF and the recommendation set out at the end of the report remained unchanged as a result.

Manchester Metropolitan University supported the proposal.

113 (from 76 households) objections were received during the first round of notification, 97 (from 77 households) had been received. Councillors Muse and Abdullatif object.

Officers noted that a letter of support had been received from the Growth Company that felt the application presented an opportunity for an exciting platform which would benefit the area for many years. Committee members had been on a site visit on the day of the meeting which focused on the tallest element of the application, at 29-storeys near Grosvenor Street, and its impact on nearby accommodation on Hamsworth Close. On the visit, members stopped opposite Elizabeth Yarwood to see another taller element on Upper Brook Street with the lower element closer to Kincardine Court. Members noted the proximity to homes on the opposite side to Kincardine Court. The visit stopped at Gartside gardens, noting the proximity of buildings to road frontages and therefore the community. Members asked questions during the visit that were answered by Officers.

The Planning Officer noted that the Council's main priority was to deliver commercial space, and the application offered 650,000 square feet. Life sciences are one of the key growth sectors and the opportunity to commercialise that was only available in a small area, mainly around the University. To deliver that space, the application needed to provide an enabling use, which for this was PBSA, which was desperately needed in Manchester. The size of the scheme had reduced considerably. Originally

the application was for a 42-storey building but was now 29 storey following work by officers. The application had been independently tested and that was satisfied the application was not excessive and was the amount required to deliver the commercial floor space.

Two objectors addressed the Committee. The first objector raised concerns that the development would be towering, removing day light for nearby residential property. The objectors felt this was a residential area for families and that they had been told the area would be a thriving community, not a Life Science campus. It was felt that students would not move out of HMO's as PBSA was too expensive.

The second objector had similar concerns regarding the size of the application and the negative impact on residents. They felt the application would overshadow the nearby park and residential properties. They had concerns regarding a possible increase in pollution. The resident felt there was not enough sunlight in the area, and this would remove it even further. The resident felt Councillors had a lead role in looking after residential communities and requested that the application was refused.

Two applicants addressed the Committee for each application. The first stated that the applicant was investing £730 million into the area having consulted extensively and listened to the Community. The scheme had been amended to the minimum required to deliver the Life Sciences space. Nearby car parks have low occupancy levels that can be used if necessary. They noted that the local community had requested certain amenities, such as a GP surgery, which was included in the application.

The second agent noted that the applications would deliver PBSA and a leading Life Science building. Whilst this was the only suitable location, this was also the correct location. The applicant wanted to play an active role in the community. The scheme was to provide 500 Life Science jobs once completed, with 800 during the delivery of the project.

A ward Councillor addressed the Committee stating that this was an area of family homes and a tight knit community. They felt the application did not match that. The Councillor felt that the area did not need the amount of students proposed in the application. They did not believe the application would enhance any part of resident's lives. They felt the application would increase traffic and commuters in an already busy area. The application would overshadow homes, as well as green spaces.

A second ward Councillor addressed the Committee, hoping that the site visit had provided members with a clearer idea of their objections. They noted that it had been the 10 years anniversary of the Brunswick redevelopment, and that this application would have a detrimental impact on that redevelopment. They had raised consistent objections, noting a lack of parking for 5,000 people, the height of the building, and loss of light and overshadowing. They felt that there was already PBSA around, with more already approved so questioned the need for this scheme. They raised issues relating to the viability of this scheme. The ward Councillor felt the development was not suitable for the area.

The Planning Officer stated that 2 comprehensive reports addressed the issues raised. It had never been suggested that there would not be a substantial impact on the area. All impacts had to be properly tested, with all impacts set out in the reports. The application had been fully considered and that formed the basis of Officer's recommendation.

The Planning Officer noted there had been comments regarding PBSA and what it achieves, with suggestions that it did not lead to students moving out of mainstream accommodation and HMO's. They noted that in South Manchester, Council tax exemptions had dropped by 31%, meaning 670 homes had been taken out of student use. In the City Centre, council tax exemptions had flatlined but the number of students living in the centre had increased by 4,000, highlighting that most of those students were living in PBSA. In Ardwick, in the previous 10 years there had been 2,000 more students living in the area but only 200 PBSA spaces built so students were living in mainstream accommodation or HMO's. Without PBSA, those numbers would continue to rise.

