



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

**Tuesday, 20 October 2020**

Dear Councillor / Honorary Alderman,

### **Extraordinary Meeting of the Council – Wednesday, 28th October, 2020**

You are summoned to attend an extraordinary meeting of the Council which will be held at the rise of the preceding Council meeting on Wednesday, 28th October, 2020: webcast at [https://manchester.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast\\_interactive/516706](https://manchester.public-i.tv/core/portal/webcast_interactive/516706).

#### **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.

#### **1. The Lord Mayor's Announcements and Special Business**

#### **2. Interests**

To allow members an opportunity to declare any personal, prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interest they might have in any items which appear on this agenda; and record any items from which they are precluded from voting as a result of Council Tax or Council rent arrears. 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. Proceedings of the Executive**

5 - 92

To submit the minutes of the Executive on 6 May 2020, 3 June 2020, 3 July 2020, 29 July 2020, 9 September 2020. A list of resolutions made at those meetings that would otherwise have been considered by the Council can be found in the report entitled Use of Emergency Urgency Powers and Urgent Key Decisions on this Summons. For the meeting held on 14 October 2020, Council is asked in particular to consider:

**Exe/20/104 Revenue Budget Monitoring 2020/21 and Budget**

**Position 2021/22.**

To recommend to the Council the approval of the proposed budget transfer of £7.627m from 'third party payments' to 'transfer to reserves' in order to support the 2021/22 budget.

**Exe/20/105 Capital Budget Monitoring 2020/21**

To recommend that the Council approve virements over £0.5m within the capital programme as outlined in Appendix 1 of these minutes

To recommend that the Council approve the capital programme as presented in Appendix 2 of these minutes which will require prudential borrowing of £790.7m to fund non-HRA schemes over the five-year period for which provision has been made in the revenue budget for the associated financing costs (within limits previously agreed).

**Exe/20/106 Capital Programme Update**

To recommend that the Council approve the following changes to Manchester City Council's capital programme:

- Growth and Development – Demolition of Grey Mare Police Station. A capital budget increase of £0.761m is requested, funded by HCA Eastlands Reserve Fund.
- Highways Services - Planned Maintenance 2020/21 Carriageway Preventative Programme. A capital budget virement of £1.289m is requested from the Highways Project Delivery Fund budget.
- Public Sector Housing – Silk Street. A capital budget increase of £12.048m is requested, funded by £5.650m HRA (RCCO), £4.140m Grant and £2.258m Capital Receipts.

**Exe/20/112 The Factory**

To recommend that the Council approve a Capital Budget increase of £45.17m for The Factory. This will increase the total capital budget for the construction of The Factory from £140.62m to £185.79m to be met from external contributions. This increase will be met from Council resources to support the delivery of Factory in advance of external contributions being received by the Council, in order that the Council can continue to meet its contractual obligations.

**4. Scrutiny Committees**

To note the minutes of the following committees:

Resources and Governance - 23 June 2020, 21 July 2020, 1 September 2020 and 6 October 2020 (to follow)

Health - 23 June 2020, 21 July 2020, 1 September 2020 and 6 October 2020  
Children and Young People - 24 June 2020, 21 July 2020, 2 September 2020 and 7 October 2020 (to follow)  
Neighbourhoods and Environment - 24 June 2020, 22 July 2020, 2 September 2020 and 7 October 2020  
Economy - 25 June 2020, 23 July 2020, 3 September 2020 and 8 October 2020  
Communities and Equalities - 25 June 2020, 23 July 2020, 3 September 2020 and 8 October 2020 (to follow)

**5. Proceedings of Committees**

239 - 298

To submit for approval the minutes of the following meetings and consider recommendations made by the committees:

Audit - 28 July 2020, 15 September 2020 and 13 October 2020 (to follow)  
Constitutional and Nomination - 27 October 2020 (to follow)  
Health and Wellbeing Board - 26 August 2020  
Planning and Highways - 27 August 2020 and 24 September 2020

**6. Dates of Council meetings in 2020/21**

To agree the dates of ordinary meetings of the Council in 2020/21:

Wednesday 25 November 2020  
Wednesday 3 February 2021  
Friday 5 March 2021 (Budget)  
Wednesday 31 March 2021

and that the Annual Meeting of the Council 2021 will be on 19 May 2021

**7. Use of Emergency Powers and Urgent Key Decisions**

299 - 306

The report of the City Solicitor is enclosed.

---

Yours faithfully,



**Joanne Roney OBE**  
Chief Executive

## Information about the Council

The Council is composed of 96 councillors with one third elected three years in four. Councillors are democratically accountable to residents of their ward. Their overriding duty is to the whole community, but they have a special duty to their constituents, including those who did not vote for them. There are two vacancies on the Council at this time

Seven individuals with previous long service as councillors of the city have been appointed Honorary Aldermen of the City of Manchester and are entitled to attend every Council meeting. They do not however have a vote.

All councillors meet together as the Council under the chairship of the Lord Mayor of Manchester. There are seven meetings of the Council in each municipal year and they are open to the public. Here councillors decide the Council's overall strategic policies and set the budget each year.

Agenda, reports and minutes of all Council meetings can be found on the Council's website [democracy.manchester.gov.uk](http://democracy.manchester.gov.uk)

## Members of the Council

---

### Councillors:-

Hitchen, Abdullatif, Akbar, Azra Ali, Ahmed Ali, Nasrin Ali, Sameem Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Andrews, Appleby, Battle, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Chohan (Chair), Clay, Collins, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Y Dar, Davies, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Farrell, Flanagan, Green, Grimshaw, Hacking, Hassan, Hewitson, Holt, Hughes, Igbon, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, T Judge (Deputy Chair), Kamal, Karney, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, Leese, J Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Madeleine Monaghan, Mary Monaghan, Moore, N Murphy, Newman, Noor, O'Neil, Ollerhead, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reeves, Reid, Riasat, Richards, Rowles, Russell, Sadler, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, A Simcock, K Simcock, Stanton, Stogia, Stone, Strong, Taylor, Watson, Wheeler, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

### Honorary Aldermen of the City of Manchester –

Hugh Barrett, William Egerton JP, Andrew Fender, Audrey Jones JP, Paul Murphy OBE, Nilofar Siddiqi and Keith Whitmore.

## Further Information

---

For help, advice or information about this meeting please contact the meeting Clerk:

Andrew Woods  
Tel: 0161 234 3011  
Email: [andrew.woods@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.woods@manchester.gov.uk)

This agenda was issued on **Tuesday, 20 October 2020** by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Manchester City Council, Level 3, Town Hall Extension (Lloyd Street Elevation), Manchester M60 2LA

## **Executive**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 6 May 2020**

(This was a remote meeting with all persons present in the meeting being remote from each other)

**Present:** Councillor Leese (Chair)

**Councillors:** Akbar, Bridges, Craig, N Murphy, Ollerhead, Rahman, Stogia and Richards

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

**Councillors:** Leech, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Midgley, Ilyas, Taylor and S Judge

#### **Exe/20/56 Tribute to former Councillor Sue Murphy**

The Leader of the Council paid tribute to the important contribution Sue Murphy had made to the city and to the Council. Members and all those present observed a minute's silence in remembrance of Councillor Sue Murphy.

#### **Exe/20/57 Minutes**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 25 March 2020.

#### **Exe/20/58 COVID 19 - Update on Response Phase**

[Cllr Leese declared a personal interest in a part of the update as Director of Manchester Airport Group]

A report of the Chief Executive provided a summary of the work undertaken in response to the COVID-19 virus pandemic in Manchester.

The areas of work outlined in the report included:

- Providing a summary of the development of COVID-19;
- Detailing the activity undertaken by the City Council, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC) and the Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO) to establish the Community COVID-19 Testing Hub with Trafford partners;
- Describing the work of the Manchester and Trafford mutual aid hub that had been set up to distribute Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) to front-line workers as quickly as possible;
- Information was provided on the governance arrangements to support the Council response, with reference to the Greater Manchester Resilience Forum (GMRF) which was to be represented at the Strategic Coordinating Group (SCG) and Emergency Committee;
- Information on workforce considerations;

- Detailing the various forms of support available to help residents, including but not restricted to welfare and benefit support, support for carers, Free School Meals, emergency food provision and the Hardship Fund;
- Direct support to businesses, including expansion of the Retail Discount and the availability of grants;
- An update on Adult Social Care and the work with Health Partners;
- Describing the work to assist residents experiencing homelessness and rough sleeping;
- An update on the response of a range of different council services;
- Describing the financial implications for the council of the virus pandemic and controls, noting that the work to identify the financial implications of the current COVID-19 crisis was ongoing and evolving, particularly as announcements were being made regarding lockdown and continuing social distancing; and
- An overview of post lockdown planning and preparations for the next phase.

The Leader stated that the pandemic was unprecedented and having a profound impact and he, on behalf of all Members paid tribute to the Chief Executive, the Senior Management Team, officers and all Public Sector workers for their invaluable and effective response to the difficult and challenging circumstances. He stated that he was in daily contact with the Chief Executive to monitor the emerging situation and that each Executive Member was in regular contact with the appropriate officers within the council's Senior Management Team. He further advised that he was contributing to the Greater Manchester Emergency Committee, chaired jointly by the Mayor of Greater Manchester and the Chief Constable of Greater Manchester Police (GMP). He told the meeting that he was in weekly contact with the Local Government Association to lobby central government over a range of issues, including the budgetary position.

With reference to the approval of a loan to support Manchester Airport, the Leader stated that due to the commercially sensitive nature of those arrangements it was not appropriate at that time to provide detailed information; however, he reassured the Members that the Deputy Leader, who had taken the decision, had consulted the Chief Executive, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and relevant Scrutiny Chair prior to the decision being taken and that all Members had been briefed on these arrangements.

The Leader then invited each individual Executive Member to provide an update on the work within their area of responsibility.

The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing paid tribute to all the staff who were working to provide services and support to the residents of Manchester, commenting that this would not be forgotten. She explained that over previous years the foundations had been established in Manchester to respond effectively to the situation by the integration of health and social care services and by establishing effective relationships. The planning of the response to the emerging COVID-19 threat had commenced in January 2020 and those plans had been reported to the Health Scrutiny Committee and Executive. She added that it was an emerging and changing landscape and that the figures presented within the published report were already out of date and she provided the meeting with updated figures in relation to the number of reported COVID-19 deaths.

In regard to hospital capacity the Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing reported that Manchester was doing well and reiterated the message that residents were encouraged to seek medical assistance when required and not to delay or avoid seeking medical help for fear of COVID-19.

In regard to testing, the Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing advised that on 20 March 2020 the City Council, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning and the Manchester Local Care Organisation had established the Community COVID-19 Testing Hub with Trafford partners to support the national programme and to implement a Manchester response, noting that testing sites were currently provided at the Airport, the Etihad Stadium and at Alexandra Park. The intention was to implement mobile testing sites across the city. She stated that the Community Testing Team were accessing Care Homes, commenting that this was very important and discussions were ongoing with the Care Quality Commission and Public Health England to continue to test care home residents. She stated that Manchester was using its local expertise and knowledge to support and inform testing at a Greater Manchester level.

With specific reference to Care Homes, the Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing stated that Manchester remained committed to working with Care Homes to offer appropriate support and advice across a range of activities and services, noting that at the time of reporting two thirds of care homes in Manchester were not reporting cases of COVID-19. She advised that patients were being tested for COVID-19 prior to discharge from hospital to a care home. In response to a specific question, she confirmed that she had been given an assurance that anybody in a care home experiencing COVID-19 symptoms would receive the most appropriate treatment, where necessary including admission to hospital. The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing stated that all care home providers would be written to to advise them on the range of support via emergency funding that would be available to them.

With regard to PPE, the Executive Member stated that nationally there was an issue with procurement; however, Manchester had benefited from the establishment of a number of mutual aid hubs to deliver PPE to frontline staff across a range of settings, including staff working in care homes, homeless charities and GP Practices. She stated that this activity had been supported by local business and voluntary and community groups and she expressed her gratitude to all those involved.

The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing concluded by advising that the Manchester Local Care Organisation remained committed to delivering services to support vulnerable residents, including those identified as being in the shielded category. She stated the Freephone Helpline number was available to residents and advice was provided in a number of languages. She reported that the Helpline had received over 10,000 calls to date that had resulted in food being delivered to support more than 8,000 residents, with 6,000 of these identified as requiring ongoing support. She stated that this had been achieved by the efforts of the Voluntary and Community Sector and she paid tribute to the way in which they had responded and adapted to deliver this support.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods reported next, stating that he wished to place on record his thanks on behalf of all Members and residents to all staff and the Biffa crews that had worked in difficult circumstances to deliver the city's waste and recycling service with the minimum of disruption to residents. He advised that the bulky waste collection service had been reinstated and he thanked residents for their patience and understanding during this period. In response to a comment made regarding the necessity to keep all Members informed in an appropriate and timely manner of any changes to collections the Leader stated every endeavour would be made to inform Members in advance of any public announcements; however, it was important to acknowledge that circumstances changed quickly and this might not always be possible.

Problems nationally with flytipping had attracted a significant amount of press attention. The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods reported that Manchester had in fact experienced a reduction in the number of flytipping incidents, and where these had occurred contractors had been able to remove these in a timely manner.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods further paid tribute to all local faith leaders for the support offered to their local communities and congregations, noting the importance of spiritual support at such times whilst observing social distancing.

In his report the Deputy Leader paid tribute to Manchester residents in responding and adapting to the current difficult situation. He stated that whilst there had been a small number of cases of non-compliance, Manchester had been able to continue to keep parks and open spaces accessible for the benefit of the majority of Mancunians.

The Deputy Leader advised that where incidents and complaints had arisen officers from the Anti-Social Behaviour Action Team had worked closely with colleagues in GMP to address those. The policy that had been adopted was one of engage and explain, and in general that was being effective. He further welcomed the work undertaken to address speeding vehicles and off road motorcycles, which was another issue being seen across the whole country.

The Deputy Leader stated that it was acknowledged that the need to maintain social distancing would remain in place for some time and the Council was committed to supporting residents and businesses to adapt to this new way of life.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools paid tribute to all staff working in Children's and Education Services and the Senior Management Team for their response to the crisis, noting that they had demonstrated resilience and commitment. He further paid tribute to all staff working in schools and early learning settings for their response in providing home learning materials and delivering welfare checks, noting that he recognised how difficult lockdown could be for families and children, particularly those with additional needs. He thanked staff for protecting and supporting vulnerable people and stated that all this had emphasised the importance of the public sector and social care. He advised that all schools were receiving daily updates from the Director of Education and that the feedback from the schools to this contact and support was very welcome.



The Executive Member advised that ahead of the Government scheme to issue vouchers via schools to families who would usually be eligible for Free School Meals, Manchester City Council had made local arrangements to support Manchester families and he thanked the Director of Customer Services and Transactions and the work of the staff in the Revenues and Benefit Unit to deliver this support in a timely manner.

The Executive Member also informed Members that the Statutory Social Work service had continued to deliver the service in a 'business as usual' way and he continued to receive regular performance activity updates. He was reassured that all Looked After Children in Manchester continued to receive the appropriate support and regular contact from Social Workers using a range of different methods, adding that equipment has been provided to young people to enable digital and virtual contact.

Tribute was also paid to Foster Carers, recognising the important and invaluable role they provided in supporting young people. He advised that they were contacted weekly by the service to offer support and maintain contact.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools concluded by paying particular thanks to all young people across the city for adhering to the lockdown and he stated that it was recognised how challenging and difficult this was for them.

In response to a question regarding the reported decrease in the number of calls requesting assistance from Social Services, the Executive Member replied that this reflected national trends. He said that work was underway to reach out, contact and support people in need, such as those with an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP). Council teams located in the Neighbourhood Hubs were being proactive in identifying and offering such support.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources thanked all frontline staff and recognised the important work of all of the back office staff for supporting the response to this crisis, including those in the ICT and HR Departments for supporting staff as they interpreted and responded to the changing working environment and guidance. He noted that Manchester had already begun to prepare to respond to the emergency in advance of any Government announcements and made reference to the work of the Revenue and Benefit Unit to administer free school meals and financial support for businesses across the city. He advised the scale of this challenge could not be underestimated and he thanked the staff for their hard work to process the required changes and apply the grants and discounts appropriately, noting this equated to £66.865m support paid to local business. He further encouraged all local businesses to check what support they were entitled to that could help them through this challenging time and stated that information could be obtained via the Council's website.

In response to a specific question in relation to the numbers of fraudulent applications for grants, the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources advised that he had sought an assurance from the Head of Audit and he was satisfied by the checks and due diligence taken by staff when processing applications. In regard to the one

specific incident regarding a double payment he reported that this was a genuine mistake and had been resolved quickly.

In regard to a question regarding Welfare Funding the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that the use of the funding would continue to be reported.

Reporting next, the Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport thanked all staff for their work to support the residents of Manchester and wanted to take the opportunity to reassure residents that the work to tackle climate change was ongoing and remained a priority for the Council. In regard to the reporting of 2019/20 direct emissions she confirmed that this would complete the reporting against the Council's previous Climate Change Action Plan and would establish an accurate baseline by which to report progress against the new Climate Change Action Plan. The Council remained committed to ensuring that the Council's direct emissions reduced by 50% over the next five years and would continue to play a full part to support the city to achieve its carbon budget reduction ambitions.

The Executive Member reported that a mapping exercise was currently underway to explore future tree planting opportunities in 2020/21. At the appropriate time local communities and stakeholders would be invited to plant trees. In terms of reducing emissions, applications had been submitted to the Department of Transport to fund a fleet of e-cargo bikes and trailers to support greener courier services and submission had been made to the National Lottery Fund to seek funding to support local communities to deliver local environmental projects to address climate change and increase resilience. Furthermore, European Development Funding was being sought to progress work on the Hammerstone Road Depot and the installation of solar car ports at the Velodrome site. Dialogue had also commenced with the Department for Business Energy and Industrial Strategy with the aim of securing additional funding to support the delivery of the Climate Change Action Plan.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration informed the Members that across Manchester there were approximately thirty Registered Housing Partners and as a result of existing joint work arrangements and relationships they had been in a strong position to respond at a community level when the virus pandemic crisis had emerged.

The Executive Member paid tribute to the positive response and 'can do' attitude of all the staff to support vulnerable residents. She made reference to the numerous initiatives undertaken by different providers to contact and support local residents. She thanked them all for their huge and important contribution that they played in supporting residents and she stated that they in turn would be supported in the difficult months ahead.

With regard to Manchester Move, the meeting was advised that this housing allocations system had been suspended during the lockdown period with priority being given to emergency allocations to ensure people requiring discharge from hospital or those fleeing domestic abuse could be housed quickly, appropriately and safely.

In his report to the meeting the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure thanked the staff working in the Homelessness Team and across the wider Homelessness Partnership and the Voluntary and Community Sector for their invaluable work to support the most vulnerable residents in the city, often with complex needs, at such a challenging time.

The Executive Member advised that 255 people had been accommodated in hotels and other temporary accommodation and they continued to receive specialist support. He said that the ambition would now be to identify suitable permanent accommodation for these residents and this would be facilitated via individual support plans. He stated that this remained a challenge and the Government would continue to be lobbied to ensure appropriate funding was made available to Manchester to support this area of activity.

The Leader stated that despite the best efforts of officers, there remained a small number of rough sleepers who had refused all offers of accommodation; however, work with partners continued to offer support to these individuals and those individuals could still access support.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **Exe/20/59 COVID 19 - Forward Recovery Planning**

A report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer provided the Executive with an overview of forward planning work for the city's recovery from the COVID-19 crisis. This included preparations which were already underway to manage the phased opening up of the city and planning for the longer term challenges.

The report outlined proposals to reset and reposition the Our Manchester Strategy 2016 -2025 to respond to the post COVID-19 challenges the city now faced, starting with a consultation which was rooted in the Our Manchester approach.

The areas of work outlined in the report included:

- Economy – planning to support the economic recovery of the city, including support for businesses, supporting residents to develop skills and get back into employment, promoting residential and commercial development and transport planning;
- Residents and communities – including addressing poverty, supporting vulnerable residents, building community resilience and relationships, supporting the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector and understanding and addressing how the crisis was impacting on different groups; and
- Impact on the Council and Public Services – including Health and Social Care, Public Service Reform, changing ways of working and the financial impact of the crisis.

The report stated that this would be supported by:

- Evidence base and impact for each of the above workstreams;
- External relationships with a range of key partners; and
- The reset of the Our Manchester Strategy

The proposed terms of reference for the COVID-19 Recovery Coordination Group were appended to the report.

The Leader introduced the item, highlighting the challenges the city would face, in particular the predicted impact of the crisis on unemployment levels. He advised that an Executive Member would lead on each area of this work, alongside a senior responsible officer. He reported that it was important to both keep people safe and ensure that they felt safe.

The Deputy Leader advised Members that the world had changed significantly since the Our Manchester Strategy was developed in 2015 and that it needed to be reviewed to take into account the COVID-19 crisis, the impact of Brexit and the increasing priority being given to addressing climate change. He outlined the proposed approach and timeline for this review, involving consultation with stakeholders, with a revised strategy to be submitted to the Executive for approval in early 2021.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration thanked staff in the Growth and Development service for their work. She emphasised the importance of building and development for the city's economic recovery and updated Members on housing building, particularly the building of affordable housing, including confirmation of £51 million in housing infrastructure funding for the Northern Gateway project and discussions with existing housing providers were ongoing to understand the challenges they were facing due to COVID-19. She informed Members that an update on the establishment of a housing delivery vehicle would be provided to the Executive's meeting in June 2020. She stated that the Council was committed to supporting and working with developers who shared its vision of safe, secure, quality, affordable housing and to getting the city building again.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport reported that use of all forms of public transport had decreased dramatically since the start of the COVID-19 crisis and that car use had also reduced, although some key workers had switched from using public transport to driving to work due to concerns about transmission of COVID-19 on public transport. She informed Members that air quality had improved significantly due to fewer vehicles being on the road but that people who could not work from home needed to be able to travel to work safely. Enabling them to do so was a priority for the Council and its partners; looking closely at national guidance. She thanked transport workers, highways staff and Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) for their work. She advised Members that enabling people to walk safely while observing social distancing was also a priority, that a decision had already been taken to close part of Deansgate in the city centre to vehicles and that the Council was looking at what measures could be taken in local district centres, in consultation with Ward Councillors.

The Leader informed Members that colleagues in Public Health, Environmental Health and the Health Service were working together to develop proposals on contact tracing and mass testing, which would complement the work taking place at a national level.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources informed Members that, since the Council's budget had been approved on 6 March 2020, the situation had changed drastically. He highlighted some of the financial challenges which were detailed in the report submitted to the Executive and expressed concern that the additional funding being provided by the national government would not cover the full impact of the COVID-19 crisis. He advised that, due to the economic uncertainty, escalating costs and loss of income arising from this crisis, the budget would need to be reviewed and a detailed report would be brought to the Executive's meeting in July 2020.

The Chief Executive thanked the Leader, Executive Members and Council staff for all their work, emphasising that this was still an ongoing effort to respond to the situation and plan for the future of the city. She highlighted the importance of considering what data could be put into the public domain, taking into account the rapidly changing nature of the situation.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer also added her thanks to those expressed earlier. She advised Members that the Council had received funding which would cover a lot of the additional costs incurred this year but that she was concerned about the impact of the crisis on the Council's income streams including business rates, council tax, dividends and commercial income and that this impact would be felt in the next financial year. She assured Members that significant work was taking place to address all the areas outlined in the report.

The Leader informed Members that the Leader of the Opposition was experiencing technical difficulties that were making his continued participation in the meeting difficult. The Leader therefore offered that any questions or comments he wished to make would be added to the public record. He informed Members that discussions would be taking place with the Chairs of the Scrutiny Committees about what form scrutiny would take during this period, recognising that the usual requirement for officers to produce several reports each month was not practical at present.

## **Decisions**

1. To note the approach to the forward planning work and the establishment of the COVID-19 Recovery Coordination Group and its terms of reference.
2. To approve the preparatory work required to plan for a formal reset of the Our Manchester Strategy 2016-2025.
3. To note the work that is taking place through Greater Manchester, the UK Core Cities, and to influence the Government.
4. To receive monthly update reports on this work as a standing item, given the dynamic and rapidly changing nature of the situation.



## Executive

### Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 3 June 2020

**Present:** Councillor Leese (Chair)

**Councillors:** Akbar, Bridges, Craig, N Murphy, Ollerhead, Rahman, Stogia and Richards

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

**Councillors:** Karney, Leech, Sheikh, Midgley, Ilyas and Taylor

#### Exe/20/60 Minutes

##### Decision

To confirm as a correct record the minutes of the Executive meeting on 6 May 2020.

#### Exe/20/61 The killing of George Floyd and antiracist protests in the USA and around the world

The Leader commented how the events in the USA had struck a chord with the people of Manchester. He reminded the meeting of the Council's long history of opposing racial discrimination. He said that the Lord Mayor had written to the Mayor on Minneapolis and the Governor of Minnesota and that Wythenshawe Hall had been illuminated by purple lighting, to show that the city supported the campaign for equalities. However, he also stressed the risks involved during the COVID-19 pandemic for large groups of people to gather to protest in the city centre, and the risks such protests created for others in the city.

#### Exe/20/62 Revenue Outturn 2019/20

The Council's revenue budget outturn for 2019/20 was presented. The Council had overspent the revised 2019/20 budget by £0.527m. That was a much improved position compared to the forecast of a £2.790m overspend which had been the position in the last of the 2019/20 Revenue Budget Monitoring Reports (Minute Exe/20/10). That was mainly due to an improved position in Children's Services spending.

The overall outturn position had been:

Table 1	Original Approved Budget £000	Revised Budget £000	Outturn £000	Variance £000	Variance at last report £000	Movement since last report £000
Total Available Resources	(610,835)	(628,091)	<b>(630,030)</b>	(1,939)	(1,779)	(163)
Total Corporate Budgets	113,629	119,852	<b>119,085</b>	(767)	(801)	34

Children's Services	120,434	120,869	<b>122,491</b>	1,622	3,241	(1,619)
Adult Social Care	198,263	198,324	<b>205,222</b>	6,898	6,953	(55)
Homelessness	13,375	14,111	<b>14,235</b>	124	0	124
Corporate Core	67,838	69,679	<b>66,814</b>	(2,865)	(2,851)	(14)
Neighbourhoods	91,781	99,321	<b>97,256</b>	(2,065)	(1,498)	(567)
Growth and Development	5,515	5,935	<b>5,454</b>	(481)	(475)	(6)
Total Directorate Budgets	497,206	508,239	<b>511,472</b>	3,233	5,370	(2,137)
Total Use of Resources	610,835	628,091	<b>630,557</b>	2,466	4,569	(2,103)
Total forecast over / (under) spend	0	0	<b>527</b>	527	2,790	(2,263)

The report explained that on 19 March 2020 the Government had announced a total of £1.6bn of new funding for local government to help it respond to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the services provided by councils. The council's allocation of that total had been £18.589m. Of that, some £389k of expenditure had been incurred in 2019/20, covering:

- £322k in ICT to enable staff to work from home;
- £54k Facilities Management for additional cleaning equipment and materials; and
- £13k Adults Social Care for personal protective equipment.

The remaining allocated of £18.2m was available in 2020/21. On 18 April 2020 the Government had announced a second allocation of £1.6bn to local authorities, with the council's allocation being a further £15.167m.

The report explained the 2019/20 financial performance in each of the council's directorates and main service delivery functions, showing how overall spending and income compared to budget, and whether planned-for savings had been achieved during the year. The most significant underspends and overspends were outlined in each case. The large overspending in Children's and Adult's Services had been mitigated by underpends in the corporate budgets and Neighbourhood Services, as seen in Table 1 above.

The report also addressed some end of year adjustments to the budgets and reserves from 2019/20, including the announcements of some additional grant funding.

### **Budgets to be Allocated**

In setting the 2019/20 budget in February 2019 it had been agreed that some budgets were to be held back for future allocation. These remaining uses of the unallocated funds from 2019/20 were therefore proposed and agreed:

- £0.586m from contingency funds to offset the price increases on placements of fostered children;
- £476k from budgets to be allocated and £81k from contingency funds to Homecare help reduce the demand for hospital beds; and
- £91k from contingency for inflationary increases on the Street Lighting PFI.



## Use of and Transfer to Reserves

The report requested that approval be given for the use of £16k in 2019/20 and £86k in 2020/21 from the Transformational Challenge award reserve to support the Adult Social Care's strength-based development programme which involved working alongside residents to identify the support and resources available from relatives, carers and from within the local community. That request was approved.

The report also recommended a number of transfers of funds into reserves, all of which were supported:

- £340k unspent from the Private Rented Sector Access Fund;
- £108k carry forward of 2019/20 Rough Sleeper Initiative and Rapid Rehousing Funding;
- £0.672m of unspent Discretionary Housing Payments to a reserve for use against future pressures in this service;
- £0.815m of unspent Winter Pressures Grant transferred to the Adults Social Care Reserve; and
- a further £1.003m of unutilised Adult Social Care Grant to the Adults Social Care Reserve.

## Grants in Addition to that Already Planned

The report explained that notifications had been received in relation to specific external grants. These allocations had not confirmed at the time of the 2019/20 and 2020/21 budget setting processes, confirmation of them was now being sought.

These were all supported:

- Engaging libraries Phase 2 - £10k in 2019/20 and £15k in 2020/21 to employ a project manager and to fund workshops to help Multilingual Manchester research language diversity in the city
- Unlocking clean energy in Greater Manchester - £164k in 2020/21, £104k in 2021/22, and £106k in 2022/23 to increase small scale renewable energy generation in Greater Manchester;
- European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) - Research and Intelligence Biohealth Accelerator - £101k in 2020/21, £71k in 2021/22 and £72k in 2022/23 for the Council to provide advice and guidance on ERDF technical requirements as well as assisting in the processing of grant claims.
- Get Greater Manchester digital - £50k in 2020/21 to fund a digital Inclusion officer role for two years.

## Decisions

1. To note the outturn position for 2019/20.
2. To note the Housing Revenue Account position for 2019/20.
3. To note the overall General Fund position for 2019/20.
4. To approve the use of budgets to be allocated as set out above.

5. To approve the use of and transfer to reserves as set out above.
6. To approve the use of grants in addition to that already planned, as set out above.
7. To note the allocation of COVID-19 funding received by the Council.

### **Exe/20/63 Revenue Budget - Update for COVID-19 Funding 2020/21**

A report submitted by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer outlined the COVID-19 funding that has been provided by Central Government and the current forecast of additional expenditure and loss of income as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

The additional funding that had so far been announced by the Government was:

<b>Funding Source</b>	<b>Manchester £000's</b>
COVID-19 Emergency Funding for Local Government - (£1.6bn nationally) - first allocation	18,589
COVID-19 Emergency Funding for Local Government - (£1.6bn nationally) - second allocation	15,167
Council Tax Hardship Fund (£500m nationally)	7,458
Emergency Support for Rough Sleepers (£3.2m nationally)	68
Care Home Infection Control Fund (£600m nationally)	3,342
Reopening High Streets Safely Fund (£50m nationally)	489
<b>Support for Businesses</b>	
Expanded Retail Discount 2020/21 (excludes 1% for Fire Authorities)	138,477
Small Business Grant Fund and Retail, Hospitality and Leisure Grant Fund (£12.3bn nationally)	121,032
Local Authority Discretionary Grants Fund	5,432

The report described the intended and actual use of each of these sources of extra funding. The Government had said that the two allocations of Emergency Funding had been provided to support these areas and services.

- To meet the increased demand for adult social care and to enable councils to provide additional support to social care providers. The Government expected that the majority of this funding would need to be spent on providing the Adult Social Care services required to respond to the Coronavirus crisis.
- Care Commissioning Groups (CCG) were being separately funding for the additional costs of discharging and keeping people out of hospital, including social care costs - commissioned by the local authority unless existing local arrangements suggest otherwise. It was essential that 'boundary issues' did not cause delays so it was expected the some of the council's funding would be used in a pooled budget with the local CCG.
- To meet the cost of extra demand and higher business-as-usual costs of providing children's social care, including as a result of school closures and the

need for increased accommodation to provide for isolation, including for unaccompanied asylum-seeking children.

- To provide additional support for the homeless and rough sleepers, including where self-isolation is needed.
- To support those at higher risk who were asked to shield and self-isolate in their homes for the duration of the pandemic.
- To meet pressures across other services arising from reduced income, rising costs or increased demand.

However, at the meeting the Executive Member explained that the estimated cost to the Council was £160m, so the two allocations of Emergency Funding announced would not cover all the council's expected costs and loss of income.

The report also explained the assumptions made for distribution of the Council Tax Hardship funding: £6.144m had been allocated to provide for residents in receipt of working-age Local Council Tax Support in 2020/21 to receive a further discount of £150. The remaining £1.314m was being used to support other welfare priorities including lunch time meals for children, discretionary Council tax Support, emergency food provision, for a fund to support unpaid carers, and to support households that might be facing a crisis or emergency.

It was explained that the Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC) Finance Committee was recommending that Council grant funding be pooled in tranches, with the first tranche of £3.834m reflecting Adult Social Care and Public Health commitments already made and expected to the end of July. Combined with the Care Home Infection Control Fund that would see the Council contributing £7.176m to the Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC) pooled fund. That was supported.

The report then addressed how the additional funding should be included within the 2020/21 revenue budget. It was recommended and agreed that the authority to decide the allocation of that funding across the council's budgets and directorates be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources. A provisional allocation of the funding was included in the report and noted.

	<b>Original Budget 2020/21 £'000</b>	<b>Proposed Revisions £'000</b>	<b>Revised Budget 2020/21 £'000</b>
<b>Resources Available</b>			
Business Rates Related Funding	339,547	138,477	478,024
Council Tax	174,465		174,465
Grants and other External Funding	66,642	25,798	92,440
Dividends and Use of Airport Reserve	62,890		62,890
Use of other Reserves	22,581	18,200	40,781
<b>Total Resources Available</b>	<b>666,125</b>	<b>182,475</b>	<b>848,600</b>
<b>Resources Required</b>			

<i>Corporate Costs:</i>			
Levies / Statutory Charge	71,327		71,327
Contingency	860		860
Capital Financing	44,507		44,507
Transfer to Reserves	18,263	138,477	156,740
<b>Subtotal Corporate Costs</b>	<b>134,957</b>	<b>138,477</b>	<b>273,434</b>
<i>Directorate Costs:</i>			
Additional Allowances and other pension costs	9,580		9,580
Insurance Costs	2,004		2,004
Inflationary Pressures and budgets to be allocated	10,271		10,271
Directorate Budgets	509,313	43,998	553,311
<b>Subtotal Directorate Costs</b>	<b>531,168</b>	<b>43,998</b>	<b>575,166</b>
<b>Total Resources Required</b>	<b>666,125</b>	<b>182,475</b>	<b>848,600</b>
<b>Shortfall / (surplus)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

## Decisions

1. To note the COVID-19 funding received by the Council.
2. To approve an increase in the use of COVID-19 reserve of £18.2m and grants and other external funding of £15.167m in 2020/21.
3. To approve an increase in grants and other external funding for the use of the hardship fund, excluding that used to support Council Tax Support claimants as that will be held in the Collection Fund.
4. To approve an increase in grants and other external funding of £68,000 relating to the emergency support for rough sleepers allocation.
5. To approve an increase in grants and other external funding of £3.342m relating to the Care Home Infection Control Fund.
6. To approve an increase in grants and other external funding of £489,000 relating to the Reopening High Streets Safely Fund.
7. To approve an increase in business rates related funding of £138.477m related to business rates, expanded retail discounts and a corresponding transfer to the business rates reserve to fund the resultant collection fund deficit which will be included in the 2021/22 budget.
8. To note that the Council is acting as agent to administer the BEIS scheme for grants to businesses.
9. To approve an increase in grants and other external funding of £5.432m, relating to the Local Authority Discretionary Grants Fund.

10. To note that the arrangements for the payment of grants made under the Local Authority Discretionary Grants Fund will be approved by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources.
11. To delegate authority for the allocation of the additional grant funding to individual services to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources.
12. To approve an Increase in the Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC) pooled fund of £7.176m, which consists of £3.834m from the COVID-19 Emergency Funding and £3.342m direct allocation in respect of the Care Home Infection Control Fund.

### **Exe/20/64 Capital Outturn 2019/20**

The Council's capital budget outturn for 2019/20 was presented. The total capital expenditure in 2019/20 for the council's capital programme had been £203.3m. The outturn of capital expenditure for 2019/20 on behalf of Greater Manchester had been £52.2m.

A summary of each part of the programme was included within the report, giving details on the major projects in each of those parts. Also presented was a summary of the outturn position and any changes to the budget that were recommended. It was explained that the COVID-19 pandemic had created significant uncertainty across the capital programme and that it was expected to create cost pressures through higher prolongation costs, increases to material costs and skilled labour shortages. This scale of these impacts were to be presented to a future meeting.

The report set out the details of all the recommended virements to move the allocation of funds between different capital projects within the overall programme. The size of some of those virements was beyond the normal limits of the Executive's powers and so the procedure put in place by the Council on 25 March 2020 had been used, to enable these changes to be made by the Executive without having to be approved by the Council.

A full schedule of the proposed virements was appended to the report, and all those were approved.

### **Decisions**

1. To approve the virements over £0.5m between capital schemes to maximise use of funding resources available to the City Council set out in the appendix to these minutes, noting this has been subject to approval by a Scrutiny Chair under the provision of the Council decision on 25 March 2020 (minute CC/20/26)

2. To note the outturn of capital expenditure 2019/20 for the Manchester City Council Programme was £203.3m, and that the outturn of capital expenditure 2019/20 for the Programme on behalf of Greater Manchester was £52.2m.
3. To note the changes to the outturn attributable to movement in the programme that occurred after the previous monitoring report in February 2020.
4. To approve virements under £0.5m within the capital programme as set out in the appendix to these minutes.
5. To note the decisions of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer regarding the funding of capital expenditure in 2019/20.

### **Exe/20/65 Capital Budget Update 2020/21**

A report concerning requests to increase the capital programme was submitted. It was agreed to make seven changes under delegated powers, three of those being under temporary powers delegated by the Council on 25 March 2020. These changes would increase the capital budget by £5.5m in 2020/21 and £1.5m in 2021/22, funded from grants, reserves and budgets.

The report also set out other changes to the programme that had been approved by the Deputy Chief Executive using delegated powers. They were:

£330,000 for the Mellands Project in Longsight

£164,000 for the Mellands Playing Fields in Levenshulme

£292,000 for a Gorton & Abbey Hey Section 106

£229,000 for Manchester Aquatics Car Park LED funded by an external contribution

£173,000 for Manchester Aquatics Car Park LED funded by the Invest to Save budget

£143,000 for Culvert Trash Screens

### **Decisions**

1. To approve, using temporary powers delegated by the Council (Minute CC/20/26) the following changes under to capital programme:
  - a) Highways Services - Planned Maintenance carriageway works 2020/21. A capital budget virement of £0.999m is requested, funded by Highways Project Delivery fund budget.
  - b) Children's Services - Schools Capital Maintenance Programme for 2020/21. A capital budget virement of £5m is requested, funded by Unallocated Schools Capital Maintenance budget.
  - c) Growth and Development – The Factory. A capital budget virement of £10m is requested, funded by unallocated Inflation.
2. To approve the following changes to the capital programme:

- d) Children's Services – Coop Academy North Expansion. A capital budget virement of £0.488m is requested, funded by Unallocated Education Basic Needs budget.
  - e) Growth and Development – Alexandra House Additional Funding. A capital budget virement of £0.200m is requested, funded by the Asset Management Programme budget.
  - f) Highways Services - Planned Maintenance carriageway works 2020/21. A capital budget increase of £5m is requested, funded by Department of Transportation Challenge Fund Grant.
  - g) Growth and Development - St Johns Public Realm. A capital budget increase of £2m is requested, funded from Business Rates Reserve.
3. To note increases to the programme of £1.331m as a result of delegated approvals by the Deputy Chief Executive.

### **Exe/20/66 Housing Revenue Account Delivery Model - Northwards Housing**

(Councillor Midgely declared a prejudicial interest in this item of business and disconnected from the meeting while it was being considered.)

The Chief Executive submitted a report to inform the Executive of the outcome of recent review of the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) and the Arm's Length Management Organisation (ALMO), Northwards Housing. Northwards looked after 13,300 of the council's nearly 16,000 council homes.

The review had examined the sustainability of the HRA and how it could best be utilised to ensure a good housing service to tenants and provide for the investment required in the housing stock. The analysis of the business plan had shown that HRA reserves would fall below £60m in 2027/28, triggering increased interest charges on debt in 2027/28. The HRA reserves were forecast to be exhausted by the end of the 30-year business plan leaving a deficit of over £11m. In addition to that, the need to retro-fit the properties to achieve full zero-carbon was being estimated at an additional £213m. When that was added into the business plan the plan would go below the £60m level in 2025/26; into deficit in 2031/32, and end the 30-year business plan period with a deficit of £438m.

The review of the work of Northwards Housing had been undertaken by a combination of interviews, document review, attendance at relevant governance and management meetings, reflection on previous reviews and some level of benchmarking. It had sought to try and determine if the ALMO provided a service as good as, if not better, than that experienced by other social housing tenants in Manchester, and whether the ALMO provided good value for money. The outcome of the reviews was that weaknesses had been identified and action needed to be taken, and those were explained in the report, including interim arrangements for the appointment of a suitably qualified Interim Chair of the Board.

The review had also considered some initial modelling of three options on the future of the ALMO:

- taking the ALMO function back in-house into the Council; or
- making the ALMO work more efficiently; or
- transfer of the housing stock.

The efficiencies and savings from each of these options had not been fully modelled as there had not yet been a full analysis of expenditure under each of them. It was however explained that the transfer option was not considered to be feasible as it was estimated that using the stock transfer formula the stock had a negative value of -£140m and so would require a substantial dowry payment to be made. Making the ALMO work more efficiently would require a combination of much more efficient working on their part and a transfer of additional council services to the ALMO to gain a better level of economies of scale. Bringing the ALMO functions back into the Council was therefore the preferred option at this time.

It was therefore proposed and agreed that work be done to develop a detailed business case and undertake consultation with tenants, employees, trade unions and other stakeholders, which will lead to a future recommendation being made.

### **Decisions**

1. To approve consultation on the preferred option identified as part of the HRA review to bring the ALMO back in-house, with a further report to be made in September 2020;
2. To approve the commission of due-diligence exercise of the Northwards ALMO, including consultation with staff, unions, tenants and local stakeholders, to review the costs of options.
3. To agree that Northwards be asked to make interim arrangements for a suitably qualified Interim Chair and defer any recruitment until the consultation and due diligence exercises have concluded.

### **Exe/20/67 A Housing Delivery Company**

The Executive had considered a report in March 2020 on plans for the creation of a Housing Development and Management company (Minute Exe/20/53). This company would then provide direct delivery options for a range of new affordable homes utilising City Council land assets.

Two possible models for such a company were examined in the report: a joint venture company arrangement or a wholly-owned company with subsidiaries. The differences and the strength of each of these approaches were described in the report, as was the further work that now needed to be undertaken to fully evaluate them both. A budget of £1.5 to fund that extra work was requested and agreed.



It was proposed and agreed that subject to the outcome of that further work, that the authority to proceed with the setting up of a company of whatever form be delegated to senior officers.

### **Decisions**

1. To endorse the proposal to establish a Housing Delivery Corporate Structure and authorise the Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer, the City Solicitor and the Strategic Director - Growth & Development to finalise the detailed arrangements to establish the structure, in consultation with the Leader, Executive Member for Housing & Regeneration and the Executive Member for Finance & Human Resources.
2. To delegate to each of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, the City Solicitor and the Strategic Director - Growth & Development the authority to determine the most appropriate structure and arrangements for providing any funding to facilitate the delivery of housing through the Housing Delivery Structure, in consultation with the Leader, Executive Member for Housing & Regeneration and the Executive Member for Finance & Human Resources.
3. To note that the business plan and any associated financial matters associated with the establishment of the structure will be submitted to a future meeting.
4. To approve an increase to the revenue budget of £1.5m, funded from the Housing Investment Reserve, to fund the next phase of development work, and delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance & Human Resources, to spend this budget.

### **Exe/20/68 COVID-19 Monthly Update Report**

The report on the work on COVID-19 in Manchester since the 6 May meeting was presented. It provided updates on public health and the number of known cases in the city. It also explained the on-going arrangements for the supply and distribution of personal protective equipment, support to vulnerable people and addressing homelessness.

The figures in the report were that there were currently 1,944 residents in care homes across the city. As of 28 May, 77 (3.99%) care home residents had tested positive for COVID-19 and 65 (3.4%) had COVID-19 symptoms. Work was underway to ensure the Manchester COVID-19 Test and Trace outbreak control plan would be able to respond effectively to outbreaks in care homes and all social care settings.

The report also recapped on the financial support and grant scheme that the council was now operating and on the anticipated impact the pandemic will have on the council's own finances.

At the meeting it was explained that the Test, Track and Isolate scheme had been launched, although the Council's allocation of funding was not yet known. The Council's own outbreak response team was going to be in place by the end of the week. An update on infection data was given at the meeting: there were 1587 cases in Manchester, with the rate of infection of 289.8 per 100,000 people.

The Leader provided an update on the meeting of the GM COVID-19 Emergency Committee early that day. The main issues there had been issues to do with antisocial behaviour problems; the Public Health England "COVID-19: review of disparities in risks and outcomes" report; and the Test and Trace arrangements.

Other updates were given on schools and the plans for schools to reopen for some children at the start of June. The council's position statement on the reopening of schools had been published and publicised. On 1 June a minority of schools in the city had admitted more children, others were taking more time to ensure that safe arrangements would be in place before more children returned to the school.

On increasing levels of antisocial behaviour, there had been large scale antisocial disturbances in Moston, Gorton and the City Centre. It was evident that social distancing was being relaxed or ignored by increasing numbers of people.

The Executive Member referred to the Public Health England disparity review, and the disproportionate impact on Black and Bangladeshi communities, and on the health inequalities that had existed before the pandemic. The Chief Executive explained that there was going to be work across Greater Manchester to do a more in-depth analysis on the health inequalities in the city-region. It was also explained that the council had launched individual risk assessments for all staff as part of the planning for a resumption of more normal working and greater number of staff returning to the place of work.

### **Decision**

To note the report and the issues raised at the meeting.

**Exe/20/69 Appendix to the Minutes - Proposed Capital Programme Virements**

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>2019/20 In year virement proposed</b>	<b>2020/21 In year virement proposed</b>	<b>2021/22 In year virement proposed</b>	<b>2022/23 In year virement proposed</b>
Flood Risk Management - Hidden Watercourses		15		
Flood Risk Management - Higher Blackley Flood Risk		-15		
<b>Total Highways Programme</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Asset Management Programme			-350	
Estates Transformation - Alexandra House			350	
Strategic Acquisitions Programme	-18			
Hall and Rogers	18			
<b>Total Growth &amp; Development Programme</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Charlestown - Victoria Ave multi-storey window replacement			546	
External cyclical works phase 3a	-2			
Environmental works	-3		5	
Harpurhey - Monsall various externals	2			
External cyclical works Ancoats Smithfields estate	25	50		
External cyclical works Charlestown Chain Bar low rise			-45	
External cyclical works Charlestown Chain Bar Hillingdon Drive maisonettes			-4	
External cyclical works Crumpsall Blackley Village	2			
External cyclical works Higher Blackley South	-5			
External cyclical works Newton Heath Assheton estate	6			
External cyclical works Newton Heath Troydale Estate			-89	
External cyclical works New Moston (excl corrolites)			-1	
Environmental improvements Moston corrolites	22	29		
ENW distribution network	67	27		
Dam Head - Walk up flats communal door renewal	23			
Various Estate based environmental works			6	
Delivery Costs	-557			
Ancoats - Victoria Square lift replacement	72	4		

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>2019/20 In year virement proposed</b>	<b>2020/21 In year virement proposed</b>	<b>2021/22 In year virement proposed</b>	<b>2022/23 In year virement proposed</b>
Aldbourn Court/George Halstead Court/Duncan Edwards Court works	2			
Kitchen and Bathrooms programme	2			
Harpurhey - Monsall Multies Internal Works	265		41	
Newton Heath - Multies Internal Works			65	
Higher Blackley - Liverton Court Internal Works	119	34		
Various - Bradford/Clifford Lamb/Kingsbridge/Sandyhill Court Internal Works	328	94		
Charlestown - Rushcroft/Pevensey Court Internal Works	23	74	8	
Collyhurst - Mossbrook/Roach/Vauxhall/Humphries Court Internal Works	438			
Decent Homes mop ups phase 10 and voids	30		11	22
One off work - rewires, boilers, doors		17		
Installations of sprinkler systems - multi storey blocks	36		1	
ERDF Heat Pumps	51			
One off type work (rewires/boilers/doors)	32			
Fire Risk Assessments			5	
Northwards - Harpurhey 200 Estate Internal Works			10	
Rushcroft and Pevensey Courts Ground Source Heat Pumps		-245		
Delivery Costs	-686			
Bringing Studio Apartments back in use			1	
Improvements to Homeless Accommodation Phase 2			72	
Delivery Costs	-21			
Public Sector Northwards Adaptations	-200			
Adaptations 1	148	150	202	
Adaptations 2	-702	-770		
Various Locations - Adaptations	568	305	388	
Delivery Costs		52	50	
Northwards Housing Programme	-85	179	-1,272	-22
<b>Total Public Sector Housing (HRA) Programme</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Basic Need Programme</b>				
Manchester Academy	-3			
St Margaret's C of E	-3			
Matthews Lane	-4,393			

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>2019/20 In year virement proposed</b>	<b>2020/21 In year virement proposed</b>	<b>2021/22 In year virement proposed</b>	<b>2022/23 In year virement proposed</b>
Beaver Rd Primary Expansion	-48			
Lily Lane Primary	-3			
St. James Primary Academy	1			
Webster Primary Schools	-7			
Brookside Rd Moston		386		
North Hulme Adv Playground			294	
Monsall Road (Burgess)	-311	-3,717	-979	-20
Roundwood Road	139	985		
KS3/4 PRU Pioneer Street	19			
SEND Expansions - Melland & Ashgate	50			
Basic need - unallocated funds	4,559	2,346	685	20
<b>Schools Maintenance Programme</b>				
Moston Lane - re-roof	-9			
Abbott Primary School Fencing	-11			
All Saints Primary Rewire	-20			
Armitage Primary Windows	-1			
Bowker Vale Primary Heating	-3			
Buton Lane Primary Roof	-3			
Cheetwood Primary Heating	-1			
Crosslee Comm Heating	4			
Crowcroft Park Roof Repairs	-4			
Grange School Sports Hall	-2			
Higher Openshaw Rewire	-39			
Moston Fields Joinery	-3			
Ringway Primary Roof	-4			
Ringway Primary School	58			
St. Augustine's Primary	12			
Schools Capital Maintenance -unallocated	26			
<b>Total Children's Services Programme</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
New Social Care System	-2			
End User Computing	-15			
Core Infrastructure Refresh	12			
New Rent Collection System	-1			
End User Experience	15	-244		
Microsoft 365		244		
Replacement Coroners System	2			
ICT Investment Plan	-11			
<b>Total ICT Programme</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total City Council Capital Programme</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>



## **Executive**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, 3 July 2020**

**Present:** Councillor Leese (Chair)

**Councillors:** Akbar, Bridges, Craig, N Murphy, Rahman, Stogia and Richards

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

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

**Apologies:** Councillor Ollerhead

#### **Exe/20/70 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of the Executive on 3 June 2020 were approved as a correct record.

#### **Exe/20/71 COVID-19 Monthly Update Report**

The monthly report on the work in Manchester to control the COVID-19 pandemic and help the city recover from the effects and impacts of the virus was considered. It explained that as of 29 June 2020, there were 1,740 confirmed cases of COVID-19 in Manchester, a rate of 317.7 per 100,000 population. To date, there had been 383 registered deaths of Manchester residents involving COVID-19 (based on deaths occurring up to 12 June and registered up to 20 June). Of these, 76 deaths (19.8%) occurred in a care home. The infection rate and the number of deaths involving COVID-19 in Manchester was continuing to fall, from a peak of 80 deaths occurring in the week ending 17 April to just 9 deaths in the week ending 12 June.

The report and information given at the meeting explained the significant developments in the Test and Trace programme and the development of the Council's Local Prevention and Response Plan. An update was provided on the planning for the full reopening of schools in the city at the start of the new school year in September 2020. The support for the homeless was continuing but the 'Everyone In' money that the Government had been provided had now stopped. The help and support being provided to businesses in the city, in particular the hospitality businesses, to help them reopen with appropriate social-distancing arrangements was also outlined.

The report also summarised the on-going impact of the pandemic on the Council's own finances, both from a loss of income and from significant additional costs. The steps being taken to mitigate the worst of the financial effects were described.

An addendum to the report explained that on 30 June, the Prime Minister had announced a £900m fund for 'shovel ready' local growth projects in England, which could include regeneration, investment in transport, digital connectivity or technology

centres to build on local advantage. The addendum set out a list of Manchester's priority shovel ready projects, which could help ensure that the city plays its full part in the national economic recovery. The shovel ready projects identified in the list were the top priority schemes for the city over the next five years, those that had the greatest ability to contribute significantly to the city region's recovery.

### **Exe/20/72 St Mary's Parsonage - Strategic Regeneration Framework**

In February 2020 the Executive had approved in principle a draft St Mary's Parsonage Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) and requested that there should be public consultation on that draft (Minute Exe/20/27). A report submitted by the Strategic Director, Growth and Development presented the outcome of the consultation. The report proposed that a revised and final version of the Framework now be approved.

An extended period of consultation had run from 13 March 2020 to 22 May 2020. Consultation letters had been sent out to 1,172 local residents, landowners, businesses, and stakeholders, informing them about the public consultation, and how to engage in the process. The SRF was also made available on the Council's website. There had been 20 responses made:

- one response from a landowner;
- a joint response from the Deansgate Ward Councillors;
- one response from a resident management company;
- three responses from statutory stakeholders; and
- fourteen responses from local residents.

The report analysed in detail the responses of the consultees and the issues that they had raised under eight headings:

- highways and traffic management
- public realm and streetscape
- architecture, development heights and density
- water management
- waste management and street cleansing
- development uses
- sustainability
- the SRF itself and the consultation arrangements

The proposed responses to those issues were explained in the report along with the changes that had been made to the draft SRF to accommodate and take into consideration the consultees responses.

Having considered the responses to the consultation, and the changes made to the document as a result of those, it was agreed that that revised version of the SRF be approved.

### **Decisions**



1. To note the outcome of the public consultation on the draft SRF for the St Mary's Parsonage area, and subsequent suggested revisions to the draft SRF.
2. To approve the Strategic Regeneration Framework for the St Mary's Parsonage area and request that Planning and Highways Committee take the framework into account as a material consideration when considering planning applications for the area.

### **Exe/20/73 NOMA Strategic Regeneration Framework Update 2020**

The NOMA estate extends for approximately 8 hectares and is a key regeneration priority in the city centre. It is bounded to the west by Corporation Street, to the north by Angel Street and Angel Meadows, to the east by Rochdale Road and by the Metrolink line from Victoria Station and the Shudehill Interchange to the south. It is located between Victoria Station and the Northern Quarter and adjacent to the city's retail core.

In July 2009, the Executive had endorsed the Co-operative Group's Strategic Regeneration Framework which set out a vision to create a commercially-led, mixed-use destination at the northern gateway to the city centre (Minute Exe/09/82). It was then envisaged that this would support the creation of an additional 15,000 jobs and deliver in excess of £25 million annual GVA for Manchester. Since then over £150m of construction investment had been made in the estate including schemes at 1 Angel Square, Hanover and Federation, City Buildings, the Hotel Indigo, and new residential accommodation at Angel Gardens.

A report now submitted by the Strategic Director, Growth and Development explained that an updated Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) had been drafted that sought to build on the progress achieved to date and respond to Manchester's strong economic growth which had led to increased demand for commercial space within the city centre. The revision would also propose new policies on climate change and zero carbon. Optimising underutilised areas was to be a key priority, with the focus on bringing forward commercial development supported by new and integrated public realm. The details of the potential development schemes and sites were set out in detail.

The report proposed that there should now be a period of public consultation on the draft of the updated SRF. That was agreed.

### **Decisions**

1. To note the progress made to date at NOMA and the key challenges and opportunities for the next phases of development.
2. To approve the draft NOMA SRF Update as a basis for consultation with local stakeholders, and request the Strategic Director, Growth and Director undertake that public consultation and report to the Executive on the comments received.

## **Exe/20/74 First Street Development Framework Addendum 2020**

In February 2020 the Executive had endorsed, in principle, a draft addendum to the First Street development framework and requested that there be public consultation on it (Minute Exe/20/26). A report submitted by the Strategic Director, Growth and Development presented the outcome of the consultation. The report proposed that a revised and final version of the Framework Addendum now be approved.

The extended public consultation had run from the 6 March until 15 May 2020. Letters had been sent out to 3,636 local residents, landowners, businesses, and stakeholders, informing them about the public consultation, and how to participate in the process. The draft Addendum was also made available on the Council's website. There had been 11 responses received: nine from local residents; one joint response from the three Deansgate Ward Councillors; and one response from a statutory consultee.

The report analysed in detail the responses of the consultees and the issues that they had raised under seven headings:

- public realm
- development architecture, heights and density
- the framework document
- development impacts
- development uses
- water management
- general comments

The proposed responses to those issues were explained in the report along with the changes that had been made to the draft Addendum to accommodate and take into consideration the consultees responses.

Having considered the responses to the consultation, and the changes made to the document as a result of those, it was agreed that that the Addendum to the SRF be approved.

### **Decisions**

1. To note the outcome of the public consultation on the draft development framework addendum for the First Street neighbourhood.
2. To approve the development framework addendum for the First Street area and request that Planning and Highways Committee take the framework into account as a material consideration when considering planning applications for the area.

## **Exe/20/75 Co-living in Manchester**

In December 2019 the Executive had considered a report on the concept of co-living and its place in the city. At that time the Executive had noted the concept and the issues around its development, the nature of the product, and the limited contribution

that it could make to the city's housing offer, and had requested that the Strategic Director, Growth and Development undertake a consultation process with key stakeholders and reports on the outcomes of that (Minute Exe/19/102).

