



## **Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee**

Date: Thursday, 25 June 2020

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Virtual meeting - Webcast at

[https://manchester.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/485331](https://manchester.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/485331)

### **Advice to the Public**

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 concluded.

## **Membership of the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee**

---

**Councillors** - Hacking (Chair), Andrews, Battle, Chambers, Collins, M Dar, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Grimshaw, Hitchen, Kirkpatrick, Rawlins and Rawson

## Agenda

---

**1. Urgent Business**

To consider any items which the Chair has agreed to have submitted as urgent.

**2. 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.

**3. 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.

**4. Minutes**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meetings held on 5 March 2020 and 11 March 2020.

5 - 18

**5. Update on COVID-19 Activity - to follow**

**6. Overview Report**

Report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit

19 - 26

This report provides the Committee with details of key decisions that fall within the Committee's remit and an update on actions resulting from the Committee's recommendations. The report also includes the Committee's work programme, which the Committee is asked to amend as appropriate and agree.

## Information about the Committee

---

Scrutiny Committees represent the interests of local people about important issues that affect them. They look at how the decisions, policies and services of the Council and other key public agencies impact on the city and its residents. Scrutiny Committees do not take decisions but can make recommendations to decision-makers about how they are delivering the Manchester Strategy, an agreed vision for a better Manchester that is shared by public agencies across the city.

The Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee examines the work of the Council and its partners relating to reducing levels of crime, community cohesion, older people and equality and inclusion.

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. Speaking at a meeting will require a video link to the virtual meeting.

Members of the public are requested to bear in mind the current guidance regarding Coronavirus (COVID19) and to consider submitting comments via email to the Committee Officer. The contact details of the Committee Officer for this meeting are listed below.

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  
3rd Floor, Town Hall Extension,  
Lloyd Street  
Manchester, M60 2LA

## Further Information

---

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

Rachel McKeon  
Tel: 0161 234 4497  
Email: [rachel.mckeon@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:rachel.mckeon@manchester.gov.uk)

This agenda was issued on **Wednesday, 17 June 2020** by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Manchester City Council, Level 3, Town Hall Extension (Lloyd Street Elevation), Manchester M60 2LA

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2020**

#### **Present:**

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

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods  
Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing  
Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure  
Mike Wild, Macc  
Martin Preston, Macc

#### **Apologies:**

Councillors Douglas and Rawlins

#### **CESC/20/15            Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 6 February 2020 as a correct record.

#### **CESC/20/16            Review of Advice Services in Manchester - Final Report and Recommendations**

The Committee received a report of the Review of Advice Services in Manchester Task and Finish Group which presented the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the Review of Advice Services in Manchester Task and Finish Group. The Task and Finish Group had been established to consider the availability of advice services across the city, with a view to producing recommendations to be considered in the budget in the next financial year.

The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing thanked the Members of the Task and Finish Group and other stakeholders who had contributed to this work, advising that it had been a helpful process and that the recommendations were useful and achievable. She proposed that, if the Committee endorsed the recommendations in the report, she and relevant officers could bring a report to a future meeting which outlined their response to the recommendations. She informed Members of work which had already commenced in relation to the recommendations, including work to provide ward-level information on available advice services, work to provide additional training for frontline staff, including library staff, discussions taking place with Registered Social Landlords (RSLs) and consideration of options for out of hours advice provision. She also informed the Committee about resources for and work to improve the provision of advice services in relation to homelessness and the prevention of homelessness and also for asylum seekers, refugees and people with no recourse to public funds.

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

- Request for more information on proposals for out of hours advice provision, noting that if telephone advice was to be made available through libraries, privacy was important;
- That RSLs should have a greater input, including a financial contribution, to the provision of advice services and a suggestion that RSLs could commission the Council to provide advice services, noting that the Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing agreed to raise this through the Housing Providers Forum;
- The importance of having a pro-active approach to addressing debt, for example improving people's understanding of interest rates and raising awareness of issues relating to rent-to-own companies such as BrightHouse which charged high interest rates to low-income families;
- That this work should include consideration of the role RSLs could play in early intervention and that this could include a standard approach to providing support to tenants who were falling behind in their rent; and
- Concern that some tenants in overcrowded accommodation were de-prioritised for alternative accommodation because of their rent arrears and to ask that consideration be given to how households in this situation could be helped.

