



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

Tuesday, 23 November 2021

Dear Councillor / Honorary Alderman,

Meeting of the Council – Wednesday, 1st December, 2021

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the Council which will be held at 10.00 am on Wednesday, 1st December, 2021, in The Council Chamber, Level 2, Town Hall Extension.

1. The Lord Mayor's Announcements and Special Business

1. To receive a presentation: Our Year 2022.
2. Lord Mayor's Special Recognition Award – Presentation to Claire Mooney in recognition of her significant contributions to women's rights, workers rights and tackling homophobia and social injustice across the city.

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. Minutes

To submit for approval the minutes of the meeting held on 6 October 2021.

7 - 14

4. Notice of Motion - Serious Youth Violence and Trauma Informed Services

The Government's austerity agenda has decimated police numbers and stripped youth service provision to the bone over the years, and this has clearly had an impact on the growth of Serious Youth Crime. The lives impacted by Serious Youth Crime often means we see lives cut short and futures lost. Families, friends, and communities devastated for what a turf war, toxic masculinity or more dangerously, criminal exploitation?

A 2021 report from Manchester Metropolitan University on

Serious Youth Violence shows that while crime has fallen rapidly over the last 20 years, serious youth violence defined by the Youth Justice Board (YJB) as ‘any drug, robbery or violence against the person offence that has a gravity score of five or more’ – has been rising with figures showing that both perpetrators and victims of these offences are getting younger. According to the Youth Violence Commission Final Report, SYV in England and Wales generated a total economic and social cost of £1.3 billion in 2018/19; a rise of over 50 per cent since 2014/15.

Though the social and economic reasons for serious youth violence are multiple. However, one commonality is that serious youth violence is underpinned by Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs). The 2021 report noted that youth justice workers interviewed for this research noted the high prevalence of ACEs among the children they work with. They noted how rare it was for a child to have only one or two ACEs, with most children having many more.

Adverse childhood trauma affects physical health, emotional balance, academic and professional capabilities and often interrupts lives with early death.

Therefore, this motion calls on Manchester City Council in 2022, which is also Manchester’s year of the child to champion not only greater awareness of ACEs and its consequences but ensure that children should receive trauma informed interventions by professionals at the point of adverse experiences. Children should have access to these services via schools, social services and health services. Early intervention in a child’s life can not only reduce the consequences of ACE but also potentially reduce the number of children presenting to services for Serious Youth Violence offences but also reduce the economic and social cost of Serious Youth Violence.

Proposed by Councillor M Dar, seconded by Councillor Igbon and also signed (via email) by Councillors Battle, Doswell, Hussain and Riasat.

5. Notice of Motion - Stamp Out Spiking

The Council notes:

This October hundreds of women and young people took to St Peter’s Square in protests against a sharp rise in spiking cases.

Even though drink-spiking is an offence and can carry a ten-year prison sentence, it is hard to get a clear picture of the scale of drink spiking and spiking including spiking via injection: there simply is no recent or comprehensive publicly-available data on the number of reported cases.

According to Stamp Out Spiking national research, over 97% of victims don't report being spiked to the police, and generally people don't usually report spiking unless there are further offences committed.

Manchester is the home of the Women's rights movement. We are proud as a city to have active campaigning and support organisations who have continually fought for the safety and protection of women.

The Council resolves:

To support initiatives which actively challenge cultural attitudes that allow sexual assault and harassment to take place including improving education for boys and men regarding personal responsibility, respect, consent and healthy attitudes to sex and relationships;

To explore whether conditions on licenced premises can be included through the Council's licencing regime to ensure venues have appropriate security and staff training in place to improve safety including the search for spiking paraphernalia and recognising signs that someone could be perpetrating this offence;

To commit to work with key stakeholders, particularly those in the night time economy, to review and implement all possible safety options as a matter of urgency;

To ensure that women's safety is a key focus on the Council's Commission on Tackling Violence and Misogyny against Women and Girls that will be launched in 2022;

To write to the UK Government and seek clarity on its plans to classify misogyny as a hate crime, which would encourage reporting of spiking incidents and enable better categorisation of crime to understand the scale of the issue;

To ask the CEO and the new Chief Constable of Greater Manchester Police Stephen Watson to write a joint letter to the government for a comprehensive review into the prevalence of, and response of the criminal justice system when investigating spiking offences. The review to consider the incidence rates and rates of reporting by victims; charging and prosecution rates for the offence; the adequacy of sentencing guidelines for the offence; the adequacy of police investigations into reports of the offence; re-offending rates, and rates of offenders who commit sexual offences following a charge or sentence for administering substance with intent; the impact of the offence on victims.

Proposed by Councillor Lynch, seconded by Councillor Stogia and also signed (via email) by Councillors Jeavons, Ludford, Midgley, Moore, Rahman and Russell

- 6. Proceedings of the Executive** 15 - 24
To submit the minutes of the Executive on 20 October 2021 and 17 November 2021 and in particular to consider:

Exe/21/98 Capital Programme Update

The Executive recommends that the Council approve the following changes to Manchester City Council's capital programme:

- Neighbourhoods – Blackley Crematorium Cremator Replacement Additional Funding. A capital budget increase of £0.203m is requested, funded by Borrowing.

Exe/21/113 Withington Baths Financial Support

The Executive recommends to Council a capital budget increase of £1 million for the purpose of a loan from Manchester City Council to Love Withington Baths Charitable Trust, to be over a repayment period of a maximum of 25 years, and to be funded from borrowing.

Exe/21/120 This City – Funding for Phase 1 Development

The Executive recommends that the Council approve a capital budget increase of £33m funded by prudential borrowing.

- 7. Questions to Executive Members and Others under Procedural Rule 23** 25 - 28

To receive answers to any questions that councillors have raised in accordance with Procedural Rule 23

- 8. Resignation of the Leader of the Council - Councillor Sir Richard Leese**

- 9. Appointment of Leader of the Council**

- 10. Scrutiny Committees** 29 - 106
To note the minutes of the following scrutiny committees:

Communities and Equalities 2021	12 October & 9 November
Resources and Governance 2021	12 October & 9 November
Health November 2021	13 October & 10

Children and Young People	13 October & 10 November
Environment and Climate Change	14 October & 11 November 2021
Economy	14 October & 11 November 2021

11. Proceedings of Committees

107 - 188

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

Constitutional & Nomination Committee	1 December 2021 (to be tabled)
Health & Wellbeing Board	3 November 2021
Licensing & Appeals Committee	25 October 2021
Licensing Committee	25 October 2021
Licensing Policy Committee	15 November 2021

LPC/21/07 Revised Gambling Policy 2022 - 2025

The Council is recommended to approve and adopt the Gambling Policy 2022-2025.

A copy of the policy is attached.

Personnel Committee	20 October 2021
Planning and Highways Committee	21 October & 18 November 2021
Standards Committee	4 November 2021

12. Key Decisions Report

189 - 192

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.

Six 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 www.manchester.gov.uk

Members of the Council

Councillors:-

T Judge (Chair), Abdullatif, Akbar, Azra Ali, Ahmed Ali, Nasrin Ali, Sameem Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Andrews, Appleby, Baker-Smith, Bano, Battle, Bayunu, Benham, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Chohan, Clay, Collins, Connolly, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Y Dar, Davies, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Farrell, Foley, Flanagan, Green, Grimshaw, Hacking, Hassan, Hewitson, Hilal, Hitchen, Holt, Hughes, Hussain, Hutchinson, Igbon, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, Leese, J Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Monaghan, Moore, Newman, Noor, Nunney, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reeves, Reid, Riasat, Richards, Robinson, Rowles, Russell, Sadler, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, Simcock, Stanton, Stogia, Taylor, Wheeler, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

Honorary Aldermen of the City of Manchester –

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

Further Information

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

Andrew Woods

Tel: 0161 234 3011

Email: andrew.woods@manchester.gov.uk

This agenda was issued on **Tuesday, 23 November 2021** by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Manchester City Council, Level 2, Town Hall Extension (Library Walk Elevation), Manchester M60 2LA

Council

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 6 October 2021

Present:

The Right Worshipful, the Lord Mayor Councillor T Judge – in the Chair

Councillors:

Abdullatif, Akbar, Azra Ali, Ahmed Ali, Sameem Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Andrews, Appleby, Baker-Smith, Bano, Battle, Bayunu, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Chohan, Clay, Connolly, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Y Dar, Doswell, Evans, Farrell, Flanagan, Foley, Green, Grimshaw, Hassan, Hewitson, Hilal, Hitchen, Holt, Hughes, Igbon, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, Leese, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, McHale, Midgley, Monaghan, Moore, Newman, Noor, Nunney, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reeves, Reid, Riasat, Richards, Robinson, Rowles, Russell, Sadler, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, A Simcock, Stanton, Stogia, Taylor, Wheeler, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

CC/21/54 The Lord Mayor's Announcements and Special Business – Local Authority Chief Executive of the Year Award

The Lord Mayor presented the Chief Executive, Joanne Roney with the Municipal Journal Annual Award for Local Authority Chief Executive 2021. The award is presented to leaders in the top tier of local government in recognition of outstanding leadership, innovation, determination and commitment to their organisation and communities. The Lord Mayor acknowledged the achievement in view of the challenges Manchester has faced over the recent past including the terrorist attack at Manchester Arena, Manchester's response to Covid-19 and work to improve opportunities and skills for local people.

CC/21/55 The Lord Mayor's Special Business – Presentation on the Benefits of City Centre Development

The Lord Mayor introduced the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure, Pat Bartoli who gave a presentation to Council on the Benefits of Development. Following the presentation, the Director answered questions from Council members.

CC/21/56 Lord Mayor's Special Business – Presentation on Armed Forces Covenant Gold Accreditation

The Lord Mayor introduced the Director of Children's Services, Paul Marshall who gave a presentation on the Armed Forces Covenant Gold Accreditation that the Council has received. Following the presentation, the Director answered questions from Council members.

CC/21/57 Lord Mayor's Special Business – Presentation on Race Review into Council Workforce

The Lord Mayor introduced Michael Salmon, Policy Partnerships and research Team who gave a presentation on the progress of the implementation of the findings of the recent race review into Council workforce practices. Following the presentation, the Michael answered questions from Council members.

CC/21/58 Minutes

Decision

The Minutes of the meeting held on 14 July 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

CC/21/59 Notice of Motion – Calling on the government not to scrap the £20 per week uplift in universal credit

Motion proposed and seconded:

This Council notes:

Universal Credit was increased by £20 a week (or £1,040 a year) in April 2020 as part of a government support package when the country first went into lockdown. This was paid to all working age residents in receipt of Universal Credit and other means tested benefits. This has continued for the last eighteen months and has had a positive impact on residents and the economy of the city. The government has now withdrawn this additional payment from 6 October 2021. This withdrawal will have a negative impact on low-income households in the city, including those that are working, and is also expected to have an impact on discretionary budgets including the Welfare Provision Scheme and the Discretionary Housing Payment scheme. This will have a devastating impact on residents across our city. It has been calculated that the withdrawing of the £20 per week uplift will result in a loss of approximately £4.96m per month to families across our city. This will impact an estimated 58,339 households across Manchester. Many of these households are working households in low paid jobs who rely on Universal Credit to make ends meet on a daily basis. We are talking about carers, shop workers, cleaners the roles that got us all through the pandemic. The roles that had previously been described as low skilled became some of the most important roles in society when Covid hit. In Manchester we have a long standing commitment to creating good jobs for Manchester residents, proudly paying the real living wage and promoting the GM Good Employment Charter. We must continue to work to create good, sustainable jobs that all Manchester people can access.

This Council moves to:

- Call upon the Conservative Government not to scrap the £20 per week uplift in Universal Credit.
- Call upon the Government to increase the minimum wage to the real living wage that reflects the cost of living.
- To support our residents impacted by government changes to benefits.
- To continue to work to ensure jobs in our city are sustainable, secure and fairly paid.
- To continue to support our residents through training and upskilling to make sure that jobs in this City are accessible to all of our residents.

Resolution

The motion was put to Council and voted on and the Lord Mayor declared that it was carried unanimously.

Decision

This Council notes:

Universal Credit was increased by £20 a week (or £1,040 a year) in April 2020 as part of a government support package when the country first went into lockdown. This was paid to all working age residents in receipt of Universal Credit and other means tested benefits. This has continued for the last eighteen months and has had a positive impact on residents and the economy of the city. The government has now withdrawn this additional payment from 6 October 2021. This withdrawal will have a negative impact on low-income households in the city, including those that are working, and is also expected to have an impact on discretionary budgets including the Welfare Provision Scheme and the Discretionary Housing Payment scheme. This will have a devastating impact on residents across our city. It has been calculated that the withdrawing of the £20 per week uplift will result in a loss of approximately £4.96m per month to families across our city. This will impact an estimated 58,339 households across Manchester. Many of these households are working households in low paid jobs who rely on Universal Credit to make ends meet on a daily basis. We are talking about carers, shop workers, cleaners the roles that got us all through the pandemic. The roles that had previously been described as low skilled became some of the most important roles in society when Covid hit. In Manchester we have a long standing commitment to creating good jobs for Manchester residents, proudly paying the real living wage and promoting the GM Good Employment Charter. We must continue to work to create good, sustainable jobs that all Manchester people can access.

This Council moves to:

- Call upon the Conservative Government not to scrap the £20 per week uplift in Universal Credit.
- Call upon the Government to increase the minimum wage to the real living wage that reflects the cost of living.
- To support our residents impacted by government changes to benefits.
- To continue to work to ensure jobs in our city are sustainable, secure and fairly paid.
- To continue to support our residents through training and upskilling to make sure that jobs in this City are accessible to all of our residents.

CC/21/60 Proceedings of the Executive

The proceedings of the Executive on 28 July 2021 and 15 September 2021 were submitted. The Council was asked to give particular consideration to the following recommendations:

Exe/21/74 Capital Programme Monitoring 2021/22

The Executive recommends that the Council approve the virement of £1.0m to the Maintenance Challenge Fund, 17 – 42 Council consolidating the budget to enable priority works to be completed within the Highways Portfolio.

The Executive recommends that the Council approve the virement of £1.0m to the Maintenance Challenge Fund, 17 – 42 Council consolidating the budget to enable priority works to be completed within the Highways Portfolio.

Exe/21/76 National Cycling Centre

To recommend that Council approves:-

- The establishment of a capital budget of £22.456 million for the refurbishment of the Centre, funded from £20.566 million from borrowing and £1.89 million on a spend to save basis funded by joint funds held by Manchester City Council and Sport England.
- A virement from the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme budget of £2.145 million.

Exe/21/86 Capital Programme Update

Executive recommends that Council approve the following changes to Manchester City Council's Capital Programme:

- Children's Services - Manchester Creative Media Arts Academy Completion Works. A capital budget increase of £0.661m, funded by borrowing.
- Growth and Development - Manchester Equipment and Adaptations Partnership (MEAP) Relocation. A capital budget virement of £2.025m, funded by the Asset Management Programme budget.

Decisions

1. To receive the minutes of the Executive held on 28 July 2021 and 15 September 2021.
2. To approve the virement of £1.0m to the Maintenance Challenge Fund, 17 – 42 Council consolidating the budget to enable priority works to be completed within the Highways Portfolio.
3. To approve the establishment of a capital budget of £22.456 million for the refurbishment of the Centre, funded from £20.566 million from borrowing and £1.89 million on a spend to save basis funded by joint funds held by Manchester City Council and Sport England.
4. To approve virement from the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme budget of £2.145 million.
5. To approve the following changes to the Council's Capital Programme:
 - Children's Services - Manchester Creative Media Arts Academy Completion Works. A capital budget increase of £0.661m, funded by borrowing.
 - Growth and Development - Manchester Equipment and Adaptations Partnership (MEAP) Relocation. A capital budget virement of £2.025m, funded by the Asset Management Programme budget.

CC/21/61 Questions to Executive Members under Procedural Rule 23

Councillor Rawlins responded to a question from Councillor S Judge fly tipping and the use of Trails Cams to help combat the issue.

Councillor Bridges responded to a question from Councillor Igbon regarding youth and play services within Hulme ward.

Councillor Midgley responded to a question from Councillor Flanagan regarding measures to improve the lives and safety of woman and girls in Manchester.

Councillor Rawlins responded to a question from Councillor Stanton regarding road safety and road resurfacing.

Councillor Rawlins responded to a question from Councillor Nunney regarding the Council's strategy for litter bins outside the city centre.

Councillor White responded to a question from Councillor Nunney regarding Council support those who have lost their employment within the aviation industry, as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic.

Councillor Leese responded to a question from Councillor Nunney regarding the Council's position on the Places for Everyone document on plans to increase passenger numbers at Manchester Airport.

Councillor Akbar responded to a question from Councillor Stanton regarding an update on work with the GMP to ensure Didsbury is a safe and inclusive community for all its residents.

Councillor Akbar responded to a question from Councillor Leech regarding a planning application at Houghend Fields.

Councillor Rawlins responded to a question from Councillor Leech regarding charges to owners of non-compliant motorcaravans and campervans as part of clean air zone proposals.

Councillor White responded to a question from Councillor Leech regarding the residency requirement to join the Manchester social housing waiting list.

Councillor Rawlins responded to a question from Councillor Leech regarding the Greater Manchester Pension Fund investments.

Councillor Akbar responded to a question from Councillor Leech regarding Greater Manchester Police.

CC/21/62 Scrutiny Committees

The minutes of the following Scrutiny Committee meetings were submitted:

Resources and Governance – 25 May and 22 June 2021
Health – 21 July and 8 September 2021
Children and Young People – 21 July and 8 September 2021
Environment and Climate Change – 22 July and 9 September 2021
Economy – 22 July and 9 September 2021
Communities and Equalities – 20 July and 7 September 2021

CC/21/63 Proceedings of Committees

The minutes of the following meetings were submitted:

Audit Committee – 27 July and 28 September 2021
Health and Wellbeing – 1 September 2021
Licensing Committee – 19 July 2021
Licensing and Appeals – 13 September 2021
Licensing Policy Committee – 16 August 2021
Planning and Highways Committee – 29 July and 23 September 2021

Constitutional and Nomination Committee – 6 October 2021
The Council was asked to give particular consideration to the following recommendations from those minutes:

CN/21/20 Membership of Council Committees

To recommend the Council to make the following changes in appointments to Committees and Boards of the Council.

COMMITTEE	MEMBER APPOINTED	MEMBER REMOVED
Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee		Councillor Shazia Butt
Audit Committee	Councillor Thomas Robinson	

CN/21/21 Appointments to Joint Authorities and Joint Committees

To recommend the Council to make the following changes in appointments to the membership of GM bodies and committees and other external bodies.

COMMITTEE	MEMBER APPOINTED	MEMBER REMOVED
Parking and Traffic Regulation Outside London (PATROL) Committee	Councillor Emma Taylor	
Peoples History Museum	Councillor Adele Douglas	
Planning and Housing Commission	Councillor Gavin White	
Police & Crime Steering	Councillor Rabnawaz	

Group	Akbar	
Police and Crime Panel	Councillor Rabnawaz Akbar	
Draft Joint Development Plan – Places for Everyone Committee	Councillor Tracey Rawlins	
Air Quality Administration Committee	Councillor Tracey Rawlins	
Clean Air Charging Authorities Committee	Councillor Tracey Rawlins Councillor Emma Taylor (Substitute)	
Health & Social Care – Joint Commissioning Board	Councillor Joanna Midgley	
GM Work & Skills Executive	Councillor Gavin White	
GM Culture & Social Impact Fund Cttee	Councillor Tim Whiston	
Corporate Issues and Reform Overview and Scrutiny Committee	Councillor Lee-Ann Igbon	
Health and Social Impact Fund Committee	Councillor Joanna Midgley	

Decisions

1. To receive those minutes submitted.
2. To approve the changes in appointments to Committees of the Council, as detailed above.
3. To approve the changes in appointments to Appointments to Joint Authorities and Joint Committees, as detailed above.

CC/21/64 Places for Everyone

The Council considered the report of the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure and Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing.

The report sought approval by the Council for the submission of the draft Places for Everyone Publication Plan (PfE) plan pursuant to Regulation 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. It is expected that the plan will be submitted for examination in early 2022.

Decision

To approve submission of the Places for Everyone Publication Plan 2021 and supporting background documents, to the Secretary of State for examination pursuant to Regulations 19 and 22 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

CC/21/65 Urgent Key Decisions

The Council considered the report of the City Solicitor on key decisions that have been taken in accordance with the urgency provisions in the Council's Constitution.

Decision

To note the report.

Executive

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 20 October 2021

Present: Councillor Leese (Chair)

Councillors: Akbar, Bridges, Craig, Midgley, Rahman, White

Also present as Members of the Standing Consultative Panel:

Councillors: Butt, Karney, M Sharif Mahamed, Ilyas and Taylor

Apologies: Councillor Rawlins

Exe/21/95 Minutes

The Executive approved as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 15 September 2021.

Exe/21/96 COVID 19 Public Health & Economic Recovery updates

The Executive considered a report of the Director of Public Health and the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure, which provided an update on the COVID-19 situation within the city and the progress that was being made with the city's economic recovery.

The Director of Population Health advised that the Health Secretary would be making an announcement later in the afternoon on any additional measures that Government would be putting in place in advance of winter to address the national rise in COVID infection rates. It was expected that it would, as a minimum, confirm arrangements around the booster programme and the vaccination programme for 12 to 16 year olds.

The Executive Member for Health and Care advised that infection rates within the city were now 316.7 per 100,000 population and Manchester was currently 9th amongst Greater Manchester's Local Authorities in terms of infection rates, with rates gradually increasing but remaining below the national average and the infection rate amongst the over 60's was 233 per 100,000 which had increased over the past week and put Manchester 5th across Greater Manchester.

The Executive Member for Health and Care also reported that there had been increases in the rates of infection amongst school aged children but unlike last year there hadn't been large outbreaks in the city's university student population as there had been a good uptake of the vaccine from students. It was also reported that the Etihad mass vaccination centre would be used for the roll out of the 12 to 16 year old vaccination programme. The booster programme was well underway and the Executive Member for Health and Care stressed the importance of Manchester residents (who were eligible) taking up this offer for greater protection over the winter months.

The Executive Member for Health and Care concluded by thanking all staff who were working in CQC registered care homes for their co-operation in taking up the vaccine offer.

In relation to the city's economic recovery, the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure advised that there had been a stronger footfall in both the city centre and district centres. Recent Chamber research had demonstrated that prospects were improving and independent retail was recovering slightly faster than general retail. Hotel occupancy figures had increased, with August achieving an 85% rate for weekend stays. It was also noted that the inward investment pipeline was doing well, however there were still challenges in relation to recruitment and ensuring Manchester residents who were out of work could access employment opportunities. The Council was about to launch the Business Fighting Fund which would enable the remainder of the ARG grant being made available to businesses to support their recovery.

Councillor Karney thanked the officers involved in the city's economic recovery over the last 18 months and confirmed that the Christmas Markets would be making a return to the City Centre for 2021, which would contribute to retaining jobs in the hospitality and retail sector of the city's economy.

The Leader also noted positively the scale of "job creating" development that was taking place in the city and advised that this was not being replicated anywhere else in the country.

Decision

The Executive note the update.

Exe/21/97 Our Manchester - Progress Update

The Executive considered a report of the Chief Executive which provided an update on key areas of progress against the Our Manchester Strategy – Forward to 2025 which reset Manchester's priorities for the next five years to ensure the Council could still achieve the city's ambition set out in the Our Manchester Strategy 2016 – 2025.

The Executive Member for Children's Services reported that supermarket vouchers worth £15 per eligible child, from nursery through to Year 14, would be funded by the Council over the October half term. The move was a response to the Government's decision to end the Universal Credit uplift and growing fuel prices and financial pressures on the most in-need Manchester families.

In the absence of the Executive Member for Environment, the Deputy Leader (Finance) advised that Manchester's new Tower of Light structure had been switched on, marking a milestone in the development of the city's new Civic Quarter Heat Network. The illuminated 40m tower would provide heating and electricity to some of Manchester city centre's most iconic buildings. The network would go live in early 2022 and help reduce each building's carbon emissions and support the city's transition to zero carbon by 2038.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment reported that Planning permission had been granted for the development of 69 low-carbon social homes on Silk Street, Newton Heath. Electric vehicle charging points would be included as part of the development. The houses would have generous gardens and solar panels, while the apartments would feature living green roofs as part of the project's low carbon commitment. This would also include the use of Ground Source Heat Pumps and mechanical ventilation with heat recovery to keep utility costs down for residents. The homes would be managed by Northwards Housing. Work was expected to begin on site in the New Year.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods advised that two Manchester parks and four cemeteries had been awarded the prestigious Green Flag Award, the international quality mark for well-managed parks and green spaces. Heaton Park and Alexandra Park, along with Gorton, Phillips Park, Southern and Blackley Cemeteries, had all been awarded the status which was a recognition of the hard work of both staff and volunteers to maintain and improve the spaces. Heaton Park had also been awarded the coveted Green Heritage Site accreditation, supported by Historic England, for the management of its historic features.