The Strategic Director reported that the initial consultation on co-living had been carried out in two phases. A consultation process had taken place with developers and key organisations. (Phase 1). Consultation with wider stakeholders, including residents (Phase 2), had then taken place as part of the Local Plan review. The report explained that the Phase 1 stakeholder consultation had closed on 9 March 2020 and five developers had responded. They all expressed an interest in developing co-living schemes in Manchester, adding that:

- the approach should be less cautious in the city centre and the amount of accommodation should not be limited;
- there should be more flexibility about where it would be supported in the city centre;
- the scope should be broadened to include existing successful business and not just new or recently arrived employers;
- the size of units in co-living schemes should not necessarily have to comply with approved space standards;
- restricting the length of tenancies could disrupt tenants;
- some considered co-Living to be affordable housing;
- zero carbon policy requirements could undermine viability; and.
- co-Living schemes should not automatically exclude students.

The Phase 2 consultation had closed on 3 May. In that respondents had been asked to comment on this statement:

“The emerging issue of co-living accommodation is a matter the plan will also need to address. The Council has recently set out an initial position on the matter, noting the issues around its development, the nature of the product, and the limited contribution it could make to the city's housing offer. Further work will be required to help inform any policy approach that will feature in the Local Plan in due course. Other forms of short-term renting, including AirBnB, will also need to be addressed in the Local Plan.”

There had been 561 responses to that from residents, businesses, statutory consultees and partner agencies (although not all commented on the co-living statement). Most of the responses were from residents. Whilst most 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 also concern that car parking can be prioritised over green spaces when planning for multi-occupational developments, and there was often increased instances of littering and build-up of refuse in the surrounding areas of multi occupational buildings.

In responding to the issues that had been raised in both phases of the consultation, the report set out a proposed policy position on co-living for the Council to adopt pending the conclusion of the review of the Local Plan. Those were:

- Co-living should be restricted to a limited number of key areas of high employment growth within the city centre, where it can be demonstrated that a co-

living development could provide added value to the wider commercial offer in the area.

- The size and scale of the developments need to be underpinned by the generation of employment opportunities from growth in key sectors in the city.
- Safe and secure, zero carbon developments will only be considered. Schemes should be in city centre locations that are well connected, to ensure residents can access jobs, public transport, walking and cycling routes in the city.

With these conditions being considered for co-living schemes, possibly through Section 106 agreements:

- Development should provide an appropriate mix of cluster flats and private studios, complying with MCC's adopted space standards, as part of the Manchester Residential Quality Guidance.
- A long-term operational management platform will need to be provided for across each scheme in its entirety. This should include a single management and lettings entity, with a long-term commitment.
- Developers should be required to legally commit to renting only to working households, or households actively seeking work, and precluding letting to students.
- A maximum stay should be defined for short-term studio lets, for example, six months.
- Developments must contribute to Council Tax revenue, with Council Tax paid by the operator, in order to strengthen the tax base.
- A contribution should be made in accordance with the city's affordable housing policy.
- Developments must have a clear place-making delivery strategy, including open spaces and public realm.
- Planning applications should include a conversion plan to demonstrate how the building could be repurposed if required.
- Co-living is not an affordable housing product on a price per sq. metre basis and cannot be seen as a mechanism for developers to meet affordable housing targets in Manchester.
- That parking should not be a component of any co-living scheme.

Other principles were

- Developers will need to demonstrate a clear rationale and need, based around their contribution to the local economy, responding to the specific needs of employers and supporting jobs; it would be essential to demonstrate that there was a clear link between the need to recruit and retain staff and the adjacency of the co-living product.
- As a general principle co-living schemes should conform to Manchester policies and specific standards. If a co-living proposals does not accord with current policy (for example, departing from space standards), it will need to show that there is a compelling and over-riding rationale for so doing, and that the benefits outweigh the areas of non-compliance.

Having considered the views expressed by the consultees, and the responses to those that the report proposed, it was agreed that the proposed approach be approved and commended to the Planning and Highways Committee.

## Decisions

1. To note the outcome of the consultation exercise with key stakeholders on co-living.
2. To endorse the approach set out in the report, as described above, 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.

### **Exe/20/76 Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan - Tackling Nitrogen Oxide Exceedances at the Roadside - Outline Business Case**

A joint report submitted by the Deputy Chief Executive and the City Solicitor set out the progress that had been made following the Government's response to Greater Manchester's Outline Business Case to tackle Nitrogen Dioxide Exceedances at the Roadside (OBC). The report explained the implications of relevant COVID-19 pandemic management policies for the 10 Greater Manchester (GM) local authorities in relation to the schedule of work and statutory consultation on the Clean Air Plan. It also set out the links to the taxi and private hire common minimum licensing standards (MLS).

The report set out the more recent work that had been undertaken across Greater Manchester on public engagement, consideration of future provision and support for commercial vehicles, and correspondence from Government on the next steps the Government required the GM Councils to take, a timetable for those, and an indication of the financial support the Government will provide for the implementation of the Clean Air Plan.

It was explained that the plans for consultation had been badly affected by the COVID-19 pandemic, as the consultation timetable had been due to commence but had to be suspended. As a result the overall programme was going to be set-back by four months.

## Decisions

1. To note the progress of the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan.
2. To note the progress in the development of the Clean Commercial Vehicle and Hardship funds.
3. To note the initial funding award of £41m for clean vehicle funds to award grants or loans to eligible businesses.
4. To note the Government has accepted the need for vehicle replacement funds for Hackney Carriages, and Light Goods Vehicles, but has requested further development of shared evidence on the needs within that complex sector before responding and does not support the sustainable journeys measure.

5. To note that TfGM is seeking confirmation that the funding award for Bus Retrofit is a continuation of Clean Bus Technology Funds to be distributed as soon as possible as per previous arrangements.
6. To note the government will not support electric vehicle charging infrastructure through Clean Air monies but have committed to work with GM on securing funding from the Office for Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV).
7. To agree the position that the GM Local Authorities will move to a statutory public consultation on the GM Clean Air Plan as soon as reasonably practicable.
8. To agree the position that the GM Local Authorities' decision to commence a public consultation should be taken once there is a clear timeframe for exiting lockdown and moving to the next phase of the COVID-19 response.
9. To note the implementation of a GM CAZ is delayed to 2022 with a revised implementation date to be confirmed in the consultation commencement report.
10. To note the DfT's positioning paper "Decarbonising Transport – Setting the Challenge".
11. To note the assessment of the possible impacts of COVID-19 to inform a technical briefing note for decision makers.
12. To note that the GM local Authorities intend to consult on GM's proposed Minimum Licensing Standards, alongside the Clean Air Plan consultation and agree the position for consultation, on when taxi/PHV fleets should be Zero Emission Capable.

### **Exe/20/77 Refresh of the Ancoats and New Islington Neighbourhood Development Framework – Poland Street Zone**

In February 2020 the Executive had received a draft refreshed Neighbourhood Development Framework (NDF) for Ancoats and New Islington (Minute Exe/20/24). The revised elements in that refresh had related to the back of Ancoats, referred to as the Poland Street Zone, and the former Central Retail Park. At that time the Executive had approved that a programme of public and stakeholder consultation should be undertaken.

That extended period of public consultation on revised proposals for the Poland Street Zone involving local residents, businesses, land and property owners, public and statutory bodies and community sector organisations had been undertaken between March and May 2020. Following this exercise, and based on the responses to that, a final draft of the Ancoats and New Islington NDF Poland Street Zone had been produced and was being proposed for approval.

The consultation plans had been affected by the COVID-19 pandemic and some planned events had had to be cancelled. The consultation techniques that had been employed included:

- An updated Ancoats and New Islington consultation web page on the council's website.
- Letters to all local residents (465 addresses) within the study area consultation boundary.
- Letters to local businesses within the study area registered on the Manchester City Council Business Rates Database.
- Letters to property and landowners delivered to all freehold and leasehold interests registered at the land registry within the consultation boundary area.
- Consultation notification emails to key public and statutory stakeholders.
- Consultation notification emails to non-statutory stakeholder groups including community groups.
- Press release and news articles on the manchester.gov.uk website, supported by social media.
- A dedicated email address and telephone information line.

A total of 130 responses had been received: 119 via an online questionnaire and a further 11 by email. Of those, 120 of the responses were from people who live, work or visit the area frequently. A further 2 responses were from a local community group, 4 responses from or on behalf of local landowners, and others from statutory consultees.

The responses to the consultation had been largely positive and recurring themes and comments had include:

- strong support of the vision and priorities contained within the draft NDF update and the strategy to maximise opportunities for future development;
- strong support for the proposals linked to reduced car use and improved connectivity and pedestrian and cycle routes through the area;
- further comments were made in relation to car parking and how this is managed in terms of on street parking and centralised parking provision to service the area and support businesses and residents;
- strong support for the objectives of maintaining the character and conservation status of the area and ensuring that appropriate consideration is given to this in future developments;
- highlighting the need for flood management and sustainable drainage solutions where appropriate;
- highlighting the need for design to positively address the waterways corridor and link to wider green and blue networks;
- highlighting the need to consider flexibility on building massing and heights at certain locations in the area;
- support for the delivery of affordable housing across a range of typologies and tenures;
- highlighting the need to ensure live work mix is balanced appropriately to ensure that either use is not detrimental to the other; and
- support for potential of green streets and open green spaces that could be used for a variety of activities. However, concern was expressed about the possible loss of public open space at Ancoats Green.

An updated version of the Development Framework had been produced to take into account and respond to the issues raised in the consultation. A copy of that revised document was appended to the report under consideration. The Executive approved that revised version.

To take forward the implementation of the Framework the report proposed that the remit of the partnership company that had been established to take forward the redevelopment of the Central Retail Park be extended so as to allow that partnership company to undertake feasibility work in relation to Council land interests in the Poland Street Zone, which would inform future developments proposals for that area. That was supported.

### **Decisions**

1. To note the comments received from stakeholders including local landowners, residents, businesses and statutory consultees.
2. To approve the final version of the refreshed Ancoats and New Islington Neighbourhood Development Framework Poland Street Zone to guide and co-ordinate the future development of the area, with the intention that it will be a material consideration in the Council's decision making role as Local Planning Authority.
3. To approve an extension to the remit of Manchester Life Strategic Development Company Limited (MLSDC) to undertake feasibility work relating to City Council owned sites within the Poland Street Zone.
4. To authorise the City Solicitor to complete all the necessary documentation to give effect to these decisions.

### **Exe/20/78 Capital Programme Update**

A report concerning requests to increase the capital programme was submitted. We agreed to make two change under emergency powers established by the Council in March 2020, and to make a further seven changes under delegated powers. These changes would increase Manchester City Council's capital budget by £4.726m funded by a mixture of government grants, borrowing and external contributions.

An addendum to the report explained that the "Our Town Hall" project had been paused so as to allow for an assessment to be made of the possible implications for the project of the COVID-19 outbreak, and of the high levels of construction cost inflation seen within Manchester. The addendum outlined the position for the Our Town Hall Project and the factors which had changed since February 2020 when a key decision to proceed with the project had been made. It explained why there was now a change in completion date from December 2023 to May 2024.



1. To approve, under the emergency provision agreed by the Council on 25th March 2020 (minute CC/20/26), the following changes to Manchester City Council's capital programme:
  - (a) Children's Services - Hyde Road Secondary School. A capital budget virement of £2m is requested, funded by Unallocated Education Basic Needs budget.
  - (b) Growth and Development – Acquisition of Land at Red Bank. A capital budget virement of £1.705m is requested, funded by Northern Gateway Budget
2. To approve the following changes to the City Council's capital programme:
  - (c) Highways Services – Chorlton to Manchester Scheme Development Costs. A capital budget increase of £1.432m is requested, funded by Mayor's Challenge Fund.
  - (d) Highways Services – Manchester Cycleway. A capital budget increase of £0.593m is requested, funded by Mayor's Challenge Fund.
  - (e) Highways Services – Northern Quarter Walking and Cycling Development Costs. A capital budget increase of £1.547m is requested, funded by Mayor's Challenge Fund.
  - (f) Highways Services – Beswick Filtered Neighbourhood Development Costs. A capital budget increase of £0.554m is requested, funded by Mayor's Challenge Fund.
  - (g) Children's Services – Our Lady's RC High School Expansion. A capital budget virement of £0.160m is requested, funded by Unallocated Education Basic Needs budget.
  - (h) Children's Services – Manchester Communication Academy Expansion. A capital budget virement of £0.111m is requested, funded by Unallocated Education Basic Needs budget.
  - (i) Growth and Development – Acquisition of Land at Red Bank. A capital budget increase of £0.600m is requested, funded by Government Grant (Housing Infrastructure Fund)
3. To note increases to the programme of £0.232m as a result of delegated approvals.
4. To note the project cost plan (for Construction) for Our Town Hall project had been agreed with the Management Contractor in the terms described in the addendum to the report.

5. To note that the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer was now able to issue the Notice to Proceed for the “Our Town Hall” project, with construction therefore likely to commence on site in July 2020.

## Executive

### Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 29 July 2020

**Present:** Councillor Leese (Chair)

**Councillors:** Akbar, Bridges, Craig, N Murphy, Rahman, Stogia, and Richards

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

**Councillors:** Karney, Leech, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh and Taylor

**Apologies:** Councillors Ollerhead, Midgley, Ilyas and S Judge

#### Exe/20/79 Minutes

##### Decision

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting of the Executive on 3 July 2020.

#### Exe/20/80 COVID-19 Monthly Update Report

The written report submitted by the Deputy Chief Executive was a compilation of documents and situation reports to give an overview of the recovery work in the city. It included an update on the 'Our Manchester Strategy' reset, progress reports on the 'Residents and Communities work-stream and the 'Future Council' work-stream, a summary of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's Summer Statement that had been delivered earlier in July, and a summary of projects that were included in bids for funding.

At the meeting the Director of Public Health reported that the overall situation in the city remained dynamic. The latest figures he had were that 20,174 people in Manchester had contracted the virus, with the latest weekly rate of infection being 22.2 people / 100,000, which was below the rates being experienced in other Greater Manchester boroughs. He stressed that the trends in cases in Manchester was increasing, that the virus had not gone away, and so it was very important to maintain the control measures of social distancing, hand washing, isolation of suspected cases. He also reported that the Council Outbreak Prevention Board had had its first meeting and would now meet regularly to develop the messages and communications with residents on how to control and limit the spread of the virus.

Other members of the Executive then gave updates on matters within their portfolio, including:

- the national shielding arrangements were coming to an end but the Council was to continue providing local support to those who needed it, with 1,300 households still being supported across the city;

- the hospitality industry was beginning to resume and thanks were given to all who had been involved in the planning and preparation for the reopening of those businesses;
- the Council and Greater Manchester Police were continuing to respond to unlawful social gatherings and raves when they were reported;
- work was continuing to ensure that victims and survivors of domestic violence still had access to support and help when they needed it;
- a campaign was underway to encourage people to wear masks when using public transport;
- it is the Council's desire to put zero-carbon at the heart of the city's recovery plans;
- the work of neighbourhood officers across the city on both recovery and on more routine matters such as the annual student exodus from the city;
- the work of children's social services during the pandemic and an increase in referrals that were coming back towards the levels experienced before the virus outbreak;
- the work that had been done to keep schools open for the children of key workers, and thanks were given to all who had played a part in that;
- the plans for the reopening of schools in the new term in September including the sending of a 'transition read' book to every child that was to start in secondary school in September;
- 95% of play areas in parks had been reopened after safety checks with guidance provided;
- work was underway to allow leisure centres to reopen safely, and they should start to reopen this week;
- work on the cultural recovery plan was also reported, and the recent funding announcements from the Arts Council and the Government;
- 109 people who had been supported by the 'everyone in' scheme for homeless people had now moved on to more stable and permanent accommodation, and the priority for the service remained for no one to have to return to the living on the streets;
- It was reported there had been an 89% increase of benefits claimants and it was estimated that a third of the workforce in the city was furloughed or in receipt of self-employment support, and there were concerns for how the situation would change as the furlough scheme was wound-down by the Government;
- construction activity in the city was still underway which was seen as a good indicator of the future health of the city's economy; and
- the Council's future finances were still of significant concern and it was felt that the risk that the Council would need to issue a Section 114 Notice was increasing. Such a notice would mean that no new Council expenditure would be permitted, with the exception of safeguarding vulnerable people and statutory services.

## Decision

To note the report.

**Exe/20/81 Revenue Budget Monitoring 2020/21**

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer presented a review of the 2020/21 revenue budgets. The report provided an overview of the Council's financial position as at the end of May 2020 and the work underway to develop a balanced budget for 2020/21. The report identified a projected deficit for 2020/21 of £5.476m. That was based on the financial implications of COVID-19, government funding confirmed to date, other identified budget changes, in year efficiencies and mitigations. The anticipated financial cost of the COVID-19 pandemic to the Council so far was £166.26m. It was anticipated the deficit could be met through the Council's share of the third tranche of emergency funding for income loss that had yet to be allocated by the Government. The report also anticipated that the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic were expected to have a significant impact on the council's finances for a number of years. With the likely scale of funding pressures and future resource reductions, the report stressed that it would be important for the Council to hold a robust position on reserves, and to maintain the ability to deal with issues that might arise during the financial year. The overall revenue forecast for 2020/21 was:

2020/21 Budget Position as at May 2020	Original Approved Budget £000	Revised Budget £000	Forecast Outturn £000	Total P2 Forecast Variance £000
<b>Total Available Resources</b>	<b>(666,125)</b>	<b>(821,252)</b>	<b>(806,419)</b>	<b>14,833</b>
<b>Total Corporate Budgets</b>	<b>126,761</b>	<b>264,855</b>	<b>264,479</b>	<b>(377)</b>
Children's Services	130,320	130,485	137,164	6,679
Adult Social Care	221,253	229,213	237,578	8,365
Homelessness	15,285	15,306	22,450	7,144
Corporate Core	69,958	76,918	80,136	3,218
Neighbourhoods	93,802	94,306	102,802	8,496
Growth and Development	8,746	10,169	15,701	5,532
<b>Total Directorate Budgets</b>	<b>539,364</b>	<b>556,397</b>	<b>595,831</b>	<b>39,434</b>
<b>Total Use of Resources</b>	<b>666,201</b>	<b>821,252</b>	<b>860,310</b>	<b>39,058</b>
<b>Total forecast over / (under) spend</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>53,891</b>	<b>53,891</b>
COVID-19 Government grant income (tranche 1 and 2) -Confirmed				(33,367)
Proposed Corporate measures				(7,963)
<b>Sub-Total Pre July Funding Announcement</b>				<b>12,561</b>
COVID-19 Government grant income (tranche 3)				(7,085)
<b>Net forecast over / (under) spend</b>				<b>5,476</b>

And the means of addressing the impacts of COVID-19 in the current year were:

	<b>2020/21 £000</b>
--	-------------------------

<b>COVID-19 Budget impact of Additional Costs and Net income losses</b>	<b>64,456</b>
P2 - Savings, mitigations and other changes	(10,565)
<b>COVID - Budget shortfall after in year measures</b>	<b>53,891</b>
<b>COVID 19 Emergency Funding Tranches 1 and 2</b> (Note £389k applied in 2019/20)	(33,367)
Corporate measures identified	(7,963)
Original budget shortfall	
<b>COVID - Budget shortfall after in year measures</b>	<b>12,561</b>
<b>Forecast COVID 19 Emergency Funding Tranche 3</b> (Confirmed to date)	(7,085)
<b>Budget shortfall after confirmed funding and mitigations</b>	<b>5,476</b>

However, the projected budget deficit for 2021/22 was much greater, £162.5m.

Should further tranche 3 funding be awarded it was proposed and agreed that authority to allocate that funding to services should be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer.

The report explained that the Council had been awarded £225k of the Local Authority Business Rates Grant Administration (New Burdens) funding. It was proposed and agreed that this is included in the Revenue and Benefits budget to contribute towards the costs of administering both the Small Business Grant Fund and Retail, Hospitality and Leisure Grant Fund schemes to provide support to businesses across the city.

The report included an appendix giving a more detailed breakdown of the current year's finances. Within that were a number of proposals that required authorisation.

### **Budgets to be allocated**

When setting the 2020/21 budget the Council has agreed to hold some funds for contingencies, and other money that was to be allocated throughout the year. The report proposed the use of some of these budgets to be allocated. These were agreed:

- £364,000 allocated to in-house foster care as a 2% inflation uplift to be applied as at 1 April 2020.
- £200,000 allocated to care provision as an inflationary uplift for residential care providers
- £805,000 allocated for the waste collection and disposal contract inflation increase
- £91,000 allocated for the annual inflationary increases on the Street Lighting PFI unitary charge

### **Use of an External Grant**

The report also explained that notification had been received in relation to a specific external grant, the use of which had not confirmed as part of the 2019/20 budget setting process. Approval was given to the use of £15,000 of 'pocket parks' funding to

improve accessibility of Fletcher Moss park and help support social subscribing for those with mild depression, social isolation or health problems.

### **Budget Virements**

The report proposed two funding virements which were both agreed.

- allocation £300K in each of 2020/21 and 201/22 from Neighbourhood Services to Communications in the Corporate Core
- allocation £600 of uncommitted inflation funding to Adult Social Care Services in 2020/21

### **Use of a Reserve**

The report also addressed the use of the Council's reserves. Three new draw-downs from the Adult Social Care reserve had been requested, totalling £1m. Those were approved, being: £550k to support the demand from increased placement costs within the Learning Disability Service, a further £300k to support the immediate implementation of a Brokerage function to embed new commissioning arrangements resulting from the implementation of the Liquidlogic IT system; and a further £150k due to the demand diagnostics work which will support the future funding work for Adult Social Care in 2021/22.

### **Decisions**

1. Note the global revenue monitoring report and a forecast outturn position of a £5.476m deficit, which it is anticipated will be balanced by government funding.
2. Approve the use of budgets to be allocated as set out above.
3. Approve the use of grants in addition to that already planned, as set out above.
4. Approve the proposed virements set out above
5. To approve an increase in Growth and Development Directorate budget of £0.957m for the Local Welfare Assistance Fund.
6. To approve an increase in the Corporate Core Directorate budget of £225k for New Burdens funding in respect of the costs associated with administering the business rates grants schemes (Small Businesses Grant Fund and Retail, Hospitality and Leisure Grant Fund).
7. To delegate to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer the allocation of the COVID-19 tranche 3 grant funding to individual services, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources.
8. To approve, under the emergency provision of the Council Decisions on 25 March 2020 - "Constitutional Amendments and Other Matters for Council Business Continuity - Part 7", the use of £1m of reserves as set out above.

## Exe/20/82 Capital Budget Monitoring 2020/21

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer's report informed us of the revised capital budget 2020/21 to 2023/24 taking account of agreed and proposed additions to the programme, profiling changes, and the latest estimates of forecast spend and resources for the 2020/21 capital programme. The report explained the major variations to forecast spend, and any impact that variations had on the five-year Capital Programme.

The forecast of expenditure for 2020/21 for the Manchester City Council capital programme was £471.4m, compared to a proposed revised budget of £471.5m. Spend as of 2 July 2020 was £140.2m, which included financial support of £106.5m provided to the Manchester Airport Group, which had been agreed by the Deputy Leader of the Council in April 2020.

Appended to the report was a schedule of projects within the overall capital programme where the allocations needed to be revised and funding allocations vired between projects. The appendix showed the virement needed for each scheme and each project. We agreed to approve all the proposed virements, including those over £500,000.

The report also proposed changes to some of the capital expenditure, financing and borrowing prudential indicators. These changes were agreed.

Indicator	Original	Revised
Forecast Capital Expenditure (Non-HRA)	£339.6m	£453.7m
Forecast Capital Financing Requirement (Non-HRA)	£1,543.1m	£1,637.1m
Maturity Structure of Borrowing - Upper Limit for 10 years and above	40%	20%

A means of assigning relative priority to capital projects within the overall programme was put forward in the report so as to incorporate role that capital investment would play in the recovery plan for the City and the number of strategic priorities the Council was committed to. It was proposed that priority be given to projects that would:

- be catalytic for growth;
- support job creation;
- reduce of carbon emissions
- encourage housing development
- bring about place-based transformation of health, economic and social outcomes

These addition factors would also be taken into account:

- creating or supporting the delivery of revenue savings;
- avoiding additional revenue cost; or
- increasing revenue income through, for example, increasing the council tax or business rates tax base.

That proposal was supported.



## Decisions

1. To approve, under the emergency provision of the Council Decisions on 25th March 2020 - "Constitutional Amendments and Other Matters for Council Business Continuity - Part 7", the virements over £0.5m between capital schemes as set out in the appendix to these minutes.
2. To approve the revised prudential indicators as shown above.
3. To approve virements under £0.5m within the capital programme as set out in the appendix to these minutes.
4. To support the prioritisation process proposed in the report and to approve that these projects should proceed accordingly:
  - Piccadilly Gardens phase 1
  - Hammerstone Road depot redevelopment - subject to a full review of the requirements of what the Council needs from the depot and the scale of the office space to be reconsidered.
  - Medieval Quarter investment
  - Abraham Moss rebuild - it is estimated that there is an inflationary cost increase of £2.7m following the deferral and due to the impact of COVID-19. This is one of the proposals in the update report elsewhere on the agenda
  - Gorton Hub - subject to contract review to include provisions for COVID, and potential rescoping of the scale of the project with partners
  - West Gorton Park
  - Manchester Aquatic Centre - agree to progress to RIBA Stage 4, subject to review of potential maintenance costs if start date for works is deferred
  - National Cycling Centre - agree to progress to RIBA Stage 4
6. To note that approvals of movements and transfers to the capital programme, will reflect a revised budget total of £471.5m and a latest full year forecast of £471.4m. Expenditure to the end of June 2020 was £30.7m. Expenditure as at 2nd July 2020 was £140.2m which includes the support for Manchester Airport Group.
7. To note the prudential indicators at Appendix C of the report.

## Exe/20/83 Capital Programme Update

A report concerning requests to increase the capital programme was submitted. We agreed to make four change under emergency powers established by the Council in March 2020, and to make a further six changes under delegated powers. These changes would increase Manchester City Council's capital budget by £25.352m over the next three years, funded by a mixture of government grants, borrowing, 'Invest to Save' funds, and external contributions.

The report also set out details of an approval that the Deputy Chief Executive had made under delegated powers, being £352,000 for survey works at the Ancoats Dispensary funded by an external contribution.

## Decisions

1. To approve, under the emergency provision of the Council Decisions on 25th March 2020 - "Constitutional Amendments and Other Matters for Council Business Continuity - Part 7", the following changes to Manchester City Council's capital programme:
  - (a) Children's Services – EBN Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Programme Additional Costs. A capital budget virement of £0.923m is requested, funded by unallocated Education Basic Needs Grant.
  - (b) Neighbourhoods – Indoor Leisure – Abraham Moss. A capital budget virement of £2.7m is requested from the Inflation budget, funded by borrowing.
  - (c) Neighbourhoods – Electric RCV Infrastructure – Additional costs. A capital budget increase of £0.150m is requested, funded by borrowing.
  - (d) Growth and Development – House of Sport. A capital budget increase of £8.420m is requested, funded by borrowing on an invest-to-save basis.
2. To approve the following changes to the City Council's capital programme:
  - (e) Highways Services – Chorlton to Manchester Scheme. A budget increase of £8.449m is requested, funded by Mayor's Challenge Fund.
  - (f) Highways Services – Northern Quarter Walking and Cycling. A budget increase of £8.183m is requested, funded by Mayor's Challenge Fund.
  - (g) Children's Services – St Peters RC High School Expansion. A capital budget virement of £0.383m is requested, funded by Unallocated Education Basic Needs budget.
  - (h) Neighbourhoods – Gateley Brook Pre-Development Fees. A capital budget virement of £0.116m is requested, funded by Parks Development Programme budget.
  - (i) Neighbourhoods – Angel Meadow. A capital budget increase of £0.150m is requested, funded by S106 External Contribution, and a capital budget virement of £0.042m is requested, funded by Parks Development Programme budget.

- (j) Adult Services - Technology Enabled Care (TEC) Digital Platform. A capital budget virement of £0.157m is requested, funded by ICT Investment budget.
3. To note the increase to the programme of £0.352m as a result of a delegated approval.

### **Exe/20/84 Northern Gateway: Progress Update & Housing Infrastructure Fund**

In March 2017 we had authorised the City Solicitor, City Treasurer and Strategic Director (Development) to enter into an agreement with the Council's preferred investment partner for the regeneration of the Northern Gateway lands, Far East Consortium International Limited (FEC). We had also delegated authority to the Chief Executive to dispose of the Council's interest in land at the Northern Gateway Site (Minute Exe/17/064).

The Council had entered into the Joint Venture (JV) with the Far East Consortium (FEC) in April 2017 for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Northern Gateway for housing and ancillary development. As part of the delivery arrangements, the Council and FEC established a JV company, Northern Gateway Operations Limited (OpCo), to have strategic input into and oversight of the development of the Northern Gateway.

In February 2019 we approved the Strategic Regeneration Framework for the Northern Gateway, the 155 hectare land area made up of the adjacent neighbourhoods of New Cross, the Lower Irk Valley and Collyhurst. This Framework was to support the opportunity to deliver up to 15,000 new homes over a 15-20 year period (Minute Exe/19/25).

In June 2019 consideration was given to the preferred approach to facilitating strategic land acquisitions within the Northern Gateway SRF area, and approval given to making a loan of up to £11 million to FEC (Minutes Exe/19/52 and Exe/19/57).

In February 2020 consideration was given to an outline Strategic Business Plan for the Joint Venture, and authority was delegated to the Chief Executive to approve the full initial Development Area Business Plan (Minute Exe/20/29).

A report now submitted provided an update on the successful outcome of the City Council's bid for £51.6m into the Government's Housing Infrastructure Fund Programme. It also reported on progress with finalising the Joint Venture's Initial Development Area Business Plan. The £51.6m of Housing Infrastructure Fund money had been announced as part of the Budget in March 2020 and the report set out the terms and conditions for that funding to be made available. We agreed to delegate the final acceptance of those terms and conditions to the appropriate council officers.

### **Decisions**

1. To approve the Council entering into a Grant Determination Agreement with Homes England for the receipt of up to £51.6m Housing Infrastructure Fund grant to deliver major infrastructure in the Northern Gateway area, a high level summary of which is set out in the body of this report.
2. To delegate authority to the Strategic Director, Growth and Development, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the City Solicitor to finalise the terms of this Grant Determination Agreement to secure this funding.
3. To delegate authority to the City Solicitor to enter into and complete all necessary documents to give effect to the recommendations set out in i) and ii).
4. Subject to the finalisation of the Grant Determination Agreement, to approve a £51.6m increase to the Capital Budget to be expended on the delivery of infrastructure works that will facilitate the delivery of new homes.
5. To note overall progress being made towards the delivery of new homes as part of an Initial Development Area Business Plan in the neighbourhoods of Collyhurst, New Cross and New Town.
6. To note the approach being taken to identify and deliver social and economic benefits and the alignment with the broader piece of work being developed at a North Manchester level with partners leading on plans for the North Manchester General Hospital site.

### **Exe/20/85 Honorary Recorder to the City**

The Chief Executive reported to us on the retirement of His Honour Judge David Andrew Stockdale QC, the senior Judge in Manchester and Honorary Recorder of the city.

The Courts Act 1971 empowered the city to appoint a Court Recorder or a Circuit Judge to be Honorary Recorder of the City. The City Council has always exercised its power under the Act and invited the Senior Judge to be Honorary Recorder. The appointment of an Honorary Recorder for Manchester is recognition of the status of the city as a major legal centre.

The report explained that the Lord Chief Justice had appointed His Honour Judge Nicholas Dean QC, to be Senior Judge at Manchester Crown Court with effect from 6 July 2020. Accordingly we agreed to invite His Honour Judge Nicholas Dean QC, to accept the office of Honorary Recorder of the City.

### **Decisions**

1. That the City Council place on record its sincere appreciation of the services of His Honour Judge David Andrew Stockdale QC, as Honorary Recorder of the City from 20 November 2013 to 21 March 2020.

2. That the new Senior Judge at Manchester, His Honour Judge Nicholas Dean QC, be appointed to the office of Honorary Recorder of the City.

**Exe/20/86 Decisions of the GMCA and the AGMA Executive meetings on 26 June 2020**

**Decision**

To note the decisions made by the GMCA and by the AGMA Executive at their meetings on 26 June 2020.

**Exe/20/87 Appendix to the Minutes**

**Appendix**

**Minute Exe/20/82 – Capital Programme Virements from the Capital Programme Update**

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>2020/21 In year virement proposed £000</b>	<b>2021/22 In year virement proposed £000</b>	<b>2022/23 In year virement proposed £000</b>
Carriageway Resurfacing	836	8,385	
Footway schemes	-836	-3,561	
Carriageway Preventative		-4,824	
<b>Total Highways Programme</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Harpurhey Lathbury and 200 Estates external cyclical works		-13	
Harpurhey Shiredale Estate externals		-15	
External cyclical works Moston Estates (Chauncy/Edith Cliff/Kenyon/Thorveton Sq)		-2	
External cyclical works Cheetham Appleford estate		-2	
External cyclical works Higher Blackley South		-1	
External cyclical works Newton Heath Assheton estate		-27	
Electricity North West distribution network phase 4 (various)	162		
Delivery Costs			229
Newton Heath - Multi Internal Works	-87		
Higher Blackley - Liverton Court Internal Works	-13		
Various - Bradford/Clifford Lamb/Kingsbridge/Sandyhill Court Internal Works	-74		
Collyhurst - Mossbrook/Roach/Vauxhall/Humphries Court Internal Works	283	49	
Installations of sprinkler systems - multi storey blocks		-274	
ERDF Heat Pumps	108	391	101
Fire Risk Assessments	-758	-42	
Rushcroft and Pevensey Courts Ground Source Heat Pumps	13		
Delivery Costs	-81		
Delivery Costs	4		
Stock Acquisitions	2		
Delivery Costs	-10		

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>2020/21 In year virement proposed £000</b>	<b>2021/22 In year virement proposed £000</b>	<b>2022/23 In year virement proposed £000</b>
Northwards Housing Programme - Unallocated	451	-64	-330
<b>Total Public Sector Housing (HRA) Programme</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
Brookside Road Moston		324	
North Hulme		266	
Roundwood Road		333	
Basic need - unallocated funds		-923	
Moston Lane Reroof	6		
Schools Capital Maintenance -unallocated	-6		
<b>Total Children's Services Programme</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Capital Programme</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>





## **Executive**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 9 September 2020**

**Present:** Councillor Leese (Chair)

**Councillors:** Akbar, Craig, N Murphy, Rahman, Stogia and Richards

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

**Councillors:** Karney, Leech, M Sharif Mahamed [part], Sheikh, Midgley, Ilyas, Taylor and S Judge

**Apologies:** Councillors Bridges and Ollerhead

**Exe/20/88 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 29 July 2020.

#### **Exe/20/89 COVID-19 Monthly Update Report**

The written report from the Chief Executive took the form of three “situation reports”, one each for the work on the city’s economic recovery, work with residents and communities, and work on the future of the Council itself. The written report was noted.

At the meeting an oral update on the pandemic was provided by the Consultant in Public Health. She provided a general update on the levels of infection in the city. Overall case numbers on the North West and in Greater Manchester continued to rise, and the infection control restrictions remaining in place in Greater Manchester with more stringent measures recently introduced in Bolton. In Manchester household and community transmission still seemed to be the main cause of new infections, with new cases spread across the city. The latest figures showed 62.8 cases per 100,000 people, which meant that there was about new 50 cases each day in the city. There were no significant outbreaks or clusters to report.

She then addressed the testing arrangements and the many problems that grown to prominence in the national media. There were seven sites in the city where residents could obtain a swab test, and those sites were not yet operating at capacity. The swabs from those sites were processed at national laboratories and it was the labs that were experiencing capacity problems. So it was lab processing capacity rather than the availability of swabbing that was responsible for some people being told to travel many miles for a test. A number of possible local mitigations to those problems had been considered but there was also insufficient spare local processing capacity to overcome the problems with the national system.

The schools in the city had successfully opened at the start of the new term and the priority was to make sure that schools were well supported if there was a case in the students or staff members. She was concerned about the possible transmission among the returning university students who were starting to come back to the city. Work was underway with the Council, the police and the universities to see how both on-campus and off-campus incidents could best be contained.

She then spoke of the community engagement work that was being undertaken to help residents understand how best to protect themselves. This was providing a opportunity to get good public health messages to a large number of people.

The meeting thanked the Consultant for her comprehensive report.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **Exe/20/90 Draft Withington Village Framework for Consultation**

A report submitted by the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) presented a draft of a proposed Withington Village Framework, requesting authority to undertake public consultation on that draft. The report described Withington Village as a key district centre in south Manchester and the draft Framework sought to be a guide to investment and development within Withington Village, as well as a framework to support applications for future funding.

The draft Framework included a series of spatial strategies for public realm, movement, heritage and streetscape, and identified a range of potential projects including:

- An enhanced public space outside the Library (Rutherford Place)
- A more pedestrian friendly environment on Copson Street
- Enhanced public realm along Wilmslow Road
- Reviewing the use of public car parks as possible public spaces.
- Enhanced gateways to the Village
- Improved walking and cycling routes to the Centre from its catchment.
- Restored heritage features including enhancing shop fronts
- Encouraging appropriate development in the Village

The report explained that the intention was for the draft Framework to be the subject of a public consultation, with the outcome of the consultation reported to a future meeting. That was supported.

The meeting was addressed by two of the Withington ward councillors, Councillors White and Wills. They both welcomed the preparation of the draft Framework, explaining that it would provide the opportunity to work with community groups, support local businesses and to strengthen the conservation of the area's assets. It would build on heritage of the area and the Council's past investments in the village's community.

### **Decisions**

1. To approve the draft Withington Village Framework as a basis for public consultation with local stakeholders.
2. That the Strategic Neighbourhood Lead (South) undertakes a public consultation exercise on the draft Withington Village Framework with local stakeholders.
3. That a further report be presented to summarise the outcome of the public consultation, respond to the comments received, and to present a final draft for approval.

[Councillor M Sharif Mahamed left the meeting at this point]

### **Exe/20/91 Manchester's Economic Recovery Plan & Update**

A report from the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) set out an overview of work to develop an Economic Recovery Plan for the city. That plan was a key part of the Council's forward planning in response to the COVID-19 crisis. The Plan was a detailed narrative on how the city was well-placed to use its strong assets in order to re-establish economic momentum over the coming few years. It was to be mainly directed at government, businesses and investors. It would aim to set out the city's direction of travel and to look to the future with a confident message that the city would rise to the challenges, and continue to focus on our drive for inclusive growth.

The plan was to be founded on the three strategic aims identified in the Our Manchester Strategy and Our Manchester Industrial Strategy - People, Place and Prosperity – and on the priorities of inclusive growth and the foundational economy and our zero carbon commitments.

The plan would incorporate transformational schemes and key projects and was to form part of our funding bid to the Spending Review, highlighting how those projects would generate new jobs and homes, and leverage further investment. The Plan would reinforce the importance of regional cities such as Manchester as economic engines, particularly highlighting opportunities in the city centre, the Oxford Road Corridor, North Manchester and Airport City. It would also recognise that achieving inclusive growth was to be more challenging than ever before with anticipated significant unemployment increases, business closures and the impact of education disruption on young people. There would, therefore, also be an emphasis on working with distressed businesses as new opportunities emerge; youth skills and encouraging young people to stay in education; graduate re-skilling; apprenticeships schemes; and support for Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic residents and the over-50's who have also been disproportionately impacted by Covid-19.

The meeting also considered a presentation by Mike Emmerich of Metro Dynamics Limited and John McCreadie of Eskogen consulting who were members of the team that had developed the recovery plan.

It was noted that the Economy Scrutiny had also recently considered the report and had endorsed its recommendations, requesting some revisions that could be made to future versions of the document (Minute ESC/20/31).

Authority was sought and granted for the Chief Executive to finalise the Plan and to submit to the government.

## Decisions

1. To note the progress being made on preparing an Economic Recovery Plan as a key part of the city's overall recovery programme.
2. To note the focus in the Plan on inclusive growth, in particular, the investment in skills and employability, to enable local people to return to employment as opportunities are created.
3. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) and the Leader of the Council, to finalise the Economic Recovery Plan and submit it to government.

### **Exe/20/92 Clean Air Plan and Minimum Licensing Standards for Taxis and Private Hire Vehicles**

In July 2020 the Executive had noted the progress being made with the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan - Tackling Nitrogen Oxide Exceedances at the Roadside (Minute Exe/20/76). A report now submitted by the City Solicitor and the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer explained the progress that had been made on the development of Greater Manchester's Clean Air Plan following the decision that the GM Local Authorities would move to a statutory public consultation on the GM Clean Air Plan as soon as reasonably practicable in light of COVID-19 restrictions, and the link to taxi and private hire common minimum licensing standards. The report also considered the formal governance mechanisms that would underpin the delivery of a GM Clean Air Zone (CAZ) and the supporting measures. The report also set out a position for consultation on the daily charge, discounts and exemptions of a Category C GM Clean Air Zone, and the proposals for the supporting funds that had been developed taking stakeholder engagement and statistical modelling into account. It sought agreement to consult and endorsement of the policy for consultation.

The plan was for the consultation to take place over an eight-week period starting in October 2020. The report explained the proposals for consultation on the daily charge, discounts and exemptions, and the proposals for the supporting funds that had been developed, including:

- A revision to the proposed daily charges, including a reduction in the charge for HGVs and buses from £100 per day to £60, an increase in the charge levels for LGV and minibuses from £7.50 to £10 as modelling has shown this will have a greater impact in behavioural responses to the charge, and the taxi and private hire charge has been held at £7.50 per day;
- That the Clean Air Zone (CAZ) will be implemented in Spring 2022;
- That the Government has accepted an exemption for LGVs and minibuses to 2023;

- Details of the vehicle finance offer;
- Details of temporary exemptions, including a temporary exemption to 2023 for wheelchair accessible taxi and private hire vehicles licensed with a Greater Manchester authority, and a temporary exemption to 2023 for coaches registered within Greater Manchester. Additionally, owner-drivers of GM-licensed PHVs (and PHVs leased full-time by 1 person), will be offered a discounted weekly charge of 5/7 of the total from implementation as these vehicles are used for personal use and private cars are not charged under the CAZ.

A copy of the GM Policy for Consultation was appended to the report and was endorsed.

At the meeting concerns were raised in relation to the Equality Impact Assessment work that had been undertaken given that proposals for taxis and private hire vehicles might have a disproportionate impact on Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic community members. It was agreed that a more detailed Equality Impact Assessment would be needed after the consultation had finished. It was also noted that the Council is minded to support an ultraclean air zone in the city centre.

### **Decisions**

1. To note the progress of the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan.
2. To note that TfGM have confirmation that the funding award for Bus Retrofit should be distributed as soon as possible as per arrangements put in place for the Clean Bus Technology Funds.
3. To note the update on the possible impacts of COVID-19 on the GM Clean Air Plan.
4. To agree that Manchester City Council along with the other nine GM local Authorities hold an 8-week public consultation on the GM Clean Air Plan commencing in October 2020.
5. To note that the GM local Authorities intend to consult on GM's proposed Minimum Licensing Standards, alongside the Clean Air Plan consultation.
6. To agree that TfGM act as the Operating Body for the GM CAZ and supporting measures.
7. To agree that Manchester City Council along with the other nine GM Authorities individually be a 'charging authority' for the purposes of the CAZ, pursuant to the Transport Act 2000.
8. To endorse the GM Clean Air Plan Policy for Consultation at Appendix 3 of the report.
9. To note the Equalities Impact Assessment on the Clean Air Plan, as set out at Appendix 5 of the report.

10. To note that further reports will be brought forward to set out the formal governance mechanisms that will underpin the delivery of a GM Clean Air Zone (CAZ) and the supporting measures, including the full scope of the suite of powers that will be needed to be delegated to the Operating Body.
11. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Executive member for Planning Transport and the Environment, to approve the submission of the cases for measures to the Government's Joint Air Quality Unit to support the GM Clean Air Plan.
12. To delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Executive member for planning, Transport and the Environment, to approve the GM Clean Air Plan consultation materials, to include the Equalities Impact Assessment on the consultation.
13. To note that response to DfT's Decarbonising Transport – setting the challenge, as set out at Appendix 1 of the report, has been submitted to Government.

### **Exe/20/93 Charles Street & Granby Row Development Framework**

A report from the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) outlined the proposals in a draft development framework Victoria Park and Charles Street in the wider Oxford Road Corridor area; and Granby Row within the Piccadilly regeneration area of the city centre.

The proposed Development Framework area covered three sites within the city centre and wider Oxford Road Corridor area. Two of the sites (Charles Street & Granby Row) at the south-easterly gateway to the core of the city centre and the third located within the wider Oxford Road Corridor at Victoria Park.

At present each site was felt to be underutilised, with a mix of uses, including car parking, hotel, student accommodation, commercial spaces including office, retail and leisure. The framework would set out a vision to create new places and bring underutilised space back into use. The proposed developments would seek to provide:

- Purpose-built student accommodation in a central and well connected location for the Oxford Road Corridor campuses of the University of Manchester (UoM) and Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU);
- A new hotel close to Piccadilly Station;
- Co-Living accommodation to diversify the choice of residential accommodation in the city centre;
- A range of commercial and social spaces such as bars, restaurants and retail facilities;
- Affordable housing to support the demand for homes within close proximity to the range of employment opportunities on offer within the city centre; and
- New connections and public realm to create a sense of place and ensure the areas' integration with the wider city centre and its neighbourhoods.

The report set out the details of how each of the three sites could contribute to these ambitions.

The report explained that the intention was for the draft Development Framework to be the subject of a public consultation, with the outcome of the consultation reported to a future meeting. That was supported.

## Decisions

1. To note the site context and opportunities presented by the draft framework for three key strategic sites within the city.
2. To approve the draft Charles Street & Granby Row Development Framework as a basis for consultation with local stakeholders.
3. That the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) undertakes a public consultation on the framework with local stakeholders.
4. That a further report be brought back to the Executive, following the public consultation, responding to the comments received.

## Exe/20/94 Fire Safety in High Rise Residential Buildings

Reports submitted in June 2017, September 2017 and December 2017 (Minutes Exe/17/078, Exe/17/113 and Exe/17/153) had explained the implications for Manchester's residents of the devastating fire at Grenfell Tower in London, and the action being taken to ensure that the residents of tower blocks in Manchester are safe and feel safe.

A comprehensive update report submitted by the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) now sought to provide updates on a range of related topics including:

- the latest information on the removal of unsafe Aluminium Composite Material (ACM) cladding from buildings;
- the collection of data on all External Wall Systems;
- information on other fire safety issues in High Rise Residential Buildings;
- safety and improvement work being undertaken on council-owned High Rise Residential Buildings;
- the work of the Council's interdepartmental Fire Safety Group;
- the Council's work with residents and, in particular, the community group known as "The Cladiators";
- the Council's role as an early adopter of the recommendations in the Dame Judith Hackitt Independent Review of Building Regulations and Fire Safety;
- an introduction to the Building Safety Bill and Fire Safety Bill and the implications for Manchester.

On the removal of the dangerous ACM cladding, none of the high rise residential buildings owned by the Council had ACM cladding on them, all the buildings managed by Register Providers had had the cladding removed where necessary, likewise two private-sector buildings. There was still ten private sector builds where ACM cladding needed to be removed:

<b>Building name</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Work started?</b>
One Smithfield Square	122 High Street	Yes
Pall Mall House	18 Church Street	Yes
Vita Student – First Street	13 Jack Rosenthal Street	Yes
Wilmslow Park	Hathersage Road	Yes
Citygate 1	1 Blantyre Street	No
Citygate 2	3 Blantyre Street	No
Citygate 3	5 Blantyre Street	No
The Quadrangle	1 Lower Ormond Street	No
X1 Eastbank Tower	Advent Way	No
Travelodge – Manchester Central Arena	Great Ducie Street	No

Of the six where work had yet to start, five of those were reported as developing plans. There was no progress to report from the owners of the Travelodge building on Great Dulcie Street.

All other private high rise building owners had also been asked to identify all of the external wall systems on each building they owned. Owners were asked to identify the type and amount (percentage) of insulation and cladding on each elevation and the material on any balconies on the building. The response had been good and the information had been provided for almost all buildings, and the outstanding ones were anticipated.

The report explained that draft legislation was proposing the setting up of a new, national Building Safety Regulator that was to be responsible for implementing a more stringent regulatory regime for tall buildings as well as overseeing the safety and performance of all buildings. That Regulatory was to establish a system of Mandatory Occurrence Reporting for any structural safety or fire safety related event which was perceived to represent a significant risk to life in multi-occupied residential buildings within the scope of the new regime. As an early adopter of the recommendation of the Hackitt Independent Review of Building Regulations and Fire Safety it was proposed and agreed that the Council should have a Mandatory Occurrence Reporting system in place as soon as possible, and authority was delegate to the Strategic Director to create and set up that process.

The report also explained that the proposed legislation would result in the designation of the Accountable Person for a building. The Accountable Person was to be legally responsible for ensuring that they understand fire and structural risks in their buildings and to take appropriate steps and actions to mitigate and manage these fire and structural risks on an ongoing basis so the building can be safely occupied. The Accountable Person would be required to appoint a competent Building Safety Manager, approved under a system agreed by the Building Safety Regulator, to support them in carrying out the day to day functions of ensuring that the building is safely managed. However, ultimate accountability will reside with the Accountable Person for assessing and managing fire and structural safety risks. The Accountable Person could be an individual, a partnership or a corporate body and it was It is



proposed and agreed that for Council-owned High Rise Residential Buildings the Accountable Person be the Council of the City of Manchester.

A Deansgate ward councillor, Councillor Johns, addressed the meeting. He welcomed the report and stressed that the problems faced by residents of tall buildings in the city centre were not confined to ACM clad buildings, but that other cladding materials were now also a concern and that surveys and inspections of buildings had brought other concerns to light. He hoped that financial help would be provided by the government and the building owners so that the remedial costs would not all have to be borne by the leaseholders alone. He also commended the work of the “Gladiators” group, a residents of group that had come together to campaign for support for leaseholders and action by building owners.

It was noted that this report had also been considered at a recent meeting of the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee, and that the Committee had endorsed its recommendations (Minute NESC/20/37).

### **Decisions**

1. To note this report
2. To delegate authority to the Strategic Director (Growth & Development), in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration, to develop a process for Mandatory Occurrence Reporting.
3. That the Accountable Person for buildings in scope be the Council of the City of Manchester.

### **Exe/20/95 Private Rented Sector Strategy 2020-2025**

The meeting considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) that provided an overview of the new Private Rented Sector Strategy 2020-25. The report was accompanied by the delivery plan.

The main focus of the strategy was to improve housing and management standards at the lower end of the private rented sector market and ensuring fire safety issues are addressed in all relevant buildings. It sought to help landlords and residents meet their individual responsibilities by providing advice and information. The main issues within the report included:

- Providing a rationale for the strategy and setting out how the Council along with its partners would support the improvement of housing standards within the sector over the next 5 years (2020-25);
- Describing how the strategy had been developed; and
- Describing the strategy’s three main themes and its objectives. The themes being:-
  - Theme 1: Improve Property and Management Standards
  - Theme 2: Increase Opportunities within the Sector for Low Income Households
  - Theme 3: Greater Communication Across the Sector

A copy of the Strategy and the accompanying Delivery Plan were appended to the report and both were endorsed.

It was noted that this report had also been considered at a recent meeting of the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee, and that the Committee had endorsed its recommendations (Minute NESC/20/34).

## **Decision**

To approve the Private Rented Sector Strategy 2020-25 and delivery plan.

### **Exe/20/96 Extension to Selective Licensing Schemes - Public Consultation**

Under the Housing Act 2004 Local Authorities have the power to introduce the licensing of private rented homes within a designated area, with the aim of improving the management and condition of these properties. A report submitted by the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) presented proposals to identify areas that meet the criteria to designate a selective licensing area.

One of the themes of the Council's Private Rented Sector Strategy was to improve property and management conditions in the private rented sector with a particular focus on the poorest quality properties. Selective licensing was seen as being a useful tool to apply targeted interventions in the most challenging areas of the City. The report explained the work that been undertaken, and the data that had been used to identify the geographic areas that met the criteria. Authority was now sought to commence an extensive consultation exercise to establish whether the declaration of a selective licensing scheme was required within these identified areas.

Twelve possible areas had been identified, and a map showing the boundary of each was appended to the report. The areas were:

- Area 1; Ben Street- Clayton and Openshaw (approximately 105 PRS properties)
- Area 2; Trinity- Harpurhey (approximately 430 PRS properties)
- Area 3; Ladders- Gorton and Abbey Hey (approximately 773 PRS properties)
- Area 4; Flats above shops Hyde Road- Gorton/ Abbey Hey (approximately 94 PRS properties)
- Area 5; Royals- Longsight (approximately 64 PRS properties)
- Area 6; Laindon Road/ Dickenson Road- Rusholme (approximately 37 PRS properties)
- Area 7; Claremont Rd/Great Western Street- Moss Side (approximately 318 PRS properties)
- Area 8; Heywood Street- Cheetham (approximately 248 PRS properties)
- Area 9; Birch Lane- Rusholme (approximately 69 PRS properties)
- Area 10; Esmond/Avondale- Cheetham (approximately 76 PRS properties)
- Area 11; Flats above shops Cheetham Hill Road -Cheetham (approximately 60 PRS properties)
- Area 12; Matthews Lane- Levenshulme (approximately 159 PRS properties)

The report explained that the intention was to now consult local residents, tenants and landlords, managing agents and local businesses, both within the proposed areas and in the surrounding areas, and also national landlord associations who

support and advocate for a number of private rented sector landlords across the country. The methodology for the consultations was described in the report.

The responses were to be evaluated and published on the Council's website, and would inform officer decision making on whether to proceed with the approval of any of the proposed areas, in consultation with Executive Members.

It was noted that this report had also been considered at a recent meeting of the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee, and that the Committee had endorsed its recommendations (Minute NES/20/35).

The proposals in the report were supported.

### **Decisions**

1. To approve a consultation with residents, private landlords, businesses and other stakeholders to designate selective licensing schemes within the geographical areas listed in the report.
2. Subject to the outcome of the consultation, to delegate authority to the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods), in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration and the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources, to approve up to 12 selective licensing areas identified in the report.

### **Exe/20/97 Housing Revenue Account Delivery Model - Northwards ALMO Review**

(Councillor Midgely declared a prejudicial interest in this item of business and withdrew from the meeting while it was being considered.)

In June the Executive had approved consultation on a preferred in-house option for the future management of the Council's Arm's Length Management Organisation (ALMO) that had been identified as part of the Housing Revenue Account review. The same meeting had also approved a due-diligence exercise of the Northwards ALMO, including consultation with staff, unions, tenants and local stakeholders, to review the costs of options (Minute Exe/20/66).

A report submitted by the Chief Executive set out the outcome of the due-diligence exercise that had been undertaken by Campbell Tickell Limited management consultancy. The report set out how those consultants had carried out their assessment and analysis. The work had concluded that returning the service to Council control offered the greatest financial benefit and arguably the greatest non-financial benefits.

The report therefore described the next steps that would have to be taken to bring about the change in the operation of the ALMO, including the requirement to consult with the tenants about proposals that relate to the management of their homes. It was proposed and agreed that the consultation take the form of a "test of opinion" where

every tenant would be given the opportunity to respond to the Council's proposals. That proposal was supported.

It was noted that the Economy Scrutiny had also recently considered the report and had been unable to endorse its recommendations, raising concerns about the benefits to residents of bringing the service in-house (Minute ESC/20/33). At the meeting consideration was given to the concerns the Committee had raised and it was agreed to adopt a revised version of the second recommendations in the report.

## Decisions

1. To note the review had concluded that found that doing nothing was not an option and that there was an opportunity to achieve savings of at least £77m over the 30-year business plan by ending the current arrangements under which the Council's housing stock is managed by Northwards Housing Limited (NHL).
2. To agree that for the service to remain out-sourced there would need to be demonstrable benefits for tenants. To confirm that insourcing the service remains the preferred option and the intention to take over direct management of the Housing Service into the Council from 5 July 2021 subject to a "test of opinion" involving all tenants and leaseholders.
3. To note the proposals contained within the report about how the new council controlled service offer would be developed and how, in future, tenants were to be involved and empowered in the decision making about services to homes and communities.

## Exe/20/98 Capital Programme Update

A report concerning requests to increase the capital programme was submitted. We agreed to make one change under emergency powers established by the Council in March 2020, and to make a further five changes under delegated powers. These changes would increase Manchester City Council's capital budget by £4.642m over the next two years, funded by a mixture of the Capital Fund, capital receipts, external contributions and government grants.

It was also reported that the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer had made a further three changes using delegated powers:

- £219,000 for Private Sector Housing relating to the Brunswick PFI – Turkish Centre additional costs, funded by capital receipts
- £51,000 for Highways Services for residents parking zones in Hathersage and near the North Manchester General Hospital, funded by an external contribution
- £75,000 for Growth and Development for the Factory, the Allied London Contribution (Cabin relocation), funded by an external contribution.

## Decisions

1. To approve, under the emergency provision of the Council (Minute CC/20/26) these changes to capital programme:

- a) ICT – Early Years and Education System (EYES) Additional funding. A capital budget decrease of £0.661m with a corresponding revenue budget increase of £0.661m funded from Capital Fund.
2. To approve these changes to the capital programme:
- b) Growth and Development – Space Studios Manchester: Phase 3 Feasibility Budget. A capital budget increase of £0.650m funded by £0.325m grant and £0.325m capital receipts.
- c) Growth and Development – Manchester Digital Security Innovation Hub (CyberHub). A capital budget increase of £2m funded by external contribution.
- d) Private Sector Housing – Marginal Viability Fund New Victoria additional funding. A capital budget increase of £0.9m funded by Government grant.
- e) Highways – Beswick Filtered Neighbourhood Delivery costs. A capital budget increase of £0.878m funded by external contribution.
- f) Children’s Services - Lyndene Children’s Home Refurbishment. A capital budget increase of £0.875m funded by grant.
3. To note increases to the programme of £0.345m as a result of delegated approvals.

**Exe/20/99 Retirement of the Head of Local Planning and Infrastructure**

To record the Council’s thanks to Richard Elliot, the Head of Local Planning and Infrastructure, for his exemplary service to the Council and to the city.



