



Executive

Date: Wednesday, 14 October 2020

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: [https://manchester-public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/485349](https://manchester.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/485349)

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

Under the provisions of these regulations the location where a meeting is held can include reference to more than one place including electronic, digital or virtual locations such as Internet locations, web addresses or conference call telephone numbers.

To attend this meeting it can be watched live as a webcast. The recording of the webcast will also be available for viewing after the meeting has ended.

Membership of the Executive

Councillors

Leese (Chair), Akbar, Bridges, Craig, N Murphy, Ollerhead, Rahman, Stogia and Richards

Membership of the Consultative Panel

Councillors

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

The Consultative Panel has a standing invitation to attend meetings of the Executive. The Members of the Panel may speak at these meetings but cannot vote on the decisions taken at the meetings.

Agenda

1. Appeals

To consider any appeals from the public against refusal to allow inspection of background documents and/or the inclusion of items in the confidential part of the agenda.

2. Interests

To allow Members an opportunity to [a] declare any personal, prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interests they might have in any items which appear on this agenda; and [b] record any items from which they are precluded from voting as a result of Council Tax/Council rent arrears; [c] the existence and nature of party whipping arrangements in respect of any item to be considered at this meeting. Members with a personal interest should declare that at the start of the item under consideration. If Members also have a prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interest they must withdraw from the meeting during the consideration of the item.

3. Minutes

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2020 (to follow).

4. COVID-19 Monthly Update Report

The report of the Chief Executive is to follow.

All Wards

5. Revenue Budget Monitoring 2020/21

The report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer will follow.

All Wards

6. Capital Budget Monitoring 2020/21

The report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer will follow.

All Wards

7. Capital Programme Update

The report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer will follow.

All Wards

8. Purpose Built Student Accommodation in Manchester

The report of the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) is enclosed.

**Ardwick;
Deansgate;
Fallowfield;
Hulme;
Levenshulme;
Longsight;
Moss Side;
Old Moat;
Piccadilly;
Rusholme;
Withington**

9. **Demolition of the Maisonettes on Bridgnorth Road**
The report of the Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth is enclosed. **Higher Blackley**
25 - 32
10. **Lyndene Children's Home - Re-modelling and Next Steps**
The report of the Strategic Director for Children and Education Services is enclosed. **All Wards**
33 - 44
11. **Former Central Retail Park Development Framework**
The report of the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) will follow. **Ancoats and Beswick;
Piccadilly**
12. **Exclusion of the Public**
The officers consider that the following item or items contains exempt information as provided for in the Local Government Access to Information Act and that the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information. The Executive is recommended to agree the necessary resolutions excluding the public from the meeting during consideration of these items. At the time this agenda is published no representations have been made that this part of the meeting should be open to the public.
13. **Capital Budget Monitoring 2020/21 Part B**
The report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer will follow. **All Wards**

Information about the Executive

The Executive is made up of nine Councillors: the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council and seven Executive Members with responsibility for: Children Services & Schools; Finance & Human Resources; Adult Services; Skills, Culture & Leisure; Neighbourhoods; Housing & Regeneration; and Environment, Planning & Transport. The Leader of the Council chairs the meetings of the Executive.

The Executive has full authority for implementing the Council's Budgetary and Policy Framework, and this means that most of its decisions do not need approval by Council, although they may still be subject to detailed review through the Council's overview and scrutiny procedures.

The Council wants to consult people as fully as possible before making decisions that affect them. Members of the public do not have a right to speak at meetings but may do so if invited by the Chair. If you have a special interest in an item on the agenda and want to speak, tell the Committee Officer, who will pass on your request to the Chair. Groups of people will usually be asked to nominate a spokesperson. Speaking at a meeting will require a telephone or a video link to the virtual meeting.

The Council is concerned to ensure that its meetings are as open as possible and confidential business is kept to a strict minimum. When confidential items are involved these are considered at the end of the meeting and the means of external access to the virtual meeting are suspended.

Joanne Roney OBE
Chief Executive
Level 3, Town Hall Extension,
Albert Square,
Manchester, M60 2LA

Further Information

For help, advice and information about this meeting please contact the Committee Officer:
Donald Connolly
Tel: 0161 2343034
Email: d.connolly@manchester.gov.uk

This agenda was issued on **Tuesday, 6 October 2020** by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Manchester City Council, Level 3, Town Hall Extension (Lloyd Street Elevation), Manchester M60 2LA

**Manchester City Council
Report for Resolution**

Report to: Executive - 14 October 2020

Subject: Purpose Built Student Accommodation in Manchester

Report of: Strategic Director (Growth & Development)

Summary

This report informs the Executive of the outcome of a consultation exercise with key stakeholders, on purpose built student accommodation (PBSA) in Manchester. In addition, this report seeks the Executive's approval to use the outcomes to further inform a policy approach to purpose built student accommodation in Manchester, with a view of developing a policy position as part of the Local Plan review process, subject to further consultation.

Recommendations

The Executive is recommended:

1. To note the outcome of the consultation exercise with key stakeholders on purpose built student accommodation.
 2. To endorse the approach set out in the report to help guide the decision making process in advance of the review of the Local Plan and request the Planning and Highways Committee take this approach into material consideration until the Local Plan has been reviewed.
-

Wards Affected – Deansgate, Piccadilly, Ardwick, Rusholme, Longsight, Hulme, Moss Side, Fallowfield, Withington, Old Moat, and Levenshulme

Environmental Impact Assessment - the impact of the decisions proposed in this report on achieving the zero-carbon target for the city

The suggested revised approach to Purpose Built Student Accommodation will only consider development of new accommodation in close proximity to the University campuses, reducing the need to travel, and thus minimising carbon emissions. Green travel plans will also be encouraged. There is also a key ambition to increase the quality of accommodation, which will be required to meet high standards of sustainability that contribute to achieving the zero carbon target.

Our Manchester Strategy outcomes	Contribution to the strategy
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and	Students make a significant economic contribution to Manchester whilst they live and study in the city.

opportunities	The development of assets within the Oxford Road Corridor area is vital to capture the commercial potential of research and innovation and help to realise the economic potential of the Corridor.
A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city's economic success	A high quality residential offer for students in appropriate locations, is critical for Manchester's Universities ability to attract and retain students in a global market. The retention of highly skilled graduates from the city's universities is a key component in the drive towards a knowledge economy, and forming the critical mass of activity necessary to strengthen the economy.
A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities	Freeing up former student-lets and, therefore, increasing the supply of good quality homes for sale and rent will provide the opportunity for Manchester residents to raise their individual and collective aspirations.
A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work	Managing the impact of large student populations on residential neighbourhoods will lead to improved local resident satisfaction. The city's liveability, sustainability and connectivity aspirations can be achieved by integrating green and smart ideas into new student developments, as part of the planning process. It is expected that journeys will be made using public transport and active modes, supporting the climate change and clean air policy responses.
A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth	Student accommodation will be encouraged in areas which are in close proximity to both the University campuses and high frequency public transport routes.

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

- Equal Opportunities Policy
- Risk Management
- Legal Considerations

Financial Consequences – Revenue

Students are exempt from paying Council Tax and in 2019/20 Manchester will forego almost £17m in tax revenue due to this exemption. There is potential to improve the

Council's Council Tax revenue through a reduction in student Council Tax exemptions in city centre and south Manchester properties by directing students to purpose built student accommodation (PBSA).

Financial Consequences – Capital

None arising from this report.

Contact Officers:

Name: Louise Wyman
 Position: Strategic Director, Growth & Development
 Telephone: 0161 234 5515
 E-mail: l.wyman@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Dave Roscoe
 Position: Deputy Director of Planning
 Telephone: 0161 234 4567
 E-mail: d.roscoe@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Pat Bartoli
 Position: Director of City Centre Growth & Infrastructure
 Telephone: 0161 234 3329
 E-mail: p.bartoli@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

The following documents disclose important facts on which the report is based and have been relied upon in preparing the report. Copies of the background documents are available up to 4 years after the date of the meeting. If you would like a copy please contact one of the contact officers above.