## Decisions

1. To note the findings of the Task and Finish Group and endorse the recommendations as set out in the report.
2. To submit the recommendations to the Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing and the recently-established multi agency Advice Forum for their consideration.
3. To request that the Committee receive a report in approximately six months' time which updates Members on actions being taken in response to the recommendations.
4. To request that the Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing additionally consider the issues that Members have raised at this meeting and that a response to these also be included in the report.

## **CESC/20/17                      Review of Council's Processes - Accessibility for Disabled People**

The Committee received a report of the City Solicitor which set out the intended approach for a review of how the Council engaged with disabled residents, to act upon the Council's previously stated commitment to embed disability inclusion and accessibility considerations in the design and development of Manchester's capital and public realm projects.

The report stated that embedding effective processes for accessibility for disabled people would ensure that Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) would recognise that

climate change might have differential and unique impacts on disabled people's communities across the city, for example in terms of poor air quality, more frequent incidences of extreme weather and initiatives to reduce car journeys or the use of plastics.

The Chair outlined the context within which the report was requested, noting the desire to learn from and rectify the issues which had become apparent when an inaccessible design for the Peterloo Memorial was approved.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Review of engagement mechanisms with disabled residents;
- Internal engagement;
- External research and engagement;
- Inclusive design round table;
- Outcomes and scope;
- Proposed timescales; and
- Communication.

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

- To welcome this review and to recognise the contribution of the Lead Member for Disability in this work;
- That the timescale for this work seemed long and what were the reasons for this;
- How the Council would ensure that partners, such as companies contracted to undertake building work, aligned with the Council's policies;
- Whether some of the work taking place in Manchester could in future be expanded across Greater Manchester; and
- Concern that there was a shortage of accessible housing for disabled people and to ask what data was available on future need and what could be done to plan for this.

The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform reported that the timescales had been set to allow time for a good consultation with a range of people and to engage with different areas of the Council, as well as to allow for other work that the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Team was involved in; however, he advised that the team was not waiting until the review was finished to start making improvements to processes.

The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform reported that the Council used its Ethical Procurement Policy to require contractors to comply with its standards and that the Council was in discussion with other partners about this approach including discussions with Greater Manchester partners on adopting a consistent approach to ethical procurement.

The Equalities Specialist advised Members that she would discuss the issue of accessible housing with colleagues in the housing service as part of the review.

In response to a Member's question, the Equalities Specialist informed Members that the Our Manchester Disability Plan Board and its Access Subgroup would be involved in the review. The Chair encouraged both Members and officers to consider, and to ask other stakeholders, whether there was anyone else who should be involved in this review.

### **Decision**

To request that the Committee receive a further report after the Inclusive Design Round Table meeting in October 2020.

### **CESC/20/18            Equality Objectives 2020 - 2024**

The Committee received a report of the City Solicitor which set out the Council's proposed equality objectives for the period 2020 - 2024. It outlined the approach that the Council had taken to setting these in the past and described the process that had been undertaken to ensure that the most recent set of objectives represented the priorities of Manchester residents and other stakeholders, as well as those of the Council. The report set out the objectives in draft form and provided an opportunity for the Committee to comment on these to influence further refinement of them before they were published by no later than 6 April 2020.

The report noted that, whilst the process of setting equality objectives did not directly demonstrate an impact on the achievement of the Council's zero-carbon target, the refresh of the draft objectives did take the opportunity to commit to more fully understanding the interaction of equality issues and environmental issues. It stated that the Council would complete EIAs against relevant aspects of its environmental programme, which would support this undertaking.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Engagement on the Equality Objectives 2020 – 2024;
- Draft Equality Objectives 2020 – 2024;
- Monitoring and reporting progress; and
- Publicising the Equality Objectives.

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

- How progress would be monitored;
- That deprivation and poverty should be included in this work, in addition to the protected characteristics listed in the Equality Act 2010; and
- What work would be done to increase the proportion of Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) people in the Council's workforce and to improve representation in the Council's senior leadership.