## **Executive**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 14 October 2020**

**Present:** Councillor Leese (Chair)

**Councillors:** Akbar, Bridges, Craig, N Murphy, Rahman, Stogia, and Richards

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

**Councillors:** Karney, Leech, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Midgley, Ilyas and Taylor

**Apologies:** Councillor Ollerhead and S Judge

#### **Exe/20/100 Minutes**

##### **Decision**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 3 September 2020.

#### **Exe/20/101 The Queen's Birthday Honours**

Congratulations were offered to the Executive Member for Culture and Leisure, Councillor Luthfer Rahman, and to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, Carol Culley, on their award of an OBE by Her Majesty The Queen.

#### **Exe/20/102 Appointment of the (Statutory) Deputy Leader**

##### **Decision**

To note the appointment by the Leader of Councillor Nigel Murphy as the (Statutory) Deputy Leader.

#### **Exe/20/103 COVID-19 Monthly Update Report**

The written report from the Chief Executive took the form of three "situation reports", one each for the work on the city's economic recovery, work with residents and communities, and work on the future of the Council itself. The written report was noted.

The Leader of the Council provided the meeting with a report on the discussion that had been taking place on the levels and the possible 'Tiers' that would be applied by the Government across the country and in Greater Manchester. He also explained the proposals and actions that Greater Manchester was putting forward collectively as a more effective way to contain the virus outbreak and reduce the other health and economic damage that the Tier 3 restrictions would cause to people in Greater

Manchester. He reported that the government had been urging the local authorities in the region to accept the Tier 3 restrictions being applied in Greater Manchester. He explained why that had been resisted.

The Executive Member reported that the recent spike in rates of infection had peaked a few days previously at 582 cases per 100,000 people and since then had begun to level off and drop, with the latest non-validated data showing 448 cases per 100,000. The profile of infection was also explained, including the impact on the number of university students that had contracted the virus, as had been anticipated in the Council's planning.

At the meeting an oral update on the pandemic was also provided by the Director of Public Health. He gave more details of the Council's work with the city's universities and the steps that had been taken to deal with the outbreaks that had occurred in the student populations in the city. He also explained the on-going priority being given to tackling and reducing levels of community transmission. He also reported that the situation with respect to access to testing in the city had been improving, with fewer problems being reported by residents.

## Decision

To note the report.

## Exe/20/104 Revenue Budget Monitoring 2020/21 and Budget Position 2021/22.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer presented a review of the 2020/21 revenue budgets. The report provided an overview of the Council's financial position as at the end of August 2020 and the work to develop a balanced budget for 2020/21. The report identified a projected deficit for 2020/21 of £271k, a significant improvement on the forecast deficit reported in July of £5.476m (Minute Exe/20/81). That new forecast was based on the financial implications of COVID-19, government funding confirmed to date, other identified budget changes, and in-year efficiencies and mitigations. The anticipated financial cost of the COVID-19 pandemic to the Council so far was £55.583m in 2020/21, increasing by a further £160.675m in 2021/22. The overall revenue forecast for 2020/21 was:

Forecast as at 31 August 2020	Original Approved Budget £000	Revised Budget £000	Forecast Outturn £000	Total Forecast Variance £000	Movement from last report £000
<b>Total Available Resources</b>	(666,125)	(827,470)	(812,604)	14,866	33
<b>Total Corporate Budgets</b>	126,761	264,202	262,634	(1,568)	(1,192)
Children's Services	130,320	130,540	131,198	658	(6,021)
Adult Social Care	221,253	232,291	239,165	6,874	(1,491)
Homelessness	15,285	17,292	22,120	4,828	(2,316)
Corporate Core	69,958	77,598	78,893	1,295	(2,414)
Neighbourhoods	93,802	94,841	103,282	8,441	2,497
Growth and Development	8,746	10,706	16,035	5,329	(2,264)



Forecast as at 31 August 2020	Original Approved Budget £000	Revised Budget £000	Forecast Outturn £000	Total Forecast Variance £000	Movement from last report £000
<b>Total Directorate Budgets</b>	<b>539,364</b>	<b>563,268</b>	<b>590,693</b>	<b>27,425</b>	<b>(12,009)</b>
<b>Total Use of Resources</b>	<b>666,125</b>	<b>827,470</b>	<b>853,327</b>	<b>25,857</b>	<b>(13,201)</b>
<b>Total forecast over / (under) spend</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40,723</b>	<b>40,723</b>	<b>(13,168)</b>
COVID 19 Government grant income (tranche 1, 2 and 3) - Confirmed				<b>(40,452)</b>	0
Proposed Corporate mitigations				<b>0</b>	7,963
<b>Net forecast over / (under) spend</b>				<b>271</b>	<b>(5,205)</b>

The report examined the impact the COVID-19 pandemic was expected to have on the council's finances in 2021/22 and beyond. The report included a reminder that the Council had, back in February and early March 2020, forecast a £20m budget deficit which would have had to be addressed as part of the 2021/22 budget setting process. With the impact of the pandemic, the added costs and the loss of income, the forecast deficit had increased to £136m before possible mitigations, and £105.448m after mitigations. The forecast position for the coming years was:

	Revised 2020/21 £000	2021/22 £000	2022/23 £000	2023/24 £000	2024/25 £000
<b>Budget shortfall after confirmed funding/ mitigations</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>135,958</b>	<b>146,801</b>	<b>110,143</b>	<b>123,391</b>
Sales, fees and charges support (estimate)	(6,400)	0	0	0	0
Smooth Collection Fund over 3 years:	0	(24,381)	12,190	12,190	0
Defer planned use of reserves to balance the budget	6,129	(6,129)			
<b>Total - Potential Budget Gap</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>105,448</b>	<b>158,991</b>	<b>122,333</b>	<b>123,391</b>

Unless further government support was forthcoming that scale of reduction in 2021/22 would require cuts of about 20% of the budgets for the delivery of services. Those cuts would be on top of cumulative budget cuts of £379m and workforce reductions of around 40% since 2010. The ways the potential deficit could be addressed were to be considered in November, by the Scrutiny Committees and then by the Executive.

The report also addressed a number of specific changes and approvals needed as part of the Council's budget revisions processes in 2020/21.

## **Budget to be Allocated**

When setting the 2020/21 budget the Council has agreed to hold some funds for contingencies, and other money that was to be allocated throughout the year. The report proposed the use of some of these budgets to be allocated. These were agreed:

- £5,252,000 in 2020/21 for the annual pay increase award for employees
- £57,000 for external fostering placements as the North West framework for external fostering had been updated with an average price increase of 1.5%
- £61,000 for inflation in the Council's own costs for business rates
- £600,000 additional budget provision to meet the requirements of a security contract
- £100,000 for a trauma informed response to domestic violence to provide an opportunity to resolve issues, preventing the escalation of risk and demand on services

## **Grants in Addition to that Already Planned**

The report explained that notifications had been received in relation to specific external grants. These allocations had not confirmed at the time of the 2020/21 budget setting processes, confirmation of them was now being sought. Five of the eight grants were additional funds for the Council's response to the COVID-19 pandemic. These were all supported:

- £230,000 in 2020/21 and £395,000 in 2021/22 for "Build-A-Business" in libraries to help improve support for start-up and newly formed businesses across Greater Manchester.
- £224,000 in 2020/21 and £224,000 in 2021/22 from a National Network Funding award also to improve support for start-up and newly formed businesses currently supported by the Business & IP Centre in Central Library.
- £65,000 in 2020/21 for a wellbeing for education return grant to provide training and support on specific mental health issues.

The grants awarded in relation to the pandemic were:

- £2m in 2020/21 for the Next Steps Accommodation Programme, being £1.6m for government additional funding for rough sleepers as part of the "Everyone In" programme; £100,000 for cold weather provision for those sleeping rough when the temperature drops below zero; and £300,000 for incentives to landlords to secure properties in the private rented sector specifically for people who were rough sleepers and have been provided with accommodation during the COVID pandemic.
- £1.862m in 2020/21 and £2.975 in 2021/22 from the Test and Trace Support Grant, total government support being £4.837m to support Manchester City Council's Test and Trace programme.
- £3.084m in 2020/21 from Infection Control Round 2 funding, to be provided to care homes within Manchester on a 'per beds' basis and to CQC-regulated community care providers on a 'per user' basis, including to social care providers with whom the Council has no existing contracts. The Council had discretion over the remaining 20% (£0.617m) to provide support to other care settings and wider workforce measures in relation to COVID-19 infection control.

- £0.68m in 2020/21 for the Test and Trace Support Payments (Self Isolation Scheme) to assist individuals who have been formally notified to self-isolate.
- £0.453m in 2020/21 from the Local Authority Compliance and Enforcement Grant to support additional compliance and enforcement activities in the city.

### **Budget Virements**

The report proposed three funding virements. All those were supported and agreed, with the largest virement to be recommended to the Council for final approval:

- From corporately held budgets to be allocated to Facilities Management: £600,000 in each of 2020/21 and 2021/22 for an increase on security contract costs so as to maintain Manchester Living Wage for the staff.
- From all directorates to corporately held budgets to be allocated: £204,000 in 2020/21 and 451,000 in 2021/22 from savings on the Council's energy bills, with savings of 8% on electricity and 7% on gas having been secured.
- To be recommended to the Council - from third party payments to transfer to reserves: £7,627,000 in 2020/21 from retaining 50% of the anticipated growth from participation in the 100% business rates pilot scheme, instead of transferring that money to the GMCA, as had been the intention when the budget had been set. This was to help increase reserves that would be available to mitigate the business rates deficit in 2021/22.

### **Decisions**

1. To recommend to the Council the approval of the proposed budget transfer of £7.627m from 'third party payments' to 'transfer to reserves' in order to support the 2021/22 budget.
2. To note the global revenue monitoring report and a forecast outturn position of a £271k deficit, which it is anticipated will be balanced by government funding, with any surplus supporting the 2021/22 position.
3. To approve the use of budgets to be allocated, including the 2020/21 pay award, as set out above.
4. To approve the use of grants in addition to that already planned, as set out above.
5. To approve the proposed virements as set out above.
6. To approve additional COVID-19 grants in Homelessness of £2.000m, made up of £1.600m for the Next Steps Accommodation Programme grant, £100k for cold weather provision, and £300k for incentives to landlords to secure properties in the private rented sector.
7. To approve additional COVID-19 grants in Adult Social Care of £3.084m for Infection Control round 2.
8. To approve additional COVID-19 grant in Neighbourhood Services of £453k for Compliance and Enforcement.

9. To note the application of £0.680m for Test and Trace Support Payments to assist individuals self-isolating following the confirmation of the Government's Self Isolation Scheme.

### **Exe/20/105 Capital Budget Monitoring 2020/21**

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer's report informed the Executive of the revised capital budget 2020/21 to 2023/24 taking account of agreed and proposed additions to the programme, profiling changes, and the latest estimates of forecast spend and resources for the 2020/21 capital programme. The report explained the major variations to forecast spend, and any impact that variations had on the five-year Capital Programme.

The forecast of expenditure for 2020/21 for the Manchester City Council capital programme was £435.9m compared to the proposed revised budget of £435.7m. Spend as of 31 August was £169.9m.

Appended to the report was a schedule of projects within the overall capital programme where the allocations needed to be revised and funding allocations vired between projects. The appendix showed the virement needed for each scheme and each project. We agreed to recommend the virements of more than £500,000 to the Council for approval, and to approve those below £500,000.

Also appended to the report was a schedule showing the updated capital budget for each project within the overall programme. The budgets shown in that table anticipated the approval of the virements being requested at this meeting. They also included the changes arising from any predicted or known advances or delays in when money would be spent in each of the five years in the programme. It was agreed that the Council also be recommended to approve that complete programme.

The prudential indicators as at the end of August 2020 were shown at appendix C of the report, and were noted.

It was also noted that the report had been considered at a recent meeting of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee, and the Committed noted the report and not made any recommendations of the decisions the Executive was being asked to consider (Minute RGSC/20/39).

### **Decisions**

1. To recommend that the Council approve virements over £0.5m within the capital programme as outlined in Appendix 1 of these minutes
2. To recommend that the Council approve the capital programme as presented in Appendix 2 of these minutes which will require prudential borrowing of £790.7m to fund non-HRA schemes over the five-year period for which provision has been made in the revenue budget for the associated financing costs (within limits previously agreed).

3. To approve virements under £0.5m within the capital programme as outlined in Appendix 1 of these minutes.
4. To note that approvals of movements and transfers to the capital programme, will result in a revised budget total of £435.7m and a latest full year spend forecast of £435.9m. Expenditure to the end of August 2020 is £169.9m.
5. To note the prudential indicators as set out in the report.

### **Exe/20/106 Capital Programme Update**

A report concerning requests to increase the capital programme was submitted. It was agreed to recommend three changes to the Council for approval, and to make a further two changes under delegated powers. These changes would increase Manchester City Council's capital budget by £15.647m over the next three years, funded by a mixture of the Eastlands Reserve, borrowing, capital receipts, and external grants.

It was also reported that the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer had made a further change using delegated powers:

- £33,000 for the Early Years maintenance programme within Children's Services.

### **Decisions**

1. To recommend that the Council approve the following changes to Manchester City Council's capital programme:
  - a) Growth and Development – Demolition of Grey Mare Police Station. A capital budget increase of £0.761m is requested, funded by HCA Eastlands Reserve Fund.
  - b) Highways Services - Planned Maintenance 2020/21 Carriageway Preventative Programme. A capital budget virement of £1.289m is requested from the Highways Project Delivery Fund budget.
  - c) Public Sector Housing – Silk Street. A capital budget increase of £12.048m is requested, funded by £5.650m HRA (RCCO), £4.140m Grant and £2.258m Capital Receipts.
2. Under powers delegated to the Executive, to approve the following changes to the City Council's capital programme:
  - a) Highways Services - Patching defect repairs 2020/22 Maintenance Programme. A capital budget increase of £2.838m is requested, funded by Government Grant.

- b) Neighbourhoods – Wythenshawe Track Changing Rooms. A capital budget virement of £0.380m is requested from the Parks Development Programme budget
3. To note the increase to the programme of £0.033m as a result of a delegated approval.

### **Exe/20/107 Purpose Built Student Accommodation in Manchester**

#### **Decision**

To defer this item of business to a future meeting so as to allow councillors to have more time to examine the potential issues in their wards.

### **Exe/20/108 Demolition of the Maisonettes on Bridgnorth Road**

The Riverdale estate in the Higher Blackley ward has four blocks of maisonettes at Bridgnorth Road, Inchcape Drive and Riverdale Road. Together, these comprise 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 considered to be a generally a poor housing offer with limited demand for the upper units.

A report submitted by the Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth explained that an assessment of all the blocks had been undertaken. That had concluded that that three of the blocks at Riverdale Road and Inchcape Drive were considered to be suitable for refurbishment but that the block at Bridgnorth Road was not, and should be demolished. That block comprised 16 x 2-bed homes. That block was situated on a large site next to other vacant land and so provided an opportunity, if the block was 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 had the potential for 38 new homes, providing an increase of 22 homes in the area.

The report explained that a consultation exercise with residents had been concluded in March 2020. Overall, 82% of residents responded to the consultation of which 93% supported the proposal to demolish the block, so being more than three quarters of all the residents.

The estimated total cost of the demolition and the tenant homelessness & disturbance payments was £637k. This was made up of £475k demolition costs and £162k for home loss and disturbance payments to existing tenants. All the affected residents were to be relocated to alternative accommodation with at least 2 bedrooms in accordance with their housing need, if they requested relocation.

The necessary approvals to demolish the block and relocate the tenants were given.

#### **Decisions**

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.

### **Exe/20/109 Lyndene Children's Home - Re-modelling and Next Steps**

The Lyndene children's home in Wythenshawe is at a property owned by the Council in Wythenshawe; a large detached property with its own substantial grounds. A report submitted by the Strategic Director for Children and Education Services explained that the home had been operating under-capacity in its current format in recent years.

The report explained that a number of children and young people in Manchester had high volume, complex needs and packages of care. Some of those children had to be placed outside the city, away from home, family, carers, friends and their local community, because local provision was not available or not configured to meet their needs. The intention therefore was for the under-occupied home to be refurbished to provide outreach and short term support as part of a pathway to enable children and young people to remain with or move back to their family environments.

The proposal was procure the capital works needed 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. The estimated refurbishment cost of approximately £850,000 was to be met through external National Health Service England grant funding.

This proposal was supported.

### **Decisions**

1. To approve the decommissioning of the existing children's home provision.

2. To approve 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.

### **Exe/20/110 Former Central Retail Park Development Framework**

Central Retail Park, on Great Ancoats Street on the eastern side of the city centre, had been an established retail destination in the city. It had occupied the strategically significant site since the late 1980s. In 2015 and 2016 consideration had been given to the possible redevelopment of the site and a Development Framework for the area had been approved in February 2016 (Minute Exe/16/013). The Council holds the freehold on the site and in September 2017 resolved to take full control of the site, buying out the then leaseholder (Minute Exe/17/122). In October 2019 temporary consent had been granted by the Planning and Highways Committee for the site to be used as a car park (Minute PH/19/93). In February 2020 the Executive had endorsed a new draft Development Framework for the Central Retail Park site as a basis for public consultation (Minute Exe/20/24). A report now submitted by the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) reported on the outcome of that consultation and proposed that the revised Framework be adopted.

The vision for the area was for it to become an exemplary net zero-carbon commercial district with the ability to attract new businesses and talent to Manchester. The development should bring together activities and people to create a vibrant mixed use neighbourhood.

The consultation exercise had run for eight weeks from Monday 3 August 2020 to Friday 25 September 2020. A total of 598 responses had been received, the breakdown of which included:

- 471 who describe themselves as local residents
- 19 who describe themselves as local business owners
- 8 who describe themselves as landowners
- 2 who describe themselves as from a statutory body
- 106 who describe themselves as working in the local area
- 142 who describe themselves as a regular visitor to the local area
- 16 who describe themselves as belonging to a local interest group

The report set out the issues that consultees had raised in their responses, including details on the submissions from other statutory bodies, utility companies, housing providers and local councillors.

The report then set out proposed responses to those issues, examining in turn the public realm and greenspace, zero-carbon objectives, the height, density and massing of the proposed developments, the development principles and proposed uses of the land, and traffic and highway safety.

Having examined the outcome of the consultation, the report suggested that the development framework be amended to:

- highlight the proximity of public space in adjacent areas;



- note the requirements for the development to be more walking and cycling friendly, particularly in how it links through to adjacent districts; and
- better capture the aspiration to deliver zero carbon objectives.

That was agreed and the amended framework was adopted.

## **Decisions**

1. To note the outcome of the public consultation on the draft Development Framework for the former Central Retail Park.
2. To approve the Development Framework for the former Central Retail Park area and request that Planning and Highways Committee take the framework into account as a material consideration when considering planning applications for the site.

## **Exe/20/111 Exclusion of the Public**

### **Decision**

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

## **Exe/20/112 Capital Budget - The Factory - Part B**

A joint report submitted by the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) and the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer provided an update on progress with the delivery of The Factory, including the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the project; and progress with the redevelopment of St John's.

In relation to the Factory development, the report explained the source of unavoidable and irretrievable additional projects costs that had arisen from the pandemic, the prolongation costs for the revised building and commissioning programme, and other changes to projects costs.

The report proposed the means for those budget changes to be addressed, which were supported.

## **Decisions**

1. To recommend that the Council approve a Capital Budget increase of £45.17m for The Factory. This will increase the total capital budget for the construction of The Factory from £140.62m to £185.79m to be met from external contributions. This increase will be met from Council resources to support the delivery of Factory in advance of external contributions being

received by the Council, in order that the Council can continue to meet its contractual obligations.

2. Subject to the Council approving the increase in the Capital Budget, to delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Leader, to determine the Council resources which are to be used in advance of receipt of external contributions. Noting that there is a MIF reserve of £11m held to support the revenue funding match funding requirement for future years and a £4.3 m capital loan repayment due to be paid by Manchester Quays Riverside Limited to the Council in August 2023 which may be applied to support the project until external contributions are received.
3. To note progress with the delivery of The Factory.
4. To note that the external contributions are proposed to be funded from a funding application to Arts Council England (ACE) and external fundraising and commercial sponsorship.
5. To note the intention to make the next formal submission of the updated business plan to ACE in December 2020 and the planned Business Case review process with ACE.
6. To note the progress in the development of employment, training and education opportunities and creative engagement programmes as part of The Factory's skills development programme.

**Exe/20/113 Appendices to the Minutes**

**Appendix 1 - Proposed Programme Virements**

<b>Project Name</b>	<b>2020/21 £'000</b>	<b>2021/22 £'000</b>	<b>2022/23 £'000</b>	<b>2023/24 £'000</b>	<b>2024/25 £'000</b>
Other Improvement works		359			
Princess Rd Safety Review		-359			
<b>Total Highways Programme</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
External cyclical works Charlestown Chain Bar Hillingdon Drive maisonettes		-11			
External cyclical works Crumpsall Blackley Village		-20			
Environmental improvements Moston corrolites	31				
Delivery Costs	-5	-4			
Fire Risk Assessments			800		
Delivery Costs		54	138		
Delivery Costs	-2				
Delivery Costs	14				
Northwards Housing Programme - Unallocated	-38	-19	-938		
<b>Total Public Sector Housing (HRA) Programme</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
St. Augustine's	1				
Mauldeth Rd Rewire	17				
Charlestown Community Fire Alarm/Lighting	-80				
Manley Park Primary roof repairs	-1				
Schools Capital Maintenance -unallocated	63				
<b>Total Children's Services Programme</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Total Capital Programme</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>

**Appendix 2 - Proposed Revised Capital Budget**

<b>Project</b>	<b>2020/21 Proposed revised budget £'000</b>	<b>2021/22 Proposed revised budget £'000</b>	<b>2022/23 Proposed revised budget £'000</b>	<b>2023/24 Proposed revised budget £'000</b>	<b>2024/25 Proposed revised budget £'000</b>	<b>Total Budget £'000</b>
Drainage	2,120	1,871	0	0	0	<b>3,991</b>
Patching Defect repairs	2,000	528	0	0	0	<b>2,528</b>
Carriageway Resurfacing	8,592	8,499	0	0	0	<b>17,091</b>
Footway schemes	1,316	2,110	0	0	0	<b>3,426</b>
Carriageway Preventative	3,500	1,100	0	0	0	<b>4,600</b>
Bridge Maintenance	500	2,234	2,233	2,233	0	<b>7,200</b>
Other Improvement works	739	4,164	4,164	4,164	0	<b>13,231</b>
Highways Maintenance Challenge Fund	5,160	910	0	0	0	<b>6,070</b>
Hyde Road (A57) Pinch Point Widening	3,147	0	0	0	0	<b>3,147</b>
Manchester/Salford Inner Relief Road (MSIRR)	100	0	0	0	0	<b>100</b>
Great Ancoats Improvement Scheme	5,854	514	0	0	0	<b>6,368</b>
Mancunian Way and Princess Parkway NPIF	4,910	87	0	0	0	<b>4,997</b>
Christie Extension Residents Parking Zones	108	201	0	0	0	<b>309</b>
Hathersage Residents Parking Zones	60	0	0	0	0	<b>60</b>
North Mcr General Hospital Residents Parking Zones	63	0	0	0	0	<b>63</b>
St George's Residents Parking Zones	90	71	0	0	0	<b>161</b>
Rusholme Residents Parking Zones	55	204	0	0	0	<b>259</b>
School Crossings	3,784	0	0	0	0	<b>3,784</b>
Chorlton Cycling Scheme	4,381	7,645	354	0	0	<b>12,380</b>
Northern Quarter Cycling Scheme	1,996	8,280	0	0	0	<b>10,276</b>
Manchester Cycleway	415	178	0	0	0	<b>593</b>
Beswick Filtered Neighbourhood Development Costs	938	494	0	0	0	<b>1,432</b>
Green Bridge at Airport City	852	71	0	0	0	<b>923</b>
A6 Stockport Road Pinch Point Scheme	438	8	0	0	0	<b>446</b>
Levenshulme Mini Holland Cycling and Walking scheme	638	340	0	0	0	<b>978</b>
Northern/Eastern GW Walking and Cycling scheme-development costs	503	111	0	0	0	<b>614</b>
Rochdale Canal	168	9	0	0	0	<b>177</b>
20mph Zones (Phase 3)	124	0	0	0	0	<b>124</b>
Princess Rd Safety Review	60	28	0	0	0	<b>88</b>
Public Realm	1,500	924	0	0	0	<b>2,424</b>

<b>Project</b>	2020/21 Proposed revised budget £'000	2021/22 Proposed revised budget £'000	2022/23 Proposed revised budget £'000	2023/24 Proposed revised budget £'000	2024/25 Proposed revised budget £'000	Total Budget £'000
Street Lighting PFI	1,500	3,039	0	0	0	<b>4,539</b>
Didsbury West	23	0	0	0	0	<b>23</b>
A56 Liverpool Road	62	0	0	0	0	<b>62</b>
A56 Chester Road	40	0	0	0	0	<b>40</b>
Sunbank Lane	7	0	0	0	0	<b>7</b>
Sharston Roundabout SCOOT	6	0	0	0	0	<b>6</b>
Derwent Avenue	8	0	0	0	0	<b>8</b>
Woodhouse Park	16	0	0	0	0	<b>16</b>
Arena Security Measures	28	0	0	0	0	<b>28</b>
Ladybarn District Centre	26	0	0	0	0	<b>26</b>
CCTV Operating System Upgrade	243	0	0	0	0	<b>243</b>
Manchester Trash Screens	143	0	0	0	0	<b>143</b>
Oldham Rd Feasibility study	255	45	0	0	0	<b>300</b>
<b>Total Highways Programme</b>	<b>56,468</b>	<b>43,665</b>	<b>6,751</b>	<b>6,397</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>113,281</b>
Waste Reduction Measures	750	330	0	0	0	<b>1,080</b>
Waste Contract	200	350	350	0	0	<b>900</b>
Purchase of Electric Refuse Charging Vehicles	9,896	0	0	0	0	<b>9,896</b>
Cremator and Mercury Abatement Plant Replacement Strategy	310	1,241	0	0	0	<b>1,551</b>
Park Events Infrastructure	12	0	0	0	0	<b>12</b>
Parks Development Programme	552	3,200	3,574	4,685	0	<b>12,011</b>
Somme 100 Year Memorial	3	0	0	0	0	<b>3</b>
Painswick Park Improvement	2	0	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
Heaton Park Southern Play Area	28	0	0	0	0	<b>28</b>
Wythenshawe Park Sport Facilities	5	0	0	0	0	<b>5</b>
King George V Park	15	0	0	0	0	<b>15</b>
Angel Meadow	192	0	0	0	0	<b>192</b>
Gately Brook Pre-Development Fees	116	0	0	0	0	<b>116</b>
Indoor Leisure - Abraham Moss	212	9,631	13,030	46	0	<b>22,919</b>
Indoor Leisure - Moss Side	68	0	0	0	0	<b>68</b>
Boggart Hole Clough - Visitors Centre	0	535	0	0	0	<b>535</b>
Mount Road	0	32	0	0	0	<b>32</b>
Culture Website	4	0	0	0	0	<b>4</b>
Manchester Regional Arena Track Replacement	404	434	0	0	0	<b>838</b>
Mellands Playing Fields - Levenshulme	164	0	0	0	0	<b>164</b>
Mellands Project - Longsight Ward	330	0	0	0	0	<b>330</b>
Gorton & Abbey hey Project	292	0	0	0	0	<b>292</b>
Hough End Master Plan - Strat	508	0	0	0	0	<b>508</b>

<b>Project</b>	2020/21 Proposed revised budget £'000	2021/22 Proposed revised budget £'000	2022/23 Proposed revised budget £'000	2023/24 Proposed revised budget £'000	2024/25 Proposed revised budget £'000	Total Budget £'000
Football Hub Development Costs						
Range Stadium Capital Project	168	0	0	0	0	<b>168</b>
Manchester Aquatics Centre - Car Park Improvements	402	0	0	0	0	<b>402</b>
Non-Turf Wickets - Parks & Playing Fields	232	0	0	0	0	<b>232</b>
Central Library Wolfson Award	2	0	0	0	0	<b>2</b>
Central Library Refresh	194	763	0	0	0	<b>957</b>
Open Libraries	115	190	0	0	0	<b>305</b>
Contact Theatre loan	200	0	0	0	0	<b>200</b>
HOME Arches Phase 1	215	0	0	0	0	<b>215</b>
<b>Total Neighbourhoods Programme</b>	<b>15,591</b>	<b>16,706</b>	<b>16,954</b>	<b>4,731</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>53,982</b>
First Street Cultural Facility	14	0	0	0	0	<b>14</b>
The Factory (Build)	37,930	36,931	227	0	0	<b>75,088</b>
St Johns (Public Realm)	288	3,820	91	0	0	<b>4,199</b>
Asset Management Programme	7,536	13,291	0	0	0	<b>20,827</b>
Manchester Aquatics Centre feasibility works	464	0	0	0	0	<b>464</b>
Town Hall Complex Transformation Programme	54	0	0	0	0	<b>54</b>
Hammerstone Road Depot	2,154	11,303	5,815	0	0	<b>19,272</b>
Carbon Reduction Programme	3,910	10,200	5,000	5,000	0	<b>24,110</b>
Greening of the City	500	500	0	0	0	<b>1,000</b>
Estates Transformation	0	0	800	0	0	<b>800</b>
Estates Transformation - Hulme District Office	90	0	0	0	0	<b>90</b>
Estates Transformation - Alexandra House	5,426	1,180	0	0	0	<b>6,606</b>
Ross Place Refurbishment	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Proud Trust - Sidney Street	250	0	0	0	0	<b>250</b>
Space - Phase 3	195	455	0	0	0	<b>650</b>
The Sharp Project	0	600	0	0	0	<b>600</b>
Digital Asset Base - One Central Park	230	538	0	0	0	<b>768</b>
Strategic Acquisitions Programme	3,038	1,323	0	0	0	<b>4,361</b>
Sustaining Key Initiatives	0	2,858	8,600	0	0	<b>11,458</b>
Mayfield Park	296	35	0	0	0	<b>331</b>
Housing Infrastructure Fund	2,230	14,000	16,500	18,270	0	<b>51,000</b>
Acquisition of land at Red Bank	2,305	0	0	0	0	<b>2,305</b>
Northern Gateway	6,700	4,445	7,275	4,875	0	<b>23,295</b>
Eastern Gateway - Central Retail Park	709	0	0	0	0	<b>709</b>
Eastern Gateway - New Islington	10	55	0	0	0	<b>65</b>

<b>Project</b>	2020/21 Proposed revised budget £'000	2021/22 Proposed revised budget £'000	2022/23 Proposed revised budget £'000	2023/24 Proposed revised budget £'000	2024/25 Proposed revised budget £'000	Total Budget £'000
Marina						
House of Sport	432	7,988	0	0	0	<b>8,420</b>
St. Peters Square - Peterloo	106	0	0	0	0	<b>106</b>
Medieval Quarter Public Realm	851	801	0	0	0	<b>1,652</b>
Manchester College	5,000	0	0	0	0	<b>5,000</b>
Digital Business Incubators	200	0	0	0	0	<b>200</b>
Lincoln Square	0	1,200	0	0	0	<b>1,200</b>
Piccadilly Gardens - Phase 1	250	1,561	0	0	0	<b>1,811</b>
Manchester Digital Security Innovation hub	0	2,000	0	0	0	<b>2,000</b>
New Smithfield Market	100	369	0	0	0	<b>469</b>
Heron House and Registrars	1,966	0	0	0	0	<b>1,966</b>
Civic Quarter Heat Network	9,679	4,000	0	0	0	<b>13,679</b>
<b>Total Growth &amp; Development Programme</b>	<b>92,913</b>	<b>119,453</b>	<b>44,308</b>	28,145	<b>0</b>	<b>284,819</b>
Our Town Hall refurbishment	39,140	70,327	86,216	50,397	34,094	<b>280,174</b>
<b>Total Town Hall Refurbishment Programme</b>	<b>39,140</b>	<b>70,327</b>	<b>86,216</b>	50,397	<b>34,094</b>	<b>280,174</b>
Brunswick PFI Land Assembly	100	593	677	0	0	<b>1,370</b>
Collyhurst Regeneration	0	178	1,000	2,700	0	<b>3,878</b>
Collyhurst Environmentals	0	55	0	0	0	<b>55</b>
Collyhurst Land Assembly	29	0	0	0	0	<b>29</b>
Collyhurst Land Acquisitions	0	210	799	0	0	<b>1,009</b>
Eccleshall Street - 3 Sites	0	0	500	0	0	<b>500</b>
Site Investigation and Early Works HIF Pilot Sites	0	0	65	0	0	<b>65</b>
Miles Platting PFI Land Assembly	4	146	266	0	0	<b>416</b>
Disabled Facilities Grant	4,004	7,200	1,000	0	0	<b>12,204</b>
Toxteth St CPO & environmental works	1	29	0	0	0	<b>30</b>
Bell Crescent CPO	0	0	0	482	0	<b>482</b>
HCA Empty Homes Cluster Phase 2	107	415	891	0	0	<b>1,413</b>
Princess Rd	100	0	0	0	0	<b>100</b>
Empty Homes Scheme	2,000	0	0	0	0	<b>2,000</b>
Ancoats Dispensary: Survey Work to Confirm Major Project Viability	352	0	0	0	0	<b>352</b>
Redrow Development Phase 2 onward	21	0	0	0	0	<b>21</b>
West Gorton Compensation	4	0	0	0	0	<b>4</b>
West Gorton Ph 2A Demolition &	51	386	904	0	0	<b>1,341</b>

<b>Project</b>	2020/21 Proposed revised budget £'000	2021/22 Proposed revised budget £'000	2022/23 Proposed revised budget £'000	2023/24 Proposed revised budget £'000	2024/25 Proposed revised budget £'000	Total Budget £'000
Commercial Acquisitions						
HMRP	10	30	89	0	0	129
Collyhurst Acquisition & Demolition (Overbrook & Needwood Close)	0	664	0	0	0	664
Extra Care	0	1,245	1,200	0	0	2,445
Moston Lane Acquisitions	0	0	0	7,500	0	7,500
Equity Loans	0	0	397	0	0	397
West Gorton Community Park	350	25	25	0	0	400
Ben Street Regeneration	428	623	0	0	0	1,051
Marginal Viability Fund - New Victoria	6,215	5,185	0	0	0	11,400
Chimebank	34	0	0	0	0	34
<b>Total Private Sector Housing Programme</b>	<b>13,810</b>	<b>16,984</b>	<b>7,813</b>	10,682	0	<b>49,289</b>
Charlestown - Victoria Ave multistorey window replacement and external cyclical works	2,382	6,420	3,481	0	0	12,283
Harpurhey Lathbury & 200 Estates external cyclical works	-18	18	0	0	0	0
Environmental works	0	5	0	0	0	5
Moston Miners Low Rise externals	0	18	0	0	0	18
Newton Heath Limestone Drive externals	0	6	0	0	0	6
External cyclical works Ancoats Smithfields estate	75	0	0	0	0	75
External cyclical works New Moston (excl corrolites)	0	8	0	0	0	8
Environmental improvements Moston corrolites	81	0	0	0	0	81
ENW distribution network (various)	194	0	0	0	0	194
Various Estate based environmental works	100	163	0	0	0	263
Moston Corrolites external work	53	1,050	117	0	0	1,220
Charlestown Pevensey and Rushcroft Courts door entry systems renewal	49	0	0	0	0	49
Retaining Walls	0	150	150	0	0	300
Delivery Costs	540	1,002	486	0	0	2,028
Decent Homes mop ups ph 9 and decent homes work required to voids	0	20	0	0	0	20
One offs such as rewires, boilers, doors, insulation	0	31	0	0	0	31
Ancoats - Victoria Square lift	4	0	0	0	0	4



<b>Project</b>	2020/21 Proposed revised budget £'000	2021/22 Proposed revised budget £'000	2022/23 Proposed revised budget £'000	2023/24 Proposed revised budget £'000	2024/25 Proposed revised budget £'000	Total Budget £'000
replacement						
Boiler replacement programme	-6	0	0	0	0	-6
Harpurhey - Monsall Multis Internal Works	583	365	0	0	0	948
Newton Heath - Multies Internal Works	1,452	1,685	0	0	0	3,137
Higher Blackley - Liverton Court Internal Works	4	62	0	0	0	66
Various - Bradford/Clifford Lamb/Kingsbridge/Sandyhill Court Internal Works	152	0	0	0	0	152
Charlestown - Rushcroft/Pevensey Court Internal Works	678	265	0	0	0	943
Collyhurst - Mossbrook/Roach/Vauxhall/Humphries Court Internal Works	405	127	0	0	0	532
Decent Homes mop ups and voids	181	214	22	0	0	417
One off work - rewires, boilers, doors	2	50	0	0	0	52
Fire precautions multi storey blocks	0	150	0	0	0	150
ERDF Heat Pumps	2,488	1,825	101	0	0	4,414
Charlestown - Rushcroft/Pevensey Courts Lift Refurb	0	300	225	0	0	525
One off type work (rewires/boilers/doors)	211	0	0	0	0	211
Fire Risk Assessments	697	3,473	1,640	0	0	5,810
Northwards - Harpurhey 200 Estate Internal Works	636	215	0	0	0	851
Rushcroft and Pevensey Courts Ground Source Heat Pumps	1,261	1,162	0	0	0	2,423
Harpurhey Baths Estate (excl Edward Grant Court) and Cheetham Appleford Estate	318	507	0	0	0	825
Newton Heath Troydale and Croyden Drive Low Rise Estates	463	1,637	0	0	0	2,100
Responsive Investment Works	0	650	100	0	0	750
Retirement blocks various M&E/H&S works	215	769	250	0	0	1,234
Retirement blocks lift replacement apprentice and edward grant courts	0	114	0	0	0	114
One off type work such as rewires boilers doors	0	350	0	0	0	350
Delivery Costs	1,804	1,760	301	0	0	3,865
Bringing Studio Apartments back in use	0	12	0	0	0	12
Various Locations - bringing bedsits	0	104	0	0	0	104

<b>Project</b>	2020/21 Proposed revised budget £'000	2021/22 Proposed revised budget £'000	2022/23 Proposed revised budget £'000	2023/24 Proposed revised budget £'000	2024/25 Proposed revised budget £'000	Total Budget £'000
back into use						
Delivery Costs	0	15	0	0	0	15
Improvements to Homeless accommodation city wide	0	36	0	0	0	36
Plymouth Grove Women's Direct Access Centre	0	28	0	0	0	28
Improvements to Homeless Accommodation Phase 2	375	355	0	0	0	730
Woodward Court reroofing	102	145	0	0	0	247
Woodward Court lift replacement	0	0	434	0	0	434
Delivery Costs	88	71	54	0	0	213
Stock Acquisitions	2	0	0	0	0	2
Adaptations	150	202	0	0	0	352
Various Locations - Adaptations	305	388	0	0	0	693
Delivery Costs	56	50	0	0	0	106
Northwards Housing Programme - Unallocated	0	0	13,366	0	0	13,366
Collyhurst Maisonette Compensation & Dem	0	89	935	0	0	1,024
West Gorton PH2A Low & High Rise Demolition	26	0	0	0	0	26
Collyhurst Estate Regeneration	0	0	1,541	0	0	1,541
Buy Back Properties - Right to Buy	6	0	0	0	0	6
Collyhurst Regeneration - Highways Phase 1	0	287	1,394	0	0	1,681
Collyhurst Regeneration - Churnett Street	0	0	790	0	0	790
Collyhurst Regeneration - Needwood & Overbrook acquisition / demolition	0	134	0	0	0	134
Willert Street Park Improvements	0	10	0	0	0	10
North Manchester New Builds	38	339	0	0	0	377
North Manchester New Builds 3	245	0	0	0	0	245
Parkhill Land Assembly	0	0	4,270	0	0	4,270
Collyhurst	500	13,890	4,210	0	0	18,600
Buying Back Former Council Homes	0	500	500	500	0	1,500
<b>Total Public Sector Housing (HRA) Programme</b>	<b>16,897</b>	<b>41,226</b>	<b>34,367</b>	<b>500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>92,990</b>
Lytham Rd	14	0	0	0	0	14
Plymouth Grove Refurbishment	89	0	0	0	0	89
Crossacres Primary School	24	0	0	0	0	24
Dean Trust Expansion	2,859	0	0	0	0	2,859

<b>Project</b>	<b>2020/21 Proposed revised budget £'000</b>	<b>2021/22 Proposed revised budget £'000</b>	<b>2022/23 Proposed revised budget £'000</b>	<b>2023/24 Proposed revised budget £'000</b>	<b>2024/25 Proposed revised budget £'000</b>	<b>Total Budget £'000</b>
Brookside Rd Moston	4,632	2,784	5	0	0	<b>7,421</b>
North Hulme Adv Playground	2,522	2,127	10	0	0	<b>4,659</b>
Roundwood Road	5,940	1,905	159	0	0	<b>8,004</b>
Coop North Expansion	488	0	0	0	0	<b>488</b>
Our Lady's Expansion	160	0	0	0	0	<b>160</b>
Manchester Communications Academy	111	0	0	0	0	<b>111</b>
Hyde Road Secondary School	1,000	1,000	0	0	0	<b>2,000</b>
St Peters RC High school expansion	383	0	0	0	0	<b>383</b>
Basic need - unallocated funds	0	20,866	44,359	0	0	<b>65,225</b>
Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM) - Allocated	7	0	0	0	0	<b>7</b>
Universal Infant Free School Meals (UIFSM) - Unallocated	75	0	0	0	0	<b>75</b>
Broad Oak Primary School Kitchen	757	0	0	0	0	<b>757</b>
Lily Lane Prim Windows	0	46	0	0	0	<b>46</b>
Moston Lane Reroof	6	0	0	0	0	<b>6</b>
St. Augustine's	68	0	0	0	0	<b>68</b>
Medlock Primary - Boundary Wall rebuild	80	0	0	0	0	<b>80</b>
Crumpsall Lane - Electrical rewire	899	0	0	0	0	<b>899</b>
Mauldeth Rd Rewire	693	0	0	0	0	<b>693</b>
Button Lane Primary Fire Alarm	161	0	0	0	0	<b>161</b>
Charlestown Comm Fire Alarm/Lighting	202	0	0	0	0	<b>202</b>
Northenden Primary Pipework and Radiators	258	0	0	0	0	<b>258</b>
Crowcroft Park roof repairs	324	0	0	0	0	<b>324</b>
St Wilfreds CE roof repairs	6	444	0	0	0	<b>450</b>
Northenden Comm external works	81	0	0	0	0	<b>81</b>
Abbott Kitchen ventilation	114	0	0	0	0	<b>114</b>
Manley Park Primary roof repairs	350	0	0	0	0	<b>350</b>
Broad Oak Reception class and roof repair	346	0	0	0	0	<b>346</b>
Schools Capital Maintenance - unallocated	150	3,361	0	0	0	<b>3,511</b>
Early Education for Two Year Olds - Unallocated	52	0	0	0	0	<b>52</b>
Healthy Pupil Capital Funding	0	257	0	0	0	<b>257</b>
North Ridge SEN	3,127	9	0	0	0	<b>3,136</b>
Special Educational Needs grant	0	683	0	0	0	<b>683</b>
Seymour Road	653	0	0	0	0	<b>653</b>
Commercial Wharf/ISS Refurbishment	97	43	0	0	0	<b>140</b>

<b>Project</b>	2020/21 Proposed revised budget £'000	2021/22 Proposed revised budget £'000	2022/23 Proposed revised budget £'000	2023/24 Proposed revised budget £'000	2024/25 Proposed revised budget £'000	Total Budget £'000
of YJS Building						
Ghyll Head	1,091	0	0	0	0	<b>1,091</b>
Acquisition of land at Hyde Road	13,157	12	0	0	0	<b>13,169</b>
Nurseries Capital Fund - Unity Community	230	139	0	0	0	<b>369</b>
Lyndene Children's Home Refurbishment	655	220	0	0	0	<b>875</b>
<b>Total Children's Services Programme</b>	<b>41,861</b>	<b>33,896</b>	<b>44,533</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>120,290</b>
Internet Resilience	30	0	0	0	0	<b>30</b>
Network Refresh Programme	96	3,837	2,349	0	0	<b>6,282</b>
Data Centre Network Design and Implementation	510	0	0	0	0	<b>510</b>
End User Experience	570	1,000	0	0	0	<b>1,570</b>
Microsoft 365	1,760	0	0	0	0	<b>1,760</b>
Telephony	200	200	0	0	0	<b>400</b>
Technology Enabled Care Digital Platform	157	0	0	0	0	<b>157</b>
ICT Investment Plan	0	6,560	8,900	7,690	0	<b>23,150</b>
<b>Total ICT Programme</b>	<b>3,323</b>	<b>11,597</b>	<b>11,249</b>	<b>7,690</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>33,859</b>
Pay and Display Machines	220	0	0	0	0	<b>220</b>
Phase 1 Implementation - Locality Plan Programme Office	375	112	0	0	0	<b>487</b>
Integrated Working - Gorton Health Hub	4,429	14,674	1,076	0	0	<b>20,179</b>
BioMedical Investment	3,792	7,785	2,308	0	0	<b>13,885</b>
Manchester Jewish Museum Loan	290	0	0	0	0	<b>290</b>
Manchester Airport Car Park Investment	3,730	0	0	0	0	<b>3,730</b>
FC United	170	0	0	0	0	<b>170</b>
VCSE Small premises works	0	500	500	0	0	<b>1,000</b>
Irish World Heritage Centre Loan	10	0	0	0	0	<b>10</b>
Airport Loan	142,700	0	0	0	0	<b>142,700</b>
Inflation	0	8,783	5,965	2,527	0	<b>17,275</b>
<b>Total Corporate Capital Programme</b>	<b>155,716</b>	<b>31,854</b>	<b>9,849</b>	<b>2,527</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>199,946</b>
<b>Total Capital Programme</b>	<b>435,719</b>	<b>385,708</b>	<b>262,040</b>	<b>111,069</b>	<b>34,094</b>	<b>1,228,630</b>

## **Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 23 June 2020**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Andrews, Clay, Davies, Lanchbury, B Priest, Rowles, A Simcock, Stanton, Wheeler and Wright

**Also present:**

Councillor Leese, Leader

**Apologies:**

Councillors Ahmed Ali and Moore

### **RGSC/20/25 Minutes**

**Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 3 March 2020 as a correct record.

### **RGSC/20/26 Update on activity under COVID 19**

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which set out a summary of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of the committee.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- Detailing the Public Health response, both at a Manchester and Greater Manchester level;
- Describing the financial implications and funding arrangements for the Council and the implications of this;
- Recovery planning, including a reset of the Our Manchester Strategy and workforce considerations; and
- An update on the impact of the pandemic to the following areas of service delivery – ICT, Customer Service Organisation, Shared Service Centre, Revenues and Benefits, Discretionary Spend including Welfare Provision Scheme, Audit and Risk Management, Capital Programmes and Commissioning and Procurement

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

- How did the anticipated budget gap of £157 million in 2021/22 compare to the historic cuts in budget the Council faced across 2011-2013;
- What areas did the commercial loss of £77million represent;
- There was a need to recognise the positive steps the Council had taken to help support those who were homeless during the crisis;
- Was there any further information on the lobbying of Government to relax the requirement for the Council to produce an in year balanced budget and Medium Term Financial Plan given the significant budgetary challenges the Council now faced;
- What role would Scrutiny have in the four workstreams that were being progressed in order for the City and the Council to prepare effectively for the recovery;
- In relation to remote working, how many staff had been working from home and was there any potential future savings that could be derived from this way of working going forward;
- What was the cost to the Council for the continued use of agency staff and what were they being employed to do;
- Was the Council ensuring that for those staff working from home they had been provided with all the necessary and appropriate equipment;
- Concern was raised in relation to the proposed cut in 15 FTE posts in ICT given the additional demand being placed in this service for supporting a workforce working remotely;
- What would be the management and governance arrangements for dealing with the impact of COVID-19 on the BAME communities and what was the plan for progressing the outcomes of the Race Review report and how would scrutiny be involved in this;
- How would the Our Manchester Forum reflect the range of views of Manchester residents as part of the Our Manchester Strategy reset;
- An assurance was sought that the Council had appropriate ICT security in place given that a larger percentage of its workforce were now working remotely;
- Concern was raised about the current inability for residents to contact the Revenue and Benefits service by telephone;
- Assurance was sought that the Council was still managing to process the exemptions for larger families outside of the standard DWP process;
- Further information was requested on the take up of COVID-19 Business Rates Reliefs and Grants and COVID-19 Discretionary Grant Scheme to small businesses; and
- Was there any ability to recover the cost incurred in providing the additional grant scheme to support families with free school meals up until the point that the government agreed a voucher scheme for both term time and the school holidays, including the summer holidays.

The Leader commented that £157million represented between a 20-25% cut to the Council's net budget and if this was to happen it would be difficult to envisage how the Council could fulfil its statutory obligations. It was clarified that due to the prudence of the budgetary decisions taken so far, the Council would be able to manage the projected short fall for this financial year but it would be the 2021/22 financial year where the real difficult challenges existed. It was also explained that

the biggest difference between this projected shortfall and the budgetary cuts that had to be made between 2011-2013 was the additional responsibilities the Council now had. It was also reported that the largest element of loss of commercial income was from the Manchester Airport Group dividend, and whilst this loss would not be felt in the current financial year, it would have a significant impact on the next two to three years and place budgetary pressures on the Council for up to the next five years

The Committee was advised that whilst the Council had been able to support a high number of homeless and rough sleepers during the crisis, there still remained a number of significant challenges in supporting homeless and rough sleepers, which the Leader outlined. He also advised that the Council was still awaiting an additional financial package of support from the Government to assist in continuing to provide support beyond the end of June and without this funding, the Council would be facing an imminent funding crisis to tackle rough sleeping and homelessness.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that Core Cities and Greater Manchester local authorities were pushing government for recognition of the additional costs in tackling COVID-19 beyond the current financial year. As well as this the Council was also seeking flexibility on its collection fund to enable this to be undertaken over more than one financial year and finally the Council was looking for further support in light of the loss of income. It was commented that an agreement had been reached with the Minister for Housing, Communities and Local Government that any local authority would have a conversation first prior to issuing a Section 114 Notice and it was important to look at how the Council balance its budget over the current financial year and how it could be achieved over the next five year time frame.

The Committee was advised that all Scrutiny Committees would be cited on the progress being made under each work stream which related to the remits of each Scrutiny Committee.

In terms of remote working, it was reported that 2,700 members of staff had returned to work, undertaking their normal duties. For those staff that were working from home, planned investment in ICT had had to be brought forward to enable some staff to work appropriately. In the longer term, it was envisaged that savings could be made from changes in patterns to how staff worked. Further analysis of this would be required before any formal plans could be developed and put in place. In terms of agency staff, it was explained that the majority of these were in council front line roles where demand was increasing, such as social care. The Director of HROD advised that one of the challenges around the provision of equipment was the provision of suitable chairs for staff working from home. It was reported that a priority list had been devised of staff who had special needs or required specific equipment to undertake their roles at home and it would be these members of staff who would be prioritised to receive the necessary equipment first. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer added that since lockdown commenced, the Council had issued 650 laptops, 620 additional mobile phones and 100 tablet devices to assist staff in working from home. It was also clarified that the reduction in FTE posts in ICT would not be permanent reduction but rather these posts would be frozen until October 2020 and then reviewed in the second half of the financial year.

The Leader commented that the Council had significant information on the differential impacts of COVID-19 on different communities. Public Health England was undertaking more detailed work on the impact of COVID-19 on BAME communities to fully understand why people from these communities were at more risk of COVID-19. At a local level, this was being led by Directors of Public Health, working together across Greater Manchester, reporting into the Community Cell set up by NHS England. It was reported that the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods had been requested to circulate the Action Plan arising from the outcomes of the Race Review report to all Members to keep them up to date on what steps were to be taken.

The Chair advised that it would be pertinent that scrutiny of the Action Plan would be an area that either this Committee or the HR Scrutiny Sub Group would place on its work programme for this Municipal Year.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that she would provide a detailed update to Committee members on the proposed reset of the Our Manchester Strategy and how the Our Manchester Forum would play a part in this. In relation to ICT security, it was reported that there had been a 400% increase in cybercrime since the start of COVID-19. As a result the Council had strengthened its cyber security team to ensure all appropriate arrangements were in place.

The Director of Customer Services and Transactions advised that the majority of calls made to the Revenue and Benefits team by residents only came about following contact being initially made by the Council to residents in relation to Council tax re-setting payment plans and payment holidays etc. Consequently a decision had been taken to stop this recovery process until July at the earliest after the Council Tax credits had been allocated to accounts. This would see approximately 36,000 residents receive £150 into their accounts and for some of the most vulnerable residents, this would cover the cost of their Council Tax for this year. It was also confirmed that the Council was still managing to process the exemptions for larger families outside of the standard DWP process.

It was explained a large effort was being made to contact businesses that had yet to make a claim under the COVID-19 Business Rates Reliefs and Grants and a lot of work had been undertaken in correcting liability details retrospectively. It was reported that the Council was still dealing with approximately 40 cases a day. In terms of the COVID-19 Discretionary Grant Scheme to small businesses, it was reported that the low take up of this was possibly due to the application process and the need to prove two elements of conditionality – loss of significant income and high rates/rental costs. It was reported that Manchester had had 1,259 cases which was higher than other core cities.

Furthermore it was reported that the Council had paid out approximately £250,000 on the provision of free school meals and this money was recoverable from schools who would receive government funding for this. This money would be placed in the Council's Hardship fund to help support other discretionary support schemes.

## **Decision**



The Committee notes the report.

### **RGSC/20/27 Overview Report**

The report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment.

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.



## **Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 21 July 2020**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Andrews, Clay, Davies, Lanchbury, Moore, B Priest, Rowles, A Simcock, Stanton, Wheeler and Wright

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Leese, Leader

**Apologies:** Councillor Ahmed Ali

#### **RGSC/20/28 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 June were approved as a correct record

#### **RGSC/20/29 Update on COVID-19 activity**

Further to Minute RGSC/20/26 (Update on activity under COVID 19), the Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which provided a further update of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of the Committee.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- An update on the phased physical return to work of Council staff and what future ways of working would potentially look like;
- Details of the progress and re-scoping of the Our Transformation strategy to ensure it supported the delivery of wider future Council objectives;
- The programme of work underway within ICT to support the new ways of working including infrastructure and capacity, end user device and telephony; and
- An updated position of the impact of COVID-19 on the Council's finances and budget.

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

- In terms of Our Ways of Working, how far along was the Council in determining numbers of staff who would continue working from home;
- Was the roll out of new ICT equipment and the move to Microsoft 365 still going ahead as planned and within the planned timeframe;

- It was asked whether there was any clarity on the methodology used for the second tranche of government funding;
- Further information was requested on the anticipated funding that the Council was hoping to receive to deliver the “shovel ready” schemes within the recovery plan of the Capital Programme;
- What projection did the Council have as to the percentage of pre-COVID19 Business Rates collection it was hoping to achieve;
- Members welcomed the trial by Money Advice Pension Service on the availability of independent debt advice and commented that they would like to support the publicising of this;
- Was there information that could be shared with Members on a breakdown of the nature of businesses that had received Business Rate support and where these businesses were located in the city;
- Was there any information on the take up of additional grants for Nurseries;
- Was there any estimate on the proportion of businesses that had still not applied for Business Rates support;
- Were any assessments being undertaken on the number of people over the next two years that would have difficulty paying their Council Tax and what impact this would have on Council finances;
- It was suggested that information on Council Tax support and debt advice was also shared with organisations such as the Citizen’s Advice Bureau to ensure consistent advice was given; and
- Had any communications in community languages been undertaken in regards to Council Tax support.

The Leader advised that the recent staff survey picked up on the fact that the majority of staff who were currently working from home were happy to continue to do so for the time being, but it had been identified that staff’s health and wellbeing had been impacted upon since working from home. It was anticipated that going forward there would be flexible working arrangements for staff to enable them to work part of the week at home and part of the week physically in work. In terms of the move to Microsoft 365, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer commented that the move was still going ahead and was currently being tested within ICT before being rolled out to other service areas.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer explained that the methodology being used for the second tranche of funding was on a per capita basis. For the recently received third tranche the method used to determine the level of additional government funding took into account population, deprivation and some elements of the foundation formula. Government had shared the full formula with the Council and it had been reassuring to see that deprivation was a driver of spend.

The Leader commented that £52 million of funding had been received for a number of Combined Authority schemes, two of which were located in Manchester, which totalled £31 million.

The Deputy City Treasurer advised that the Council was currently forecasting that Business Rates collections were approximately 19% down on pre-COVID19 figures although due to deferrals early in the year it was difficult to draw any conclusion from this and this position was improving each month. For the overall financial year the

Council was forecasting a 10% reduction in the collection of Business Rates which equated to around £23.6million. She also advised that a breakdown of the nature of the businesses that have been supported with their Business Rates on a constituency level could be provided to Members.

The Director of Customer Services and Transactions advised that in terms of Nurseries, the Council was able to pay full relief to non-Manchester nurseries or where the Council didn't pay their business rates, which equated to approx. 91 nurseries and equated to just over £1million. There was also another group of nurseries that had a rateable value below £15,000 that were able to claim a grant of £10,000 and then for those nurseries that didn't qualify for this grant, 10 nurseries were able to claim £5,000 through the discretionary scheme.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer commented that the Council had been working hard to get in touch with all businesses to make them aware of the Business Rate grant support available to them and advised that payment rates were at approximately 90%.

In terms of Council Tax and Council Tax support it was reported that the Council was looking at these arrangements, which included the smoothing of the Council Tax deficit over three years and some form of risk share on the collection fund position, but was awaiting the outcome of the Comprehensive Spending Review before any final decisions could be made. It was acknowledged that there would be an increase in the demand for Council Tax support in future years due to the impact of COVID19. Furthermore, the Deputy City Treasurer highlighted that the Council was currently anticipating a 6% shortfall in Council Tax collection. This, plus the full year effect of the Council Tax Support Scheme and increases in bad debt provision was resulting in the Council looking at a potential shortfall of £20million in Council Tax collection.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the update.
- (2) Requests that a breakdown of the nature of the businesses that have been supported with their Business Rates on a constituency level be provided to Members.