In terms of Public Realm, there were 3 significant areas proposed as part of scheme, with 3 generous routes linking Brunswick and Upper Brook Street through the site that were landscaped with seating throughout.

The Planning Officer stated that there was no parking with scheme, but it is Council policy to reduce car journeys and increase public transport use. To provide parking as part of the scheme would not encourage that. They did also note that there were 3 car parks within a 10-minute walk of site that operated well below occupancy levels.

The Planning Officer stated that the impact of overshadowing was set out in both reports and had not been ignored. They were not suggesting that there would be no impact, but assessments had shown that the impact would not be significant.

Following persistent interruption from the public gallery, at this stage the Chair requested that the meeting being adjourned whilst the public gallery was cleared. The Committee restarted in the Antechamber.

The Planning Officer continued that in terms of viability, this was a large and complex scheme, that in total was over 2 hectares. As the proposal was not just Life Sciences, it had to be tested how much of enabling development was necessary to deliver the scheme. An Independent Party had assessed the proposal and agreed that the level of PBSA was required to deliver the 650,000 square feet of commercial space.

In terms of rights of light, the Planning Officer stated that was a private matter and could not be assessed in the Planning process. During that process, the impact on day light, sun light and overshadowing are all assessed and that was set out in the report.

The Chair moved on to taking questions from members, grouping questions together. A member questioned if the scheme could not be built or maintained without the subsidy of the PBSA, and if so, why that was the case. A member also queried if there was any provision for highway adaptations within the applications due to the increased population they would bring. A member then questioned how the

developer would have an active role in the community, as had been suggested. They did not see how residents wants were being met by the applications.

The Planning Officer noted that the viability assessment had shown the requirement for a subsidy, but that subsidy was from the developer and not students. In terms of Upper Brook Street, thousands of students cross over there every day to get to the University as a third of Ardwick population are already students. One of the public crossings was to be enhanced as part of the application but if there were safety issues, the highways authority would already have been aware. The Planning Officer felt it important to remember that students were also residents and part of the communities that they live in. The proposal included retail units to benefit the Community, with the developer having attempted to get a Lidl supermarket but Lidl were not interested at the time. There was to be a community centre, and medical centre along with 3 major pieces of public realm with 3 wide, landscaped routes.

A member queried to what extent a different model was feasible where a subsidy would not be needed. A member questioned how it would be made sure that the local retail would be for local residents rather than takeaway outlets aimed at students.

Councillor S. Ali moved the Officer's recommendation for both applications.

The Planning Officer was invited to respond to the member queries prior to the moving of Officer recommendations. The Planning Officer reminded the Committee that they had to make decisions on planning policies. This site was seen as complex, with the application across 2 hectares which was larger than usual applications. The only viable way to deliver the proposal was using enabling development of PBSA of this scale. The data showed where students want to live, which was close to the Universities. The evidence showed that when PBSA is available, students move out of family homes and HMOs into the PBSA. The Planning Officer accepted that students were a transient population, but they wanted to free up homes to be occupied by permanent residents. The developer had engaged with the community to establish what types of retail units they wanted in the space created by the application. Whilst it could not be confirmed the type of retail that would be there, the Planning Officer felt that the developer wanted retail to serve the residents.

A member continued to query why the scheme was not profitable and did not understand the need for a subsidy. A member then questioned how deliveries to the PBSA would be managed. A member also noted that a recent report stated that students from Manchester were travelling to other cities for university.

The Director of Planning noted that students were staying outside Manchester due to not being able to get any accommodation. They reminded the Committee that they had to form a decision based on current planning policy.

The Planning Officer repeated that in relation to the need for a subsidy, that was what the viability assessment had shown. Strategies were also proposed within the report for dealing with moving in and out, and managing deliveries, with conditions proposed to support that.

As Councillor S. Ali had moved the Officer's recommendation for both applications earlier, at this point, Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve both applications subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement to secure the provision of affordable rented accommodation, a mechanism to secure the delivery of the employment building, that private waste collections would take place for the perpetuity of the development and secure the project architect.