The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform drew Members' attention to section 4 of the report, which outlined how progress would be monitored. He proposed that the Committee receive a report on an annual basis, which would provide both qualitative and quantitative evidence on progress made. A Member suggested that the Committee receive a progress report sooner than this, in order to check that the

work was on track. The Chair advised that he would be happy for this item to be considered sooner.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods confirmed that the Council's work on equality and diversity went beyond the protected characteristics listed in the Equality Act 2010 and did include deprived communities. The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform drew Members' attention to the Council's Inclusive Growth Strategy and Family Poverty Strategy, which aimed to address issues of deprivation and poverty. He reported that there were actions which the Council was able to take to improve the life chances of people in more deprived communities but that some factors, such as the impact of welfare reform, were not fully within the Council's control, although the Council would try to mitigate their impact.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods informed Members about an Independent Race Review of the Council, reporting that this work was currently being finalised. He advised the Committee that the Council would need an action plan with short, medium and long-term actions to improve representation of both BAME people and disabled people at all levels. He stated that a report on this would be submitted to the relevant committee, which was likely to be either the Audit Committee or the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee.

### **Decision**

To request a further report on how the Council was achieving these objectives.

### **CESC/20/19 Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) Infrastructure Service**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform which provided an update on the VCSE infrastructure service, specifically on the contract management arrangements put in place since October 2019.

The report stated that officers would work with Macc (the provider) to consider how the VCSE Infrastructure service contract could contribute to Manchester's ambitions to live within the city's science-based carbon budget and become a zero carbon city by 2038 at the latest.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Background information;
- The contract management framework; and
- Next steps.

The Committee discussed the proposals for future communication and engagement with Council Members set out at point 4.1 in the report, including the benefits of both larger sessions for a big group of Members and smaller meetings. Members supported the proposals but commented that two Members' briefings per year would be sufficient, rather than the three or four suggested in the report.

In response to a Member's question on the referral mechanism for local groups, Mike Wild from Macc advised the Committee that this was a proposal for Ward Councillors to be able to refer local groups to Macc for support and to provide Macc with useful information about the group. He offered to re-circulate the link for how to put groups in contact with Macc.

### **Decision**

To support the proposals for communication and engagement with Members outlined in the report, while noting that two Members' briefings per year will be sufficient.

### **CESC/20/20            Community Events Funding and Applications**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided an update on the funding of Community Events and additional information related to applications to the Community Events Fund.

The report stated that recipients of Community Event Funding support were required to demonstrate a commitment to implementing a range of sustainable event practices as part of the management of their event in order to support the Council's carbon reduction target and work with the Council and partners to support Manchester in accelerating its efforts to encourage all residents, businesses and other stakeholders to take action on climate change. It also stated that it was a requirement that the Council's Sustainable Event Guide for Community Events was used as part of the planning, management and monitoring of sustainable practice and that this had been produced to help support community event organisers incorporate good practice into their event planning and delivery.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Background information on Community Events Funding;
- Community Events Funding Programme 2019/20, including the allocation of funding; and
- 2020/21 Community Events Funding.

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

- What was the rationale for the different amounts of funding allocated to each event;
- Were there any other sources of funding which could contribute to these events;
- That it would be useful in future to be provided with the reasons why applications had been declined;
- That some events were being funded every year, meaning that less funding was available to new groups to help them become established; and
- Funding for the Wythenshawe Games.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure reported that the Community Events Fund could be used to fund up to 20% of the overall budget of an event so, where larger amounts had been awarded, these were for higher cost events. He

reported that events could cover the rest of their costs from a range of sources, including other funders, commercial income and sponsorship, and that the Council encouraged groups to try to increase their funding from other sources so that they needed less funding from the Council. The Events Lead informed Members that obtaining sustainable funding from other sources could be challenging but that there had been some successes, for example, event organisers obtaining alternative funding from the Arts Council. He advised Members that, where events had received funding from the Council every year for a number of years, this was because they met the criteria and this had been assessed as being justified.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure confirmed that information could be provided on the reasons for the declined applications. He advised the Committee that this Fund was for events which had a citywide remit so one of the reasons for declining applications was that they were for more local events. He informed Members that in some cases the Council supported unsuccessful groups to build their capacity to enable them to successfully obtain funding in future. He reported that, following an underspend on the MCRactive budget, this budget had been used to fund the Wythenshawe Games.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **CESC/20/21            Overview Report**