Decision

The Executive note the update

Exe/21/98 Capital Programme Update

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which informed Members of requests to increase the capital programme. The report also sought approval for those schemes that could be approved under authority delegated to the Executive and asked the Executive to recommend to Council proposals that required specific Council approval.

The proposals which required Council approval were those which were funded by the use of reserves above a cumulative total of £2 million, where the use of borrowing was required or a virement exceeded £0.5m. These included the following proposed changes:-

- Neighbourhoods – Blackley Crematorium Cremator Replacement Additional Funding. A capital budget increase of £0.203m was requested, funded by borrowing for additional required works including, increased ventilation requirement, electricity supply upgrade, increase in the amount of builder works required to align new cremators with existing openings and inflation costs.

The report then went on to detail the proposals that did not require Council approval which were funded by the use of external resources, use of capital receipts, use of reserves below £2million, where the proposal could be funded from existing revenue budgets or where the use of borrowing on a spend to save basis was required. These included:-

- Highways Services – Manchester Cycleway Construction (Fallowfield Loop and Yellow Brick Road). A capital budget increase of £0.375m in 2021/22 and

£3.341m in 2022/23 was requested, funded by external contribution for upgraded pedestrian and cycle facilities with improvements from a safety, access, lighting and ecological perspective on the Fallowfield Loop and Yellow Brick Road.

- Children's Services – City Centre School. A capital budget increase of £2.450m in 2022/23 and £0.250m in 2023/34 was requested, funded by external contribution, and a capital budget virement of £0.250m in 2021/22 and £3.250m in 2022/23 was requested, from the approved Education Basic Need Unallocated budget for the creation of a new primary school at the Crown Street Phase 2 development in the ward of Deansgate.
- ICT - Highways Maintenance and Street Works Asset Management Software. A capital budget decrease from ICT Investment budget of £0.356m in 2021/22 and £0.075m in 2022/23 was requested and approval of a corresponding transfer of £0.431m to the revenue budget, funded by capital fund for the implementation of a new software solution for Highways which will make Manchester City Council more efficient and effective in discharging its statutory duties with regard to Highways Maintenance and Streetworks.
- Highways Services - Transfer of Great Ancoats Street (GAS) Funding to the A6 Stockport Road Pinch Point Scheme. A capital budget virement of £0.155m in 2021/22 is requested, funded by borrowing from the Great Ancoats Street Improvement Works approved budget due to unforeseen costs encountered during the construction phase of works due to ground conditions and a water main requiring additional works.

The report highlighted that there had been increases to the programme totalling £0.376m as a result of delegated approvals since the previous report to the Executive on 15 September 2021 and if the recommendations in the report were approved the General Fund capital budget would increase by £6.188m across financial years which would also result in an increase in the prudential indicator for Capital Expenditure in corresponding years.

Approval had also been given for a capital budget virement from the Unallocated Education Basic Needs budget to The Barlow RC High School. The £1.050m for the project would add a resource provision of 16 places to the school's capacity for children with an Education, Health, and Care Plan (EHCP). A further capital budget virement had been approved to ensure the final outstanding payment to the contractor for the expansion of Crab Lane Primary School in 2015-16. £0.010m was vired from the Unallocated Education Basic Needs budget. And finally, a virement for Wythenshawe Track Changing Rooms was also approved utilising the Parks Development Programme budget. The additional £0.105k for the project would ensure the replacement of accessible changing and toilet facilities at Wythenshawe Athletics Track.

Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Recommends that Council approve the following changes to Manchester City Council's capital programme:

- Neighbourhoods – Blackley Crematorium Cremator Replacement Additional Funding. A capital budget increase of £0.203m is requested, funded by Borrowing.
- (2) Approves the following changes to the City Council's capital programme
- Highways Services – Manchester Cycleway. A capital budget increase of £3.716m is requested, funded by External Contribution.
 - Children's Services – City Centre School. A capital budget increase of £2.7m is requested, funded by External Contribution, also, a capital budget virement of £3.5m is requested, from approved Education Basic Need Unallocated budget.
 - ICT - Highways Maintenance & StreetWorks Asset Management Software. A capital budget decrease from ICT Investment Budget of £0.356m in 2021/22 and £0.075m in 2022/23 is requested and approval of a corresponding transfer of £0.431m to the revenue budget, funded by Capital Fund.
 - Highways Services - Transfer of Great Ancoats Street (GAS) Funding to the A6. A capital budget virement of £0.155m is requested, funded by Borrowing from Great Ancoats Street approved budget.
- (3) Notes the increases to the programme of £0.376m as a result of delegated approvals.
- (4) Notes the virements in the programme of £1.165m as a result of virements from approved budgets

Exe/21/99 Large Scale Renewable Energy Generation Feasibility Summary Study

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which presented the key findings from the Feasibility Study and Options Appraisal for Large Scale Energy Generation for Manchester City Council, which had been undertaken to determine the best way for the Council to achieve a 7000 tonne reduction in CO₂ by 2025, which was a target within the Council's Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP).

The Feasibility Study concluded that the Council had two options, either purchase a solar PV facility or negotiate a suitable power purchase agreement (PPA). Both options were assessed to be better than the "do nothing" option. Solar PV was recommended as the most appropriate renewable technology as onshore wind developments were very limited in availability and were often subject to planning challenges. Offshore wind was generally too large a scale to be suitable.

The size of requirement needed to deliver 7,000 tonnes of CO₂ annual savings was equivalent to 33MW of solar PV. To deliver benefits beyond this point and contribute more significantly to the Council meeting its target to be zero carbon by 2038, then between 45-50MW of solar PV would be required and it was recommended that the Council should consider adopting this size of requirement to future-proof residual emissions through to 2038. It was noted that the Council had maximised capacity on

its own buildings for renewable energy generation with 6.67MW already scheduled to be installed via roof-mounted solar PV installations on the Council's estate.

It was reported that there was no suitable land in Council ownership to deploy 45-50MW of solar capacity. An area of approximately 100 Hectares of land would be required to deliver the 7,000 tonnes of CO₂ requirement nor were any opportunities identified within Manchester for a partnership project. As such the feasibility study concluded that the Council needed to look out of area to deliver the required size of generation, given there were no local opportunities for solar PV at the required scale.

It was noted that a budget of £27m–£30m was the estimated cost for an asset purchase, which would have an anticipated lifespan of 35-40 years. Should this option be selected, and a suitable facility identified, the Council would need to be prepared to move at speed as the numbers of projects of this kind coming to market were relatively few and were likely to be in high demand.

It was reported that in order to progress effectively, a project team would be created which would incorporate appropriate internal capacity within the Council's Corporate Landlord functions (including our Energy Management and Facilities Management Teams). This team would be complemented by securing appropriate expert advice to implement the recommendations around purchase of a solar facility twin-tracked with a PPA. This twin-track approach would allow the Council to progress the two recommended options in line with the findings of the feasibility study and was necessary to allow the Council to make the right purchase to meet its needs within the CO₂ targets and timescales set in its Climate Change Action Plan.

Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Note the options available to the Council.
- (2) Agree that the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Chair of the Zero Carbon Coordination Group establish a delivery team to develop the options further, with a view to returning to the Executive with a proposal.

Exe/21/100 Manchester Fort - Draft Development Framework

The Executive considered a report of the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure, which informed of the outcome of a public consultation exercise with local residents, businesses and stakeholders, on the draft Development Framework for the Manchester Fort site and sought approval of the framework.

The Manchester Fort Shopping Park occupied a strategic location in North Manchester; adjacent to the intersection of the main radial routes of Cheetham Hill Road and Queens Road. It had been established as a bulky goods shopping destination in 2004 and had since evolved into one of the largest and most successful retail parks of its kind in the North West.

The framework was produced in collaboration with Nuveen who were the owners of the site. In response to evolving market trends within the retail sector, Nuveen were seeking to diversify the shopping park in order to maximise its potential and create flexibility to adapt to the changing market. The vision and development principles set out within the framework sought to secure the long-term prosperity of the park and ensure that it continued to play an important role for the communities of North Manchester.

A total of 33 responses were received to the consultation, 73% of respondents 'strongly agreed' that they supported the long-term plan to introduce new flexible retail space, an expanded food and drink offer, a hotel and a cinema. 70% of respondents 'strongly agreed' that they supported plans to extend the usage of Manchester Fort Shopping Park to contribute to the evening economy and 83% of respondents 'strongly agreed' with plans to enhance the environment of the shopping park whilst providing better accessibility for pedestrians.

An additional response was also received on behalf of a landowner and operator of a site within Manchester city centre which included a range of leisure operators. This landowner had recently secured planning permission to deliver a range of works to the external and internal appearance of their site, to ensure that it remained at the forefront of the leisure market. The response highlighted that the committed investment could be impacted, should a major leisure-led development come forward at Manchester Fort. The concerns raised within their response predominantly focused on the proposed expanded uses detailed within the draft Development Framework.

In response to the consultation, the draft framework had been updated to accurately capture the role and importance of the city centre and reaffirm the need for future relevant planning applications to be subject to planning policy requirements throughout.

Decisions

The Executive

- (1) Note the outcome of the public consultation on the draft Manchester Fort Development Framework, and subsequent suggested revisions to the draft framework.
- (2) Approve the Manchester Development Framework and request that Planning and Highways Committee take the framework into account as a material consideration when considering planning applications for the area.

Exe/21/101 Youth and Play Commissioning Arrangements

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods), which provided a summary of the evidence and research collated during consultation with the wider youth and play sector during the spring and summer and set out a revised model of delivery for the commissioning of the youth and play sector, which was currently a role undertaken by Young Manchester.

As part of the research into different approaches to youth and play commissioning, officers spoke to Heads of Youth (or equivalent) in five other Local Authorities, as well as Head of Service from across Manchester City Council, to understand what worked well and what was needed.

Some respondents involved in the wider engagement had expressed concern that if any future arrangements were delayed it would create uncertainty for organisations across the City, which in turn would have a negative impact on children and young people. It was noted that any future commissioning arrangements would need to be underpinned by a programme of workforce development and strategic leadership – both of which had been highlighted as a high priority during the Young Manchester Review and the Sector Engagement sessions.

Following the engagement that had been undertaken it was proposed that the commissioning arrangements for Manchester City Council funding for youth and play activity was directed under a new model, with the Council's role to administer, manage and provide continued support to all organisations involved in the delivery of the wider youth and play offer. The proposed new arrangements would see providers within the 6 youth and play partnerships and Neighbourhoods supported directly by their Area Youth Lead to submit applications for youth and play funding. These applications would be reviewed by a local youth advisory panel, who would make funding recommendations to the Youth Commissioning Board.

The proposed new model of delivery would build on the existing strengths and progress made over the last four years, it would reduce operational overheads and seek to remove duplication. In time it was anticipated that more funding would reach grassroot organisations who were working directly with children and young people. The new arrangements would ensure that place-based commissioning would be embedded, which would be approved by a panel of individuals who were based in and had in-depth knowledge of the area and would also provide the City Council with increased influence over the effective deployment of its own resources.

In order to ensure the next steps in the process were completed fully and robustly, it was recommended that Council extended the current commissioning arrangements in place for a one-year period as all current arrangements issued under the Youth & Play fund ended on March 31 2022. Whilst the one-year extension would be with the same organisations under the same monitoring requirements, new grant agreements would be issued and managed via the City Council Youth, Play & Participation team. The proposal was to agree and execute all grant funding arrangements for 2022/23 by the end of December 2021. As per existing agreements, all grant funding contributions would be subject to providers evidencing appropriate match funding.

Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Note the findings from the sector consultation and Local Authority research which have informed the future commissioning arrangements.

- (2) Agree the option presented for the future commissioning of the youth and play sector, which will enable the Council to a) fulfil its Statutory Youth Duty; b) fulfil the priorities identified in the Our Manchester Youth Strategy; c) align with the priorities and focus of the Children & Young People's Plan.
- (3) Delegate responsibility to agree the grant payments for 2022/23 totalling £1.44M to the Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer and Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods, in consultation with the Executive Member for Children & Young People and the Deputy Leader.

This page is intentionally left blank

Council meeting – 1 December 2021**Rule 23. Questions for Executive Members (Agenda Item 7)**

1. Question from Councillor Shilton Godwin to the Executive Member for Environment**Question**

What strategic approach does the Council take to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists on pavements and in cycleways against slips during icy weather and leaf fall?

Received 26/11/21 at 12:34pm

2. Question from Councillor Nunney to the Executive Member for Deputy Leader with responsibility for Digital Strategy**Question**

If a resident is not computer literate, how would the Deputy Leader recommend that they contact the council?

Received 28/11/21 at 16.27

3. Question from Councillor Nunney the Executive Member for Environment**Question**

The Labour lead Trafford Council recently passed a motion which included to have an easy access link from their main webpage to climate emergency information. Would Cllr Rawlins reconsider supporting a similar measure on this council's website?

Received 28/11/21 at 16.27

4. Question from Councillor Nunney to the Leader of the Council**Question**

With regards to greenhouse gas emissions from aviation, the Leader pointed out at the last council meeting that this requires international solutions. In his opinion, is there anything that Manchester City Council as a significant shareholder in Manchester Airport Group can do in order to help bring down emissions from this sector?

Received 28/11/21 at 16.27

Council meeting – 1 December 2021**5. Question from Councillor Leech to the Executive Member for Environment****Question**

How many trees does the Council expect to plant or replace in the current planting season?

Received 29/11/21 at 01:43

6. Question from Councillor Leech to the Executive Member Housing and Employment**Question**

The Executive Member will be aware that there is a lot of opposition to the Council's development plan for Ryebank Fields, with local people wanting to see the fields remain as open green space. In the recent Chorlton byelection, the Liberal Democrat, Green, Independent and Women's Equality Party candidates all confirmed their commitment to saving Ryebank Fields, and even the Labour candidate, and now Chorlton Councillor, claimed to be opposed to building on the fields. So will the Executive Member agree to reconsider the Council's commitment to building Executive homes on Ryebank Fields?

Received 29/11/21 at 01:43

7. Question from Councillor Leech to the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods**Question**

How many alleyways and passages in Manchester, which fall under the responsibility of the Council, are not included in the Biffa cleansing contract?

Received 29/11/21 at 01:43

8. Question from Councillor Leech to the Executive Member for Environment**Question**

What is the current proportion of passengers wearing masks on public transport in Manchester, and what impact does she expect the Prime Minister's announcement on compulsory mask wearing to have on levels of compliance?

Received 29/11/21 at 01:43

9. Question from Councillor Leech to the Executive Member for Housing and Employment

Council meeting – 1 December 2021**Question**

How many social housing properties have been bought under the right to buy each year since 2015 in Manchester?

Received 29/11/21 at 01:43

10. Question from Councillor Leech to the Executive Member for Housing and Employment**Question**

According to Council records, £460,161 has been transferred by developers to Manchester's housing affordability fund as a result of s106 agreements from housing developments in the Didsbury West Ward since 2013. How many social and affordable homes to rent have been built in the Didsbury West ward since 2013, paid for by the housing affordability fund?

Received 29/11/21 at 01:43

This page is intentionally left blank

Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2021

Present:

Councillor Hacking - In the Chair

Councillors Azra Ali, Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Chambers, Connolly, M Dar, Evans, Grimshaw, Hilal, Rawson, Sheikh, Wills and Wilson

Also present:

Councillor Rahman, Deputy Leader

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods

Chief Superintendent Paul Savill, Greater Manchester Police (GMP)

Apologies:

Councillors Douglas, S Judge and Whiston

CESC/21/40 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2021 as a correct record.

CESC/21/41 Deep Dive: Race and Ethnicity in Manchester

The Committee received a report of the City Solicitor which provided an overview of the data and activity in Manchester in relation to Race and Ethnicity, linked to life chances, COVID-19 impacts, crime and community participation. This was one of a series of 'deep dive' reports that the Committee requested into different aspects of equalities.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Data relating to race and ethnicity in Manchester, including geographical data and information on educational attainment;
- Work to improve life chances;
- How the city's diversity was celebrated; and
- The impact of COVID-19.

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

- What aspects of this related to the Council's climate change aims;
- What was being done to address the inequalities which had led to Black and South Asian people been hit hardest by COVID-19;
- The economic recovery of BAME communities following the pandemic;
- That the report should have included a focus on Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) women and the impact of the pandemic on them;
- That the Kashmiri community should be specifically referenced in the report, noting the Motion to Council in April 2015 calling for this to be included as a

category in equality monitoring and for more work to take place to engage with this community;

- Concern about some of the statistics on educational attainment within the report, whether they could be further broken down by gender, to see the impact of the intersection of race and gender, and whether there were any more recent figures since 2019;
- That, in addition to work to improve educational attainment for these groups, schools should conduct a race review of their workforce, similar to the one conducted by the Council, noting that teaching staff and senior leadership within schools were disproportionately white; and
- Uptake of applications for compensation for those affected by the Windrush scandal and work to encourage eligible Manchester residents to apply.

The Deputy Leader outlined the ways in which climate change linked in with work to create a more equal city and improve people's lives, including tackling poor housing, making homes more energy efficient, creating, and preparing people for, jobs in the green economy and encouraging a healthy lifestyle, including walking and cycling.

The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform informed Members that health and social care partners were working on a recovery framework and that inequalities based on race and ethnicity were central to this work. He also informed Members about the COVID Health Equity Manchester Group, which was working with those communities. He highlighted that the Health Scrutiny Committee would be looking at health inequalities at its meeting the following day.

In response to questions about domestic abuse and the intersection of race and gender, the Strategic Lead (Business Change, Reform and Innovation) advised that intersectionality was an area that the Council would be looking at and that issues relating to intersectionality would be pulled together in the Communities of Identity report which would be submitted to a future meeting of the Committee. She advised that, when more up to date educational attainment figures were available, she would circulate them to Committee Members and that she would also check whether a further breakdown by gender was available.

The Deputy Leader advised that work would now take place to address the inequalities which had been identified through this report. In relation to educational attainment, he highlighted the work that had been done in Wythenshawe previously to improve the attainment of white working class boys and advised that similar work could be done to address educational inequalities affecting other groups. The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform advised that he would speak with colleagues in Children and Education Services about the points raised in relation to educational attainment and the schools workforce. In response to a further question about care leavers of Afro-Caribbean heritage, he advised that he would also discuss this with the service.

In response to the question about the Kashmiri community and which groups were included in the demographic data, the Strategic Lead (Business Change, Reform and Innovation) advised that officers were reliant on the data available but that it was hoped that the data coming out of the next census would be more robust. The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform advised that, in addition to the statistics,

officers could do more to gather intelligence from local communities and that this would be included in the Communities of Identity report. The Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager suggested that she speak with the Member who had raised the issue about the best way to engage with the Kashmiri community.

The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform advised that he would provide data on the take-up of the Windrush compensation scheme after the meeting. The Deputy Leader advised that he had circulated a note to Members on this. He reported that this was a government scheme but that the Council and Citizens' Advice Bureau were offering support to Manchester residents who had been affected and that the Council would continue to promote awareness of the scheme.

In response to a Member's question about youth crime and violence involving young people from BAME communities and strategies to address this, Chief Superintendent Paul Savill advised that he and the Community Safety Lead could meet with the Member outside of the meeting to discuss this further and, if invited, would be happy to attend a future meeting to provide the Committee with data and information on actions being taken in relation to this.

In response to a question from the Chair about data on the ethnicity of students in further and higher education and why there was no data recorded for 33% of students, the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform advised that this information came from one survey and that he would look into whether there was a better source of data available. He also advised that it was important that people understood why this data was being collected as that would encourage more people to respond to those questions.

Decision

To note the report.

CESC/21/42 Greater Manchester Police (GMP) presentation

The Committee received a presentation of Chief Superintendent Paul Savill, GMP, which provided an update following the HMICFRS Victim Services Inspection and the presentation delivered to the Committee's meeting in March 2021.

The main points and themes within the presentation included:

- Progress made in responding to the concerns raised in the HMICFRS Victim Services Inspection report of December 2020;
- An accelerated cause for concern raised in the most recent inspection relating to the timeliness of GMP's response to incidents where the subject of the public contact might be at continuing risk of harm; and
- How GMP was going to address those causes of concern in a more sustainable way, including the Plan on a Page.

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

- To welcome the detailed presentation and plans to strengthen the neighbourhood policing teams;
- That the Chief Officer team did not reflect the diversity of the city;
- Concern that people were not reporting crimes and that GMP was not receiving useful intelligence because of people struggling to get through on the 101 non-emergency police number;
- Domestic abuse training, including whether specific training would be provided on domestic abuse affecting BAME women;
- The triaging of domestic abuse cases; and
- Whether some of the concerns that Members had, such as about GMP's IT system and the number of police officers, should be directed to the Mayor of Greater Manchester, rather than to GMP.

Chief Superintendent Savill recognised that there were currently no women in the Chief Officer team, although there were now two Assistant Chief Constables from BAME communities and he advised that he would feed back the Member's concerns. He informed the Committee that the new Chief Constable was leading on GMP's Inclusion and Diversity Strategy. He supported the Member's comment about the importance of people being able to get through on the 101 number, stating that he and Chief Superintendent Chris Gibson, who oversaw the Operational Communications Branch (OCB), provided mutual challenge to each other. He advised that he welcomed feedback from Members on this and that Chief Superintendent Gibson could attend a future meeting, if the Committee wished.

Chief Superintendent Savill assured the Committee that GMP's domestic abuse training for officers would reflect the diverse communities within the city and informed Members that officers were provided with a toolkit of different support services so they could work with the victim to identify and refer them to a service which met their needs. He advised that the triaging of domestic abuse cases was subject to internal scrutiny and he outlined how cases were assessed and responded to, using the Domestic Abuse Safeguarding scores.

Chief Superintendent Savill explained that there were three parts to GMP's iOPS (Integrated Operational Policing System) IT system and that the part which was of concern was PoliceWorks. He advised Members that the Chief Constable had commissioned an external review of PoliceWorks and the outcome of this review was expected soon. The Community Safety Lead reported that all Greater Manchester local authorities regularly met with GMP colleagues and the Mayor's office and received regular updates about iOPS.

The Chair advised that some of the Committee's concerns should be discussed with the Mayor of Greater Manchester or the Deputy Mayor for Policing, Crime, Criminal Justice and Fire, rather than GMP, to which the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods agreed. The Chair reported that he would work with the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods to try to get the Mayor or Deputy Mayor to attend a future meeting. A Member suggested that they liaise with their counterparts in other local authorities regarding this.

The Chair thanked Chief Superintendent Savill and his officers for their work.

Decision

That the Chair will work with the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods to invite the Mayor or Deputy Mayor to attend a future meeting.

CESC/21/43 Review of Leisure Recovery

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided an overview on the leisure centre recovery position in Manchester, following the most recent restart on 12 April 2021. The report set out the performance of the various sport and leisure centres compared to their pre-pandemic levels. The report detailed usage data, lesson and course uptake information and health and fitness patronage. The report also highlighted demographic data and how this had changed during the pandemic for protected characteristic groups.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Background information;
- Current position;
- Participation and usage levels;
- Equalities information; and
- Next steps.

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

- A suggestion for family days at leisure centres to promote the activities and facilities available;
- Was data on BAME leisure centre users broken down by gender available, to ensure that activities were accessible to BAME women;
- Request for information on the provision of women-only classes;
- What was being done to encourage people from areas of higher deprivation to return to leisure facilities; and
- The impact of the forthcoming temporary closure of the Aquatics Centre for refurbishment work.

In response to a question from the Chair, the Head of Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth outlined work that had been carried out across the city's leisure facilities to reduce their carbon footprint and advised that this would continue to be a focus for the service in future. A Member asked for further information on this work to be included in a future report.

The Head of Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth reported that family days had been held previously and agreed that they were an effective way to engage people with leisure facilities. He reported that he would speak to leisure operators about arranging more family days when he met with them the following week. He advised that all the demographic data that the service currently held had been included in the report. He reported that participation by women and ethnic minorities had increased from pre-pandemic levels. He advised that, when they had re-opened, pools were not operating the full range of sessions due to social distancing but that, with demand increasing, more women-only sessions were being re-introduced. A Member

highlighted the increase in use of Whalley Range Sports Stadium and its strong women only offer and suggested that their approach be replicated elsewhere. In response to a Member's question on pre-operative transgender women and women-only swimming sessions, the Head of Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth advised that he would look into this and respond to the Member.

In response to a Member's question, the Head of Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth advised that grants had been provided to voluntary and community organisations through MCR Active to provide additional support for them with recovery from the impact of the pandemic.

The Head of Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth reported that, when new facilities with swimming pools had been built to replace older pools, community groups had stepped in to run some of the older facilities which would have otherwise been closed and this had led to additional pool capacity in the city; however, he advised that, the Aquatics Centre provided a significant part of the city's capacity and it was, therefore, planned to phase the work, for example, carrying out work on the upstairs and downstairs pools separately so that some access was still available during this period.

The Head of Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth advised that the Council was working with its leisure operators to look at ways to identify and incentivise people on lower incomes to return to leisure facilities. He reported that discounted charges for off-peak use of leisure facilities had recently been introduced.