- Manchester Student Strategy - Report to Communities and Neighbourhoods Overview and Scrutiny Committee, 19th May 2009
- Student Strategy Implementation Plan – Report to Executive, 21st October 2009
- The Manchester Core Strategy - Adopted on 11th July 2012
- Manchester Residential Growth Strategy and Action Plan 2016/17 – Report to Executive, 2 March 2016
- Corridor Manchester Strategic Spatial Framework - Report to Executive, 7th March 2018
- Manchester Science Park Strategic Regeneration Framework Update - August 2018
- Oxford Road Corridor Strategic Regeneration Framework Guidance - November 2018
- Manchester Science Park (MSP) SRF update - Report to Executive, 14th November 2018
- Report to Executive - 13 November 2019 - Consideration of Policy H12: Purpose Built Student Accommodation Within the Changing Market Context

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Manchester is widely recognised as being in the top tier of international cities for higher education, rich in research excellence and innovation that is helping to drive the economy and generate jobs and growth. Key to Manchester's ambition of developing a world class education hub is the city's ability to compete for students, resources, and quality staff in a highly competitive global market. An important element of this relates to the city's residential offer, which has to be able to meet the expectations of students from home and abroad in neighbourhoods close to the universities and beyond.
- 1.2 Manchester has one of the largest student populations in Europe, with over 90,000 students at Greater Manchester's five universities, and over 380,000 students at the 22 Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) within an hour's drive. There were 74,164 students enrolled at one of Manchester's three HEIs in 2017/18, of which 48,393 had a term time address in Manchester (HESA). Of the remaining c.25,000 students, a significant proportion live at home with their families across Greater Manchester and beyond.
- 1.3 The resident student population makes an invaluable contribution to the city's economy, diversity and vibrancy whilst they study here. Graduates from Manchester's universities are one of the core assets underpinning a broad based, high skilled economy and the driving force behind some of Manchester's most valuable growth sectors in advanced manufacturing, health and life sciences. Manchester Universities have a high retention rate of students, with over 50% of students staying in the city after graduating.
- 1.4 The Council is committed to creating a sustainable and inclusive residential market that meets the demands of all residents across the city, alongside the Council's wider objectives. Previous reports to the Executive have highlighted how the make-up of Manchester's population has a direct link to changes in residential demand. In light of this, the Council must ensure that as the population expands, all residents have access to good quality accommodation, in terms of type, price and tenure. It is against this background that the Council and its partners have to consider how to approach the provision of student accommodation in the city.
- 1.5 Following the publication of the Student Strategy in 2009, fears of an oversupply of PBSA were raised in response to the announcement in 2010 that tuition fees would rise. At the same time, following the global economic recession, developers/investors started to see PBSA as an attractive investable proposition in comparison to other types of development including mainstream residential and commercial. It was against this backdrop, and the ensuing fall in undergraduate admissions, that the Core Strategy was developed.
- 1.6 Policy H12 of the city's Core Strategy (adopted in 2012) was developed with the objective of managing the supply of student accommodation in Manchester. It sets out the criteria which have been used to guide planning applications for student accommodation since then.

- 1.7 As reported to Executive on 13 November 2019, whilst Policy H12 remains relevant, and provides an effective tool in determining planning applications, market changes, which have seen higher numbers of second and third year students in particular living in the mainstream private rented sector in the city centre, set a new context in which the Policy needs to be interpreted and applied. This will primarily respond to affordability challenges and the need to locate accommodation in close proximity to the HEI's. The Executive agreed that key stakeholders should be consulted on the key policy considerations and issues on purpose built student accommodation, as detailed in the report and outlined in Section 4.0.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The report to Executive in November 2019, set out a number of issues and considerations regarding purpose built student accommodation in Manchester, which would need to be considered in developing a policy position, as part of the review of Manchester's Local Plan. This was in response to the significant changes in both the demography (make up and location) and needs of the student population, and the wider development context, since the adoption of the Student Strategy, the Core Strategy and Policy H12.
- 2.2 Manchester's total student population is the largest concentration outside London, with a growing proportion of international students (prior to the COVID-19 crisis). International students are typically choosing to live in the city centre, driven by rising lifestyle expectations, property type and management.
- 2.3 There were c.24,000 total PBSA beds available to students in Manchester for the 2018/19 academic year, owned or leased by either the two Universities or the private sector. This accommodation varied in age, price and quality. In the period 2010/11 - 2018/19, 6,440 new homes have been built in the city centre, of which c.1,800 units were PBSA. This means that for most students choosing to live in the city centre, the mainstream lettings market is the most likely destination. The issues associated with this were outlined in the November 2019 report.
- 2.4 The Council has begun the process to review the Core Strategy, adopted in 2012; and remaining policies from the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) adopted in 1995. The new Local Plan will set out how the city should plan for new development, infrastructure and a growing population over the next 15 years, whilst ensuring the zero-carbon framework is achieved. An initial public consultation was held February - May 2020, on the issues to be covered in the new plan. The review of the Local Plan will consider the residential context in the city centre and is due to be adopted in 2023, after further consultation stages are completed.

3.0 Key Issues and Policy Considerations

- 3.1 The report to Executive on 13 November 2019, outlined some of the

considerations for reviewing Policy H12 and the policy on purpose built student accommodation within the changing market context, which should be included in the consultation. These are summarised below and are also set out in more detail in Appendix 1:

- a) The starting point for all student residential schemes should be that they contribute to delivering the regeneration objectives for the city; supporting employment growth, graduate and talent retention, place making and the city's international reputation.
- b) The approach needs to be within the context of the approved Corridor Spatial Framework which establishes the principle that development of land in the Oxford Road Corridor should prioritise commercial or educational/research use, in order to maximise the growth potential of the Corridor, recognising the limited availability of land. Student accommodation should, therefore, be in the right locations, in appropriate numbers, and only where it supports wider growth.
- c) As shown by the evidence, Manchester is one of the most expensive cities in the UK for PBSA. A more diverse pipeline of new PBSA is now needed to help stabilise rental growth. It is critical to ensure there is a residential market, which meets the needs of students at an affordable price.
- d) The overall quality of Manchester's PBSA stock is poor compared to other cities. For Manchester to remain competitive as a world class education hub, with an accommodation offer to match, the current level of poor quality accommodation needs to be addressed. New stock in appropriate locations represents an opportunity to deliver an improved student experience, which better reflects Manchester's institutions and its educational reputation overall, and also helps to contribute to sustainability targets. All PBSA must be of a high quality, providing a high standard of living, within close proximity to the city's higher education institutions.
- e) Linked to the above, purpose built accommodation should consider the welfare and wellbeing of students as a major factor, in both design and management. Ensuring that student accommodation is delivered in safe and secure locations, and with appropriate management and facilities, will be a fundamental consideration for any PBSA proposals. Location of accommodation close to University facilities is a critical issue in ensuring the safety and wellbeing of students.
- f) It is currently voluntary for private developers who build and operate PBSA to sign up to the three codes of practice required for higher education providers, which aim to ensure that accredited student accommodation is safe, good quality and reputable. These are:
 - The Universities UK/GuildHE Code of Practice for University Managed Student Accommodation.

- The ANUK/Unipol Code of Standards for Larger Residential Developments for Student Accommodation Managed and Controlled by Educational Establishments
- The ANUK/Unipol Code of Standards for Larger Developments for Student Accommodation NOT Managed and Controlled by Educational Establishment.

It is suggested that, the principles included within these three codes of practice should be adopted for all new PBSA developments, whether private sector or educational establishment led.

- g) It should also be noted that owners of PBSA are not required to pay business rates on this accommodation, meaning that they currently do not make a direct tax contribution to the place making or management of the areas in which they are located, despite the additional management issues that can arise from a concentration of student tenants. There may be opportunities to look at reducing the impact of this through the planning process, as part of the renewed Local Plan policies.
- h) Density of student accommodation will be essential to deliver the level of new high quality accommodation needed within the context of scarce land availability both in the Oxford Road Corridor area and the wider city centre.
- i) Given the current climate emergency and Manchester's commitment to be carbon neutral by 2038, it is increasingly important that the location of student accommodation in Manchester should continue to be driven by proximity to university campuses, reducing the need to travel, and to sustainable modes of transport. This supports existing green travel plans.

4.0 Consultation Process

The consultation on purpose built student consultation had two phases. A consultation process has taken place with developers, students and higher education establishments as key stakeholders (Phase 1). Consultation with residents and other organisations (Phase 2), has taken place as part of the local plan review to inform the further consideration of a policy position on purpose built student accommodation in Manchester. The key stakeholders engaged with are as follows:

Phase 1 – Property Developers; students; higher education establishments

Phase 2 – Manchester residents and businesses

5.0 Outcomes of the consultation

Phase 1

- 5.1 Consultation with Phase 1 stakeholders closed on 9th March 2020 and there were 85 respondents with the following breakdown: 6 property developers; 3 higher education establishments; 76 students (this includes representation from Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU) Student Union).
- 5.2 Whilst property developers broadly agreed with the content and recommendations set out in the November 2019 report, they raised the following challenges:
- In developing policies, the provision for new student accommodation and their locations should be balanced with the need to promote other types of housing to ensure long term retention of talent. A suggestion would be to link this to a Council aim to increase skill retention from the current 50% of graduates to a higher figure.
 - Agreed with the principle to focus PBSA within close vicinity of the University campuses, but the proposal to only consider development of new accommodation in such locations is too rigid and does not provide the flexibility needed for the lifetime of the Local Plan. A strict approach such as this could stifle delivery of other types of housing in city centre areas, and there is a need to balance PBSA provision with supply of conventional homes for people who want city centre living.
 - The requirement for PBSA should not undermine the need to secure mixed and inclusive neighbourhoods; any provision will need to contribute positively to creating communities and place-making.
 - Agreed that an approach for the delivery of affordable PBSA should be included within the policy, but the suggestion to follow the Mayor of London's approach needs further consideration. The London policy states that 35% of bedrooms in PBSA are required to be affordable, or to follow the Viability Tested Route and submit evidence to justify any reduction in this figure.
 - To ensure exceptional, functional accommodation, the Council should set out some high level standards, such as room sizes, communal spaces and storage to ensure quality of accommodation is delivered.
 - The policy should provide the mechanism for the re-use of poor quality or discontinued PBSA sites for other residential uses and not just family accommodation as currently stated.
- 5.3 Of the 76 students who responded to an on line survey in relation to purpose built student accommodation, 31 stated that they were looking to move to new accommodation for their subsequent academic year but less than 50% of these said they wanted to share any future accommodation with other students. Of the 31, 20% stated they wanted to move closer to their campus and just over 50% stated they wanted to move closer to Manchester city centre.
- 5.4 The MMU Student Union, who represent 38,000 students, provided a response which set out the following challenges:

- Increasingly students are concerned about who they are living with rather than where they live, suggesting that allocation of rooms by PBSA operators is a barrier to students taking up places in PBSA – a problem not present in HMO rentals.
- The National Union of Students defines affordable as rooms being offered at 50% of the maximum student loan available to UK-domiciled students and they would encourage Manchester City Council to use a similar percentage.
- Agreed broadly with all of the principles laid out in the report and would additionally encourage any new PBSA operators to sign up to the University's accreditation scheme through Manchester Student Homes. (MMU Student Union).

5.5 Responses were received from MMU, University of Manchester (UoM) and the Royal Northern College of Music (RCNM) raising similar issues and recommendations, including the following:

- The reports fails to recognise complexities of the overall student population which includes international, under-graduate, postgraduate, mature, living at home, parent students and part-time students. Accommodation preferences are different for a typical under-graduate student, and even within this cohort there is no homogenous type of student that can be planned for in terms of their living choices.
- It should be noted that there will always be a cohort of students that make informed choices to reside in a local community, in traditional shared housing, alongside their peers for both experiential and affordability reasons.
- There is a risk that the rental market becomes depressed and subject to high numbers of voids which cause their own blight on the community. There are reports of this already happening in areas of Leeds, Nottingham, Liverpool and Belfast where action was implemented to relocate students to city centre areas. These cities also experience voids in City Centre PBSA.
- Cost and availability of land in the city centre is prohibitive to many developers and the associated financial model drives the delivery of high end accommodation leaving the affordability elements lacking. In order to provide affordable accommodation in these locations the resulting designs will deliver high density and a reduction in welfare support and facilities e.g. public realm, social space, bathrooms and lounges, impacting on student experience and demand.
- PBSA has historically not provided robust welfare and pastoral care for tenants and the introduction of such support systems will come at a cost per bed space to provide the necessary staffing levels and specialist training. This will impact further on student rents.
- It may be naive to assume freeing up former student lets would result in a return to family housing, raising that the majority of Landlords have invested in a buy to let model and will need to swiftly re-fill the properties to satisfy their funders. The next tenure group is unlikely to be families as this type of accommodation no longer fits a modern family requirement.

- The requirement for clarification of the geographical definition of the Oxford Road Corridor and the need to work in collaboration to agree locations suitable for PBSA development
- Whilst they welcomed the consultation document's reference to the need for affordable accommodation, they disagreed with the suggestion of implementing a similar protocol as the draft London Plan.

Phase 2

- 5.6 Consultation on Local Plan Issues closed on 3 May and individuals were asked to comment on the following statement:

“Manchester is home to the largest number of students outside London. Approaches to provide purpose-built student accommodation at a range of price levels may allow existing student homes to revert back to family use and reduce the need for students to rent mainstream accommodation, thereby preventing over-inflation of rental costs in newer developments.”

- 5.7 There were 561 respondents overall to the Local Plan consultation, made up of residents, businesses, statutory consultees and partner agencies (although not all commented on the purpose built student accommodation statement). It should be noted that most of the responses were from residents.
- 5.8 Whilst most residents who responded on the purpose built student accommodation question statement acknowledged the need for a range of good quality, affordable accommodation there was a general consensus that this should not include multi occupation developments or subdivision of buildings into multiple units. There was significant opposition to the conversion of existing family homes into shared living arrangements for students.
- 5.9 A number of respondents referenced the fact that they would encourage the development of settled and mixed communities but opposed the idea of turning parts of the city into predominantly student only areas.
- 5.10 There was significant opposition to the idea of further development in the Oxford Road Corridor, with a number of respondents referring to what they described as “over development”
- 5.11 Most respondents were supportive of the idea of converting existing HMOs back to family use. In addition, respondents stated that any future Council strategy should impose restrictions on private landlords converting properties into HMOs.
- 5.12 A further concern raised related to increased problems of littering and refuse build-up in the areas surrounding multi occupational buildings.
- 5.13 It was commented that submissions from landowners and developers (normally via a professional agent) generally seek to promote their own sites for development, and are supportive of growth and development in general.

6.0 Response to the Issues Raised from the Consultation

- 6.1 In response to the requirement for high level standards to ensure quality of accommodation is delivered, planning proposals are assessed to ensure all new accommodation is in line with the required space standards adopted by Manchester in 2016 as part of the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance. Development proposals are assessed against a number of criteria to ensure both sustainable development and health and safety is adhered to in the design. PBSA schemes will need to conform to all existing Manchester policies and specific standards, in advance of any policy changes brought about by the Local Plan.
- 6.2 In response to the stakeholders questioning whether a similar protocol to the Draft London Plan should be used, the Council understands these protocols would need to be assessed in a Manchester context to understand any impacts. The impacts of any new approach would be also need to be monitored and evaluated in order to develop robust policy as part of the Local Plan that is fitting to future demand.
- 6.3 Manchester Council agree with the response that there is a need to retain young, highly skilled professionals and graduates entering the workforce, so other forms of high quality housing will be needed. For this reason, the Council has also developed its policy on Co-living as part of the review of the Local Plan. Recent residential developments in the city centre, and the pipeline for further residential development located close to major regeneration schemes enable the retention of talent close to skilled employment opportunities in the city centre. We also agree with the need to provide balanced neighbourhoods, which is the intention of Manchester's Residential Growth Strategy. This is supported by the proposal to concentrate new PBSA development in close proximity to the University campuses, supporting the other functions of the Universities and allowing a broader mix of accommodation across the city centre and the city as a whole. The provision of further PBSA can also support the freeing up of mainstream housing in the city centre currently being occupied by students.
- 6.4 The Council is supportive of the University's accreditation scheme through Manchester Student Homes, which is helping to ensure quality of the accommodation available for students.
- 6.5 Littering and refuse collection is an area of concern that respondents have included in their response. A number of PBSA have building management in place to facilitate refuse removal and cleansing of the building. Increased enforcement and street cleansing would also reduce litter issues. Any new planning applications for PBSA would need to include a management plan, setting out how the building will be managed and maintained over the long term, including issues such as waste management.
- 6.6 In response to the comment that the report does not recognise the complexities of the overall student population, (including international, under-

graduate, postgraduate, mature, living at home, parent students and part-time students and families), it is recognised that it is important to ensure that a balance of different types of housing continue to be delivered in the city centre, and outside of it, to meet the needs of all residents, in line with Manchester's Housing Strategy, as part of a broader city wide strategy. This will help to meet the different types of students identified. The report is focussed on the majority of PBSA demand, which is from those living away from home, and to tackle some of the existing issues faced in areas of the city centre and South Manchester. The Our Manchester Strategy, currently being refreshed, already sets out the need for good quality, diverse housing in clean, safe, attractive and cohesive neighborhoods as one of its key priorities.

- 6.7 We welcome the support for good quality, affordable accommodation and for growth and development in general. The lack of quality, affordable student accommodation was one of the key issues highlighted in the 2019 report, and is considered a particular barrier for domestic students. A key objective of Manchester's Housing Strategy (2016-2021) is for all residents to have access to good quality accommodation across different types, tenures, and price ranges. Manchester Council's Affordable Housing Strategy, includes the Residential Growth target of 32,000 new homes by March 2025, with a minimum of 6,400 of them to be made affordable. This is to help meet the demand created by a growing economy and growing population.
- 6.8 In terms of the proposed geographical location of PBSA within the Oxford Road Corridor, it should also be noted that the closure of MMU's Crewe and South Manchester campuses has resulted in an even larger number of student places being located at city centre campuses. Whilst there might be a short term dip in the number of students taking up places as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic (see below), it is expected that numbers will continue to remain strong over the medium term, indicating a need for accommodation close to the university campuses. There has been an increase of people living and wanting to live in the city centre, and their needs must be balanced with the needs of new students and the needs of communities in South Manchester, to support diverse communities and good quality housing options for all residents.
- 6.9 In response to those opposed to predominantly student only areas in parts of the city, and consideration of a PBSA Design Supplementary Planning Document, Strategic Regeneration Frameworks (SRF's) are currently used to guide development in city centre areas, to support place-making and regeneration through the holistic planning of mixed-use developments. The proximity of these frameworks to other SRF's, and to existing and planned residential accommodation is considered in their implementation and delivery. The Oxford Road Corridor contains, or is adjacent to, SRF's such as Circle Square, First Street, Great Jackson Street and Mayfield, which provide a range of accommodation to meet the needs of all residential communities. The Council is in the process of reviewing the City Centre Strategic Plan to outline the current position and future development opportunities in the city centre, using key performance statistics, and this, along with the Local Plan will help further define suitable areas for PBSA in the future, recognising the changing

context of the city centre in recent years to support residential uses. One of the key principles within the November 2019 report was that new PBSA schemes should provide added value in terms of their contribution to the regeneration objectives of the city.