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

The Chair noted that the Committee had requested a further report on the Peterloo Memorial and advised that he wanted to schedule this for when there was some substantial information to update the Committee on. He asked the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure to briefly outline the current position, including when it was likely that there would be something substantial to report.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure reported that discussions had taken place with stakeholders to discuss options to make the Memorial accessible for disabled people but that, while over 20 options had been considered, the majority of these had not been viable. He advised the Committee that a couple of further options were now being explored in detail, for example, considering whether there was sufficient space available around the monument for the proposed design and whether it met with relevant regulations. He informed Members that, following this, a meeting would be held with all the stakeholders and an independent chair to identify the most acceptable option. He suggested that the Committee might want to receive a further report on this at its June 2020 meeting, when a more substantial update should be available.

**Decision**

To note the report and agree the work programme and to provisionally schedule the Peterloo Memorial report for the June 2020 meeting.

## **Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 11 March 2020**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Hacking (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Andrews, Chambers, Collins, M Dar, Doswell, Douglas, Grimshaw, Hitchen and Rawson

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods  
Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader

**Apologies:** Councillors Battle, Evans, Kirkpatrick and Rawlins

#### **CESC/20/22 Call In: To make a Public Spaces Protection Order in respect of the City Centre for a maximum of 3 years**

The Committee considered a call in of the decision taken by the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) relating to the decision to make a Public Space Protection Order in respect of the City Centre for a maximum of three years.

The Call In had been proposed by Councillor Hacking, Chair of the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee. Councillor Hacking informed the Committee that the reason he had called the decision in was to seek an assurance from the Strategic Director that the concerns raised by the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 7 November 2019 in relation to the proposed PSPO for the City Centre had been taken fully into account prior to the decision being made.

The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) responded to the concerns raised by the Chair. In doing so she advised that to enable the Council to enable its strategic objectives of a safe, clean and welcoming city centre the Council and the police used a wide range of informal and formal powers to protect the public and tackle crime and antisocial behaviour. These measures included community resolution, warnings, Acceptable Behaviour Agreements, Community Protection Notices, injunctions, dispersal powers, arrests, prosecution and Criminal Behaviour Orders, alongside appropriate offers of intervention and support. The use of these powers had enabled the Council and Police to address some of the ASB that occurred in the city, however there were limitations to these powers. Current powers did not always facilitate an appropriate response to some of the problems that were frequently reported in the City Centre, like urination and defecation, health and safety hazards caused by the erection of tents and obstruction of exits, and build-up of commercial waste on the city streets.

The Strategic Director commented that she felt satisfied that the conditions as set out in Section 59 of the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 had been met and that by introducing the PSPO it would prohibit certain activities or require specified activities to be carried out by persons to ensure compliance with the Order. In order to make the decision, the Strategic Director advised that she had taken the following into consideration:-

- The evidence of the issues concerned'
- The consultation responses from the statutory consultation between 12 Feb to 8 April 2019, which included over 2000 responses; and
- The proposals for the PSPO presented to the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee on 7 November 2019 and the associated feedback form Committee Members.

The Committee's attention was drawn to two specific points that had been withdrawn from the original proposal. These were the removal of begging with associated ASB as either a prohibition or a requirement and at Article 7 in relation to the obstructions and erection of tents and structures had also been amended to ensure that this requirement was intended to address health and safety risks only.

The Strategic Director assured the Committee that in making the decision she had taken full account of the concerns that had been raised by the Committee at its meeting in November 2019 and the response to those matters were detailed in section 8 of the report. She also explained in making the decision, she had decided to include a six month review of the implementation and impact of the PSPO, which was not requirement of the provisions of the legislation and offered to bring a report back to this Committee in regards to this.