PH/24/04 138126/00/2023 - University of Manchester Fallowfield Campus Wilmslow Road, Manchester M14 6HD - Fallowfield Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding an outline planning application (with access only in detail) for the phased demolition of existing buildings and phased development of up to 3,300 Purpose Built Student Accommodation bedrooms (Sui Generis use class) with associated facilities including waste storage, laundry and cycle storage; up to 4,500 sq m of floorspace to be used for ancillary purposes associated with the student residential use of the site within Use Class F1a, Class E(a), E(b), E(c), E(d), E(g), Sui Generis (drinking establishment and hot food takeaway); ancillary supporting staff accommodation (up to 55 bedrooms) (Sui Generis use class), and up to 1,200 sq m of ancillary residential dwellings (Use Class C3), plus associated car parking, hard and soft landscaping, open space, utilities, footpaths and roads.

The application related to the redevelopment of part of the University of Manchester student halls of residence at its Fallowfield Campus within the Fallowfield ward. Planning permission had previously been granted for its demolition and redevelopment as part of a wider scheme to provide additional bedspaces at the Campus. The application sought to update the University's proposals to modernise the campus and provide further additional capacity at the site to address the need within the City for further purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA).

The Government published, an updated National Planning Policy Framework NPPF) on 19 December 2023. The assessment of the issues and matters arising from the application set out in the report remained valid as a result of the publication of the updated NPPF and the recommendation set out at the end of the report remained unchanged as a result.

The Planning Officer had nothing to add to the report.

An objector noted that they had lived in the area for 24 years. They felt Fallowfield to be struggling with the number of people there. There were already issues with litter. The University of Manchester only guaranteed PBSA for students in their first year. The objector did not believe that this application would free up family homes and felt there was no evidence to support that it would. They felt the application was an overdevelopment of the site. They had concerns about carbon emissions and the effect of those on children, the elderly and the most vulnerable.

The agent, noted that this was an outline application with strict limits contained within that, such as having declared the maximum number of beds, the maximum height of the scheme and the areas that must be free from development and the points of access that were fixed in the application. The agent felt that the outline application allowed for Officers to make a full assessment of the scheme. The agent noted that it was desirable to increase the student population of Manchester but to do that, extra PBSA was required. Prices were to be purposely set at a competitive rate, typically 30% cheaper than what was available elsewhere. The agent noted that PBSA was necessary to move students out of residential homes and HMOs, as supported by the evidence. Fallowfield remained a popular location for students. The scheme had been designed to be zero carbon emissions in operation and achieve a net-gain of 20% in biodiversity, which was a university standard. The university had been involved in extensive engagement with the neighbourhood team in Fallowfield to put long-term support into the area.

A ward Councillor accepted that issues would be easier to manage whilst students were in PBSA. They accepted that the area was marketed for students to move into but did not believe the application would free up HMOs and family homes. The ward Councillor noted that a previous application in the area was refused on appeal due to that application bringing an extra 425 students to the area and the impact that would have. They noted the application being considered by members was for over 3,000 bedrooms. They felt that it was long-term residents who would be impacted most by the application.

A second ward Councillor addressed the Committee, stating their belief that this was an overdevelopment. They wanted residents to be considered and did not believe they had been as part of this. They felt the application had not considered whether the site was suitable for PBSA. The ward Councillor did not believe that PBSA would free up family homes and HMOs.

The Planning Officer noted that the report before members addressed the issues that had been raised. They stated that there were clear parameters to approve the scheme contained within the report. The Planning Officer was aware of the need to provide family homes in Fallowfield and stated that without PBSA, students would continue to take up those family homes. The university had agreed a programme of work with the neighbourhood team in Fallowfield for the short and long term.

A member queried if the Planning Officer had details on the number of students who had moved out of HMO's. A member asked what percentage of the rooms in the application would be for second- and third-year students.

The Planning Officer stated that the council tax exemptions data from their housing colleagues provided the data regarding students moving into PBSA and away from HMO's. They noted that approving the outline application did not constrain the Committee but set a limit on what can be proposed in subsequent applications, such as the number of bedrooms and height of the building.

A member queried what the drawback was for students not in their first year. Another member asked that the developer works closely with the neighbourhood teams to improve their offer to the community.