- 6.10 In response to the concern of “over development” in the Oxford Road Corridor, the area has been a designated Enterprise Zone (EZ) since 2016. Recent development is reflective of a world class, innovative location, currently generating £3billion GVA per annum, providing 60,000 jobs of which half are within knowledge intensive sectors, and is consequently one of the most important economic districts in the city. The value of this new development must not be underestimated in terms of the overall growth of, and talent retention, in the city.
- 6.11 Manchester has seen a relatively low level of investment in new PBSA compared to other cities, as a result of the careful management of the pipeline through Policy H12. This has been reflected in the high levels of students living in mainstream housing and the high take up of places in the new PBSA accommodation. MMU are currently not able to provide accommodation to all first year undergraduates. The Council therefore, believe that there is scope to provide additional PBSA, provided it is of the right quality, price and in the right locations, without leading to a high number of voids. However, we recognise the continued need to see a planned and judicious level of growth, in line with the principles of H12. It is noted that there are currently two PBSA schemes within the planning pipeline, at River Street and New Wakefield Street, with further schemes planned by IQ Manchester and Marlborough Street. These schemes will jointly provide around 3,000 new student bedrooms. The impact of these schemes will be taken into account, when considering further applications, and the level of student accommodation kept under review.
- 6.12 In balancing the views of HEI’s, developers, students and residents, along with current policies and standards, it is considered that the principles set out in the report to the November Executive remain appropriate as providing the context for the application of Policy H12. For ease of reference the principles are attached at Appendix 1. The principles will be kept under review as applications come forward, and a formal review of the policy can be developed and tested through the review of the Local Plan. It is also proposed that any new PBSA developments should be designed in such way that they can be easily adapted in response to changing circumstances and requirements. The current context (see below) should also be considered.

7.0 Covid-19 – Potential Impact on PBSA

- 7.1 It should be noted that the *Consideration of Policy H12: Purpose Built Student Accommodation Within the Changing Market Context* report was written prior to the Covid-19 pandemic and subsequent lockdown arrangements. Similarly, consultation with Phase 1 stakeholders closed before lockdown restrictions were put in place.

- 7.2 The full economic impact of the pandemic, and the speed of economic and business recovery is not yet clear. As stated earlier in this report there had been a growing proportion of international students at Manchester's universities but it is likely that this trend will be impacted in the short term by ongoing travel restrictions and fears about resurgence of the virus.
- 7.3 The current indications are that social distancing policies are likely to be in place for some time, while the longer term behaviour change resulting from the outbreak is still unknown. The result could mean that co-living arrangements for students could become temporarily unpopular with potential tenants who may be reluctant to share accommodation and amenities with strangers, and make such developments less viable.
- 7.4 Whilst it was anticipated that Covid 19 may have had a detrimental impact on student numbers for 2020/21, there are positive indications (September 2020) that this is not the case. Although final student numbers will not be known until October 2020, expectations are that totals, including for overseas students, will be comparative with the previous year. Any reduction in numbers is likely to be a short to medium term challenge, with numbers building back up as the city recovers and a sense of normality returns. The Council's long term plan remains one of growth in the city and any future approved PBSA developments will not be completed before 2023, at which point the target would be for student numbers to have returned to or improved on current numbers.
- 7.5 Consideration should also be given to the fact that future PBSA developments will not only provide accommodation needs for increasing numbers of students but will also replace existing poor quality stock. As previously stated in this report, for Manchester to remain competitive as a world class education hub, it must have an accommodation offer to match.

8.0 Conclusions & Next Steps

- 8.1 This report details the outcomes of a consultation process with stakeholders for purpose built student developments in the city, in order to review Policy H12 and develop the policy in line with the changing market context. The Issues Consultation Stage of the Local Plan has been undertaken to engage with stakeholders on the issues covered by the new plan.
- 8.2 This report details the outcomes of a consultation process with stakeholders on purpose built student accommodation in the city, in order to inform a policy approach in advance of the Local Plan review. While not formal policy, the recommendation is for this approach to be of material consideration in the application of Policy H12 when considering planning applications for purpose built student accommodation schemes.
- 8.3 It is, therefore, recommended the City Council adopts the approach set out in this report as context for the application for Policy H12, in advance of the Local Plan review and update in 2023. The impact of any new purpose built student accommodation proposal will be monitored and appraised, and

outcomes from these evaluations will feed into the future review of the Local Plan. This approach supports the current policy position in that regeneration remains a critical consideration.

9.0 Recommendations

9.1 Recommendations appear at the front of this report.

10.0 Key Policies and Considerations

(a) Equal Opportunities

10.1 The Council's proposed approach to purpose built student accommodation has been consulted upon with a wide range of stakeholders, enabling all interested parties to engage in the process.

(b) Risk Management

10.2 Risks will be considered on a scheme by scheme basis.

(c) Legal Considerations

10.3 Any new planning policy relating to Purpose Built Student Accommodation will need to be developed and adopted through the Local Plan process.

Appendix 1

Policy Proposals outlined in the Consideration of Policy H12: Purpose Built Student Accommodation Within the Changing Market Context Executive report (November 2019)

- The aim of Policy H12 has been to ensure that the right mix of student housing is delivered, in the right parts of the city, to meet the demands of the evolving student population and the wider growth, regeneration and financial objectives of the City Council and its partners. The Policy has been successful in achieving these objectives to date.
- An initial appropriate consultation is proposed with key stakeholders on the changing market context set out in this report, with a view to the changed market context being taken into account in determining planning applications in advance of a full review of Policy H12. Following this, as part of the development of the revised Local Plan, an evolution of implementation of the student accommodation policy will be considered and consulted on. The rest of this report sets out the key policy ideas that it is proposed the Council consult the Universities and other stakeholders on, based on the issues set out in this report, in relation to all student residential development. The approach to the student housing market should also be kept under review, to ensure responsiveness to both changing market circumstances (including the impact of leaving the EU) and demand.
- An approach to affordability could be included within the new Local Plan - perhaps along the lines of the Draft New London Plan (published in August 2018), which specifically addresses affordability in PBSA (see Appendix I). The London policy states that 35% of bedrooms in PBSA are required to be affordable, or to follow the Viability Tested Route and submit evidence to justify any reduction in this figure.

Supporting Regeneration Objectives

- The starting point for all student residential schemes should be that they contribute to delivering the regeneration objectives for the city; supporting employment growth, graduate and talent retention, place making and the city's international reputation.
- As part of this, the approach needs to be within the context of the approved Corridor Spatial Framework (see paragraph 3.4), which establishes the principle that development of land in the Oxford Road Corridor should prioritise commercial or educational/research use, in order to maximise the growth potential of the Corridor, recognising the limited availability of land. Student accommodation should, therefore, be in the right locations, in appropriate numbers, and only where it supports wider growth. Given the location of the majority of accommodation within the wider Corridor area, the Corridor Board, will be a consultee on proposals for PBSA.
- Conditions set through the planning process for example through Section 106

agreements, will seek to restrain students living in new non-PBSA developments.

Affordability

- As shown by the evidence, Manchester is one of the most expensive cities in the UK for PBSA. A more diverse pipeline of new PBSA is now needed to help stabilise rental growth.
- New accommodation would need to adhere to the quality criteria set out below, including adequate room sizes, storage and social spaces. However, more studio-style accommodation, or a product similar to the shared apartment scheme being developed at River Street may provide examples of how more affordable PBSA could be delivered.
- It is critical to ensure there is a residential market, which meets the needs of students at an affordable price. The city cannot allow affordability to impact on the ability to attract and retain students from a range of backgrounds, and/or prohibit them from living in areas close to the university campuses. An approach similar to the London policy of 35% affordable units within any new PBSA should be encouraged.