The Chair then invited the Committee to ask questions of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods). Some of the key questions and points that were made by the Committee were:-

- It was felt that the proposals around displacement were weak and there was concern that there was no dedicated team or officer identified to implement the proposals;
- How would the commercial waste element of the PSPO be enforced and who would be attributed the blame of creating commercial waste, the employee or employer;
- What would the six month review of the PSPO cover;
- What analysis had been undertaken of the use of existing powers to determine that they were not sufficient to address the areas that the PSPO addressed and as part of the six month review it was requested that a breakdown of how effective and how often the PSPO had been used in comparison to existing powers was included;
- In relation to Article 6 (Health and/or safety risks – obstruction), if there was a protest in the city and the highways were being blocked, who would the written order be served on;
- In relation to Article 7 (Health and safety risks – obstruction), who would you serve a written order n if they were homeless,
- There was concern that there had been no consultation with wards that neighboured the city centre in respect of the proposals around displacement;
- How was Greater Manchester Police going to deliver the required training to its Officers to deal with displacements in neighbouring wards;
- What would happen if a person who was rough sleeping refused to move or was on private property;

- It was requested that a measure of adherence to the Equality Act was included in the six month review of the PSPO;
- What was the timeframe for the needle exchange review; and
- What consideration was given to the letter received by over 50 community and voluntary organisations who worked in partnership with the Council to combat homelessness and adhered to the homelessness charter.

The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) advised that the PSPO would look to identify what support people, who were subject to displacement, needed through an existing strong multi agency partnership and it was clarified that it was not meant to be used in a punitive way and was part of a suite of tools and powers. It was acknowledged that displacement was not just confined to the City Centre and it was commented that there was a clear approach to addressing this across the city. What was proposed as part of the displacement article was to monitor carefully any issues that were directly arising from displacement.

In terms of commercial waste, it was reported that the PSPO would not be used in isolation to tackle this but it would however provide a more robust approach to addressing commercial waste which was not currently being achieved through existing powers. It was also confirmed that this would be enforced against the employer, not the employee and would not be enforced if the employer had complied with their contracted collection time but their waste had not been collected on time by their waste contractor. It was also confirmed that reporting back on the performance of the PSPO in regards to commercial waste could be reported back as part of the six month review.

The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) advised that some existing powers did not go far enough in tackling particular issues, such as commercial waste and obstructions. The six month review of the PSPO would cover the implementation and impact of the PSPO in the City Centre but at the current moment in time the exact content was still being scoped.

The Committee was advised that if there was a protest in the City Centre, the PSPO legislation would not be used, but rather Public Order legislation and this was covered by the Police. In terms of obstructions from tents, this would not be a prohibition of the PSPO but a requirement and as such those causing an obstruction would be asked to move. The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) clarified that the consultation on the PSPO had been available to everyone in the city and a number of responses had been received from groups and individuals in the city, not just the city centre.

It was clarified that the PSPO would only be operational within the City Centre and would not be used outside of the city centre boundary. The enforcement of displacement would be from a combination of Police Officers and Neighbourhood staff working in the city centre who would all be adequately trained. Having spoken to the Chief Superintendent for the City, it was envisaged that it would predominantly be city centre Neighbourhood Beat Officers who would be trained to use these powers. Again it was reiterated that the PSPO would not be used in isolation but rather as a suite of powers. As it had not been considered to use the PSPO anywhere outside of the City Centre it was explained that there was a requirement to

train staff who worked outside of the city centre and in terms of displacement there were teams of people who worked across the city to tackle anti social behaviour. Officers explained that the first step in dealing with rough sleepers would be to try and engage with the individual, find out who they were and what support they needed. to try and identify if they were already known or engaging with services. Only if this approach was unsuccessful or where someone continued to engage in anti social behaviour or cause an hazard by obstruction would enforcement action then be considered. It was also reported that powers would still be able to be used on private land that was publically accessible.

The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) advised that she would ask the Director of Population Health to share information on the needle exchange review. Furthermore she advised that if the letter from the voluntary and community organisations was received as part of the consultation it was taken into consideration alongside all other responses received

A Member of the Committee sought clarification as to what power the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) had in respect of incorporating any recommendations that the Committee may ask that she took into account if asked by the Committee to reconsider the decision. The Chair provided clarification of what options the Committee had in terms of determining what it could do in terms of dealing with the Call In, and if it was minded to refer the decision back to the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods), she would be required to give consideration to any recommendations put forward but was not obliged to accept them.