The Chair reported that he had received an email from a Manchester resident questioning why swim only membership and gym and swim membership were no longer available and stating that he had not seen any offers or discounts being promoted by the leisure operator Better. The Chair asked officers to respond to these points.

The Head of Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth reported that the contractual arrangements with its leisure providers gave the Council control over their pricing which protected the charge for a range of activities; however, he advised that the providers had some freedoms to introduce new products, determine the pricing of those products and also to remove them at a later date, as well as to introduce discounts whenever they felt this was appropriate. He advised that operators could choose to no longer make these offers available to new customers, for example, because the use of the facility was reaching saturation point. He advised that operators tended to offer discounts at particular times of the year, such as New Year, to coincide with a promotional campaign, that some discounts had been introduced over the summer which were no longer available but that more would be introduced in future to coincide with future campaigns to increase participation.

Decision

To note the report.

CESC/21/44 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 and agree the work programme.

Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 12 October 2021

Present:

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair
Councillors Ahmed Ali, Andrews, Clay, Hitchen, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, B Priest, Robinson, A Simcock, Wheeler and Wright

Also present:

Councillor Craig, Deputy Leader (Finance)
Councillor Rahman, Deputy Leader (Equalities and Human Resources)
Councillor Igbon (Lead Member, Race, Women)

Apologies:

Councillors Davies and Rowles

RGSC/21/41 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2021 as a correct record.

RGSC/21/42 Update from the Revenues and Benefits Unit

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, that provided an update on the activity of the Revenues and Benefits Unit, including details of how the service was affected and maintained during the pandemic.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Benefits administration, including Council Tax Support and the management of the Welfare Provision Scheme as well as other discretionary schemes;
- The financial support provided as part of the Test and Trace Scheme;
- Performance in the collection of council tax and how we balance collection, whilst working in an ethical way and supporting those residents on a low income; and
- Performance in the collection of business rates including the support that has been made to businesses during the pandemic.

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

- Welcoming the comprehensive report and recognising the positive contribution the service made to the residents of the city;
- Noting that 79% of applications to the Discretionary Housing Payments (DHP) funding were successful, what alternative support was provided to those application that were not successful;

- Noting the increased pressures experienced by residents as a result of a reduction in Universal Credit and the freeze in Local Housing Allowance (LHA), was it anticipated that the LHA rate would increase;
- Was the budget allocated to deliver support to residents sufficient to meet the demand;
- Were the incidents of evictions increasing;
- Are there any figures available to indicate how many households were seeking to move to more affordable accommodation;
- What measures had been introduced through the Council Tax scheme to encourage owners of empty properties to bring them back into use;
- Was data available at a ward level that detailed the numbers of long term empty properties;
- Were officers confident that all residents that were eligible for Council Tax support during the pandemic had accessed this;
- What was the approach taken to the assessment of applications to the Welfare Provision Scheme;
- An explaining was sought as to the changes in the reported figures of 4,331 children who received Free School Meals – Alternative Support during the Easter period and 6,709 for the autumn half-term;
- How had the findings of the Manchester Poverty Truth Commission been communicated to staff administering support;
- With reference to Council Tax collection rates, how did Manchester compare to other cities; and
- What modelling was done to predict future Business Rates levels in the city;
- Was the Director confident that staff were capturing all of the larger families who were potentially eligible for support under our Council Tax Support Scheme, whose third and subsequent children were potentially not eligible for benefit support under national government criteria?

The Deputy Leader (Finance) said that the report represented and reflected the important work that the service provided to protect the most vulnerable residents across the city. She paid tribute to the staff working in the service who continue to strive to improve the outcomes for residents. She highlighted that this was in the context of continued austerity, cuts to Universal Credit and a freeze to the Local Housing Allowance. She gave reference to the Council having passed a motion deploring the cut to Universal Credit and said that Manchester would continue to lobby the Government on this issue. She said that despite the financial challenges placed on the city as a result of unfair funding settlements, Manchester had taken the decision to fund this discretionary scheme.

The Director of Customer Services and Transactions said that all staff assessing an application for a discretionary award took a holistic approach to the circumstances of the individual. She said that each case was treated on its own merits with the priority to keep people safe and to maintain the occupancy of their home. She stated that this could be complex and challenging and regrettably not all applications would be

successful. She added that for those that were unsuccessful appropriate sign posting to alternative support was provided.

The Head of Corporate Assessments commented that a written decision notice would be issued following a DHP application and if an application had been refused the individual could request that decision was reviewed and the applicant had the opportunity to submit any additional supporting evidence to assist the decision maker. He commented that the decision to extend any existing DHP award during the pandemic without the need to reapply was a positive step, noting that as the lock down restrictions began to be lifted people would be invited to reapply, with the budget being used to support the most vulnerable residents and prevent homelessness. He described that systems had been established to support those residents at risk of being evicted from their property.

The Head of Corporate Assessments said that weekly reporting on the DHP budget was undertaken to understand the pressures and trends and to flag any concerns if necessary.

The Head of Corporate Assessments also said that following his previous experience when dealing with the Valuation Office Agency who determine Local Housing Allowance rates, he was not optimistic that the rates would be reassessed.

The Director of Customer Services and Transactions said that the service did not have the time or resources to be able to collate data on the numbers of households across the city wanting to move to more affordable housing at any one time.

The Director of Customer Services and Transactions explained that Officers and Members from the Council were involved in the recent Manchester Poverty Truth Commission that was published earlier this year. This included the commissioner role and to take part in a specific session on how the collection of council tax could be improved. She made reference to principles that had been agreed following this process and said that these had been shared across the service to reinforce the requirements of council staff to support and inform the dialogue that staff had with residents.

The Director of Customer Services and Transactions informed the Committee that having listened to the wishes and preferences of the management team at the Oasis Centre it had been agreed that access to four named individuals in the council tax back office had been given as a contact to deal with any enquiries and resolve issues brought up by the local community who visit the facility.

The Head of Corporate Revenues advised the Members that the numbers of empty properties (empty for 2 years) had reduced from c1400 properties in 2013 to c400 currently. He stated that those properties empty for over ten years attracted a 400% Council Tax charge. He also said that they worked closely with colleagues in Strategic Housing with the intention to work with owners to bring properties back into use. In

terms of empty property data at a ward level, he advised this could be provided to Members following the meeting.

The Director of Customer Services and Transactions addressed the comments regarding Council Tax collection rates by stating that compared to other cities Manchester's performance was not as good in terms of in year collection rates, noting the particular challenges presented by the pandemic. She said it was important to understand why people on a limited income or benefits struggle to pay their arrears or were reluctant to engage on this issue. She said that the intention was to engage with people who have arrears, understand their particular circumstances and establish a realistic and sustainable repayment plan. The Head of Corporate Revenues commented that for those people who were working and earning a reasonable income yet refused to pay their Council Tax an attachment to earnings could be applied to recover debts.

The Head of Corporate Assessments advised that the take up of the Free School Meals – Alternative Support had been promoted by using the eligibility information retained by schools. He stated that as Universal Credit was administered by the DWP the Revenues and Benefits Unit no longer maintain a list of all those that were eligible, however by working with the schools the FSM offer was promoted and as knowledge of this scheme became known amongst families the uptake figures were seen to increase.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer explained that he modelling for the predicted levels of Business Rates to be collected in future years was conducted by Finance Officers using a range of metrics. He also confirmed that the Service believed that they were capturing all relevant larger families for the Council Tax Support Scheme.

Decision

To note the report.

RGSC/21/43 Equalities Strategy Implementation Update

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Human Resources and Organisation Development, which provided Members with an update on progress to date to increase diversity in the organisation, ensure we are an inclusive employer and to challenge discrimination.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The context and development of the Strategy, which had arisen from the findings of an external review of race issues published in 2020;
- An update on a range of activities over the last 12 months against identified actions, arising from the review;
- An update on the ongoing development of a revised Workforce Equalities Strategy; and
- Conclusions.

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

- The extended scope of the data the organisation now gathers from its workforce, and how the collection of data is embedded across the Strategy
- Progress towards achieving parity across the disciplinary action process for employees
- Changes to the organisation's recruitment practices
- Communication strategy

The Race Lead for Women welcomed the report and the organisation's ambition to eradicate all forms of discrimination. She spoke about her involvement in the Working Group and said that she was encouraged to see that early feedback from staff had been positive. She said it was important to recognise that the overarching purpose of the Strategy was to ensure that the organisation's employment practices recognised and respected differences amongst all employees, and that those differences were not solely confined to race or ethnicity but were represented across all of Manchester's communities. She acknowledged the breadth and quality of work undertaken at pace to develop a more comprehensive and inclusive workforce strategy that discriminates against no one. She thanked officers for their ongoing commitment to developing the Strategy.

There was a discussion about the work undertaken to close the gaps that had been identified in the data that the organisation gathers on the workforce. The Committee was informed that the organisation's staff monitoring classifications had been significantly broadened out to develop a richer picture demographically of the workforce population. This had been done in consultation with Trade Unions, focus and community interest groups and the information gathered would again be evaluated alongside updated census data due next year. The revised categories were tested out in a recent staff survey and had received a good response rate with further surveys underway. The Chair commented that completion of the revised survey had been disappointingly low (44%) amongst managers graded 10 and above. The Chair noted that although she would not wish to see anyone pushed to provide information if it made them uncomfortable, she would be worried if given the work done in this area, large numbers of senior leaders were unhappy about providing it. There was a discussion about potential barriers to completion and the essential role Leaders and Managers play in headlining the implementation of policy change. Mindful that completion itself was discretionary and therefore not a compulsory requirement for any staff, the Committee noted that active discussions with the Senior Management Team were planned to explore ways to improve completion rates and gather data across the directorates.

With regard to tracking employee progression within the organisation, the Deputy Director HROD said that the employee appraisal system was an ideal way to set objectives and monitor progress over 12 months. She agreed to circulate information to committee members about the revised appraisal system following the meeting. She

added that proposals were also underway to review the 'About You' (one-to-one) system with particular reference to the developing Strategy.

Mindful of the sensitivities around the disclosure of suspected discrimination, the use of exit questionnaires as a possible way to explore retention issues was discussed. Members were informed that whilst exit questionnaires were an available option for employees leaving the organisation, uptake was historically low, despite the alternative submission route through HROD. Options were however being considered for the development of exit questionnaires for employees leaving a particular service yet remaining within the wider organisation.

There was a discussion about the need to champion both the organisation's zero tolerance approach to discrimination and the volume of work being delivered to support its implementation. The Race Lead for Women felt that the positive and inclusive message this relayed to staff should be celebrated. The Deputy Director HROD spoke about the broad programme of research and engagement which had revealed a strong message around the need for parity in the Strategy's commitment to both anti-discrimination and inclusivity. This message would therefore form the central message of all aspects of communication about the strategy and would be reflected through various processes to reinforce that balanced approach through variety of strategies to raise awareness.

Discussions moved to a previously reported issue around a disparity in disciplinary cases involving Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic staff who had been disproportionately represented in proceedings that took place in the 2018/19 municipal year. Whilst acknowledging a significant statistical drop in cases more recently, the numbers were still not at parity and Members sought assurance that this matter had been and would continue to be appropriately explored and addressed. The Deputy Director HROD described the extensive involvement of the HR casework team, whose role of support and challenge was to ensure that there was consistency across those proceedings and explore all possible underlying factors that may have influenced the decision to progress to disciplinary action.

With regard to the delivery of equalities training, the Committee noted that amongst a range of learning objectives, this aimed to raise awareness about the impact of unconscious bias as well as exploring other attitudes and beliefs that may adversely affect behaviours or decision-making. Members expressed an interest in being included in this type of training so that they may play a more active role in supporting the delivery of Strategy. It was also suggested that such training should be targeted to managers who are graded below Grade 10.

There was a discussion about how the impact of the various number of outputs would be evaluated for effectiveness. Members expressed the view that there should be an appropriate focus on auditing and measurable outcomes to help determine whether meaningful progress had been made and to underpin further decision making. It was also suggested that staff groups should be consulted about the development of targets.

The Talent and Diversity Lead gave assurance that whilst the Strategy itself formed the overarching document, numerous detailed action plans sat beneath and that specific pieces of work had been commissioned to extract the highest quality and most accurate data. He added that the aim of the Strategy was not purely to focus on protected characteristics but to create a working environment where all employees could thrive, be treated with respect and dignity and feel supported by the organisation's zero tolerance approach to all forms of discrimination.

There was a discussion about the organisation's recruitment practices. It was noted that austerity measures had contributed to a greater focus on internal recruitment. The Committee was informed that the organisation was about to embark on a full scale review of the application of its recruitment policies and practices with a view to developing task based assessments to develop a more inclusive recruitment process that provides for all forms of diversity.

The Deputy Leader (Equalities and Human Resources) spoke about the findings of the race review and welcomed the organisation's clear commitment and enthusiasm to address those imbalances at pace. In response to questioning regarding the budget for this work, he stated that there was no specific budget but that resources were being committed as required. He urged the Committee to note that whilst the update given today provided some insight into the wholesale transformation of the organisation's recruitment policies, these initial measures should be seen as the early foundations of the organisation's solid commitment to eradicate the perception of a 'glass ceiling' for any employee and uphold that talent will be recognised irrespective of an employee's background or protected characteristic. He added that progress reports on the development and implementation of the revised Strategy would be submitted to future meetings of this Committee.

Decision

1. To welcome the latest version of the Workforce Equality Strategy and note the progress towards increasing diversity across the organisation.
2. To note that a further report on the development and implementation of the Workforce Equality Strategy will be submitted to a future meeting of the Committee.

RGSC/21/44 Overview Report

The Committee considered the report by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which provided details of key decisions that fall within the Committee's remit and an update on actions resulting from the Committee's recommendations. The report also includes the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to amend as appropriate and agree.

No amendments to the Work Programme were proposed.

Decision

To note the overview report and agree the Committee's Work Programme.

Health Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2021

Present:

Councillor Green – in the Chair
Councillors Appleby, Cooley, Curley, Leech, Monaghan, Newman, Reeves, Riasat and Richards

Apologies: Councillor Hussain

Also present:

Councillor Midgley, Executive Member for Health and Care
Professor Sir Michael Marmot, University College London
Dr Manisha Kumar, Executive Clinical Director Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC)
Chris Gaffey, Head of Corporate Governance, MHCC
Dr Sohail Munshi, Chief Medical Officer, MLCO
Lizzie Hughes, Integrated Neighbourhood Team Manager, MLCO
Sarah Lambrechts, Connecting Service Manager, Breakthrough UK
Atiha Chaudry, Associate Lead for Manchester BME Network
Hanif Bobat, Development Manager, Ethnic Health Forum
Francesca Archer Todd, Divisional Director, Big Life Group- Be Well
Beylai Tanpanza, Employment Coach, One Manchester
Valérie Touchet, Citizen of Manchester
Sharmila Kar, Director of Workforce, OD and Inclusion
Dr Cordelle Ofori, Consultant in Public Health medicine
Neil Walbran, Chief Officer, Healthwatch Manchester
Morgan Tarr, Information and Communication Officer, Healthwatch Manchester
Anna Tate, Policy and Influence Development Worker, MACC
Hendrix Lancaster, Coffee4Craig

HSC/21/38 Minutes

A Member stated that, whilst the minutes of the meeting of 8 September 2021 were accurate, the section that related to the item HSC/21/35 'Provision and access to NHS Dentistry' did not fully capture the strength of feeling and frustration expressed by the Committee during the discussion.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2021 as a correct record, noting the above comment.

HSC/21/39 Professor Sir Michael Marmot

The Committee heard from Professor Sir Michael Marmot, University College London and author of 'Fair Society Healthy Lives' (The Marmot Review) published in February 2010 and 'Health Equity in England: The Marmot Review 10 Years On', published February 2020. Professor Marmot had been invited to discuss with

Members the key issues relating to health inequalities and what he believed were the measures to be taken to address these in Manchester.

Professor Marmot spoke of the positive measures taken following the publication of his review, stating that cities such as Coventry and Gateshead had declared themselves as Marmot Cities and sought to implement the Marmot recommendations to address health inequalities. He stated that he had welcomed the decision taken by Greater Manchester to also become a Marmot City region.

The Professor described that the onset of COVID-19 had drastically revealed and amplified the existence of health inequalities, and he further highlighted the stark figures in relation to life expectancy in Manchester and across the North West. He stated that the understanding of inequalities and deprivation, across a range of metrics was essential to tackle and address adverse health outcomes for residents of the city.

The Committee noted that recently published data on life expectancy at birth over time in Manchester compared with England showed that life expectancy had fallen (i.e. got worse) for both males and females in Manchester in the 3-year period 2018-20 compared with the previous period of 2017-19. However, data for the 3-year period 2018-20 combined did not fully reflect the impact of the pandemic on life expectancy. Local calculations showed that life expectancy at birth for Manchester residents had fallen by 3.1 years for men and 1.9 years for women in 2020 compared with 2019. In absolute terms, 568 more men and 295 more women died in 2020 compared with 2019.

In response to questions from Members, the Professor advised that it was undeniable that the Government's policy of austerity and continued reductions in public sector budgets had an adverse effect on health outcomes and exacerbated inequalities, adding that austerity had not ended and the Government needed to address the regressive funding cuts that had been imposed. He stated that if the Government was committed to Building Back Fairer for regions such as the North West, they needed to provide adequate funding settlements to support activities across a person's life course. He further commented that it was important that Government investment should be prioritised in social infrastructure, not physical infrastructure projects.

In response to a specific question regarding the decision to abolish Public Health England to be replaced by the UK Health Security Agency and Office for Health Improvement and Disparities, Professor Marmot stated that whilst he always remained optimistic the use of the term Disparities was not adequate and a more appropriate title would have been Office for Health Improvement and Inequalities.

In reply to a question regarding his opinion of the Health and Social Care Bill, published 6 July 2021 that set out key legislative proposals to reform the delivery and organisation of health services in England, Professor Marmot commented that the lessons from the roll out of the COVID-19 vaccination programme indicated that local knowledge and expertise were best placed to plan and deliver services, rather than increased centralised control. He further called for adequate funding to deliver social care and supported the continued design and delivery of integrated care models.

In reply to a specific question regarding the impact of the Pupil Premium, a fund to improve education outcomes for disadvantaged pupils in schools in England, he stated that due to the real term cuts of education budgets of 8% per pupil he doubted that the Pupil Premium compensated for the overall budget cuts. He did state that he recognised the improvements made in Manchester in relation to education outcomes for those children in poverty.

In reply to a discussion regarding the *Inequalities in health: report of a research working group* (also known as the 'Black report') that was published in August 1980 that had reported the findings of a working group on inequalities in health, chaired by Sir Douglas Black, that had been commissioned in 1977 by the Labour government to investigate the variation in health outcomes across social classes and consider the causes and policy implications. Professor Marmot stated that, unlike that report, that had been ignored by the subsequent administration he remained optimistic and urged that if the Government was serious in their stated commitment to Level Up the country, he had provided them with a blue print to deliver on.

In response to a question regarding where the Scrutiny Committee should direct their focus and attention to, again he advised that regular scrutiny across the relevant scrutiny committees should be given to monitoring and reporting progress against the Marmot Beacon Indicators. He reiterated the importance of addressing inequalities as a central consideration in all decision making taken by Local Authorities.

The Chair commented that the Economy Scrutiny Committee would be considering a report entitled 'Build Back Fairer – COVID-19 Marmot Review: Housing, Unemployment and Transport' at their meeting of 14 October 2021 and she would discuss this issue further with all the scrutiny Chairs to ensure appropriate attention was given to this within their relevant Work Programmes.

Professor Marmot encouraged Manchester and the wider Greater Manchester city region to drive and deliver on the Marmot Beacon Indicators and he commented that he would use Greater Manchester as an example and model of good practice, both nationally and internationally.

The Executive Member for Health and Care addressed the Committee and said that addressing health inequities was a priority for the city and would continue to be central to all considerations and decision making. She further called upon the Government to deliver a fair funding settlement for the city to enable the continued delivery of this important work.

The Chair, on behalf of the Committee, concluded this item of business by thanking Professor Marmot for attending the meeting and contributing to the discussion.

Decision

The Committee;

1. Endorse the implementation of the recommendations from the review: 'Build Back Fairer in Greater Manchester: Health Equity and Dignified Lives';

2. Recommend that update reports that describe the activities and progress against the agreed Marmot Beacon Indicators are submitted for consideration at regular intervals; and

3. Recommend that all Scrutiny Committees regularly consider the Marmot Beacon Indicators, once agreed, that are relevant to the remit of the respective Committee.

HSC/21/40 Building Back Fairer in Manchester

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Public Health that gave an overview of some of the current population health inequalities in Manchester and provided examples of how partners across our population health and wellbeing system worked collaboratively to address them. The examples included a particular focus on social prescribing as requested by the Committee. The report also covered the work of COVID-19 Health Equity Manchester (CHEM) and the important lessons learned for ongoing work to promote health equity in the City. Finally, it summarised the next steps for Population Health Recovery within the context of the pandemic, and how Manchester would be responding to “Building Back Fairer in Greater Manchester” - the post-pandemic recommendations made for Greater Manchester as a Marmot City region.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- An overview of the Manchester’s Population Health Plan (2018-2027), the city’s overarching plan for reducing health inequalities and improving health outcomes for Manchester residents;
- What health inequalities looked like for Manchester’s population;
- Population Health Recovery Framework;
- Health equity and the impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic;
- Delivering the Population Health Plan – Examples of collaborative working;
- Whole system approach to population health and wellbeing;
- Taking action on preventable early deaths;
- COVID-19 Health Equity Manchester and its objectives and activities;
- Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC) – addressing health inequalities in health and care; and
- Next steps, including the Marmot Task Group and refresh of Manchester’s Population Health Plan and delivery of Manchester’s Population Health Recovery framework and associated flagship programmes.

The Committee heard from Valérie Touchet, citizen of Manchester, who spoke of her experience of engaging with her Employment Coach at One Manchester. She spoke of her circumstances that led to her engagement with this service and the positive outcomes that she had experienced. The Committee expressed their appreciation to Ms Touchet for attending and speaking to the Committee. Members expressed the importance of continuing to appropriately engage with people to keep enquiring if they were okay and to be there when assistance was required.

The Chief Medical Officer, MLCO, stated that all partners across the MLCO embraced the Our Manchester approach and were committed to delivering better

outcomes for residents, noting that that the question that was asked by practitioners was 'what matters to you?' rather than 'what is the matter with you?' which was indicative of the approach taken.

The Committee then heard from Hendrix Lancaster, Coffee4Craig who described a case study that he had circulated to Members of the Committee in advance of the meeting. In response to this example the Executive Director of Adult Social Services stated that she remained committed to reviewing the services provided for homeless people, adding that a Health and Homelessness Group had been established that included key partners and stakeholders. She said that a report to the Committee on this work could be provided at an appropriate time. In reply to the issue raised in the case study regarding the lack of identification, the Director of Public Health stated this issue would be looked at. The Executive Clinical Director MHCC stated that ID was not required to access Primary Care and she suggested that the issue of unconscious bias was evident in the case study and she would take that away from the meeting for further discussion. Members commented on the importance of tackling unconscious bias so that people were not denied the appropriate care and access to services.

The Chair commented that examples of relatively small scale interventions, such as the installation of age friendly benches at key locations, should be rolled out across the city and more work needed to be done with business to implement schemes, such as the slow tills in supermarkets. The Director of Public Health commented that positive relationships had been strengthened with businesses during the response to the pandemic and the intention was to build upon these relationships to deliver equivalent schemes and initiatives. He further commented that Age Friendly Manchester were a partner of the MLCO.

In response to a question regarding the impact on residents, particularly older residents who were having to wait longer for routine surgery that resulted in people having to endure painful conditions, the Consultant in Public Health Medicine described that the 'While You Wait' programme had been commissioned to support those residents in this situation.

The Committee then heard from Atiha Chaudry, Associate Lead for Manchester BME Network, who described the positive and important work of the South Asian Sounding Board. She described that their work had been invaluable during the pandemic to engage with and inform residents around the issue of COVID-19 and the vaccination. She described that this engagement and sharing of information was vital to build confidence amongst residents, challenge misconceptions using trusted community champions in an appropriate manner to address health inequalities. She stated this model could be replicated to target engagement activities with other communities and groups across the city.

The Consultant in Public Health Medicine discussed the vaccination programme in relation to both the local African community and the Caribbean community, noting that it was important to recognise the two distinct groups and their unique experience and history in Manchester. She described the important role of the relevant Sounding Boards and engagement of community leaders which were vital to understanding their experience and relationship with health services in Manchester. She further

stated that the design and delivery of the COVID chats had proven to be very positive.

The Director of Workforce, OD and Inclusion stated that it was important to address the structural inequalities in systems and services to promote and deliver inclusive services. She described that this approach and understanding was central to the work of COVID-19 Health Equity Manchester (CHEM). CHEM had been set up in July 2020 in response to the disproportionate impact that was increasingly evident in some of Manchester's communities. The group aims were to achieve its objectives through collaborative whole system working, influence and advocacy as well as direct actions through its programme of work.