Quality

- The overall quality of Manchester's PBSA stock is poor compared to other cities. A recent appraisal by Cushman and Wakefield found that Manchester has fewer high quality rooms compared to the UK average (15% vs 23%) and more low-quality rooms than average (39% vs 33%). Accommodation is considered to be less sustainable where:
 1. It is a greater than 20 minute walk to campus
 2. Room quality is below average
 3. There is below average quality common space
- For Manchester to remain competitive as a world class education hub, with an accommodation offer to match, the current level of poor quality accommodation needs to be addressed. New stock in appropriate locations represents an opportunity to deliver an improved student experience, which better reflects Manchester's institutions and its educational reputation overall, and also helps to contribute to sustainability targets.
- All PBSA must be of a high quality, providing a high standard of living, within close proximity to the city's higher education institutions. To ensure the delivery of student accommodation that is high quality and highly accessible, with strong and sustainable connections to the city's universities, all future PBSA should be within or immediately adjacent to Oxford Road Corridor (with the exception of the area surrounding the Institute of Sport, on the Etihad Campus as set out below). Design should allow sufficient facilities to cater for the overall wellbeing of students, including, for example, generous living space, communal spaces for students to socialise, and public realm, which

contributes to the quality of place. PBSA design must also be sufficiently flexible to allow for re-purposing as demand varies.

Wellbeing, Safety and Security

- Linked to the above, purpose build accommodation should consider the welfare and wellbeing of students as a major factor, in both design and management. Ensuring that student accommodation is delivered in safe and secure locations, and with appropriate management and facilities, will be a fundamental consideration for any PBSA proposals. Location of accommodation close to University facilities is a critical issue in ensuring the safety and wellbeing of students. The safety and security of accommodation has a significant impact upon student retention which is of clear importance for both the universities and the city as a whole. Location and security are consistently identified by international students as the top factors when choosing accommodation.
- It is currently voluntary for private developers who build and operate PBSA to sign up to the three codes of practice required for higher education providers, which aim to ensure that accredited student accommodation is safe, good quality and reputable. These are:
 - The Universities UK/GuildHE Code of Practice for University Managed Student Accommodation
 - The ANUK/Unipol Code of Standards for Larger Residential Developments for Student Accommodation Managed and Controlled by Educational Establishments
 - The ANUK/Unipol Code of Standards for Larger Developments for Student Accommodation NOT Managed and Controlled by Educational Establishment.
- It is suggested that, the principles included within these three codes of practice should be adopted for all new PBSA developments, whether private sector or educational establishment led.
- Private halls of residence should be encouraged to provide pastoral care and programmes which seek to provide an enhanced student experience (as is already evident in the current higher end schemes). These packages can deliver the provision of welfare care and extra-curricular activity in various ways.
- It should also be noted that owners of PBSA are not required to pass business rates on this accommodation, meaning that they currently do not make a direct tax contribution to the place making or management of the areas in which they are located, despite the additional management issues that can arise from a concentration of student tenants. There may be opportunities to look at reducing the impact of this through the planning process, as part of the renewed Local Plan policies.

Density

- Density of student accommodation will be essential to deliver the level of new high quality accommodation needed within the context of scarce land availability both in the Oxford Road Corridor area and the wider city centre.

Location

- Location is a key factor in ensuring the quality, security, sustainability and wellbeing benefits of accommodation. As a result, purpose built student accommodation should be located in the areas immediately adjacent to the core university areas, principally the Oxford Road Corridor area. This may include parts of surrounding neighbourhoods such as Hulme and Ardwick which are immediately adjacent to the university campuses, for example, appropriate sites on Cambridge Street and Upper Brook Street, which accord with the Corridor Spatial Framework. The exact sites would need to take into account the principles of the Corridor Spatial Framework, the context of the surrounding neighbourhood, and support the wider economic and academic growth of the Corridor.
- The only exemption to this within the city would be within the Eastlands Strategic Regeneration Framework area, where consideration will be given to high quality PBSA to support the Institute of Sport proposals on the Etihad Campus as plans develop.

Sustainability

- Given the current climate emergency and Manchester's commitment to be carbon neutral by 2038, it is increasingly important that the location of student accommodation in Manchester should continue to be driven by proximity to university campuses, reducing the need to travel, and to sustainable modes of transport. This supports existing green travel plans. Students are encouraged not to bring vehicles to the city and instead sustainable travel, discounted travel passes and alternative modes of transport are already comprehensively promoted to new and returning students.
- The requirements driving quality in new PBSA will ensure that all new accommodation meets the highest standards of sustainability, to meet the Council's zero carbon policies. They will also be expected to provide appropriate public realm and connectivity, which can contribute to the local environment; provide opportunities for reducing climate change impacts (e.g. providing new trees); and encourage walking and cycling, also contributing to levels of wellbeing.

Mix of uses

- It is essential that the Oxford Road Corridor, and the city centre as a whole, is able to maintain the right balance of commercial, educational, residential, cultural and leisure use, in order to ensure that it can maximise its contribution to the economic growth of the city. Given its unique position, and as outlined above, the presumption will be that commercial and educational use will be

prioritised within any new development in the area.

- However, a level of high quality PBSA will be important to achieving the right student offer, and address the issues raised throughout this report, including the attraction and retention of students. A limited amount of PBSA will be considered, in appropriate locations, where it can be demonstrated that it will support commercial and educational use, and the overall growth and regeneration objectives for the Corridor and the city.

**Manchester City Council
Report for Resolution**

Report to: Executive - 14 October 2020

Subject: Demolition of the Maisonettes on Bridgnorth Road

Report of: Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth

Summary

This report sets out proposals for the demolition of a maisonette block on Bridgnorth Road, Higher Blackley. The block is in a poor state of repair and will require significant investment over the next few years to bring it up to Decent Homes standard.

Located alone on a large site, which sits next to other vacant land, it provides an opportunity, if the block was to be demolished, to create a larger development site for the re-provision of modern, energy efficient, social and affordable homes in the area. The larger development site has the potential for 38 new homes, providing an increase of 22 homes in the area.

A comprehensive consultation exercise was conducted, in March 2020, to ensure residents living at the maisonette block, numbers 2 to 32 Bridgnorth Road, had the opportunity to have their say on the proposals. Overall, 82% of residents responded to the consultation of which 93% supported the proposal to demolish the block.

Recommendations

The Executive is recommended:

1. To note the results of the residents' consultation where 82% of residents took part, of which 93% supported the proposal to demolish the maisonette block.
2. To authorise the Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth, in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration, to cease new lettings for the maisonettes at Bridgnorth Road.
3. To authorise the Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth, in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration, to declare the maisonettes in the block surplus to requirements and should be demolished.
4. To authorise the Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth to serve Initial Demolition Notices to all secure tenants within the block in order to suspend the right to buy pending the demolition of the block.
5. To authorise the Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth to award Band 1 rehousing priority to displaced residents.

6. To approve the use of Home Loss and Disturbance compensation for all displaced residents.

Wards Affected: Higher Blackley

Environmental Impact Assessment - the impact of the decisions proposed in this report on achieving the zero-carbon target for the city
The existing maisonette block is poorly designed, not energy efficient and fuel costs for residents are considered to be high. Demolition will allow for more energy efficient/low carbon homes to be developed on the site, together with vacant land adjacent to the site, hence increasing the number of affordable homes across the city.

Our Manchester Strategy outcomes	Contribution to the strategy
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities	Affordable housing gives people a stable, well-managed home to enable them to fulfil their potential
A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city's economic success	A world class city requires a mix of homes for all members of the community
A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities	Increasing the amount of affordable housing will provide the opportunity for Manchester residents to raise their individual and collective aspirations
A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work	The right mix of quality energy efficient housing is needed to support growth and ensure that our growing population can live and work in the city and enjoy a good quality of life.
A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth	Demolishing poorly designed, low demand housing and replacing with new, better designed, housing will enable us to retain neighbourhoods where residents choose to live and their housing needs and aspirations are met

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

- Equal Opportunities Policy
- Risk Management
- Legal Considerations

Financial Consequences – Revenue

Following the demolition of these properties there will be a loss of rent of c£60k per annum to the HRA, and this will be slightly offset by reduced ongoing investment requirements. The net loss to the HRA over the life of the 30 year business plan is c£1.533m.

In addition to the above there will also be an additional £161k for security and holding costs in relation to the void properties for a period of up to 12 months. This would also be funded through the Housing Revenue Account (HRA).

Financial Consequences – Capital

The estimated capital costs of the demolition, and tenant homelessness & disturbance payments are £0.637m. This is made up of £475k demolition costs and £162k for home loss and disturbance payments to existing tenants. Approval for an increase to the capital programme is required and the project will be subject to the usual checkpoint process for approvals.

Depending on the future use of the land the Council may receive a capital receipt once the vacant site is disposed of.

Contact Officers:

Name: Kevin Lowry
Position: Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth
Telephone: 0161 234 4811
E-mail: k.lowry@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Martin Oldfield
Position: Head of Housing Services
Telephone: 0161 234 3561
E-mail: m.oldfield@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

The following documents disclose important facts on which the report is based and have been relied upon in preparing the report. Copies of the background documents are available up to 4 years after the date of the meeting. If you would like a copy please contact one of the contact officers above.