After all questions were asked, the Chair proposed a five minute adjournment

On the recommencement of the meeting, it was proposed to refer the decision back to the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) with the following recommendations:-

- That as part of the six month review, this was to include information and data on homelessness and information and data on commercial waste;
- That in relation to displacement, consideration be given to establishing a dedicated Officer or Team to deal with any displacements arising from the implementation of the PSPO; and
- That the enforcement of the PSPO should only be done by Police Officers or Council Staff who had received the necessary training to implement the PSPO;

## **Decisions**

The Committee:

- (1) Agrees to refer the decision back to the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) with the following recommendations
  - That as part of the six month review, this was to include information and data on homelessness and information and data on commercial waste;
  - That in relation to displacement, consideration be given to establishing a dedicated Officer or Team to deal with any displacements arising from the implementation of the PSPO; and

- That the enforcement of the PSPO should only be done by Police Officers or Council Staff who had received the necessary training to implement the PSPO;
- (2) Requests that the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) when scoping the content of the six month review of the PSPO, the additional points and areas raised by the Committee in its discussions is taken into account and included where possible; and
  - (3) Requests that the six month review is reported back to a future meeting of this committee, the precise date to be agreed in consultation with the Chair.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Manchester City Council  
Report for Information**

**Report to:** Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee – 25 June 2020

**Subject:** Overview Report

**Report of:** Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit

---

**Summary**

This report provides the following information:

- Recommendations Monitor
- Key Decisions
- Items for Information
- Work Programme

**Recommendation**

The Committee is invited to discuss the information provided and agree any changes to the work programme that are necessary.

---

**Contact Officer:**

Name: Rachel McKeon  
Position: Scrutiny Support Officer  
Telephone: 0161 234 4997  
Email: rachel.mckeon@manchester.gov.uk

**Background documents (available for public inspection):**

None

## 1. Monitoring Previous Recommendations

This section of the report lists recommendations made by the Committee and responses to them indicating whether the recommendation will be implemented and, if it will be, how this will be done.

Date	Item	Recommendation	Action	Contact Officer
7 December 2017	CESC/17/48 Volunteering – Timebanks	To ask Equality Lead Members to consider what role they could play in enabling timebanking to reach different communities, including consideration of specific timebanks around protected characteristics.	A response to this recommendation has been requested and will be reported back to the Committee via the Overview Report.	Keiran Barnes, Equality Team Leader
11 October 2018	CESC/18/39 Widening Access and Participation, Leisure, Libraries, Galleries and Culture – Update	To request that data on which wards the users of individual leisure facilities lived in be circulated to Members.	A response to this recommendation has been requested and will be circulated to Members.	Lee Preston, Sport and Leisure Lead
6 December 2018	CESC/18/54 Update on Revenue Financial Strategy and Business Plan Process 2019/20	To ask the Chief Operating Officer (Neighbourhoods) to confirm the implications of the change of management for staff employed at the Powerleague in Whalley Range.	A response to this recommendation has been requested and will be reported back to the Committee via the Overview Report.	Fiona Worrall, Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods)
7 March 2019	CESC/19/17 Manchester Community Events	To request that a list of groups which were successful and unsuccessful in obtaining funding through the Community Events Funding Programme 2019-20 be circulated to Members, including details of whether the groups have been funded in previous years.	A response to this recommendation was incorporated into the report submitted to the Committee's meeting on 5 March 2020.	Neil Fairlamb, Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure and Events)
5 March	CESC/20/16	To submit the recommendations to	This recommendation has been	Rachel McKeon,

2020	Review of Advice Services in Manchester - Final Report and Recommendations	the Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing and the recently-established multi agency Advice Forum for their consideration.	completed.	Scrutiny Support Officer
11 March 2020	CESC/20/22 Call In: To make a Public Spaces Protection Order in respect of the City Centre for a maximum of 3 years	<p>(1) Agrees to refer the decision back to the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) with the following recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That as part of the six month review, this was to include information and data on homelessness and information and data on commercial waste;</li> <li>• That in relation to displacement, consideration be given to establishing a dedicated Officer or Team to deal with any displacements arising from the implementation of the PSPO; and</li> <li>• That the enforcement of the PSPO should only be done by Police Officers or Council Staff who had received the necessary training to implement the PSPO;</li> </ul> <p>(2) Requests that the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) when scoping the content of the</p>	A response to these recommendations was circulated to Members by email on 26 May 2020.	Fiona Worrall, Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods)

		<p>six month review of the PSPO, the additional points and areas raised by the Committee in its discussions is taken into account and included where possible; and</p> <p>(3) Requests that the six month review is reported back to a future meeting of this committee, the precise date to be agreed in consultation with the Chair.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

## 2. Key Decisions

The Council is required to publish details of key decisions that will be taken at least 28 days before the decision is due to be taken. Details of key decisions that are due to be taken are published on a monthly basis in the Register of Key Decisions.