The Planning Officer noted that they could not control through the Planning process whether second- and third-year students live in the building. They had discussed the possibility of reserving places for those students with the university. The Planning Officer stated that discussions were already underway between the developer and neighbourhood teams.

Councillor Andrews moved the Officer's recommendation to Approve.

Councillor Davies seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application.

PH/24/05 130387/FO/2021 - 130387/FO/2021 - The Former Gamecock Public House Boundary Lane Manchester M15 6GE

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of a part 7, part 9 storey purpose-built student accommodation building comprising 146 bed spaces (Sui Generis use class) with ancillary amenity space, a ground floor community hub (proposed for Use Classes F2(b), E(b), E (3), E(f)) and associated landscape works and infrastructure.

A scheme was reported to Planning and Highways Committee on the 16 November 2023 for a part 7, part 9 storey PBSA building providing 146 bed spaces. The Committee were 'minded to refuse' on the basis that PBSA of that size would have been contrary to maintaining a sustainable mixed residential neighbourhood and would lead to an imbalance of students living in the area. The planning policy context for this proposal was set out clearly in the section of the report with the subheading 'Policies'. That part of the report addresses all the policies that were relevant to the determination of the application. As had been set out in previous reports, officers did not consider that there was a policy-based reason to refuse this proposal.

There were 22 objections to the latest scheme, one expression of support and two neutral comments.

The Planning Officer stated that a letter of objection had been received from the Guinness Partnership on behalf of Cooper House residents, drawing particular attention to issues associated with the parking spaces for disabled people on Camelford Close, land they believe was not a public highway. The Council is a freeholder of the land on Camelford Close, providing a lease to the Guinness Trust but applicant would have a legal right to access the parking spaces. The Planning Officer noted that 31 objections from when the item was last before the Committee had been missed off this most recent report.

An objector stated that the development would have a profound impact on daylight and be overbearing on Cooper House. They felt there would be insufficient parking and loading, that would lead to further traffic congestion. They believed the

application to be a far denser development than others in the area. They felt the development threatened residents' quality of life.

A second objector noted that they had been consistent in stating that this development was inappropriate for the area. The proposed development would overlook children's bedrooms. They felt the offer of a Community Hub from the developer to be insulting and asked the Committee to refuse the application.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee, stating that this would be a high quality, sustainable development. They felt there was a pressing need for PBSA in Manchester and that this site was currently a blight on the local area. The proposed site was 500 metres from the University of Manchester and 200 metres from Manchester Metropolitan University. The proposed PBSA would offer a variety of accommodation, in-line with the offer of a typical PBSA and will provide disabled parking and a Community Hub. The proposal was in-line with other buildings in the area with the reduced scale and mass.

A ward Councillor addressed the Committee, stating that this was the time to finally refuse the application. They felt the proposal did nothing to address their concerns and had provided no evidence of the need for PBSA on this site. They felt the application would bring disruption to a settled residential area, failing to consider the health and wellbeing of residents. They felt that the trees proposed to be planted would not have sufficient light. The Councillor felt that the rooms offered were below the required standard.

A second ward Councillor addressed the Committee, stating that nothing had changed. They had objected on every occasion the application had been before the Committee. The application was in a residential area and students already living in the area had had a negative impact.

The Planning Officer noted that the applicant had amended the application on three occasions. The Planning Officer could find no policy-based reason to refuse the application based on the reason the Committee had been previously minded to refuse, on the basis that PBSA of this size would be contrary to maintaining a sustainable mixed residential neighbourhood and would lead to an imbalance of students living in the area.

A member stated that they thought a different reason for minded to refuse had been given at the previous meeting, relating to the size of the scheme. They felt the application did not fit with the Oxford Road Regeneration Scheme. They wanted to propose refusal based on the size of the scheme and policy H12.

The Director of Planning informed members that there was clear protocol relating to minded to refuse. When members are minded to refuse, Planning officers take that away to try to find a reason for refusal. Previously, the applicant had amended the scheme based on the reasons that members had been minded to refuse. At the previous meeting the reason for minded to refuse was that PBSA of this size would be contrary to maintaining a sustainable mixed residential neighbourhood and would lead to an imbalance of students living in the area, and not the height of the scheme.

If members wanted to change the reason, then they would have to be minded to refuse again rather than being able to propose refusal.