Delivering Manchester's Affordable Homes to 2025 - Executive 11 September 2019

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 The 'Our Manchester' strategy has established a series of high level aims to secure the 2025 vision for the city, in particular the need to build well designed, energy efficient, sustainable and affordable homes to rent and buy. Creating more homes to meet the needs of a growing population and economy is our highest priority.
- 1.2 Manchester's aspiration, through the Residential Growth Strategy, is that we have sufficient homes for people to buy or rent that are affordable for Manchester residents. At the core of what we are doing, as set out in the Housing Strategy 2016-21, are Manchester City Council's three objectives:

Growth	Increasing the quantity of housing to ensure the right types of housing are available in the right places.
Place	Raising the quality and sustainability of our homes and neighbourhoods.
People	Enhancing opportunities to access homes for residents with raised aspirations and a sense of self-esteem.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 The Riverdale estate in the Higher Blackley ward is a sustainable area with good demand for most property types. The stock profile for the estate is a mix of houses, flats and maisonettes, with a high percentage of properties sold through the Right to Buy.
- 2.2 The estate has four blocks of maisonettes at Bridgnorth Road, Inchcape Drive and Riverdale Road, comprising 44 properties: 8 x 3-bed and 36 x 2-bed homes. Despite investment in the maisonettes to achieve the Decent Homes standard in 2011, the blocks are generally a poor housing offer with limited demand for the upper units.
- 2.3 Options appraisals carried out suggest that three of the blocks at Riverdale Road and Inchcape Drive are suitable for refurbishment and the block at Bridgnorth Road, comprising 16 x 2-bed homes, should be demolished. Whilst all four blocks require significant improvements and investment, the block on Bridgnorth Road sits alone on a large site and is adjacent to other vacant land which will provide potential for more housing to be delivered in the area. The estimated refurbishment costs for the block (without zero carbon measures) also exceed the cost of demolition and rehousing.

3.0 Options Appraisal

- 3.1 Without major investment the maisonettes at Bridgnorth Road are set to fail the Decent Homes standard by 2022. In addition, significant further investment over the next few years would be required to meet the Council's 'Decent Homes Plus' and zero carbon target.

- 3.2 Demolishing the block, which sits alone on a large site, next to vacant land, provides an opportunity to engage a Registered Provider (RP) partner to build out more social and affordable homes in the area or to include the land for development by the Council's embryonic housing delivery vehicle.
- 3.3 The following points support the proposal to stop lettings and demolish:
- A resident consultation on the proposal to demolish the block in March 2020 highlighted overwhelming support (93%) for the demolition of the block due to its poor state of repair.
 - The site sits next to other vacant land which provides an opportunity to create a larger development site for the re-provision of modern affordable homes in the area.
 - The development land made available by the demolition of these properties has the potential for 38 new homes, providing an increase of 22 homes in the area.
- 3.4 The following options have been explored:
- To carry out a refurbishment scheme, to bring the maisonettes up to decent home plus standards, at a cost in excess of £1.2m (£75K per property), and significantly more investment would be required to bring the maisonettes up to zero carbon standards. This option is not considered to be good value for money.
 - To demolish the maisonette block at Bridgnorth Road as this will provide opportunity for more affordable homes on the site, which are modern and energy efficient.

4.0 Consultation

- 4.1 Under Section 105 of the Housing Act 1985 the Council must consult its tenants before making a housing management decision in relation to demolition.
- 4.2 A comprehensive consultation exercise was carried out in March 2020. The aim of the consultation was to provide residents with the opportunity to express their views on the proposals to either demolish or to refurbish the block, through a questionnaire, and it was felt important that residents had the opportunity to ask officers questions face to face during the consultation exercise.
- 4.3 Letters were distributed to residents, residing at numbers 2 to 32 Bridgnorth Road, informing them of the proposals, the decision making process and how their views would be captured through the consultation exercise, including details that officers would be visiting , every day, over a specified period. Residents were also given the option of making appointments with officers at a time that suited them, or to complete the questionnaires themselves and return using stamped, addressed envelopes provided.

- 4.4 82% of residents took part in the consultation of which 93% supported the proposal to demolish the block. A summary report of the findings is attached at appendix A.

5.0 Stopping Lettings / Rehousing

5.1 Meeting residents' housing needs

Affected residents will be relocated in accordance with their housing need to alternative accommodation with at least 2 bedrooms, if requested.

5.2 Empty properties

The Council will carefully consider the impact on the residents and in the surrounding area when choosing the type of security for the block as homes become empty as a result of the decision to demolish.

6.0 Delivery and timescales

6.1 Following approval by Executive the indicative delivery timescales are:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| • Rehousing Registrations | November - December 2020 |
| • Rehousing (including compensation) | February 2021 – April 2021 |
| • Procurement of Building Services | January 2021 |
| • Demolition Works | July 2021 - December 2021 |
| • Handover of vacant site | December 2021 |

7.0 Management of Vacant Sites

7.1 Following demolition the resulting vacant site will be managed by the City Council until the future redevelopment commences.

8.0 Conclusion

8.1 Due to the high cost of maintaining and improving the maisonette block on Bridgnorth Road, the opportunity to deliver more affordable housing on the site and overwhelming resident support for the proposal to demolish, the Executive is asked to support the proposal for the Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth to rehouse residents and demolish the block. In the longer term this would allow for more modern, energy efficient, low carbon, affordable homes in the area to be built.

9.0 Contributing to a Zero-Carbon City

9.1 The right mix of quality, energy efficient housing is needed to support growth and ensure that our growing population can live and work in the city and enjoy a good quality of life.

9.2 The existing maisonette block is poorly designed, considered not to be energy efficient and fuel costs for residents are high. Demolition will allow for more energy efficient and low carbon homes to be developed. The remaining 3

blocks of maisonettes will be refurbished including work which will support the Council's carbon reduction strategy.

10.0 Contributing to the Our Manchester Strategy

(a) A thriving and sustainable city

- 10.1 Affordable housing gives people a stable, well-managed home to enable them to fulfil their potential

(b) A highly skilled city

- 10.2 A world class city requires a mix of homes for all members of the community

(c) A progressive and equitable city

- 10.3 Increasing the amount of affordable housing will provide the opportunity for Manchester residents to raise their individual and collective aspirations

(d) A liveable and low carbon city

- 10.4 The right mix of quality energy efficient housing is needed to support growth and ensure that our growing population can live and work in the city and enjoy a good quality of life.

(e) A connected city

- 10.5 Demolishing poorly designed housing and replacing with new, better designed and sought after housing, will enable us to retain neighbourhoods where residents choose to live and their housing needs and aspirations are met.

11.0 Key Policies and Considerations

(a) Equal Opportunities

- 11.1 Residents of maisonettes will be treated fairly and equally and provided with clear, consistent information regarding this proposal. Every attempt will be made to engage with residents and assist them with their rehousing options if the decision is to demolish.

(b) Risk Management

- 11.2 Risks associated with the project will be managed by the Director of Housing and Residential Growth. The Risk Log will be updated and reviewed regularly.

(c) Legal Considerations

- 11.3 Before making a housing management decision in relation to demolition, Section 105 of the Housing Act 1985 provides that the Council must consult those of its tenants that are likely to be substantially affected.

- 11.4 Initial Demolition Notices will need to be served on all secure tenants within the block in order to suspend the statutory right to buy. The City Solicitor will continue to support and advise the project team to ensure that the necessary arrangements are put in place, which sufficiently protect the Council, and comply with all relevant legislation, regulatory and constitutional requirements.

**Manchester City Council
Report for Resolution**

Report to: Executive – 14 October 2020

Subject: Lyndene Children’s Home - Remodelling and Next Steps

Report of: Strategic Director for Children and Education Services

Summary

Lyndene is currently used as a ‘mainstream’ children’s home to care for and meet the identified needs of Manchester’s looked after children. The service is commissioned and delivered from a property owned by Manchester City Council that is located in Wythenshawe. The site is a large detached property with significant grounds making it ideal for the proposed use.

Despite a need for children needing a residential setting due to the changing needs of our children since being established Lyndene is not able to meet their needs and as a result, in part due to our successful “edge of care offer” supporting families to live together, has been operating under capacity in its current format.

The proposed service delivery model is reflective of the Our Manchester, Our Children Strategic priorities. In summary, Lyndene will be repurposed to provide in/outreach help and support alongside a short break package; thus enabling children and young people to remain within or move back to their family environments (parents or foster care) as well as providing close family support during this time.

Children, Young People and their families have played a key role in developing the concept and vision. It is from their feedback on ‘what would make a difference’, that has enabled Manchester City Council and Manchester Health and Care Commission (MHCC) to have a real opportunity to draw down NHS England capital funding to refurbish and respecify the facility. This will result in a service that better responds to the needs of children and their families whilst offering a more efficient use of current resources and value for money.