In response to a specific question relating to smoking cessation and pregnancy, the Director of Public Health stated that he would seek to obtain the data requested regarding rates of smoking post child birth.

In concluding this item of business, the Chair thanked all representatives in attendance for contributing the Committees deliberations. She said that the Committee welcomed their continued work and commitment to addressing the health inequalities across the city.

Decision

The Committee;

1. Note the report and express their appreciation to all those engaged in the delivery of this important area of work; and
2. Recommend that the Director of Public Health consult with members of the Committee when establishing the Marmot Beacon Indicators that are within the remit of the Committee.

HSC/21/41 COVID-19 Update

The Committee considered the joint presentation of the Director of Public Health and the Executive Clinical Director, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning, that had been circulated to all Members in advance of the meeting. The presentations provided an update on COVID-19 activity that included the latest available information on data and intelligence.

In response to a question from the Chair regarding COVID-19 rates and school age children, the Director of Public Health stated that the situation was being closely monitored. He informed the Members that the Public Health Team continued to support and advise Education colleagues and support Head Teachers. He further commented that it was anticipated that the October school holiday would act as a natural circuit break, however he reassured the Committee that this situation would continue to be closely monitored, with the appropriate advice and support offered to local schools.

Decision

To note the presentation that had been circulated to all Members in advance of the meeting.

HSC/21/42 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.

The Chair informed the Committee that the 'Suicide Prevention Local Plan' and the 'The Our Manchester Carers Strategy' would be considered at the December meeting. The Chair further advised that an item relating to Climate Change and Health would be considered at a future meeting, with the date to be determined following discussions with relevant officers to agree the scope of the report.

Decision

The Committee notes the report and agrees the work programme, subject to the above comments.

Health Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2021

Present:

Councillor Green – in the Chair

Councillors Appleby, Cooley, Curley, Hussain, Leech, Monaghan, Newman, Reeves, Riasat and Richards

Also present:

Councillor Midgley, Executive Member for Health and Care

Dr Manisha Kumar, Executive Clinical Director Manchester Health and Care

Commissioning (MHCC)

Chris Gaffey, Head of Corporate Governance, MHCC

Katy Calvin Thomas, Chief Executive MLCO

HSC/21/43 Urgent Business – Statement from the Executive Director Adult Social Services on the mandated COVID-19 vaccination for Health and Social Care Staff

The Chair introduced an item of urgent business by inviting the Executive Director Adult Social Services to provide a verbal update in relation to mandated COVID-19 vaccinations for Health and Social Care staff.

The Executive Director Adult Social Services provided the Committee with assurance that work was ongoing with all care homes and providers across the city to support staff to obtain their vaccination given the introduction of the vaccine mandate for Care Home staff and staff entering Care Homes for work on 11 November. She described that detailed work has been undertaken with Care Homes and their staff including contingency planning. She stated that work has also been underway to understand the impact on our own staff who visit care homes in consultation with Trade Unions and with the other Directors of Adult Social Services across Greater Manchester. Further work will also be commencing to understand the impact of the new regulations which have been announced extending the mandate to all CQC regulated services across health and social care. She stated that further updates would be provided to the Committee at an appropriate time.

Decision

To note the verbal update from the Executive Director Adult Social Services.

HSC/21/44 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2021 as a correct record.

HSC/21/45 Health and Social Care - Adult Social Care and Population Health Budget 2022/23

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director Adult Social Services and the Director of Public Health that described that following the Spending Review announcements and other updates the Council was forecasting an estimated shortfall of £4m in 2022/23, £64m in 2023/24 and £85m by 2024/25. The report set out the high-level position and where Officers had identified options to balance the budget in 2022/23 which were subject to approval.

Key points and themes in the report included:

Describing that the Local Government Finance Settlement would be released in December 2021;

A longer-term strategy to close the budget gap was being prepared with an estimated requirement to find budget cuts and savings in the region of £40m per annum for 2023/24 and 2024/25; and

Describing the priorities for the services within the remit of this committee, details on the initial revenue budget changes proposed by officers and the planned capital programme.

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

Noting the significant number of Manchester residents with adult social care needs; The need to articulate this to residents of the city, stating that despite the inadequate funding by Government, Manchester had remained committed to protecting the most vulnerable residents; and

Stating that the Government needed to recognise the important role that health workers and carers played, noting this had been demonstrated throughout the pandemic and they needed to adequately fund this service.

The Executive Member for Health and Care said that during the years of imposed austerity Manchester had witnessed a loss of £419M to the budget, making it very difficult to deliver services and support residents, however despite this Manchester had remained committed to supporting the most vulnerable residents in the city. She described that the Government had failed to recognise the demands upon the service and had failed to adequately fund Adult Social Care.

The Executive Director Adult Social Services stated that despite the financial challenges Manchester was committed to improving the health outcomes for Manchester residents and described that the Better Outcome Better Lives approach and the delivery of the Manchester Local Care Organisation, demonstrated this. She stated that Manchester would continue to work with the Government and articulate the case for appropriate funding to support this activity, in particular as Manchester was a Marmot City Region and was committed to addressing health inequalities.

The Director of Finance (MLCO) described that there was a clear stated commitment across all partners delivering Health and Adult Social Care to build upon and strengthen the partnership approach. She further made reference to the success of the improved arrangements to support patients being assessed to leave hospital

(Discharge to Assess). In response to a specific question regarding the Greater Manchester Integrated Care Board (MCIB) she advised that she was confident that it would have the approved budgets by 31 March 2022, adding that this Board would assist with reducing the cost of commissioning of services due to the economy of scale this would enable.

The Deputy Director Adult Social Services stated that the report made reference for the need for Adult Social Care to intervene in the social care market to shape the market to meet health and social care needs including new build facilities, or the acquisition of existing buildings which could be tailored to care models. However, at this time there were no specific schemes in the pipeline, and these would be developed with partners and further options would be detailed in future budget reports to the Committee.

Decision

To note the report.

HSC/21/46 COVID-19 Update

The Committee considered the joint presentation of the Director of Public Health and the Executive Clinical Director, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning, that had been circulated to all Members in advance of the meeting. The presentations provided an update on COVID-19 activity that included the latest available information on data and intelligence.

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

- Was there enough capacity for people to access their booster jab;
- All options for residents to easily access their booster jab should be utilised;
- Patient records needed to be updated in a timely fashion following the administration of a vaccination; and
- The message regarding second jabs and 16/17 year olds needed to be clearer.

The Executive Clinical Director, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning stated that there were more sites to deliver the third phase of the booster vaccination in Manchester. She advised that General Practice had proactively written to all over 70 year olds to encourage them to take up their booster jab. She advised that patient records should be updated in a number of days following a jab, however if there were issues that Members were aware of they could direct them to her and she would take these up. She advised that the messaging and guidance from government regarding 16/17 year olds had been unclear and it was important that the correct message was communicated.

Decision

To note the presentation that had been circulated to all Members in advance of the meeting.

HSC/21/47 The Manchester Local Care Organisation

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Executive Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO) that provided an update on the MLCO and the delivery of its key priorities.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Operational planning;
- Neighbourhood working;
- Recovery, reform, and transformation;
- Addressing inequalities;
- Resilience and winter planning;
- Population health and managing long term conditions;
- Vaccinations; and
- Workforce.

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

- Noting the recent negative media coverage regarding difficulties accessing Primary Care, it was important to celebrate and promote the work of the MLCO across the neighbourhoods;
- Noting the example provided that described the positive outcomes as a result of the door knocking exercise to engage with residents regarding the vaccination programme;
- The need to champion the care sector, value care workers and promote caring as a viable career option;
- Appropriate consideration needed to be given to ensure Neighbourhood Teams were aligned with ward boundaries;
- Noting the reported figure of the 80 'Discharge to Assess' beds, was this sufficient and how had this number been arrived at;
- Requesting that the MLCO Operating Plan 2021-22 be circulated to all Members of the Committee following the meeting;
- Welcoming the commitment that GP leadership is at the heart of the MLCO; and
- The need to include all strands of work that could support and strengthen the work of the MLCO; such as Adverse Childhood Experiences & Trauma Informed Practice.

The Chief Executive, MLCO commenced her response by paying tribute to all of the staff working within the MLCO. She stated that although there were a number of examples provided within the report further examples of the range and variety of work delivered that had been tailored to the needs of the local neighbourhoods could be provided. She said that the example provided within the report that described the door knocking exercise demonstrated the value of such exercises. She said this had resulted in building and strengthening connections with local residents, connecting residents with appropriate services and had helped build upon the understanding of the local communities.

The Chief Executive, MLCO commented that they were mindful to align the LCO with ward boundaries, however she acknowledged the issue raised by the Member. She commented that this was being addressed and she would discuss this further with the Member outside of the meeting.

The Chief Executive, MLCO said that the number of 'Discharge to Assess' beds had been assessed based upon local knowledge, patient flow management data and winter planning. She described that this strengths-based approach was beneficial as it resulted in more patients being discharged, where appropriate back to their home with the correct measures of support in place.

The Executive Director Adult Social Services stated that it was recognised that care staff played a critical role and issues such as pay and terms of conditions of employment were to be considered to ensure there was parity of esteem for care staff. She also described that discussions were underway to develop local bespoke training opportunities to support and develop staff. She stated that to develop and deliver such schemes would require the appropriate funding from central government. In response to a specific issue raised by a Member regarding changes to BTEC courses, she advised she would raise this with the Director of HR.

The Chief Executive, MLCO stated that the MLCO Operating Plan 2021-22 would be circulated following the meeting, and in addition the 'We Will' statements would be provided as this would also assist Members in their understanding of the approach taken by the MLCO.

Decision

The Committee recommend that the MLCO Operating Plan 2021-22 be circulated for information.

HSC/21/48 Better Outcomes Better Lives

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director of Adult Social Services that provided an update on progress and the impact of the programme since June 2021, when the committee last had an update.

Better Outcomes, Better Lives (BOBL) was the adult social care transformation programme. It was a long-term programme of practice-led change, which aimed to enable the people of Manchester to achieve better outcomes with the result of less dependence on formal care.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- An introduction and background, noting that the programme was key to delivering the savings set out in the 2021/2022 budget agreed by the Council in March 2021;
- Describing the six key workstreams the programme was structured around;
- Describing what would feel different for residents who received our adult social care services in the future;

- Describing the aspirations for what social care would feel like after the Better Outcomes Better Lives programme was complete in 2024;
- What would feel different for families and carers;
- What would feel different for staff;
- Information on Communities of Practice;
- The approach to Strengths-based reviews that were designed to identify if a person's needs had changed and if the support being provided might need to be altered as a result;
- Improving the short term offer;
- Better use of Technology Enabled Care (TEC);
- Improvements to reablement;
- The eight priorities within the commissioning plan Commissioning Plan which set out how the approach to commissioning would support integration between health and social care services in the coming year;
- Case studies; and
- Next steps.

The Committee then heard from Elizabeth Garrett, Social Work Consultant; Dave Bradley, Health Development Co-ordinator and Winifred Laryea, Senior Social Worker who in turn spoke of their professional involvement and benefits realised from engaging in the Communities of Practice, described as weekly meetings, held in teams, which gave practitioners a space to learn, reflect, share experiences as well as enable peer support and challenge.

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

- Supporting the Better Outcomes, Better Lives approach;
- Welcoming the opportunity to hear from frontline workers and practitioners, noting that it gave Members an assurance that this approach was embedded across teams;
- How was the impact and outcomes of the Better Outcomes, Better Lives approach to be assessed;
- Clarification was sought as to the data sets presented within the report;
- Were the outcomes for residents recorded and reported;
- Could the Top Level Report that was referred to that was designed to give an overarching view of performance across the directorate be shared with the Committee;
- The importance of encouraging people to access help and support and not to be put off from doing so, with reference to people delaying accessing primary care during the pandemic or only being able to access services online; and
- Welcoming the frank and honest testimonies of staff and encouraging report authors and guests to describe scenarios when mistakes had been made and the lessons learnt.

In response to the comments and questions asked, the Deputy Director of Adult Social Services stated that the outcomes of BOBL would be assessed and reported using a variety of indicators, including the outcomes of the Communities of Practice, Learning Logs and budgets. She further advised that work was ongoing to refine the Liquid Logic system to capture and record resident outcomes. She further provided

clarification as to the data sets and years used to explain the difference in the figures provided within the report, adding that the BOBL was the best approach to deliver Adult Social Care both in the short and long term.

The Deputy Director of Adult Social Services reassured the Members that the improved online presence, so that people were empowered to help themselves, when appropriate, would not replace the frontline contact, but rather be an addition. She further added that the improved online offer would also be an additional resource for staff and help support staff access appropriate advice and information.

The Deputy Director of Adult Social Services stated that consideration would be given as to how the information within the Top Level Report could be meaningfully circulated to Members.

The Executive Member for Health and Care stated that she had had the opportunity to visit a range of teams and meet with staff and witness their work. She described that she was assured that this approach was embedded across the teams and was beneficial to both staff and residents in receipt of the services.

Decision

The Committee recommend that an update report be considered at an appropriate time that included and the voice of the practitioner and service users.

HSC/21/49 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.

A Member requested that an item on the Gorton Health and Community Hub be included on the work programme.

In response to specific questions relating to the process for Members to be notified if an inspection was to be undertaken by the Care Quality Commission (CQC) in their ward, the Executive Director Adult Social Services stated she would discuss the issues raised by Members with her regional contact at the CQC and feed back to Members.

Decision

The Committee notes the report and agrees the work programme, subject to the above amendment.

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2021

Present:

Councillor Reid – in the Chair
Councillors Sameem Ali, Bano, Collins, Hewitson, Lovecy, McHale and Nunney

Co-opted Voting Members:

Ms Z Derraz, Parent Governor Representative

Also present:

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children's Services
Councillor Doswell, Ward Councillor for Fallowfield
Tracey Forster, Health Visiting, Vulnerable Babies & Child Health Services,
Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO)
Jenny Lewis, Health Visiting, Vulnerable Babies & Child Health Services, MLCO
Sheila Davies, Adoption Counts
Kristen Roberts, Adoption Counts
Nicola Marsden, MLCO
Lorraine Ganley, MLCO

Apologies:

Councillors Alijah, Cooley and Sadler
Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative
Mr L Duffy, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

CYP/21/43 Minutes

Decision

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2021.

CYP/21/44 Youth and Play Commissioning Arrangements

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods which followed the Young Manchester review, which was commissioned by the City Council in December 2020, with a subsequent report presented to Executive in March 2021. That report considered the response to the review and actions proposed to build stronger and more effective arrangements going forward. An alternative delivery model was proposed to be designed and developed in 2021. This report provided a summary of the evidence and research collated during consultation with the wider youth and play sector during the spring and summer and set out a revised model of delivery for the commissioning of the youth and play sector, which was currently a role undertaken by Young Manchester. The report considered the response to the questions asked of the youth and play sector, as well as information collated from discussions with other Local Authorities in terms of their commissioning and youth partnership arrangements. The Committee was invited to comment on the report prior to its submission to the Executive on 20 October 2021.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Developing the new model;
- Sector engagement findings;
- Research findings;
- Future commissioning; and
- Next steps.

The Executive Member for Children's Services reported that Members had previously informed him that they were not aware of what funded youth and play work was taking place in their ward and that this proposal would improve the situation, formalising their involvement in the process and strengthening links between them, the providers and other agencies.

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

- To welcome the report and the involvement of Members in the proposed process and that this should improve the way play and youth provision was allocated across different wards;
- To welcome the division of central Manchester into Central West and Central East and to ask where the boundaries would be; and
- Noting that the youth and play advisory panels for each area would have a Member on the panel, how would they be selected, commenting that it was important that they impartially represented the interests of all the wards in the area, not just their own ward.

The Ward Councillor for Fallowfield highlighted the recent case in her ward of a 16-year-old boy who had been murdered, prior to which there had been warning signs indicating his vulnerability and the involvement of a number of agencies. She reported that issues could start to arise when children were aged around 12 or 13, starting with low level anti-social behaviour, issues at school and child criminal exploitation, subsequently escalating to very serious risk of harm. She expressed concern at the public sector cuts over the years which had impacted on youth provision and the lack of youth provision in her ward and reported that, with the right intervention at an earlier age, many of these young people could be put on a better path in life. She advised that it was important for each ward to have its own youth provision which met the area's needs and that many young people would not travel to neighbouring wards to access provision. She welcomed the proposals in the report, in particular giving Members more of a voice in the allocation of provision and redirecting funds from administration and management processes to the direct provision of youth and play services.

A Member highlighted the role of schools in identifying young people who were at risk of exploitation and violence and in educating young people on child sexual exploitation and child criminal exploitation through the Sex and Relationship Education curriculum. The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services outlined how the Council engaged with schools over this and offered to bring a report to a future meeting, to which the Chair agreed.

In response to the visit of the Prime Minister and Home Secretary to the Hide Out Youth Zone in her ward, the Chair expressed disappointment that the government had not contributed to the funding of this facility and that the centre had been built with private funding from the businessman Fred Done, with the Council committing to providing funding for ongoing costs.

The Chair outlined questions and issues raised by a Ward Councillor for Hulme which focused on training and development for the youth and play sector, ensuring a fair allocation of provision across different wards, the need for targeted work with young people at risk and how the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector would be supported to secure additional funding.

The Head of Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth advised that the decision to split the central area into east and west had been taken following discussions with the youth sector and that the boundary was still to be determined, in consultation with the youth sector and Ward Councillors. He advised that a role profile would be produced outlining the role of and level of commitment required for Members appointed to the youth and play advisory panels. He reported that this would be shared with Ward Councillors and that, if there were multiple nominations in a particular partnership area, there would be a process for identifying the most appropriate candidate. He highlighted that there was still only limited funding available for youth and play provision, which was probably not sufficient to do everything that Members wanted so there was a need to both lobby national Government for more funding and work with the VCSE sector to leverage in more funding. He advised that work had been taking place to address inequalities in the distribution of youth provision funding in particular wards. He recognised the importance of training and development in ensuring high quality provision and reported that the Council would lead on gaining an understanding of the training needs of the sector, in collaboration with the voluntary sector, and that expertise within the sector would be used to provide this training, as well as bringing in external training where necessary. In response to comments about work with vulnerable young people, he advised that there was a crossover between youth work and the point where other agencies needed to become involved to support young people who had become involved in extremism or gangs. He reported that the deployment of youth work resources would take into consideration how other agencies, such as Greater Manchester Police (GMP), were deploying their resources to work with these young people and that it was proposed that GMP have a role in the advisory and decision-making processes for youth work allocation.

The Executive Member for Children's Services highlighted the role of GMP and the Community Safety Partnership in addressing serious issues such as those raised by the Ward Councillor for Fallowfield, including the development of the Serious Violence Strategy, which Members would also be involved in.

In response to a question from the Ward Councillor for Fallowfield, the Head of Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth reported that over the previous two years Young Manchester had secured approximately £200,000 to £250,000 a year in addition to the funds that the Council had provided them with and that it was anticipated that it would still be possible to access these types of funds under the proposed new

arrangements and, where the Council could not apply for particular funds directly, VCSE sector organisations could host those funds.

In response to a point from the Chair about some VCSE organisations being more knowledgeable about how to successfully apply for funding than others, the Head of Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth advised that the new commissioning arrangements would be as streamlined as possible, while ensuring high quality youth work and appropriate safeguarding measures, and that organisations would be supported in getting to the position where they could apply. The Chair suggested holding events in different areas to encourage VCSE organisations to apply for funding for youth and play work.

Decisions

1. To receive a report on Sex and Relationship Education in schools, including how child sexual exploitation and child criminal exploitation are addressed through this.
2. To receive a further report on Youth and Play commissioning arrangements at an appropriate time.
3. To endorse the recommendations to the Executive that:

The Executive is recommended to:

1. To note the findings from the sector consultation and Local Authority research which have informed the future commissioning arrangements.
2. To agree the option presented for the future commissioning of the youth and play sector, which will enable the Council to a) fulfil its Statutory Youth Duty; b) fulfil the priorities identified in the Our Manchester Youth Strategy; c) align with the priorities and focus of the Children & Young People's Plan.
3. Delegate responsibility to agree the grant payments for 2022/23 totalling £1.44M to the Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer and Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods, in consultation with the Executive Member for Children & Young People and the Deputy Leader.

CYP/21/45 Start Well Strategy - 1001 Days

The Committee received a presentation of the Strategic Head of Early Help, the Strategic Lead (Early Years) and Tracey Forster, Lead Manager, Health Visiting, Vulnerable Babies and Child Health Services, MLCO, which provided an overview of the Start Well Strategy.

The main points and themes within the presentation included:

- The Start Well Partnership Board;
- The vision and principles of the Strategy;
- The current picture;
- The offer;
- The workforce; and
- Next steps.

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

- To welcome the good, innovative work taking place;
- The take-up of Healthy Start vouchers;
- Smoking around hospitals;
- What work was being done to encourage breast-feeding; and
- The Health Visitor Service, including vacancy levels and whether home visits were being carried out, rather than virtual meetings with families.

The Chair praised the work of her local Sure Start Centre. She also highlighted the positive work in her ward, including the Imagination Library and work to bring a range of services under one roof and suggested that these be introduced elsewhere.

The Strategic Head of Early Help advised that the take-up of Healthy Start vouchers was around 66% and that this had been identified as requiring further promotion, looking at all the organisations and professionals who had contact with pregnant women and new mothers and identifying opportunities to inform them about the scheme. She reported that the Go Smoke-Free Pilot started at the ante natal stage so hospitals were involved with this work and she advised that she would communicate the Member's point about smoking around hospitals to the steering group.

In response to comments from the Chair about the impact of the reduction in Universal Credit and rising fuel prices on families, the Strategic Head of Early Help acknowledged that addressing this would be a challenge. She reported that, throughout the pandemic, there had been an increase in families asking Sure Start staff for advice and guidance and a lot of that had been linked to financial issues and poverty and she outlined some of the support provided to alleviate hardship, for example, providing meals to children accessing services in the Sure Start Centres and through links with food clubs.

The Commissioning Manager advised that 91% of Health Visitor posts were currently filled and that the service was half-way through a 4-year-plan to invest in training nurses to become Health Visitors. He reported that visits were now taking place face-to-face again but that the service had also been praised for how quickly it had mobilised earlier in the pandemic to undertake checks remotely.

Tracey Forster from Health Visiting, Vulnerable Babies and Child Health Services informed Members that the service had received significant funding about 3 years ago to set up an Integrated Infant Feeding Service in north Manchester, which provided advice and support on breastfeeding to new mothers and that the data showed that this had increased breastfeeding levels in that part of the city. She

advised that the Health Visiting Teams provided support on breastfeeding in central and south Manchester but that additional funding had now been received which would enable the service to review its model for breastfeeding support in central and south Manchester.

In response to a Member's question about meeting the diverse needs of different communities, the Strategic Head of Early Help advised that Sure Start was a mixed model that involved a range of voluntary and community sector partners which helped it to reflect the community of the area they were working in. She advised that work was taking place to offer parents and grandparents support with improving their English, which would then increase their confidence in engaging with services, such as the two-year-old early years offer. In response to a further question, she advised that work was taking place to develop and deliver services for families who had recently arrived from Afghanistan.

Decision

To note the presentation.

CYP/21/46 Adoption Counts Annual Report 1 April 2020 – 31 March 2021

The Committee received a report of Adoption Counts which fulfilled the obligations in Adoption National Minimum Standards (2011) and Adoption Service Statutory Guidance (2011) Adoption and Children Act 2002 to report to the "executive side" of the local authority.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Working with Manchester;
- Performance;
- Disruptions;
- Quality of reports;
- Adoption support;
- Recruitment of adopters; and
- Practice developments in Adoption Counts.

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

- The impact of court delays;
- The recruitment of prospective adopters; and
- Positive experience of the process for people being assessed and prepared for becoming foster carers or adoptive parents.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services confirmed that, due to the pandemic, there had been delays in children's cases being heard, whether that related to adoption or other matters, and that this had had a negative impact, although it appeared that progress had since been made. He advised that there were plans to

discuss this issue with the local Family Justice Board, looking at some of the delays and identifying practical joint resolution to speed this up.

Sheila Davies from Adoption Counts informed the Committee that there was an ongoing recruitment strategy, as well as work taking place around National Adoption Week the following week, with a lot of this aimed towards Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) communities as children from these backgrounds were waiting longer to be matched. The Chair suggested that billboards across the city could be used.

Decision

To note the report.

CYP/21/47 Managing Allegations against Adults who work with children - Local Authority Designated Officer Annual Report 2020-2021

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Lead (Safeguarding and Practice Improvement) and the Service Lead (Safeguarding) which provided an overview of the management of allegations in Manchester and the role of the Designated Officers between 1 April 2021 and 31 March 2021.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- The service and legal context;
- Overview of enquiries and referrals data - 1st April 2020 to 31st March 2021;
- Managing allegations;
- Service reflection;
- Service achievements; and
- Key priority areas.

In response to a Member's question about the differences in enquiry and referral levels between different sectors, the Strategic Lead (Safeguarding and Practice) advised that her service provided training to different agencies throughout the year to raise their awareness, looked at changes in patterns and compared statistics with those across the north west to identify any outliers which might be a cause for concern.