A member then stated that they would second the proposal if amended to minded to refuse on the basis of Policy H12.

A member then stated their belief that it would be disingenuous to be minded to refuse again, feeling that a decision was necessary. They queried how the vote would work.

The Director of Planning and the City Solicitor's representative informed the committee that if a motion is defeated, then another motion would need to be proposed for a decision. The same motion could not be moved twice.

Councillor Lovecy moved minded to refuse on the basis of Policy H12. Councillor Curley seconded the proposal. The proposal was defeated, with three members in favour, nine against and two abstentions.

Councillor S. Ali moved the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Chohan seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve subject to a legal agreement containing affordable rent obligations for up to 20% of all bed spaces being advertised as being below market rent level in each academic year.

PH/24/06 138302/FO/2023 - 1 Park Place Manchester M4 4EZ

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of a part 25 and part 15 storey residential building comprising 154 apartments (Use Class C3a) with ground floor commercial uses (Use Class E), together with associated residents amenity space, cycle parking, substation, servicing, and associated landscaping works following demolition of existing buildings.

The proposal would create 154 homes, of which up to 20% would be affordable (shared ownership), with commercial space in a part 15, part 25 storey building. There would be public realm, parking for disabled residents and a loading bay.

Six objections had been received.

The Planning Officer report incorrectly stated that the affordable housing as part of the application was to be shared ownership, but it would be discounted market sales at 80% of market rates.

The applicant attended and addressed the Committee, noting that they had been a Manchester resident for a long time and had made a high-quality application

containing 20% affordable housing. The application provided commercial space whilst also aligning with the zero carbon aims of the city.

Councillor Riasat noted that the report was detailed and was happy to move the Officer's recommendation.

A member had concerns regarding the design of the application, with white buildings often becoming stained.

The Planning Officer stated that there were lots of white buildings that were not stained. When designed correctly, white buildings will remain white. The application had employed an experienced architect.

Councillor S. Ali seconded the proposal of Councillor Riasat to move the Officer's recommendation.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a legal agreement to secure 20% affordable housing and to secure the use of the project architect.

PH/24/07 137657/FO/2023 - 27-29 Middleton Road Manchester M8 5DT

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of two storey building (with basement) to form synagogue (Class F.1) following demolition of existing building, together with associated parking and landscaping.

The application related to a pair of semi-detached dwellinghouses which had been subdivided into flats. Consent is sought for the erection of a two-storey building (with basement) to form a synagogue (Class F.1) following demolition of existing building, together with associated parking and landscaping. The application site is located within the Crumpsall Lane Conservation Area.

7 objections and 103 emails of support had been received.

The Planning Officer stated that if members were to agree the recommendation of Officers, they would ask for one additional condition regarding another bat survey taking place before demolition of the building.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee, noting the proposal to demolish two houses and replace with a religious centre. The houses are part of a conservation area and were part of the reason why there is a conservation area in the first place. The objector could not see the justification for demolishing the properties. They raised concerns regarding traffic, noting the site is between two sets of traffic lights with congestion issues already apparent. They felt the application would make the congestion issues worse.

The applicant attended and addressed the Committee, accepting that it was a conservation area. The application had been in process for two years to ensure that the design addressed the needs of the area. They noted that they would not be able to keep the building as it was, and that the application brought less than substantial harm. Issues relating to traffic and parking had been addressed in the report, noting that the building was for an Orthodox religious community who were prohibited from driving on the days they visited the centre.

The Planning Officer accepted that it was regrettable to lose a building in a conservation area but it has been fully explored with the applicant whether it was possible to reuse the existing building or retain the frontage but it was accepted that the proposed scheme was an appropriate design and that there would be less than substantial harm with the public benefits outweighing any limited harm. The Planning Officer was satisfied that users of the centre would walk and not drive.

A member queried if the building was still in use as housing.

The Planning Officer stated that the building was in use as apartments, owned by the applicant. There was a condition that the applicant would assist those living in the apartments with relocation.

A member questioned if there would be a pressure on timing relating to that relocation.

The Planning Officer stated that the condition would include time scales to relocate existing tenants.

Councillor Riasat moved the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor S. Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve (subject to statutory notices lapsing and no new issues being raised).