Recommendations

It is recommended that the Executive:

1. Approves the decommissioning of the existing children's home provision.
 2. Approves the recommissioning of Lyndene Children’s Home to better respond to the presenting needs of children and young people with learning difficulties and/or autism and their families.
-

Wards Affected: Various

Environmental Impact Assessment - the impact of the decisions proposed in this report on achieving the zero-carbon target for the city

All capital projects are reviewed throughout the approval process with regard to the contribution they can make to Manchester being a Zero-Carbon City. Projects will not receive approval to incur costs unless the contribution to this target is appropriate.

Manchester Strategy outcomes	Summary of the contribution to the strategy
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities	Continuing to improve edge of care and short breaks provision will contribute to improving educational outcomes, aspirations and job opportunities for young people with autism and/ or Learning Disabilities and contribute to Manchester's young people becoming happy, safe and successful adults.
A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city's economic success	Improving outcomes for young people with autism and/ or Learning Disabilities and continuing to improve the experience and opportunities for children and young people with SEND will better enable them to gain qualifications and contribute to Manchester's economic success.
A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities	Continuing to improve provision, through co-production, for children and young people with autism and/ or Learning Disabilities will ensure increased opportunities and outcomes for one of our vulnerable groups - children with SEND
A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work	<p>Mechanical survey completed on the property to review the potential of providing executive level budget cost for providing a Low Carbon solution for the existing building and the future proposed extension.</p> <p>Thermodynamic Solar System to be installed as part of the project which could lead to significant savings</p> <p>The estimated carbon (CO₂) emission reduction in a given year is:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Electric = 143 kg/year Gas = 729 kg/year Total = 872 kg/year</p> <p>Larger savings on the electric services could possibly be made by utilizing more PV panels with PIR sensors, LED lighting etc. however, the cost effectiveness would need to be considered in the finalized proposal.</p>
A connected city: world class	Investment in family support and social care

infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth	provision will enhance the City's attractiveness to potential residents and contribute to the development of high quality neighbourhoods.
---	---

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

- Equal Opportunities Policy
- Risk Management
- Legal Considerations

Financial Consequences – Revenue

The proposals contained in this report are expected to reduce the cost of residential placements for Children's Services. The proposed new home will cost £0.913m per annum which is £273k per annum higher than the current budget for the existing provision. The additional cost will be met from placements savings and CCG contribution. The redesigned service is expected to deliver an estimated annual saving of £462k net of the additional cost of the new provision. In addition, it is expected that the cost of 5 external residential placements for young people will be diverted from residential care placements.

Financial Consequences – Capital

The estimated refurbishment costs of approximately £850k are proposed to be met through external NHSE (National Health Service England) grant funding. A business case was approved by the Capital Strategy Board on the 15th September 2020.

Contact Officers:

Name: Paul Marshall
 Position: Strategic Director for Children and Education Services
 E-mail: p.marshall1@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Sarah Austin
 Position: Strategic Commissioning Lead Children's Services
 E-mail: sarah.austin@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Mark Leaver
 Position: Strategic Lead Integrated Commissioning
 E-mail: m.leaver@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

There are no background documents.

1.0 Background

- 1.1 Lyndene has been operating under capacity in its current format; the refurbishment and specialisation of this facility will allow for a more efficient use of current resources and value for money.
- 1.2 A small yet significant number of Children and Young People in Manchester have high volume, complex needs and packages of care that are jointly funded by health, social care and education. A number are placed out of the local authority boundary, away from potentially protective factors of home, family, carers, friends and their local community, not because they require specialist support 'at distance' but because local provision is presently not available or configured to meet their needs.
- 1.3 In 2020 a cost benefit analysis was developed to understand how this would benefit young people in Manchester. The proposed operating model has taken into account the findings from this cost benefit analysis and has 3 key aims:
- a) improve the outcomes for children and families
 - b) support integrated working across the system, drawing on existing local healthcare and wider expertise
 - c) reduce the number of children in high cost long-term residential or extended inpatient hospital settings.
- 1.4 Manchester City Council (MCC) and Manchester Health and Care Commission (MHCC) have successfully bid for and secured £850k NHSE Capital funding to adapt and transform Lyndene to respond to the needs of children with learning difficulties and/or autism.
- 1.5 The Council proposes to enter into a compliant procurement process for the capital works to be tendered and awarded to support the delivery of a service for children and young people with learning difficulties and autism who may potentially become looked after by the Council and/or transition to a family setting. This procurement process will be undertaken in compliance with the provisions of the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and its own Contractual Standing Orders; applying due regard to ensuring best value is achieved.
- 1.6 Once refurbished Lyndene will provide outreach and short term support as part of a pathway that aims to enable children and young people remain with or move back to their family environments (parents or foster care). In addition another element is to actively promote close family support and engagement during this time.

2.0 Proposed Funding Model

- 2.1 The proposed new home will cost £0.913m per annum which is £273k per annum higher than the current 'running' cost for the existing provision. This principally is attributed to the requirement for a larger staff group to ensure residents are safe and staff are able to fulfill the full range of outreach/care

arrangements. The additional cost will be met from placements savings and CCG contribution.

- 2.2 The redesign of the provision is expected to deliver an estimated annual saving of £462k net of the additional cost of the new provision. This will be achieved by diverting the need for 5 external residential care placements for young people.
- 2.3 There are 4 young people in the current provision. The additional costs relating to finding alternative provision relate estimated to total £23k to the end of the financial year as they are about to transition to independence or have a plan to move to an alternative arrangement.
- 2.4 It has been agreed MHCC will contribute up to £150k towards the increased additional running cost (revenue budget) and any savings will 'flow' back at the agreed percentage rate of investment. A revenue case will define these arrangements between MCCG and MCC; noting this is a firm commitment from MHCC rather than in principle.
- 2.5 It is anticipating the service will over time lead to further savings in terms of increased capacity within the in house foster carers to support children with complex needs, less children placed 'at distance' and a reduced reliance on independent short breaks respite facilities.

3.0 Reduced Funding

- 3.1 The proposed costs are identified to deliver an 'in/outreach' service required to staff a respite/short break home. The focus of this work will be to work with children and their families, foster carers to avoid an escalation of need that all too often historically has resulted in their admission to high cost/specialist provision. Short breaks services would include overnight stays and regular support.
- 3.2 Cognizant of the financial challenges which are facing all Local Authorities, consideration has been given to operating the service with the existing staffing complement. However, in light of the presenting children and their needs in order for the service to be safe and effective one of the following options would need to be considered;
 - a) Only short breaks could be delivered,
 - b) Scaled down model of short breaks at weekends only with outreach during the week
 - c) Outreach only without short break 7 days a week
- 3.3 Ultimately the adoption of any of the above options would ultimately reduce the efficacy of the model and potential impact on reducing the numbers of residential care placements.

4.0 Needs of children and their families/carers

- 4.1 Reviews and analysis such as an independent review undertaken by Peopletoo Report in 2017 and the Grant Thornton 2019 identified gaps in existing services

for supporting children with autism, learning disability and behaviours that challenge, and their families. Particularly those with more complex needs who are either in or at 'risk' of becoming 'looked after' by the Council, or in a hospital setting. In addition, practitioners, families, wider stakeholders and research indicate;

- The limited choice of good quality alternative support options is a factor in driving the use of long-term residential care.
- The limited specialist residential or fostering provision available locally creates physical distance between a child and their family. There are currently 23 children currently in residential placements with autism or Learning Difficulties (LD). Of those, 11 have just autism, 5 just LD and 7 both.
- The proposed operating model for Lyndene Children's Home has the potential to enable some of those young people to be placed in family settings such as foster provision with wrap around support.
- The scope for closer integration with existing commissioned health and education services in Manchester as part of the transforming care agenda, as opposed to providers sourcing their own provision (e.g. therapeutic support).

4.2 According to the Learning Disability and Autism Integrated Care Team (part of MHCC), there were 6 Care and Education Treatment Reviews (CETRs) for young people with ASD between Jan - July 2020: 3 CETR for young people with ASD and LD who are at high risk of hospital admission, 1 young person with ASD and LD that who admitted in hospital and 2 young people with ASD and LD on periphery of hospital care.

4.3 Additionally, the proposed operating model for Lyndene Children's Home comes into its own when supporting families and their children who are 'at risk' of becoming 'looked after'. In addition a recent 'need' mapping identified that there are families / foster placements that may be at risk of breakdown. Families / placements without wrap around support, are more likely to result in a residential setting, which invariably becomes a long term arrangement. Referral routes and planning will ensure the facility does not become a long term residential home.

4.4 To illustrate the benefits, the following 3 case studies, informed by current placement costs, identify the potential direction with and without the proposed operating model for Lyndene Children's Home. It is important to note that none of these families indicated an overwhelming desire for their children to be 'looked after'; wanting to maintain a meaningful relationship with their son/daughter.