## **RGSC/20/30 Global Monitoring report**

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which outlined the projected outturn position for 2020/21, based on spend and income as at the end of May 2020 and future projections.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- An overview of COVID-19 financial implications, which included a forecasted outturn position of £5.476m deficit which was anticipated to be balanced by government funding;
- Details of additional Central Government funding for COVID-19 response;

- An overview of the overall forecast financial position 2020/21;
- Measures that would be taken to balance the budget in 2020/21; and
- Proposals for the use of budgets to be allocated, grants in addition to those already planned, proposed virements, increases to Directorate budgets and the use of reserves in addition to that already planned, which all required Executive approval.

The report and proposals contained within would also be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 29 July 2020.

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

- Was the £4.837million allocated to rolling out of a local Test and Trace programme sufficient
- Would local authority staff be included in the recent announcement by government of public sector worker pay rises and if so would this be built into the Council's projected budget;
- It was suggested that the Council pro-actively communicate with Manchester residents on the true impact of COVID19 on the Council's future financial arrangements;
- What, if any, assurance was being given by the Government that they would be reimbursing the Council for the costs it had incurred in tackling the impact of COVID19;
- Was there any indication that there would be financial support from Government from the loss of revenue income from Manchester Airport;
- It was concerning that the deficit of approximately £19 million within the HRA would result in the level of reserves being exhausted over the course of the next three years;
- Why was there such a significant underspend in terms of the Children's budget for No Recourse for Public Funds (NPRF), how many children in the city were within families with no recourse to public funds, was it considered generally appropriate to treat this underspend as a saving given the doubt recently cast over the legality of the NPRF scheme, and had any equality impact assessments been undertaken in using this underspend as a potential saving;
- Concern was expressed that savings were being proposed around unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children and clarification was sought as to how these savings were being proposed; and
- Were any additional resources going to be provided to support the Section 21 Team when the suspension of evictions ended on 23 August 2020.

The Leader advised that the £4.837million was allocated for the tracing element of the project as the funding for the testing element was separate from this amount. He added that this money was adequate in so much as it covered cost until the end of the year, but further funding would be required to continue beyond the end of the year. In terms of the recent government announcement of pay rises to public sector workers, he advised that it would not include local government workers, but what was not clear was whether the pay rises would be fully funded by the Government, as in previous occasions it had not been and had been left to local authorities to make up the difference.

The Committee was advised that there was no assurance coming from Government that they would reimburse the total expenditure the Council had made in tackling the impact of COVID19 and that their position on funding to local authorities from the start of the outbreak had changed from supporting no matter what to sharing the burden of cost.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer reported that the Government had not to date provided any financial support to the Council for the loss of revenue income from Manchester Airport. The Leader added that the Council would continue to lobby the government on this issue as the real financial impact of this loss would not be felt until the 2021/22 financial year.

The Deputy City Treasurer commented that the forecasted £18.961million deficit on the HRA was not attributed to the impact of COVID19, and was in relation to planned investment in capital works in the HRA which would be funded through reserves. The COVID19 impact on the HRA was closer to approximately £2million.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer agreed to provide a response to the questions posed around No Recourse to Public Funds following the meeting. The Leader added that the Council, through the LGA, regularly lobbied government about the inadequacy of the amount received to support adults with NPRF.

The Deputy City Treasurer advised that the underspends around unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children would be achieved through additional grant funding from Government. This would now cover some of the additional costs in this area that the Council had been expecting to have to fund at the time the budget was set.

The Leader commented that he received a weekly report from the Council's Homelessness team which was reporting an increase in referrals from families and individuals, but the reason for this was not due to evictions. Government had announced national funding to tackle homelessness but it was not clear how the Council could access this at present.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report
- (2) Places on record its dissatisfaction with Government for its failure to recognise all key workers in its announcement of public sector pay rises, including local authority staff, who have been and continue to work tirelessly throughout the COVID19 pandemic
- (3) Requests that the Committee is provided with a briefing note on the questions asked around No Recourse to Public Funds.

## **RGSC/20/31 Overview Report**

The report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment.

**Decision**

The Committee notes the report.



## **Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 1 September 2020**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Ahmed Ali, Andrews, Clay, Davies, Lanchbury, Moore, B Priest, Rowles, A Simcock, Wheeler and Wright

**Also present:**

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods  
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools  
Councillor Leese, Leader

**Apologies:** Councillor Stanton

### **RGSC/20/32 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2020 as a correct record.

### **RGSC/20/33 Independent Race Review update**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of HR and OD, which provided an update on the Council's response to issues relating to race equality, and in particular to the review carried out last year of race relations and discrimination within the City Council. The report included an update on the work being carried out by a working group established to progress the recommendations, and of consultation with Trades Unions.

The key point and themes in the report included:-

- The review had found that, there were issues that needed to be addressed by the Council in order to ensure fairness and equity for Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic staff in the workforce;
- Whilst wanting to make swift progress on the issues identified, it was also identified that the Council lacked a strategic and coherent approach to workforce equalities generally.
- A commitment had been made to produce a Workforce Equalities Strategy for the Council for consideration at the meeting of the Executive in November 2020;
- An overview of the key drivers in taking the recommendations of the Race Review forward;

- The established working group consisted of over 40 employees from across the organisation who were dedicating 1 day per week over a 12 week period to ensure there was adequate resource to give focus to this work and to ensure real impact could be achieved in this initial 3 month period;
- The working group was balanced in terms of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic staff and those staff who had responsibility for creating the systems, policies and culture which enabled progress to be made.
- The 27 recommendations from the original race review have been grouped into 5 broad themes –
  - Monitoring
  - Developing Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic staff
  - Engagement and communications
  - HR policies
  - Leadership
- The parallel role Trade Unions would play in supporting the work of the Working Group; and.
- An overview of key progress to date

Officers from the working group also attended the meeting to update the Committee on the areas of work which they were leading on.

What followed was a lengthy discussion by the Committee on the content of the report and the updates provided by Officers from the Working Group.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- How had the membership of the working group been determined; was the ethnicity breakdown of the whole group known or being monitored and if not why not; and where Elected Members part of the group and again, if not why not;
- What steps were taken to ensure staff of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic backgrounds had the opportunities to be part of the working group;
- Disappointment was expressed that Cllr Ahmed Ali had not been invited to meetings of the working group, given he was the lead Member for Race Equality within the Labour Group;
- Questions were asked as to whether any Black councillors had been invited to take part;
- Had Trade Union representatives been invited to take part in the working group;
- It was important that the working group included “critical voices” from all levels of the organisation, not just senior officers;
- It was questioned as to how ‘Agile’ was selected as the methodology to progress the work of the working group;
- Clarity was sought as to what would happen once the working group concluded;
- It was requested that all equality leads were provided with quarterly intelligence in order to make appropriate observations;
- Would race awareness training also be offered to Elected Members as well as Officers;
- It was suggested that intersectionality needed to be embedded in all Council policies and procedures;

- Why had a range of equality groups have been re-established
- Were figures kept on the number of staff referred for compulsory equality training;
- Clarity was sought on the governance arrangements of the working group for delivering in the recommendations of the review
- It was hoped that Officers on the working group felt that Elected Members were taking the issue of tackling race inequalities within the Council seriously;
- It was hoped that staff were not made to feel that they were compelled to tell their manager about any protected characteristic they may align themselves to;
- Elected Members needed to ensure that their contribution to addressing race inequalities resulted in actual actions and material difference; and
- whilst acknowledging that the Race Review focussed on the Council and its staff, it was suggested that the next stage should also include a focus on how the council engaged and listened to Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic residents across the city to address inequalities and put in place non-discriminatory policies;

The Director of HR&OD explained that the makeup of the working group had not been formally monitored but the breakdown of ethnicity was approximately a 50/50 split between white and Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic officers. It was explained that that the membership of the group had come from various sources, including publicising in the staff broadcast, staff putting themselves forward and getting permission from their managers and in some cases people had been identified by SMT. It had been considered not appropriate to ask people to complete a monitoring form if they had been approved by their manager to be part of the working group, with no one being excluded because of their ethnicity.

It was explained that as it was an officer working group, no Elected Members had formally been appointed, however, the Executive Members for Neighbourhoods and Children and Schools had attended meetings of the group. The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods advised that Cllr Ahmed Ali would be invited to future meeting of the working group. He added that whilst the important role Elected Members needed to play in holding officers and Executive Members to account in addressing the issues identified by the review was acknowledged, it was reminded that as the issues were staff issues, it was appropriate that the action plan needed to be dictated and set by staff themselves. The City Solicitor added that as it was a staff working group and due to the intensive frequency of meetings, it was felt that the inclusion of Elected Members in the working group would alter how officers wanted the group to work.

The Director of HR&OD advised there was a standing invitation to Trade Union representative to join the working group, however they felt they wanted a parallel consultation process which had commenced by looking at the over representation of Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic staff subject to disciplinary proceedings, which was acknowledged as an issue this Committee had raised concerns about previously. An overview of the work being undertaken by Officers with the Casework team in addressing this issue was also given. In light of this, the Chair suggested that the Committee received a further update on the length of suspensions and misconduct process.

The Director of HR&OD advised that she had chosen the 'Agile' methodology based on previous experience. She commented that this type of methodology was good at producing outcomes and it was also felt that it would be a good developmental exercise for staff in the working group and really allowed the voice of others to come through as part of the work. She supported the point raised around intersectionality and advised that if the Committee felt race awareness training would be beneficial to Elected Members this could be arranged. The Leader commented that the equality groups had previously been disbanded at a time between 2010 and 2015 when the Council was facing unprecedented levels of cuts to its services and staff due to lack of funding from government which had also resulted in a link of these groups to an SMT lead.

The Director of HR&OD confirmed that she was the lead officer for the working group and detailed the reporting arrangements to SMT and the Lead Executive Members. All of the work would be captured in a report to Executive in November forming part of a wider workforce equalities strategy. It was also reported that the senior project manager in HR (Lorna Williams) had been recruited to take forward this work over the next 12 months to ensure it was sustained.

The Director of HR&OD acknowledged the point around how the council engaged and listened to Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic residents across the city but reminded Members that this work was around the equality of the workforce and having a workforce equality strategy and the interaction with residents was probably an area that the Equalities and Communities Scrutiny Committee would pick up.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Requests that all Elected Members be provided with the opportunity to undertake race equality training
- (2) Notes that the Chair will consult with Officers as to how Scrutiny can most successfully continue to support and scrutinise the work undertaken by the Working Group and progress in this area;
- (3) Requests a further report on the length of staff suspensions and the council's misconduct process is added to the Committee's Work Programme.
- (4) Thanks all the Officers for their contribution to this item.

## **RGSC/20/34 HROD Update**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of HR&OD, which provided an overview of the support to staff during the Council's response to the COVID19 pandemic and an update of the work to develop management standards as part of the Our Ways of Working programme.

The key points and themes in the report included:-

- An update on ICT support to enable staff to work from home;
- Communications and engagement with staff;
- Health and Wellbeing support

- The current position of numbers of staff working on site and the work going into prepare for more staff to return;
- An update on those staff classed as vulnerable or shielding;
- Future ways of working based on a maximum 30% of the workforce in the building at any one time; and
- The steps being taken to strengthen accountability

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

- Concern was expressed that the 62 staff who were classed as shielding and unable to work from home were being managed under the Council's management of attendance policy;
- Was the ambition to have all staff returning to work by October too ambitious given that most staff felt comfortable working from home;
- Why were staff who were not comfortable working from home, especially BAME and disabled staff, still awaiting receipt of appropriate equipment to enable them to work from home more comfortably;
- How many Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic staff were in the 373 within the 'vulnerable' or 'living with someone that is shielding' categories; and
- Were the any common/predominant issues being raised through the Employee Assistance Programme.

The Deputy Director of HR&OD advised that the 62 staff referred to in the report were not able to work from home due to the nature of their jobs. It was clarified that at present anyone who had been classed as shielding and unable to work from home were not being managed by attendance and all were going through individual risk assessments to look at their specific circumstances, which would include a referral to Occupational Health. The ambition to return all staff to work would be on a much reduced basis (approx. 30%) and would equate to staff having access to work on site approximately one or two days a week. The Committee was also advised that all staff working from home had been provided with the necessary technology to enable them to work (laptop, mobile phone etc), and the provision of equipment for those who had specific medical, such as chairs, was being facilitated.

The Deputy Director of HR&OD agreed to provide a breakdown of the 373 staff that fell within the 'vulnerable' or 'living with someone that is shielding' categories and advised that the Council was informed of themes by the EAP providers but not specific details. This alongside feedback from managers and support groups helped identify predominant areas of concern felt by staff which HR were then able to look at and put plans in place to address.

## Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report.
- (2) Places on record its thanks to all staff within HR during the pandemic.
- (3) Request that the Deputy Director of HR&OD circulates the information on the ethnicity breakdown of the 373 staff that fell within the 'vulnerable' or 'living with someone that is shielding' categories to all Committee Members.

### **RGSC/20/35 Our Manchester Strategy re-set**

#### **Decision**

The Committee agrees to defer this item to its next meeting on 6 October 2020

### **RGSC/20/36 Overview Report**

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

#### **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report;
- (2) Agrees the Work Programme as submitted

## Health Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2020

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

Councillor Farrell – in the Chair  
Councillors Clay, Curley, Holt, Newman, O'Neil, Riasat and Wills

**Apologies:** Councillor Mary Monaghan

**Also present:**

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing  
Nick Gomm, Director of Corporate Affairs, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
Claire Yarwood, Chief Finance Officer MHCC  
Dr Mainisha Kumar, Medical Director MHCC

**HSC/20/20                      Minutes**

**Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 3 March 2020 as a correct record.

**HSC/20/21                      COVID-19 update**

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided a brief summary of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of this committee.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- Detailing the Public Health response, both at a Manchester and Greater Manchester level;
- Describing the financial implications and funding arrangements for the City Council and the implications of this;
- Recovery planning, including a reset of the Our Manchester Strategy and workforce considerations; and
- An update on Adult Social Care.

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

- Welcoming the regular updates Members had received outside of the formal scrutiny meeting structure;

- Noting the significant impact COVID-19 had on the Council's budget, in addition to a decade of austerity;
- Staff should be supported and encouraged to continue working from home as this would support social distancing and reduce exposure to COVID-19;
- The reduction in funding for Adult Social Care was significantly higher in those areas with high levels of deprivation;
- The financial support for Local Authorities recently announced by Government was not weighted to support those areas with high levels of deprivation;
- Lobbying of Government needed to continue to ensure appropriate funding was awarded to Local Authorities; and
- Concern that the budget savings identified included an option not to recruit vacant reablement posts.

Further to the information provided in the published report, the Director of Public Health informed Members that the updated mortality figures (up to 12 June 2020) for Manchester were 383, with 76 of these within a Care Home setting.

The Executive Director of Adult Social Services addressed the Committee and acknowledged the comment regarding staff safety by stating the Council remained committed to safe working practices. She further commented that with regard to budget savings, the report described proposals only and work was still ongoing to understand the budgetary implications.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing stated that announcements regarding future funding were still awaited from Government, however initial indications were that they would not compensate for loss of income incurred by Local Authorities during this period. She described that the Council continued to plan and work towards delivering a balanced budget.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

### **HSC/20/22            COVID-19 Care Homes Update**

The Committee considered a report of the Director and Deputy Director Adult Social Services that provided information and data on the measures introduced to support and maintain care home provision in Manchester during the COVID-19 outbreak.

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

- Describing the landscape of Care Homes across Manchester;
- The strategy adopted in response to the pandemic to support this sector to ensure that Manchester residents were supported;
- Describing the work undertaken with partners to deliver this, building on established strong relationships to deliver a co-ordinated system wide response, both at a local level and across Greater Manchester;
- Information on the work of the Community Infection Control Team;



- Describing a range of initiatives enacted to support this sector, including the operation of the Mutual Aid Hub to oversee personal protective equipment (PPE) provision and the adaptation of Moston Grange Care Home;
- Information on testing arrangements for Care Homes;
- Detail on the financial measures to support providers;
- Data on the outbreaks, infections and deaths (involving COVID-19 in care homes; and
- Next steps and planning ahead.

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

- What was the approach taken to those Care Homes who had not applied for testing;
- Noting the benefits realised of the integration of Health and Social Care to respond quickly and effectively to the pandemic, with particular reference to the ability to test patients prior to discharge from hospital into a care setting;
- Analysis was required to understand excess deaths in the region;
- Was the Care Home sector financially resilient enough to withstand the pandemic and what support was being offered;
- What impact had improved air quality experienced during the pandemic period had on mortality figures;
- What financial support was offered to those residents in Care Homes who were self-funding; and
- What was the rationale for the block booking of beds in Care Homes.

The Director of Public Health said that the introduction and control of testing at a local level would provide greater management and oversight of this activity across a range of settings and he advised that follow up work was ongoing with those settings that had not applied for testing. The Executive Director of Adult Social Services added that a pilot scheme was being delivered across Greater Manchester that would deliver testing in supported accommodation settings.

In regard to the comments surrounding analysis and understating of the mortality rates, the Director of Public Health informed the Members that a recent report published by the Office of National Statistics had presented a number of explanations, however work would be undertaken at a local level to understand the Manchester context. He described that issues such as air quality would inform this analysis and information on the outcomes of this would be reported to the Committee at an appropriate time.

The Executive Director of Adult Social Services stated that a report on the support offered to Care Home providers could be provided for consideration by the Committee at a future meeting. In regard to self-funding residents she reported that individuals could request an assessment for financial support.

The Deputy Director of Adult Social Services stated that conversations were being undertaken with Care Homes to understand the landscape and the challenges they were experiencing, commenting that vacancy rates could significantly impact upon them. He said that this regular dialogue with the sector enabled appropriate support options to be considered. He advised that this activity was continually being

monitored and reviewed. With regard to block booking beds he stated that this had been done to protect capacity so that vulnerable people were supported.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing supported the comment from the Chair regarding the benefits realised by the integration of Health and Social Care to plan and respond quickly and effectively to the pandemic. She added that the Neighbourhood Teams had proven to be very important in supporting residents throughout this period and that the Valuing Older People Board were involved with the discussions regarding the wider health and wellbeing of our older residents.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **HSC/20/23                      COVID-19 Manchester Test and Trace**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Public Health that provided detailed information on the national, Greater Manchester and Manchester approach to Test and Trace and the development of the Manchester COVID-19 Management Plan, referred to in the overarching COVID-19 Update Report. The Manchester Test and Trace Team went “live” on Monday 8 June 2020 and the Director of Public Health was the Senior Responsible Officer for the development of the COVID-19 Management Plan.

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

- Providing a summary of the national NHS Test and Trace service launched by the UK Government on 28th May 2020;
- Describing the approach to test and trace in Greater Manchester and Manchester Test, Trace, Contain and Enable (TTCE), noting that the GM TTCE approach would involve the creation of 10 bespoke Local Outbreak Control Plans;
- The Manchester Public Health Team were currently collating the production of the Manchester Local Outbreak Control Plan (COVID-19 Management Plan) across a range of settings;
- Locality roles and responsibilities and GM Roles and Responsibilities and identified priorities; and
- Noting that the Director of Public Health at the City Council would lead the development of the Manchester COVID-19 Management Plan with local partners.

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

- Recent reports in the media suggested that meat and food processing plants were susceptible to outbreaks of COVID-19 and what was being done to monitor these locally;
- Following the announcement that lockdown rules were to be relaxed what were the concerns regarding further outbreaks and how would this be managed;
- What reassurance could be offered to residents concerned about leaving their contact details with premises; and

- What guidance and support was being offered to the many different businesses across the city.

The Consultant in Public Health addressed the comments regarding meat and food processing plants by reporting that colleagues from Environmental Health were supporting this activity and all such sites had been identified and a Greater Manchester plan was developed to manage and support such sites. In regard to any concerns residents may have when requested to leaving personal contact details with premises, such as pubs or restaurants it was important to emphasise that this information would only ever be used to contact them to alert them in the event of another patron who then subsequently reported symptoms. She stated that it was then vital if contacted to follow the advice and guidance given to prevent a further outbreak.

The Director of Public Health stated that whilst he acknowledged the messages and instructions from Government were changing it was important that the advice and messages given to the public were clear to minimise the risk of further infections. He said that this information would continue to be reviewed following any Government announcements.

The Director of Public Health reiterated the statement regarding personal information only ever being used for tracing purposes and that if contact was required, a telephone call would be made rather than relying on the use of an app. With regard to guidance and advice to business he stated that colleagues within Environmental Health would assist with this as they had established relationships with businesses across the city.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **HSC/20/24            COVID-19 NHS Overview**

The Committee considered a report of Manchester Health and Care Commissioning that provided an overview of how the NHS has responded to, and is recovering from, the impact of Covid19.

Dr Kumar referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- Providing a description of both national and regional requirements;
- An update on Local Arrangements noting that in Manchester, and across Greater Manchester, Community Cells had been established. These worked with Hospital Cells and linked in with the wider response and recovery work being led by local authorities;
- Current financial arrangements;
- An update on Health service provision during the pandemic;
- Monitoring the impact of COVID-19; and
- Understanding the impact of COVID-19 on Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) communities.

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

- Acknowledging that COVID-19 impacted BAME communities and commenting that recognition needed to be given to the impact on specific religious communities due to their ethnic heritage;
- Consideration needed to be given to density within households and the rates of COVID-19;
- Supporting the 'Welcome Back Manchester' campaign and who was this being used to encourage people to access health services;
- What measures were in place to follow up patients who missed a routine hospital appointment, especially vulnerable residents.

Dr Kumar responded to the discussion by informing the Committee that COVID-19 was a new disease and the understanding of this was evolving. She described that it was now understood to be a vascular rather than a respiratory condition. She stated that work continued to develop an understanding of this disease, especially in relation to its impact and prevalence across BAME and particular religious communities and citizens, and this understanding would then inform the response and guidance. She stated that this work was continuing at pace, with the involvement of all partners and acknowledged the importance of this understanding in the context of an imminent relaxation of the lockdown rules and the potential for a second wave of infections

Dr Kumar stated that currently the NHS was operating at a Level 4 COVID -19 warning (a COVID-19 epidemic was in general circulation; transmission was high or rising exponentially), with Primary Care operating on a telephone consultations and triage model. She stated that those patients who were due regular health checks were being contacted and 'Safe and Well' checks were also being undertaken with vulnerable patients by telephone. She further informed the Committee that if a patient was to miss an appointment with a hospital, the GP Practice would be notified and follow up calls would be made, and if necessary the patient would be triaged again and re-prioritised as appropriate. She further gave an assurance that if a patient failed to attend a hospital appointment they would not be removed from the waiting list and every attempt would be made to contact the patient.

The Director of Corporate Affairs, MHCC informed the Members that Health and Social Care messages would be included in the 'Welcome Back Manchester' campaign and this would be informed by both national and local guidance and priorities.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing acknowledged comments from Members regarding the wider detriments on health outcomes and the links between deprivation and health. She stated that the Committee had considered the 'The Marmot Review – 10 Years On' at their meeting of 3 March 2020 and the activities described during that discussion would continue.

In concluding the themed meeting the Chair, on behalf of the Committee expressed his gratitude and appreciation to all staff, across all organisations for their dedication and professionalism in responding quickly and effectively to the pandemic.

**Decision**

To note the report.

**HSC/20/25            Overview Report**

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment.

**Decision**

To note the report.



## Health Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2020

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

Councillor Farrell – in the Chair  
Councillors N. Ali, Clay, Curley, Holt, Newman, Riasat and Wills

**Apologies:** Councillor Mary Monaghan

**Also present:**

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing  
Nick Gomm, Director of Corporate Affairs, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
Peter Blythin, Group Executive Director of Workforce and Corporate Business, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Ed Dyson, Executive Director of Strategy, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
Stephen Gardner, Programme Director, Single Hospital Service, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Michelle Humphreys, Director of Strategic Projects, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Sharmila Kar, Director of Workforce & Organisation Development, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning

**HSC/20/26                      Minutes**

**Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2020 as a correct record.

**HSC/20/27                      COVID-19 update**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Adult Social Care and the Director of Public Health that provided a brief summary of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of this committee.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- An update on the current Public Health response;
- Information relating to the current Adult Social Care response; and
- Planning ahead for the recovery.

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

- Noting the high number of patient discharges from Wythenshawe hospital;
- How would an outbreak of COVID-19 be managed in a care home;
- Following the relaxing of lockdown rules and the increase in the number of people travelling into the city centre from neighbouring authorities for work, was there any concern if this would impact on the number of COVID-19 cases; and
- Requesting a briefing note on the reported safe and well calls, delivered by in house provider services to support citizens.

The Director of Public Health provided the Committee with an update on the figures provided within the report by stating that currently there were 3041 confirmed cases of COVID-19 in Manchester, which represented 553 per 100,000 of the population, and the number of recorded deaths was 413, with no further deaths recorded in care home settings. He added that data on the number of deaths were reported based on Office for National Statistics figures.

The Director of Public Health stated that as the lockdown was eased there was a need to shift the focus of local COVID-19 monitoring systems towards the early identification of any emerging 'second wave' of coronavirus in Manchester. He stated that all data sets available would be closely monitored and reviewed to manage such an event occurring. He referred to the local powers to manage such events and teams were working with local businesses to support them comply with the national COVID-19 guidance and advice. He stated that whilst the compliance teams would take action if necessary against a business to protect the public, however the approach currently was one of engagement and encouragement.

With reference to managing an outbreak of COVID-19 in a care home setting, the Director of Public Health stated that any such occurrence would be managed appropriately and sensitively. He stated that the current situation was significantly more stable than it had been and systems were established to ensure appropriate notifications were received and outbreak control meetings were regularly held to monitor and review the situation.

The Director of Adult Social Care addressed the comments made regarding patient discharge by saying that this was only ever done if the patient was medically fit to do so and managed using an appropriate care pathway. She further agreed to circulate a briefing note to all Members on safe and well calls as requested.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **HSC/20/28                      Local Prevention and Response (Outbreak) Plan**

The Committee considered a report and presentation of the Director of Public Health that detailed the Manchester COVID-19 Local Prevention and Response Plan that had been published on the Council's website and had been endorsed by the Health and Wellbeing Board.



Members were advised that the plan was structured in line with national guidance and all other nine Local Authority areas in Greater Manchester had developed their own plans and had also contributed to the establishment of the Greater Manchester Integrated Contact Tracing Hub.

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

- Requesting the latest data on the R number for the North West;
- Was there any improvement in the quality of data provided to identify and manage any emerging trends were they to occur;
- Noting the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on BAME citizens and areas of socio-economic deprivation;
- Noting the prevalence of BAME citizens in certain occupations, with specific reference to taxi drivers and the risk of infection this presented to them;
- An assurance should be sought that any supplier the Council held contracts with were supplying appropriate Personal Protective Equipment (PPE) equipment for their staff and ensuring their working environments were COVID safe and compliant;
- Whilst recognising the initial requirement to accommodate individuals experiencing street homelessness to protect them during the pandemic, it was important to acknowledge and support the hidden homeless;
- Consideration needed to be given to including the specific needs of the older LGBT community within the plan;
- Noting that for certain residents with health conditions it was difficult to adhere to COVID-19 guidance, such as observing social distancing rules;
- What support was available to children who were asylum seekers; and
- Despite the relaxation of lockdown measures it was important to emphasise that COVID-19 had not gone away and still presented a significant public health risk, especially as many people infected were asymptomatic.

The Director of Public Health responded to Members by stating that he was confident that local arrangements to trace individuals who may be at risk of infection following a positive test were suitable, however stressed that to do this effectively appropriate resources and capacity needed to be allocated to this function.

The Director of Public Health acknowledged the comments regarding BAME citizens and occupations and stated that whilst not currently mandatory, good practice was for all taxi passengers to wear a face mask. He stated that all taxi operators should be risk assessing their drivers and providing the appropriate PPE, and support was available for this. He further advised that the Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety was working with partners across Greater Manchester and the North West to ensure a consistent approach was taken by the taxi trade.

With reference to the older LGBT community, the Director of Public Health stated whilst this was not explicit within the plan, he reassured Members that a significant amount of work had been undertaken around that issue. He further reassured the Committee that work was also underway to support all people experiencing, or at threat of homelessness. He further stated that COVID-19 advice and guidance was available to all contract service providers.

The Director of Public Health acknowledged that for some individuals understanding and complying with COVID-19 guidance would be difficult, however the intention would never be to prosecute in those circumstances. He further described that care homes would seek to manage this in a compassionate and appropriate manner.

The Director of Public Health reiterated the importance of continuing to comply with all of the Public Health advice and guidance regarding COVID-19 to prevent a second wave, particularly as we move out of summer and into the winter period and flu season.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing informed the Committee that unaccompanied asylum seeking children would be considered as 'Looked after Children' arrangements. She described that discussions were ongoing with the providers of the emergency asylum accommodation to prevent evictions if an individual were to receive a favourable Home Office decision as to their status.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **HSC/20/29                      Addressing Inequalities**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Workforce and Organisation Development, MHCC and the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform Manchester City Council that described that clear evidence had emerged that COVID- 19 was having a disproportionate impact on some communities who already experienced health inequalities in our city. BAME (Black, Asian and minority ethnic), disabled and people in poverty were more likely to contract Coronavirus and had poorer mortality outcomes. The longer term health impacts were not known yet but it was expected that the socio-economic impacts and impacts of higher mortality rates not directly linked to COVID- 19 would also be within these communities, unless there were radical changes to the approach to health and social care.

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

- How the pandemic had affected different communities in the city and the actions that were to be taken to respond to this;
- Describing the strategy for planning ahead and describing the workstreams that had been identified to progress the city's recovery;
- Each workstream involved a significant portfolio of work, and each was in the process of identifying short, medium and longer term priority actions;
- Describing the requirement to continue to meet the statutory duty under the Equality Act 2010 to consider equality implications when reviewing policies and practices and introducing new ones through an equality impact assessment;
- Equality Impact Assessments would be used against each of the Council's relevant practical recovery actions;
- Describing that actions identified across Health and Care to address inequalities and provided a summary of the 'Community Cell' that had been established to

lead the out of hospital/care system within the City during the period of COVID-19 response and recovery;

- The Manchester COVID-19 Response Group (“the CRG”) (previously called the Manchester COVID-19 Locality Planning Group (MCLPG)) fulfilled the role of the Manchester Health Protection Group, which was the established group for all health protection issues in Manchester;
- Addressing inequalities/Health Equity was a key workstream under this group, with the purpose of that workstream was to improve experiences of, and outcomes for, communities that suffered disproportionate adverse impacts from COVID-19;
- The report described the governance and reporting arrangements.; and
- Workforce specific measures, noting staff risk assessments were being undertaken across MHCC, MCC, MLCO and other partner organisations to address the need to ensure that ‘at risk’ staff, including BAME staff were protected.

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

- Consideration needed to be given to the messages and imagery used when discussing older residents to ensure this was done in a dignified manner;
- Noting the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on BAME citizens and areas of socio-economic deprivation;
- Consideration needed to be given to ensure all sources of advice and information was accessible to all citizens;
- Welcoming the reported governance arrangements; and
- What were the barriers and challenges to progressing this important area of work.

The Equalities Lead noted the comment regarding the representation of older people and stated that the Age Friendly Board had met with the Chief Executive and Leader to ensure any communications were positive and age friendly and this had been accepted. He further stated that all of the national COVID-19 data and analysis undertaken of factors such as incidents of deaths within BAME communities, gender, socio-economic indicators and lifestyle factors would be reviewed and used to inform the local understanding and response.

The Equalities Lead further stated that emergency Hub had been established very quickly as the pandemic emerged, however acknowledged the comment regarding inclusive accessibility. He reassured the Committee that a review of this had been undertaken and the lessons learnt would inform any response in the event of second wave.

The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing stated that this area of work was not just a health matter but rather a wider issue that incorporated a range of factors and considerations, such as housing, planning and employment opportunities. All of which influenced and determined the health outcomes of residents, and as such needed to be considered in all strategies, plans and decisions. Further noting the detrimental impact that any economic down turn would have on the city and its residents.

The Director of Workforce & Organisation Development, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning stated that this was a very substantial and complex issue with many contributing factors, with consideration also needing to be given to the issue of racism when planning and considering next steps. She described that the work described was not a 'box ticking' exercise, but rather an opportunity to inform and direct the design and delivery of services. She stated that it was important that this agenda was kept at the forefront of all partners and organisations and was maintained as a key priority. She stated the Health and Wellbeing Board had recently considered the report and had agreed to review progress as a regular item.

The Chair stated that the Committee similarly recognised the importance of this work and would continue to review progress against this activity. He advised that update reports would be scheduled on the Work Programme for consideration at an appropriate time.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **HSC/20/30 North Manchester General Hospital Update**

The Committee considered a report and presentation of the Executive Director of Workforce and Corporate Business, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust and the Executive Director of Strategy, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning that provided an update on progress in relation to delivering the future strategy for North Manchester General Hospital (NMGH), including the planned acquisition of NMGH by Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust (MFT) as part of a Single Hospital Service (SHS) in Manchester; the delivery of the wider site strategy; and the Health Infrastructure Plan capital redevelopment of the site.

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

- Providing a background and information on the development of the SHS;
- An update on the interim arrangements for incorporating NMGH into the SHS, including management arrangements; and
- Describing the ambitions and delivery of the wider site strategy that set out how the capital redevelopment of the NMGH site could provide improved health and care facilities, act as a catalyst for local regeneration and support improved health outcomes for local people.

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

- Welcoming the plans and ambitions for the site and the benefits this would deliver to the wider area and community;
- Noting the significant progress to date;
- Recognising the evident commitment to the site and the improvements in the management arrangements at NMGH; and

- Welcoming the recognition that NMGH is an important site to deliver specialist services, both for the city and the North West.

The Group Executive Director of Workforce and Corporate Business, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust stated that careful consideration continued to be given to the project spend and discussions continued with the Treasury. He said that he was confident that the Treasury remained committed to the project and the case for change was strengthened by the existing relationships across a range of partners in Manchester to deliver a broader scheme and deliver wider improvements and economic benefits to the area. He further stated that staff continued to be informed and consulted with as the plans progressed,

The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing stated that she wished to place on public record her thanks and appreciation to all involved in this project. She recognised the progress made to date, despite the challenges presented by COVID-19. This sentiment was supported by the Chair on behalf of the Committee.

The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing stated that north Manchester Councillors would be consulted with regarding the Strategic Regeneration Framework and when this was to be considered again by the Committee, Members may wish to consider inviting the Chair of the Economy Scrutiny Committee to attend and contribute to the discussion.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **HSC/20/31                      Overview Report**

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment.

The Chair noted that the Members would be meeting in private following this meeting to discuss the work programme.

### **Decision**

To note the report.



## Health Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 1 September 2020

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

Councillor Farrell – in the Chair  
Councillors Clay, Curley, Holt, Newman, Riasat and Wills

**Apologies:** Councillors N.Ali and Mary Monaghan

**Also present:**

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing  
Lindsey Bowes, Senior Primary Care Manager (Dental) Greater Manchester Health & Social Care Partnership  
Emma Hall-Scullin, Consultant in Dental Public Health  
Don McGrath, General Dental Practitioner in Manchester, and Chair of the Local Dental Committee  
Jon Slattery, General Dental Practitioner in Manchester  
Adam Young, Associate Director of Operations GMMH  
Mark Edwards, Chief Operating Officer MLCO  
Dr Manisha Kumar, Executive Clinical Director MHCC  
Dr Veronica Devlin, Chief Transformation Officer MFT

**HSC/20/32                      Minutes**

**Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2020 as a correct record.

**HSC/20/33                      Manchester's 10 Point COVID-19 Action Plan**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Public Health that presented the 10 Point Action Plan that built on the Prevention and Response Plan that had been considered by the Committee at their meeting of 21 July 2020 (See HSC/20/28). The report set out the key actions that had been progressed over the month of August, noting that many of the actions in the 10 Point Plan would continue throughout September and the plan would be updated regularly.

The Consultant in Public Health delivered a presentation that included the latest available comparative data and intelligence.

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

- What work was being done to address the concerns of residents living in areas that also housed large numbers of students who would be returning to the city;
- Noting that guidance issued by Government to schools had been issued late;
- Thanking all of the staff working in Public Health on behalf of the residents of the city;
- Was it anticipated that the reported increase in positive COVID-19 cases would translate to an increase in hospital admissions;
- Noting that the messages issued regarding local lockdown changes issued by Government was confusing for residents;
- Appropriate funding should be allocated by central government to support and increase local testing and tracing services;
- Was it appropriate to establish a test centre at the Abraham Moss site noting it's close proximity to both the school and the leisure centre;
- Questioning the validity of the statement that residents would be no more than twenty minutes walking distance from a testing site;
- How many of the national track and trace cases were referred to the local service, and how many of those resulted in contact being made with individuals;
- What guidance was provided to chilled or frozen food businesses;
- What advice had been provided to schools regarding staggering start and finish times;
- Noting the recent press reports regarding the transmission of COVID-19 cases connected to a flight destined for Wales, what work was being undertaken with the aviation industry to mitigate the risk of further infection; and
- What work was being done with care homes to ensure contact with family members was maintained with residents in such settings.

The Consultant in Public Health advised the Committee that work was underway with the local Universities and the Student Partnership to prepare for the imminent return of students. She further acknowledged that this was a concern for some residents with students moving into communities from other areas of the country. She advised that communications regarding the work undertaken with the student population would be shared with residents and this would also be provided to local Members.

In regard to the number of positive cases identified in Manchester, the Consultant in Public Health stated that the increase in cases could be linked to the relaxation of lockdown restrictions and this trend was reflected nationally. She stated that the increase of positive cases were related to community and household transmissions, rather than transmissions in settings such as care homes as had previously been witnessed. She said that the effect of COVID-19 on younger people did not appear to be as severe and hence these cases did not translate into hospital admissions, however the risk remained that this could then be spread to older / more vulnerable people that could then result in an increase in hospital admissions. She stated that this landscape continued to be closely monitored, both locally, nationally and internationally, especially as the winter and flu season approached.

With reference to the testing centre located at the Abraham Moss site, the Consultant in Public Health informed the Committee that the decisions as to where to locate these sites was undertaken in consultation with Public Health Teams, the Department for Health and Social Care and the Council and all facilities had been



appropriately risk assessed. In response to the specific question regarding the number of cases referred to the local tracing service from the national service, she stated that approximately 50% of cases were referred from the national service, and of these, 99.5% had resulted in a successful contact. She further stated that whilst the local service were able to utilise their local knowledge and contacts, the ability to undertake additional test and tracing would require adequate resourcing.

In regard to national guidance, the Consultant in Public Health stated that this was updated regularly on the Public Health England website and advised that she would enquire as to any specific guidance for frozen food businesses. With reference to staggered start and finishing times for schools she advised that all schools would plan to mitigate the risk of infection and had been supported to devise plans that were most appropriate to their setting.

The Consultant in Public Health advised that Public Health England were working nationally with the aviation industry to ensure the correct advice and information was provided to both staff and passengers, and that appropriate contact details were obtained to assist with track and tracing in the event of an outbreak.

The Deputy Director, Adult Social Services addressed the issue of care homes by stating that whilst the importance of maintaining family contact was acknowledged the challenges that COVID-19 had on the ability of sites in maintaining this was recognised. He described that regular contact was made with individual settings and providers to ensure they were adequately supported at this time. He advised that care homes had facilitated visits in a number of imaginative ways, such as using video calls, supporting visits at a safe distance where appropriate and facilitating socially distant visits in parks. He advised that good practice would continue to be shared between sites to help support this activity. In regard to the specific issue raised by a Member he advised that this would be looked into following the meeting, adding that staff absence could impact on a settings ability to safely manage and facilitate a visit.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing advised the Committee that she was pleased to advise that there had been no significant issues reported over the bank holiday weekend. She paid tribute to the residents of the city for adhering to the lockdown restrictions and thanked all of the staff working in the Public Health team for effectively communicating key messages.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing advised that the 10 Point COVID-19 Action Plan helped Manchester manage and respond locally, noting the importance of local decision making. She further stated that the Government needed to commit to fully resourcing all local Council's in recognition of the financial demands and pressures COVID-19 had placed on already pressured budgets.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

[Cllr Wills declared a personal and non prejudicial interest as he is employed by the Manchester Metropolitan University.]

## **HSC/20/34                      Recovery of NHS Services**

The Committee considered a report of Manchester Health and Care Commissioning, Manchester Foundation Trust, Manchester Local Care Organisation, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHSFT and Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Partnership that provided an update on the reinstatement of NHS services following changes in service provision as a result of the impact of Covid-19.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- Acute Services (including Cancer);
- Community health services;
- Mental Health services;
- Dental services; and
- Primary Care (GP practices).

In attendance at the meeting were representatives from each respective service.

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

- Expressing the Committee's gratitude and appreciation to all staff working in the NHS;
- Noting that recovery of services was within the context of a continued response to COVID-19;
- Would there be an increased pressure placed on Primary Care to manage a medical condition, or if a patient's condition begins to deteriorate when surgery was delayed due to COVID-19;
- Noting the challenge and limitations of telephone / video consultations, especially when assessing patients with mental health issues;
- Noting that in Manchester cancer treatment had continued to be delivered, however nationally this had not been the case;
- What did 'partially stopped' service mean;
- Noting that the imminent winter pressures would place additional pressures on services;
- Noting the impact that COVID-19 would have on people's mental health and the increased demand for mental health services, adequate funding should be allocated by central government to deliver such services;
- Recognising the important role of the voluntary, community and social enterprise sector (VCSE) in supporting people with mental health issues;
- When would the 'No 93' Health and Wellbeing Centre in North Manchester be reopening;
- Where were the 92 Urgent Dental Care sites to meet the needs of any patients of practices currently restricted in their delivery located.
- Would the ability to treat a reduced number of patients in NHS dental practices and the NHS contract arrangements result in practices only treating private patients; and
- A person centred approach was required when delivering care and services.

Dr Veronica Devlin, Chief Transformation Officer MFT advised the Committee that patients who's surgery had been deferred due to COVID-19 would continue to be provided with advice and information as to how to manage any condition with advice on what to do if the condition deteriorated. She advised that patient waiting lists were regularly reviewed to prioritise patients based on clinical need.

Dr Devlin further stated that whilst the delivery of cancer treatment services had continued in Manchester throughout COVID-19, the anticipated challenge related to the testing for cancer and the impact this would have on the service as patients had not been attending for testing due to fears surrounding COVID-19. She advised that to address this consideration and planning had been given to increasing access to testing and delivering safe diagnosis pathways.

Mark Edwards, Chief Operating Officer MLCO reported that services would continue to be re-established and to support this process and to ensure that services could restart safely MLCO had established a Recovery and Programme Board that oversaw the processes. He acknowledged that the ability of the MLCO to deliver services and patient care impacted on the demand on secondary care services, so it was important that services resumed as quickly and as safely as possible. He further advised that where services had been partially withdrawn, those had been clinical decisions taken in consultation with patients with appropriate advice provided.

Adam Young, Associate Director of Operations GMMH informed the Committee that the Trust continued to monitor and map requests for services, and currently this was in line with planning, however this continued to be reviewed daily. In terms of resources to deliver mental health services he advised that Greater Manchester would be submitting a funding bid. With reference to the 'No 93' Health and Wellbeing Centre in North Manchester he stated that work continued to reopen this site as soon as was safely possible and added that staff had continued to work with patients and maintain contact whilst the site had been closed.

Emma Hall-Scullin, Consultant in Dental Public Health informed the Committee that the details of the 92 Urgent Dental Care sites would be circulated to Members following the meeting.

Jon Slattery, General Dental Practitioner in Manchester responded to the question regarding a practices ability to treat a reduced number of NHS patients and the NHS contract arrangements result in practices only treating private patients by stating that he did not recognise this as a concern. The Chair commented that the topic of NHS Dentistry provision across the city would be revisited by the Committee at an appropriate time.

With regard to the video and telephone consultations, all of the professionals present all reported that these had been received positively by both patients and practitioners, whilst recognising that for certain assessments 'face to face' meetings were preferable.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

**HSC/20/35                      Overview Report**

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

**Decision**

To note the report.

## Health Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 6 October 2020

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

Councillor Farrell – in the Chair  
Councillors N. Ali, Clay, Curley, Holt, Mary Monaghan Newman and Wills

**Apologies:** Councillor Riasat

**Also present:**

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing  
Nick Gomm, Director of Corporate Affairs, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC)  
Dr Manisha Kumar, Executive Clinical Director MHCC  
Heather Bury, Deputy Head of Medicines Optimisation, MHCC  
Jenny Osborne, Strategic Lead, Population Health Programmes, MHCC

**HSC/20/36                      Minutes**

**Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 1 September 2020 as a correct record.

**HSC/20/37                      COVID-19**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Public Health that described that at their September meeting the Committee received the Manchester COVID-19 10 Point Plan setting out the key actions that were to be progressed over September. The Plan was to be updated regularly and the latest version that would cover the Autumn/Winter period was attached and given the very distinct work required for schools, universities and care homes it was now a 12 Point Plan.

The Director of Public Health and the Director, Adult Social Services delivered a presentation entitled 'Manchester's COVID-19 12 Point Action Plan – Autumn 2020' that reported activity against the actions. The presentation further included the latest available relevant data and intelligence.

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

- Noting the report of increased transmissions within households and enquired if there was any understanding of specific occupations that impacted on these rates of infections;
- Noting national press reporting of people being directed to testing centres located a significant distance from their home address, had there been improvements in the provision of testing facilities locally;
- Noting that occupation data was often not recorded from the national testing data and this needed to be improved;
- A Member commented that the rise in infections amongst the student population, both locally and nationally should have been anticipated and stated that the decision to encourage students to attend University rather than deliver courses online was an economic decision rather than a health decision;
- Noting that the Christmas and New Year period would present a challenge if and when students return to their homes and then return to their place of study;
- Noting the significant contribution the Universities made to the city and that it is impractical to deliver certain courses online;
- Noting that it was important to recognise that Universities employed a wide variety of staff in many different roles and were not comprised solely of teaching staff and students;
- Manchester remained a welcoming and inclusive city and called upon the government to adequately resource the city so that all residents remained safe;
- Recognising the benefits of local knowledge, experience and established relationships across local health partners, the delivery of COVID-19 vaccine, when available should be administered and managed locally;
- Was the 10pm curfew across the hospitality sector effective in managing transmission rates of COVID-19;
- Noting the often confusing messages relating to national and local lockdown requirements, would the introduction of a three tier system simplify the message;
- What was the current position on aerosol transmission of the virus and what was the current advice on the use of face masks; and
- Were people expected to make appointments to attend Accident and Emergency Departments.

The Director of Public Health responded to the Members discussion and questions by stating that the virus had never left communities in Manchester and the rates and incidence of community infections continued to be closely monitored to understand and respond effectively to outbreaks. With regard to testing he stated that he was confident that residents had appropriate access to testing facilities.

In regard to national data on testing the Director of Public Health said that it was the case that some data fields, such as occupation were not completed, and representations had been made to seek to improve this recording. He stated that of those cases referred to the local tracing service, 90% of these were successfully contacted and these contacts allowed for data that had been omitted nationally to be recorded. He commented that this data allowed for the better monitoring and understanding of cases so that resources could be allocated appropriately. He stated that the preference would be to undertake more local test and tracing, however to deliver this successfully would require additional resources to be allocated by government.

The Director of Public Health commented that he was of the opinion that the introduction of a three tier lockdown system would simplify the message, adding that a decision on this was expected to be announced by the Secretary of State later that week.

With regard to the Universities, the Director of Public Health said that Public Health and the Universities had met with the Cabinet Task Force to plan for the return of the student population to the city. He further paid tribute to Public Health England for their invaluable additional support that they have provide locally to the Universities. He recognised the comments regarding the movement of students during the Christmas and New Year period and the planning and preparation for this was underway with Universities and health partners. He commented that the Universities remained committed to the health and wellbeing of all staff and students. He again reiterated his call for additional national resources to be allocated to support local test and trace services.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing stated that Universities were operating on a financial model that had been imposed upon them due to government funding changes. She stated that it was a failure of government to provide a national position and leadership to Universities and their delivery of education during the pandemic. She commented that in the absence of national guidance, Universities locally, with the support of all local health partners had responded well to the issues they had found themselves presented with.

In response to the issue of administering the delivery of a COVID-19 vaccine once this was available, the Director of Public Health agreed with the Committee that this would be best co-ordinated and delivered locally, again with appropriate recourses allocated by government.

The Director of Public Health then addressed the question regarding the introduction of the 10pm curfew across the hospitality sector and the effectiveness of managing incidents of transmissions. He commented that as autumn and winter approached people attending bars and restaurants would prefer to be inside and this could be accommodated as long as the premises were safe and managed in a COVID secure manner. He stated that the evidence regarding the impact of the 10pm curfew was still being evaluated and he would be liaising with colleges in Bolton to understand the impact of changes to their restrictions were having on rates of infection.

Dr Manisha Kumar commented that the proposals for Accident and Emergency Departments were to be finalised, however they were to ensure that admissions to hospitals were managed in a COVID safe manner. She added that issues of language and safeguarding would be taken into consideration and an update on these developments would be provided to the Committee at an appropriate time. She further stated that whilst the learning and understanding of COVID-19 continued, the evidence was that masks did help with the reduction of transmissions.

## **Decisions**

The Committee

1. Note the report and support the call on government to allocate adequate resources to deliver a local test and trace service to help tackle COVID-19; and
2. In recognition of the knowledge and expertise of local health partners, support the call for the local control and management of the delivery of a COVID-19 vaccine when available.

[Cllr Wills declared a personal and non prejudicial interest as he is employed by the Manchester Metropolitan University.]

### **HSC/20/38                      Seasonal Flu Immunisation Programme 2020/21**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Public Health and the Medical Director, Manchester Health & Care Commissioning that described Manchester's Flu Programme for 2020/21 and outlined some of the key areas and challenges.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- Providing the context and agreed system-wide approach as start of a three-year plan to drive up flu vaccination rates within the city;
- Describing the scope of the Manchester Flu Programme 2020/21; and
- Programme Approach.

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

- Welcoming the additional cohorts in scope for flu vaccination this year and were key workers included;
- Was the supply of the flu vaccine sufficient to meet the demand;
- Were there different strains of the vaccine that were appropriate for different cohorts;
- Would unaccompanied asylum seeking children be eligible to receive the flu vaccination;
- Noting the important roles of Councillors, especially those acting as school governors in promoting flu vaccination;
- Recognising the importance of reaching out to hard to reach communities to promote flu vaccination, including the use of social media to dispel myths and counter incorrect messaging regarding vaccination;
- Were GP practices proactively contacting their patients to offer the flu vaccine; and
- Could the service administer a COVID vaccine when one was available.

The Strategic Lead, Population Health Programmes, MHCC addressed the Committee and said that the take up of the flu vaccination had increased by 30% compared to the same period last year, noting that in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic this was very important, both in terms of the health of the general population and mitigating pressures on health services. She described that vaccination data was obtained weekly to assist in the delivery of the vaccination. She described that to continue to progress this programme a system wide approach had been adopted at a neighbourhood level, working with communities to ensure every



contact with residents counted. She stated that this approach was complimented and supported with a communications and engagement campaign.

In response to the specific question regarding unaccompanied asylum seeking children, the Strategic Lead, Population Health Programmes stated that they would offer the vaccination via the primary school aged children and Year 7 children in secondary school cohort or via their GP practice.

The Strategic Lead, Population Health Programmes informed the Committee that the list of cohorts had been prescribed nationally and not determined locally, however local arrangements had been agreed to support staff to receive the vaccination.

With regard to national stocks of flu vaccination, the Deputy Head of Medicines Optimisation, MHCC described that the process for ordering stocks of vaccinations has been completed prior to the pandemic. She said the supply of vaccinations was a national issue and representations were being made to ensure Manchester had the required numbers. She further advised that there were four different strains of flu vaccination available, specific to different cohorts.

With regard to communications and engagement, the Deputy Head of Strategic Communications acknowledged the comment regarding listening to the messages that were being circulated on social media and the need to counter misleading or dangerous advice appropriately.

Dr Manisha Kumar reassured the Committee that GP practices were actively contacting patients with the offer of flu vaccination, including the use of text messaging that had proven to be very successful. She stated that the take up of the vaccination is monitored and reviewed weekly to inform any targeted work. She described that practices were working flexibly to deliver vaccinations to their patients.

With regard to the administration of a COVID vaccine once available, the Strategic Lead, Population Health Programmes stated that the planning and modelling for this had commenced, however was still at an early stage.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **HSC/20/39                      Overview Report**

A report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

## **Decision**

To note the report and agree the work programme.



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

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2020**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Stone – in the Chair  
Councillors Sameem Ali, Alijah, Cooley, Hewitson, T Judge, Kilpatrick, Lovecy, Madeleine Monaghan, Reeves, Reid and Wilson

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

Ms Z Derraz, Parent Governor Representative  
Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative

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

Mr L Duffy, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools

#### **Apologies:**

Councillor Sadler  
Ms S Barnwell, Parent Governor Representative  
Ms J Fleet, Primary Sector Teacher Representative

### **CYP/20/19 Councillor Sue Murphy**

The Chair paid tribute to Councillor Sue Murphy, who had recently passed away, and the Committee paused to reflect on her life.

### **CYP/20/20 Minutes**

The Chair noted that an update had been requested about the work to address the issues arising from the decision to close Newall Green High School, including progress in finding new school places for the affected pupils, and asked that this be provided to Committee Members.

#### **Decisions**

1. To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 4 March 2020.
2. To receive the minutes of the meeting of the Ofsted Subgroup held on 22 January 2020.
3. To request that an update on the work to address the issues arising from the

decision to close Newall Green High School, including progress in finding new school places for the affected pupils, be circulated to Committee Members.

### **CYP/20/21 Children and Education Services response to COVID-19**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided an update on the impact, progress and response of schools, children and education services to the presenting challenges of COVID-19, with a specific focus on the support being provided to Manchester's schools and those children considered to be more vulnerable than their counterparts. The report noted that, through the learning and education system, children were informed about and understood environmental issues and the negative impact of carbon, promoting safe and healthy lives.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- An update on schools, early years settings, childminders and post-16 providers;
- Initiatives to support children and young people, including the provision of laptops and support to children at transition stages in their education;
- Support for Children with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND);
- Free School Meals;
- Support for children who were not currently on a school roll;
- An update on Children's Services, including the impact of lockdown on demand, interface with the Family Court and work to support Our Children and Young People (Looked After Children and Care Leavers);
- The potential impact of COVID-19 on the mental health of children and young people and how this was being addressed; and
- The financial implications of COVID-19.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools recognised the achievements of Council staff and partners, including schools and early years providers, during this challenging time and welcomed the high quality of the data which had been provided to the Executive. He also highlighted the work of the Director of Customer Services and Transaction and her team in putting in place the Manchester Free School Meals Scheme. He reported that, while there had been some positive outcomes from the current situation, such as increased engagement from young people who preferred to communicate via digital means, there were many challenges for the Council and its partners to address. He advised that these included most children not attending school, lower social work referrals and existing issues such as poverty and domestic abuse being exacerbated by the crisis.

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

- Concern about children not being in school, including that there was variation in what support children were getting from their schools and how much learning they were doing at home;
- Concern that mental health issues would increase as a result of the pandemic;

- Preparations for children returning to school;
- Concern that some children and school staff were in a high risk category or lived with someone who was, noting that data indicated that Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups were at higher risk of mortality from COVID-19;
- What progress had been made in providing laptops to pupils who needed them;
- Free School Meals (FSM), including recognising the success of Marcus Rashford's campaign for FSM to be provided to eligible families over the summer holidays and to thank him for using his platform to achieve positive change;
- Concern about the financial impact of the pandemic on Council services if the national government did not provide sufficient financial support to local government; and
- The potential for increased referrals to social services once children returned to school and issues which had arisen or worsened during lockdown were identified and how the Council would manage that increased demand.

A Member highlighted the work that some Councillors were doing to support residents during the pandemic, including producing a leaflet about support that was available. She advised that this being distributed to try to reach residents who might not be accessing information online and encouraged other Councillors to do the same. The Chair suggested that the Member circulate the leaflet to other Councillors.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services advised Members that the pandemic and lockdown had not impacted equally on everyone, with some children and families being worse affected by not being able to attend school, by financial problems and other issues such as mental health. He reported that Children's Services expected to see an increase in referrals once children returned to school and needed to plan for this. He drew Members' attention to the information in the report on the mental health services available to children and young people. He advised Members that there had been an increase in eating disorders during the lockdown which was putting a pressure on the support services.

The Director of Education reported that the Council and schools were still waiting for government guidance on how schools could safely re-open to all pupils in September; however, she advised Members that her service had already been discussing this with schools and colleges. She informed Members that schools and colleges wanted to have all pupils attending school, not just some year groups, either full-time or on a part-time basis, using a blended learning approach. She reported that schools were currently working with "bubbles" of 15 pupils who did not mix with other pupils in the school but that in future the bubbles might potentially be increased to a full class. She highlighted that secondary schools and colleges faced additional challenges as pupils were studying different combinations of GCSE and A-Level subjects but needed to stay in a bubble with one group of students. She informed Members that a lot of work had taken place to develop home learning, for example online lessons, and that schools needed to continue to work on that offer, particularly as there could be another spike in virus transmissions or a case of COVID-19 within a school requiring a class to self-isolate for two weeks. She advised Members that there would also be some children who could not attend school because they, or

someone in their household, was in a high risk group so the remote learning offer would need to be available for them. She informed the Committee that schools had also been provided with risk assessment forms to complete with individual staff members and that this took into account the risk factors relating to being from a BAME group. She reported that the Council had received 3000 laptops from the national government and 150 from the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA). She informed Members that these had been distributed to schools to give out to pupils and that a number of schools had already used their own resources to provide laptops to pupils who were most in need of them. In response to a Member's question, she reported that the government had announced that £650 million would be allocated to schools to support children to catch up on their education and that £350 million would be provided to the national tuition service to provide subsidised tuition but that further detail was still to be announced on how this would work in practice.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services stated that officers shared the concern that there could be an increase in demand for social work services but highlighted that the average social work caseload was currently 17.8 and the progress in the Council's social worker recruitment campaign, both of which, he advised, provided some assurance of the capacity to cope with increased demand. He also reported that increased use of technology during the pandemic, for example, use of virtual meetings, had highlighted some efficiencies which could be adopted longer term. A Member requested a report at a future meeting on social work recruitment, including the impact of this recruitment on caseloads and information on how cases were allocated and responded to. The Executive Member for Children and Schools suggested that this include information on the recent recruitment campaign, highlighting a video which had been made featuring a current Manchester social worker.