PH/24/08 138294/FO/2023 - Land At Plymouth Grove Manchester

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of a part six storey, part eight storey building for use as purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) (Sui Generis) comprising 263 bed spaces, with associated amenity space, cycle parking, external landscaping, access, and other associated works.

6 objections had been received.

The Planning Officer recommended a further condition should the Committee be Minded to Approve, to agree details of boundary treatment.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee, stating that there had been extensive engagement regarding the application from the outset. The application would reuse a vacant brownfield site. The agent stated that there was a clear need for additional student accommodation in Manchester. The agent stated that the application met Policy H12. The application would provide economic and regeneration benefits, bringing construction jobs that would be targeted at Manchester residents. They noted there had been no objections from statutory consultees.

Councillor Hewitson proposed a site visit, noting that the proposed site was facing a children's nursery and would overshadow nearby buildings.

Councillor Curley seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the motion for a site visit in order to investigate the potential impact of overshadowing on nearby buildings and the impact on the nearby children's nursery.

This page is intentionally left blank

Health and Wellbeing Board

Minutes of the meeting held on 24 January 2024

Present:

Councillor T Robinson, Executive Member for Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care (MCC) - In the Chair
Councillor Chambers Deputy Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care
Katy Calvin, Thomas - Manchester Local Care Organisation
David Regan, Director of Public Health
Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services
Amanda Smith, Chair, Healthwatch
Dr Murugesan Raja, Manchester GP Board
Dr Geeta Wadhwa, Manchester GP Board
Dr Doug Jeffrey, Manchester GP Board

Apologies:

Councillor Craig, Leader of the Council
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools Services
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust
Tom Hinchliffe, Deputy Place Based Lead

Also in attendance:

Dr Cordelle Ofori, Deputy Director of Public Health
Jo Johnston, Head of Reform and Innovation
Andrea Daubney, Assistant Director for Education
Barry Gilesie, Assistant Director of Public Health
Julie Jerram, Programme Lead, Public Health
Laura Parker, Public Health
Neil Bendel, Public Health

HWB/24/01 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 1 November 2023 as a correct record.

HWB/24/02 Manchester Partnership Board update

The Board received a verbal update from the Director of Public Health following the Manchester Partnership Board meeting held on 23 January 2024.

The private meeting of the Board considered verbal updates from the Manchester Foundation Trust (MFT), Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO), Primary Care

providers, Greater Manchester Mental Health Foundation Trust (GMMH). The updates focussed on the ongoing challenges to health service provision during the winter period and how the services had responded. It was reported that MFT had set an Operations Pressure Escalation Level (Opel) at 3 and this had been adjusted to Opel 2. Reference was also made to the pressures experienced by the North-West Ambulance Service and MLCO control room where it was recognised both organisations were performing well. The Board also discussed the impact of recent worker strikes within the health service and the use of the Strategic and Operational Plan for the locality which would be submitted to the Health and Well Being Board for a formal agreement and sign-off. Updates were provided on the work of MFT and GMMH.

Decision

The Board noted the update.

HWB/24/03 Update on Board Recommendations from 2023

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health that provided a summary of the progress made on the reports considered and subsequent decisions the Board had agreed during the calendar year 2023. Reference was made to the subjects considered by the Board and where follow up work had developed into actions and positive outcomes throughout the year.

From the subjects listed in the appendix, the Director of Public Health referred to a number of matters, including the Making Manchester Fairer (MMF) report in January 2023, that looked to develop a strategy and in particular the adoption of a Anti-Poverty Strategy which has led in the first year to a number of positive actions in helping to address anti-poverty. In developing the MMF strategy, a thematic approach to different aspects of health provision has continued during the year. In reference to the oral health and dentistry, the Board was advised that only £10k of an expected £150k funding was received. However, it was anticipated that the full amount would be provided in 2024/25. A further update will be provided in November 2023. Health protection work has provided the city with plans to prepare for outbreaks of infections such as measles.

The Board was advised that as part of MMF, Greater Manchester Public Health Leadership Group had commissioned the Leadership Centre to work with 50 systems leaders from across the ten locality Integrated Care Services to build understanding, confidence and capacity around collaborative and system leadership. An offer of five per locality has been made to participate in the programme which will be delivered through four face-to-face workshops and online convening sessions running up to August 2024. Members of the Board were asked to propose individuals to take part in the training.