Age	Current placement type	Proposed placement / cost without Lyndene model	Proposed placement/ cost with Lyndene model	Family Outcomes
10	Family Home Parents are struggling to manage escalating behaviours	External residential £6,000/week	Family Home overnight respite and outreach £400 / week	Parents have the confidence and ability to meet behaviour need, young person remains at homes
14	Family Home Identified that unable to stay at home without outreach and overnight respite support	External Residential £6,000/week	Family Home overnight respite and outreach £400 / week	Local respite provision is available and young person able to remain at home
16	Family home Parents unable to manage behaviours	External Residential £6,000/week	Family Home overnight respite and outreach £400 / week	Foster carers and parents are supported to meet the behaviours needs and a shared care model maintains within Manchester.

- 4.5 As illustrated in the table above, the potential for improving the experiences and outcomes for children whilst delivering financial savings that result from this better utilisation of resources is significant. Currently costs of supporting this cohort of children are consistently high. Manchester's analysis last year showed average residential costs of around £4,500 per week for children with a learning disability but there are many placements which cost significantly higher than this (as the examples above show based on existing placement costs); similarly extended inpatient hospital costs are high. Placements typically become long-term.
- 4.6 The scale of opportunity (i.e. number of families a new model could benefit) is also significant. For example of the 79 presentations for a targeted Short Break in the last 6 months, 75% are over 11 years of age; of which 12% had multiple presentations. Families and practitioners report that there are not the services commissioned to meet and support the needs of these children, young people and their families.
- 4.7 Analysis completed by Manchester City Council's Performance, Research and Intelligence Team identified that for young people in residential care with autism half entered between the ages of 5 - 10 years and at the request of their parents due to the complexity/escalation of their needs. In addition, this analysis indicated presently care provision for young people with learning disabilities are more likely to be residential schools meaning that they are placed outside of the city and are expensive. A large proportion of those who were in their placement

for over 2yrs tended to have profound and multiple disabilities, usually with higher parental involvement and higher resourcing leading to greater stability.

5.0 Proposed timeline

Capital Work tender commence	September 2020
Co-production of final model	September 2020
Capital tender contract award	October 2020
NHSE Capital Grant Provided	October 2020
Transition plans co produced and implemented	October 2020
Tender / Implementation of staffing model	October 2020
Capital Work Commence	November 2020
Ofsted Application Commence	December 2020
New Service Commence	May 2021

6.0 Human Resource Implications

- 6.1 Subject to the decision of the Executive, it is planned the project group will work with Human Resource colleagues to address and respond to any workforce implications.
- 6.2 Based on the information to date, TUPE will not apply to Manchester City Council as there isn't a transfer of service provision into, or out of the Council's direct employment. However, TUPE may apply between two external providers (provider a. currently delivering a service from Lyndene and provider b. that has successfully bid for the proposed service specification outlined within this report) although this doesn't have direct employment implications to the Council.
- 6.3 If it is determined that TUPE applies between the providers, and either provider doesn't have a HR function to manage the transfer process in-line with The Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 the Council may decide for MCC HR to support this process.

7.0 Conclusion

- 7.1 As part of its ongoing review and monitoring of service provision and performance, Manchester City Council has undertaken an analysis of children's presenting needs and associated care provision. This analysis identified a gap in provision for children with Learning Difficulties and/or Autism. In addition the Lyndene Children's Home operates at below capacity for periods of time.
- 7.2 In recognition of the views of children and their families, the underperformance of a specific unit and a reliance on expensive external provision, working in partnership with MHCC grant funding has been secured from NHSE. The basis of this funding is to reform and adapt Lyndene Children's Home.

- 7.3 Informed by research and experiences from children, young people and their families the reformed service will focus on providing outreach and a specialist short break provision. This focus is expected to not only improve the experiences and outcomes of children but also whilst acknowledging an increase to the service's revenue budget, informed by a cost benefit analysis it will deliver significant financial savings in the medium/long term.
- 7.4 Without reform, Manchester City Council and MHCC will continue to pay for expensive health and care placements for children and young people, especially considering that there are indicators that the particular cohort is increasing in size (i.e. a 'do nothing' option).
- 7.5 Having considered the presenting challenges, the financial position and needs of Manchester's children, the Executive are recommended to approve the decommissioning of Lyndene Children's Home to be recommissioned to provide an outreach/short break service for children with learning difficulties and/or Autism.

Appendix A

Lyndene Children's Home & Outreach Service Service Description & Care Planning

Population Covered

Services will be provided to Manchester resident/registered children, young people and families aged 0-19 with a diagnosis of Learning Disability and/or Autism Spectrum Disorder. Despite the outlined age criteria, cohort analysis indicates the service will be utilised predominantly by adolescents (12+). A review will be undertaken with a view to increasing the upper age limit of the service to 25 in line with adult service planning. Children with physical disabilities will be provided for.

Service Model

The aim of this service is to provide intensive therapy and support to children and young people with a learning disability and/or autism and their families/carers who may or may not have physical disabilities who require more intensive support to manage a crisis or escalation in needs - this is achieved by two key functions of support:

The model will provide intensive outreach support as a means of supporting the CYP and their families in the home environment and around their usual support networks. Skilled outreach staff will play a key role in providing interventions via functional behavioural analysis, positive behavioural support and wider social support to ensure families build resilience in managing challenging behaviour and crisis intervention. Each outreach worker based at Lyndene will retain small caseloads to ensure that adequate input can be provided to each family to form a meaningful and trusting relationship and sufficient support and contact time.

The model will also support a short term accommodation provision for up to 6 CYP as a means of providing a comfortable and homely environment during which time appropriate assessments and intensive therapy can be provided with a view to CYP being returned to the family environment after a short period. Outreach workers will also provide close wider family support and intervention during this time. This respite service will act as a short term break from the home environment and from families/carers during crisis or alternatively provide an interim short term residential provision for medically optimised CYP who are currently in inpatient settings who are awaiting long term placement provision; it must be noted, that this unit is not a long-term residential solution and maximum length of stay is to be determined.

This provision will act as an intermediary gatekeeping service to further, more restrictive practices of care (out of area residential placements or hospital services) and will be focused on keeping children in their home environment; protocols will be put in place to ensure that the facility is not used to repatriate current out of area residential placements unless this is appropriate to the service model. The model will support a person centred, holistic model with an integrated 'virtual team' providing support and services across all relevant local services and domains, both for children and their families. The outreach team will operate 7 days per week on an extended hour's basis.

Care planning will take place at the point of admission to a residential bed, with a defined plan of interventions aimed at both the individual and family with a view to them returning to their home environment when possible with follow up outreach provision a possibility depending on presentation.

The team at Lyndene will be made up of a Manager and Assistant Manager along with a number of specialist, highly skilled key workers who can provide a range of interventions as well as drawing on specialist expertise such as occupational therapy, nursing, psychology, SALT, social care, early help and other local services when necessary. Staff will have experience in working with individuals with learning disability and/or autism as well as experience of working with both children and adults. Staff will also be required to have an understanding of the health, education & social care system generally as a means of signposting and will require an in-depth understanding of Positive Behavioural Support (PBS), FGC, AIM, and ACE & Trauma Focused Care.

The service will support a clear referral and assessment process. The model will support a Positive Behavioural Support (PBS) approach whereby a full functional assessment will be undertaken to inform the PBS Plan. This will require a link Behavioural Lead in order to link in with special schools. A focus on PBS values and building resilience with families will help to support a long term, preventative approach.

The service will support a 'team around the child', whole family approach rather than providing support to the child individually. This will be aimed at providing support and resilience to parent/carers for any needs they have (health & social) which may be attributing to the escalation in behaviour; this will require positive relationships with both adult health and social services more generally.

An assessment process will be undertaken prior to any child being accommodated to ensure that the current personality mix and dynamic is not disrupted to the detriment of any other children.

The pathway will need to be reviewed following implementation to ensure caseloads and bed utilisation is appropriate and is meeting the needs of the population.

Success Measures

It is envisaged the project will support the following direct and wider system benefits:

- Reduction of emergency/crisis admissions.
- Reduction in out of area placements. This is a key priority across Manchester and Greater Manchester.
- Children experience 'permanence' through stable home and care placements and consistency of relationships, even in short- term placements.
- Reduction in family/placement breakdown.

The project aims to help children and young people live in a family environment where appropriate – i.e. providing short-term intensive accommodation (and corresponding support to the family) to support the child back into a family

environment. Furthermore, where a child does for whatever reason need to stay in a residential setting for a longer period, these models aim to reduce placement breakdowns. Breakdowns are a major cause of turmoil for children and young people currently in residential care. For example, the Narey review into residential homes highlighted that on average a residential placement lasts around just 6 months, meaning that it is common for a child to have numerous placements.

- Reduction in length of stay in residential and/or care settings
- Increase in engagement in education. More local provisions will help to support a child to remain connected to a local school, where possible.
- Improved health and wellbeing of children and young people (e.g. as measured through Strengths and Difficulties questionnaire).
- Wider experiences of care / support for children, young people and families / carers.
- Efficiencies – better value for money, including wider system benefits (e.g. transition)