Decision

To note the report.

CYP/21/48 Update on COVID19 and the impact on the opening of schools and colleges

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education which provided an update on the return of children and young people to education following the summer break and the arrangements in place in schools and colleges to report and manage COVID-19. The report had a particular focus on the work over the summer to ensure that young people in year 11 had a destination for September and ongoing work to

reduce the numbers of young people in the city not in education, employment or training (NEET).

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Key changes from the previous academic year;
- Numbers of positive cases;
- School attendance; and
- Post 16 and NEET young people during the pandemic and work to support this group.

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

- Whether any more up-to-date data on cases was available as the figures in the report only went up to 1 October 2021;
- Should face coverings be re-introduced in schools rather than waiting for infection rates to rise before taking further action; and
- How transitions from Year 6 to Year 7 had been managed.

The Education Business Partner advised that the latest figures showed a reduction with 191 cases, 168 positive children, 23 positive adults and 91 adults isolating. She advised that officers met regularly with colleagues in the city and across Greater Manchester to look at case rates and discuss whether new instructions should be issued across schools or whether to continue with the individual plans for each school. She confirmed that the Council could only provide advice to schools on the use of face coverings.

In response to a question about the vaccination of young people, Lorraine Ganley from MLCO reported that the vaccination of 16 and 17-year-olds was being delivered through Manchester Health and Care Commissioning and the Primary Care Network Vaccination Hubs but that they were looking at delivering vaccinations to 12 to 15-year-olds through schools. The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services informed the Committee that so far 38% of 16 and 17-year-olds in Manchester had had their first COVID-19 vaccination.

The Director of Education informed the Committee about work that had taken place to support children who were transitioning from Year 6 to Year 7, including the transition read. She reported that very high COVID-19 infection rates had affected plans for face-to-face activities in transition week but that many schools had made alternative arrangements. She advised that pupils transitioning to Year 7 appeared to have settled in well and attendance rates for Year 7 were very high, which was part of a positive trend for attendance rates in Manchester schools, which were currently significantly higher than the national average.

Decision

To note the report.

CYP/21/49 Overview Report

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

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme.

Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2021

Present:

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair
Councillors Flanagan, Foley, Holt, Hughes, Lyons, Sadler, Shilton Godwin and Wright

Apologies: Councillors Hassan, Jeavons, Lynch and Razaq

Also present:

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment
Richard Elliott, Interim Policy and Strategy Advisor, Manchester Climate Change Agency
Samantha Nicholson, Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency
Jo Wall, Strategic Director, Local Partnerships

ECCSC/21/19 Minutes

A Member enquired when the requested list of all organisations in Manchester that had signed up to the MCCA and a list of all those that had not, and where available the reasons for not signing up would be provided. (See ECCSC/21/16 Manchester Climate Change Agency Progress Report 2021/22).

The Executive Member for Environment stated that she would action this request following the meeting.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2021 as a correct record.

ECCSC/21/20 Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing Update

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) that provided an update on progress in delivering waste, recycling, and street cleansing services, describing how the activity contributed to the climate change agenda and key priorities for the future, including an update on the English Resources and Waste Strategy (2018).

Key points and themes in the report included:

- An introduction to the service area;
- Impact of the Pandemic (COVID-19) and Brexit;
- Biffa Performance Update;
- Bin collections;
- Electric Refuse Collection Vehicles (eRCV);
- Fly tipping and the Fly Tip Intervention Investment;
- Keep Manchester Tidy campaigns, including case studies;

- Recycling Campaigns and Initiatives; and
- Conclusions and Next Steps

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

- Questioning the cleansing scores given to cycle lanes, noting the prevalence of littering from motor vehicles;
- The need for a specific campaign to tackle the issue of litter discarded from motor vehicles;
- Noting that assisted collections were important for those residents that required them;
- More needed to be done to engage with businesses to reduce commercial waste and excessive packaging;
- What was the process to review the Biffa contract ahead of the break point and would Members be involved in these discussions;
- That a rebalancing of services between the city centre and district centres should be addressed through any contract negotiations;
- The issue of returning bins remained an ongoing issue;
- More emphasis was required on behaviour change and waste with the need to repair, reduce and recycle more;
- Behaviour change need to be included in each ward plan, including utilising the local Neighbourhood Teams to engage with local schools and business;
- Noting the importance of Carbon Literacy Training;
- Noting the challenges of missed bin collections, particularly in relation to apartment blocks and the need to recognise the need for improved communications between management agencies and caretakers and crews;
- Was the CRM (Customer relationship management) system fit for purpose to report issues;
- Noting issues that had arisen where crews were unable to access locations due to development works or irresponsible parking;
- Biffa needed to work closely with Housing Providers to support the education of residents in regard to what could be recycled and what could be placed in each bin;
- Noting that delays in issuing permits for skips to be placed on the highway were contributing to waste accumulation;
- Discussing if it would be more beneficial to allow commercial waste to be taken to Household Recycling Centres in attempt to save money and reduce the incidents of fly-tipping; and
- Paying tribute to the Biffa crews for their work, particularly during the unique challenges presented by COVID-19.

In reply the Contract Manager, Waste stated that both Biffa and Council Officers conducted NI195 monitoring, a national standard of all areas, including cycleways, both straight after clean and between cleaning cycles, however he accepted that the standards could deteriorate between cleaning.

The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleaning stated that discussions regarding the Biffa contract would be an opportunity to discuss the service in the context of the budget.

The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleaning stated that assisted collections and the returning of bins had been impacted by COVID-19 and the disruption this had had on the crews. She reassured the Members that officers were working with Biffa to address both these issues, noting the importance of these for residents was recognised.

The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleaning commented that options for increasing and promoting repair and recycling opportunities were being explored, including the increased use of social media to advertise local schemes and connect residents. She further recognised the comments regarding behaviour change regarding waste and recycling and noted that tailored initiatives at a ward level could greatly assist in this activity.

The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleaning advised that commercial waste was not appropriate for Household Waste and Recycling Centres, noting that it was the duty of all commercial businesses to have a waste management strategy. The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) advised it was important to recognise that there was often criminality associated with fly-tipping. She made reference to the recent press reports where prosecutions had been taken against perpetrators, adding that these had been achieved by working collaboratively with different agencies, including Greater Manchester Police.

The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) addressed the point raised regarding the CRM system by advising that this system would be replaced as part of the wider digital strategy, commenting that senior officers from the service were involved in this process to ensure the replacement service was fit for purpose.

The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) stated that the issue raised by the Member regarding the delay in issuing permits for skips would be relayed to the Highways Department for attention. She further commented that access issues were considered when development permissions were granted.

The Neighbourhood Officer updated the Committee on the work underway with seventeen local schools to deliver the Eco Schools programme, in addition to projects that had been delivered with children during the school holidays. She further commented that there was a national Keep Britain Tidy campaign directly designed to address the issues associated with student accommodation.

The Executive Member for Environment encouraged Members to undertake a visit to the Longley Lane Household Recycling Centre and she would arrange visits for Members. She further supported the discussion regarding the inclusion of waste and recycling behaviour change in all ward plans. She further commented that discussions were ongoing with local Universities and landlords to tackle the waste issues associated with student accommodation. She also advised the Members that discussions were ongoing at a Greater Manchester level to explore the options for improved messaging regarding the recycling opportunities at recycling centres.

Decision

The Committee recommend that the Executive Member for Housing and Employment discuss with all local housing providers the options for supporting their residents to increase their recycling.

ECCSC/21/21 Climate Change Action Plan Quarterly Progress Report, Q2 July - September 2021

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided a progress update on delivery of the Council's Climate Change Action Plan for Quarter 2 2021-22 (July-September 2021).

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

- Reiterating the call for the need to emphasise the urgency of the issue of climate change and the need for all citizens and organisations to take immediate action to address this;
- Recommending that a report be submitted for consideration at an appropriate time that collated all of the other Scrutiny Committees' items on the issue of climate change;
- More information on the modelling that was used to agree and set the suite of targets reported;
- The need to reduce business travel, noting the use of technology during the pandemic to conduct meetings;
- More information was requested on the active travel scheme for staff, with particular reference to the implementation of a mileage scheme for cyclists;
- Was the assistance scheme to purchase a bicycle only applicable to Halfords, noting the need to support local independent traders;
- Any cycle purchase scheme should also use the Council's procurement policies to ensure Social Value was achieved and this should be subject to the appropriate audit process;
- The cycle purchase scheme should also include e-bikes;
- All staff should be encouraged to cycle to work;
- Noting the figures reported in regard to the use of single use plastics at events, and calling for this to be rolled out and publicised;
- Asking that consideration be given to including the Net Zero Carbon New Build Policy that had been launched by the Manchester Climate Change Partnership into local building regulations;
- An update was sought in relation to the Civic Quarter Heat Network;
- Noting that that Carbon Budget spend to date was recorded in the Annual Report that was submitted to the Committee;
- The need to engage all stakeholders and sources of expertise that existed within the city to drive and progress this area of work to deliver the required savings for the city;
- The continued call for all staff to complete the Carbon Literacy training; and
- Consideration should be given to establishing a Climate Clock in the city, similar to that in Glasgow, noting that a Climate Clock was a graphic to demonstrate how quickly the planet was approaching 1.5°C of global warming, given current

emissions trends. It also showed the amount of CO₂ already emitted, and the global warming to date.

The Strategic Lead (Policy and Partnerships) stated that consideration was being given as to the Net Zero Carbon New Build and how this could be incorporated into the Local Plan. He further advised that the data and outcomes from the single use plastics events were being used to highlight the scale of the issue and was a powerful tool to influence local business, adding that such events were gaining in popularity. In response to the comment made regarding business travel, he commented that this would continue to be monitored, and IT was used wherever possible to minimise the need for any such travel. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer added that there were occasions where in person meetings were required; however, she recognised the comments from the Committee and suggested that a further update on business travel be included in the next reporting cycle. The Executive Member for Environment added that a carpool service was also available for staff to use.

In response to the comment regarding the need to understand the methodology and modelling used to establish and report targets, Officers stated that a training session would be arranged for Members to discuss this further.

The Executive Member for Environment commented that all Scrutiny Committees were encouraged to consider climate change through the lens of their respective remits, and she agreed to update the Committee on this activity. The Chair commented that she would also liaise with the other Scrutiny Chairs on this issue, adding that she had recently had a conversation with the Chair of the Health Scrutiny Committee on this very subject. The Chair further added that she would discuss the issue of Social Value and the cycle purchase scheme with the Chair of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee.

The Strategic Lead (Resources & Programmes) informed the Members that the cycle purchase scheme was not restricted to Halfords and there was a mileage scheme for staff. He stated that he would circulate the information to Members following the meeting.

The Director, MCCA addressed the comments made by a Member regarding the Council's Carbon Budget and the trajectory of savings reported. She advised that 75% of the Council's direct emissions were attributed to the estate and that a detailed plan to decarbonise the estate was established, adding that the Committee had a report on this issue scheduled on their work programme.

The Director, MCCA advised that there was a Carbon Budget for the city, describing that this had been established utilising the expertise of the Tyndall Centre at the University of Manchester. The Strategic Lead (Policy and Partnerships) added that there was an extensive range of partnership working across the city to address climate change.

The Director of Commercial Operations informed the Members that the Civic Quarter Heat Network should be operational from November.

Decisions

The Committee recommend that;

1. The Executive Member for Environment give consideration to establishing a Climate Clock in the city, similar to that in Glasgow;
2. The Executive Member for Environment and Officers arrange a briefing session for Members on the modelling that was used to agree and set the suite of targets reported in the Action Plan.

ECCSC/21/22 Development of Manchester Climate Change Framework 2.0 – Update on Consultation and Development of the Detailed Action Plan

The Committee considered the report of the Manchester Climate Change Agency (MCCA) that provided an update on progress in developing an updated Climate Change Framework for the city (Framework 2.0). It reviewed the responses to the first round of consultation with communities and businesses that would help to inform the Framework and summarised the emerging objectives and proposed actions required to deliver the scale of carbon reduction required across the city. The Framework was intended to provide a more detailed definition of the urgent actions required across the city if Manchester was to remain within its adopted carbon budget and remain on track to be a zero-carbon city by 2038 at the latest.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- An introduction and background;
- Describing the 5 key components of Framework 2.0;
- Describing the process to support the development of the Framework and Action Plan;
- Objectives of the draft Action Plan; and
- An update on activities to involve Manchester Communities and Businesses.

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

- An update report was requested that described the outcomes of the Community Assembly;
- The need to prioritise actions and engage with local businesses on the issue of carbon reduction;
- What was the difference between this reported exercise and previous reports;
- The need to be given the opportunity to scrutinise reports in a timely manner; and
- Noting that Manchester Climate Change Youth Board had launched their manifesto on 7 October 2021 and that a full presentation would be delivered to full Council.

In response to the question regarding the Community Assembly, the Director, MCCA informed the Committee that in November 2021, the Citizens' Mandate would be taken to the international COP26 Climate Change Conference in Glasgow, along with an Impact Assessment Report of the process and a film capturing the process, where

it would be presented to delegates and groups from across the world with the help of the COP26 Coalition. The report was due to be completed by 29 October 2021.

In reply to the question regarding the difference between this reported exercise and previous reports, the Interim Policy and Strategy Advisor, MCCA described that Framework 2.0 was a 'deeper dive' across different sectors with the aim of developing specific actions. The Executive Member for Environment commented that it was useful to consider Framework 1 as the theory and Framework 2 as the actions.

In response to the specific issue regarding scrutiny, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that she discuss this further with the Executive Member for Environment.

Decision

To note the report.

ECCSC/21/23 Large Scale Renewable Energy Generation Feasibility Summary Study

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that described that the Council's Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) has a target to reduce direct emissions of CO₂ by 50% over the five-year period of 2020-25. In addition, the Council has a target to be zero carbon by 2038.

Action 1.4 of the CCAP targets 7,000 tonnes of annual CO₂ by 2025 savings to be delivered via a "feasibility and business case for a large-scale energy generation scheme from large scale Solar PV or Onshore or Offshore Wind on Council land and buildings, or sites in third party ownership".

Local Partnerships were appointed in November 2020 to deliver the feasibility study and their study, "Feasibility Study and Options Appraisal for Large Scale Energy Generation for Manchester City Council", was completed in April 2021 and was appended to the report.

The Feasibility Study concluded that the Council has two options: either purchase a solar PV facility or negotiate a suitable power purchase agreement (PPA). Both options were assessed to be better than the "do nothing" option.

The Committee was invited to comment on the report prior to it being considered by Executive.

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

- The need to visualise and articulate what a tonne of CO₂ looks like relative to the amount that is produced;
- Noting the recent energy crisis and the importance of future proofing;
- The need to lobby for increased onshore wind developments;
- The need to promote the Solar Together Greater Manchester group-buying scheme;

- All opportunities for job creation and addressing fuel poverty should be utilised through any development; and
- All opportunities for delivering small local renewable energy schemes should be explored and supported.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that the proposed development was the optimum size had been designed with due consideration given to future proofing. She stated that the feasibility study that underpinned the proposal could be shared with Members. She stated that the work would be progressed to deliver this programme and updates reports would be submitted to the Committee for consideration at an appropriate time.

The Strategic Lead - Resources & Programmes stated that the scale of the proposal was necessary to meet the challenge to address the emissions from the Council's estate. He did acknowledge the comments regarding small local renewable energy schemes. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer informed the Members that work was underway at a Greater Manchester level to look further at small local renewable energy schemes.

The Strategic Director, Local Partnerships acknowledged the comments regarding wind power and commented upon the challenge to deliver these due to Government legislation compared to delivering solar powered schemes. She further commented that it had been evidenced that established solar panel installations benefited the local bio diversity.

Decision

The Committee recommend;

1. That the Executive Member for Environment take every opportunity to lobby for the increased delivery of onshore wind power.
2. That the Executive Member for Environment review the information that is provided to residents regarding climate change to ensure a visual representation of carbon tonnage is included.

The Committee also endorse the recommendations that the Executive;

1. Note the options in Section 3.1 available to the Council; and
2. Agree that the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Chair of the Zero Carbon Coordination Group establish a delivery team to develop the options further, with a view to returning to the Executive with a proposal.

ECCSC/21/24 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.

A Member commented that further information was required that reported the impact on air quality and emission reductions of any proposals to reduce the speed limit on the Mancunian Way. The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) stated that any proposed changes would be subject to a formal consultation process.

A member commented that regular reports on the issue of Clean Air should be included as an item on the work programme. The Chair advised that she had noted the comment and would discuss this further with officers following the meeting.

Following discussions at the meeting of the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee of January 2021 an update was sought on the recommendation to establish a bespoke Manchester Considerate Constructors Scheme. The Chair advised that she had noted the comment and would discuss this further with the Executive Member for Environment following the meeting.

Members discussed the scope of the 'Neighbourhood Working to address climate change' report that was scheduled for the November meeting and how the carbon reductions would be reported against a range of activities. The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) advised that she had noted the comments and would discuss this with the officer preparing the report.

Decision

The Committee note the report and agree the work programme, noting the above comments.

Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2021

Present:

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair

Councillors Flanagan, Foley, Hassan, Holt, Hughes, Jeavons, Lynch, Lyons, Razaq, Shilton Godwin and Wright

Apologies: Councillor Chohan

Also present:

Councillor Craig, Deputy Leader (Finance)

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods

Councillor Simcock, Member for Didsbury East Ward

Victoria Ryan, Business Partner, Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA)

Claire Nicholls, Flood Resilience Advisor, Environment Agency

Peter Costello, Area Flood and Coastal Risk Manager, Environment Agency

Lisa Lingard, Resident and Communities Programme Lead, Manchester Climate Change Agency

ECCSC/21/25 Urgent Business – Famine in Madagascar

The Chair introduced an item of urgent business by inviting Cllr Flanagan to address the Committee.

Cllr Flanagan stated that in mid-2021, a severe drought in southern Madagascar had caused hundreds of thousands of people, with some estimating more than one million people, to suffer from food insecurity and being on the verge of famine. He stated that this was as a direct result of climate change. He therefore called upon the Government to urgently address climate change and called upon all Members to support a motion that was being drafted on this issue to be considered by Council.

Cllr Flanagan stated that all reports being considered by any Committee should explicitly articulate how the item being considered contributed to the Council's Climate Change Action Plan. He further stated that following the budget setting process an audit should be undertaken to consider how each Scrutiny Committee had considered the issue of climate change as part of their deliberations, with due consideration given to how this information was articulated so that it was accessible to members of the public.

Decision

To note the statement from the Committee member.

ECCSC/21/26 Minutes

A Member requested that the list of all organisations in Manchester that had not signed up to the MCCA, and where available the reasons for not signing up was still outstanding. (See ECCSC/21/16 Manchester Climate Change Agency Progress Report 2021/22). The Scrutiny Support Officer was asked to follow up this request for information.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2021 as a correct record, subject to the above comment.

ECCSC/21/27 Budget Report

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) that described that following the Spending Review announcements and other updates the Council was forecasting an estimated shortfall of £4m in 2022/23, £64m in 2023/24 and £85m by 2024/25. The report set out the high-level position and where Officers had identified options to balance the budget in 2022/23 which were subject to approval.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Describing that the Local Government Finance Settlement would be released in December 2021;
- A longer-term strategy to close the budget gap was being prepared with an estimated requirement to find budget cuts and savings in the region of £40m per annum for 2023/24 and 2024/25;
- Describing the priorities for the services within the remit of this committee, including those to address climate change, details on the initial revenue budget changes proposed by officers and the planned capital programme.

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

- Consideration needed to be given to continued funding for the Climate Change Officers posts; and
- Analysis needed to be undertaken to understand the cost if action to address climate change was not taken.

The Deputy Leader (Finance) said that as part of the budget setting process the Council would articulate where the Council used the budget to contribute and support the core aims of the Council, and this included the commitment to address climate change.

Decision

To note the report.

ECCSC/21/28 Approach to Flood Prevention and Management

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) that provided the Members with an overview of the approach to flood prevention and management including:

Key points and themes in the report included:

- How this was coordinated locally and how this was delivered with neighbouring authorities that impacted on Manchester;
- Flood Risk Management and Resilience;
- Lessons learnt from previous recent events;
- Role of the Civil Contingencies Unit; and
- Information on the strategies and planning in relation to local reservoirs.

Accompanying the report, the Committee further received a presentation from the Environment Agency that provided an overview of the role and responsibilities of the agency. The Area Flood and Coastal Risk Manager, Environment Agency concluded the presentation by advising that it was important for residents living in a flood risk area to sign up for flood alerts and to adhere to any advice given to evacuate a property. He stated that failure to do so could result in additional demands and pressures on the emergency services and present additional dangers to residents. He further commented that the Environment Agency would advise the Gold Command when it was necessary to evacuate an area.

The Members then heard from Councillor Simcock who addressed the Committee and spoke of his experience during Storm Christoph. He described that he had witnessed the event and had visited the control centre in Didsbury. He paid tribute to all of the staff working at the Environment Agency during the event. He further paid tribute to the response provided by Council officers, the emergency services, Didsbury mosque and Southway Housing. He commented that the regular clearing of gullies was important to prevent episodes of flooding and consideration needed to be given as to the location of evacuation centres to ensure they were appropriate and accessible for all residents. He recommended that the Committee should undertake a site visit to the flood management arrangements in the Goyt Valley. The Chair endorsed this recommendation.

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

- Welcoming the report and presentation, noting the benefits of partnership working;
- Noting the absence of the Canals and River Trust from the list of members of the Greater Manchester Resilience Forum;
- Noting the information provided relating to nature based solutions and requesting that further information be provided on these projects and information on how residents could get involved with such initiatives;
- Recognising the importance of coordinated and factual information provided to residents at times of flooding, referencing the lessons learnt during the pandemic on this issue;

- The importance of ensuring that any communications were appropriate, especially for vulnerable residents;
- How were sandbags distributed to residents;
- Where could residents obtain flood resilience advice and information to protect their properties;
- Information regarding the modelling used for future flood management plans was requested;
- Noting the increased incidents of surface water flooding and what was being done to address this;
- What work is being done to protect the Council's own housing stock against flooding; and
- The need to communicate to residents, particularly young people, the dangers and risks association with contaminated flood water.

The Area Flood and Coastal Risk Manager, Environment Agency stated that residents were involved with the nature based solutions projects, particularly supporting the ongoing maintenance of such schemes and he said that local Councillors would be contacted regarding local schemes. He stated that the modelling work for future plans was currently underway and could be shared with the Committee when available.

The Flood Resilience Advisor, Environment Agency welcomed the comments from the Committee and stated that she was willing to attend any resident events to speak on the issue of flood management. She commented that information was available for residents wishing to seek advice regarding home flood resilience measures, however the Environment Agency was unable to endorse any one product or service. She stated that residents should be directed to the Flood Hub website and the Blue Pages where information could be obtained. She further endorsed the comment regarding the need for factual information and recognised the importance of trusted key community contacts to disseminate this information at times of flooding.

The Head of Compliance Enforcement and Community Safety supported this statement and said that the Neighbourhood Teams were supporting the activity regarding improved communications with residents through the development of community flood resilience plans. She said that this was being done using all of the learning from Storm Christoph. She further noted the comments regarding the messaging on the issue of the dangers and risks associated with contaminated flood water and young people. She further reassured the Committee that the Canals and River Trust did assist with flood incidents, where appropriate, but they were not a Risk Management Authority or a Category 1 or 2 responder as defined by the Civil Contingencies Act and are not therefore required to undertake any specific civil protection duties under the Act. In respect of work being done to protect the Council's own housing stock from future flooding she agreed to raise this with the Director of Northwards.

The Head of Network Management advised that there were a limited number of sandbags available, and these were provided to the emergency services to deploy as they felt appropriate during incidents of flooding. He commented that there was a recognised demand from residents for sandbags and a policy on how to manage this demand was being considered to ensure it was equitable. He further commented that

the issue of surface flooding was recognised, and any new highways scheme was designed to account for the increased intensity of rain fall. The Business Partner, AGMA commented that the Multi-agency Flood Plan, specific to Manchester, was being reviewed and this had involvement from Highways. She said this would be shared with Members when this was finalised.

The Area Flood and Coastal Risk Manager, Environment Agency concluded by noting the importance of partnership working to address flood management and this was clearly demonstrated in Manchester and he thanked the Members for the opportunity to present to the Committee.

Decisions

The Committee;

1. Recommend that Neighbourhood Teams review and strengthen the communication channels with residents around the issue of flooding and utilise local ward members as trusted community voices.
2. Recommend that priority should be given to the cleaning of gullies in those areas identified as being at risk of flooding.
3. Recommend that appropriate consideration is given to flood management on all future highways schemes.
4. That a visit be arranged for Members of the Committee to witness the flood management arrangements in the Goyt Valley.

ECCSC/21/29 The Role of Neighbourhood Teams In Developing Local Climate Change Activity and Partnership Working

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) that provided information on how the Neighbourhood Teams were supporting local communities to engage in local climate change activity and reduce carbon emissions.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- An update on the In Our Nature programme pilot schemes;
- Describing the approach and outcomes of partnership working;
- Use of the Neighbourhood Investment Fund;
- Work of Climate Change Neighbourhood Officers including supporting development of wider partnership structures;
- Information on the delivery of active travel; and
- Describing the key elements that were required for the local approach to be successful.