## **Decisions**

1. To express concern about the financial impact of the pandemic on Council services and recognise the importance of the government providing financial support to local councils.
2. To thank Council staff and partners, including schools and early years providers, for their hard work.
3. To write to Marcus Rashford to thank him for using his platform to campaign for eligible families to receive Free School Meal vouchers over the summer holidays.
4. To request a report at a future meeting on social work recruitment, including the impact of this recruitment on caseloads and information on how cases are allocated and responded to.

## **CYP/20/22 Attainment and Progress 2019**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education which provided an analysis of the 2019 outcomes of statutory assessment at the end of the Early Years

Foundation Stage, Key Stage 1, Key Stage 2, Key Stage 4 and Key Stage 5. The report also included a summary of performance according to groups by ethnicity.

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

- Early years outcomes;
- Primary school outcomes;
- Secondary school outcomes;
- Post-16 outcomes;
- Outcomes by groups, including disadvantaged children, those with English as an Additional Language (EAL), Our Children, children with SEND and children by ethnicity; and
- Next steps.

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

- That GCSE and A-Level results for 2020 would be based on teacher assessments as no examinations would be taking place, noting that the situation had been made more challenging by the move from modular assessments to a system where results were based on final examinations at the end of the course, and concern that pupils from BAME groups could be negatively affected due to unconscious bias;
- How the Council could support schools to have a more inclusive curriculum that represented all communities in the city, commenting that this should not just be restricted to Black History Month; and
- Request for an update on work to ensure young children were school ready.

The Head of Schools Quality Assurance and Strategic SEND outlined how GCSE and A-Level results would be assessed, which involved schools sending two pieces of each student's work to the examination board, along with the grade they expected they would have received and a list ranking all students entered for that subject. She advised Members that the Office of Qualifications and Examinations Regulation (Ofqual) was standardising grades against schools' historic performance and that this was concerning for Manchester schools which had previously been failing but were now on a strong improvement journey. She reported that attainment data was analysed by ethnicity and that this would continue with the 2020 results.

The Director of Education informed Members that there was some very good practice in Manchester of ensuring that the curriculum was relevant to all communities and that the data analysis of outcomes by ethnicity would be used to identify schools which had good practices and share that learning across the city. The Executive Member for Children and Schools informed Members that discussions were currently taking place on how issues relating to Black Lives Matter and racial equality could be better addressed and that further information on the Council's response could be provided to the Committee at a later date.

The Director of Education reported that the Council was involved in the Greater Manchester plan to improve school readiness but that a lot of young children had not been in early years settings over the past few months due to COVID-19, although

schools were now able to re-open to nursery children. She advised the Committee that the Council had been working to address this, for example, providing learning materials to the families of two-year-olds who were eligible for the free two-year-old early years offer; however, she reported that the money that the government was providing to schools to enable pupils to catch up on missed learning did not include support for early years. In response to a Member's question, she reported that COVID-19 had placed an additional financial strain on early years settings, particularly as many parents were not yet sending their children back to these settings, and that work which had started prior to the pandemic on addressing financial challenges in this sector would be resumed.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **CYP/20/23 Overview Report**

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

The Chair informed Members that a decision had not yet been made about when the next meeting would take place but that Members would be informed.

A Member highlighted some of the Committee's previous recommendations to which Members had not yet had a response and, while recognising the current pressure on officers, asked that a date be agreed by which a response would be provided.

### **Decisions**

1. To note the report.
2. To request that a date be agreed by which officers would provide a response to the three recommendations which had been on the recommendations monitor for over a year.



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

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2020**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Stone – in the Chair  
Councillors Sameem Ali, Alijah, Cooley, Hewitson, T Judge, Kilpatrick, Lovecy, Madeleine Monaghan, Reeves, Reid and Sadler

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

Ms S Barnwell, Parent Governor Representative  
Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative

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

Ms J Fleet, Primary Sector Teacher Representative  
Mr L Duffy, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Midgley, Mental Health Champion  
Councillor Russell, Chair of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee  
Councillor M Sharif Mahamed, Assistant Executive Member for Children and Schools  
Michael Devine, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC)  
Darren Parsonage, MHCC  
Dr Paul Wallis, Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (MFT)  
Maria Slater, MFT

#### **Apologies:**

Councillors McHale and Wilson

#### **CYP/20/24 Councillor McHale**

The Chair informed the meeting that Councillor McHale was ill and that the Committee sent him its best wishes for a speedy recovery.

#### **CYP/20/25 Minutes**

The Chair reported that, following the requests at the last meeting, an update on Newall Green High School had been circulated to all Members of the Committee and a letter had been sent to Marcus Rashford

#### **Decision**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2020.

## **CYP/20/26 Manchester's Transformation Plan for Children and Young People's Mental Health and Wellbeing**

The Committee received a presentation of Michael Devine, Lead – Children and Young People, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC) which provided an overview of the transformation plan for children and young people's mental health and wellbeing.

Representatives from the MHCC and Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (MFT) referred to the main points and themes within the presentation which included:

- The current situation, including access rates to children and young people's mental health services, waiting times and presenting issues and outcomes;
- Wider community children's mental health developments;
- The MHCC-commissioned grants programme to engage the Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector and schools in supporting the mental health and wellbeing of children and young people in Manchester; and
- M-thrive, the new delivery model of place-based care.

The Mental Health Champion shared her positive experiences of Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and how the service had continued to operate through the COVID-19 pandemic. She welcomed the M-thrive programme to improve mental health and wellbeing services for children and young people. She highlighted that most mental ill health issues started before the age of 25 and advised that, therefore, work to improve the mental health and wellbeing of children and young people would make a positive difference to their life chances, as well as preventing further costs later on. She asked what percentage of the budget for mental health and wellbeing was allocated to services for children and young people, which Darren Parsonage from MHCC said he would look into. She welcomed that waiting times were reducing and asked about the waiting time target. Maria Slater from MFT advised that the waiting time target was being reduced nationally to four weeks. In response to a concern raised by the Mental Health Champion about the transition from children's to adults' mental health services, Maria Slater advised that an 18 to 25-year-old offer was being looked into so that young people would not have to transition directly for children's to adults' services.

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

- That Catalyst, an organisation which provided mental health services to children and young people, had been producing a regular newsletter during the COVID-19 pandemic which included a lot of useful resources;
- That young people trying to directly access support online needed a more user-friendly digital front door to help them to access services;
- How this work fitted in with the work to become a trauma-informed city;
- What was being done to support young people presenting with gender dysphoria; and
- Support for young people leaving care.

Maria Slater agreed that a more youth-friendly digital front door was needed and advised that her service was currently working with a company to develop this. She informed the Committee that the online support offer had been increased during the pandemic and that CAMHS had worked with Education Services and third-sector organisations to provide a leaflet to schools on support available.

Dr Paul Wallis from MFT assured Members that a trauma-informed approach was being embedded in M-thrive, including training on Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs).

Darren Parsonage from MHCC reported that the support for young people leaving care had recently been increased to the age of 25 so those young people now had a contact point through their LAC (Looked After Children) Nurse for signposting and support. In relation to young people with gender dysphoria, he highlighted the funding which had been provided to the Proud Trust to carry out work in this area.

The Chair thanked the guests for their contribution. He noted the reference in the report to No Wrong Door and the Alonzi House Hub Mental Health Support, and commented that this was a good initiative which the Committee supported. He also noted the plans related to schools outlined in the presentation, including the plans for a Mental Health Lead in every school and college. He requested that school governors be included in this and that CAMHS and the support on offer be included on the agenda of a future Chair of Governors briefing.

### **Decision**

To request that school governors be included in the plans for schools and that CAMHS and the support on offer be included on the agenda of a future Chair of Governors briefing.

### **CYP/20/27 A five-year workforce strategy to sustain and continually improve Children's Social Care Services**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which set out the strategic direction of the service and its workforce plan, including an approach to recruitment and retention for the next five years.

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

- The five year strategy for recruiting and retaining qualified social workers;
- The introduction of financial incentives for social work staff;
- An update on the current recruitment campaign;
- Performance management; and
- Service redesign and development.

The Chair of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee informed Members that her Committee's HR Subgroup had considered a report on this issue in October 2019. She commented that officers had previously not been in favour of offering retention bonuses and asked why a decision had since been made for social workers

to be offered financial incentives to stay with the Council. She also asked how the workforce strategy would fit in with the work on racial equality.

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

- The use of agency staff;
- Social work caseloads;
- How many social work staff were shielding and what impact was that having on the service; and
- Race equality in relation to the service's staff and children and young people.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services reported that there had been a significant reduction in the use of agency staff, which had included successfully recruiting a number of agency staff to become permanent Council employees. He advised that reducing the number of agency staff was beneficial from a financial perspective and in enabling the service to build a different culture. He informed Members that the strategy to retain social work staff was not just about financial incentives but about professional and organisational development and providing a career pathway. He reported that, as the pandemic had resulted in more home working, it had highlighted more longer-term opportunities for the service to use agile working and that this would be useful in recruiting and retaining social workers with caring responsibilities, particularly women.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services advised that the use of agency staff, staff retention and turnover would be used as measures of the strategy's success and he suggested that the Committee might want to receive a further report on the impact of the strategy in 12 months' time. He reported that the proposed retention payment was different from that which had been previously proposed as it was on a sliding scale of payback and linked to the service's ambitions.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services advised that the average caseload across the locality and permanence teams was 18 and that very few social work staff had a caseload of over 23, although he acknowledged the complexity of some of the work staff were dealing with. He reported that approximately 16 staff were shielding for medical reasons but advised that this was not impacting on the service's ability to carry out its responsibilities.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services reported that the service had a high proportion of staff from Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups but that, at present, too few were in senior positions and that the service was working to address this. He suggested that Members might want to look at this issue in a further report, to either this Committee or the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee. The Chair commented that this would be discussed in the work programming session, which was taking place after the meeting. The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services informed Members that work was also taking place to address issues faced by BAME children and young people, for example, that that they were disproportionately likely to be in the criminal justice system.

## Decision

To note the report and that this area of work would continue to be monitored through this Committee and the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee.

### **CYP/20/28 Children and Education Services Response to COVID-19**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided an update on the impact, progress and response of schools, children and education services to the presenting challenges of COVID-19; with a specific focus on the support being provided in respect of planning for the start of the new academic year in September 2020.

In relation to the aim of becoming a zero carbon city, the report stated that, as part of the preparation for the start of the academic year in September 2020, parents and carers were being encouraged to walk, use public transport and cycle to work; making use of and accessing schemes that supported such approaches.

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

- Feedback and learning from schools as they had increased the number of pupils attending;
- Government guidance on school attendance from September 2020;
- Proposed approach for Manchester schools in September 2020;
- Challenges; and
- Children's Services.

The Assistant Executive Member for Children and Schools provided an overview of the impact of the pandemic on schools, children and families and how the Council and schools had responded. He advised that it was important to ensure that diverse communities across the city were aware of the guidelines on sending children back to school in September and that it was also important for schools to keep developing remote learning in order to be prepared for a possible second wave of infections.

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

- Whether there was any data on children and families not engaging with schools during lockdown;
- Whether the number of families choosing to home school might increase as a result of the lockdown period;
- Recognising the hard work of schools and the support the Council had provided to them during the pandemic;
- Concern about the additional financial costs for schools in responding to the pandemic; and
- How information about the full re-opening of schools from September could be best communicated to families.

The Director of Education informed the Committee that the Council did not have figures on families not engaging but that schools were doing welfare checks and

taking additional measures where necessary, including carrying out doorstep visits. She reported that schools had been informed how to access information and advice where there were serious concerns about a family. She informed Members that, where children were not on a school roll, for example because they had just moved into the area, welfare checks had been carried out by Council staff and, where requested, an education offer had been made available through One Education. She reported that digital access, particularly access to wifi and data, was one of the biggest challenges, although schools had been working hard to enable their pupils to access education, including delivering work packs to pupils who could not access them online. She informed Members that schools were being required to produce a business continuity plan by the end of September 2020 on how they would provide education continuity in case a group of pupils or the entire school had to remain at home due to an outbreak of COVID-19.

The Director of Education agreed that the number of families choosing Elective Home Education (EHE) might increase as some families had found that this approach had worked for them but that it needed to be made clear to them that this would not include the access to remote learning being provided by their school during lockdown. She also reported that the Council was working on a summer campaign on school attendance in advance of schools re-opening to all pupils in September. She advised Members that the Frequently Asked Questions document for parents, which was appended to the report, had been translated into a number of community languages. She reported that she would circulate these translated documents to the Committee Members and asked that these be shared as widely as possible.

### **Decision**

To consider this further at the Committee's next meeting in September 2020.

### **CYP/20/29 Overview Report**

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

### **Decision**

To note the report.

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

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2020**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Stone – in the Chair  
Councillors Sameem Ali, Hewitson, T Judge, Kilpatrick, Lovecy, Madeleine Monaghan, Reeves, Reid and Wilson

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

Ms S Barnwell, Parent Governor Representative  
Ms Z Derraz, Parent Governor Representative

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

Mr L Duffy, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools

#### **Apologies:**

Councillors Alijah, Cooley and McHale  
Ms J Fleet, Primary Sector Teacher Representative  
Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative

#### **CYP/20/30 Dr Omara**

The Chair informed the Committee that this was Dr Omara's last meeting as a Co-opted Member of the Committee, although unfortunately he had been unable to attend due to another commitment. He reported that Dr Omara had been a valuable Member of the Committee and advised that he would write to him to thank him for his contribution.

#### **Decision**

That the Chair will write to Dr Omara to thank him for his contribution to the work of the Committee.

#### **CYP/20/31 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2020.

## **CYP/20/32 September opening of schools and colleges for all children and young people**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education which provided an overview of the work that had taken place in Manchester to support the reopening of schools and colleges for all children and young people in response to the most recent Government guidance which was also summarised in the report. The report also noted that, through the learning and education system, children were informed about and understood environmental issues and the negative impact of carbon; promoting safe and healthy lives.

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

- Government guidance;
- Implementation in Manchester;
- Supporting pupils to attend school;
- School operations;
- Curriculum offer;
- Continuity planning;
- Mental health and wellbeing;
- Safeguarding; and
- School/college workforce.

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

- To thank everyone involved for their work in re-opening schools to all pupils;
- How the position of schools would be reviewed if infection levels increased significantly and increased lockdown restrictions were required;
- The mental health impact of the pandemic on both pupils and staff;
- The additional funding that had been made available to schools;
- The use of bubbles in schools, noting that many households would have more than one child in different bubbles;
- Request that the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) documents being shared with schools also be circulated to Members of the Committee;
- Discussion about the wearing of face coverings by secondary school pupils when moving around school and whether these should also be worn in the classroom;
- Concerns about the potential for the transmission of the virus outside of school, for example, from parents congregating at the school gate and from secondary school pupils mixing on the way home; and
- The impact on children transitioning to the next stage of their education who had not had the normal support through the transition period.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools recognised the hard work involved in re-opening schools to all pupils and thanked all those involved. He expressed concern that new Government guidance had been issued shortly before the start of term, which had presented challenges for schools as they had already made plans.



The Director of Education drew Members' attention to the Government guidance on schools, which included four tiers of restrictions for education settings. She reported that, despite local restrictions in Manchester, schools were currently operating at Tier 1, where schools were open to all pupils; however, if necessary, a decision could be taken to move to Tier 2, where secondary school pupils would attend school on a rota basis, Tier 3, where secondary schools would be closed to most pupils and, in the most serious circumstances, Tier 4, where primary schools would also be closed. She advised Members that, under all these circumstances, schools would still be open for the children of key workers and vulnerable children, as they had been during the full lockdown earlier in the year. She informed Members that the Government guidance was to not require pupils to wear face coverings in the classroom on the basis that this impeded teaching and meant that pupils would be wearing them for long periods but that the rules on this were at the discretion of individual schools. The Consultant in Public Health advised the Committee that schools had reviewed their classroom layouts, for example, making sure that pupils were not facing each other at close proximity so this reduced the risk of transmission in classrooms in a way that was not always possible when groups of pupils were moving around school corridors. In response to a Member's question, the Director of Education clarified that pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) were not required to wear a face covering.

The Director of Education advised the Committee that a lot of work was taking place to support the mental health of pupils but agreed that support for teachers should also be considered and she suggested that this could be raised with schools through the Headteacher briefings and Chair of Governor briefings. She clarified that schools had been provided with additional funding from the Government, which they could use however they thought best to support pupils to catch up on missed learning, and that there was separate provision for subsidised tuition through the Education Endowment Fund, although schools had to pay the rest of the cost of this tuition.

The Consultant in Public Health advised the Committee that the purpose of bubbles was to enable the quick identification and isolation of close contacts of an infected person. She acknowledged that this was complicated because each pupil within a bubble would also have other close contacts, such as other family members, and she advised that, if that child subsequently tested positive, the rest of their household would also have to isolate.

The Director of Education advised that a few schools had experienced problems in the first week with parents gathering around school gates when dropping off and collecting their children and that the Council had offered support to the schools on managing this situation. She informed the Committee that no schools had contacted her service to report problems with this in the second week of term so it would appear that these issues had been resolved. She advised Members that a letter had been sent out to parents at the end of the last term about the importance of them working with schools to ensure that procedures were followed and that it would be worth sending another letter to remind them of this. She also stated that she would circulate the FAQs to schools to Members of the Committee.

The Director of Education reported that every school would receive a visit from a member of the Quality Assurance Team during the Autumn term to look at how

schools were managing, including where they were up to in teaching the full curriculum, what their remote learning plan was and which children had the greatest gaps in their learning which they needed support to catch up on. She advised Members that this would include how children entering Year 7 were doing, considering that they would not have had gone through the normal transition process to prepare them for secondary school.

## Decisions

1. To have a standing item on future agendas on the response to COVID-19, including updates on schools, for as long as is necessary.
2. To note that the Director of Education will circulate the FAQs that have been sent to schools to Members of the Committee.

## **CYP/20/33 Working With Children and Young People and Their Families During COVID-19**

The Committee received a presentation from Children's Services which provided an overview of how Children's Services was working with children and young people and their families during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Head of Locality (North) delivered the presentation which referred to:

- The service's principles, approach, behaviours and impact;
- Response to the pandemic and initial crisis management;
- Creative responses in practice;
- Quality assurance and performance; and
- Next steps.

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

- Preparations for a potential increase in referrals following the re-opening of schools to all pupils;
- Availability of Personal Protective Equipment (PPE);
- Concern that supervised contact visits between children and their families had not been able to take place;
- Concern about young people being at risk of criminal exploitation and involvement in knife crime over the summer; and
- Concerns about the level of funding from the Government and the impact on Children's Services.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services reported that some modelling had taken place in relation to future demand for social work services following the lockdown but that this was difficult to do without past similar events to compare it to. He informed the Committee about the planning taking place for a potential increase in demand, including engagement with a range of partners such as school clusters, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS) and Greater Manchester Police (GMP), consideration of staffing levels and ensuring that the front door service and the

provision of advice and guidance were as robust as they could be. He also confirmed that, beyond the first week or two of the lockdown, Children's Services had not had any issues with the availability of PPE.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services reported that planning had been taking place for the re-opening of centres for supervised contact and that two contact centres were re-opening that week. He outlined the work of the Complex Safeguarding Hub, the Community Safety Partnership and GMP in addressing child criminal exploitation and knife crime, including joint working using intelligence to target specific areas or individuals where there were concerns. The Director of Children and Education Services highlighted the role of the Inclusion Strategy in preventing young people from being excluded and becoming exposed to negative influences and the Youth Offer which had been available over the summer.

### **Decision**

To thank officers for an informative presentation and to pass on the Committee's thanks to frontline social work staff and other key workers.

### **CYP/20/34 Early Years sector update and the response to COVID-19**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education which provided an update on how the Early Years sector had responded to the COVID-19 pandemic and gave an update on the key activities that had taken place to support the Early Years sector and plans to support providers moving forward in the Autumn term. The report also stated that education about the environment started in Early Years and a high quality Early Years sector supported this agenda. In addition, the buildings review of the Tendered Day Care Sites would enable the sites to have greater energy rating efficiency.

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

- Response and financial support to the Early Years sector during COVID-19;
- Quality assurance support for the Early Years sector during the COVID-19 pandemic;
- Changes to the Early Years Foundation Stage (EYFS) Framework;
- Review of day care provision in Sure Start Children's centres; and
- Next steps.

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

- That the support the Council had provided to Early Years providers had been excellent;
- Concerns about the financial position of Early Years providers, particularly loss of income from private fee-paying families, as the funding commitment from the Government did not include this;
- That parents were concerned about sending their children back to Early Years settings due to COVID-19; and

- Reforms to the EYFS Framework.

The Senior School Quality Assurance Officer advised that his team was regularly engaging with and offering support to the Early Years sector regarding the financial challenges they were facing during the pandemic. He reported that a significant majority of Early Years settings across the city had re-opened but acknowledged that there were concerns about a loss of income from private fee-paying families and reported that his service would continue to offer support and advice to providers. He advised Members that work was taking place with the Quality Assurance Team, Outreach Workers, the Communications Team and Early Years providers to communicate to parents that measures had been taken to make settings safe for their children to return to. He informed the Committee that it was hoped that attendance would continue to increase and that attendance figures would be monitored over the next month.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools thanked staff in the Early Years sector across the city, noting that some settings had been open through the lockdown period. The Chair echoed these thanks.

The Head of School Quality Assurance and Strategic SEND advised that, due to the Early Years reforms, the baseline of children's levels at the end of the EYFS would no longer be available as a basis for measuring progress through primary school. She also highlighted the focus on reading comprehension in the new Framework, informing the Committee that increasing numbers of children in Manchester's Early Years settings had English as an Additional Language (EAL) and that these children usually made more progress in this area further on in primary school; however, the progress made later on would be difficult to show without the baseline data. She advised Members that previous work to improve reading levels, such as the Every Child A Reader initiative, had been very successful, with work which had taken place 10 or 11 years ago being reflected in improved attainment at high school for that cohort of children. She reported that, prior to the pandemic, it had been noticed that this approach had become diluted, that work had been started to re-focus on improving reading and comprehension at an early age and that this work would continue. She reported that there was no clear picture yet of how school readiness would be assessed under the Early Years reforms. The Chair and the Executive Member for Children and Schools both expressed their concern about the Early Years reforms.

## **Decision**

To note the report and to continue to monitor the Early Years reforms.

## **CYP/20/35 Overview Report**

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

**Decision**

To note the report.



## **Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2020**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair  
Councillors Appleby, Azra Ali, Butt, Hassan, Hughes, Jeavons, Kilpatrick, Lynch, Lyons, Razaq, Strong, White and Wright

**Apologies:** Councillors Sadler and Whiston

**Also present:**

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods  
Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure  
Councillor Richards, Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration  
Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport

### **NESC/20/25            Tribute to former Councillor Sue Murphy**

The Chair paid tribute to the important contribution Sue Murphy had made to the city and to the Council. Members and all those present observed a minute's silence in remembrance of Councillor Sue Murphy.

### **NESC/20/26            Minutes**

#### **Decisions**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 4 March 2020 as a correct record.

### **NESC/20/27            COVID-19 update**

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided a brief summary of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of this committee.

The main points and themes within the report which included: -

- Describing the Public Health response to the pandemic;
- Information on the financial implications and the additional costs incurred;
- Response and planning ahead for the recovery including a reset of the Our Manchester Strategy; and

- Specific updates on activities relating to the work of Neighbourhood Teams; Compliance and Enforcement; Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing; Highways; Housing and Residential Growth; Homelessness; Climate Emergency / Zero Carbon.

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

- Paying tribute and appreciation to all staff and those working with partner organisations for responding effectively and professionally during this unprecedented period;
- What was being done to support rough sleepers who had been accommodated in hotels during the pandemic to prevent them returning to the streets;
- What was being done to ensure appropriate levels of funding would be allocated to Local Authorities;
- What were the number of homeless presentations during the period of lockdown;
- What was the approach to promoting active travel and clarification was sought on the rationale not to introduce 'pop up' cycle lanes and a call for discussions on this area to be open and transparent;
- Communication with both residents and local business was essential when planning and developing active travel schemes;
- Noting the reduction in emissions and improved air quality during this period what work was being done to build on these improvements and could data be provided for different areas of the city;
- What analysis had been undertaken of the measures introduced, such as the temporary closure of roads on social distancing;
- How could residents suggest other areas for consideration for the introduction of similar measures to support social distancing and what would be the associated time frame for delivering any scheme;
- Noting the bid to the National Lottery's Climate Action Fund with the Manchester Climate Change Partnership was unsuccessful, what feedback and learning had been obtained that may inform future bids;
- How would the Highways Department and the Licensing Unit work with licensed premises to ensure they were managing their premises safely and in line with guidance as the lockdown began to ease;
- Recognising the important role of all staff who worked for Registered Social Landlords for their dedication in identifying and supporting vulnerable residents;
- What work was being done with landlords, particularly those with student properties to manage waste generated at the end of term;
- An update on the Private Rented Sector Licensing Policy and HMO (house in multiple occupation) Standards was sought;
- When would the green bin collection revert back to a weekly collection;
- Thanking the Biffa crews for their work, however noting that reports had been received regarding the inconsistency in the service provided by Biffa and could this be addressed;
- An update was sought on Household Waste and Recycling Centres;
- Had incidents of flytipping increased and could resources be allocated to tackling identified 'hot spots';
- Thanking residents for providing intelligence and reporting incidents of flytipping and anti social behaviour;



- How could residents report noise nuisance after 10pm;
- Thanking staff working in the Anti-Social Behaviour Team for responding to complaints; and
- Noting the detrimental impact that off sales of alcohol had on green spaces and parks and what was being done to address this.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure informed the Committee that during the pandemic, in excess of 250 rough sleepers had been accommodated as part of the Everyone In scheme. He described that in addition to accommodation every individual had been provided with access to mental health and substance misuse services. He said that to prevent people returning to the street individual personal plans had been drawn up to support people enter secure accommodation and discussions were ongoing with registered landlords and other partners to identify suitable accommodation to facilitate this. He stated that the Government funding for Everyone In was due to cease on the 30 June 2020 and clarification was currently being sought as to future funding arrangements to support this activity. He stated that if required the arrangements for hotel accommodation would be extended to October 2020.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure informed the Committee that in the period 19 March 2020 to 22 June 2020 there had been a total of 430 families and 1737 single people presenting as homeless, which represented a 12.8% decrease on the same period last year.

In response to the comments made regarding the impact on Local Authority budgets and the need for adequate funding the Director of Neighbourhoods stated that representations were being made to Government by the Leader, the Chief Executive and the Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer. In addition work was also ongoing with other Core Cities and the Local Government Association to lobby for adequate funding.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure stated that adequate levels of funding were essential to ensure that the most vulnerable people in society could be protected and the appropriate wrap around services could be provided. He encouraged all residents of Manchester to donate to the Big Change campaign rather than giving money directly to individuals on the street as he said this was often counterproductive.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport addressed the Committee and informed the Members that the Executive Members had continued to meet on a weekly basis to co-ordinate activities and collaborate on areas of work, such as the retrofitting of housing stock and the development of the Young Peoples Climate Charter. She stated that the Highways teams had continued to deliver programmes of work whilst adhering to social distancing guidance, with work prioritised across wards and to take advantage of the reduction in traffic witnessed during the period of lockdown.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport commented that Highways had also introduced a number of measure to support social distancing and facilitate people's journeys as people returned to work and the lockdown eased. She

stated that if residents identified other areas that may benefit from similar measures they could suggest these via the Council website and if accepted measures would be implemented as soon as practically possible.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport then addressed the issue of 'pop up' cycle lanes. She described that the Council remained committed to promoting active travel, including pedestrians in district centres. She stated that there were a number of conversations to be had over the summer period regarding future walking and cycling schemes. With specific reference to 'pop up' cycle lanes she stated that there were a number of myths circulating regarding the Council's approach to these. She clarified that not all neighbouring authorities had applied for funding for pop up lanes and evidence indicated that the majority of cycle journeys were undertaken in local, district centres rather than the commute into the city centre. She explained that the Council's Emergency Active Travel submission follows government guidance which stated that the quickest and cheapest way to reallocate road space to cyclists and pedestrians was point closures, which was in effect active filtered neighbourhoods and was a more effective measure to support both pedestrians and cyclists as opposed to pop up cycle lanes that support cyclists only. She said through the proposals, support for additional work was being sought which could be delivered in the short-term, but which also had the potential to secure longer-term benefits for people cycling or walking across the city while remaining committed to delivering high quality, well designed active travel schemes and infrastructure.

In regard to zero carbon, the Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport stated that the green agenda would be at the heart of the city's recovery plans and the Annual Carbon Emissions report would be published in the near future. She stated that a report on the proposals to deliver the Clean Air Plan would be considered by the Executive at their meeting of 3 July 2020 and a public consultation exercise would be undertaken. In response to the data regarding air quality she advised the Committee information and data obtained from the various monitoring stations located across the city could be viewed via the Greater Manchester Clean Air website.

In response to the specific question regarding the unsuccessful applications to funding, the Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships stated that the bids for the eCargo bikes was oversubscribed nationally, however they would continue to explore alternative funding options for these. He also advised that they were awaiting the formal feedback from the National Lottery regarding the unsuccessful bid, and when this was available this would be shared with Members.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration described that officers working within strategic housing had worked with Registered Social Landlord staff to mobilise a community response to identify and support vulnerable residents. She described that this co-ordinated response had identified people who required support and appropriate services were engaged. She stated that the lessons learnt during this period would inform any future response if required. She paid tribute to the staff, adding that in addition to their normal duties, many had undertaken additional voluntary work to assist vulnerable residents.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration described that many of the normal services, such as repair and maintenance services were beginning to resume and measures were being taken across all providers to ensure these were being reinstated in a coordinated manner so there was consistency in this offer. She described that this was being achieved through the Manchester Housing Provider Partnership that had been established, and the benefits of this local arrangement had been realised during the pandemic.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration stated that the housing allocations scheme, Manchester Move remained suspended with housing priority being given to homeless people and those requiring discharge from hospital. She further described that the compliance and enforcement teams continued to respond to enquiries and a communications exercise had been delivered to inform private landlords of tenants' rights during lockdown to prevent evictions. She described that a tool kit for landlords had been produced at a Greater Manchester level and that the updated Private Rented Sector Licensing Policy and HMO Standards would be submitted for consideration by this Committee later in the year.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration responded to the comments regarding student accommodation by advising that landlords had been engaged with around the appropriate management of their properties at the end of term and this had been supported by the delivery of a Landlord Forum that had been very positive and an opportunity to engage with Landlords. In addition to this, work continued with the Universities and Manchester Student Homes to promote this message.

In regard to Selective Licensing, the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration stated that the Council remained committed to use this power on the permitted 20% of privately rented sector stock and a rolling programme would be developed to deliver this. She stated ward Members and local Registered Housing Providers would be consulted on these proposals as they progressed and a report would be submitted to the Committee at the appropriate time.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods described the critical role of the Neighbourhood Teams in supporting those residents that were identified as being vulnerable and at risk during the pandemic. In addition, he described the work of the various teams within in the Compliance and Enforcement Unit and the Food and Health & Safety Airport Team for providing specialist food safety advice to those involved in food provision across the city, including to the new Nightingale Hospital. He also advised of the work with Trading Standards to enforce the new regulations during the lockdown period; Environmental Protection Team, Neighbourhood Compliance Team, Environmental Crime Team and the Licensing and Out of Hours Team.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods informed Members that the Licensing Unit had responded by adapting the service to mitigate public safety risks, and measures were put in place to help with the financial hardship faced by many of the individuals in the taxi and private hire trade. The Licensing Unit had also been working closely with their counterparts in Westminster to lobby government to allow more flexibility to Local Authorities with regard to the Licensing rules and regulations so that the businesses could be supported in the coming period.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods stated that currently the green bin would remain on the winter collection cycle, two weekly with priority and resources given to collecting the black bins. He described that following a phased reopening Household Waste and Recycling Centres were now fully operational, except for the textiles. The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing stated that analysis had indicated that the numbers of visits to these sites was consistent with previous years.

In regard to flytipping, the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods stated that whilst there had been an increase in the number of reported incidents that actual number of incidents was comparable with other years. He stated this could be explained by jobs being reported multiple times.

The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing stated that if flytipping hotspots were identified resources could be deployed to help identify and prosecute perpetrators.

In regard to Biffa and the reported inconsistency of service in regard to the passageway container service, the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods stated that if this was brought to his or officers attention this would be raised with Biffa. The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing added that Monitoring Officers are monitoring collections and had flagged some issues with Biffa. She further advised that Members needed to consider that staff from different crews and agency staff had been deployed to support the Biffa crews, which had accounted for some errors. The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods further informed the Committee that 27 new electric vehicles had been purchased and would be in service from September.

In response to the discussion regarding the approach to be taken to support licensed premises and other businesses following the relaxation of lockdown the Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety stated that the approach taken with businesses was always one of engage, educate and enforce. She described that during the lockdown period there had been a reduction in the number of enforcement notices require and they would continue to work with premises to ensure they were managing the areas outside of their premises appropriately. She described that ultimately it was the responsibility of the premises to manage and comply with national guidance and if a premises was proving to be problematic appropriate enforcement action would be taken.

The Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety acknowledged the comment regarding the impact of off sales and public space and commented that it was anticipated that as the lockdown was relaxed and licensed premises reopened this should address the issues experienced. The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing further commented that the Keep Manchester Tidy project had piloted a scheme for parks that would be rolled out.

In regard to residents reporting noise disturbance after 10pm, the Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety stated that any complaints would be picked up and responded to the next day and residents would be directed to the appropriate website via the pre-recorded message. She stated that the decision had

been taken to end this service at 10pm due to resources, however this would be reviewed.

In concluding the discussion the Chair, on behalf of the Committee thanked all staff, across all partner organisations for supporting the residents of the city during this unprecedented public health emergency.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

[Councillor Appleby declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest as her partner is employed by Biffa.]

### **NESC/20/28            Overview Report**

The report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment.

In response to a question regarding the Climate Change Subgroup, the Chair reminded the Committee that at the 25 March 2020 meeting of Council the report 'Constitutional Amendments and Other Matters for Council Business Continuity' was considered and approved. The Committee were reminded that within that report it recommended that Scrutiny Subgroup meetings should be suspended for the time being. The Chair stated that consideration would be given to scheduling an update report on climate change at an appropriate time.

### **Decision**

To note the report.



## Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2020

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair  
Councillors Azra Ali, Butt, Flanagan, Hassan, Hughes, Jeavons, Kilpatrick, Lynch, Whiston, White and Wright

**Apologies:** Councillors Appleby, Lyons, Sadler and Strong

**Also present:**

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods  
Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure  
Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport

**NESC/20/29            Minutes**

**Decisions**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2020 as a correct record.

**NESC/20/30            COVID-19 update**

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided a brief summary of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of this committee.

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

- Expressing disappointment that the report made no specific reference to BAME citizens;
- Expressing disappointment following the decision to withdraw the 179 bus service, noting that this service was important for key workers and older residents and calling for an end to any further cuts to bus services;
- Calling upon the Chair to write to the Chief Executive of Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) to request an immediate review of this decision to withdraw the 179 bus service;
- What advice had been provided to schools to support social distancing as schools prepare for a return in September and requesting an update on the Active Travel Bids;

- Recognising the amount of work delivered by the Highways Department during the lockdown period, however commenting that communication with residents still appeared to be an issue;
- Requesting an update on the number of homeless people in temporary accommodation;
- What was the approach to supporting homeless people in district centres;
- Noting the pressures that would be placed on the Homeless Service following the end of furlough and the ending of the restriction on the use of Section 21 (Notice to Quit) by private landlords;
- Information on the number of licensed premises across the city and the number of staff employed in the Licensing and Out of Hours Team to understand the scale of the challenge;
- Commenting upon the positive and proactive approach taken by licensed premises; Council officers and Greater Manchester Police to ensure the easing of the lockdown measures was managed in a responsible and safe manner.

The Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods stated that the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on BAME residents was acknowledged and the strategies and recovery approach had been reported to both the Health and Wellbeing Board and the Health Scrutiny Committee.

The Chair stated that she would consult with the Chair of the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee with the intention to writing a joint letter to the Chief Executive of TfGM to express the views of the Committee and to request a review of the decision to withdraw the 179 bus service.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport stated that she shared the disappointment of the Committee in regard to the withdrawal of bus services, recognising the importance of these for residents and providing an alternative to journeys by car. She described that this clearly highlighted the need for the introduction of a democratically controlled, regulated bus service.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport further stated that work with the Education Department continued around the issue of active travel in preparation for the schools returning in September. She advised that the local Neighbourhood Teams were supporting this activity, however resources were limited and called upon local Councillors and partners to support this activity. She stated that information on the Active Travel Bids would be provided to Members following the meeting

In response the comments regarding communications and school crossings work, the Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport advised that letters were sent to all affected properties and schools to inform them of planned works and local Members were informed via email. In addition the contractor would display signage in the area to notify the public of the works. She also added that it might be the case that some schools had not picked up correspondence due to Covid19 lockdown. She was aware of only one specific incident in Withington where the programme for the crossing delivery was paused following concerns from residents on the location of the proposed works. However, she invited where Members experience any communication issues they were to let her know, and that she would circulate a note



to members on how many crossings have been delivered to date. The Chair stated that a separate private meeting with Members of the Committee and the Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport would be useful for Members to raise issues they had experienced. The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport agreed to convene such a meeting if there is interest from the committee for it.

The Director of Homelessness stated that there were currently 158 individuals placed in temporary hotel accommodation who had been rough sleeping at the start of the pandemic. He said that each had individual housing plans with a view to securing them permanent accommodation so they did not return to the streets. He stated that the decision had been taken to continue funding the hotel accommodation for rough sleepers until March 2021, despite the funding from central government ending.

The Director of Homelessness stated that currently there were approximately 2000 households in temporary accommodation across Greater Manchester. He stated that Bed and Breakfast (B&B) accommodation was only every used as a last resort and there was a statutory limit on the length of time a person could be accommodated in such a setting. He further advised that there had been a significant reduction in the number of families accommodated in B&Bs, adding that if families had been placed in them the average time before being moved to more appropriate accommodation was two weeks. He informed Members that the Homeless Service worked with private landlords, charities and registered housing providers to secure accommodation for people experiencing homelessness and a number of supported accommodation units had been commissioned to provide additional support.

In regard to the district centres, the Director of Homelessness acknowledged this issue and stated that the Outreach Team were working in district centres and were included in the regular homeless counts. He stated that whilst Outreach Workers continued to work with street homeless individuals, the approach was still on the prevention of homelessness. He further acknowledged the concerns expressed by the Chair regarding the ending of furlough and Section 21 Notices, and stated that this situation would continue to be closely monitored and the service was working closely with Shelter to understand the emerging situation, noting the importance of preventative work around the issue of homelessness.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure stated that the Council had both a statutory and moral duty to respond to the issue of homelessness. He commented that the current situation of using temporary accommodation was not ideal, however this was as a result of a failure of government to invest in the building of social and affordable housing. He concluded by encouraging any residents wishing to help rough sleepers to donate to the Big Change campaign rather than giving money directly to individuals on the street as he said this was often counterproductive.

The Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety informed the Members that across the city there was in excess of 2000 licensed premises and the Licensing and Out of Hours Team currently had 38 staff and managers working a shift pattern that covers from 10am to 4.30 am on Friday and Saturdays and 10am -

1 am the rest of the week She stated that the staff have a wide range of duties and responsibilities and also undertake a significant amount of proactive work.

With regard to the number of Requests for Service, the Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety reported that whilst the number had not significantly changed compared to the same period last year, the nature of complaints had with far more domestic noise complaints being received. She explained that this could be attributed to the fact that people were at home a lot more than they usually were as a result of COVID-19 and would therefore likely be more conscious of noise from neighbours including music, DIY, parties etc. The Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety described that in terms of COVID-19 guidance the vast majority of premises had managed the transition from lockdown well. She described the circumstances that had resulted in two premises being required to close, however these had both successfully reopened and the situation would continue to be monitored.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods paid tribute to all of the staff working within the Licensing and Out of Hours Team and further reiterated the wide remit and responsibility for a relatively small team, noting that they were not just responsible for licensed premises. He further stated that the recent successful and safe reopening of licensed premises was to be applauded and had been informed by the positive proactive work undertaken by officers and the positive relationships that had been established. He stated that officers would, if necessary take appropriate enforcement action to ensure public safety.

In regard to the strategy for planning ahead and describing the workstreams that had been identified to progress the city's recovery, The Strategic Director, Neighbourhoods reported that the move to reopening leisure centres, play areas and hosting events would be managed with due attention to the national public health guidance regarding COVID-19.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **NESC/20/31          Clean Air and Climate Change progress update**

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update on the Greater Manchester (GM) Clean Air Plan including the impact of COVID-19 (C19) on the timetable for its implementation. It also provided an update on progress to deliver the Council's Climate Change Action Plan 2020-25 and annual direct emissions data for the 2019/20 financial year.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- Information on the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan and the considerations given to the statutory public consultation on the GM Clean Air Plan to be undertaken as soon as reasonably practicable due to COVID-19;

- An update on Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan, noting the documents provided Annual Direct Emissions Report, Pathway to Zero Carbon 2038, Quarterly Quantitative Emissions Reporting, Quarterly Qualitative Reporting and the correspondence with the Greater Manchester Pension Fund; and
- Information on Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25 annual report that was due to be launched 21 July 2020.

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

- Noting the anniversary since the Council declared the Climate Emergency motion, what progress had been made against the fifteen specific asks of the motion;
- What progress had been made in retrofitting domestic properties across the range of tenures;
- How would the Local Plan promote the mitigation of climate change and support the stated ambitions to reduce carbon emissions;
- An update was sought on the number of carbon / environmental themed engagement events held across the city;
- An assurance was sought that any consultation on proposals for a Clean Air Plan for Greater Manchester was inclusive and captured the voice of young people;
- Welcoming the introduction of 27 electric refuse vehicles;
- Was there any information on the proposals by Manchester Metropolitan University to distribute mobile air quality monitoring stations; and
- Noting the disappointing response from The Greater Manchester Pension Fund and reiterating the need for them to disinvest from fossil fuels as soon as possible to support the ambitions of Greater Manchester to address climate change.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport addressed the Council motion and described that progress against each of the "asks" which had also been provided within the report submitted for consideration by the Committee. She detailed which actions were either completed or partially completed and described the reasons for this including those which had been impacted by COVID-19. She further stated that she shared the disappointment and frustration of Members in regard to the response from The Greater Manchester Pension Fund. She said the Pension Fund needed to set out a clear pathway so as to address climate change in line with the ambitions of the region, and she would work with her colleagues from across Greater Manchester to continue to lobby on this important issue.

The Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships informed the Members that work had been commissioned to understand the cost of retrofitting Northwards properties, and this analysis was being used as the basis to estimate the costs of retrofitting the city's Private Rented Sector stock but with a 20% uplift to take into account the condition of these properties. . He stated that this would involve significant sums of money to deliver and that bids were being prepared to submit to government as part of the Comprehensive Spending Review. He further stated that confirmation was still awaited on the full details of the Green Homes Grant that had recently been announced by government including eligibility criteria.

The Chair commented that a substantive item on the issue of housing would be submitted to a future meeting of the Committee and this would provide an opportunity for Members to discuss this further.

With regard to the Local Plan, the Head of Local Planning and Infrastructure stated that the existing Core Strategy included the requirement for developments to include a range of environmental standards to mitigate climate change. He commented that Manchester was the first to require BREEAM assessments to be completed for proposed developments, noting that BREEAM assessments were undertaken by independent licensed assessors using scientifically-based sustainability metrics and indices which covered a range of environmental issues. He concluded by saying that the new Manchester Local Plan whilst needing to comply with national guidance would also seek to be ambitious in demanding high environmental standards from new development and a full consultation exercise would be undertaken.

The Head of Local Planning and Infrastructure informed the Members that a GM wide consultation on the GM Clean Air Plan would be conducted in October 2020. He noted the comments from the Committee regarding the need to ensure this was inclusive and stated that an Equality Impact Assessment of the proposed consultation would be undertaken prior to the launch. He acknowledged the need to capture the voice of young people in this exercise. He concluded that further enquiries would be made regarding the proposals by Manchester Metropolitan University to distribute mobile air quality monitoring stations.

The Head of Neighbourhoods described that prior to the COVID-19 lockdown a number of environmental themed resident events had been held across the city, which had included engagement with schools and young people. In addition ward coordination meetings continued to promote environmental issues and local climate change actions. She said work would continue with schools around the issue of active travel and that a list of all events held would be circulated to Members following the meeting.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport stated that she had attended a number of events across the city and consideration was being given as to how these can be reinstated in a safe and appropriate manner with regard for the current guidance regarding COVID-19.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport summarised the achievements to date of the City Council to address climate change and reduce carbon emissions. She stated that the Council had achieved a 53.8% reduction in its direct CO2 emissions against the target set of 41% between 2009/10 and 2019/20. She said this had been achieved by an ambitious and wide ranging plan of action that had seen the delivery of the civic quarter heat network; the introduction of electric vehicles; the switch to LED street lighting; reducing emissions from the estate; a programme of planting trees; supporting bio diversity and nature based solutions; allocating space for active travel and progressing the introduction of clean air zones. She described that in response to comments from the Committee regular reporting of this progress had also been introduced.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport concluded by stating that the impact of COVID-19 was unprecedented and reflection and consideration would be given to this as the city planned for green recovery. She recognised the impact that COVID-19 had on young people and the importance of recognising their concerns and ambitions around climate change. She reiterated that

the Council recognised this and supported them. She further commented on the significant socio-economic impact that COVID-19 would have on a large number of residents as the ending of furlough was realised and the impact that have on food and fuel poverty experienced by residents. She stated that this was recognised as a social justice issue and she called upon all partners and local businesses to continue to build upon the good work and help deliver a cleaner, healthier, carbon neutral city.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **NESC/20/32          Overview Report**

The report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment.

The Chair noted that the Members would be meeting in private following this meeting to discuss the work programme.

### **Decision**

To note the report.



## Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 2 September 2020

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair  
Councillors Appleby, Butt, Hassan, Hughes, Jeavons, Lynch, Lyons, Strong, White and Wright

**Apologies:** Councillors Azra Ali, Flanagan, Kilpatrick, Razaq, Sadler and Whiston

**Also present:**

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods  
Councillor Richards, Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration  
Robin Lawler, Chief Executive, Northwards Housing

### **NESC/20/33            Minutes**

#### **Decisions**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2020 as a correct record.

### **NESC/20/34            Private Rented Sector Strategy 2020-2025**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) that provided an overview of the new Private Rented Sector Strategy 2020-25. The report was accompanied by the delivery plan.

The Committee had been invited to comment on this report prior to its submission to the Executive on the 9 September 2020.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- Providing a rationale for the strategy and setting out how the Council along with its partners would support the improvement of housing standards within the sector over the next 5 years (2020-25);
- Describing how the strategy had been developed; and
- Describing strategy themes and objectives.

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

- Consideration needed to be given to other methods and opportunities of providing information to tenants on their rights, suggestion that information should be sent out in the annual Council Tax mailing;
- Had there been any indication if the Local Housing Allowance in Manchester would be increased;
- Supporting the ambitious strategy and requesting that the Committee receive regular progress reports;
- Requesting an update on the numbers and location of temporary accommodation across the city;
- More information was sought on the retrofitting of homes;
- Noting the difficulty tenants had obtaining relevant information relating to their property; and
- What was the approach to short term lets.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration stated that she thanked Members for their contributions and suggestions in bringing forward this strategy. She said that the priority of the strategy was to tackle low quality housing in Manchester and to protect the most vulnerable residents who were increasingly reliant on the private rented sector to meet their housing needs, noting that it was anticipated that the impact of COVID-19 would see an increase in those on welfare benefits and the impact this had on their housing options.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration stated that currently there was still no clarification as to what the government intended to do in relation to Section 21 notices (notice to quit), similarly with the Local Housing Allowance following the temporary uplift. She described that lobbying of government would continue on these important issues and despite the budget pressures she remained committed to progressing and delivering this ambitious plan. She called upon the government to adequately fund local authorities and pending further announcements she stated it was the correct decision to focus all available resources on those residents most in need within the city. She said the delivery plan would enable progress to be analysed and mapped and agreed to submit progress reports and updates to the Committee.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration welcomed the suggestion regarding including information on tenant rights in the annual council tax mail out, adding she would take this away to progress. She described that it was important that information was available in languages other than English and she said the local Neighbourhood Teams provided advice and signposting for residents. She described local resident forums and similar community engagement events were opportunities at a local level to signpost residents and provide advice on a range of issues, including tenant rights. The Chair stated that it was important to be able to deliver advice in local community settings to residents in addition to online sources.

The Neighbourhood Manager informed the Members that forums had been established to engage with and create a dialogue with landlords and understand issues and concerns that they were experiencing within the sector.

In response to the issues raised regarding short term lets, the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration stated that she would encourage residents to report issues and the appropriate action would be taken. She further informed the



Committee that the intention was to launch a Short Term Letting Charter in Manchester to address the issues experienced within this sector and set out expectations and management standards of both hosts and guests in this sector.

Members supported the establishment of a Short Term Letting Charter and commented that all stakeholders and interested parties, including local resident and community groups should be included in this process.

The Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety described that proactive work was undertaken with short let providers and platforms, such as Airbnb and booking.com, and where appropriate enforcement action would be taken to address issues. She stated that all available powers would be used, including anti-social behaviour legislation, noise abatement notices, fixed penalty notices and consideration was currently being given to using public health powers to close premises. She further made reference to the recent media reports where action had been taken to address problematic premises.

In response to the question requesting further information on the provision of temporary accommodation, the Head of Housing Services stated that this information would be requested from the relevant team and circulated to Members for information following the meeting.

The Head of Housing Services advised that funding bids to deliver retrofitting had been submitted, both at a local and Greater Manchester level and the outcomes of these bids were still awaited. The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration advised that a report on this important area of work could be provided to the Committee at the appropriate time. She stated that despite budgetary pressures the Council remained committed to meeting its emissions targets.

The Head of Housing Services further informed the Committee that the Building Safety Bill and Fire Safety Bill made provision to access to information relating to a building that tenants had access to.

## **Decisions**

The Committee;

1. Note the report and endorse the recommendations that the Executive approve the Private Rented Sector Strategy 2020-25 and delivery plan.
2. Recommend that the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration provide advice and information on tenant rights to be included in the annual Council Tax mail out to residents.
3. Recommend that a briefing note on the progress of the Private Rented Sector Strategy 2020-2025 be provided to Members in six months' time and a formal update report be submitted for consideration by the Committee in September 2021.

4. Recommend that the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration consult with all stakeholders and interested parties, including local resident and community groups when developing the proposed Short Term Letting Charter.

#### **NESC/20/35                      Extension to Selective Licensing Schemes - Public Consultation**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) that described that Officers were seeking approval to commence an extensive consultation exercise to establish whether the declaration of a selective licensing scheme was required within the 12 potential areas identified within the report.

The Committee had been invited to comment on this report prior to its submission to the Executive on the 9 September 2020.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- Providing a context of the Private Rented Sector (PRS) in Manchester;
- The legal framework in the context of The Housing Act 2004, noting that Selective Licensing is intended to address the impact of poor quality property and management standards primarily in areas of low demand or high deprivation and with poor quality housing;
- Describing the measures required to introduce Selective Licensing in a designated area;
- Information on fees and conditions;
- Describing licensing considerations and objectives; and
- An update on the proposed Selective Licensing Consultation.

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

- Welcoming and supporting the proposed extension of the scheme;
- Noting the improvements realised in those areas where Selective Licensing had been introduced;
- Clarification was sought regarding the funding and staff resourcing to undertake property inspections of any agreed future schemes;
- Had consideration been given to increasing the Selective Licensing fee;
- Would temporary accommodation be subject to Selective Licensing; and
- Requesting that a list of all temporary accommodation by ward be circulated to all Members of the Committee.

The Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety informed the Committee that Selective Licensing schemes were self-funding via the license fee applied. She stated that the license fee had been set in accordance with agreed eligible charges. She stated that the extension of schemes and the corresponding revenue from fees would fund officer posts and the experience and knowledge obtained from the delivery of other schemes in the city had informed the planning for the delivery of the proposed schemes.

In regard to the comment regarding the numbers of inspections required, the Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety advised that in the initial stages of

a designated licensing period priority was given to processing the applications and this was then followed by a programme of inspections, noting that the programme of planned inspections had been impacted by COVID-19. The Neighbourhood Manager stated that she would circulate a flow chart to all Members that described the licensing process.

The Neighbourhood Manager advised the Committee that the legislation governing Selective Licensing did not extend to temporary accommodation. She acknowledged the issues raised in relation to temporary accommodation and stated that officers would continue to work with partners and colleagues to resolve any issues identified.

## **Decisions**

The Committee note the report and endorse the recommendations that the Executive:

1. Approve a consultation with residents, private landlords, businesses and other stakeholders to designate selective licensing schemes within the geographical areas listed in paragraph 4.2 of this report; and
2. Subject to the outcome of the consultation, delegate authority to the Director of Neighbourhoods in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration and the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to approve up to 12 selective licensing areas identified in the report.

## **NESC/20/36            Housing Compliance and Enforcement - Performance in 2019/20**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) that provided Members with an update on demand for and performance of the Housing Compliance and Enforcement Team during 2019/20.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- Data on reactive demand compared to the previous year;
- Data on service requests based on area and category of complaint;
- An update on activities to Rogue Landlord Team;
- Data on formal enforcement action;
- An update on the Selective Licensing Pilot, noting that selective licensing areas encompassed approximately 2,000 private rented properties;
- An update on Mandatory Licensed HMO (House in Multiple Occupation), noting that a public consultation was currently ongoing regarding HMO standards;
- Information on illegal evictions and landlord harassment;
- Electrical Safety Checks and the duties imposed on landlords;
- Information on Energy Performance Certificate (EPC) requirements;
- Describing the impact of the pandemic on the service; and
- Providing case studies.

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

- What more could be done through the HMO licensing scheme to encourage landlords and tenants to improve the management and maintenance of their properties;
- Requesting a breakdown by ward of compliance activity;
- Welcoming the inclusion of case studies to demonstrate the breadth of work undertaken by the service;
- All attempts should be made to encourage the return of HMOs to be reverted to family homes;
- What was the difference between a HMO and co-living models; and
- Noting the importance of the Rogue Landlord Team and questioning whether more officers were required for the team.

The Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety stated that a breakdown of activity by ward could be provided to Members following the meeting. She further acknowledged the work of the Rogue Landlord Team and stated that she would always welcome additional resources to expand capacity within the team. The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration added that the team provided an important service to some of the most vulnerable residents across the city and lobbying for additional funding to deliver this service would continue.

In response to the question and comments regarding HMO licensing and standards, the Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety described that the definition of a HMO was prescribed in legislation. She stated that she was confident that the HMO standards and conditions applied in Manchester were robust, however they remained committed to working with and listening to both residents and landlords on this issue. She added that she would also welcome feedback and suggestions on this subject from Members.

The Neighbourhood Manager advised the Committee that officers from across different teams met regularly to share intelligence and identify any problematic HMO properties to then agree an action plan. She said this could include inviting in landlords for discussions.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration reported that work was also currently underway with the local Universities to refresh the Student Strategy that would assist students to access high quality and better managed student accommodation, noting the benefits that could bring to local neighbourhoods. The Chair welcomed this and stated that it was important to recognise the impact of the behaviour of tenants and the management of properties had on communities and neighbourhoods.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration stated that the aspiration would be to return HMOs back into larger family homes as it was recognised that there was a demand for these in areas of the city.

In regard to the question relating to co-living, the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration stated that this was a model of housing that was distinct from HMOs and she made reference to the report that had been considered by Executive at their

meeting of 3 July 2020 and the approach to co-living adopted in advance of the review of the Local Plan

The Chair concluded this item of business by expressing her gratitude to all staff working within the service for the work they undertook on behalf of the residents of the city.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **NESC/20/37 Fire Safety in High Rise Residential Buildings**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) that described those activities to address fire safety in high rise residential buildings.

The Committee had been invited to comment on this report prior to its submission to the Executive on the 9 September 2020.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- The latest information on the removal of unsafe Aluminium Composite Material (ACM) cladding;
- An update on the collection of data on all External Wall Systems;
- Information on other fire safety issues in High Rise Residential Buildings;
- An update on work undertaken on council-owned High Rise Residential Buildings;
- A description of the Council's interdepartmental Fire Safety Group;
- An update on the Council's work with residents and, in particular, the Cladiators;
- A description of the Council's role as an Early Adopter of the Dame Judith Hackitt recommendations; and
- An introduction to the Building Safety Bill and Fire Safety Bill and the implications for Manchester.

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

- Welcoming the comprehensive report and acknowledging the work that had been undertaken to progress this important issue;
- Acknowledging the role of the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration in leading on this issue and providing a voice for the many affected residents in Manchester;
- Welcoming the Council's role as an Early Adopter of the Dame Judith Hackitt recommendations;
- This approach should apply to all properties, including those under 18 metres;
- Developers should be encouraged to rectify any issues with cladding rather than occupiers; and
- Occupiers access to relevant information relating to the property was important; and

- Noting the difficulties experienced by occupiers who lived in High Rise Residential Buildings obtaining insurance, insurance companies should be lobbied on this issue.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration said that the Council would continue to support residents and work with them to lobby the government for more resources to deal with all fire safety issues in multi-occupied buildings. The Council would continue to argue that leaseholders should not be made to pay to remedy problems in poorly constructed buildings. The Council would also support Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue Service and residents in lobbying the government to provide funding to remedy all fire safety issues in multi-occupied buildings irrespective of the arbitrary 18m height definition. She said the lobbying on behalf of residents extended to insurance companies.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration described that Leader had written to the Secretary of State to suggest that VAT not be charged to developers to encourage them to rectify cladding, however this had been rejected by the Treasury. She further advised the Members that the Council was also a member of the Greater Manchester High Rise Task Force.

The Interim Director of Housing & Residential Growth advised the Committee that Manchester was a member of the national Early Adopters Forum which provided an mechanism for the Council to seek to influence national policy and directly represent the lived experience and views of residents to the government.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration advised the Committee that because of the Council's role as an Early Adopter of the Dame Judith Hackitt recommendations they had undertaken proactive work with premises and managing agents to ensure occupants were aware of fire safety within the premises. She further stated that fire safety advice and responsibilities would also be included in the Short Term Letting Charter that had previously been discussed. The Committee welcomed this.