A key decision, as defined in the Council's Constitution is an executive decision, which is likely:

- To result in the Council incurring expenditure which is, or the making of savings which are, significant having regard to the Council's budget for the service or function to which the decision relates, or
- To be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in an area comprising two or more wards in the area of the city.

The Council Constitution defines 'significant' as being expenditure or savings (including the loss of income or capital receipts) in excess of £500k, providing that is not more than 10% of the gross operating expenditure for any budget heading in the in the Council's Revenue Budget Book, and subject to other defined exceptions.

An extract of the most recent Register of Key Decisions, published on **12 June 2020** containing details of the decisions under the Committee's remit is included below. This is to keep members informed of what decisions are being taken and, where appropriate, include in the work programme of the Committee.

## Register of Key Decisions:

Subject / Decision	Decision Maker	Decision Due Date	Consultation	Background documents	Officer Contact
<p><b>National Taekwondo Centre 2018/10/19A</b></p> <p>Enter into a 39 year lease with Sport Taekwondo UK Ltd for areas within the building.</p>	Chief Executive	Not before 1st Nov 2018		Briefing Note and Heads of Terms	Richard Cohen r.cohen@manchester.gov.uk
<p><b>Leisure Services - External Ref: 2016/02/01C</b></p> <p>The approval of capital expenditure on external Leisure Services land and buildings.</p>	City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive)	Not before 1st Mar 2019		Business Case	Lee Preston l.preston2@manchester.gov.uk
<p><b>House of Sport (2019/07/26A)</b></p> <p>Remodelling of the Regional Athletics Arena/National Squash Centre to incorporate and accommodate the relocation of sports and related institutions to be known as the House of Sport.</p>	City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive)	Not before 3rd Oct 2019		Report to Executive (Eastlands Regeneration Framework – 13.12.17, 25.07.18 (update), 25.07.19) Eastlands Update Executive Report – 11.09.19 & Full Council	Richard Cohen r.cohen@manchester.gov.uk

				02.10.19	
<p><b>Financial approval of MCR Active Contract 2020/21(2020/02/04A)</b></p> <p>To seek financial approval of 2nd year of MCR Active Contract for period 1st April 2020 to 31st March 2021.</p>	Executive	11 Mar 2020		Executive report	Yvonne O'Malley, Lord Mayor Charity y.omalley@manchester.gov.uk
<p><b>Wynnstay Grove Public Space Protection Order (2019/01/08A)</b></p> <p>To grant a Public Space Protection Order to address anti-social behaviour outside the Marie Stopes Abortion Clinic on Wynnstay Grove.</p>	Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods)	Not before 1st Apr 2020		Consultation responses and covering report	Sam Stabler s.stabler@manchester.gov.uk
<p><b>Extra Care - Russell Road LGBT Project 2019/03/01H</b></p> <p>The approval of capital expenditure on the City's Extra Care Programme to develop new build extra care units which will be in the ownership of MCC.</p>	City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive)	Not before 1st Mar 2019		Checkpoint 4 Business Case	Steve Sheen s.sheen@manchester.gov.uk

**Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee  
Work Programme – June 2020**

<b>Thursday 25 June 2020, 2.00 pm (Report deadline Monday 15 June 2020)</b>				
Item	Purpose	Executive Member	Strategic Director/ Lead Officer	Comments
Update on COVID-19	To receive an overview of the city's response and recovery work and an update on areas within the Committee's remit.		Fiona Worrall	
Overview Report	The monthly report includes the recommendations monitor, relevant key decisions, the Committee's work programme and any items for information.	-	Rachel McKeon	

<b>Thursday 3 September 2020, 2.00 pm (Report deadline Friday 21 August 2020)</b>				
Item	Purpose	Executive Member	Strategic Director/ Lead Officer	Comments
Overview Report		-	Rachel McKeon	

This page is intentionally left blank