In presenting the report the Head of Neighbourhood Management requested an amendment to the wording of paragraph 10.3 to read as follows;

'The 'Towards Inclusive Environmental Sustainability (TIES)' project based in the Sustainable Consumption Institute (SCI) at the University of Manchester is researching how the knowledge and practices of immigrants from the Global South contribute to building just and sustainable cities in the UK.

The TIES team has interviewed key representatives and organisations who engage in the green agenda and climate work in Greater Manchester and nationally. These interviews will help build a picture of the local context as well as identifying challenges to and opportunities for greater inclusivity.

In the next few months the team will be conducting a survey about the environmental behaviours, practices, and attitudes of residents in Greater Manchester (GM). They will be asking 400 non-UK born participants who have arrived from Pakistan or Somalia to the UK in the last 10 years and 100 UK-born participants to take part in the survey. Researchers will be available to help interpret and translate the survey for participants for whom English is not their first language.

The roll out of the survey will begin in Central Manchester. Areas including Moss Side, Rusholme, Hulme and Longsight. The TIES team welcome invitations from organisations and individuals to host 'Survey Groups' in these areas. They particularly encourage organisations who would like to support/run a sustainable group activity (e.g., a clothing swap, litter pick or host a guest speaker) alongside or during the survey group to get in touch. The TIES team will help facilitate these groups and activities. For further information, email Dr. Nafhesa Ali at nafhesa.ali@manchester.ac.uk .

The Committee also heard from the three Climate Change Officers who provided a verbal update on the work that had been delivered in their respective areas.

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

- Recognising the contribution that the Climate Change Officers had made and called for the continued funding of these posts;
- Noting the useful Energy Demand Solutions (CREDS) Place-Based Carbon Calculator tool;
- An update was sought as to Carbon Literacy training and if there was any intention to roll this out further; and
- How were the outcomes of the work described calculated in carbon savings.

The Head of Neighbourhood Management stated that the work of the Neighbourhood Teams, supported by the Climate Change Officers, all contributed to the Manchester Climate Change Action Plan. She stated that work was underway with the Tyndall Centre to formulate a methodology for reporting the carbon savings achieved as a result of these actions. She also commented that engagement work with local businesses in district centres would be undertaken.

The Strategic Lead (South) commented that the CREDS tool was a useful tool that had helped inform the local Neighbourhood Climate Change Plans as this mapped the local area to identify the 'hotspots' in each ward. The Resident and Communities Programme Lead, Manchester Climate Change Agency advised that the Tyndall

Centre were building upon the CREDS tool to develop a bespoke tool for Manchester and that Members would be updated on this at the appropriate time.

The Executive Member for the Environment stated that consideration was being given as to the next steps for carbon literacy training, including working with schools on the eco schools programme and various faith groups across the city.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods paid tribute to the work of the Climate Change Officers and the progress they had made in a relatively short period of time and in the context of the pandemic. He further called upon the government to adequately fund climate change activity.

Decision

The Committee recommend;

1. That a briefing note is provided to Members regarding the future funding of the Climate Change Officers posts when this is available.
2. Recognising the positive climate change initiatives delivered in wards, that good practice and learning should be shared across all Neighbourhood Teams to help strengthen and embed climate change across the city.
3. Active Streets should be promoted and supported across all wards.

ECCSC/21/30 Manchester City Council Estates Decarbonisation

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Estates and Facilities that described the activities and progress to date on the decarbonisation of Manchester City Council's operational estate.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- The Council's Climate Change Action Plan 2020-25 included a target to reduce annual emissions from the operational estate by 4,800 tCO₂;
- Describing carbon reduction activity, noting that the Carbon Reduction Programme had been established to oversee the delivery of a wide range of energy efficiency and low carbon energy generation measures throughout the estate;
- An update on the Civic Quarter Heat Network;
- Describing other major construction projects that were underway that included significant opportunities to reduce carbon emissions, over and above the retrofit work carried out by the Carbon Reduction Programme; and
- Future projects in development.

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

- Recognising the work and progress reported to date;

- What was being done to address other smaller buildings and settings, such as those delivering child care and education; and
- Were carbon emissions as a direct result of construction included in the information provided relating to the number of major construction projects underway as part of the Estate Strategy.

The Head of Estates and Facilities stated that priority had been given to the largest carbon emitting buildings within the estate, however work was underway to understand the need of the wider estate in recognition that these will need addressing also. He advised that schools did not form part of the Council's estate, however as part of the capital funding for early years provision all carbon reduction options would be considered when improvements to these sites were considered.

The Head of Estates and Facilities advised that emissions as result of construction and the Estates Strategy were not included however the policy team had been asked to look into this. In addition, he added that the Capital Programme Team had adopted a Low Carbon Build Standard and that low carbon construction methods could be tested via the procurement process. He further commented that where possible the approach of Refurb and Reuse had been adopted to the estate and made reference to the decision to refurbish Alexandra House in Moss Side.

The Executive Member for the Environment commented that the Local Plan would be an opportunity to formalise the new build policy and support the carbon reduction ambitions of the city.

The Deputy Leader (Finance) proposed that further update reports would include a list of those remaining assets, adding that priority had been given the major assets in the first instance and Members needed to appreciate the scale of the challenge and the significant progress to date.

Decision

To note the report.

ECCSC/21/31 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. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

Following a discussion regarding receiving a report on construction companies and their impact on carbon emissions in the city, the Chair advised she would discuss this further with the Director of Planning and Building Control with a view to progressing this request.

Decision

The Committee note the report and agree the work programme, noting the comments above.

Economy Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2021

Present:

Councillor H Priest (Chair) – in the Chair
Councillors Doswell, Farrell, Johns, Moore, Raikes, Stanton and Shilton Godwin

Also present:

Councillor Midgley, Executive Member for Health and Care
Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Employment

Apologies:

Councillors Baker-Smith and Noor

ESC/21/47 Minutes

A Member commented that a report that described how the recommendations of the Poverty Truth Commission were being implemented should be included as an item on the Committee's work programme (see ESC/21/42 Manchester's support for families living in poverty).

Decision

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2021 were approved as a correct record, subject to the above amendment.

ESC/21/48 Build Back Fairer – COVID-19 Marmot Review: Housing, Unemployment and Transport

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Inclusive Economy and Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships that provides an overview of the Marmot Build Back Fairer report focusing on housing, unemployment and transport in Manchester, in line with the remit of the Committee. The report discussed the impact of COVID-19 on housing, unemployment and transport in the city, relative to health inequalities, and outlined Manchester's response to recommendations in the Build Back Fairer report.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing and introduction and background;
- Describing the impact of COVID-19 in a Manchester context;
- Noting that The Marmot report detailed the disproportionately negative impact that the COVID-19 pandemic has had in Greater Manchester;
- Describing the factors that had affected the inequalities in infection and mortality from COVID-19 in Greater Manchester;

- Noting that Manchester's residents had been disproportionately negatively impacted by the pandemic.
- Describing a range of factors such as Housing, Work and Unemployment, Transport and Active Travel in a Manchester context and describing the associated The Build Back Fairer report summaries; and
- Providing information relating to the Marmot Report Framework and Recommendations and detailing the Manchester's response to these Recommendations.

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

- The need to retrofit domestic properties, particularly those in the Private Rented Sector;
- The need to protect tenants from eviction if they did complain about disrepair in their privately rented accommodation;
- The need to promote the Good Employment Charter, noting the impact that good quality employment could have on a person's outcomes;
- The call for improved and affordable public transport to connect residents with employment and training opportunities;
- What metrics and timescales would be used to measure progress against the Marmot Recommendations;
- Noting that the Marmot Review and Recommendations was a tool that could be used to demonstrate to the Government the need for appropriate levels of funding to address the identified inequalities;
- Welcoming the recognition that being in good work was usually protective of health while poor quality work, stressful jobs, and unemployment, particularly long-term unemployment, contribute significantly to poor health and low wellbeing and increase the risk of mortality;
- Consideration needed to be given to all needs of different residents, including disabled residents when considering the re-design of how major areas of the city centre would function and to reallocate space to walking and public realm;
- More information was sought on the Anchor pilot scheme;
- Noting that the NHS was a major employer in the city and a key partner of the Council they should use their procurement policies and scale of purchasing to deliver Social Value; and
- The need for accessible and affordable child care places; especially for those families who were earning just above the threshold for free child care.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment stated that COVID-19 had highlighted and exacerbated many of the health inequalities that existed in the city. He described that prior to this the city had experienced a sustained period of austerity and cuts to public service funding. He advised that the wider determinants of health, such as quality housing and employment were understood. He called upon the Government for adequate funding to be able to deliver more affordable and social housing. He advocated the need to take action to address poor practice in the Private Rented Sector using Houses in Multiple Occupation and Selective Licensing schemes. He further made

reference to the Section 21 Team who would support those residents at risk of eviction from a private landlord. He concluded by reiterating that the wider determinants of health needed to be addressed such as improved public transport networks and investment in skills and training for residents and he would continue to lobby Government for a fair funding settlement.

The Director of Inclusive Economy advised the Committee that a Task Group would be established to be Chaired by the Director of Public Health to oversee the delivery of the Marmot recommendations. She described that the reporting metrics would be agreed via this group and could be shared with Members when available.

The Director of Inclusive Economy stated that the recently launched Anchors Pilot had a twin focus of supporting Manchester to become a Real Living Wage City and increasing commitment to employing local people, particularly from our more disadvantaged communities. This would further support the implementation of the Good Employment Charter and any future evolving definition of a GM quality of work guarantee. In response to a comment regarding those areas of the city that did not have a major employer she described that they would be working for the city as a whole and not just the geographical location then were situated in, adding that in North Manchester there existed a North Manchester Business Network with good links between local smaller business and community initiatives.

The Director of Inclusive Economy acknowledged the comments regarding the NHS and the role they played in the city as a major employer. She stated that officers had spoken with their procurement teams however stated it was important to recognise that the NHS was subject to national procurement policies and guidance so had little local discretion on such matters. She advised that the local hospitals had initiated schemes and programmes to deliver training and employment opportunities for local residents.

The City Centre Growth Manager advised that work continued at a Greater Manchester (GM) level to improve public transport, especially the bus network and made reference to the Bus Service Improvement Plan, adding that the ability to franchise the bus network would present an opportunity to address the issue of fares and deliver a planned integrated service. The Chair commented that there was need to report any analysis of changes to modes of transport and travel, noting the impact of COVID-19 and emissions.

The Director of Inclusive Economy acknowledged the comment regarding the need for appropriate, affordable child care and stated that this provision is reported to the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee. The Chair stated that she would discuss this further with the Chair of that Committee.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Recommends that the Executive Member for Housing and Employment lobby the Government for adequate funding to enable the retrofitting of properties in the Private Rented Sector.
- (2) Notes that the Chair will discuss with the Chair of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee the issue of appropriate provision of affordable child care across the city.

ESC/21/49 Work and Health

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Inclusive Economy that provided an update on the activity of the most recent Working Well programmes (Work & Health, Early Help and JETS) and the impact of the programme overall in Manchester.

Working Well is a well-established Greater Manchester Combined Authority commissioned programme which is based on a key worker model bringing together support to tackle barriers that affect people's ability to enter the labour market and sustain jobs. It has evolved since 2014 to reflect a focus on different target groups, with the latest being the Work and Health programme. In 2020 it was expanded with the JETS programme as part of the National Plan for Jobs in response to COVID19.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing and introduction and background;
- Describing the content of the report in a Health and policy context;
- Describing the Manchester Population Health Plan 2018-2027 that set out a priority of 'Strengthening the positive impact of work on health';
- An overview of each Working Well programme and its impact in Manchester;
- Economic recovery and the Government's Plans for Jobs; and
- Conclusions and next steps.

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

- Noting the positive progress made in relation the Real Living Wage;
- An explanation was sought as to the reason the 'no work requirements group' continued to rise from c10,000 to c17,000;
- Comparative figures were sought, where available across the range of metrics reported as this would assist with the scrutiny process;
- Clarification was sought as to the type of jobs and sectors people were accessing through the initiatives;
- An analysis of the success of the Kickstart programme should be included on the Committee's work programme;
- Was the reported support for 8,000+ Manchester residents over the next 3 years as part of the Restart programme an ambition or part of the contract with Ingeus;
- The need to recognise the importance of the quality of jobs people were accessing and this importance this had on people and their outcomes;

- The need for programmes to be flexible to respond to the changing needs and demands of the labour market;
- Supporting the adoption of the Real Living Wage;
- The need to consider what was best for the individual and not focus on targets and welcoming the reported holistic approach taken by advisors;
- Calling for more regional control on the design and delivery of skills programmes;
- Requesting the independent evaluation of the Population Health Prevention Programme be shared with Members when this was available;
- Noting that people were often reluctant to engage with the benefit service due to the perceptions that any reassessment of their benefits would result in them being financially worse off or having to commence the claiming of benefits again;
- An update on the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) was sought, noting the importance of the for both Manchester and the wider city region;
- Welcoming the Working Well programme that had helped drive Disability Support Webinars with Small, Medium enterprises (SMEs) by offering to upskill businesses to deal with a variety of health conditions;

The Executive Member for Health and Care stated that health inequalities were inextricably linked to the wider determinants of health. She stated that the city region needed appropriate funding to support the actions identified to address these inequalities and to counter the significant impact that austerity has had on the residents of the city. She advocated that addressing health inequalities should be the central consideration to all decision making.

The Work and Skills Lead commented that the reported rise from c10,000 to c17,000 in the 'no work requirements group' could be attributed to the recording of data by the DWP following conversations with residents, however he advised that he would seek clarification on this point. He advised that Job Centre Plus staff were encouraged to engage in holistic conversation to ensure potential job opportunities were appropriate and sustainable, taking into account a range of considerations that included travel requirements.

The Work and Skills Lead advised that the figures reported for the Restart programme were part of the contract arrangements.

The Work and Skills Lead advised that comparative data where available could be shared with the Committee, and he further advised that the type of work people were accessing through these programmes were predominantly in the Care and Customer Service sectors. He further commented that the roles of the key workers was to review all options that were available, including understanding the changing labour market to ensure the most appropriate and tailored support was provided and identify and address any barriers to accessing employment opportunities. A member noted the need to acknowledge people's genuine concerns regarding accessing jobs in certain sectors, in particular the care sector if they themselves had a health issue due to the perceived increased risks of contracting COVID-19.

The Director of Inclusive Economy commented that a report on the impact of Kickstart, a programme delivered locally by Jobcentre Plus, offers 6 month jobs for young people aged 16-24 who are currently claiming Universal Credit and who are at risk of long term unemployment could be provided to the Committee at an appropriate time, adding that initial analysis indicated that the outcomes were not as good as had been anticipated, despite the impact of the pandemic and this strengthened the case for more local control over the design and delivery of schemes.

The Director of Inclusive Economy stated that further information in the business that had delivered the Disability Support Webinars would be provided to the Members following the meeting. She stated this importance of this approach was recognised and commented that a report issued by the British Chamber of Commerce had recently published a report that emphasised the need to consider the health and wellbeing of employees.

The Director of Inclusive Economy acknowledged the comments made regarding the barriers presented by perceptions of the benefits system by stating that Universal Credit is more flexible than previous systems and it was designed to be an 'in work' benefit, however acknowledged the comment from the Chair on this subject.

The Chair commented that she would discuss with the Chair of the Health Scrutiny Committee how the reporting of the independent evaluation of the Population Health Prevention Programme could be appropriately reported to scrutiny.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Recommends that the Director of Inclusive Economy circulate for information the details of organisations who had delivered the Disability Support Webinars;
- (2) Request that a report on the impact and outcomes of the Kickstart programme be added to the Committee's work programme for consideration at an appropriate time;
- (3) Note that the Chair will discuss with the Chair of the Health Scrutiny Committee the options for reporting the findings of the independent evaluation of the Population Health Prevention Programme

ESC/21/50 Opportunities and issues for older workers in the Labour Market

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Inclusive Economy and Consultant in Public Health (Ageing Well Lead) that provided data on the employment and skills status of workers (aged 50 to 64) in Manchester, how they had been impacted by Covid and the actions being taken to connect them to opportunities in the City as part of the Economic Recovery Strategy.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and context, noting that older workers who are out of work are twice as likely to be long-term unemployed as younger workers who are out of work;
- Describing the situation for Older Workers in Manchester;
- Data on Employment and Skills for those residents aged over 50 years old;
- Data on the levels of Universal Credit claimants for those residents aged over 50 years old;
- Describing the Impact of COVID-19 on employment;
- Challenges and issues, including the digital divide and the digital inclusion work underway to address this;
- Information on Age Friendly Manchester (AFM) and Manchester's Ageing Strategy - Manchester: A Great Place to Grow Older 2017 – 2021;
- Programmes and work being delivered across Manchester Age Friendly Employment; and
- Conclusions.

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

- The need to give due consideration when describing digital skills when discussing the over 50's as the range of knowledge and experience could differ greatly;
- Noting that it was socio economic barriers that presented the largest challenge to many older residents;
- The need to recognise that over 50's had a wealth of other experiences that they could bring to the work place;
- Noting the need for employers to recognise and accommodate the different life pressures experienced by older workers;
- People should be supported and encouraged to prepare a CV rather than having to rely solely on submitting job applications on-line;
- Welcoming the reported co-creation activities, adding that this approach of utilising and learning from lived experience should be applied to all services and programmes and would there be any evaluation of this undertaken;
- Had consideration been given as to the impact of Long Covid

The Director of Inclusive Economy acknowledged the comment made regarding the need to recognise the different needs and challenges for people over the age of 50, and the different existing skills sets within this cohort. She commented that in Manchester the digital inclusion work had targeted over 65s.

In response to the comment made regarding CV's the Director of Inclusive Economy commented that Manchester City Council had changed its policy and would now accept a CV and covering letter, however acknowledged the wider point on this issue. She further stated that a report on the outcomes of the co-creation activities would be submitted to the Committee at an appropriate time for consideration. In response to the

issue regarding Long Covid and its impact on the over 50s she advised that no specific data was currently available however this would continue to be monitored.

The Programme Lead – Age Friendly Manchester welcomed the comment made regarding changing caring responsibilities and stressed the importance of employers recognising these. He stated that Manchester Council had responded by introducing a flexible working policy and there was a need to engage with the private sector to demonstrate the benefits to both employers and employees by introducing such schemes.

Decision

The Committee recommend that an evaluation report on the co-creation activities relating to the Over 50's and Employment Project be submitted for consideration at an appropriate time.

ESC/21/51 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.

In response to a question from the Member the Chair commented that the COVID-19 Situation Report would be included as a regular item on future agendas and that the Economy Dashboard would also be included at the appropriate time.

Decision

The Committee note the report and agree the work programme, noting the comments above.

Economy Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2021

Present:

Councillor H Priest – in the Chair
Councillors Bayunu, Moore, Noor and Raikes

Also present:

Councillor Leese, Leader
Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Employment
Julian Skyrme, Director of Social Responsibility, The University of Manchester
Michael Stephenson, Director of Public Affairs, Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU)

Apologies:

Councillors Doswell, Farrell, Johns, Stanton and Shilton Godwin

ESC/21/52 Minutes

Decision

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 October 2021 were approved as a correct record.

ESC/21/53 Growth & Development Directorate Budget 2022/23

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director Growth & Development that described that following the Spending Review announcements and other updates the Council was forecasting an estimated shortfall of £4m in 2022/23, £64m in 2023/24 and £85m by 2024/25. The report set out the high-level position and where Officers had identified options to balance the budget in 2022/23 which were subject to approval.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Describing that the Local Government Finance Settlement would be released in December 2021;
- A longer-term strategy to close the budget gap was being prepared with an estimated requirement to find budget cuts and savings in the region of £40m per annum for 2023/24 and 2024/25; and
- Describing the priorities for the services within the remit of this committee, details on the initial revenue budget changes proposed by officers and the planned capital programme.

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

- Did the identified priorities align to the various strategies that were considered by the Committee;
- An assurance was sought that the City Centre Growth & Infrastructure priorities extended to the wider city and districts; and
- Further information was sought on the accidents and trips budget.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment stated that Manchester remained committed to delivering on its key priorities that included delivering affordable housing, addressing climate change and job creation. He further commented that the priorities did align with the various strategies, such as the Housing Strategy that were considered by the Committee.

The Leader stated that the City Centre Growth and Infrastructure priorities did extend to the wider city, making reference to the schemes to be delivered in Wythenshawe as an example.

In response to a specific question relating to the reduction in the accidents and trips budget within the Highways Directorate, the Director of Highways stated that this fund was to cover any personal injury claims and accidental repairs to vehicles. He advised that the reduction in that budget had been proposed due to the reduction in journeys undertaken by vehicles and fewer pedestrians during the pandemic.

In response to a comment from a Member regarding previous budget decisions taken by the Council, the Chair directed the Member to the list of background documents listed at the front of the report.

Decision

To note the report.

ESC/21/54 Contribution of Higher Education Institutes to Manchester's economy (Cllr Moore in the Chair)

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Inclusive Economy and Strategic Lead Policy & Partnerships that provided an overview of the economic contribution of Manchester's two main universities, The University of Manchester and Manchester Metropolitan University.

The report utilised research by Public First which was undertaken in 2020 using data from 2018/19 which quantified the direct value created by the universities, their wider supply chain and procurement spending with local businesses, and the additional spending of their staff, students and visitors. It also drew upon Research England's new Knowledge Exchange Framework (KEF) and Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) data.

The report described that both universities had signed the Greater Manchester Civic University Agreement on 24 September 2021 during the Greater Manchester Combined Authority meeting and were committed to delivering positive outcomes for Manchester and the city region.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Information relating to Sustainability and the Greater Manchester Civic University Agreement;
- Both universities had signed the Greater Manchester Civic University Agreement on 24 September 2021 during the Greater Manchester Combined Authority meeting and were committed to delivering positive outcomes for Manchester and the city region;
- Data and narrative relating to research, teaching and economic impact;
- Education and Skills;
- Business support, innovation, enterprise and start-ups;
- Public engagement;
- Case studies across a range of activities; and
- Next steps.

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

- Welcoming the information relating to the Living Wage;
- What methodology was used to arrive at the figure to describe the economic impact of research;
- An update was sought on attracting Research and Development Funding to the city;
- How did the Universities work with local schools and FE colleges;
- The need to acknowledge the cost of the Universities to the Council and other public sector bodies, for example student exemptions from Council Tax and issues relating to the student accommodation, such as waste; and
- The need for appropriate student accommodation in appropriate areas, noting the impact this could have on neighborhoods and communities.

The Director of Social Responsibility, The UoM stated that the two institutions worked very closely together bringing strengths to the city. He described that both had signed up to the Civic University Agreement along with the other universities across Greater Manchester to work together to drive social and economic change in the city region. The agreements contained six principals of education and skills, reducing inequalities, jobs and growth, the digital economy, net zero and the creative and cultural economy.

He further described that it had been evidenced that Manchester residents had great pride in the Universities in Manchester and was aligned to the economic ambitions of residents.

The Director of Public Affairs, MMU commented that both sites took their role as anchor institutions very seriously and their policies and ambitions mirrored those of partners, such as the City Council. He further commented that the importance of public engagement was recognised by both institutions and a Community Engagement Plan was in development.

The Director of Social Responsibility, The UoM stated that the figures to describe the economic impact of research had been derived using an agreed formula. He stated that a benchmarking exercise had been undertaken against the two Nottingham Universities and information on this could be shared. He described that joint proposals across the Combined Authority were submitted to attract Research and Development Funding, adding that the establishment of Innovation GM, a £7bn blueprint for translational innovation between Greater Manchester and the Government was a sound base on which to attract funding into the city and the wider city region.

The Director of Public Affairs, MMU stated that the Universities had established relationships with the local FE providers across Greater Manchester and a Statement of Joint Cooperation had been agreed. This had seen fourteen colleges and universities across Greater Manchester coming together with a joint commitment to address the skills and economic challenges facing the region.

The Director of Social Responsibility, the UoM described that the Universities were committed to attainment, wellbeing and inspiration to the young people of Manchester, noting the positive impact that the delivery of the museum, galleries and libraries had on citizens' lives and aspirations. He stated that whilst it was difficult to quantify the benefits of these, it was accepted that they were important to the residents of the city.

In response to the issue raised regarding the cost to the city council and partners, both guests acknowledged this had been a challenge, however improvements had been made in terms of the response of both institutions to issues when they arose. The Director of Social Responsibility, the UoM commented that the University had worked closely with Manchester Student Homes to address the issues related to student accommodation experienced in some neighbourhoods and the disciplinary procedures had been strengthened to address off campus behaviour.

The Committee noted that a report on Purpose Built Student Accommodation would be considered at the appropriate time.

Decision

To note the report.

[Councillor Priest declared a personal pecuniary and prejudicial interest in this item of business and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.]