The Committee welcomed Robin Lawler, Chief Executive, Northwards Housing. He described that all of their high rise properties had been subject to an independent fire risk assessment. He said that the programme for installing sprinkler systems in blocks continued, however tenants did have the right to refuse the installation of these in their flats. He said that whilst every attempt had been made to encourage them to have these installed they respected the views of the tenant. He advised that that installation was such that at the time a property became vacant sprinklers could be installed prior to any re-let.

## **Decisions**

The Committee note the report and endorse the recommendations that the Executive:

1. Note this report;
2. Delegate to the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) in consultation with

the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration responsibility to develop a process for Mandatory Occurrence Reporting as detailed in section 9.10; and

3. Agree that the Accountable Person for buildings in scope is the Council of the City of Manchester as described in section 9.16.

### **NESC/20/38            Overview Report**

The report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

The Chair informed the Committee that following discussions with officers it had been agreed that the budget item listed for the October would be removed from the work programme.

In response to a question regarding the Climate Change Subgroup, the Chair reminded the Committee that at the 25 March 2020 meeting of Council the report 'Constitutional Amendments and Other Matters for Council Business Continuity' was considered and approved. The Committee were reminded that within that report it recommended and agreed that Scrutiny Subgroup meetings should be suspended for the time being.

### **Decision**

To note the report subject to the above amendment.





## **Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 7 October 2020**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair  
Councillors Appleby, Butt, Flanagan, Hassan, Hughes, Jeavons, Kilpatrick, Lynch, Lyons, Razaq, Whiston, White and Wright

**Apologies:** Councillors Azra Ali, Lynch and Sadler

**Also present:**

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods  
Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport

**NESC/20/39            Minutes**

**Decisions**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 2 September 2020 as a correct record.

**NESC/20/40            Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing Update**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) that provided the Members with an update on progress in delivering waste; recycling and street cleansing services.

The main points and themes within the report which included updates and information on a range of activities relating to: -

- The impact of pandemic (COVID-19);
- Service Update;
- Cycle lane cleansing;
- Bin collections;
- Collections and Quarterly cleansing of passageway bins;
- The Passageway Container Service Improvement Programme;
- Apartments;
- Contamination of recycling bins;
- Fly tipping;
- Household Waste and Recycling Centres (HWRC) and analysis of the impact of HWRC policy changes on incidences of flytipping;
- Keep Manchester Tidy – COVID Response;
- Littering in parks and green spaces;

- Love parks week and campaigns; and
- Engaging with residents in tackling litter and case studies.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods introduced the report by placing on record his thanks to all Neighbourhoods staff and Biffa crews for continuing to deliver a service during the challenging time of the COVID pandemic. He stated that those staff delivering these services are rightly regarded as key workers.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods stated that despite the challenges presented by COVID the city had maintained its recycling rate of 40%, commenting that this was an achievement when compared with the performance of other core cities. He stated that following conversations at previous scrutiny meetings and in response to concerns raised by Members significant work had been undertaken to improve aspects of the service, such as bin returns and passageway cleaning. He stated that Members had been kept regularly updated with these planned improvements. He further advised the Members that the 27 electric wagons were expected to be delivered before Christmas.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods described that challenges remained regarding the incidents of flytipping, collections from passageways and the sweeping of the areas around container bins. He described that he and officers were continuing to work closely with Biffa to address issues with the ambition to return stability to the service. He stated that when the green bin collection had moved to the winter schedule the staff resources that had been released had been redeployed to other duties.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods concluded by thanking the residents of Manchester for their understanding during the COVID period and continuing to recycle appropriately.

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

- The Committee wished to place on record their thanks to all staff and Biffa crews for delivering the service during the COVID period;
- Welcoming the positive case studies provided that described resident participation in Keep Manchester Tidy Campaigns;
- Noting the increase in PPE (Personal Protective Equipment) being disposed of irresponsibly and what was being done to address this;
- Noting that the implementation of physical measures to support social distancing had become traps for litter to accumulate and what was being done to address this;
- Had any analysis of capacity been undertaken of container bins been undertaken to ensure they meet the demand;
- Noting the incidents of missed bin collections was a recurring problem, causing frustration for residents;
- Passageways were not being swept;
- More detail was requested on contingency planning for the service;
- Questioning the issuing of a schedule for 2021 that had been sent to residents that had implied that it would remain on the winter schedule;

- Clarification was sought as to what constituted a passageway and information on the schedule and contract standards for the cleaning of walkways and ginnels would be welcomed;
- Had representations been made to government to help fund the additional demand on waste services that had arisen as result of lockdown;
- Communications with residents needed to be improved so that they fully understood the challenges experienced by the service; and
- Bins were not being emptied fully.

The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing responded to the Members by advising that a review of container bins had been undertaken and information had been shared with Members, adding that a certain points on the year such as when students arrive and leave their accommodation additional resources were deployed, adding that if there were particular issues with certain locations Members could raise this with the local team.

The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing stated that during the COVID lockdown period the service had experienced a 30% increase in residual waste and post lockdown this was still at a 15% increase level. She explained that to address this a decision had been taken to reduce the frequency of the green bin collections so that staff resources could be released and deployed to clear residual waste, adding that in Manchester side waste had also been collected. She acknowledged the comment regarding the information that had been circulated to residents regarding the green bin collection schedule for 2021 stating that the decision had been taken to issue this information and any subsequent changes would be relayed to residents. She commented that relevant information regarding the service was regularly reviewed and update on the Council's webpage in addition to the use of social media. The Chair stated that it was important that Members were informed of any changes to services in a timely and appropriate manner.

The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing advised the Members that representations had been made to government to seek additional funding to address the increased pressures on the service, noting that this was being experienced by all authorities across the country.

In regard to missed bin collections, the Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing stated that Biffa crews would inform the contact centre if this occurred and crews would return the next day as a priority to collect. She further stated that in terms of priorities for service it was to successfully navigate the service through the COVID pandemic and all of the challenges that it presented with the hope of returning to pre COVID stability and delivering continued improvements to the passageway service. Further commenting that the impact of test and trace on Biffa crews and the subsequent use of agency staff had impacted on the stability of service delivery, noting that this situation continued to be monitored. She further clarified that no Biffa staff had been furloughed, however staff would have been deployed to other functions within the service and street cleaning had continued through the pandemic.

The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing acknowledged the comment regarding the accumulation of rubbish around physical social distancing

measures, commenting that this was an unfortunate consequence, however they continued to work with Biffa to resolve, including the use of manual cleaning when mechanical cleaning was inhibited.

With reference to the return of bins by crews, the Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing acknowledged that this had been raised previously by the Committee and as a result this had been raised with Biffa and they had been tasked to look at their practice. She described that Biffa were actively monitoring this activity through the use of the cameras on the wagons and then providing feedback to crews. With regard to half emptied bins she described that she was unaware that this was an issue and explained that this could be as a result of bins being compacted so the waste was not released into the wagon when lifted and agitated.

The Contract Manager informed the Committee that the contract for passageways did not include every ginnel and walkway in the city, stating that the cleaning of those areas would be addressed in other service contract agreements.

The Keep Manchester Tidy Project Manager stated that during lockdown they had experienced an increase in interest from residents wishing to form groups to address litter in their local communities. She stated that they had run a campaign to address discarded PPE, and this would be re-run as an increase in discarded masks was being witnessed, adding that partners such as CityCo and local housing providers were also supporting this key messaging. She stated that 'Bin it or take it home' signage had been deployed around the city centre area, with a view to rolling this campaign out across the city following evaluation.

The Chair commented that despite the reported improvements in the service delivery, Members continued to receive complaints from residents on the same issues. She stated that a meeting would be arranged for Members from each district to meet with the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods and relevant officers so that they could articulate their concerns and those of residents with the view to resolving recurring complaints. She further added that the cleaning of district centres needed to be improved and the communications strategy needed to be reviewed with due consideration given to access and equality. The Chair recommended that an update to Members on the review of communications strategy be circulated to Members when this was available.

In response to comments regarding the cleaning standards and areas prescribed as district centres the Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing commented that this would be recirculated to the Committee, this will also include maps for all district centres, the schedule for cleansing work and the agreed service standards. In addition she would also circulate the latest data relating to recycling rates in apartment blocks.

In respect to a discussion on the budget the Chair advised that this would be looked at in further detail as the Committee began to consider the budget options and proposals.

## **Decision**

1. To note the report.
2. Recommend that the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods and relevant officers arrange a meeting with local Members so that the concerns of both Members and residents regarding the delivery of waste, recycling and street cleansing services be addressed.
3. Recommend that the Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing circulate an update to Members of the Committee on the review of communications strategy at the appropriate time.
4. Recommend that the Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing recirculate to Members the maps of all district centres, the schedule for cleansing work and the agreed service standards.
5. Recommend that the Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing circulate the latest data relating to recycling rates in apartment blocks to Members.

[Councillor Appleby declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest as her partner is employed by Biffa.]

#### **NESC/20/41            Highways Maintenance Programme**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Highways that provided an update further to the report that was considered by the Committee at their meeting on 6 November 2019. The update was provided in the context of a service that had progressed well through an improvement journey and provided an overview of both key successes over this period alongside some ongoing challenges and areas that continued to need further improvement.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- The Highways Service Key Achievements and Challenges
- Inspections and Repairs
- Highways planned Maintenance Programme update – year 4 progress and year 5 programme confirmation;
- Major projects update;
- Dashboard Performance Monitoring;
- Social Value;
- How information about how major schemes is provided to both local Ward Councillors and residents;
- Managing disruption caused by major projects;
- An update on the Winter gritting programme;
- Motorcycle Parking; and
- Covid response and Active Travel.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport introduced the item by expressing her gratitude to all staff and contractors for their continued work during the pandemic. She described the Highways department as a proactive and positive

service. She explained that work had continued to be delivered whilst complying with all local and national COVID guidance and that progress had continued to be made on the delivery of projects. She stated that the service had delivered social distancing measures and facilitated road closures so as to support people and business return to the city in a safe manner. In addition consultations had continued and the programme of active travel had continued and major schemes such as the CYCLOPS had been successfully completed. She further paid tribute to the contractors who had assisted the city's response to the pandemic and supporting residents by delivering food parcels, supporting homeless charities, delivering PPE and helping with social distancing measures so that schools could reopen safely.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport stated that Manchester remained committed to encouraging active travel for all residents across the city, however to successfully deliver all of the schemes adequate funding needed to be allocated by government. She informed the Members that despite statements being made by government on this issue funding to deliver this was not forthcoming.

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

- Consideration needed to be given as to when works were to be delivered, noting that in residential areas it was not appropriate to undertake works at night that would cause a disturbance to local residents;
- Residents needed to be appropriately informed of the intention to undertake works;
- An update was sought on the green screening of the Princess Road roundabout;
- Noting the delivery of Social Value through the contracts an assurance was sought that Manchester residents benefited from this and all companies undertaking works were appropriately vetted;
- Road marking were not reinstated in a timely manner following patch repairs;
- Utility companies needed to be held responsible for reinstating highways following works;
- Welcoming the successful delivery of the Fallowfield Loop scheme;
- Welcoming the information that had been provided by ward on gullies;
- Welcoming the review to be undertaken relating to the provision of motorcycle parking and clarification was sought regarding what was meant by off road parking; and
- Did the Highways Department consult with the Neighbourhoods Department to mitigate disruption to services.

The Director of Highways advised the Committee that there was an officer within the Department who oversaw Social Value and contracts and if Members had any specific concerns they should pass on the information and this would be investigated. He further stated that he recognised the tension that arose as a result of late night working and said it was always a difficult balance to achieve between disturbance and progressing the projects, noting the particular challenges presented by the location and physical environment of the Princess Road roundabout scheme. In response to the specific question regarding the green screening he advised that he would provide local Members with an update on this following the meeting.

A Member commented upon the impact of construction works and building sites on highways and enquired what the approach to monitoring these was. The Director of Highways advised that section 8 of the report described the approach taken to managing disruption caused by major projects

A Member recommended that the Committee received a report at their next meeting that detailed all of the social value achieved to date as a result of contracts awarded through the delivery of the Highways Maintenance Programme. The Member requested a breakdown of each scheme, the social value achieved (including employment and apprenticeship opportunities) with this information provided at a ward level where possible, to identify where those residents who had benefited from this lived in the city. The Chair endorsed this recommendation.

In regard to communications the Director of Highways informed the Committee that both he and the Executive Member had convened meetings to hear the views, feedback and suggestions from Members with a view to lessons learnt from the delivery of major schemes and improving communications with both residents and Members. The Chair welcomed this dialogue and recommended that these meetings continued, to include all Members of the Committee and that a briefing note on the outcomes and identified actions arising from these meetings are circulated to Members at an appropriate time.

The Director of Highways stated that road markings should be reinstated within three weeks of works being completed and if Members were aware of cases where this was not being done to alert the team, similarly with any issues with drains and gullies following resurfacing. He stated that work was underway to prioritise the schedule for gully emptying, however reassured the Members that the service would always respond to emergency repairs. The Director of Highways stated that information and data on the cyclical gully cleansing programme would be included in the Members performance dashboards that was regularly circulated.

With regard to the Fallowfield Loop, the Director of Highways stated that the department had received a significant volume of detailed responses to the consultation that were currently being reviewed. He further stated that appropriate drainage formed part of the design of any cycle scheme, having due regard to the users safety.

In response to the issues raised regarding works undertaken by utility companies the Director of Highways stated he recognised the frustration of Members, adding that whilst some companies responded better than others it remained an ongoing challenge and Manchester did have representation on a national body to identify improvements in this area.

In answer to the question relating to off street secure parking spaces for motorcycles, he said this related to consideration for options to locate these in multi storey car parks.

The Director of Highways confirmed that following organisation redesign the service now worked closely with the Neighbourhoods Department and had an officer

dedicated to this role, adding that this had greatly improved dialogue between the services.

In respect to a discussion on the budget the Chair advised that this would be looked at in further detail as the Committee began to consider the budget options and proposals. The Chair further advised the Committee that at their November meeting the Committee would be receiving a report on active travel.

### **Decision**

1. The Committee requests that information is submitted to the November meeting, detailing all of the social value achieved to date as a result of contracts awarded through the delivery of the Highways Maintenance Programme. The information should provide a breakdown of each scheme with the information provided at ward level, where possible, to identify where those residents who had benefited from this lived in the city.
2. The Committee recommend that regular meetings are convened by the Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport with all Members of the Committee to discuss Members issues or concerns relating to the delivery of highways projects, and that a briefing note on the outcomes and identified actions arising from these meetings are circulated to Members at an appropriate time.
3. Recommend that the Director of Highways include information and data on the cyclical gully cleansing programme in the Members performance dashboards that was regularly circulated.

### **NESC/20/42            Overview Report**

The report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

### **Decision**

To note the report and agree the work programme.



## **Economy Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 25 June 2020**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

Councillor H Priest (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Abdullatif, Green, Hacking, Johns, Noor, Raikes, Shilton Godwin, K Simcock and Stanton

**Also present:**

Councillor Leese, Leader  
Councillor Richards, Executive Member for Housing and Residential Growth

#### **ESC/20/22 Tribute to former Councillor Sue Murphy**

The Chair paid tribute to the important contribution Sue Murphy had made to the city and to the Council. Members and all those present observed a minute's silence in remembrance of Councillor Sue Murphy.

#### **ESC/20/23 Minutes**

##### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2020 as a correct record.

#### **ESC/20/24 Update on activity under COVID19**

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which set out a summary of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of the committee.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- Detailing the overall economic impact of the COVID-19 pandemic both nationally and at a Manchester level;
- Detailing the financial support packages available to residents, workers and businesses in Manchester;
- The impact of the crisis on the various sectors of Manchester's economy and the Councils delivery of Affordable Housing targets in regards to existing and future plans;
- Detailing the consequences of the pandemic on the city's transport and infrastructure ;

- The impact that COVID-19 had already had on the labour market and the unprecedented rise in the number of Manchester working age residents claiming out of work benefits; and
- Recovery planning to support business and sector growth and the response to the rise in unemployment, including a reset of the Our Manchester Strategy.

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

- Thanks and appreciation was to be placed on record to all Officers for the work they had undertaken during the crisis and the preparation of recovery and also to all the key workers across the city in coping with unprecedented levels of uncertainty;
- What work was ongoing in securing sources of funding to support the green economy and what success had been made to date;
- How was the UK's exit from the EU impacting on the ability to secure funding for the Green economy;
- What businesses were entitled to a support grant and what additional support where they in need of;
- How was the Council supporting businesses to look at their business models in light of a potential second wave of the pandemic to ensure they are prepared for its impact;
- Who would be part of the business led Sounding Board;
- With the move to more remote working arrangements for businesses, what impact would this have on office accommodation in the city;
- What support would be offered to ensure the viability of businesses within the culture sector as many businesses were Council funded;
- Did businesses across the whole city and across various sectors receive the bulletin about how to access support, guidance and updates during the COVID-19 pandemic or was this just city centre businesses and where there any gaps in sectors;
- How did city centre hospitality venues know what to ask for in terms of the use of outdoor space and did they know how to ask for it from the Council;
- Was there a risk of job losses resulting in the automation of some services as part of the city's economic recovery and what could be done to mitigate this/upskill the workforce;
- How long could the Council continue to provide financial support to businesses before it faced its own difficult financial decisions and what was being done to ensure businesses were not taking advantage of these schemes;
- Was it known what the support proposed by Intermediate Labour Market solutions to support the city's young people and residents consisted of;
- How would social value be brought into play to respond to the socio-economic challenges of COVID-19;
- What intelligence did the Council have on the potential impact of the business model for rents and properties with the possibility of less people working in the city centre and was consideration being given to alternative rental models;
- How was the Council ensuring a more equitable economy was being created as part of the city's economic recovery that addressed the current inequalities that existed in the employment market;

- What lessons had been learnt about which sectors of the economy were more resilient to economic shocks than others;
- More information was requested on the prospective residential retrofit programme and whether this was a programme of work that would be being out forward by the Council to government for appropriate funding to enable delivery;
- Clarity was sought as to who would be involved in the re-set of the Our Manchester Strategy and how this would be undertaken;
- There was concern in relation to the potential increase in the number of commuters that would park in wards that bordered the city centre to then walk to work; and
- Would tranche two of the Active Travel Fund include an increased focus on cycling provision within neighbourhoods as a means of accessing the city centre.

The Director for City Centre Growth and Infrastructure advised that the Sounding Board would be representative of all sectors across the city, including the cultural sector, and would be used to inform thinking of the next phase of recovery. She advised that there was a move to more smaller scale work space offices, however there was still a demand for office space in the city in order to provide appropriate social distancing measures. This intelligence was coming from direct engagement with business and MIDAS.

The Director of Inclusive Economy explained how businesses qualified for eligibility of the Small Business Rate Relief and the Retail, Leisure and Entertainment Grant and the steps that had been taken to take account of those businesses that did not meet the eligibility criteria but still required financial support. She also explained that in terms of the green economy, it had been built into the Council's recovery plans but it was acknowledged that it would need some substantial government investment to deliver the ambitions. The Leader added that the GMCA had written to the Prime Minister setting out a number of economic asks, including investment in the green economy. Similarly through Core Cities, there had been a general ask made to government identifying sectors where substantial investment was needed in order to create a greener future. The Council was also in the process of putting together a list of "ready to go" schemes to submit separately to government. Following a further question, the Leader provided an overview of the types of schemes that were being proposed.

The Head of Planning and Infrastructure explained that the Council had in the past benefited from European funding and it was intended that the government would replace by a prosperity fund however a formal announcement on this was still being awaited. The Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships commented that a lot of work had been undertaken to support cultural organisations in the city alongside Arts England and a cultural recovery plan was being developed to kick start its recovery.

The Director for City Centre Growth and Infrastructure reported that the Sounding Board would provide data and intelligence around any gaps of support to businesses. It was also reported that Ipsos Mori had been appointed to undertake consultations with businesses within all key sectors in the city to identify any issues. The Council was also talking individually with businesses in the city on the impacts they were

facing. All of this would help develop an economic analysis and strategy to support the recovery of the economy.

The Committee was advised that guidance around the ability to relax some of the requirement for businesses to use outdoor spaces had not yet been made available by the government, so in the absence of this, a multi-agency approach had been adopted by the Council to explore the use of outdoor space, with the aim of this approach to be as flexible as possible, with public safety remaining a priority to enable hospitality businesses to reopen on 4 July 2020.

In terms of the labour market, the technology investment in automation of jobs had not been identified as a consequence of the recovery of the economy, other than the technology needed for businesses to enable their workforce to work from home. What had come to light was digital exclusion and inclusion around lower level learners who had struggled to access online/digital learning.

The Leader assured the Committee that the Council had undertaken proper due diligence when considering all the applications that had been submitted by businesses for grant support. In terms of how long this could last, some funds were revolving which tended to be low equity investment funds which could keep going for a period of time. The support that the Council paid for out of its own revenue budget could only last for a number of months unless substantial additional financial support was provided by government.

The Leader advised that it was expected that people would start using office space differently and there appeared to be continued demand for city centre office space so it wasn't envisaged that there would be detrimental impact on the business model for rents and properties. In terms of inequalities being addressed as part of the recovery phase, he advised that long term structural changes would be required to address these and it was envisaged that through the re-set of the Our Manchester Strategy this would be an area that would be addressed.

The Director of Inclusive Economy provided a brief overview of what Intermediate Labour Market solutions were being considered to support the city's young people and residents. In terms of social value it was reported that young people, over 50's and BAME communities had been worst hit by the impact the pandemic had had on jobs it was these three areas where it was hoped social value within the labour market could meet the needs of these groups.

The Leader advised that the economy of Manchester looked like it was going to be slightly more resilient than other areas of the country in its recovery from the pandemic, in part this was due to its economic divisiveness of the city, with some sectors growing during the pandemic, such as e-commerce.

The Interim Director of Residential Growth and Housing advised that some of the retrofit projects did qualify as programmes of work that would be being out forward by the Council to government for appropriate funding to enable delivery, however he added caution that the scale of retrofit agenda to reach a zero carbon position should not be underestimated and as well as the financial cost to deliver this ambition, there

were a number of practical things that needed to take into consideration, including the size of the workforce required to deliver this and the technical capacity.

The Leader explained how the Our Manchester Strategy was consulted on when it was first conceptualised and advised that whilst the re-set would be done digitally and include the widest cross section of Manchester organisations and residents so that it reflected something the city as a whole bought into.

Finally, it was commented that the criteria for the next phase of the Active Travel Fund was to ensure Manchester residents were kept healthy and safe and enabled Manchester residents to get back to work whilst delivering a maximum benefit for the whole city.

### **Decision**

The Committee note the report.

### **ESC/20/25 Overview Report**

The report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment.

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.



## **Economy Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 23 July 2020**

#### **Present:**

Councillor H Priest (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors Abdullatif, Johns, Noor, Raikes, Shilton Godwin, K Simcock and Stanton

#### **Also present:**

Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader

Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure

**Apologies:** Councillors Green and Hacking

#### **ESC/20/26 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2020 as a correct record

#### **ESC/20/27 Update on COVID-19 activity**

Further to Minute ESC/20/24 (Update on activity under COVID 19), the Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided a further update of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of the Committee.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- An update on the Our Manchester Strategy re-set, which included a proposal for an engagement plan structured around a three tiered approach comprising universal citywide engagement; targeted engagement with key groups; and targeted engagement at a neighbourhood level;
- An update on the economic recovery work structured around the nine sub-workstreams;
- The outcomes and recommendations of the report from THINK, who had been commissioned to develop a detailed labour market analysis and recommendations for potential interventions; and
- An overview of the Chancellor's Summer Statement which was structured around three themes, Supporting Jobs, Protecting Jobs and Creating Jobs.

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

- Clarification was sought on how the Council was gauging the likely long term occupancy levels of businesses going forward as part of the recovery phase and the impact this may have on associated businesses in the city;
- How was the Council communicating with residents on the constraints it faced in terms of "Building Back Better";

- In terms of the recovery of the cultural sector/offer in the city, what role would the Council play in this, including those self-employed;
- As part of the proposed High Street Fund, what was the expectation for Wythenshawe Town Centre;
- What support was to be offered to women in relation to the development of skills and their long term prospects for the workplace;
- How much employment opportunities for Manchester residents would the “shovel ready” projects bring;
- There was concern that the support from Government was short term based which would make it difficult for the Council to plan recovery for the long term;
- How would Councillors scrutinise the Transport Consultant Plan and would City Centre Councillors be able to comment on this Plan;
- How would the Council ensure that the funding it received to assist in the recovery of the City’s economy would be distributed in an equitable way;
- More information was requested on the “We’re Good to Go” kitemark and were there any potential barriers to businesses achieving this;
- Concern was made in relation to the survivability of businesses where advanced bookings did not turn up;
- There would need to be enough capacity to provide the necessary level of support to the labour market recovery to ensure there was equality for all in gaining employment;
- Clarification was sought on how the KickStart Fund would engage with current schemes;
- The COVID19 pandemic had highlighted large short comings in the way the city’s economy operated, specifically around employment opportunities within social care and health;
- There was concern that as the Government’s furlough scheme came to an end, certain families and communities within the city would be impacted by this more than others; and
- Further information was requested on the £10million allocation for unblocking Manchester’s railways.

The Deputy Leader commented that the Council had a strong desire to Build Back Better, with a green infrastructure at the heart of any rebuild, but the reality it faced was a £162million shortfall in its 2021/22 financial year on top of cuts to funding in previous years, and without further financial support from government, any form of rebuilding would be difficult and the need to communicate this with its residents was essential. He added that lobbying for further funding from Government would continue.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) reaffirmed that as the Council did build back, it wanted to do so in a way that focussed on environmental benefits and its 2038 net zero carbon ambition. In terms of the “shovel ready” projects, it was explained that the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government had established a fund, with the Council having made several bids so far and it was hoping for funds to be approved shortly. It was also reported that there would be a real emphasis on local labour opportunities from these projects.



The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure advised that it was important to rebuild and revive the city's cultural sector as it was an intrinsic part of its economy. Steps had been undertaken to work with cultural institutions to address the impact the pandemic had had. Financial support of £71million from Government had been requested to help rebuild Manchester's cultural offer but the Council was still awaiting a response from Government on how it intended on distributing the £1.57billion that had been announced to prevent organisations and businesses across the country's cultural sector folding. It was also clarified that the financial support offered by the Government was for the current financial year only and without further government financial support for local authorities, they would struggle to continue to support the cultural sectors.

The Director of Inclusive Economy advised that the THINK report had picked up on the evidence based intervention that was needed to help the Council lobby Government for support for employment. It was noted that from the current evidence of claimant figures, there was nothing explicit that identified women as struggling to participate in the city's economy but it was agreed that this would be monitored.

In terms of the High Street Fund, it was reported that £488,000 had been provided to Manchester, but this also included some quite challenging stipulations as to how this money could be spent. It was also clarified that Wythenshawe Town Centre would be included in this Fund.

The Director of City Centre Growth explained that following a national survey by Deloitte, it had been identified from most respondents that it would be Autumn when they would prefer staff to begin returning to their places of work but this would be on a hybrid approach of 2 to 3 days a week, which would be a long term approach taken by businesses. It was acknowledged that this would have an impact on the city centre and associated businesses that relied on people being in the city centre and it would only be in the late autumn before a picture around the impact this was having would be able to be drawn to develop an appropriate response.

In terms of the kitemark position, it was reported that 150 businesses across Greater Manchester had downloaded the application form and Marketing Manchester were working to encourage more business to obtain the kitemark.

The Director of Inclusive Economy acknowledged the point made around capacity in supporting the labour market recovery and provided a brief overview of the steps that were currently being taken at regional level. She also noted that social care was an area of growing opportunities for employment within the city and city region as part of the recovery from the COVID19 pandemic.

The Deputy Leader commented that the Greater Manchester Good Employment Charter was a way of influencing employers within the city to look at equalities and provide secure jobs with good wages. Some of the work undertaken before the pandemic was even more important now to make sure areas that were not traditionally covered or left behind were now being included.

It was reported that the Council was still awaiting details as to how the Kick Start Fund was going to be rolled out by government but it was intended to commission

this at a GMCA level akin to the Future Jobs Fund. It was explained that when applying for this funding, employers would need to demonstrate that the funding would fund a new position and not just subsidise an existing position.

In terms of the funding to improve Manchester Railways, it was explained that at the present moment, detail was lacking however, it was intended to improve central Manchester railways. The funding had been given to Network Rail who had identified the Castlefield Corridor as a congested route and funding would possibly go towards feasibility studies as to what long term improvements could be made.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report.
- (2) Supports the recommendations that have been made in the THINK report (appendix 2).

## **ESC/20/28 Overview Report**

The report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment.

## **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

## **Economy Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 3 September 2020**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

Councillor H Priest (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Green, Johns, Noor, Raikes, Shilton Godwin and K Simcock

**Also present:**

Councillor Leese, Leader  
Councillor Richards, Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration

**Apologies:** Councillor Abdullatif, Hacking and Stanton

#### **ESC/20/29 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2020 as a correct record

#### **ESC/20/30 Update on COVID-19 Activity**

Further to Minute ESC/20/27 (Update on activity under COVID 19), the Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided a further update of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of the Committee.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- An economic overview at a national, regional and local level;
- A sectoral impact update, including the impact on footfall within the city, hospitality and visitor economies;
- Planned reopening dates within the cultural sector and the funding needed for Manchester's Cultural recovery plan;
- The closure of Terminal 2 at Manchester Airport and the potential impact this would have on employment in the city;
- The steps needed to stimulate development & investor confidence in the city;
- Work being undertaken with TfGM to agree a broad overall transport plan to support the gradual opening up of the city with a focus on pedestrian movement and safe use of public transport;
- Work being undertaken around Skills, Labour Market and Business Support following on from the THINK report findings; and

- A progress update on the lobbying of government for additional funding.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Concern was expressed with the reduction in residential property sales within the city centre might also be linked to cladding issues not just the impact of the COVID19 crisis;
- The increase in demand for turnover rent from hospitality businesses appeared to be a sensible response to the COVID19 crisis and was the Council engaging with landlords of businesses on this
- Concern was expressed on the dangers of monopolisation of hospitality and leisure businesses due to the impact of COVID19;
- How was the city centre likely to be impacted by the recently announced planning reforms;
- Had any progress been made with support for the city's culture sector, including small venues and freelance performers;
- Where would the capacity come from to enable people to transfer their skills into other areas as the city's economy recovered
- How was Kickstart positioned in the city and who would lead on this;
- Had there been any assessments on quality of life and wellbeing and environmental impact assessments in regards to the number of people now working from home;

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration advised that city centre residential sales had been affected due to the issue of remedial works required to the cladding of a number of buildings. This was an ongoing issue and due to a lack of qualified inspectors, was resulting in the slow certification and sign off for many buildings. Discussions were taking place to see if any partnership arrangements could be put in place to speed up this process.

The Leader commented that there had been a surge in mental health issues in the city which could likely be attributed to the increase in home working and there would be a need for some form of "return to work" for businesses as soon as possible to prevent this increasing further. It was also acknowledged that there was an environmental impact of working from home, and it was commented that as autumn/winter approached, there would be an increase in employees home fuel costs. The larger concern was not whether people were working from home but whether people were working at all as the government furlough scheme came to an end. The Leader also commented that there was a need to address the element of confidence within the city amongst businesses and people.

The Head of Local Planning and Infrastructure/City Policy stated that clarification had been sought from MHCLG on the planning reforms' impact on the ability to control the change of use of offices to residential accommodation. He advised that transition arrangements were being put in place which would mean that the Article 4 direction, previously agreed by the Council, which enabled the change of use of offices to residential accommodation to be controlled, would remain in place until the end of July 2021. A further announcement was expected from Government on any changes to the situation after that date.

The Chief Executive of Home Manchester advised that the Arts Council was managing the funds that government had made available to the country's cultural sectors and a small amount had been made available and allocated for small music venues. A second wave of applications for additional funding that had also been made available had also been submitted, the outcomes of which would be known later in September. In terms of the freelance economy, a number of projects were ongoing to support employment within this area of the cultural sector. It was commented that the biggest challenge facing employment within the sector would be next financial year.

The Director of Inclusive Economy advised that the Government had very recently announced the details of the Kickstart Programme, which would provide paid employment for unemployed 18 to 24 year olds claiming Universal Credit, for a 6 month period. Employers would need to demonstrate that the Kickstart opportunities were new or additional and wouldn't displace an existing job. If the employer had 30 or more opportunities, they applied directly to the DWP and once they had carried out their checks, they would be filled by Job Centre Plus. Where employers had fewer than 30 opportunities, they would be encouraged to work through an intermediary, which could be a business, public body, training organisation or charity and once the intermediary had 30 vacancies they would apply to DWP and receive a small one-off admin fee. On top of the wages, employers would receive £1500 to provide equipment and support to the young person. Councils or Combined Authorities had not been involved in the design of the programme nor did they have a formal role in the delivery other than what opportunities might be provided directly by the City Council or by acting as an intermediary. In response to the question relating to funding and capacity to upskill and reconnect residents to employment opportunities, the Director of Inclusive Economy said that given the likely levels of unemployment, the system currently would lack capacity to respond in a timely way.

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the update.

### **ESC/20/31 Economic recovery narrative for the City**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided an overview of plans to develop an Economic Recovery Plan for the city, as a key part of the Council's forward planning in response to the COVID-19 crisis. The Plan would primarily be directed at government, businesses and investors and set out a clear and detailed narrative on how the city is well-placed to use its strong assets in order to re-establish economic momentum over the next few years.

The report was accompanied with a more detail presentation delivered by Mike Emmerich of Metro-Dynamics and John McCreddie of Ekosgen who had been commissioned to develop the Plan on behalf of the Council.

The key points and themes in the report and presentation included:-

- The plan would focus on the three strategic aims identified in the Our Manchester Strategy and Our Manchester Industrial Strategy- People, Place and Prosperity, and on the priorities of inclusive growth and the foundational economy and our zero carbon commitments;
- The plan would incorporate transformational schemes and key projects under these areas, which would form part of the Council's ask to the Spending Review, highlighting how these could deliver new jobs, homes and leverage further investment.
- The narrative and projects would form a strong proposition to government, providing a clear plan for the city to come out of recession as powerfully and as quickly as it could, by building on its long-term strengths;
- It would reinforce the importance of regional cities such as Manchester as economic engines, particularly highlighting opportunities in the city centre, the Oxford Road Corridor, North Manchester and Airport City.
- There would also be an emphasis on working with distressed businesses as new opportunities emerged; youth skills and encouraging young people to stay in education; graduate re-skilling; apprenticeships schemes; and support for Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic residents and the over-50's who had also been disproportionately impacted by Covid-19; and
- Following feedback from the Committee, the narrative and key project proposals would be further developed for wider discussion. The document would then be finalised in advance of the Comprehensive Spending Review for submission to Government.

The report would also be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 9 September 2020.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- How would the Council seek to unlock funding from government so that the most disadvantaged residents in the city had the opportunities to access the opportunities that were envisaged as part of the Plan;
- It was important to remember the role of district centres and their contribution to the city's economy and there needed to be a continued focus on these centres going forward;
- It would be essential to obtain the necessary funding from government to deliver the ambition of zero carbon retrofitting of the Council's housing stock;
- Clarification was sought as to who was the primary audience for the Plan and what was unique about Manchester's Plan compared to other cities;
- It was commented that our response to the economic crisis needed to set a longer term trajectory in line with the local industrial strategy and Our Manchester Strategy rather than simply trying to get back to where the city was before the impact of COVID19; and
- It was felt that the narrative of the Plan needed to be mindful of the language it used in relation to "rescuing" those within the foundational sector, as the employment opportunities within this sector were also important to the cities recovery.

Mike Emmerich (Metro-Dynamics) commented that work was taking place to identify real distinctive Manchester propositions that delivered opportunities to all

communities across the city. He also acknowledged the point raised around district centres and advised that this would be picked up and incorporated into the Plan. In terms of low carbon and specifically the housing retrofit programme and fleet decarbonisation programme, he advised that these were two principle sources of carbon emissions in the city that the Council could directly affect and the Plan contained robust proposals that would profoundly change carbon emissions and fuel policy around affordable homes.

In terms of the audience of the Plan, it was explained that the principle audience of the Plan was government, as it was government who held a lot of the power to unlocking the ambitions for the city. In relation to what made Manchester's Plan unique it was commented that the Plan would be aligned to the key areas of strength that were unique to Manchester, such as its Science and Innovation sector. It was also closely aligned to the Our Manchester approach and had emphasis on achieving a zero carbon target by 2038.

The Leader noted too, the important role that district centres played in the city's economy. He commented that some of the biggest schemes with the proposals were not city centre or district centre based and emphasised that the city centre accounted for 10% of all jobs in Greater Manchester and the GMSF would identify that the city centre would see over 50% of commercial development across greater Manchester alongside the jobs that would come with this. As such it was important to acknowledge the important role the city centre played. He further commend that the business and investor sectors were of equal importance in terms of the audience for the Plan as without these, the city would not be able to get its economy back on to the correct trajectory.

Chris Oglesby (Chair of the Business Sounding Board), commented that it was essential that the city created satisfying, productive jobs for Manchester residents and this was critical to the Plan being successful, not only in high growth sectors but also the foundational sector of the economy, noting that a lot of the jobs created since the industrialisation of the 1980's had been neither satisfying or sustainable. He felt it would be challenging to get central government to empower the city through formal programmes to do more, as such, it was felt that the challenges the city's economy faced needed to be solved at a local level in partnership between the Council, businesses and education providers.

The Leader supported the point made around the language used in the narrative of the Plan centred around low skilled jobs and commented that there needed to be a system that recognised the value of the contribution that those who worked in these made to the economy.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Requests that as the narrative of the Plan develops, it contains more of a balance between the role of neighbourhoods and district centres in correlation to the City Centre.

- (2) Requests that the narrative is clearer on active travel proposals tied to government initiatives and strategies;
- (3) Requests that the language of resilience is reviewed and taken into consideration especially when referring to the foundational economy;
- (4) Requests that part of the narrative focusses on delivering jobs that are satisfying and sustainable.

### **ESC/20/32 Economy Dashboard**

The Committee considered the most recent Economy Dashboard for 2020

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Could there be comparative data to other major/core cities against the indicators in the dashboard for future reports;
- Was there any update on the extension of completion schedules in some developments and what impact this might have; and
- It was suggested that for future updates connected metrics should be provided

The Research Manager noted the points made around comparative data to other major/core cities and agreed to include this in future dashboards where possible. He also commented that on construction times these were at 90% productivity on sites and work was done to estimate how this affected the development pipeline. He agreed to look to include this in future updates if possible.

### **Decision**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the dashboard; and
- (2) Supports the proposal to move to a more integrated approach to economic monitoring that responds to and better supports emerging priorities

### **ESC/20/33 Housing Revenue Account Delivery model - Northwards ALMO Review**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Executive, which informed Members of the outcome of the recent “due diligence” review of the Arms Length Management Organisation (AMLO), Northwards Housing, undertaken by Campbell Tickell. The report provided a summary of the findings and a proposal to develop a service offer to tenants in light of the findings in order to move to a full consultation and “test of opinion” of tenants and leaseholders to the service being brought in-house.

The main points and themes of the report included:-

- A summary of the rationale for the establishment of Northwards Housing Limited (NHL) in 2005 and its primary objective;
- The current and predicted financial position of the Council’s HRA at the end of the 30-year business plan which was projecting a deficit in excess of £400m.



- The methodology used by Campbell Tickle in undertaking the review of the HRA and Northwards ALMO;
- The main findings from the review, including the current service baseline and challenges to be addressed;
- A summary of the financial and non financial benefits of three options for consideration:-
  - Retention of the ALMO;
  - Return of the Housing service to MCC; or
  - Stock transfer;
- An outline of the next steps in developing the tenants offer, which was a critical part of moving to the test of opinion ballot; and
- An indicative timescale of the next steps should the Executive support the proposal to develop a tenants offer.

The report would also be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 9 September 2020.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Whilst acknowledging the financial savings returning the housing service to the Council would bring, It was not clear what the benefit to tenants would be by bringing the housing stock back into the Council or how they would receive a better service;
- There was no mention in any of the proposals of how the repair contract would be managed;
- It was questioned what the scope of the brief given to Campbell Tickle to undertake the survey was and what qualifications did they hold to undertake the survey;
- There was serious concern that the proposed financial savings by bringing the housing service back into the Council would result in the loss of jobs to Manchester residents;
- What would happen if the tenants did not agree with the proposal to return the housing stock to the Council;
- It was commented that the savings difference between improving the existing service and removing it, which was reported to be £77m, equated to only £45 per property per year over the 30 year business plan and it was felt that this needed to be clear to tenants on the level of impact this saving would have;
- Some Members were not convinced that the interests of the tenants living in Northwards managed properties were paramount in the proposals being put forward; and
- It would be essential not to lose the best elements of the current service provided by Northwards if the management of the housing stock was brought back under the control of the Council.

The Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth advised that the report did not refer to how tenants would benefit from bringing the housing stock back into the Council as this was the next stage of the process. This stage was to validate previous assumptions that had been made that there was substance to the indicative and projected savings to be made and improvements to service. In order to deliver

the aspiration to improve services to tenants, there would need to be a test of opinion to see if there was support for the move of the management of the housing stock and to do this there would need to be an offer presented to tenants of what the service would look like if managed by the Council and how they could be engaged with and influence the service in the future.

He advised that the financial savings of returning the housing stock to the Council would be through various components, including shared back office/corporate core functions, achieving significant economies of scale.

It was reiterated that doing nothing was not an option so If the tenants didn't agree following the test of opinion, then other ways would need to be identified to tackle the financial pressures that the HRA faced.

The Leader commented that he felt there was sufficient evidence to maintain the HRA, improve the level of services and improve the overall neighbourhood management of areas by bringing the housing stock back in control of the Council.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration acknowledged the positive from the survey of Northwards tenants undertaken by Campbell Tickle had identified some areas of concern that needed to be looked at in more detail. She also commented that whilst the Business Plan put forward by Northwards identified savings, the Council had had to use HRA reserves for the last few years in order to balance the budget, so questioned why these savings hadn't been identified previously.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Does not endorse the proposal that the Executive confirm insourcing the service remains the preferred option and the intention to take over direct management of the Housing Service into the Council from 5 July 2021 subject to a "test of opinion" involving all tenants and leaseholders.
- (2) Notes the review concludes that doing nothing is not an option and that there is an opportunity to achieve savings of at least £77m over the 30-year business plan by ending the current arrangements under which the Council's housing stock is managed by Northwards Housing Limited (NHL).
- (3) Notes the proposals contained within the report about how the new council controlled service offer will be developed and how, in future, tenants will be involved and empowered in the decision making about services to homes and communities.

## **ESC/20/34 Overview Report**

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report;
- (2) Agrees the Work Programme as submitted



## **Economy Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 8 October 2020**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

Councillor H Priest (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Abdullatif, Green, Hacking, Johns, Noor, Raikes, Shilton Godwin and Stanton

**Also present:**

Councillor Leese, Leader  
Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills Culture and Leisure  
Councillor Richards, Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration  
Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport

**Apologies:** Councillor K Simcock

#### **ESC/20/35 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 3 September 2020 were approved as a correct record.

#### **ESC/20/36 Proposed Planning Reforms, Local Plan and Greater Manchester Spatial Framework**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing, which informed Members of the proposed response to the Planning White Paper, published for consultation by the Government which closed on 29 October 2020. It also included the response to the Government consultation on “changes to the current planning system” which required a response by 1 October. The report also covered the recent changes to the permitted development rights regime, and concluded with an update on the emerging Local Plan for Manchester and the next steps for the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF).

The main points and themes of the report included:-

- A summary of the proposed planning reforms and the significant challenges these would bring to how the Council used the planning system to enable and deliver key outcomes for the city including economic and sustainable growth, jobs and new homes;
- An overview of the key matters for consideration in the Council’s response to questions posed in the Planning White Paper;

- A summary of the proposed changes to permitted development and use class changes and how this might impact on manage the quantum and mix of development in key parts of the City;
- The next steps associated with the development of the Local Plan, which included consultation on a Scoping Report for the Integrated Assessment; analysis and further commissioning of key elements of an evidence base and development of a draft Local Plan;
- The GMSF was reaching an important stage with a final publication version of the plan due to be consulted on from early November until 31 December 2020; and
- The plan was then intended to be submitted for examination in summer 2021, with the Council's Executive being considering a report on 14 October 2020 recommending approval of the Publication consultation.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- There was concern that the proposals within the Government White Paper would remove the ability for local people to shape the place in where they lived;
- The proposals failed to address the issues Manchester faced in relation to planning and they would not help Manchester deliver its affordable homes strategy;
- There was concern in relation to the proposal to increase the further digitalisation of both local plan and development management processes;
- There was also concern about the proposal to introduce a fast-track for beauty through changes to national policy and legislation;
- There was concern that proposals to set some policy targets at a national level rather than at a local level could have a negative impact on Manchester to deliver its net zero carbon development target by 2028;
- Further clarity was needed on what the prior approval process proposals in regards to permitted development would mean;
- The driving principle of the Council's response to the White Paper should be centred around the fact that the proposals would diminish the opportunity for locally distinctive policies that reflect specific local conditions and drive the Council's priorities;
- There was a lack of detail in the White Paper around how the proposals would address climate change;
- There was concern that the proposal to outsource Listed Building consent would have a negative impact on the Council's enforcement powers;
- It was felt that the response around the class order change relating to the conversion of office space to residential space could be strengthened;
- The proposals were a threat to the Council's ability to achieve its priorities for the city and to local democracy and Government was misunderstanding what was slowing down house building in the country;
- There was concern around the impact to fire safety in light of the proposals within the White Paper;
- It was heartening to see the views of local residents as to how they would like to see Manchester develop as part of the Issues consultation of the Local Plan, however was the level of responses received been enough to give the process legitimacy;

- There was concern about the proposal to compress some of the later stages of the Local Plan in order to allow the Plan to be adopted in 2023; and
- How was the Council proposing to act on TFGM's response to the Issues consultation in relation to public transport and zero carbon targets

The Committee was advised that Government felt by setting a number of policies at a national level would reduce the duplication of these across numerous local authorities. However it was commented that this ignored the need to acknowledge the distinctiveness of local areas, such as Manchester.

The Director of Planning supported all the concerns that had been raised by the Committee, noting specifically the difficulty the Council would face in trying to deliver its Zero Carbon target if these targets were set nationally and those around the ability to locally determine fire safety requirements in developments. In terms of prior approvals, this was already in place for particular developments, and allowed developers and applicants to submit proposals for assessment, however, the Council was limited in refusing these developments at present. She agreed that further detail was needed from Government on how the proposal to outsource building consent work in regards to enforcement powers that the Council currently had available.

The Committee was advised that Government had already introduced measures around class order changes, however there was a legal challenge taking place brought by a number of civic societies against the introduction of these orders. The Council was awaiting the outcome of this challenge before it determined what response it might need to take.

It was reported that the Council wished to press on with the local plan within the current legislative framework whilst acknowledging the risk should the proposals within the White Paper be adopted wholesale and the impact of these on the Local Plan. It was commented that transitional arrangements would be put in place which should result in Manchester adopting a Local Plan that it wanted which would then mean any future review would need to be undertaken under any new legislative framework

The Committee was advised that the level of responses to the Issues Consultation on the Local Plan was in line with similar consultations around the Core Strategy at a similar stage. It was explained that there had been quite a significant response to the Our Manchester Strategy re-set which covered similar issues so Officers were liaising with colleagues on these responses to help feed into the Local Plan consultation.

Officers acknowledged that the response from TFGM was a key response and they were working closely with colleagues on transport issues. One aspect that would be brought forward would be a refresh of the Transport Strategy 2040 and a local implementation plan, picking up key local transport streams outside of the city centre.

## **Decision**

The Committee:-

- (1) Supports the Council's draft response to the Government White Paper.

- (2) Requests that the Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport and Officers take on board the comments made by Committee Members to strengthen areas of the response were appropriate.
- (3) Notes the updates on the emerging Local Plan for Manchester and the next steps for the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF).

### **ESC/20/37 Economic Recovery of the City's Cultural Sector**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships and Director of Culture (Home Manchester), which provided an overview of the impact of COVID on the City's cultural sector, outlined access to local and national financial support for the sector and the gaps identified in the assistance needed for the cultural economy.

Key points and themes in the report included:-

- The sector faced unprecedented challenges as one of the last industries able to reopen on a financially viable basis;
- The industry was reliant on a highly-skilled, flexible but vulnerable freelance workforce that had been severely impacted by a loss of business;
- A Manchester Culture Recovery Plan had been developed with a wide range of partners and stakeholders and a COVID Culture Recovery Board had been established to lead the city's response to the pandemic and aid the sector's recovery;
- Cultural partners had responded creatively to the crisis with many seeking new and digital solutions to engaging audiences and participants;
- There were a number of initiatives to assist businesses, support freelancers and deliver reopening strategies at a local and national level;
- Emergency assistance had been made available by Arts Council England and the Government had put in place a Culture Sector Recovery Fund for England; and
- There was evidence that the current level and means of support available would be insufficient to sustain the sector for the duration of the continued period business disruption.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- The Cultural sector had a foundational importance to the future of the city in its ability to shape the identity of Manchester and ability to attract and retain people;
- It was pleasing to see in the request for support from Government that this included support for individual freelancers and sub-contractors;
- Without significant government support to sustain this industry there was a real risk that the city would not be able to sustain the industry;
- It needed to be recognised by Government that Manchester's cultural sector had been struggling pre-COVID due to the years of cuts in public funding streams and the redirection of funding to schemes in London;
- Inclusivity of the sector need to be looked at as part of the recovery plan;
- What consideration, if any, had been given to the use of empty assets within the sector;



- There was concern about the loss of smaller cultural venues that had happened during COVID and what landscape was needed to be created to allow new venues to emerge and have a chance of surviving;
- Consideration needed to be given to broadcast media, including radio, as part of the recovery plan;
- Was there any thinking around how greater security and stability could be afforded to those freelance jobs within the cultural sector; and
- Government needed to recognise the high quality provision of skills and training that Manchester provided for those wanting to or already working in the cultural sector.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure advised that it was paramount that Manchester and other Core Cities approached government as one voice when making the case for funding. He also acknowledged the difficulty the sector had faced resulting from the removal of funding streams which in turn, had made the sector move to an income generation model which had been severely impacted by the restrictions brought about by COVID.

The Committee was advised that it was testament to the prudent financial management and good governance of cultural organisations that Manchester had not seen a more severe impact to the sector. Many organisations were now however, seeking cultural emergency funding to help support them to the end of March 2021 and the concern was how these organisations would survive past March 2021 if the restrictions related to COVID were still in place.

The Strategic Lead Policy and Partnership commented that a working group of UK Core Cities was being established with representatives of northern core cities to lobby government on the support needed around the hospitality, leisure and culture sectors.

The Committee was informed that an emerging cultural workspace plan was in development as it was acknowledged that property prices would have an impact on the ability of creative practitioners to find affordable workspaces and there would be a need to be live to the needs of grass roots venues to try and support them appropriately.

The Executive Member for Skills Culture and Leisure supported the point made around the need to provide greater security and stability for those working in freelance roles within the cultural sector. It was commented that the crisis had highlighted how valuable the creative ecology of freelancers and artists was to the city and cultural offer and how precarious and vulnerable those individuals were.

The Director of Inclusive Economy concurred with the point made around the need to recognise the high quality provision of skills and training that Manchester provided for those wanting to or already working in the cultural sector and alerted Members to what further provision was being made.

## **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

## **ESC/20/38 Update on COVID-19 Activity**

Further to Minute ESC/20/30 (Update on activity under COVID 19), the Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided a further update of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of the Committee.

The key points and themes included:-

- An economic overview at a national, regional and local level;
- A sectoral impact update, including the impact on footfall within the city, hospitality and visitor economies, aviation and universities;
- The steps needed to stimulate development & investor confidence in the city;
- Work being undertaken with TfGM to agree a broad overall transport plan to support the gradual opening up of the city with a focus on pedestrian movement and safe use of public transport;
- Work being undertaken around Skills, Labour Market and Business Support following on from the THINK report findings; and
- A progress update on the lobbying of government for additional funding.

The Leader also provided a verbal update on the most recent developments since the publication of the report.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Had there been an increase in footfall in some areas compared to others and was this as a result of displacement from the city centre;
- Was there any more detail on Kickstart and Jets and how these programmes would integrate;
- Was there any information on whether Manchester or Greater Manchester was going to apply to the Public Sector Decarbonisation Fund and if so what would be applied for.

The Director of Inclusive Economy advised Kickstart was not going to be locally designed or delivered but work had been undertaken with GM colleagues on what our approach and outcomes might be. The Council was committed to providing at least 30 Kickstart opportunities across the Council and where possible lining those up where there was turnover or apprenticeship vacancies. The Council had also started conversations with businesses around the use of Kickstart but further work was needed on this. Jet was a re-announcement of the chancellors Summer Statement for additional funding for those furthest from the labour market which would result in an additional £13m across GM delivered through the working well programme.

The Committee was advised that footfall increases likely related to the number of students that had returned to the city in Fallowfield, Withington and Rusholme wards.

The Strategic Lead – Policy and Partnership advised that Manchester intended to join the GM consortium bid for the Public Sector Decarbonisation fund with a bid being

submitted later in the year. A further update could be provided to Members closer to the time if required.

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the update.

### **ESC/20/39 Overview Report**

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

### **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report; and
- (2) Agrees the Work Programme as submitted.



## **Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2020**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Hacking - In the Chair  
Councillors Andrews, Chambers, M Dar, Doswell, Douglas, Grimshaw, Hitchen, Kirkpatrick, Rawlins and Rawson

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing  
Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader  
Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure

#### **CESC/20/23            Councillor Sue Murphy**

The Chair paid tribute to Councillor Sue Murphy, who had recently passed away, and the Committee paused to reflect on her life.

#### **CESC/20/24            Minutes**

Councillor Doswell requested that her apologies be recorded in the minutes for the 5 March meeting, to which the Chair agreed.

#### **Decisions**

1. To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2020 as a correct record, subject to the above amendment.
2. To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 11 March 2020 as a correct record.

#### **CESC/20/25            COVID-19 - Update**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided a brief summary of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the Committee's remit.

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

- Public health;
- Financial impact on the Council;
- Response and planning ahead for the recovery;
- The reset of the Our Manchester Strategy;

- Support to residents who were at risk during the pandemic;
- Update on the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector;
- Community safety;
- Parks, Leisure and Events;
- Libraries, Galleries and Culture; and
- Equality, diversity and inclusion.

The Chair thanked Council staff, partner organisations, charities and community groups for their work during this difficult time. The three Executive Members in attendance highlighted the work in their areas including the establishment of the Manchester Community Response Hub to support vulnerable residents with COVID-19 related issues, the work to enable emergency food provision from New Smithfield Market and the work of other teams across the Council, including the Anti-Social Behaviour Team, Cemeteries and Parks and thanked the officers involved. A Member also highlighted the work of the faith sector during this time and another Member praised the role of the We Love Manchester charity and Forever Manchester.

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

- To recognise that Manchester had led the way in testing people leaving hospital and going into care homes;
- That those accessing support and emergency food provision included people who needed help because they were shielding for medical reasons but also people experiencing food poverty, who could require longer term support from other services;
- Concern about what would happen if there was a second wave of the virus and the financial implications for the Council;
- Digital exclusion, including how the Council was communicating with people who did not have internet access;
- Challenges for the VCSE sector, including additional costs such as Personal Protective Equipment (PPE), additional cleaning, hand sanitisers and signage and volunteers who were medically vulnerable and might not want to return to their volunteering roles due to the risk of infection;
- The Council and Greater Manchester Police (GMP)'s strategy for dealing with breaches of lockdown;
- Plans to re-open libraries and Manchester Art Gallery;
- The temporary closure of leisure centres, including the financial implications of this;
- The letter sent to the Secretary of State raising issues about the recovery of the culture sector in Manchester; and
- The race review of the Council's workforce.

The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing confirmed that the level of infections was being closely tracked and that planning was taking place for a range of scenarios, including a second wave or ebbs and flows in virus transmission. She emphasised the financial consequences the Council was facing due to the pandemic and the importance of the national government providing the promised funding to local councils. She recognised that the people accessing emergency food provision

included different groups with different needs and reported that officers were ringing people in receipt of this to find out the reasons they were accessing it and to refer them to appropriate support. She advised the Committee that discussions were taking place with a range of partners about how to support those experiencing financial hardship and food poverty and that more information could be provided at a later date as this progressed. The Head of Neighbourhoods reported that a working group had been established to progress this.

The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing advised Members that the Council had recognised that some of the people who were vulnerable to COVID-19 might not have internet access and so had written to people and introduced the Community Response Hub telephone helpline. She reported that the Test and Trace service would also contact people who might have been exposed to the virus by telephone or letter. The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure reported that some face-to-face services could not be offered during lockdown but that, as the Council moved into the recovery period, services would again become accessible through a range of methods. He suggested that the Committee might want to look at digital exclusion at a future meeting, noting that it related to all Council services, not just Leisure Services and Libraries.

The Programme Lead (Our Manchester Funds) reported that there were many volunteers who were older and at greater risk from COVID-19 but there had also been a lot of students and other people who had offered to volunteer. He advised that the challenge was to organise this and match people wanting to volunteer with volunteering opportunities, utilising the Volunteer Centre and MCRVIP (Manchester Volunteer Inspire Programme). He reported that some organisations had managed to obtain small emergency grants to help cover the additional costs related to COVID-19 and that the option of bulk-buying PPE for distribution to VCSE organisations was being looked into. He also informed the Committee that Macc, the organisation that was delivering the VCSE infrastructure contract, was providing support and guidance to VCSE groups across the city.

The Head of Neighbourhoods reported that the Council's Neighbourhood Teams had been contacting local voluntary and community groups to get an understanding of the challenges they were experiencing and that, while financial challenges had been the main issue which had arisen initially, there were also concerns that some medically vulnerable volunteers would not want to continue volunteering and officers were looking at how MCRVIP could help to fill those gaps.

The Deputy Leader reported that GMP's response to breaches of lockdown varied depending on the circumstances of the case, advising Members that GMP had finite resources which needed to be deployed effectively, while not exacerbating a situation.