The Chair invited members to respond to the offer of training from the GM Public Health Leadership Group as soon as possible. In commenting on the report, the Chair stated that the challenge made for Making Manchester Fairer on progressing fairer health across Greater Manchester NHS and Greater Manchester Integrated Care Partnership and GMCA to ensure that the work of each organisation is aligned

and complements each other. A report providing an update on Fairer Health will be submitted later in the year.

The Chair requested that the Armed Forces Community JSNA is a regular item on the work programme to allow the Board to be updated and provide further input.

The Chair also referred to the plans in place to address the outbreak of infections and in noting the current measles outbreak in parts of England it was requested that an update is submitted to the next meeting, concerning the impact on services in Manchester.

In noting the funding provision for oral health, the Chair stated that it is important for notifications to be clear on what funding will be available and when it will be provided, to ensure effective planning and delivery of services.

The Chair invited questions from the Board.

A member thanked Public Health staff for the positive impact their work on Making Manchester Fairer and Health Inequalities has had the strategic thinking and focus across the service provision of organisations concerned. It was noted that the Board has a key role to report initiatives in public health for the city and this will continue through the forward planning and Board membership.

Decisions

1. That the Board note the report.
2. That the Director of Public Health be requested to inform the Chair of the MFT on the outcome of the report.
3. That a report on the Update on Board Recommendations be submitted on a annual basis to the Board (submit to the meeting of the Board in January 2025).

HWB/24/04 Stopping the start: Our New Plan to Create a Smokefree Generation

The Board considered the report of the Deputy Director of Public Health that follows up to the initial report, "Stopping the start: Our new plan to create a smokefree generation in Manchester" that was submitted in November 2023. The report outlined the ongoing devastating Public Health crisis and health inequalities which are caused by tobacco use in the UK. The report also proposed measures to address these Public Health problems, and are summarised as follows:

- i) To bring forward legislation that will ensure that children turning the age of fourteen, or younger, will never legally be sold tobacco.
- ii) To increase investment in stop smoking services.

- iii) To support the use of vaping devices for existing tobacco smokers who wish to stop. The “Swap to Stop” scheme will provide up to one million free vapes in England (in conjunction with local services).
- iv) A suite of measures to protect and discourage children from vaping.

The final decisions, following the public consultation about legislative changes in relation to the age of sale of tobacco and the marketing of vaping, have not been reached by government.

The Director of Public Health introduced the report and informed the Board that following a meeting with the Chief Medical Officer, this legislation is considered the most important in a generation. The national consultation response will be presented to Parliament in the coming weeks and if the proposals made are supported, it will result in a second reading of the Bill. Local MPs will be briefed and provided with up-to-date information from local sources including the report submitted.

The Chair welcomed the report and asked how the response from Manchester compared to the responses from other core cities.

It was reported that Manchester has a high prevalence of smoking and health inequalities, and the funding formula used has reflected this in the funding allocation that has been made. The funds will be received as a Section 31 grant and will require the funds to be used to support community smoking cessation services. There is a requirement to provide evidence on how the funding is spent in order to receive further funding over the five-year period. Manchester has a smoking cessation infrastructure in place and will be able to start work in April.

A Board member asked how the implementation of the initiative would help to stop smoking and prevent people from smoking for sustained results. It was reported that the implementation is based on NICE guidance and will include medication with follow up support over a twelve-week period.

A Board member asked what guidance will be included for the provision of vapes. It was reported that guidance and support will be included in the use of vapes as an alternative to smoking.

The Chair referred to the relationship with Trading Standards to ensure that enforcement work concerning counterfeit vapes is ongoing and it was reported that there is a good relationship with Trading Standards with daily contact and regular attendance at Tobacco Alliance meetings.

The Chair noted that the current arrangements and stresses the importance of maintaining contact with Trading Standards to ensure vapes sales and premises are strictly monitored and policed.

It was reported that work is ongoing to develop policy on ethical advertising regarding vaping products and gambling advertising in the city with a view to using the Council’s authority to restrict adverts that are considered harmful to individuals and the public’s health.