**ESC/21/55 Student numbers and graduate retention in the city
(Cllr Moore in the Chair)**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Inclusive Economy that provided an overview of the student body studying at the higher education institutions (HEIs) in Manchester with a specific focus on the two largest institutions, the University of Manchester (UoM) and Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU).

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an overview of Manchester's higher education provision;
- Data and narrative in relation to higher education admissions and attainment;
- Information on the UoM widening participation initiative;
- Degree apprenticeships;
- An overview of the numbers of graduates remaining in the city post-graduation;
- The emerging picture of the impact of COVID-19 on the student body;
- Graduate retention and attraction;
- Manchester's Graduate Labour Market and the local response to support the graduate labour market;
- Our Manchester Graduate Scheme;
- Case studies; and
- Next steps.

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

- Welcoming the report and the importance of promoting Manchester as a great city to live, work and socialise;
- Discussion of the data in the report regarding 'brain drain' and advising that wider consideration needed to be given to account for those residents returning to the city who had studied elsewhere and those graduates from other areas moving to Manchester, adding that this data had previously been available;
- What analysis of Teacher Assessed Grades had been undertaken to understand the impact on attainment levels; and
- Was data on the outcomes of the First Generation Scholarship Programme and the work to improve diversity and inclusion available.

The Director of Social Responsibility, the UoM stated that initial analysis of the Teacher Assessed Grades indicated that there had been an increase in those children from independent schools achieving A star grades at A Level. He advised this was concerning and could undermine the work to widen participation. He stated this would continue to be monitored.

The Director of Social Responsibility, the UoM stated that data on graduate outcomes was recorded and could be shared with the Committee. The Chair recommended that the University Equality and Diversity Plan be circulated for information following the meeting.

In response to the comment from the Member regarding the data available and 'brain drain' the Director of Inclusive Economy advised she would look into this further, noting the comments from the Member.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment welcomed the report and made particular reference to the Our Manchester Graduate Scheme, a pilot collaborative initiative between the Council and MMU aiming to connect small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) to recent graduates. The businesses would be supported with funding, candidate attraction, recruitment, and selection carried out by MMU. The business would offer a 12-month graduate opportunity with the potential for the role to become permanent. Upon starting in the role, the graduate would have access to regular CPD (Continuing Professional Development) training provided by the council's HR department. The scheme launched in August 2021 and is currently at the stage of recruiting businesses with nine SMEs interested to date.

Decision

To recommend that the University Equality and Diversity Plan is circulated to Members of the Committee.

[Councillor Priest declared a personal pecuniary and prejudicial interest in this item of business and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item.]

ESC/21/56 Update on COVID-19 Activity

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.

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

- Noting the low footfall figures reported for the King Street and St Anne's Square area of the city centre;
- Was comparative footfall data available for District Centres pre and post covid; and
- Information on the Community Renewal Fund was requested.

In response to the footfall figures for King Street and St Ann's Square, the Strategic Lead for City Centre Partnerships stated that discussions were underway with existing businesses and property owners to consider options for partnership arrangements in King Street and St Ann's Square that would attract more footfall. Footfall was impacted by some existing empty properties and by continuing concerns about the pandemic. The Leader stated that there was also an issue with the accuracy of data collection, as the recording equipment was not always functioning effectively.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment stated that the comparative footfall data was available for District Centres pre and post covid and could be provided to the Committee.

The Director of Inclusive Economy advised that further information on the Community Renewal Fund would be circulated to Members following the meeting.

The Leader advised the Committee that it had been agreed that the Economic Recovery Group would continue to meet on a monthly basis, and the Sit Rep report would continue to be submitted to the Committee for consideration.

Decision

To note the report.

ESC/21/57 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 publication of the agenda pack she had had further discussions with the Strategic Director of Growth and Development to agree the work programme. This would be made available to Members in the December Overview Report.

Decision

The Committee note the report and agree the work programme, noting the Chair's comments.

This page is intentionally left blank

Health and Wellbeing Board

Minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2021

Present:

Councillor Midgley, Executive Member for Adults Health and Wellbeing – In the chair
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools Services
David Regan, Director of Public Health
Rupert Nichols, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust
Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services
Paul Marshall, Strategic Director of Children's Services
Dr Murugesan Raja, Manchester GP Forum
Dr Doug Jeffrey, (South) Primary Care Manchester Partnership
Katy Calvin-Thomas, Manchester Local Care Organisation
Dr Denis Colligan, GP Member (North) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust

Apologies:

Dr Geeta Wadhwa, GP Member (South) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Dr Ruth Bromley, Chair Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Vicky Szulist, Healthwatch

Also in attendance:

Dr Manisha Kumar, Medical Director, MHCC
Ruth Denton, Our Year Lead
Sam Nicholson, Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency
Owen Boxx, Senior Planning and Policy Manager MHCC

HWB/21/24 Appointment of Chair

Councillor Midgley was appointed Chair for the meeting.

HWB/21/25 Better Care Fund (BCF) return

The Chair informed the Board that an item of urgent business had been agreed to accept the Better Care Fund return report of the Senior Planning Manager, MHCC. The report had been circulated to members of the Board in advance of the meeting.

The report described that NHS England had requested that a BCF return is completed for Manchester which demonstrated the plan to successfully deliver integrated health and social care.

The plan focused on the requirement to reduce long length of stay in acute settings and to provide support for people to remain in the community by having effective discharge pathways and social care provision.

NHS England requested that the plan was approved by the Health and Wellbeing Board prior to being submitted to them by 16 November 2021.

The Chair invited members of the Board to ask questions.

A member of the board referred to arrangement made for patients following their discharge from hospital and asked how a care package would be made available if needed.

It was reported that a reablement support package will be applied within the four to six weeks period after leaving hospital.

The Director of Adult Social Services informed the meeting that anyone requiring care as part of a targeted intervention, under the Care Act, would receive an assessment and a care package would then be set up and delivered by home care providers.

Decisions

1. To approve the Better Care Fund return.
2. To approve the narrative return in support of the Better Care Fund plan.

HWB/21/25 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 September 2021 were submitted for approval.

Decision

To agree as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 1 September 2021.

HWB/21/26 Winter Panning: COVID-19 and Flue

The Board received the joint presentation of the Director of Public Health and the Medical Director, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning that described the planned approach to delivering both the COVID-19 and flu vaccination programmes over the coming months. The Board noted that these programmes sat alongside the winter plans of local NHS Trusts and Adult Social Care and the overarching national Autumn/Winter Plan.

The Director of Public Health provided an update on the current data for Manchester at 13 October 2021. Manchester had a rate of 274.9 and was 9 within Greater Manchester and 285 of all local authorities in England. Transmission rates were currently highest within the 11 to 16 years age groups. Reference was made to the rates within the over 60 years age group, that have risen and the importance of continued messaging across the population to take up the offer of the first dose, second dose and the booster vaccine to help prevent hospitalisation. Details were also provided on the impact of covid on secondary care, in particular the number of patients in hospital, those discharged and the impact on staff absences.

The Medical Director, MHCC provided an update on the winter vaccine programme. Details of the first dose, second dose and booster vaccine uptake across Manchester

were provided and it was explained that the vaccine is openly available to encourage wide take up. Work is ongoing to directly notify residents that have not received a first or a second booster vaccine and to invite them to come forward to receive it. Changes to guidance on the provision of the vaccine booster allows the booster to be given before 6 months had past and this was being co-administered with the flu vaccine at the same time to reduce the need for multiple trips. The Board was advised of the timetable and programmes in place to engage with different groups to boost take up of the vaccine that has included various methods of communication to target and engage as widely as possible.

The Chair invited questions and comments from Members of the Board.

A member of the Board referred to the take up rates of the vaccine by the school age children and importance of increasing this and to ensure that schools across the city remain open.

Decision

To note the presentation.

HWB/21/27 Manchester Climate Change Framework 2.0

The Board received the report of the Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency that discussed the evidence of a strong correlation between climate vulnerability and health inequalities; to provide an update on the refresh of the city's Climate Change Framework (Framework 2.0) and to seek guidance on the best way to bring expert advice on Health and Wellbeing into the Framework refresh, both in the short and longer term.

Reference was made to section 4 of the report, that sought support from the Board with the third headline objective on 'health and wellbeing' for setting the right objectives and targets and tracking progress with their implementation. The report set out two proposals for consideration:

- a) The Health & Well Being Board itself acts as the independent Advisory Group for the Climate Change Framework's third headline objective.
- b) The Health & Well Being Board create a new sub-group of appropriate level members to be the independent Advisory group, which is then overseen by the Board.

The Chair invited questions and comments from Members of the Board.

Members of the Board welcomed the report and referred to the importance of focussing on the impact of climate change on health and making the commitment to the bringing together of the partner agencies to work towards this.

The Director of Public Health proposed that a sub-group be established to help support Climate Change Framework 2.0. The membership of the sub-group would be determined following consultation with partners.

Decisions

The Board agreed to:

1. Note the recent publication of a number of key reports that provide evidence of a strong link between climate vulnerability and health inequality.
2. Provide feedback on the type of indicators that could be adopted to show progress on addressing climate change and health inequalities.
3. Establish a Sub-Group to provide support for the Climate Change Framework 2.0.

HWB/21/28 'Our Year' 2022

The Board received the report and presentation of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services that discussed the issues and key concerns identified during COVID-19 that must be addressed before they became entrenched and hinder, or even prevent the progress of our children and young people.

The Our Year Lead officer gave an overview and a presentation that described that a citywide approach is required to listening to what children and young people want; and then harness collective resources, support communities to bring more opportunities, training and experiences for the next generation. 'Our Year' 2022 will see partners listening and acting together to create an offer of activities, opportunities and experiences.

From the ongoing work the Board was informed that an expression of interest would be made by Manchester to become part of UNICEF's Child Friendly City and Communities Programme. This would include a number of themes that would be brought to the Health and Wellbeing Board for further work to develop and engage with partners. The engagement of young people had provided valuable data on what is important to young people in the city. These included: family and friends, Education, Environment, Healthy Lives, having fun things to do and feeling included. A calendar of key events is being developed to include key events throughout the year. Members of the Board were invited to be involved in the initiative and to become Active Advocates.

The Chair welcomed the report and in particular, the link to mental and physical health of young people.

Members of the Board were the invited to questions and comment.

Members of the Board noted the enthusiasm and motivation of the young people who had been engaged so far in the process and the richness of the responses they had provided as well as the modesty of some of the requests.

Officers were asked if a fund had been made available and how would the initiative be evaluated to determine how successful the year had been.

It was reported that some funding would be made available for the initiative. Contact had been made with the business sector to help raise support for proposed activities and through other means such as contributing resources via self-funding events, free tickets, mentoring, coaching, donations and work apprenticeships opportunities. The year would be evaluated to measure its success as well as the outcome of the UNICEF Child Friendly City application. Young people will be involved throughout the process and a framework would be developed to measure this through strengthening the voice of young people and how the young people in the city look back at their year.

The Director of Adult Social Services welcomed the initiative and suggested an intergenerational element be included in the initiative that could attract young people to opportunities within the Health and Social Care Sector.

Decisions

The Board;

1. Endorse and promote 'Our Year 2022'. A year to celebrate the successes of Manchester's children and young people and supporting their recovery from the impact of Covid19;
2. Endorse and support Manchester submitting an expression of interest to become part of UNICEF's Child Friendly City and Communities programme; and
3. Promote initiatives/programmes within areas of responsibility that create activities, opportunities and celebrate the success of Manchester's children and young people.

HWB/21/29 Councillor Richard Leese

The Board noted the decision of Councillor Leese to resign from his position of Leader of the Council and Chair of the Board. In acknowledging his involvement in the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board since it was first established, the Board expressed its gratitude to Councillor Leese for the active role he has played in health related matters, especially for his depth of knowledge and awareness of issues being considered and follow up work he has undertaken to ensure Manchester remains in a strong position.

Licensing and Appeals Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 25 October 2021

Present: Councillor Ludford – in the Chair

Councillors: Grimshaw, Andrews, Chambers, Connolly, Evans Hassan, Jeavons and Lynch

Apologies: Councillor S Judge, Flanagan, Hewitson, Hughes, McHale and Reid

LAP/21/3 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 September 2021 were submitted for approval.

Decision

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Licensing Committee meeting held on 13 September 2021.

LAP/21/7 Allocation of Hackney Carriage Proprietor Licence HV434

The Committee considered the content of the report, the representations of the applicant and the Licensing officer.

The Licensing Unit Manager informed the Committee that this licence had not been renewed by the expiry date and was outside of the period for renewal that can be granted under delegated authority and was therefore referred to Committee to consider. From speaking to the licence holder, the Licensing Unit Manager relayed information to the Committee that the licence holder had been visiting a sick relative outside of the UK at the time of the renewal date and was unable to access the internet in the country he was in at the time to complete the renewal.

The licence holder addressed the Committee and explained that he had been caring for his parents and arrangements to complete the renewal, via a friend had not happened.

The Committee accepted the licence holder's version of events and in light of the circumstances outlined and considered that the renewal should be granted, out of time.

Decision

To allow the applicant to renew the licence for hackney carriage proprietor [vehicle] licence application for HV434, out of time, subject to the vehicle being required to be submitted for mechanical test in the normal way.

Licensing Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 25 October 2021

Present: Councillor Ludford – in the Chair

Councillors: Grimshaw, Andrews, Chambers, Connolly, Evans Hassan, Jeavons and Lynch

Apologies: Councillor S Judge, Flanagan, Hewitson, Hughes, McHale and Reid

LHP/21/8 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2021 were submitted for approval.

Decision

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Licensing Committee meeting held on 19 July 2021.

LHP/21/9 Review of Gambling Policy 2022-2025

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that provided responses to the public consultation to the proposed revision of the revised Gambling Act Policy.

The Principal Licensing Officer introduced the report and the committee was advised of further comments received from Trafalgar Leisure and a copy of the letter received was circulated to the Committee. The comments referred to Gaming Machines at Bingo Premises. The points raised had been accepted and the policy would be amended accordingly. Reference was also made to the comments received and the responses to them.

The Committee was advised that the Policy would be submitted to the Licensing Policy Committee on 15 November 2021 before submission to the meeting of Council on 1 December 2021 for consideration. The Gambling Policy would be implemented in January 2022.

Decision

The Committee noted the report and the responses received from the consultation process.

Licensing Policy Committee

Minutes of a meeting held on 15 November 2021

Acting under Delegated Powers

Present: Councillor Ludford (Chair).
Councillors Grimshaw (Deputy Chair), Davies and Rawlins

Apologies:

LPC/21/06 Minutes

Decision

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 August 2021.

LPC/21/07 Revised Gambling Policy 2022 - 2025

The Committee considered a revised Gambling Policy report.

The Principal Licensing Officer presented the report, stating that this was the forthcoming Gambling Policy which is published every three years and that this revision was in response to consultation. The Committee were informed that Annex 3 contained these proposed changes from the responses. There was an anti-gambling stance taken within the responses which could not be considered, but the Principal Licensing Officer confirmed that the policy did take account of harm from gambling which was still in development. Changes in the policy, it was stated, were in line with the objectives and the protection of children. Trafalgar Leisure had given a response relating to gaming machines at bingo premises (Annex 2). The Principal Licensing Officer confirmed that there were still some minor amendments to typographical errors to be fixed and confirmed that enhanced DBS checks could not be applied for all roles within the gambling industry, therefore this would be reworded. In his final statement, the Principal Licensing Officer stated that the policy would come into effect in January 2022.

The Committee were invited to comment and ask questions.

In responding to a question from the Committee, the Principal Licensing Officer stated that the policy contained standard wording for countrywide use but that there would be a varied approach from local authorities and that the policy reflects Manchester City Council's detailed approach and benefitted from additional work done in Manchester around gambling related harm, such as the work of the Greater Manchester Gambling Harm Reduction Board. The Principal Licensing Officer confirmed that project has been funded through the Gambling Commission's regulatory settlement scheme following a successful bid by MCC and colleagues in public health services. A report on the progress of the programme will be brought to this Committee in future.

In responding to a further question from the Committee, the Legal Advisor to the Committee stated that she had concerns over the suggested re-wording from “expectations” to “a requirement” regarding gambling companies social responsibilities, stating that no mandatory conditions could be added to the policy.

The Principal Licensing Officer added that there was a Gambling Code of Practice for use within the industry and confirmed this would be circulated to the Committee.

The Principal Licensing Officer then confirmed that the DBS issue was a legal issue and not linked with costings.

Decision

The Committee noted the report and recommended that Council approve and adopt the Gambling Policy 2022-2025.

Personnel Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2021

Present: Councillor Rahman – in the Chair

Councillors: Akbar, Bridges, Craig, Midgley and White

Apologies: Councillors Leese, Rawlins and Sheikh

PE/21/09 Appointment of a Chair for the meeting

In the absence of the Chair the committee appointed a member to chair the meeting.

Decision

To appoint Councillor Rahman as Chair for the meeting.

PE/21/10 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2021 as a correct record.

PE/21/11 New and Revised Policies

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development that outlined new and revised employment policies for the Committee's consideration relating to the Third-Party Harassment and Abuse Policy and the revised Disciplinary and Employee Dispute Resolution Policies.

The Committee was informed that policies have been developed in response to the recommendations of both the 2019 Race Equity Review, and the subsequent Race Equality Working Group which highlighted the need to be more explicit within the Council's workforce policies about the organisational stance on race discrimination

Noting this, the committee agreed the recommendation.

Decision

To approve the new and revised policies, as detailed in the report submitted, relating to:

- Third Party Abuse and Harassment Policy;
- The revised Disciplinary Policy; and
- Employee Dispute Resolution Policy.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 21 October 2021

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

Councillors: S Ali, Andrews, Baker-Smith, Y Dar, Kamal, Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat, Richards and Stogia

Apologies:

Councillors Davies, Hutchinson and Kirkpatrick

Also present:

Councillors Hilal, Judge, Leech and Wright

PH/21/72 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 124234/FO/2019, 128916/FO/2020 & 131163/MO/2021.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/21/73 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 23 September 2021 as a correct record.

PH/21/74 124234/FO/2019 & 124453/LO/2019 - The Lodge, Rear Of Old Town Hall, Lapwing Lane, Manchester, M20 2NR - Didsbury West Ward

The Planning and Highways Committee deferred consideration of this application on 23 September 2021 to enable a site visit to take place to better understand the proposal for car parking on the site.

The Chair confirmed that both applications (for the proposed demolition of the existing building and erection of a new build) would be considered together.

124234/FO/2019

The applicant is proposing to demolish the single storey Lodge and replace it with a 2-storey building that would provide meeting and storage facilities for the existing solicitors' office that operates out of the Old Town Hall.

124453/LO/2019

The applicant is seeking Listed Building Consent to demolish the Lodge in order to facilitate the erection of a 2 storey building to form ancillary meeting and storage

space for the solicitors' office operating out of the Old Town Hall.

The applications relate to The Lodge, a single storey detached building located at the rear of the former Withington Town Hall (now referred to as the Old Town Hall) on Lapwing Lane. The Old Town Hall is a Grade II listed building. The Lodge is located within the Albert Park Conservation Area. The Lodge is currently used as a store, in association with the office uses within the Old Town Hall, but it is believed to have originally been the gate lodge to the Corporation Yard that existed where there is now residential properties. The Lodge is accessed directly off Raleigh Close, a short cul-de sac off Lapwing Lane.

This application was placed before the Committee on 2 September 2021 but determination was deferred at the request of the applicant in order to allow for ownership issues to be resolved. The applicants have amended the site edged red location plan so that it only includes land in their ownership.

The Planning Officer addressed Committee and made reference to the site visit undertaken and also clarified that the Core Strategy car parking guidance referred to on Page 29 of the printed report should state that these are maximum number of guideline car parking spaces and not minimum.

An objector spoke against the application stating that they had spoken with other local residents who felt that their town houses were not reflected in the design of this development and added that the town houses living rooms are located on the 1st floor, meaning that the houses would be overlooked. The objector stated that parking has always been an issue on the area and noted a recent marked improvement which he felt was directly linked to the Committee's site visit and referred to photographs showing double parking and spoke of the cul-de-sac being completely blocked off at times. The objector noted that refuse trucks would use the Lapwing Lane entrance and requested that all other commercial vehicles do the same in the event of emergency services requiring access to Raleigh Close.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Hilal (Ward Councillor) attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application. The Committee was informed that Cllr Hilal was objecting to the increase in potential on street parking, noting that parking was already an issue and confirming Raleigh Close as a private road whose residents shouldn't have to provide private parking for any overflow from The Lodge. Cllr Hilal requested that the Committee refuse this application.

Councillor Leech (Ward Councillor) attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application. The Committee was informed that Cllr Leech wished for Local Ward Councillors to be able to join the site visits, adding that the lack of parking was his main concern, agreeing with the objector's submission and referred to the street scene visible on Google Maps as being a true representation regarding car parking. Cllr Leech stated that the car parking plans were unrealistic in their layout and felt that there should be no parking at the front section of the proposed layout. Cllr Leech agreed that the development would overlook town houses on Raleigh Close and stated that the travel plan proposals for bicycle use was

unrealistic and had not been conducted by an independent survey. Cllr Leech also expressed concerns over whether the development could be restricted to non-office use, stating that this was not an enforceable condition.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee to state that the large south facing window at the proposed development would have a brise soleil, that 15 parking spaces were to be provided, bike storage and shower facilities were included within the travel plan and that the use of the development as non-office space was enforceable.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions and comment on the application.

A member requested further information on what local residents on Raleigh Close could do to resolve any parking issues.

The Planning Officer stated that this would be a civil matter due to Raleigh Close being a private road.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for application 124234/FO/2019. Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

Councillor Lovecy moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for application 124453/LO/2019, stating that the reduced size of the proposal would not be a competitor for the listed building, therefore she felt there were no grounds to refuse. Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the applications for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the reports submitted.

(Councillor Kamal took no part in the considerations or the decisions made on the applications.)

PH/21/75 128916/FO/2020 - The Moss Nook at the corner of Trenchard Drive and Ringway Road, Manchester, M22 5NA - Woodhouse Park Ward

The Planning and Highways Committee deferred consideration of this application on 23 September 2021 to enable a site visit to take place to better understand the proposal for car parking on the site and the potential impact on local residents.

The applicant is proposing the erection of a part two/part three storey hotel on the site of a now vacant restaurant. The Moss Nook is a part single/part two storey building with living accommodation in the roofspace. It sits on the north-eastern corner of the Trenchard Drive/Ringway Road junction and, while currently vacant, it was last used as a restaurant with living accommodation above. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing property and erect a part two/part three storey 30 bed hotel. At the rear of the proposed building the applicant is proposing a 24 space car park accessed off Ringway Road, along with a cycle and bin store. Access to the car park would be via an

Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) controlled barrier. Two of the car parking spaces would be fitted with vehicle charging points; two would be designated disabled bays and three would be designated as *night spaces*, i.e. to be used for guests arriving late at night. To facilitate the development, 10 of the 12 trees within the site would be felled. To compensate for their loss the applicant is proposing to plant 10 replacement trees.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the site visit had taken place and the context and character of the application site was looked at as well as the relationship to neighbouring buildings and also confirmed that the agent was unable to attend but summarised points which the agent had requested be shared with Committee ; The Committee was informed that the scheme had been reduced in height, mitigation was in place to tackle noise and disturbance, vehicle registration recognition was to be installed and the rooftop garden had been omitted. The Planning Officer informed the Committee that wording for condition 20 would need rewording regarding non-opening windows if the application was approved.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

No applicant attended the meeting.

Councillor Judge (Ward Councillor) attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application. The Committee was informed that Cllr Judge objected to the scheme on the grounds that it was proposed for a small residential area and that she had already fought for residents' parking due to the overspill from the airport. The Committee was informed that 24 car parking spaces would not sufficiently service the 30 beds at the hotel and stated that the site was not nearby to any tram or bus routes and questioned whether anyone using the hotel would utilise cycling facilities. Cllr Judge further stated that the car park was likely to be permanently full of guests and staff and felt that the building design was out of keeping with the village feel of the area. In conclusion, Cllr Judge stated that she supported local businesses but asserted that this was not the best site for a proposal of this size and asked the Committee to refuse the application.

The Planning Officer stated that the scheme had been reduced in height, that there was a travel and management plan, that this was a sustainable site and of contemporary design.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions and comment on the application.

Councillor Stogia expressed concerns regarding overdevelopment of the application site overdevelopment of the site with consequential impacts on residents due to more intensive use, shortfall in car parking leading to increased pressures on nearby residential roads and potential impacts on residential amenity with the travel plan being unrealistic in adequately dealing with the lack of car parking spaces and no assurance where any overspill car parking will take place design being inappropriate with impact on character of the area, street scene in general and visual amenity and lack of landscaped setting/amenity area for the new build , adding that the new build would not sit well with the village feel. Councillor Stogia moved a recommendation to refuse for the reasons outlined.

Councillor Lovecy seconded the refusal, adding that the site visit was helpful in guiding her understanding of car parking issues and lack of public transport links.

The Planning Officer noted that there were clear concerns outlined in the reasons for a refusal and stated that they would take these concerns on board.