The Head of Libraries, Galleries and Culture reported that national guidance for museums and galleries had just been released and that the service was planning for a safe, controlled re-opening of Manchester Art Gallery in mid-August, with a one-way system in place. He reported that, following discussions with the trade unions and the Health and Safety Team, some libraries would be re-opening on the 4 July 2020 as the start of a phased re-opening of libraries across the city; however, he advised that they would not be returning to their normal operation, although people

would be able to borrow books and use the computers. A Member who was also the Lead Member for Disability advised that it was important to ensure that any new ways of operating, such as one way systems, were accessible for all customers and that she was happy to be involved in work on this.

The Head of Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events reported that leisure operators across the country were reliant on income from customers to meet their costs and, during lockdown, were seeking financial support from the local authority to cover their fixed costs, noting that Manchester had been providing this financial support to its leisure operator, GLL. He informed Members that the Council had been working closely with Sport England, UK Active and the Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport to ensure that councils were reimbursed this money and that there was ongoing financial support for leisure providers during the recovery phase.

The Chair informed the Committee that discussions had been taking place about scrutiny of the race review of the Council's workforce and which Committee should consider this and that he would pursue this further outside of the meeting.

### **Decisions**

1. To request further information on MCRVIP in a future report at an appropriate time, including inviting people who had participated in the programme to attend.
2. To request that a copy of the letter sent to the Secretary of State raising issues about the recovery of the culture sector in Manchester be circulated to Members of the Committee and that any response also be circulated.
3. To note that the Chair will discuss outside of the meeting how the race review of the Council's workforce will be scrutinised.

[Councillor Hitchen declared a personal interest as a trustee of the We Love Manchester charity.]

### **CESC/20/26 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 requested an update on the proposed Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) around an abortion-providing clinic. The City Solicitor advised that she would send an email to the Members of the Committee once she had more information.

### **Decisions**

1. To note the report.



2. To request that the City Solicitor provide Members with an update on the proposed PSPO around an abortion-providing clinic.



## **Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2020**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Rawlins - In the Chair  
Councillors Andrews, Collins, M Dar, Doswell, Douglas, Hitchen, Kirkpatrick and Rawson

#### **Also present:**

Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader  
Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods  
Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing  
Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure  
Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport

#### **Apologies:**

Councillors Grimshaw and Hacking

#### **CEC/20/27            Chair**

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

#### **Decision**

To appoint Councillor Rawlins as Chair for the meeting.

#### **CEC/20/28            Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 25 June 2020 as a correct record.

#### **CEC/20/29            Update on COVID-19 Activity**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided a further update summary of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of the Committee.

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

- the impact and challenges relating to residents at risk, community resilience and equality and inclusion;
- Key planning and recovery activity being undertaken in relation to these areas; and
- the residents and communities workstream which aimed to enable residents and communities affected by COVID-19 to live independent and fulfilling lives.

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

- Support for the approximately 2200 Manchester residents who had been receiving a food box from the national government scheme, but not local food support, when the national scheme was paused on 31 July 2020, including communication with the affected people, whether the Council had capacity to support them and whether there was any ward-level data on the number of residents affected by this and the number of people receiving support who were medically vulnerable rather than financially vulnerable;
- How domestic abuse victims could seek help and children affected by domestic abuse could receive support during lockdown;
- Request for more information on the Sanctuary Scheme;
- Digital exclusion and work to address this;
- What the definition of most vulnerable should be in the Our Manchester Strategy and that the Committee might want to consider this more at a future meeting;
- The valuable role of volunteers during the pandemic and how this could be recognised;
- Whether services had been resumed to residents who had previously been able to have library books delivered to their home;
- What measures were being put in place to ensure that play areas in parks could safely re-open;
- The re-opening of leisure centres and whether changes such as classes only being available at some leisure centres could have a greater impact on people with some protected characteristics;
- Summer youth provision;
- the Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector, including areas that the Committee would like to consider in a future report; and
- How COVID-19 was impacting differently on different groups.

The Head of Work and Skills assured the Committee of the Council's capacity to cope with additional demand from residents who had previously received support through the national government scheme. The Head of Neighbourhoods reported that the national government had already written to the affected people a few weeks ago and the Council was now following this up with a letter reiterating the support available locally. She advised Members that GPs had also been contacting their patients who were affected by this. The Head of Work and Skills reported that the Council had been mapping levels of need for food support across the city and had a good understanding of this. The Head of Neighbourhoods confirmed that the Council also had data on the number of medically-shielding people per ward and that work was currently taking place to map this against other datasets to get a better understanding of the situation and that this could be shared at a later date.

The Domestic Abuse Reduction Manager reported that during lockdown schools had continued to be notified of reports of domestic abuse affecting their pupils so that they could provide additional checks and support. She advised that, as in previous years, these notifications and support via the school's Safeguarding Lead would continue during the summer holidays. The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) reported that the Council's targeted summer play offer would be available to some children who were affected by domestic abuse, although she recognised that there would be other children affected by domestic abuse which the Council was not aware of.

The Domestic Abuse Reduction Manager reported that the Sanctuary Scheme, operated by the Independent Domestic Violence Advisory Service, was available to private tenants, owner-occupiers and tenants whose housing providers did not have a similar scheme and that it installed security measures in the homes of those affected by domestic abuse. She informed Members that the messaging in relation to domestic abuse support had been reviewed in light of the lockdown to inform victims that services were still available to them and could be accessed by phone or online. She advised the Committee that her service had also been training universal services on how to identify domestic abuse and safely communicate with victims.

The Deputy Leader informed the Committee that the Council was looking at how the work of volunteers during the pandemic could be properly recognised. He also highlighted that the Lord Mayor had carried out virtual drop-ins to voluntary groups and that the High Sheriff and the Queen's Representative in Manchester had written letters of thanks to organisations.

The Head of Libraries, Galleries and Culture informed Members that the home delivery of library books had been resumed in mid-June for people who had their own front door and that the service was looking to expand this offer in the coming months.

The Head of Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events advised Members that strict guidelines for re-opening play areas had been set by the relevant governing body working closely with the national government. He informed the Committee that not all play areas had re-opened yet as the Council wanted to ensure that the right measures were in place first but the plan was to have all play areas safely re-opened before the end of the month with appropriate measures in place, such as sanitisers and signs about how to safely use the play area.

The Head of Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events reported that it was expected that only about 40% to 50% of leisure centre users would want to return within the next month, which would have a major effect on income, but that the Council was lobbying the national government for additional money to help cover these losses. He advised that, if it was left to market forces, it was likely that only leisure centres in areas of high demand would be re-opened; however, he reported that the Council was undertaking an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) to make sure that there was as much coverage across the city as possible and that a range of activities were available which met the needs of people with different protected characteristics, while being mindful of financial viability and the current COVID-19 guidelines. The Chair welcomed the service's use of EIAs to inform its decision-making. She requested that a future report on Equalities include information on how the different Directorates

across the Council were using EIAs, for example in relation to COVID-19 recovery work.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure advised that he had circulated information on youth provision to all Members but that he would re-circulate this.

The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing reported that the Health Scrutiny Committee had been looking at health and inequalities, including in relation to COVID-19. She advised that there were three different pieces of work currently taking place in relation to equalities: one on the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on particular communities, another on work to address longer-term structural inequalities (primarily relating to health but connected to wealth) and a broader piece of work on equalities and inclusion led by the Equalities, Diversity and Inclusion Team. She reported that the Health Scrutiny Committee was interested in further scrutinising inequalities in relation to COVID-19, possibly in conjunction with the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee. The Chair advised that she would ask the Committee's regular Chair, Councillor Hacking, to discuss this with the Chair of the Health Scrutiny Committee.

In response to a question from the Chair on data-gathering and engagement with residents, the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) advised Members that engagement with residents was a key element of the refresh of the Our Manchester Strategy, which had been referred to in the report considered at the Committee's 25 June meeting.

## Decisions

1. To request a report on Domestic Abuse including details of the Sanctuary Scheme and the number of security installations carried out and information on how many families fleeing domestic abuse had been housed outside of the city and why.
2. To request a report on digital exclusion including how this varies across different parts of the city.
3. To note that the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure will re-circulate the information on youth provision to all Members.
4. To request a report on the VCSE sector, including what support the infrastructure support services are providing, whether this has changed during the pandemic and whether they will continue to work differently to meet the changing needs of VCSE groups. To also look at equalities monitoring of groups which are being funded and groups which are closing down or are otherwise impacted by COVID-19. To consider in a future report what is being done to ensure that groups which are funded are carrying out work which meets the Council's priorities.
5. To ask that the Chair speak to the Chair of the Health Scrutiny Committee about how the issue of COVID-19 and inequalities will be scrutinised.

6. To request that a future report on Equalities include information on how the different Directorates across the Council are using EIAs, for example in relation to COVID-19 recovery work.
7. To consider engagement with residents at a future meeting.

### **CESC/20/30            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.

### **Decision**

To note the report.





## **Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 3 September 2020**

**This Scrutiny meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:**

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

**Also present:**

Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader  
Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure  
Councillor Davies, Ward Councillor for Deansgate

**Apologies:**

Councillors Douglas and Rawlins

**CESC/20/31            Minutes**

**Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2020 as a correct record.

**CESC/20/32            Peterloo Memorial**

The Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure informed the Committee that a number of permanent options had been considered to make the Peterloo Memorial fully accessible to all disabled people, including a lift, a bridge and different designs of ramp. She advised Members that these options had been assessed by the Design Team, working with the access campaign group, but none of the options had proved viable, due to the constraints of the site and the geometry of the Memorial. She reported that discussions were now taking place about exploring a temporary ramp solution.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure acknowledged that mistakes had been made which had resulted in the Memorial not being fully accessible. He reported that the Council had spent 12 months working to try to find a permanent solution, in consultation with the access campaign group, but had not been able to find one. He advised the Committee that a temporary ramp was now being considered which could be in place around the date of the anniversary of the Peterloo Massacre every year. He informed the Committee that the next steps were to communicate further with the access campaign group and hold a public meeting to discuss the options that had been explored, why they were not feasible and the proposals for a temporary ramp. He advised Members that the Memorial had not been used for protests or as a speakers' corner, as had been envisaged, as events

like that tended to take place in Albert Square, St Peters Square or Piccadilly Gardens and that very few people were climbing onto the Memorial. He reported that lessons had been learnt, that considerations about accessibility had been central in the design process for the Memorial to the victims of the Manchester Arena terrorist attack from the start and that this was the approach that would be taken for any future monuments.

The Chair reiterated the Committee's commitment to the Memorial being accessible to all people. He stated that the Committee had previously requested that the options for making the Memorial accessible be reviewed, that planning processes being reviewed to ensure that accessibility issues were identified and addressed at an earlier stage and that a public meeting take place, with an independent chair, so that interested parties could explore the options that had been put forward. He reported that the public meeting had not yet taken place, noting the challenges presented by the ongoing pandemic, but that his view was that this meeting should now be arranged. He advised that consideration would need to be given to holding this meeting virtually.

The Ward Councillor for Deansgate highlighted that Ward Councillors had raised the issue of accessibility at an earlier stage in the process; however, she acknowledged that lessons had since been learnt. She advised Members that accessibility needed to be embedded in the planning process more widely, not just for monuments. She reported that the Memorial had been used for a protest on the anniversary of the Massacre. A Member commented that a number of protest groups within the city had decided not to use the Memorial for protests at present in solidarity with disabled people who were not able to use it.

The Ward Councillor for Deansgate suggested that the Committee request a report on what options had been considered, what the obstacles were, who had been consulted and any alternative views so that officers' conclusions could be interrogated.

The Chair proposed that officers proceed with the rest of the agreed process, including the public meeting, and that the Committee then receive a report at a future meeting, where Members could review what had taken place and hear the views of those involved, including the accessibility campaigners. He expressed thanks to the groups involved for their co-operation in working with the Council to try to find a solution.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure offered to circulate a note to Members outlining the work that had taken place to look for a solution, to which the Chair agreed. He acknowledged the Ward Councillor's comment about a protest having taken place on the Memorial on the anniversary of the Massacre and highlighted the proposal to put a temporary ramp in place around this date.

In response to a question from a Member on timescales for the rest of the process, the Chair advised that he would speak to the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure and other stakeholders about when the public meeting could take place and stated that his view was that it should take place as soon as was feasible. He advised that he would feed back to the disability access campaigners what had been

discussed at this meeting. He also requested a short report to the Committee's October or November meeting outlining progress made since today's meeting.

### **Decisions**

1. To ask the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure to circulate a note to Members which outlines the work that has taken place to find a solution to the accessibility issues relating to the Memorial.
2. To request a short report to the Committee's October or November meeting on the progress made since this meeting.

### **CESC/20/33 Proposed Public Spaces Protection Order Wynnstay Grove**

The Committee received a report of the Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety which provided an update on the outcome of the consultation for the proposed Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) for Wynnstay Grove.

The Deputy Leader and officers referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:

- Background;
- Evidence of issues of concern;
- Impact of the behaviour;
- Action taken to address the issues reported;
- The consultation and the responses;
- Consideration of the articles for a PSPO;
- Human rights and equality considerations;
- The proposed PSPO;
- Enforcement; and
- Next steps.

In response to a Member's question on timescales, the Deputy Leader stated that he would want the PSPO to be implemented as soon as possible. He highlighted that action was already being taken by Council officers and Greater Manchester Police (GMP) to address anti-social behaviour around the clinic but that the PSPO would be an additional piece of legislation which would assist with this. The Community Safety Lead advised that, following the six-week period in which an appeal could be made, there would be a period of educating those affected by the PSPO on the prohibitions, requirements and consequences of a breach before it was enforced. The Deputy Leader informed the Committee that officers would still be working to address the prohibited activities during this period and move people on but that the penalties laid out in the PSPO would not be used during this education period.

Members commented that it appeared that a robust process had taken place. The Chair welcomed that an Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) had been carried out. Another Member welcomed the proposed PSPO, advising that a similar PSPO in Ealing, London had been successful in addressing the issues there.

In response to a Member's question, the Community Safety Lead confirmed that the area covered by the proposed PSPO included the bus stops on Wilmslow Road which some of the people attending the clinic would be using.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **CESC/20/34 Update on COVID-19**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided a further update summary of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of this Committee.

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

- the impact and challenges relating to residents at risk, community resilience and equality and inclusion; and
- Key planning and recovery activity being undertaken in relation to these areas.

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

- The uptake of local welfare assistance for unpaid carers;
- Support for victims of domestic abuse, including refuge accommodation and safe rooms; and
- Work to address Digital Exclusion.

The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) advised Members that she would speak to the Director of Customer Services & Transaction regarding the strategy for increasing the uptake of local welfare assistance for unpaid carers. She reported that a lot of work was taking place to address digital exclusion, through work being led by the Director of Inclusive Growth and also through the Library Service. She offered to provide Members with additional information on this after the meeting. The Chair advised that the Committee had a report on Digital Inclusion on the work programme, due to be scheduled for a future meeting.

The Chair reported that the Committee also had an item on Domestic Abuse on its work programme and suggested that this could be discussed further under the Overview Report item on the agenda. The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) advised Members that she would ensure that this report included information on safe rooms. She reported that the availability of refuge accommodation was being monitored on a daily basis and would be considered as part of the refresh of the Domestic Violence Strategy. In response to a question from the Chair, she advised that a full report on Domestic Abuse could be provided to the Committee's November meeting but that she would ask the Domestic Abuse Reduction Manager to provide some information in response to Members' questions in the interim.

In response to a Member's question on food support, the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) reported that work was taking place to help people who had been

reliant on food parcels during the COVID-19 pandemic to access food in a different way and she asked the Member to contact her and the Director of Inclusive Growth if she had any particular concerns relating to her ward. Another Member praised the work of staff who had worked in the food hub at New Smithfield Depot and at local food banks to ensure that residents had access to food during this time. The Chair asked the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) to pass on the Committee's thanks to staff and partners for their work during this challenging time.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **CESC/20/35          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 recommended that the Committee receive the reports on Domestic Abuse and Digital Inclusion at its November meeting.

A Member reported that the Independent Race Review had been considered at the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee (RAGSC) meeting on 1 September 2020 but that some elements of the Review fell within the remit of this Committee. He questioned whether this should be included as part of the Equalities item on the agenda for next month's meeting or whether it should be a separate item. The Chair stated that he would discuss with the Chair of RAGSC which aspects of the Review each Committee was looking at. The City Solicitor advised Members that, while this Committee should not duplicate the work of the RAGSC, there were some elements of the Review which were not workforce-related. She suggested that the presentation slides from the RAGSC's meeting be circulated to Members of this Committee and that Members might find it useful to watch the webcast of the RAGSC's meeting on 1 September 2020 to hear the contributions of the presenting officers. The Chair advised the Committee that he would speak to the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods regarding whether to consider the Independent Race Review as part of the Equalities item or as a separate report.

### **Decision**

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

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Audit Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 28 July 2020**

**This Audit Committee meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Ahmed Ali - In the Chair  
Councillors Clay, Lanchbury, Russell, Stanton and Watson  
Independent Co-opted member: Dr S Downs

#### **Also Present:**

Karen Murray, Mazars (External Auditor)  
Alastair Newall, Mazars (External Auditor)

**Apologies:** Dr Barker, Independent Co-opted member

#### **AC/20/12     Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2020 as a correct record.

#### **AC/20/13     Audit Progress Report**

The Committee considered the report of the Council's external auditors Mazars that provided an update on progress in delivering its responsibilities to the Council.

The Committee was informed that changes had been implemented since the start of the Covid19 pandemic with the introduction of remote working for both council audit staff and external audit staff. In addition the MHCLG had introduced changes to the timetable to complete the audit for 2019/20 by the end of November 2020. The audit of the draft accounts was commencing. The report also provided information on the progress of the audit and made reference to National Publications that may be of interest to the Committee relating to its governance role.

The Committee was informed on matters relating to impact of the pandemic on valuation of financial pension fund assets and uncertainty around the valuation of the Council's Property, Plant and Equipment, particularly where that valuation is based on market conditions. It was highlighted that the Council's valuer has reported that they did consider that there will be a material impact on the valuations for 2019/20. From the list of National Publications in the report the Committee was informed that a report would be submitted to a future meeting to reflect the impact of the changes resulting from the new National Audit Office Code of Practice.

It was reported that the audit of accounts would be completed before the November 2020 deadline.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member referred to the impact of Covid19 on the deadline for the audit and other areas such as the value of property, plant and equipment. The Committee was informed that Covid19 had delayed the deadline for the audit and it was anticipated that there would be an impact on future valuations.

## **Decisions**

The Committee noted the report and comments made.

### **AC/20/14 Treasury Management Outturn Report 2019-20**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer providing details of Treasury Management activities of the Council during 2019-20. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer introduced the report and provided an update regarding:

- Housing Investment Fund and the transfer to the GMCA;
- The Council's limited borrowing activities during the year;
- The Council's use of internal borrowing and holding short term cash and achieving a good rate;
- Short term borrowing in view of the current climate;
- The Council's submission as part of a consultation on the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB).

Thanks were given to the Treasury Management Team for its continued good work in view of the impact of the Covid19 pandemic.

## **Decision**

The Committee noted the report.

### **AC/20/15 Annual Accounts 2019/20**

The report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer was submitted 2019/20 Annual Accounts, which have been signed by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer.

The City Treasurer introduced the report and informed the meeting that the accounts were in a relatively strong financial position with a small overspend identified, strong balance sheet and reserves. Following Covid19 and the lockdown, work had been undertaken by staff remotely to produce the accounts and their work in producing the accounts in such challenging circumstances was recognised. The group accounts had been delayed and circulated prior to the meeting.



The Committee received a presentation from the Deputy City Treasurer which provided:

- An accounts timetable which included public inspection until 10 September and audited accounts to the and the completion of the audit of the accounts by the end of November 2020.
- A Narrative Report providing details on the performance of the Council's strategic objectives.
- Net Revenue Budget 2019/20 – net revenue budget compared to outturn and key reasons for variations
- General Fund Revenue Outturn 2019/20
- Capital Outturn 2019/20 compared to budget, details of spend for key projects and summary of how capital expenditure was funded
- 2019/20 Key Variations on the budget
- Housing Revenue Account Outturn 2019/20
- Capital Outturn 2019/20
- Capital Spend and Financing 2019/20
- Effects of COVID 19 on 2019/20 Accounts
- Comprehensive Income and Expenditure Statement

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member referred to the capital outturn and requested that this not be presented in presentations with the revised budget but instead with the original budget report to provide a more accurate picture of how the budget has performed. Officers were asked to explain the Council's debt position, what plan there is to use the capital reserves, and the position on loans to maturity and the interest paid per year.

The City Treasurer noted the point regarding the capital outturn and revised budget and explained that changes can take place regarding budget allocations. The point was also made that the interest rates on current loans are at a fixed rate. It was reported that the long term debt book relates to loans taken from 1991 onwards, with the majority of the debt being long term, and of this c. 90% is 10 years or more until maturity. Debt of c. £6m will mature by the end of the 2021/22 financial year and the majority of the remaining debt running until 2050 onwards. The rate of interest for individual debts is set at the market rate at the time of the loan and would have been considered the best value for money at that time.

A member referred to Notional Accounting Adjustments and asked officers to explain what this related to and the re-measurement of pensions referred to in the accounts. It was reported that Note 12 in the accounts provided an explanation of the adjustments which included such items as depreciation. The re-measurement of the pension figure is a notional adjustments and is based on actuarial assumptions including projections for life expectancy which for the first time in recent years had reduced.

A member referred to the use of the term 'vulnerable' and requested officers instead refer to 'vulnerable people' in future reports. Reference was also made to the strength of Manchester Communities in helping themselves and those part of the community that experience digital exclusion and the importance of engaging with

them.

The Committee was informed that the wording within the accounts would be examined to pick up the point raised regarding the strength of communities in relation to the work ongoing with the Our Manchester approach and digital inclusion.

A member stated that the Committee was aware and understood the difficulties in producing the annual accounts in view of the COVID 19 impact and the economic challenge to the City and the time that has taken to complete them.

A member referred to the Group Accounts and in particular the Manchester Airport Group (MAG) going concern note and the waivers in financial covenants. There was concern re the potential impact of the downturn in travel with different scenarios including a possible second peak. It was reported that MAG and the Council had carried out extensive due diligence and scenario planning and at the time of the meeting current position does not relate to the worst case scenario. As the covenants included a measure of debt to EBITDA it was inevitable the covenant would be breached but a lot of work has been carried out with the bondholders and other debtors. As with all businesses there remains a financial risk if there is a significant second spike in infections but MAG would not be alone in being severely impacted.

## **Decisions**

1. To note the unaudited 2019/20 Annual Account, signed by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, including the narrative report.
2. To acknowledge the work of staff involved in the production of the Annual Accounts, in particular the circumstances under which they have had to work and that they be thanked on behalf of the Committee.

## **AC/20/16 Internal Audit Plan 2020/21**

The report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer / Head of Audit and Risk Management was submitted. The Committee was advised that the Audit Plan had been developed to be represented with a greater level of assurance over plans to address gaps in staffing resources. It was reported the impact of Covid19 on the work of the Council had resulted in Internal Audit standing down the planned audit activity in order to minimise impact on services and personnel involved in the response. Work had then focussed on audit resource on advice and guidance for the management of urgent changes required to systems and processes and to help deliver new services required as part of the crisis response. Work postponed included actions to progress the service restructure, as management were required to focus fully on the response to the crisis. Other matters arising from the impact of Covid19 related to the procurement of PPE and the logistics of ensuring distribution and work on business rates and grants to help support businesses in Manchester. Other audit work has focused on cores services such as Adults and Children” Service and the impact on the Council’s budget position and reductions over the next year.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer acknowledged the work of officers in

the Internal Audit and Risk Management Team and the additional time spent in supporting the Council's work in addressing the impact of Covid19. Reference was made to the Council's budget and the current process of budget scenarios and budget planning in view of the uncertainty of the future budget position.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member referred to the government's furlough scheme and asked what potential there was for fraud to be committed on support provided by the Council and how this would be identified and addressed. Reference was also made to re-instating safeguards in view of the pace of changes made at the start of Covid19 to ensure that staff are protected in particular through the use of IT systems.

It was reported that changes had been introduced to the process with additional controls put in place to identify fraud and audit officers were involved in consultation during the introduction of the support scheme. This included national reporting on patterns of fraud with monthly reporting to central government. In addition checks are made on spending decisions. Regular updates are also made to the Senior Management Team to highlight the risk of fraud across services. It was reported that safeguards are still in place and reference was made to the IT packages in place such as Microsoft 365 and additional cyber security measures.

A member referred to staffing levels and resources within the Internal Audit Team and the recruitment to the current structure to ensure audit work continues. Reference was also made to the passing of skills/knowledge to other non-audit staff regarding PPE in the event of a further outbreak to allow audit staff to focus on audit work. Officers were asked for a response on the updating the Audit Plan to ensure this and other actions would take place. Officers were also asked for an updated Risk Register to be submitted to the Committee to address risk within Children's Services and Adult Services.

It was reported the current staff resource position is a key priority and will be taken forward in consultation with Human Resources. Meetings would be taking place to examine the reallocation of responsibility to other non-audit staff in respect of PPE. Recruitment of additional audit staff would take place during the year and the Audit plan will be updated during August and submitted to the Audit Committee. It was reported that the Risk Register would be realigned to identify risks in core services (Children's Services and Adult Services).

A member referred to achieving best value and asked officers how plans will be amended in areas such as procurement, contract management and capital expenditure in view of future resource constraints for projects such as the Town Hall improvement scheme and the Waste Management Services Contract. The point was made that the financial stability of care homes is an additional risk to consider and what measures are in place.

It was reported that large contracts such as areas of health and social care is key focus and would be factored into planning, contract management and procurement. Other large schemes included the New Civic Quarter and the Northern Gateway would be included in the future planning. Assurance mapping would also be involved

in consideration of providers and the transition arrangements for exiting from the EU. With reference to care home stability it was reported that daily calls were made during the Covid19 crisis with those providers.

A member expressed concern on the inspections made on the properties provided for homeless adults and children. It was reported that assurances would be sought from the Director of Homelessness on the Council's statutory provision for the inspection of properties.

### **Decision**

To approve the Annual Internal Audit Plan for 2020/21 subject to the comments received.

### **AC/20/17 Head of Audit and Risk Management Annual Assurance Opinion and Report**

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Audit and Risk Management which provided the Head of Audit and Risk Management's annual assurance opinion and report on the Council's system of governance, risk management and internal control. The annual opinion of the Head of Audit and Risk Management's with a summary outturn of the work of the Internal Audit Section for the 12 months April 2019 to March 2020. Quarterly updates on progress, including assurance opinions and executive summaries of reports, have been provided to Audit Committee during the year.

The audit opinion focused on the year to March 2020 however, the events of the evident last six weeks of the year indicate that that there would be likely significant implications for the UK in relation to the Coronavirus (Covid19) outbreak.

The Head of Audit and Risk Management provided a moderate assurance that the Council's governance, risk and control framework is generally sound and operated reasonably consistently in the year.

The Chair invited questions for the Committee.

Reference was made to paragraph 2.28 of the report and the Head of Risk Management was that in view of the number of limited and no assurance opinions listed on the table, what level of assurance would be given to Adult Services.

The Committee was advised that reporting on a directorate basis Adult Services could have a limited assurance on the basis of the audits carried out. It should be noted however, that the department had been open on the areas of concern identified and there had been a lot of subsequent work carried out to address these through new processes and procedures and through the resetting of the improvement plan work as the service moves forward through the past three months during the Covid outbreak.

A member referred to Adult Services and sought assurance that reports listed on the Audit Plan scheduled for the year would be completed and not lost during the year.

It was reported that officers would continue to follow up on all limited assurance opinions with work already taking place to address risk. This would be addressed in the Audit Monitoring Report.

A member referred to Executive Summaries and when members of the Committee would receive them. It was reported that the outstanding summaries would be circulated in time for the September meeting of the Committee as part of the Quarterly Assurance Update report.

A member referred to the way in which Adult Services had reacted to the Covid crisis and made the point that the process of planning by central government during this time could have been better. The reaction of the NHS and Local Authority to the crisis had been commendable and it would be difficult to reflect the individual efforts of staff within an audit opinion. It was therefore important to consider how much of a reactive service the Council should be.

It was noted that the response by the services for adult services and adult social care to the challenges of Covid19 on Manchester had been amazing. The point was made that a holistic review of services was required. It was noted that from the comments received three main themes had been picked up that areas relating to procurement, social care and homelessness will be included within the Audit Plan.

The Committee was advised that the Annual Accounts would be submitted to the October meeting of the Committee.

## **Decisions**

1. To note the report and the comments received.
2. To note and acknowledge the work of Council Adult Care and Adult Service staff and NHS staff in responding to the challenge of Covid19 for their dedication in ensuring services continued to be maintained.



## **Audit Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2020**

**This Audit Committee meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Ahmed Ali - In the Chair  
Councillors Clay, Lanchbury, Russell, Stanton and Watson  
Independent Co-opted member: Dr S Downs  
Independent Co-opted member: Dr D Barker,

#### **Also Present:**

Karen Murray, Mazars (External Auditor)

#### **AC/20/18 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 28 July 2020 as a correct record.

#### **AC/20/19 Internal Audit Assurance Report - Quarter 2**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer / Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management. The report provided the Committee with a summary of the [work](#) of the Internal Audit Section since April 2020. The publication of quarter four 2019/20 executive summaries was delayed due to Covid19 and cancellation of Audit Committee meetings in April and June. The report included the executive summaries and assurance opinions from completed audits finalised between February 2020 and July 2020.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member referred to audits that had taken place within schools where it appeared that similar issues had been identified relating to financial procedures and policy. Officers were asked if guidance could be provided to schools and school governors to address the issues raised to improve school's financial governance arrangements. The comment was also made that in view of the audits that had raised issues within areas of Council services there are also a number of the audits that had taken place on Council services which had produced many examples of good practice.

It was reported that following the completion of the audits in schools, a consolidated themed report is produced for the Director of One Education. A common themed report is also circulated to all of the schools in Manchester highlighting common

themes and lessons learned. This process could be explored further with One Education to consider other routes to pass on guidance and support on financial governance for schools.

A member asked officers why an updated position of the Audit Plan Status had not been included in the report in view of significant problems with audit completions. Officers were also asked to explain the proposed arrangements to resource the PPE hub and business grants beyond quarter two and if any resources had been provided from Central Government to fund this.

The Committee was informed that the report had been prepared in respect of audits taking place up to the end of July 2020, although some audits may have not been completed at that point. Some additional audit reports would be submitted to a later committee. With reference to the PPE hub, it was reported that three full-time audit staff posts had been provided to deal with PPE, this had been reduced to a half full-time post until the end of March 2021, at the latest. The staff member concerned had been kept in the half post to ensure a level of continuity is maintained and it was anticipated that the other half of the post would be filled. A more structured process was now in place to deal with PPE with additional staff resources to be provided for the PPE hub. The meeting was informed that resources had been brought in from across the council to help address the ongoing incident management and prepare for business as usual and recovery planning. It was important to properly resource such areas as business rates grants with audit staff to ensure guidelines are followed as well as spot instances of fraud. It was reported that £225,000 was received from the Government as part of a New Burdens payment.

A member referred to issues relating to the audit of schools and the issues arising from those in particular financial management guidance for schools and what the position for this is and the school's development plan. Officers were asked what follow up action had been taken regarding hospitality and other issues.

It was reported that schools are provided with guidance and the findings from audits are made into formal recommendations to the schools and followed up by the auditors. School development planning is an area where the recommendation is that planning takes place three years ahead. Follow up actions on audits had been delayed due to Covid and closure of schools. Other follow up checks would be completed and reported. The issue of hospitality raised in an audit it was reported this would be checked and reported to the Committee.

A member referred to concerns raised on the use and performance of Liquid Logic and the bedding in of the system. Officers were also asked to comment on the point raised within the report that suggested a 'cultural norm' in Adult Services by social workers' approach to recording information and the concerns this raises for adult safeguarding. Members were concerned on the limited assurances given and the lack of progress being made by the service.

It was reported the audits had identified issues within adult services and children's services such as changes in business practice following the introduction of Liquid Logic. Work is ongoing to address those issues concerning Liquid Logic involving the City Treasurer, Internal Audit and Children's Services and Adult Services DMTs. The



comment made on a 'cultural norm' had been identified as an historic challenge to install business change within the service and achieve compliance through training of social work staff. Further checks would be made to ensure compliance is being achieved. With reference to concerns raised on recording safeguarding issues it was reported that the changes made to case management on Liquid Logic that children's services is a few weeks away from business of usual. Adult Services would take longer in view of the more complex nature of the care finance packages. The Director of Adult Services would be contacted on the issues raised and reported back to the Committee.

A member referred to Mental Health - Adults Services and concerns on lack of management input on decisions on mental health case work and the lack of management overview on those decisions and delays on referrals made. Reference was also made to the use of the Paris System and how it operated/ compared to Liquid Logic. The Committee also identified other issues to consider including processing between the Liquid Logic and Paris systems, management oversight on processes on recording and decision making on safeguarding recording and logging and the efficiency of communication between the two systems.

It was reported that the Paris system was used by the Mental Health Trust and not the Council. Some of the actions to be taken by the Mental Health Trust were still outstanding. It was noted that assurance is needed on how things are processed through Liquid Logic and it was expected that Liquid Logic would provide a greater level of reporting. The points made were noted and would be discussed with the Audit Team.

A member referred to the Disability Supported Accommodation Service and the limited assurance the audit had produced and drew attention to the likely changes in the support needs of the users of the service over time. Attention was also drawn to the management of the budget which did not meet the demands of the service.

Officers reported that the service had received an audit in view of concerns over budget overspends and to understand the service activity to be able to set a more accurate budget and introduce measures to better control this. It was noted that the use of agency staff was not the best use of resources and officers were now building on the recommendations of the audit.

## **Decision**

The Committee noted the report and comments made.

(Councillor Ahmed Ali declared a personal interest for the reason that he is a Council appointed representative to: Adoption Counts.)

## **AC/20/20 Outstanding Audit Recommendations – ICT Licensing**

The Committee considered the report of the of the Director of ICT which provided an update on the actions taken to address issues highlighted previously to reduce risk, barriers to full implementation and management rationale for accepting the current,

reduced level of risk. The Director addressed the Committee and explained that the audit had taken place in 2018 to look at licensing in place across the Councils IT systems and the work that has taken place since the completion of the audit.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member questioned the audit of licences and asked if this work had reduced the overall cost to the Council. Also, would officers be looking to save on the cost of licences going forward.

It was reported that figures were not available on the cost implications to the council, although it was now possible to check on the status of licences and if one was required. The cost of Microsoft rental would be based on usage and would be assessed on whether it is the most efficient model based on projections.

A member asked how centralised decision making is undertaken in respect software asset management for smaller specialised systems used by the Council.

The Committee was informed that the management of the decision making process is combined between both centrally and within the departments concerned. ICT work with departments where checks are made on the appropriateness of software and to ensure that similar software is not already available within the organisation.

## **Decision**

The Committee noted the report and the actions taken in response to the Internal Audit of software licensing and the decision of management to accept a much reduced level of residual risk.

## **AC/20/21 Outstanding Audit Recommendations - Quarter 2**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer / Head of Audit and Risk Management report which provided a summary of the current implementation position and arrangements for monitoring and reporting internal and external audit recommendations. The Head of Audit and Risk Management introduced the report. The Committee's attention was brought to Section 3.5 of the report set out those recommendations outstanding overdue by nine months:

- Adults: Transition to Adult Services (3 of which 2 partially implemented)
- Adults: Disability Supported Accommodation Services: Quality Assurance Framework (2 partially implemented)
- Adults: Management Oversight and Supervision (1)
- Adults: Mental Health Casework Compliance (6 of which 3 partially implemented)
- Core: ICT Software Licensing (3 of which 2 partially implemented)
- Core: Purchase Cards (1)
- Childrens Services: Assessed and Supported Year in Employment (2 partially implemented)

- Children Services: Management Oversight and Supervision (1)

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member referred to outstanding recommendations and confirmations from departments and the follow up work undertaken to address this and was informed that those outstanding recommendations would be addressed from meeting with management of the services concerned and reported to a future meeting.

A member referred to outstanding recommendations in respect of Adult Services and the importance of concentrating on addressing those areas of outstanding concern.

The City Treasurer welcomed the comments of the Committee in respect of Adult Services and referred to the work ongoing and undertook to consider and discuss with the Chair and the Head of Audit and Risk Management on the best way of approaching the areas of concern raised.

### **Decision**

The Committee noted the current process and position in respect of high priority Internal Audit recommendations.

### **AC/20/22 Risk Management Strategy and Risk Register**

The Committee received a presentation from the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer / Head of Audit and Risk Management providing an update and background and progress on the Corporate Risk Register. The Committee was informed that a report on the Corporate Risk Register could not be submitted for the reason that report had not been presented to the Senior Management Team.

The Committee was informed that the standard process for the Corporate Risk Register (CRR) was suspended during Covid19 crisis in favour of dynamic incident management approach with high frequency of risk and issue reporting. A formal review process has restarted and this is due to confirm the Corporate Risk Register in November 2020.

The areas of risk that have been impacted by Covid19 are as follows:

- Organisational capacity, resilience and business continuity
- Finance and Funding: 2020/21, 2021+ and capital programme
- Health and Care integration and adult social care improvement
- Responding to climate change
- ICT programmes, resilience and security
- Information risk management and data security
- Health and safety of staff and residents
- Adaptation to new ways of working
- Affordable housing and Northwards
- Post EU Exit and supply chain resilience
- Disruption to education and learning
- Safeguarding vulnerable adults and children

- Equality and inclusion

A Corporate Risk Register report would be submitted to the October or November meeting of the Committee.

A member commented that it was important to have a Risk Register presented to the Committee before February 2021 in view of the length of time since the last report (March 2019).

Officers were asked if more could be done to include the agile, real time reporting approach that has been used since the impact of Covid. The Committee was informed that it was anticipated that this would be included because it is responsive and is easy to produce.

A member asked officers if the March 2020 Risk Register could be circulated to members of the Committee in advance of the updated Risk Register report.

### **Decision**

To note the presentation and the comments made.

### **AC/20/23 Annual Work Programme - draft**

The Members considered the Committee's work programme.

### **Decisions**

1. To note the Annual Work Programme.
2. To agree that a meeting of the Committee will take place on 13 October 2020.

### **AC/20/24 Exclusion of Public**

#### **Decision**

To exclude the public during consideration of the following item which involved consideration of exempt information relating to the financial or business affairs of particular persons, and public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

### **AC/20/25 Annual Counter Fraud Report**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer / Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management which provided a summary of the anti-fraud arrangements and investigation work undertaken during 2019/20, with particular focus on the work delivered by Internal Audit.

The Committee agreed that it was satisfied with the assurance provided by the actions outlined within the report submitted.

.

### **Decisions**

To note the report.



## **Health and Wellbeing Board**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 26 August 2020**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing (Chair)  
Dr Ruth Bromley, Chair Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
David Regan, Director of Public Health  
Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services  
Dr Denis Colligan, GP Member (North) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Mike Wild, Voluntary and Community Sector representative  
Rupert Nichols, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust

#### **Apologies:**

Councillor Richard Leese, Leader of the Council  
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children's Services and Schools  
Vicky Szulist, Chair, Healthwatch  
Dr Tracey Vell, Primary Care representative - Local Medical Committee

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

Councillor Nigel Murphy, Deputy Leader  
James Binks, Director of Policy, Performance and Reform, MCC

### **HWB/20/16 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 July 2020 were submitted for approval.

#### **Decision**

To agree as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 8 July 2020.

### **HWB/20/17 Manchester's 10 Point COVID-19 Action Plan - August 2020**

At their meeting of 8 July 2020 the Board had given consideration to the report of the Director of Population Health that presented the detailed COVID-19 Manchester Prevention and Response Plan. At the beginning of this month the Director of Public Health, working with key partners, produced the attached action plan for the month of August.

In addition to the report the Director of Public Health delivered a presentation that included the latest available comparative data and intelligence. He stated that the positive cases of COVID-19 identified were predominantly amongst younger people and these had not resulted in a corresponding increase in hospital admissions, however this situation would continue to be monitored.

In response to questions from the Board regarding measures to protect children returning to education the Director of Public Health stated that consideration was being given to keeping school 'bubbles' as small as practically possible to minimise the impact if pupils were required to self-isolate, adding that he recognised the challenge this represented to larger schools. He stated that positive existing relationships already existed between Public Health and local schools and contingency planning was underway to minimise the potential disruption to a young person's education.

The Director of Public Health stated that work was progressing across Greater Manchester, in line with all relevant medical and public health guidance to ensure a consistent approach was adopted and capacity was available to support schools in the event of an outbreak, including mobilising mobile testing units and home testing if required.

The Chair acknowledged the concerns regarding the return to schools and advised that it was important to build confidence amongst parents and support them with appropriate communications that would be delivered around this message, noting that the wider benefits to children attending school was recognised.

A member of the Board suggested that GPs should be able to refer people for COVID-19 testing, similar to the way they would refer a patient for other routine testing, especially noting that the winter flu season was approaching. The Director of Public Health acknowledged these comments and informed the Board that discussions around this issue were ongoing.

The Chair welcomed the 10 Point COVID-19 Action Plan, noting that it presented a framework to enable the monitoring of progress and that this item would continue to be reviewed as a regular agenda item for the Board. She further thanked all those who had contributed to the production of the Plan.

## **Decision**

The Board note the report.

## **HWB/20/18 The Our Manchester Strategy Reset**

The Board considered the report of the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform that provided an overview of the Our Manchester Strategy reset and invited the Board to comment on how health and wellbeing priorities should be reflected within the Strategy reset.

The Chair stated that it was important when considering the reset to have regard for the individual rather than systems and process, adding that it was essential that the appropriate language was used when engaging with residents on this issue. She further commented that it was important to recognise that the Our Manchester Strategy was not a Council policy but rather a strategy that belonged to the whole of the city and this work would complement the refresh of the Locality Plan.



Members of the Board discussed the need to recognise and address the wider determinants of health, including employment opportunities; environmental factors and the use of decision making to influence change, such as planning powers to promote greener environments and air quality. In addition, it was essential to acknowledge and address inequalities in all forms, with an emphasis on prevention work and the commissioning of services having an emphasis on 'whole life story' work to deliver improved health outcomes for residents.

Members acknowledged the scale of this challenge, noting that a redesign of services would be required with due consideration given to the allocation of resources.

The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform acknowledged the comments raised and stated that an update report would be submitted for consideration by the Board at an appropriate time. He further commented that if Partners would welcome further discussions and engagement on this subject sessions could be organised if they contacted him directly.

### **Decision**

The Board note the report.



## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 30 July 2020**

**This Planning and Highways meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Hitchen, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat, Watson and White

#### **PH/20/30 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications (126669/FO/2020, 126668/FO/2020, 125655/FO/2019, 126648/FO/2020, 125573/FO/2019 and 125635/FO/2019), since the agenda was issued, was circulated.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/20/31 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 12 March 2020 as a correct record.

#### **PH/20/32 126669/FO/2020 - Land Bound by Old Mill Street and Great Ancoats Street, Manchester, M4 6EE - Ancoats and Beswick Ward**

The application relates to the erection of a Part 16/ Part 11 storey building to form 106 no. apartments (C3 Use Class) together with ground floor commercial uses (Use Class A1, A2 A3 and/or B1), with associated ancillary space, surface car parking, landscaping and associated works.

The proposals would be in the form of a stepped development with the 16 storey element being sited at the junction of Great Ancoats Street/ Old Mill Street and the 11 storey element being sited on the northern corner of the site facing towards Old Mill Street and the recently completed Phase 3 building which rises to 10 storeys closest to the application site.

Residents would access the building on foot via the main foyer located on the Old Mill Street frontage or via a level access ramp from the car parking area, a separate access for the ground floor commercial unit is also provided from Old Mill Street. A bike store providing 106 spaces would be sited on the ground floor accessed directly from an entrance on Old Mill Street.

Surface car parking for 19 cars including 4 disabled access spaces, together with 9 electric vehicle charging points which would be sited to the rear and side of the building adjacent to the Islington Wharf Phase 1 building accessed via a secure gate from the existing access road leading from Old Mill Street. This unadopted access road also provides access to the car parking associated with the Phase 1 development together with access to the Phase 3 development. Waste collections takes place from this road which would remain unaltered as part of these application proposals.

The ground floor also provides a bin store for the apartments accessed internally via the foyer and a commercial bin store located to the rear of the building.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members raised concerns regarding the non-inclusion of affordable housing as part of the development

The planning officer reported that there was no requirement for affordable housing as part of the proposal for the reason that the proposal is exempt under the Council policy. It was reported that there is an overage agreement in place where the Council may receive a sum from profits made from the development that could be used on affordable housing.

A member referred to the arrangements for water drainage and flood management of the site and whether the proposed condition was sufficient to address this.

It was reported that Flood Risk Management Team had been consulted and were satisfied that the proposed scheme would deal with water run-off from the site.

A member made reference to public realm provision on the site and that the trees would be sited within large planters and making the point that the life span of trees planted in this way was much shorter than trees planted in the ground. Officers were asked if it was possible to add a further condition to ensure trees are planted in the ground where possible and to avoid underground services.

The Planning Officer suggested that an additional condition be added to request officers to explore the possibility of planting trees in the ground where appropriate to avoid underground services and to delegate planting approval to the Director of Planning in consultation with Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee.

A councillor proposed the approval of the application and the Committee gave this their support.

## Decision

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted and subject to the addition of a further condition for the determination of the location for tree planting to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee.

### **PH/20/33 126668/FO/2020 - Land Bound by Silvercroft Street, Crown Street and the Mancunian Way, Manchester, M15 4AX - Deansgate Ward**

The application relates to a proposal for:

- 855 homes with 33 per cent one bedroom, 60 per cent two bedroom, 6 per cent three bedroom and 1 per cent duplexes;
- 244 residents' car parking spaces, with 24 accessible spaces and 24 spaces with electric vehicle charging points (EVCs) (10% provision);
- A public car park with 389 spaces in a three level basement, including 19 accessible spaces (5%) and future proofing for EVCs should the demand arise;
- 855 cycle storage spaces;
- A 0.5ha (hectare) public park;
- Two retail units facing into the public park;
- Ancillary residential amenity space including a private roof terrace and gym;
- A single form entry primary school. Outline planning permission is sought for this part of the development;
- A soft landscape zone to the west of the development;
- A wide lawn and tree planting area located to the south of the development;
- A pedestrian link along Silvercroft Street leading to Great Jackson Street and beyond;
- A shared pedestrian and cycling route along the eastern edge of the public park;
- Infrastructure improvements, such as raised tables, to promote pedestrian connectivity the Crown Street Phase 1 development;
- A servicing road that would run around the perimeter of the site.

The application is a phased hybrid application seeking full planning permission and outline planning permission. Full planning permission comprises three phases:

Phase A: a 52 storey building (building C4), comprising 414 homes, a perimeter servicing and access route, public realm, including partial delivery of a public park and landscaping, and a private residential basement car park.

Phase B: a 52 storey building (building C5), comprising 441 homes, a perimeter servicing and access route, public realm, including delivery of the remaining area of public park and landscaping, and a private residential basement car park.

Phase D: A three storey, publically accessible, basement car park.

Outline planning permission with all matters reserved is sought for:  
Phase C: A 3 storey single entry primary school with outdoor play facilities on the roof, between these buildings and Crown Street Phase 1.

The towers would be linked by a two storey podium that would be situated on the south eastern part of the site. The buildings would look out onto the public park on the north western part of the site. The podium would accommodate double height concierge spaces for each tower, with access from the park, with a lounge and amenity space, including a gym and sauna. The podium would accommodate two double height retail units fronting the park. The towers would begin at second floor with a residents' garden on the roof space of the podium between them. There would be amenity space comprising flexible spaces, such as meeting rooms and private dining areas, looking out on to and with access to the residents' garden. The top two levels of each tower would each accommodate four three-bed duplexes. The roof top of each tower would have a building maintenance unit screened by the same elevational treatment as the floors below.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members of the Committee welcomed the proposal, in particular the inclusion of a park, medical facility and a school building which would help to promote and support sustainable living for residents living in the city centre.

A member referred to the construction management plan and asked officers if the plan is sufficiently robust to protect the quality of life of residents in neighbouring areas in Hulme and Castlefield.

The Committee were advised that the scale of the construction site is large enough to include a concrete production site which would mean that there will be no vehicles carrying concrete to the site. The developer involved has been constructing buildings within the city centre over a number of years and uses a tried and tested management plan which had so far resulted in no complaints being received.

A councillor proposed the approval of the application and the Committee gave this their support.

## **Decision**

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.

**PH/20/34      125655/FO/2019 - Water Street, Manchester, M3 4JQ -  
Deansgate Ward**

The application relates to a planning permission previously granted for the demolition of all buildings and structures and the erection of a 32 storey residential building

comprising 350 homes (Class C3) with retail uses at ground floor (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4); an 8 storey mixed use building comprising workspace (B1), with retail uses (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4) and residential live/work uses; and, the creation of new public realm, landscaping, car and cycle parking, access and other associated works.

The application would supersede the Tower 1 element of the previous permission with a 32 storey building comprising 390 Co-Living Apartments with 210no. 2-, 3- and 4-bed shared apartments and 180no. studios with 870 Bedspaces. There would be ancillary amenity space on four floors consisting of residents' amenity space, a gym, commercial space, and self-storage. There would be 152 cycle spaces in the building and 40 Sheffield stands in the public realm.

80% of the 870 bedspaces would be within the Duo, Trio or Quad units which would all be single occupancy. The Duo, Trio and Quad (2, 3 and 4 bed) units could be a primary residence and would only be available on tenancies from 6-months upwards. When single occupancy is taken into account, each of the shared units meets or exceeds NDSS, without taking into account access to shared amenity. Bedroom areas would provide as much useable floorspace as possible. Each apartment will have a shared communal kitchen and lounge.

The studios would be available solely on short-term lets, up to 6 months in length, so would not be a primary residence. This would be controlled via the Section 106 Agreement and subject to action if there is a breach of the agreement. The one bedroom units in development are targeted at those requiring a short term base in the city centre.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members expressed concern at the small size of the one bedroom units and referred to the mitigation that the tenancy agreement for the units is limited to six months only. The point was made that the units' limited space could impact on the quality of life of residents living there. Co-living is a new concept and untested in Manchester and there were concerns that this may not be an appropriate development for the city and should be tested on a smaller scale first. Concern was expressed that the proposal would conflict with policies on space standards and sustainable communities and the cluster. Reference was made to the limited number of mobility adaptable units (25) and the absence of on-site disabled parking for the development. Reference was made to the meeting of the Executive – Minute number Exe/20/75 Co-living in Manchester and the conflicting nature of the planning proposal to the terms for co-living set out the Executive report.

It was proposed that the committee be minded to refuse the application on the basis of the scale of the development and number and size of co-living units and the lack of disabled parking bays proposed are in conflict with current space standard and community sustainability policies and the terms set out within the 'Co-living in Manchester' report to the Executive (3 July 2020). That was put to the vote and carried.

## Decision

Minded to refuse on the basis of the scale of the development and number and size of co-living units and the lack of disabled parking bays proposed are in conflict with current space standard and the terms set out within the Co-living in Manchester report to the Executive (3 July 2020).

The application was deferred and the Director of Planning asked to bring a report back which addresses the concerns raised and whether there are reasons for refusal that could be sustained.

### **PH/20/35      126648/FO/2020 - Water Street, Manchester, M3 4JQ - Deansgate Ward**

This application relates to planning permission previously been granted for the demolition of existing structures and the erection of a 36-storey residential building (Class C3) with retail uses at lower levels (Classes A1, A2, A3 or A4); new public realm and landscaping, including the first phase of a new riverside park and walkway, provision of external seating areas, car and cycle parking, access arrangements and highways works, rooftop plant and other associated works". (ref:114723/FO/16).

The proposal would supersede the Tower 2 element of (114723/FO/16). Given the changes to the baseline context since the original permission was approved, a fresh standalone EIA has been undertaken in support of the planning application.

This proposal would supersede the Tower 2 element of the previous permission with a 36 storey building comprising Co-Living Apartments with 188 no. 2-, 3- and 4-bed shared apartments and 186 studios with 806 Bedspaces. There would be ancillary amenity space on four floors consisting of residents' amenity space, a gym, commercial space, and self-storage. There would be 412 cycle spaces in the building and 12 Sheffield stands in the public realm.

77% of the bedspaces would be in the Trio or Quad units which would all be single occupancy. The Trio and Quad (2, 3 and 4 bed) units could be a primary residence and would only be available on tenancies from 6-months upwards. When single occupancy is taken into account, each of the shared units meets or exceeds NDSS, without taking into account access to shared amenity. Bedroom areas would provide as much useable floorspace as possible. Each apartment will have a shared communal kitchen and lounge.

The studios would be available solely on short-term lets, up to 6 months in length, so would not be a primary residence. This would be controlled via the Section 106 Agreement and subject to action if there is a breach of the agreement. The one bedroom units in development are targeted at those requiring a short term base in the city centre.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.



The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members in considering the application indicated that the application be minded for refusal on the basis that the application is not consistent with Core Strategy Policies: CC3, CC6, CC9 (impact on St Johns Conservation Area) and CC10 current Space Standards and the terms of the Executive report 'Co-living in Manchester' (3 July 2020) and the inadequacy of the Section 106 agreement which seeks to correct the conflict with the council's Space Standards, scale of the development and detrimental impact on the surrounding area. Reference was also made to the limited number of disabled parking places for the development.

It was proposed that the committee be minded to refuse the application on the basis of the scale of the development and number and size of co-living units and the lack of disabled parking bays proposed are in conflict with current space standard and community sustainability policies and the terms set out within the 'Co-living in Manchester' report to the Executive (3 July 2020). The vote on the proposal to be minded to refuse was lost and Committee then voted on the substantive recommendation to approve, and that was carried.

### **Decision**

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.

**PH/20/36      125573/FO/2019 - Plot 11 First Street Comprising Land Bound by Hulme Street to the North, Wilmott Street to the East, the Unite Parkway Gate Development and Mancunian Way to the South and Medlock Street to the West, Manchester - Deansgate Ward**

This application relates to the erection of four buildings ranging from 10 to 45 storeys linked by areas of public realm and private amenity space. 2 of the buildings would sit on a podium. The gas main on Newcastle Street has informed the layout and distribution of the buildings. Block A would be 10 storeys at the corner of Hulme Street and Wilmott Street and step up to 18 storeys and then 22 storeys along Hulme Street. (70.6m high). Block B would step from 18 storeys to 22 storeys and then to 26 at the corner of Chester Street and Wilmott Street (82.3m high). Block C would be 17 storeys fronting Mancunian Way and step down to 13 and then 10 storeys into the heart of the site (52.3m high). Block D would be a 45 storey tower (138.9m high).

The development would contain 1349 units with 609 apartments (284 one bed, 112 two bed, 89 three bed, 46 four bed, 78 five bed) and 875 studios. The studios would include 30 super, 23 deluxe, 240 premium, 309 standard and 273 compact units (2224 bed spaces total). Communal amenity facilities would include a cinema, co-working space, health and well-being facilities, café, a communal kitchen and dining area and a resident's lounge. The development would be run as a single operation

but each building would have a separate entrance with a reception & management offices.

Blocks A and B would contain a café, double height health and wellbeing space, bike store, plant, bin store, substation, laundry and management suite; Ground and First floor shared amenity areas (lounge/ kitchen/ dining) ( 5,562 sq.m and external private terrace and garden areas (2,470m<sup>2</sup>).

Block C would have amenity space, bike store, plant, substation, bin store and management suite; Ground and First floor shared amenity areas (1,157 sq.m) (lounge/ kitchen/ dining).

Block D would have a bike store, plant, substation, car park, management suite and bin store; first floor and 'sky lounge' (44<sup>th</sup> floor) amenity areas (lounge/ kitchen/ dining) (3,146 (GEA) sq.m) and external first floor and external private terrace and garden areas (1636m<sup>2</sup>).

The applicants consider that shared amenity space in centralised zones would encourage more social interaction than space on individual floors. It would also interact with the external green spaces.

For the purposes of this Report a 'unit' is a room within an apartment and a 'studio' is a self-contained single occupancy unit. Just over 10% (149 units) of the shared-living rooms / studios would be fully accessible or adaptable. The proposed wide range of accommodation types would provide a range of options that people could move around in according to their current life circumstances.

All accommodation would be fully furnished and bills would be with all-inclusive and cover rent, resident relations, concierge, superfast internet, all utilities and taxes, daily events and gym membership in one monthly payment' Unlike mainstream residential accommodation, large deposits would not be required. All residents would have access to the communal facilities and external amenity spaces and have a private bathroom and cooking facilities within their own accommodation.

The applicants have stated that Co-living accommodation aims to provide accommodation at a lower price point than more established models such as Private Rental Sector (PRS). The rent for around a quarter of the units would equate to median salary figures for those who obtained first degree qualifications and entered full-time paid work. The price point would be accessible to a range of incomes and deliver cost-effective living options which could be attractive to key workers. The all-inclusive bills should represent a saving over comparable rental accommodation. The reduction or removal of travel costs due to the accessible city centre location should further reduce overall outgoings.

1349 bedspaces would be in accommodation which would comply with the closest applicable National Described Space Standards and Manchester Space Standards. 396 apartments/508 bedspaces would be a mix of 1 and 2 bedroom units some with ensuite bathrooms. 213 apartments/841 bedspaces would be 3 to 5 bed units each with en-suite rooms and shared lounge spaces and kitchens.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

It was proposed that there be a site visit for the reason that it would be helpful for the Committee to see the site and adjacent areas and the impact on listed buildings at Cambridge Mill and MacIntosh Mill. That was voted upon and carried.

### **Decision**

To defer consideration of the matter to allow a site visit to be carried out by the members of the Committee.

(Councillor Riasat left the meeting.)

### **PH/20/37 125635/FO/2019 - Tatton Arms, Boat Lane, Northenden, Manchester, M22 4HR - Northenden Ward**

This application relates to the conversion of the former Tatton Arms public house to create 7 new residential (C3) apartments and development of a further 21 new apartments (C3) to the rear following partial demolition of existing extensions together with associated access, parking and landscaping. The applicant is seeking planning permission for the partial demolition of existing extensions and conversion of former Tatton Arms public house to create 7 new residential (C3) apartments and development of a further 21 new apartments to the rear, with associated access, parking and landscaping. There would be 28 apartments in total, 8 one bed, 18 two bed and 2 three bed.