A Board member asked what an expected target may be to reduce smoking after five years of funding. It was reported that using data on smoking reduction taken over the past few years it will be possible to set an expected trend and level of reducing smoking for the end of the funding period.

A board member referred to measures to reduce child/youth vaping and what that will include. It was reported that a training package had been developed for professionals working with children and a package for use by parents.

Decisions

1. That the Board noted the report.
2. That the Board support the proposed investment plan and Swap to Stop scheme.

HWB/24/05 Manchester Child Death Overview Panel 2022-23 Annual Report

The Board considered the report of the Assistant Director of Public Health that provided the 2022-23 Manchester Child Death Overview Panel (CDOP) Annual Report and a summary of the key factors and modifiable factors for cases closed between 1 April 2022 and 31 March 2023.

The Chair suggested that the report could be referred to the Children and Young Peoples Scrutiny Committee. The Director of Public undertook to raise the suggestion with Councillor Reid, chair of the scrutiny committee for the inclusion on the committee's work programme as an annual report.

Decisions

1. That the Board note the report and the two recommendations (see below).
2. That the Director of Public contact Councillor Reid, chair of the Children and Young Peoples Scrutiny Committee for the inclusion of the report on the committee's work programme.

Recommendation 1: The CDOP Manager will continue to work with Public Health colleagues in the development and delivery of the refreshed Reducing Infant Mortality Strategy.

Recommendation 2: Manchester CDOP continues to work with the other 3 GM CDOPs, GM Association of Directors of Public Health, and the broader integrated care system leadership – involving specialist human resource and finance expertise – to initiate a change programme to create a sustainable and flexible workforce model hosted by an appropriate organisation within GM.

The Chair took the opportunity to thank Barry Gillespie on behalf of the Board for his work in the authority in view of his impending retirement.

HWB/24/06 Joint Strategic Needs Assessments (JSNAs) - Health and Homelessness and Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Communities

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health that provided as summary of the content of two recently produced JSNAs on:

- Health and Homelessness, and
- Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) communities

The Board received an update from Neil Bendel (Health and Homelessness) and Laura Parker (Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) communities).

The Chair requested an update on the engagement work for the GRT communities. It was reported that engagement work has happening through the Europa and the Irish Community Care organisations to access the wider travelling communities. It was noted that more work is needed to engage with the Irish traveller community due to there being no permanent traveller sites in the city. The engagement provided an opportunity for the development of a working relationship and trust building from a community that may feel let down.

The Chair welcomed the report and noted that further work with stakeholders is required to focus on data collection and develop the process of engagement with communities.

Decisions

1. That the Board note the content of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessments on: Health and Homelessness, and Gypsy, Roma and Traveller (GRT) communities.
2. That the Board support the opportunities for further action described in the JSNAs.
3. That an update report be submitted concerning work that has taken place with stakeholders regarding data sets/ data collection and the development of engagement with GRT communities.

HWB/24/07 Making Manchester Fairer: Update on the Kickstarter Schemes

The Board considered the report of the Deputy Director of Public Health that provided an update on the implementation and delivery of the Making Manchester Fairer (MMF) Kickstarter Schemes:

- (i) Improving Health Equity for Children and Young People- Children's Element
- (ii) Early Help for Adults Experiencing Multiple and Complex Disadvantage.

Dr Cordelle Ofori, Deputy Director of Public Health, Jo Johnston, Head of Reform and Innovation and Andrea Daubney, Assistant Director for Education presented the report.

In welcoming the report, the Chair stated that the monitoring of the schemes for the remainder of the year will be essential following the embedding of aims of the Making Manchester Fairer. The success of MMF will be judged from the response of Manchester's residents and how they have seen changes happen where they live.

Decision

That the Board note progress made on the delivery of the MMF Kickstarter schemes:

- (i) Improving Health Equity for Children and Young People - Children's Element
- (ii) Early Help for Adults Experiencing Multiple and Complex Disadvantage.

HWB/24/08 Retirement of the Director of Public Health

The Chair reported that this would be the last meeting attended by David Regan as the Director of Public Health and that he will be retiring in April. The Board gave its thanks in recognising David's service and tireless work and support to officers and stakeholders to develop and strengthening partnership working during his time in this important role.

The Board wished David well for his future and a happy retirement.

This page is intentionally left blank