The development would also involve a detailed landscaping scheme to include tree planting, the formalisation of the Trans Pennine Trail, the creation of a footpath to the north of Boat Lane, car parking for the development and for the neighbouring Boathouse cottages, bin storage, bin storage for the neighbouring Boathouse cottages and cycle parking.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

It was proposed that the committee approve application and the committee gave this their support.

### **Decision**

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.



## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 27 August 2020**

**This Planning and Highways meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Hitchen, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeline Monaghan, and White

**Also Present:**

Councillors O'Neill (written submission), Wheeler, Johns

#### **PH/20/38 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications (126435/FO/2020, 126608/FO/2020 and 125871/LL/2020), since the agenda was issued, was circulated.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/20/39 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2020 as a correct record.

#### **PH/20/40 126435/FO/2020 - 27 Trenchard Drive Manchester M22 5LZ - Woodhouse Park Ward**

The application relates to the conversion of the existing dwelling to create two three bedroom dwellings; and the erection of two four bedroom dwellings with associated car parking and landscaping.

The application site measures 1.421m<sup>2</sup> in size and is located on the western side of Trenchard Drive. It is irregular in shape and consists of nos. 25 and 27/29 Trenchard Drive. No. 25 Trenchard Drive was a former garage that was converted into a dwellinghouse, without the benefit of planning permission, while nos. 27/29 Trenchard Drive, was originally a pair of semi-detached dwellings that was last used as a single residence (now vacant following a fire).

To the north of the site lies the landscaped buffer associated with a Manchester Airport operated long stay car park and to the west is an enclosed grass paddock associated with The Tatton Arms Public House which is located further south at the junction of Trenchard Drive and Ringway Road. To the south of the site stands a pair of semidetached dwellings. To the east of the site, on the opposite side of Trenchard Drive, there is a cleared plot of land (nos. 30-40 Trenchard Drive) which benefits from a planning permission for 15 dwellings (ref. 118924/JO/2018). The neighbourhood consists predominantly of two storey semi and terraced dwellings, though several commercial properties are located close to the junction of Trenchard Drive and Ringway Road, namely The Tatton Arms Public House, the Moss Nook Restaurant (currently vacant) and a detached two storey office premises called Moss Nook House.

The applicant is proposing the conversion of nos. 27/29 Trenchard Drive into a pair of 3 bed semi-detached dwellings, the erection of a rear dormer extension to nos. 27/29 Trenchard Drive, the erection of a 3 storey pair of 4 bed semi-detached dwellings to the side of nos. 27/29 Trenchard Drive, provision of 8 car parking spaces, 2 per dwelling and to facilitate the proposal the existing conservatory and no. 25 Trenchard Drive (the converted garage) would be demolished.

The Chair confirmed that Local Ward Councillor O'Neill had requested that the Committee consider a site visit and would have spoken on the Item but had problems accessing the virtual committee meeting.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to present the Item.

A Planning Officer requested that the Committee draw their attention to the supplementary information provided for broader context on the plans for this development.

The Chair invited an objector to speak.

The objector also requested that the Committee make a site visit and the Chair confirmed that that request had been received via a Local Ward Councillor and would be addressed within the meeting.

The Chair invited the agent for the applicant to speak and the applicant's agent addressed the Committee with information about the application.

The Chair invited a Planning Officer to speak.

The Planning Officer referred to the reduction of dwellings explaining that this was due to concerns over the visual aspect and issues regarding car parking and stated that the reduction will add to the space available on the site making more green space and availability for two car parking spaces for each property. The Planning Officer stated that the design was in keeping with other properties along Trenchard Drive with a similar gable end feature. The Planning Officer explained that there were no concerns from Highways regarding traffic.

The Chair invited the members of the committee to speak

Councillor Lyons raised concerns of over-development and construction plans of the proposal due to its location within a small community and proposed a site visit to achieve a better understanding of the development and its potential impact on the local community in terms of road use by construction vehicles.

Councillor Lovecy seconded the proposal for a site visit to address any concerns, mentioning that the dwelling spaces will double from two to four, but welcomed the reduction in the development from five to four properties.

A Planning Officer then addressed the issue of construction management stating that there had been a condition for a full construction management plan to be agreed which requests evidence that residents have been consulted.

The Committee voted and gave its support for a site visit.

### **Decision**

To defer consideration of the matter to allow a site visit to be carried out by the members of the Committee.

### **PH/20/41      125655/FO/2019 - Water Street, Manchester M3 4JQ - Deansgate Ward**

The application relates to a site, known as T1, is 0.32 hectares and bounded by Water Street, Manchester Goods Yard, and Grape Street. It is accessed from Water Street and is in use as a construction site for Manchester Goods Yard. The original planning permission (114385/FO/2016) approved the Manchester Goods Yard offices and a residential 'Tower (T1). Manchester Goods Yard is under construction and this proposal would replace the 'T1' element of that permission. The site is in the Castlefield Conservation Area and is part of a Masterplan and Strategic Regeneration Framework.

At its meeting on 30 July 2020 the Committee resolved that it was 'minded to refuse' the application on the grounds that the number of units proposed was too large and it did not provide sufficient parking for disabled people. They requested officers to bring a report to the next meeting which addresses these concerns.

This proposal would supersede the Tower 1 element of the previous permission with a 32 storey building comprising 390 Co-Living Apartments with 210no. 2-, 3- and 4-bed shared apartments and 180no. studios with 870 Bedspaces. There would be ancillary amenity space on four floors consisting of residents' amenity space, a gym, commercial space, and self storage. There would be 152 cycle spaces in the building and 40 sheffield stands in the public realm.

80% of the 870 bedspaces would be within the Duo, Trio or Quad units which would all be single occupancy. The Duo, Trio and Quad (2, 3 and 4 bed) units could be a primary residence and would only be available on tenancies from 6-months upwards. When single occupancy is taken into account, each of the shared units meets or

exceeds NDSS, without taking into account access to shared amenity. Bedroom areas would provide as much useable floorspace as possible. Each apartment will have a shared communal kitchen and lounge. The studios would be available solely on short-term lets, up to 6 months in length, so would not be a primary residence. This would be controlled via the Section 106 Agreement.

The Chair invited a Planning Officer to make comment on the application.

A Planning Officer stated that they had looked at addressing the Committee's concerns following the previous Committee meeting on 30 July 2020, stating that the applicant had secured 35 car parking spaces in an adjacent building for the sole use of disabled parking for both buildings, namely T1 (minded to refuse at the previous committee meeting) and T2 (approved at the previous committee meeting). The Planning Officer confirmed that if T1 were not approved then the disabled parking spaces would not be available for T2. The Planning Officer informed the Committee that the scheme was in keeping with the Executive resolution and that if the Co-living scheme were to be subject to a more dispersed approach it would use up more land and have a broader consequence on other requirements for commercial space in the St John's area and create a larger challenge in managing a series of smaller schemes compared to the single purpose building presented in this application.

The Planning Officer then confirmed that the scheme approved by the Committee (T2) accommodated a larger number of occupants than the scheme being considered here (T1). The Planning Officer then addressed previous concerns of the Committee around the longevity of the project and any future plans for the building should the Co-living scheme not deliver and stated that the applicant had provided a conversion plan, to a mainstream living purpose, which would be put in place in the event that the initial purpose was not successful. The Planning Officer then informed the Committee that the more affordable accommodation in the building was set within units comprising of larger spaced dwellings and that the studios were to be the more costly. The Planning Officer's final comment was that, due to the approval of the linked scheme at T2, Planning Officers did not feel that a refusal from the Committee could be substantiated.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

A Member of the Committee sought clarity on what tenants options would be when they were ready to co-habit with a partner, for instance, and the Planning Officer responded to the Member that the dwellings in this scheme were all for the purpose of single occupancy.

Members expressed concerns over whether the Manchester spatial standards were being met, the proposals of ensuring short term tenancies of six months maximum were maintained and that the proposal is untested.

Councillor Lyons proposed the application be minded to refuse on grounds of inadequate living space and that it is counterintuitive to the cautious approach set out in the Executive report.



Councillor Lovecy seconded the proposal stating that there was a further consideration to take into account regarding Coronavirus when dealing with shared dwelling spaces, stating that it would require several tenants to self-isolate in the event of one occupant contracting the virus.

The Planning Officer addressed the concerns stating that the space requirements were met within the dwellings with potential to be permanent and that only the dwellings with a maximum six month tenancy did not meet the standards. The Planning Officer referred to concerns around Coronavirus stating that the accommodation may not be available commercially for four years.

The Director of Planning made comment on the Committee's previous minded to refuse decision stating that that decision had been made on the basis of the lack of disabled car parking and that the matter had now been addressed and it was now felt that there was no reason for refusal which could be substantiated.

The Committee voted and gave support to the decision to minded to refuse.

### **Decision**

Minded to refuse on the basis that the number and size of co-living units are in conflict with current space standard and the terms set out within the Co-living in Manchester report to the Executive (3 July 2020).

The application was deferred and the Director of Planning asked to bring a report back which addresses the concerns raised and whether there are reasons for refusal that could be sustained.

**PH/20/42      125573/FO/2019 - Plot 11 First Street, Deansgate Ward Comprising Land Bound by Hulme Street to the North, Wilmott Street to the East, the Unite Parkway Gate Development and Mancunian Way to the South and Medlock Street to the West, Manchester - Deansgate Ward**

This application is for the construction of four buildings of heights varying from 10 storeys to 45 storeys together comprising Co-living bedspaces (use class Sui Generis) and associated amenity facilities, with ground floor commercial units (Use classes A3 (Café / Restaurant and D2 (Gym)), private amenity space and public realm comprising hard and soft landscaping, car parking and cycle facilities and other associated works.

Consideration of this application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 30 July 2020 to enable a site visit to take place to allow Members to assess the impact that the proposed development would have on nearby listed buildings. The site visit was undertaken on the morning of 27 August 2020.

A Planning Officer addressed the Committee with information about the application.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

A Local Ward Councillor gave objection to the proposal on the grounds of the height of the buildings with the tallest being two storeys shorter than the Beetham Tower which the Local Ward Councillor felt was not in keeping with this area, stating that First Street was comprised of mid-rise towers of public realm usage. The Local Ward Councillor further stated that the development would overshadow areas of Deansgate and Hulme and sit uneasily with the immediately local aspects of Manchester's industrial history. The Local Ward Councillor made comment that the Co-living aspect is in conflict with current space standard and felt concerned around the impact of the Coronavirus restrictions when applied to living in such dwellings. Further comment was made about the large increase of population in this Local Ward from this development alone and how that would present with more traffic and round the clock disturbances from food deliveries and taxis. In conclusion the Local Ward Councillor stated that whilst the open green space proposed as part of the development was welcomed, it was outweighed by the harm that allowing this application would present on the local surrounding area.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to address the concerns of the Local Ward Councillor.

The Planning Officer questioned the comment that the building was too tall by stating that the site was situated at the main gateway entrance to the City Centre from the Airport and South Manchester motorway network and that this would be a prime location for such a development, being built on open land and away from the more historic aspects of the City Centre. The Planning Officer requested that the Committee take note of the inclusion of a park on the site and that the site in its current state was overdue for development.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

A Member raised concerns around the close proximity of this development to listed buildings at Mackintosh Mill and Cambridge Street Mill, the loss of residential amenities in the north side of Hulme, the potential for a conversion plan if the Co-living scheme was not successful, if short term tenancies for Co-living (i.e. 2 weeks) were to be considered and any arrangements concerning the access and egress of vehicles to and from the site.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to address the Member's concerns.

The Planning Officer stated that the closest aspect of the proposed development to the listed buildings is lower than the previous proposal for this site and lower than other consented similar schemes. Addressing the issue of a conversion plan the Planning Officer confirmed that this had been taken into account and would not require any structural work. On the subject of short term lettings the Planning Officer confirmed that this type of arrangement is already occurring in the City Centre in serviced apartments and hotels and that the Co-living method of living addressed the needs of this style of living arrangement. In conclusion the Planning Officer confirmed that there is an access strategy for the First Street site as a whole.

Further concerns were raised by a Member on the previous proposal for this site having provision for a Primary School and a medical practice which was not included in this proposal, having a public green space instead. The Member questioned the lack of residential community facilities.

The Planning Officer responded to address the concerns and state that a development nearby would house a Primary School and that previously the implied demand for public use amenities was underused and led to empty commercial units finally adding that the inclusion of green, open space would be easily accessible from Hulme.

Councillor Davies proposed the committee be minded to refuse the application and this was seconded by Councillor Lyons.

The Committee voted and gave their support to the decision of minded to refuse.

(Councillor Monaghan abstained from vote due to a poor internet connection which did not allow her to take part in the full consideration of the application).

### **Decision**

Minded to refuse on the basis of the impact on neighbouring residential areas in Hulme and also the development is in conflict with policies on current space standard and previous reports from the Executive.

The application was deferred and the Director of Planning asked to bring a report back which addresses the concerns raised and whether there are reasons for refusal that could be sustained.

(Councillor N Ali left the meeting at this point and did not return).

### **PH/20/43 126608/FO/2020 - Land to the South of Store Street, Manchester, M1 2NE - Piccadilly Ward**

This application is regarding the erection of part 4, part 11 storey residential (Class C3) development (with roof top plant room) comprising 66 (Class C3) residential units (3 x 2 bed town houses, 46 x two bed apartments and 17 x one bed apartments) together with associated car parking (10 spaces including 5 Electric Vehicle Charging spaces), cycle parking (66 spaces) communal roof terrace (level 6), landscaping and ancillary infrastructure including rooftop PV solar panels, alterations to access onto Store Street

The site is 0.1 hectares and bounded by Store Street, the Ashton Canal, the 3 storey William Jessop Court, a retaining wall and the junction of Millbank Street and Store Street. The elevated Ashton canal passes the southern boundary and crosses Store Street on an aqueduct, which is grade II\* listed. The site is 200 m North West of Piccadilly Station and is close to all sustainable transport options. The site is in Flood Risk Zone 1 (low risk) and is within a critical drainage area.

The application proposes the erection of part 4, part 11 storey building comprising 66 shared ownership homes (100% affordable) delivered through a joint venture with a registered provider. It would include 3 two bed town houses, 46 two bed apartments and 17 one bed apartments.

20% of the affordable homes would be secured through a S106 Agreement and the remaining 80% as a condition of grant funding from Homes England. The shared ownership housing model requires that the homes would be available for purchase at between 25% and 75% of market value. Occupiers who have entered into a Shared Ownership Lease would be allowed to 'staircase' to full ownership.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee with information about the application.

The Chair invited a Local Ward Councillor to speak on the application.

A Ward Councillor gave support to the application giving mention to it being a proposal of 100 percent affordable housing by Government definition and 20 percent genuinely affordable by the Manchester definition. The Ward Councillor welcomed the addition of City Centre premises that were classed as affordable and the two to one provision on tree planting whereby any one tree removed to develop the site would be replaced with two.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Councillor Lyons confirmed that he had declared an interest on the Item and was speaking as a Local Ward Councillor, not as a Member of the Committee. Councillor Lyons stated that this was the result of Local Ward Councillors putting their values and principles in action and thanked the applicants for working together with them to realise this vision of affordable housing in the City Centre. Councillor Lyons then left the meeting and took no part in the debate or vote on this item.

The Chair again invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

A Member spoke in support of the application on the basis of affordable housing on a shared ownership scheme and the two to one provision on tree planting.

A Member asked if there was any provision in place to halt any property developers purchasing any of the dwellings to sell for a profit.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the S106 scheme would prevent multiple acquisitions of any of the properties.

Councillor Y Dar made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor Kamal.

The Committee took a vote and gave their support to the decision to agree the recommendation

## **Decision**

Minded to approve the application, subject to a legal agreement in respect of securing the provision of 20% on site affordable housing (shared ownership – aligned with Manchester’s average income level) and subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.

**PH/20/44      125871/LL/2020 - 42 - 46 Thomas Street (including 41-45 Back Turner Street) Manchester M4 1ER - Piccadilly Ward**

This application is in regard to the demolition of 42, 44 and 46 Thomas Street (including 41, 43 and 45 Back Turner Street) to facilitate redevelopment of the wider site under extant planning permission and listed building consent ref: 113475/FO/2016 and 113476/LO/2016

Planning permission and listed building consent were granted in August 2017 to develop a site bounded by Thomas Street, Kelvin Street and Back Turner Street. The scheme incorporated 7 Kelvin Street, a grade II listed building, but removed the 3 storey former weaver’s cottages known as 42-46 Thomas Street (including 41, 43 and 45 Back Turner Street). 7 Kelvin Street is on the City Council’s local Buildings at Risk list.

Due to the particular circumstances of the matter a site visit had been arranged for members which took place in the morning prior to the committee meeting.

The meeting was informed that the Weavers Cottages referred to were not then listed but they were considered to be non-designated heritage assets. The impact of their loss was properly considered in the context of national and local planning policies. They have been heavily altered internally and much original fabric and character has been lost.

The application approved the erection of a 4/5 storey building that retained and incorporated the Grade II Listed 7 Kelvin Street, to provide 20 dwellings, with active ground floor uses, following the demolition of numbers 42 to 46 Thomas Street (113475).

A related application for listed building consent approved alterations and repair and change of use of 7 Kelvin Street to 3 apartments as part of a 4/5 storey residential development (113476).

In July 2018, following the acquisition of the site, the Weavers cottages were designated as Grade II Listed. As such all remaining buildings on-site are now grade-II listed. Applications to discharge pre-commencement conditions on the site have been submitted and are currently under consideration

The Chair invited a Planning Officer to introduce the Item.

The Planning Officer requested the Committee take note of a minor amendment in the supplementary agenda.

The Chair then invited the applicant to speak and the applicant addressed the Committee with information about the application.

A Ward Councillor spoke in objection to the proposed demolition and redevelopment of the site, stating that the grade-II listed buildings in question consist of three mill workers cottages and are survivors of Manchester's industrial and working class heritage. The Ward Councillor gave mention to Historic England having submitted a representation which detailed why they felt the demolition should not be allowed and that Historic England believed there was still a viable use for the buildings in their current state. The Ward Councillor requested the Committee consider a decision of minded to refuse to facilitate further investigations on how the buildings could be developed without losing their heritage character, giving further mention of Heritage England's alleged intention of appealing any proposed demolition and redevelopment.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Councillor Lyons confirmed that he had declared an interest on the Item and was speaking as a Ward Councillor, not as a Member of the Committee. Councillor Lyons made comment that the application was not for renovation but for demolition of a grade-II listed building, stating that the site was structurally sound and inferred that the redevelopment application was for a larger net gain. Councillor Lyons stated that the objection received from Heritage England was one of the strongest he had known in his time as a Ward Councillor. Councillor Lyons requested a motion of minded to refuse and stated that, if achieved, he and other Ward Councillors would work with the developers to facilitate the renovation of these grade-II listed buildings. Councillor Lyons then left the meeting and took no part in the debate or vote on this item.

The Chair invited a Planning Officer to speak on the application.

The Planning Officer gave mention to Heritage England having stated that the loss of the grade-II listed buildings would be considered as substantial harm and that the scheme would be viable if the buildings were kept. The Planning Officer informed the Committee that if they were in approval of the proposal the decision could only be as minded to approve as the matter would then need to be referred to the Secretary of State. The Planning Officer then stated that the situation was unique in that the plot had been purchased and planning permission approved prior to the buildings receiving their heritage status.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members spoke of the useful site visit they had attended and expressed their concern over the proposed demolition of what is now listed as part of Manchester's industrial and working class heritage.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to make a comment.

The Planning Officer stated that the listed building status was confirmed two years ago and that no other scheme had presented itself prior to this application further

stating that there had been a notable volume of objections received in the run up to the committee meeting.

Councillor Lovecy proposed the Committee be minded to refuse and this was seconded by Councillor S Ali.

### **Decision**

Minded to refuse on the basis that demolition would be contrary to policies on the conservation of historic assets in the city which represent Manchester's working class heritage.

The application was deferred and the Director of Planning asked to bring a report back which addresses the concerns raised and whether there are reasons for refusal that could be sustained.

### **PH/20/45      127142/FO/2020 - Land to the East of the Fairway Manchester M40 3WS - Moston Ward**

The application site relates to an open piece of land situated along The Fairway within a predominantly residential area of Moston in North Manchester. The site is bounded by residential to the north, east and the west, with Moston Brook Recreational Space to the east. The site is accessed via The Fairway.

The proposal site is irregular in shape with the frontage being narrower than the remainder of the site which opens up as it goes further rearward. It is immediately bounded to the north east of the application site by a sub-station and a detached property identified as no. 51 The Fairway. Moston Brook Recreational Space lies immediately to the south of the site, and to the east residential properties on West Avenue and opposite the site and to the east are residential properties relating to The Fairway.

Currently the frontage of the site is bounded by low timber rail fencing erected by the applicant and connects to the dry stone wall that returns partially along the eastern boundary with the pathway running through to Moston Brook Recreational Space. There is no formal vehicular access to the site with the main access being pedestrianised.

The submitted application proposes the erection of one 2 storey dwellinghouse (Class C3) with associated parking, landscaping and boundary treatment.

The Chair invited the applicant to speak and the applicant addressed the Committee with information about the application.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members welcomed the proposal and the zero loss of trees on the site.

Councillor Lyons moved the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor S Ali.

**Decision**

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted.



## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 24 September 2020**

**This Planning and Highways meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Hitchen, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeline Monaghan, and White

**Also Present:**  
Councillors M Dar, O'Neill and Wheeler

#### **PH/20/46 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications (126431/FO/2020, 125596/FO/2019, 127053/FO/2020 and 126435/FO/2020), since the agenda was issued, was circulated.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/20/47 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2020 as a correct record subject to the inclusion of Councillors Riasat and Watson in the list of apologies given at the meeting.

#### **PH/20/48 126431/FO/2020 - Site South of Sportcity Way, East of Joe Mercer Way, West of Alan Turing Way And North of the Ashton Canal at the Etihad Campus Manchester - Ancoats and Beswick Ward**

The application proposes a multi-use arena comprising 68,608 sqm of floorspace with ancillary retail, food and beverage uses.

This 4.46 hectare site is used as a 500 space overspill car park for events at the Etihad stadium. The site is secured with a mesh fence on all sides and contains a number of self-seeded trees and shrubs. Its topography is relatively flat with a gentle slope from south to north before the site drops steeply down to the Ashton Canal.

The site is bounded by Joe Mercer Way (an elevated pedestrian walkway connecting to the Etihad Stadium) which separates the site from the Manchester Tennis and Football Centre located further west, Alan Turing Way, a four lane road with segregated cycle lanes is to the east with the Ashton Canal and the Etihad Metrolink stop to the south.

The applicant's aim is to develop the best arena in Europe in Manchester that would attract the world's top events and shows. They aim to set new standards in terms of arena design and environmental sustainability.

The design would be unique and enable the main auditorium to operate in a variety of different seating modes and host different entertainment and leisure events including music, sport, performances, awards ceremonies and other live entertainment. Its capacity would normally be 20,000 but could be extended to 23,500 for events where a centre stage configuration is used.

The arena would host events on scheduled days throughout the week and year. The operational strategy could occasionally result in events taking place at the same time or same day as football events at the Etihad Stadium. The associated impacts of this are considered in detail in the report.

The auditorium would be custom designed for a much more compact, flexible and intimate configuration compared to comparable capacity venues. The lower tier of the seating bowl would have retractable seating that could be configured in a variety of ways in maximise the spectator experience. The upper tier would project and be lower to the heart of the auditorium to enable a more intimate spectator experience.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to present the Item.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that additional information had been provided within the 'Supplementary Information on Applications' document, previously circulated. Reference was made to representations received from the Manchester Arena and Printworks to have the application referred to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to decide whether the application should be called in for determination, if the Committee was minded to Approve. The Planning Officer reported that all aspects of the scheme had been addressed and this was detailed within the planning report. Reference was made to a representation received from the Executive Vice President of ASM Global (operating company of Manchester Arena), regarding the impact of the development on the Manchester Arena, and which requested the Committee to consider the impact of the application in line with the concerns of other city centre stakeholders. In addition it was reported that the £100million investment planned for the Manchester Arena by ASM Global, may not be justified if the application was approved.

A further representation from ASM Global had suggested that the Market Assessment had not been properly considered by the Council's independent advisor. The planning Officer confirmed that the Council's independent advisors had reviewed the additional work and had confirmed in writing that it did not fundamentally alter their advice that there is robust evidence to support the proposal.

The Committee was advised that if the Committee was Minded to Approve the application, the approval notice would not be issued until the Secretary of State had considered the application.

The Chair invited an objector to speak.

The objector spokesperson addressed the Committee on behalf of ASM Global and other interested stakeholders. Concern was expressed on the impact of the application on the sustainability and vitality of the city centre economy. In addition, concern was expressed on the matters not included within the planning report that were raised in the late representation that had been left unanswered relating to growth in the market and the split from the city centre. The point was made that the forecasts produced in the application had yet to be tested and needed to be fully understood before a decision could be made. Other issues raised related to the impact of the application on the Manchester Arena and the planned investment of £100million by ASM Global. In addition, reference was made to policy C9 which seeks to protect the city centre and the East Manchester Regeneration Framework which was produced to complement the city centre offer. The Committee was advised that the Manchester Arena had the capacity to meet expansion and growth in the market. The application did not provide links to the city centre similar to the Manchester Arena and took potential trade away from city centre businesses.

The Chair invited the applicant's agent to speak on the application. In response to the points raised in the representations it was stated that there is sustainable growth in the market for two city arenas. Other cities have recognised growth in these markets and this would be sustained in Manchester through the increase of the population over the next fifteen years. The evidence produced has been robustly tested independently and this has indicated that the visitor spend generated by a second arena would benefit the city centre economy. It was hoped that a new arena will help spur the operators of the Manchester Arena to invest in the facility and provide the city with two high quality entertainment venues.

A ward councillor addressed the Committee and reported that other ward councillor and local residents in surrounding wards have welcomed the application and supportive recognising the benefits this will bring to the surrounding ward areas such as job creation and apprenticeships.

A ward councillor welcomed the application and referred to the importance of maintaining balance between the two arenas and businesses in the city centre. Reference was made to the positives which the development would bring to East Manchester in the form of jobs during and after construction and the potential of attracting further investment to the area. It was hoped that Manchester Arena could continue to be a world class venue and a second arena could complement this.

A ward councillor referred to parking arrangements for local residents and sought an assurance that there would be no cost to residents or the Council. In welcoming the application and the positive benefit it provides for local residents through jobs and training opportunities, the councillor considered it reasonable that the city could accommodate two arenas. Officers were asked for clarification regarding the overlap of events being held at the new arena and football matches arranged for the Etihad

Stadium and the traffic plan to deal with the large numbers of attendees and vehicles this would attract.

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

A member in welcoming the application and the benefits it would bring to the area and local economy also asked officers to explain the arrangements in place to deal with events at both the arena and the Etihad Stadium.

The Planning Officer responded by explaining that the evidence that has been presented to the Committee had been analysed and the conclusion from this suggests that two arenas could operate successfully in the city. Officers are currently working with the operators of the Manchester Arena regarding their investment proposals which will take a phased approach. The residents parking zone intended for the area around the application site will be set up and operated at no cost to the Council and is subject to a Section 106 agreement. With reference to events clashing on the same day at the arena and the Etihad Stadium, it was reported that special measures would be introduced such as to stagger the start and finish times at each venue. Attendees would also be advised that limited parking would be available and sustainable transport options would be encouraged as well as improvements being made to the three existing walking routes from the city centre.

Officers were asked for clarification on the operation of a travel plan and in view of location of the site of the proposal being on the former Bradford coal mine, could an assurance be given on the safety of the development and impact on surrounding residential homes. With regard to the public realm works in the application would the trees planted be mature trees.

It was reported that the travel plan would be reviewed annually by the Council and the venue operators. The Coal Authority had been consulted on the proposal and was satisfied that the issues raised can be addressed within the application. The Committee was informed that details of the public realm works had yet to be finalised but it was expected that the trees to be planted would be mature/semi mature.

A member referred to the consideration of market assessments as part of the application and asked officers for guidance on this.

It was reported that the application presents a large proposal and market assessment is a material consideration. The applicants have provided a detailed assessment and so had the objectors and the Council had engaged an independent consultant to provide advice. The advice received was there is a market available for two arena venues. The proposed venue would look to facilitate more diverse formats and layouts than the existing arena to open Manchester to different types of event and in doing so would attract a wider regional/national audience and provide a balance to the national economy.

A member referred to a community fund for the three local wards affected by the proposal and asked how this would be monitored. The Committee was informed that this was included in the draft S106 agreement but it was not a material planning consideration and members of the Committee should not consider it in their decision.

Councillor S Ali made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor Y Dar.

The Committee took a vote and gave their support to the decision to agree the recommendation.

## Decision

**Minded to Approve** subject to:-

- i) the signing of a section 106 agreement with regards to the review and expansion of the existing Residents Parking Zone (RPZ), an operational event management strategy, walking route improvement works, local labour commitments and waste management arrangements.
- ii) confirmation that the Secretary of State does not intend to call the application in for his own determination.
- iii) Revision to condition 15 as follows:

*15) Prior to the first use of the arena hereby approved, a strategy for use of the ancillary spaces throughout the arena building, including kiosks to the canal (as shown on drawing BRA-POP-ZZ-01-DR-A-0613 Rev 00 stamped as received by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, on the 6 March 2020), on non-arena event days shall be submitted for approval in writing by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority.*

*For the avoidance of doubt, this shall include details of the nature of the uses which would take place within the ancillary spaces including which facilities/spaces would be made available, the amount of floorspace to be utilised, operating hours and any management arrangements to ensure authorised access to the arena building only.*

*The use of the ancillary spaces on non-arena event days shall be carried out in accordance with this strategy for as long as the arena is in use.*

*Reason – To facilitate the use of the ancillary spaces on non-arena event days for community use and other appropriate purposes including kiosks to the canal which would support natural surveillance and activity at the arena and Etihad Campus as part of supporting the vitality of the campus and community access to the building pursuant to policies SP1, EC7 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).*

(Councillor Flanagan declared a personal and pecuniary interest in the application and spoke as a Ward Councillor and took no part in the consideration of the application.)

(Councillor Hitchen declared a personal and pecuniary interest in the application and spoke as a Ward Councillor and took no part in the consideration of the application.)

(Councillor Monaghan did not take part in the consideration of the application or vote.)

**PH/20/49 126944/FO/2020 - Land Bound by Dantzic Street, Gould Street, Williamson Street and Bromley Street (Known As Victoria Riverside) Manchester – Cheetham Ward**

This application is for a proposal comprising 3 residential tower buildings of 37, 18 and 26 storeys above two 6 storey podiums on Dantzic Street to form 634 homes. 611 would be apartments with 13 townhouses and 10 maisonettes. 35% would be one bedroom, 55% two bedroom and 10% 3 bedroom offering a range of choice and accommodation would be attractive to families as well as smaller households.

The tower A, at 37 storeys, is at the junction of Gould Street and Dantzic Street followed by the tower B at 18 storey tower and the tower C at 26 storey tower. The distances between the towers has been maximised for privacy and to maximise views. A lower level block, 6 storey block on Dantzic Street and Bromley Street would include townhouses, maisonettes and commercial uses creating front doors onto the street.

Shared indoor and outdoor amenity spaces would be created on two podiums with private and semi-private amenity space and balconies. Podium A is the south of Bromley Street adjacent to Tower A. Podium B is located to the east of Bromley Street between towers B and C.

This 0.97 hectares vacant site is bounded by Dantzic Street, Gould Street, a railway viaduct and a warehouse unit. It is bisected by Bromley Street which lies in a northwest-southeast orientation. Bromley Street is closed.

The Planning Officer had nothing further to add to the application.

No objector was present at the meeting.

The applicant's representative spoke to the Committee on the application.

The Chair invited member of the Committee to comment on the application.

Members referred to the design of the proposal and officers were asked if the design was age friendly to enable residents to age in place and officers were asked if the proposal would include a local labour agreement to provide employment opportunities for local people.

The Committee was informed that there are a number of types and styles of accommodation proposed including houses and apartments gardens which would be suitable for all age groups. In addition, the Committee was informed that the S106 agreement did include a local labour agreement.

In welcoming the application the Chair noted that the development would include 20% affordable housing across the development.

Councillor S Ali made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor M Watson.

The Committee supported the recommendation.

### **Decision**

Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement in relation to affordable housing and the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted.

**PH/20/50      125596/FO/2019 - Land Bounded by Hulme Hall Lane, Varley Street, Iron Street, Coleshill Street and Rochdale Canal  
Manchester M40 8HH - Miles Platting & Newton Heath Ward**

This application relates to a housing-led mixed use development. It involves 410 new dwellings (Class C3) and 744sq.m of commercial floorspace comprising Class A1 (retail), Class A3 (restaurant/cafe) Class B1 (business/office use), together with recreation open space and landscaping, infrastructure provision and car parking. Following recent changes to planning legislation, the Class A1, A3 and B1 uses now fall within use Class E and the title of the application has been changed accordingly.

There would be a variety of house types ranging in size and design (2 bedroom 4 person, three bedroom 4 person, three bedroom five person and three bedroom six person houses) along with 107 apartments. All would meet the Council's approved space standards.

The development would include two blocks of apartments located along the south western boundary of the site adjacent to Varley Street, close to the junction with Holland Street, with a further two blocks fronting onto Hulme Hall Lane in proximity to Coleshill Street. The apartment blocks would be part four, part five, and five storeys in height. The rest of the site would then include the dwellinghouses, which would be either 2 or 3 storeys in height.

The layout would be in the form of a gird iron pattern of buildings with the majority of houses facing onto the street (some terraces facing the canal would face onto pedestrian routes which link to the proposed highways). Each would have a small rear garden and access to larger shared courtyard areas which would include some off street parking provision. These areas would be secured, On street parking controlled by the use of permits is also proposed.

A range of different tenures are included, build to rent and affordable housing being delivered through a registered provider (One Manchester). Overall there would be 36 Shared Ownership, 34 Affordable Rent, 44 rent to buy and 296 Build to Rent

The proposed commercial floorspace would primarily be located at ground floor level within the apartment block fronting onto Hulme Hall, the café element of the scheme would be located at ground level facing onto the canal with a flat above.

As noted there would be a new highway network into and around the site, which would connect Hulme Hall Lane in an east west direction to Varley Street. Car parking has been provided at a provision of 310 parking spaces, 438 cycle spaces and 22 parking spaces for disabled users which are all included within the proposed development. Parking for the most part is in the form of on street bays and would be managed through a residents permit scheme.

Associated landscaping, boundary treatments, new highways with street trees, and significant site remediation is also proposed. The layout of the site incorporates seven key areas of open space each with its own distinct character but which would create a chain of practical and useable space for future and existing residents.

The scheme would also necessitate the provision of a number of substations within the overall site.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to present the Item.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that additional information had been provided within the 'Supplementary Information on Applications' document, previously circulated. The Committee was informed that an objection had been received from a ward councillor regarding the loss of football pitches and recreational land. As a result of concerns raised an amendment was recommended to be made to the legal agreement to include a payment for the provision of recreational /sports facilities, with the current green space to remain in use until any new or upgraded facility becomes available. In recognising the potential for a 'rat run' through the development it is proposed that a further condition is added with the condition wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee. In addition, Condition 7 of the application, referencing offsite highways works on Traffic Regulation Orders would need to be amended to reflect the additional condition. Significant alterations to the canal frontage have been proposed by the applicant and agreed by the Canals and Waterways Trust including the removal of railings and the addition of new access points and these would be subject to an amendment to the existing proposed conditions to ensure full details of accessible access points to the canal are first agreed. A number of remediation works were also proposed and contained within the supplementary information. The recommendation to the Committee remained Minded to Approve subject to the amendment to the legal agreement and the inclusion of further condition and changes to the existing conditions as outlined.

No objector attended the meeting.

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

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments on the application.

A member welcomed the proposal and the opportunity that it would bring to the area but expressed concern on the lack of consultation with local councillors by officers. In addition, concern was expressed regarding a potential rat run through the development which had not been identified in the report. An assurance was sought for a physical barrier would be installed to reduce vehicle speed to protect



pedestrians and better access to the Rochdale Canal for the public. The Committee was informed that there are three pitches as part of the green space and no contact had been made with Sport England on the proposal to remove the pitches. It was requested that any financial agreement be in consultation with local councillors and would benefit local residents. The proposal was welcomed for the reasons that it will provide affordable good quality housing and use a brown field site requiring significant remediation works.

The planning Officer gave an assurance that the additional condition would address the concern of a 'rat run' and the legal agreement would be robustly worded to address the loss of green space and provision of a new or upgraded facility.

A member referred to the use of parking permits as part of the proposal and expressed concern that this may push parking onto existing residential areas and needed to be addressed to prevent it. Reference was also made on the lack of timely consultation with ward councillors on the application. Officers were asked to include ward councillors in the consideration of the additional highways condition.

The Planning Officer reported that the adopted roads within the controlled parking zone would subject to the existing wider controlled parking zone. Private roads would be subject to parking management measures on match days.

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

Director of Planning noted the concerns of members regarding consultations and offered to bring together officers from the service areas concerned to meet with local councillors to work through and address the concerns that had been raised.

A member took issue with the statement from the applicant's agent that local councillors had been consulted and stated that this was not the case. The Chair was requested to write to the Chief Executive to highlight the issues on consultation and involvement of local councillors arising from the application to ensure they are not repeated in future applications.

Councillor G White made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor J Flanagan.

The Committee supported the recommendation.

## **Decision**

1. **Minded to Approve** – subject to a section 106 legal agreement and amendment as outlined relating to a payment towards improved /new facilities to replace the green space to be lost, a clause relating to the timing of delivery of these facilities, a mechanism to re-test the viability of the development in relation to the delivery of affordable housing, should there be a delay in the implementation of the planning permission, together with a further review prior to the occupation of the development, and to finance the future administration, enforcement and maintenance of the residents permit parking scheme. An additional condition to address the creation of a 'rat run' within the development and also rewording of

existing proposed conditions in order that details of accessible access points to the canal are agreed, with the wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning and the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee a subject to the additional conditions outlined in the supplementary information document.

2. That the Director of Planning facilitate a meeting with local ward councillors and officers involved in the areas of service concerned to address issues that have been identified relating to traffic calming measures arrangements to maintain access to green and recreational space and public access to the Rochdale Canal.

**PH/20/51 127053/FO/2020 - Vacant Land on the corner of Victory Street and Claremont Road Manchester M14 5AE - Moss Side Ward**

This application relates to the erection of four two storey houses with associated car parking and landscaping. The application site comprises vacant land (previously used to accommodate residential housing until between 1961 and 1979) measuring 923m<sup>2</sup> in size.

The land is currently in an unkempt condition, it currently features a number of trees and a significant area of dense vegetation undergrowth, it is located on the west side of Victory Street near to its junction with Claremont Road. The site is located in Moss Side Ward.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to introduce the application. The Planning Officer informed the Committee that additional information had been provided within the 'Supplementary Information on Applications' document, previously circulated. There was no further information to present on the application.

There was no objector to the application and the applicant did not attend the meeting.

Councillor M Watson made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor J Flanagan.

**Decision**

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.

**PH/20/52 126435/FO/2020 - 27 Trenchard Drive Manchester M22 5LZ Woodhouse Park**

The application site relates to the conversion of the existing dwelling to create 2 no. three bedroom dwellings; and the erection of 2 x 4 bedroom dwellings with associated car parking and landscaping.

This application was placed before the Planning and Highways Committee on 27 August 2020 and at that meeting the committee deferred deliberation in order to allow Members to undertake a site visit due to concerns about overdevelopment and the impact on the community from construction vehicles.

The application site measures 1,421m<sup>2</sup> in size and is located on the western side of Trenchard Drive. It is irregular in shape and consists of nos. 25 and 27/29 Trenchard Drive. No. 25 Trenchard Drive was a former garage that was converted into a dwellinghouse, albeit without the benefit of planning permission, while nos. 27/29 Trenchard Drive, was originally a pair of semi-detached dwellings that was last used as a single residence (now vacant following a fire).

The Committee had undertaken a site visit to view the development site and surrounding area.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that additional information had been provided within the 'Supplementary Information on Applications' document, previously circulated.

An objector to the application addressed the Committee.

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

A Ward Councillor addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

The Planning Officer advised the Committee that in response to the objections raised regarding overdevelopment it was necessary to show significant harm the development would cause. The size of the development had been reduced and the properties would have larger gardens with tree planting and eight parking spaces.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment on the application.

Members referred to the site visit and opportunity to view the application site and in doing so supported the application, in view of the changes made by the applicant following consultation with planning officers.

Councillor Y Dar made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor S Ali.

### **Decision**

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.

**PH/20/53 125871/LL/2020 - 42 - 46 Thomas Street (including 41-45 Back Turner Street) Manchester M4 1ER - Piccadilly Ward**

This application relates to the demolition of 42, 44 and 46 Thomas Street (including 41, 43 and 45 Back Turner Street) to facilitate redevelopment of the wider site under extant planning permission and listed building consent ref: 113475/FO/2016 and 113476/LO/2016.

At its meeting on 27 August 2020 the Committee resolved that it was 'minded to refuse' this application on the basis that the demolition would be contrary to policies on the conservation of historic assets in the city which represent Manchester's working class heritage. They requested officers to bring a report to the next meeting to address their concerns.

Officers believe that the case setting out why these buildings cannot be retained was clearly set out in the previous report and on that basis they do not believe that a reason for refusal can be substantiated. However, there are policies that seek to protect the historic environment and if Members remain sufficiently concerned about the validity of the case to support the demolition the following reason for refusal is suggested:

The demolition of 42-46 Thomas Street would fail to preserve or enhance the Grade II designated heritage asset causing irreversible harm through the total loss of the buildings which would not meet the tests set out in section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) as a clear and convincing justification for the loss has not been provided and it has not been demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. It is therefore considered to be contrary to Government Guidance contained in Sections 16(2) of (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and The Core Strategy for the City of Manchester, in particular Policy EN3 (Heritage) CC9 (Design and Heritage) and saved policy DC19.1 (Listed Buildings) of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

Notwithstanding the suggested reason for refusal, for the reasons set out in the remainder of the report, the recommendation of officers is that this application be approved subject referral to the Secretary of State in accordance with the Arrangements for handling heritage applications – notification to Historic England and National Amenity Societies and the Secretary of State (England) Direction 2015

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to introduce the report. The Committee was advised that the recommendation of planning officers was that the application should be approved, however if it was the Committee's decision to refuse the application the report provided reasons to support the decision.

No objector attended the meeting.

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

A ward councillor addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

The Planning Officer responded to the issues raised and stated that the buildings were currently in a poor state of repair and it was unlikely that sufficient funds would be available to rescue the buildings and further decline was inevitable. In the current state the buildings had no commercial value.

The invited the Committee to comment on the application.

Members in commenting on the application referred to the heritage value of the buildings and the historical importance they hold in terms of Manchester's textile history. It was considered that the historic value of the building outweighed the value provided by the development and for that reason the application should be refused.

Councillor White made a request to move refuse and this was seconded by Councillor J Hitchen.

### **Decision**

Refuse - the demolition of 42-46 Thomas Street would fail to preserve or enhance the Grade II designated heritage asset causing irreversible harm through the total loss of the buildings which would not meet the tests set out in section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) as a clear and convincing justification for the loss has not been provided and it has not been demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. It is therefore considered to be contrary to Government Guidance contained in Sections 16(2) of (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and The Core Strategy for the City of Manchester, in particular Policy EN3 (Heritage) CC9 (Design and Heritage) and saved policy DC19.1 (Listed Buildings) of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

### **PH/20/54 125655/FO/2019 - Water Street Manchester M3 4JQ - Deansgate Ward**

Consideration of this application was deferred at Committee on 27 August 2020.

At its meeting on 30 July 2020 the Committee resolved that it was 'minded to refuse' the application on the grounds that the number of units proposed was too large and it did not provide sufficient parking for disabled people. They requested officers to bring a report to the next meeting to address these concerns.

The site, known as T1, is 0.32 ha and bounded by Water Street, Manchester Goods Yard, and Grape Street. It is accessed from Water Street and is in use as a construction site for Manchester Goods Yard. The original planning permission (114385/FO/2016) approved the Manchester Goods Yard offices and a residential 'Tower (T1). Manchester Goods Yard is under construction and this proposal would replace the 'T1' element of that permission.

This application would supersede the Tower 1 element of the previous permission with a 32 storey building comprising 390 Co-Living Apartments with 210no. 2-, 3-

and 4-bed shared apartments and 180 studios with 870 Bedspaces. There would be ancillary amenity space on four floors consisting of residents' amenity space, a gym, commercial space, and self-storage. There would be 152 cycle spaces in the building and 40 sheffield stands in the public realm.

Planning Permission has previously been granted for the demolition of all buildings and structures and the erection of a 32 storey residential building comprising 350 homes (Class C3) with retail uses at ground floor (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4); an 8 storey mixed use building comprising workspace (B1), with retail uses (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4) and residential live/work uses; and, the creation of new public realm, landscaping, car and cycle parking, access and other associated works.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to introduce the application.

No objector was present at the meeting.

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

The Chair invited the Committee to comment on the application.

Members of the Committee referred to the issues previously raised by the Committee regarding the scale of the development and the untested concept of co-living in Manchester and the space provided. Reference was also made to the provision of disabled parking and the necessity of ensuring provision is available for residents and visitors without charging at a prohibited level.

The Planning Officer noted the comments made and explained that the units within the development that could be permanent homes do meet space standards. Issues relating to additional parking would be included in the S106 agreement and conditions attached to the approval notice to the applicant.

Councillor S Ali made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor N Ali.

## **Decision**

Approve subject to:

- a s.106 covering occupancy, long-term management, payment of Council Tax, reduced rental provision and waste management.
- Inclusion in the s106 agreement of 35 disabled parking spaces for residents and visitors that are not charged at a prohibited level.

(Councillor Monaghan did not take part in the consideration of the application.)

**PH/20/55      125573/FO/2019 - Plot 11 First Street Comprising Land Bound by Hulme Street to the North, Wilmott Street to the East, the Unite Parkway Gate Development and Mancunian Way to the South and Medlock Street to the West Manchester - Deansgate Ward**

This application relates to the construction of four buildings of heights varying from 10 storeys to 45 storeys together comprising Co-living bedspaces (use class sui generis) and associated amenity facilities, with ground floor commercial units (Use classes A3 (Café / Restaurant and D2 (Gym)), private amenity space and public realm comprising hard and soft landscaping, car parking and cycle facilities and other associated works.

Plot 11 First Street Comprising Land Bound By Hulme Street To The North, Wilmott Street To The East, The Unite Parkway Gate Development And Mancunian Way To The South, And Medlock Street To The West, Manchester

At its meeting on 27 August 2020 the Committee resolved that it was 'minded to refuse' the application on the grounds of the impact on neighbouring residential areas in Hulme and the development is in conflict with policies on current space standard and previous reports from the Executive. They requested officers to bring a report to the next meeting to address these concerns.

The site is an integral part of First Street and is clearly within the City Centre. It is part of a broad sweep of land to the north of the Mancunian Way which has been identified for high density development for over 20 years and includes Great Jackson Street, First Street, Circle Square, UMIST/IQ/ID and Mayfield. It is one of the few remaining areas in the City where the Councils commercial and growth ambitions can be delivered. The committee has previously approved schemes within these areas of a similar overall density and what is proposed here is not unusual.

The southern boundary of the site is adjacent to the Mancunian Way which is an interface with Hulme, This stretch of the Mancunian way is 18m in width and includes an elevated section which clearly separates this part of the City Centre from Hulme. The closest part of the development to any residential property in Hulme is 67m. The impacts of the scheme in terms of amenity are clearly set out in the main body of the report and these are all considered to be acceptable. On this basis officers do not believe that a reason for refusal on these grounds could be substantiated.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to introduce the application.

The Planning Officer made reference to economic information contained within the application which provided an outline of potential benefits of the proposal for:

- employment creation of direct and in direct jobs and apprenticeships;
- inclusion of a local labour agreement;
- the overall benefit the city economy and workforce.

There was no objector present at the meeting.

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

The Chair invited the Committee to comment on the application.

A member referred to size standards of the studio accommodation which had been considered as unacceptable by the Committee. The point was made that during the Committee's site visit it was noted that the residents of Hulme had a view of the

Mancunian Way and this was not shielded in any way. Officers were asked if an agreement could include help with landscaping to improve the view and reduce road noise for Hulme residents.

The Planning Officer explained that the planning response to issues raised on the space standards of the development had not changed. In response to the point raised on the impact of the development on residents of Hulme it was reported this was not mitigation to support refusal of the application.

Members of the Committee raised a concern that applications that have been previously agreed could result in a new altered application which could make refusing difficult for the Committee. The point was made that co-living could result in residents paying more and living in smaller substandard accommodation. Officers were reminded that the Executive report on co-living had recommended caution in the development of proposals and this should be observed in consideration of the application.

The Planning Officer reported that there is no incentive for people to stay in smaller space accommodation for the reason that it is more expensive. The Council's Executive had agreed to use three locations to test the concept of co-living. The Committee was asked to note the development will help to provide choice of different styles of accommodation to meet demand and the management of the development when completed will be of a very high standard. The Committee was advised that the three locations identified for co-living developments were St John's, Piccadilly/ Northern Quarter and the Southern Corridor. The developments proposed would provide around four thousand five hundred units and it was not proposed to bring further developments of this scale at this time. A cautious approach had been taken with the size and scale of the developments as recommended by the Council's Executive. It was projected that users of the short term tenancy arrangement would vary in length and would provide an alternative to staying in an aparthotel.

A member indicated that they would oppose the application for the reasons that the scale and massing of the development would have a detrimental impact on listed building within the vicinity and loss of amenity for Hulme residents.

The Planning Officer stated that the assessment of the impact of the development of listed buildings had been provided in the planning report and was less than the impact of the previously agreed application for the site. On that basis there were no policy based reason to refuse the application.

A member referred to disabled parking arrangements and proposed that an additional forty four spaces be made available for disabled residents and visitors either on site or off site and that this be included in the s106 agreement.

The recommendation for approval of the application subject to the inclusion of forty four additional disabled parking spaces for residents and visitors either on site or off site to be included in the s106 agreement was proposed by Councillor Flanagan and seconded by Councillor S Ali.

## **Decision**



Minded to approve, subject to a legal agreement in respect of the Heads of Term and the inclusion of forty four additional disabled parking spaces for residents and visitors, either on site or off site, to be included in the s106 agreement.

(Councillors N Ali and Monaghan did not take part in the consideration of the application.)

This page is intentionally left blank

**Manchester City Council  
Report for Information**

**Report to:** Council – 28 October 2020

**Subject:** Use of Emergency Powers and Urgent Key Decisions

**Report of:** City Solicitor

---

**Purpose of report**

To report those key decisions that have been taken in accordance with the urgency provisions in the Council's Constitution.

The report also includes resolutions of the Executive made under the emergency provision agreed by the Council on 25<sup>th</sup> March 2020 (minute CC/20/26)

**Recommendation**

To note the report.

---

**Wards affected:** All

---

**Financial consequences for the Revenue budget**

None

**Financial consequences for the Capital Budget**

None

**Implications for:**

<b>Antipoverty</b>	<b>Equal Opportunities</b>	<b>Environment</b>	<b>Employment</b>
No	No	No	No

---

**Contact officers:**

Fiona Ledden  
City Solicitor  
0161 234 3087  
f.ledden@manchester.gov.uk

Donna Barnes  
Governance Officer  
0161 234 3037  
d.barnes@manchester.gov.uk

**Background documents:**

None.

## **1. Background**

- 1.1 The Constitution (Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules) establishes a procedure for dealing with key decisions where action needs to be taken immediately for reasons of urgency, and is therefore not subject to the normal call in arrangements.
- 1.2 The procedures states that the chair of the appropriate scrutiny committee must agree that both the decision proposed is reasonable in all the circumstances, and to it being treated as a matter of urgency.
- 1.3 Such decisions are to be reported to the Council and are listed under Section 2 of this report.
- 1.4 At its meeting on 25 March 2020 the Council agreed specific arrangements that would ensure continuity of the Council's decision-making functions during the COVID-19 outbreak, with the risks that might arise from members and officers being unable to participate in council business. (See minute CC/20/26). A list of resolutions of the Executive made under the emergency provision can be found in Section 3 of this report.

## 2 Urgent Key Decisions taken since the last meeting of Council

2.1 A list of key decisions requiring exemption from the call in procedure that have been taken since the last meeting of Council is set out below.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Reason for urgency</b>	<b>Decision Taken by</b>	<b>Approved by</b>
25 March 2020	Approval to extend the contract for the provision of a Community Falls Service	The contract was due to expire on 31 March 2020.  The Decision Maker sought to provide Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust (MFT) reassurance of continuity of service during a national emergency (COVID 19), and to provide some support for stability for a reasonable period of time at a time of national emergency.	Director of Public Health	Councillor Russell – Chair of Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee
25 March 2020	Approval to extend the contract for the provision of Support to Female Sex Workers	The contract was due to expire on 31 March 2020. The Decision Maker sought to provide the provider, MASH (Manchester Action on Street Health), reassurance of continuity of service during a national emergency (COVID 19), and to provide some support for stability for a reasonable period of time. MASH are a small charity delivering valued critical health and support services to a vulnerable client group	Director of Public Health	Councillor Russell – Chair of Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee
25 March 2020	Approval to extend the contract for the provision of a Health Visitor Service	The contract was due to expire. The Decision Maker sought to provide the provider reassurance of continuity of service during a national emergency (COVID 19), and to provide some support for stability for a reasonable period of time.	Director of Public Health	Councillor Russell – Chair of Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee
25 March 2020	Approval to extend the	The contract was due to expire. The Decision Maker sought to provide the provider reassurance of	Director of Public Health	Councillor Russell – Chair of

	contract for the provision of School Health Service	continuity of service during a national emergency (COVID 19), and to provide some support for stability for a reasonable period of time.		Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee
1 April 2020	Extension of the block contract with Standwalk for the period of 1/4/20 -31/3/21; as part of the Adults Contract Framework Extension	The contract had expired on 31st March 2020. The contract was in the process of being reviewed, however, due to current pandemic; COVID-19 this process was put on hold, hence agreement has been given for this to be extended for a further 12 months to 31st March 2021 as per the Adults Contract Extension Framework	Executive Director for Adult Services	Decision was taken under Emergency Planning Arrangements as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.
1 April 2020	Extension of the block contract with Potens for the period of 1/4/20 -31/3/21; as part of the Adults Contract Framework Extension	The contract had expired on 31st March 2020. The contract was in the process of being reviewed, however, due to current pandemic; COVID-19 this process was put on hold, hence agreement has been given for this to be extended for a further 12 months to 31st March 2021 as per the Adults Contract Extension Framework	Executive Director for Adult Services	Decision was taken under Emergency Planning Arrangements as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.
23 April 2020	Strategic Investment into a key asset in Greater Manchester	<p>There was an urgent requirement for the local authority to consider support to a key asset in Greater Manchester as a result of the global COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>The asset was of strategic economic and financial importance to Manchester, GM and the North West and provides a significant number of jobs to local residents. The delay would seriously prejudice the legal and financial position of the Council or the</p>	The Deputy Leader	Decision was taken under Emergency Planning Arrangements as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic.

		interests of the residents of Manchester.		
30 April 2020	Financial Measures to support the Care market through the COVID-19 Emergency Period	The COVID-19 response and associated financial plan was being progressed under Emergency Planning arrangements at the time of the decision. It was impractical to give 5 clear days' notice of the decision.	Executive Director for Adult Services	Decision was taken under Emergency Planning Arrangements as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic. The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing and the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources were consulted.
1 October 2020	To extend the Public Spaces Protection Orders relating to alley gating for a period of up to 3 years	To allow the existing alley gating schemes to remain and therefore to help reduce crime and anti-social behaviour within the relevant areas	Strategic Director - Neighbourhoods	Councillor John Hacking (Chair of Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee)



### 3. Use of Emergency Urgency Powers

3.1 A list of resolutions made by the Executive under emergency powers, since the last meeting of Council is set out below

#### **Executive 3 June 2020**

To approve the virements over £0.5m between capital schemes to maximise use of funding resources available to the City Council.

To approve these changes to capital programme:

- a) Highways Services - Planned Maintenance carriageway works 2020/21. A capital budget virement of £0.999m, funded by Highways Project Delivery fund budget.
- b) Children's Services - Schools Capital Maintenance Programme for 2020/21. A capital budget virement of £5m, funded by Unallocated Schools Capital Maintenance budget.
- c) Growth and Development – The Factory. A capital budget virement of £10m, funded by unallocated Inflation.

#### **Executive 3 July 2020**

To approve these changes to capital programme:

- a) Children's Services - Hyde Road Secondary School. A capital budget virement of £2m is requested, funded by Unallocated Education Basic Needs budget.
- b) Growth and Development – Acquisition of Land at Red Bank. A capital budget virement of £1.705m, funded by Northern Gateway Budget

#### **Executive 29 July 2020**

To approve a change to the Revenue Budget allowing the use of £1m of reserves: £550k to support the demand from increased placement costs within the Learning Disability Service, a further £300k to support the immediate implementation of a Brokerage function to embed new commissioning arrangements resulting from the implementation of the Liquidlogic IT system; and a further £150k due to the demand diagnostics work which will support the future funding work for Adult Social Care in 2021/22.

To approve these changes to capital programme:

- a) Children's Services – EBN Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) Programme Additional Costs. A capital budget virement of £0.923m, funded by unallocated Education Basic Needs Grant.
- b) Neighbourhoods – Indoor Leisure – Abraham Moss. A capital budget virement of £2.7m, funded from the Inflation budget, funded by borrowing.
- c) Neighbourhoods – Electric RCV Infrastructure – Additional costs. A capital budget increase of £0.150m, funded by borrowing.
- d) Growth and Development – House of Sport. A capital budget increase of £8.420m, funded by borrowing on an invest-to-save basis.

---

**Executive 9 September 2020**

To approve this change to capital programme:

ICT – Early Years and Education System (EYES) Additional funding. A capital budget decrease of £0.661m with a corresponding revenue budget increase of £0.661m funded from Capital Fund.