Decision

The Committee was minded to refuse the application and requested that officers bring back a report addressing the concerns raised with potential reasons for refusal.

(Councillor Baker-Smith declared a prejudicial interest and left the meeting and took no part in the consideration or the decision made on the application.)

PH/21/76 130030/FO/2021 - 25-33 Central Road, Manchester, M20 4YE - Old Moat Ward

The application site comprises 3 large semi-detached Villas, namely nos. 25 to 27 Central Road, nos. 29 to 31 Central Road and 33 Central Road. The properties, which are shown below, were converted into a total of 20 flats (ground to second floor level) under planning permission 019106 approved in April 1983.

The applicant is applying retrospectively to convert the basements of the three properties into five two- bedroom flats. Lights wells to the front, side and rear are also proposed.

Seventeen letters of objection have been received from local residents, along with one from Councillor White. Objections have been raised in respect of the standard of accommodation proposed, waste storage and the impact on residential amenity but the main concern is that insufficient parking spaces have been provided and as a result the proposal would lead to an increase in cars parking on-street on Central Road.

The Planning Officer stated that the applicant's agent had not provided details of the electric charging points or of the number of cycles that can be accommodated within the bike store and therefore conditions 7 and 8 would need to be re-worded for these details to be agreed and then implemented. if the application was approved by the Committee.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

No applicant attended the meeting.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions and comment on the application.

A member stated that the scheme in its current format indicated a lack of respect for the planning process and considered this proposal to be "overdevelopment by stealth." The member further stated that this scheme would put pressure on local areas to such extremes that they may feel unliveable and indicated that this style of

application was not part of the Council's strategy. The member stated they would refuse but understood that this would not be possible given the circumstances of the case.

The Director of Planning agreed with the members concerns in relation to works taking place without planning permission.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application. Councillor Y Dar seconded the proposal.

A member gave mention of comments on p81 regarding the initially proposed 20 dwellings and expressed concern that an extra 5 had been added.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there had been an agreement for 20 dwellings in the 1980s and that in 2017 permission had been granted for five additional one bed apartments within the basement areas. The Planning Officer confirmed that the applicant had commenced works without planning permission for five two bedroom apartments and that this was a clear cause for concern.

Councillor Richards moved a recommendation for deferral to allow the submission of information which was referred to by officers but had not been provided by the agent prior to Committee and for this information to be properly considered.

Councillor Lovecy seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed to defer the application for the reasons outlined.

PH/21/77 131163/MO/2021 - Land Bounded by Dinton Street, Cornbrook Road, Chester Road and Trentham Street, Manchester, M15 4FX – Hulme Ward

This Reserved Matters Application sought approval of appearance, layout, scale and landscaping, following the approval of Outline permission referenced 118625/FO/2017 for the erection of a part 11, part 15 building to form a 154 bed hotel and 88 bed apart-hotel building (Use Class C1) with associated public realm, car parking, and other associated works following demolition of existing buildings

The Planning Officer stated that there would be no Chester Road entrance near to the Metrolink station as this was deemed unsafe for commuters. The Planning Officer stated that this application was part of the Cornbrook Hub Strategic Regeneration Framework, a joint document between Manchester City Council and Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council and would add improvements to the area.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

No applicant attended the meeting.

Councillor Wright (Ward Councillor and speaking on behalf of Ward Councillor Bayunu) attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application. The Committee was informed that Cllr Wright noted that the scheme was agreed in 2018 but was not elected at this time and would have opposed. Cllr Wright commented that this area is not a gateway to the city centre, adding that residents were scared of gentrification and had not had any opportunity to speak to the developers. There were concerns of the impact of construction vehicles on and around the estate and stated that an arrangement was required to manage this. Councillor Wright also felt that jobs arising from the development would not be solely for local people.

The Planning Officer stated that this was a request for approval of reserved matters only, considering the layout, scale, landscaping and access, adding that the previous consultation in 2014 and 2018 was in line with procedures. The Planning Officer stated that local residents had been notified and gave mention to improvements to the area (which previously housed scrap yards) and the underpass. The Planning Officer stated that, as a joint document between Manchester City Council and Trafford MBC, it was perceived that Manchester had covered their requirements.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions and comment on the application.

A member expressed their sympathy with the local residents and asked if there were any conditions available to promote the inclusion of the community.

The Planning Officer stated that this was covered on the initial plan.

A member questioned the addition of trees and waste collection.

The Planning Officer stated that there are 15 trees proposed, 4 of which were located in Trafford and that this was one application for two hotels so there could be either one or two waste strategies.

A member questioned the lack or level of communication between the developer and the community and requested that this be monitored.

The Planning Officer stated that they could reinforce these conditions.

Councillor Andrews moved the officers recommendation of approve for the application.

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the deferral of the application, in order to undertake a site visit.

(Councillor Stogia left before the close of this item and took no part in the consideration or the decision made on the application.)

PH/21/78 130912/FO/2021 - 20 Lord Street, Manchester, M4 4FP - Cheetham Ward

This proposal was for the creation of accommodation for 31 homeless men (sui generis) with an ancillary healthcare office/facility following demolition works and elevational alterations to the existing building. The site is 0.09 hectares, and bounded by Lord Street, Stock Street, Stock Street East and Mehtab House, a car garage/workshop to the north. It comprises two connected buildings and a detached building which are vacant.

The Planning Officer stated nothing further to add.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

The Planning Officer stated that the Homeless Directorate and other associated services were in support of the application.

A member stated that homelessness was a huge issue in the city and, whilst noting that local residents had concerns about the management of this facility, added that the management team had 3 years experience in the Cheetham Ward. The member confirmed that he would address residents' concerns and gave support to this proposal.

Councillor Lyons gave their support to this development and encouraged the long-term use of the facility and moved the officer's recommendation of approve for the application.

Councillor Riasat seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the applications for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the reports submitted.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 18 November 2021

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

Councillors: S Ali, Andrews, Baker-Smith, Y Dar, Davies, Kamal, Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat, Richards and Stogia

Apologies:

Councillors Hutchinson and Kirkpatrick

Also present:

PH/21/79 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 131719/FO/2021, 130030/FO/2021, 123430/FO/2019 & 131147/FO/2021.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/21/80 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2021 as a correct record.

PH/21/81 131719/FO/2021 - Ivygreen Allotments Off Halstead Avenue Manchester M21 9FT - Chorlton Ward

This application sought to erect a small building to the west of the allotment access road, on the site of an existing summer house and shed, to house a compostable toilet for use by the allotment holders and their guests. The building would measure 2.46 metres by 1.9 metres and be a maximum of 2.33 metres in height, sloping down to 2.13 metres with its monopitch roof. It would be constructed from box profile sheet cladding and a vent pipe would project from the top of the building. A trellis screen would be erected in front of the proposed building to screen it from Halstead Avenue. Underneath the proposed building two vaults would be created to hold the solid waste while urine would be separated and sent to a soakaway in the ground. The soakaway would be located to the rear of the proposed building and beyond that another trellis screen would be installed. The proposed building would be located approximately 14 metres away from the access gates located adjacent to Halstead Avenue.

The Planning Officer made an apology for the use of the wording “elderly” in the report and stated that it should have read “older.”

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

The Planning Officer stated that this would be a sustainable solution to users of the allotment and noted the recommendation that the scheme be approved.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions and comment on the application.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of approve for the application.

Councillor Lyons seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the application for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the reports submitted.

(Councillor Davies took no part in the considerations or the decisions made on the applications.)

PH/21/82 130030/FO/2021 - 25-33 Central Road Manchester M20 4YE – Old Moat Ward

This application was placed before the Committee on 21 October 2021, but determination was deferred in order to allow the applicant to submit details of the vehicle charging points, cycle storage facilities and a swept path for parking space no.2. The required information had been provided and considered to be appropriate and acceptable.

The application site comprises 3 large semi-detached Villas, namely nos. 25 to 27 Central Road, nos. 29 to 31 Central Road and 33 Central Road. The properties were converted into a total of 20 flats (ground to second floor level) under planning permission 019106 approved in April 1983. The applicant is applying retrospectively to convert the basements of the three properties into five two-bedroom flats.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this application was deferred in October due to a lack of information regarding cycle storage and electric charge points. The Planning Officer then stated that this information had been received, assessed and included in the report.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

No applicant attended the meeting.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions and comment on the application.

A member stated that they felt that this type of retrospective application was disrespectful to the planning processes and asked if there was any way to deter this

from happening in future. The member noted the incremental effect this type of scheme would have on neighbourhoods and asked that the Committee need to say no to this style of overdevelopment.

The Planning Officer stated that work had commenced on the site and that there was no legislation to penalise the developer once work had begun but that this was at the developer's risk as the application could be refused and costly enforcement action could be taken against the developer.

Councillor Baker-Smith sought clarification on whether she needed to express an interest in the item due to having a friend who lived at the site.

The Chair had confirmation from the Director of Planning that Councillor Baker-Smith would be able to take part in the hearing for this item so long as she had no discussions with this resident.

Councillor Andrews requested feedback from the Planning department on the ratio of allowed and refused outcomes for these retrospective planning applications and then moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

The Director of Planning confirmed that the requested information would be fed back to the Committee.

Councillor S Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the application for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the reports submitted.

PH/21/83 123430/FO/2019 - Clyde Court Nursing Home 22 - 24 Lapwing Lane Manchester M20 2NS - Didsbury West Ward

This application was proposing to convert a former nursing home (nos. 22/24 Lapwing Lane) into five dwellinghouses and erect a detached dwellinghouse fronting onto Clyde Road. Part two and three storey extensions are also proposed to the side and rear of nos. 22/24 Lapwing Lane and numerous unsympathetic extensions to the nursing home would be demolished to facilitate the proposal.

Eight letters of objection have been received from local residents, along with one from West Didsbury Residents Association. Objections have been raised in respect of the impact on residential amenity, existing tree coverage, the character of the Albert Park Conservation Area and the exacerbation of existing parking problems.

The Planning Officer added no further information to the reports provided.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

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

The Planning Officer added that the scheme, if approved, would secure the building for long term family use.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor Lyons seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the application for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the reports submitted.

PH/21/84 131147/FO/2021 - Manchester College Arden Centre Sale Road Manchester M23 0DD - Northenden Ward

This proposal related to the redevelopment of the Manchester College Arden Centre site located off Sale Road in the Northenden Ward of Wythenshawe. The proposals had been amended since they were first submitted and now consist of the provision of 224 no. dwellinghouses of a range of house types accessed via the existing vehicular access point to the College via Moss Hey Drive. 357 nearby residents were notified of the proposals and 10 responses were received, 7 of these objected to the proposals and 3 made neutral and other observations.

The application site contains playing pitches associated with the College use to the southern portion of the site, the replacement of these pitches is required and is necessary in order to make the proposals acceptable from a planning policy point of view. The applicants are to enter into a section 106 agreement to enable the provision of mitigation pitches at Wythenshawe Park and other pitch provision within Wythenshawe through a financial contribution to the Council.

The proposal also identified the provision of affordable housing to be provided on site as part of the development in the form of 45 no semi-detached dwellings (23 no. 2 bedroom and 22 no. 3 bedroom). The provision of these properties is to be secured via the section 106 agreement.

The Planning Officer added that the scheme had been reduced in size.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

The Planning Officer confirmed that, if approved, condition 20 (relating to acoustic treatments) would no longer be required as the pump station would now be located underground and had been fully assessed.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions and comment on the application.

A member welcomed the scheme as providing affordable housing on the site and asked how these properties would be allocated.

The Planning Officer confirmed that they would be “pepperpotted” across the site with 5% social affordable rented housing and 15% intermediate, that the details of all housing within the scheme would be within the legal agreement and added that colleagues from MCC Housing department would be involved in the allocation process.

A member asked about the provision of car parking spaces.

The Planning Officer confirmed that each dwelling would have car parking and also electric charging points.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer’s recommendation of “Minded to Approve subject to the signing of Section 106 agreement for the provision of 20% affordable housing on site, financial contributions towards replacement pitch provision and additional sports provision; and, provision of signalised pedestrian crossing and bus shelter on Sale Road” for the application, removing condition 20.

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the application for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the reports submitted.

(Councillor Richards declared an interest in this item and took no part in the consideration or the decision made on the application.)

PH/21/85 Confirmation of The Manchester City Council (Land at car park adjacent to York Street, Didsbury) Tree Preservation Order 2021 - Didsbury West Ward

The Committee were asked to consider 1 objection made to this order relating to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) served at the above address on 1 Birch tree (T1) and 6 Callery Pear trees (T3 – T8) immediately adjacent to a car park on York Street, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UE.

The Planning Officer added no further information to the report provided.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

No applicant attended the meeting.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions and comment on the application.

Councillor Andrews moved the Head of Planning’s recommendation to instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the Tree Preservation Order in the report.

Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the recommendation to confirm the Tree Preservation Order.

Standards Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2021

Present

Independent Co-opted Member: N Jackson – In the Chair
Councillors Andrews, Connolly, Evans, Lanchbury and Simcock

Ringway Parish Council: Councillor O'Donovan

Independent Co-opted Member: G Linnell

Also present:

Independent Person: Mr A Eastwood

ST/21/16 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held 17 June 2021 were submitted for approval.

The Chair advised the Committee that in respect of Minute number *ST/21/14 Terms of Office of the Independent Members of the Standards Committee and the Council's Independent Persons*, the Independent Co-opted Members and Independent Persons had each agreed to extend their current appointments for a further year, until 18 November 2022.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2021 as a correct record.

ST/21/17 Dispensations

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer that described the operation and efficacy of the process for granting dispensations in relation to Members' Interests. It is the Monitoring Officer's view that the requests for dispensations that have been made, have been sought in appropriate circumstances and that the level of requests for dispensations does not give rise to concern.

A member asked if councillors sponsored by a trade union should seek dispensation for the length of their four year term, rather than seeking dispensation on individual matters.

The City Solicitor advised the Committee that introducing a blanket dispensation could be problematic and it would be more appropriate to use the dispensation process on a case-by-case basis.

Decision

To note the report

ST/21/18 Planning Protocol

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that described the operation and efficacy of the Planning Protocol. Members noted that the Planning Protocol sets out a duty to promote and maintain high standards of conduct in the discharge of the Council's duty as local planning authority and it is considered to be effective in doing so.

The Committee was advised that the Planning Protocol is kept under review and amendments will be considered as circumstances may arise. Members were advised of one issue regarding late representations to Planning and Highways Committee that is currently being discussed. The process allows the receipt of late representations prior to a cut off of 4pm, two days prior to the meeting that will consider the application. A supplementary agenda is then issued the day before the meeting that includes late representations and the planning officer responses. It was reported that there have been occasions where late representations are submitted on the morning of the meeting and the lateness and detail of the submission, in some instances have resulted in only a verbal update being given that prevented the planning officer from providing a complete response and detailed advice to the Committee. The short length of time had on occasion resulted in the application being deferred to a later date. The Committee were asked if it had any comments.

A member referred to the importance of committee members having all of the information prior to a meeting that allows them to read and understand the application and the two day cut off for the submission of late representations appeared to be a sensible rule. Officers were asked if the information being presented at such a late stage of the process was due to the circumstances of a particular application or could it be due to an accepted practice that had developed over a period of time.

The Committee was advised that the planning application process allows opportunities to make submissions and it was unlikely that a very late submission would have a significant impact on the application.

A member referred to the protocol that provides the opportunity during a Planning and Highways Committee for the public to speak for four minutes and ward Councillors to speak to planning applications and made the point that this allowed further late representations to be made. Reference was also made to the use of site visits for lobbying committee members and officers were asked if ward councillors who were not a member of the Planning and Highways Committee and members of the public are allowed to attend a site visit.

The Committee was informed that ward councillors and members of the public could attend a site visit, if it is in a public place. The Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee would use their discretion on the reasons of individuals attending and make it clear that lobbying the committee members is not allowed. The purpose of a site visit is to help provide committee members with additional information and local knowledge of the application site and the surrounding area and not an opportunity to lobby members of the committee. If committee members were being lobbied or pressured, the officers present would discourage this and advise everyone present of the planning procedure. The Committee were advised that members are reminded of

the purpose and reasons for the site visit and this is explained to members of the public in attendance.

The Committee endorsed a deadline of 4:00pm two days prior to the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee for the submission of late representations.

Decision

To note the report and note the potential amendment to the Planning Protocol.

ST/21/19 Register of Members Interests

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer that described the operation of the Register of Members' Interests. The Monitoring Officer is of the view that Register of Interests requirements are understood by Members but will, as a matter of good practice, continue to issue specific guidance to all Members regarding declaration of interests at meetings.

Decision

To note the report.

ST/21/20 Gifts and Hospitality Guidance for Members

The Committee considered the report of the operation and efficacy of the Gifts and Hospitality Guidance for Members.

Decision

To note the report.

ST/21/21 Review of the Operation and Efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that described the operation and efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol. The Monitoring Officer did not consider that any amendment of the Protocol is required at this time. However, when the Code of Conduct for Members is next subject to substantive change, the Monitoring Officer does consider that a full review of the Protocol should be undertaken to align the Protocol with the revised Code.

Decision

To note the position set out in the report submitted, regarding the operation and efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol.

ST/21/22 Local Government Association (LGA) Model Code of Conduct for Members

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that invited the Committee to consider the LGA Model Code of Conduct for Members. It is the view of the Monitoring Officer, for the reasons highlighted within the report, that Manchester should retain the current code of conduct. It was recommended that the central government response to CSPL recommendations and any legislative changes should be awaited before changing Manchester's code, noting that the Government's response is expected by the end of this year.

A member of the Committee endorsed the recommendation to defer consideration and recommendations regarding adoption of the LGA model code of conduct.

The Chair stated that it was important for the Committee to monitor the government response to the CSPL recommendations and the LGA Model Code of Conduct for Members would be placed on the Committee Work Programme for each meeting in preparation for the Government's response.

The City Solicitor reported that if any changes were made to the code of conduct, members would be briefed, and training would be provided to ensure members were made aware of what is required of them.

Decision

1. To defer consideration and recommendations regarding adoption of the LGA Model Code of Conduct, pending the receipt of central government's response the Committee on Standards in Public Life recommendations and any legislative changes.
2. To request a further report on consideration and recommendations regarding adoption of the LGA model code be submitted to the next appropriate meeting, when the Government's response is available and that the subject be added to the Committee's workplan for each meeting, until it is received.

ST/21/23 Members' Update on Ethical Governance

The members considered the report of the City Solicitor that sought the Committee's comments on and approval of the draft Members' Update on Ethical Governance for November 2021. A draft of the Members' Update for November 2021 was set out in the Appendix to the report. Members were asked to provide comments on the draft and to approve its content for circulation to all members by e-mail. A paper copy would be available on request.

Reference was also made to cyber training and it was suggested that the Members Development Committee be requested to contact members to ensure they have undertaken the training.

The City Solicitor reported that a reminder will be circulated to all members of the Council to remind them of the importance of undertaking cyber training, if they have not already done so.

Decision

To approve the content of the draft Members' Update on Ethical Governance, as set out in the Appendix of the report submitted, for circulation to all members.

ST/21/24 Work Programme for the Standards Committee

The Committee considered the report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit that invited the members of the Standards Committee to consider its work programme for future meetings and make any revisions.

Decision

To note the report and agree the Work Programme, with the inclusion of the Local Government Association (LGA) Model Code of Conduct for Members for each meeting of the Committee.

This page is intentionally left blank

Manchester Statement of Principles under the Gambling Act 2005

Table of Contents

1. Foreword	4
2. Introduction	5
Publication of this Policy	6
Manchester	7
3. General principles.....	12
Other regulatory regimes.....	12
Responsible Authorities	12
Public Health	13
Determining whether a person is an interested part in relation to a premises licence, or an application for or in respect of a premises licence.....	15
Exchange of information between the licensing authority and the Gambling Commission (s29 and s30 of GA2005), and the exchange of information between the licensing authority and other persons listed in Schedule 6 of the Act	16
Functions of the licensing authority under Part 15 of the GA2005 with respect to the inspection of premises and the power under s346 of the Act to institute criminal proceedings in respect of the offences specified in that section	16
Commenting on a licence application.....	18
Factors that will not be relevant.....	18
Split Premises.....	19
Premises “ready for gambling”	19
Applications and plans	20
Tracks	20
4. Determining Premises Licences.....	21
How the Licensing Authority decides whether to grant or refuse an application.....	21
How the licensing committee decides what conditions to apply to premises licences	21
Determining whether to review a licence	22
5. Relevant factors when considering applications and reviews	24
Location of the premises.....	24
Gambling-related harm.....	25
Local risk assessments	25
Local Area Profile	28
How the premises will operate consistent with the licensing objectives.....	28

Preventing gambling from being a source of crime or disorder, being associated with crime or disorder or being used to support crime:	28
Ensuring that gambling is conducted in a fair and open way	29
Protecting children and other vulnerable persons from being harmed or exploited by gambling	30
Expectations of operators: Staffing provision.....	32
Expectations of operators: Data gathering and sharing	32
Expectation of applicants: Staff Training and Knowledge	33
Expectation of applicants: Gaming machines / layouts	34
6. Premises-specific considerations	35
Adult Gaming Centres	35
Casinos	35
'No Casinos' resolution	35
Bingo premises.....	35
Electronic bingo gaming machines	36
Gaming machines at bingo premises	36
'Entertainment' Bingo.....	38
Betting Premises	38
(Licensed) Family Entertainment Centres.....	39
Occasional use notices	39
7. Permits and other permissions.....	40
Alcohol Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permits	40
Prize Gaming Machine Permits.....	40
Unlicensed FECs (uFEC)	40
Small Society Lotteries	41
8. Appendix 1 –Responsible Authorities	42
9. Appendix 2 – Template for data collection	44
10. Appendix 3 - Glossary	46

1. Foreword

1.1

To be published in final policy

2. Introduction

- 2.1 As the licensing authority, we are required to perform the following functions under the Gambling Act:
- 1) Be responsible for licensing premises where gambling activities are to take place by issuing premises licences
 - 2) Issue provisional statements where it is proposed that gambling activities will take place but a premises is not yet ready for use
 - 3) Regulate members' clubs and miners' welfare institutes who wish to undertake certain gaming activities by issuing club gaming permits and/or club machine permits
 - 4) Issue club machine permits to commercial clubs
 - 5) Issue permits for unlicensed Family Entertainment Centres where Category D machines may be used
 - 6) Receive notifications from premises licensed for on-sales of alcohol for use of two or fewer Category C or D gaming machines
 - 7) Issue licensed premises gaming machine permits for premises licensed for on-sales of alcohol for use of two or more Category C or D machines
 - 8) Register small society lotteries
 - 9) Issue prize gaming permits
 - 10) Receive and endorse Temporary Use Notices for temporary use of premises for gambling
 - 11) Receive Occasional Use Notices for betting at tracks
- 2.2 Gambling is defined in the Act as either gaming, betting or taking part in a lottery
- 2.3 Gaming' means playing a game for the chance to win a prize.
- 2.4 'Betting' means making or accepting a bet on:
- the outcome of a race, competition or other event
 - the likelihood of anything occurring or not occurring
 - whether anything is true or not.
- 2.5 A 'Lottery' is where participants are involved in an arrangement where prizes are allocated wholly by a process of chance.
- 2.6 The responsibility for regulating gambling is shared between the Gambling Commission and local authorities. The Gambling Commission is responsible for issuing operating licences to organisations and individuals who provide facilities for gambling and personal licences to persons working in the gambling industry. The Commission takes the lead role on ensuring that gambling is conducted in a fair and open way through the administration and enforcement of operating and personal licence requirements. The Commission is also responsible for remote gambling activities such as facilities provided via the internet, television or radio.
- 2.7 We are also required to:

- Provide information to the Gambling Commission regarding details of licences issued
 - Maintain a register of the permits and licences that are issued under the functions above.
- 2.8 The council has a responsibility under the Gambling Act 2005 to decide whether to grant or reject applications and in the case of premises licence applications to decide any conditions to apply where the decision is taken to grant. All decisions made by the licensing authority in relation to premises licences (and some other authorisations – see specific sections for details) are based on the Act, relevant guidance, Codes of Practice, our Gambling Policy and the three licensing objectives. These objectives are:
- Preventing gambling from being a source of crime or disorder, being associated with crime or disorder or being used to support crime
 - Ensuring that gambling is conducted in a fair and open way
 - Protecting children and other vulnerable persons from being harmed or exploited by gambling
- 2.9 In the case of premises licences (and some other authorisations – see specific sections for details), the licensing committee will permit gambling only so far as it is reasonably consistent with these three objectives.

Publication of this Policy

- 2.10 Licensing authorities have a requirement to develop, consult on, and publish a statement of licensing policy every three years with regards to the principles they propose to apply in exercising functions under the Gambling Act 2005.
- 2.11 The policy statement forms the licensing authority's mandate for managing local gambling provision and sets out how the licensing authority views the local risk environment and therefore its expectations in relation to operators with premises in the locality.
- 2.12 The authority is one of the 10 Metropolitan Districts of Greater Manchester. In Greater Manchester we have a shared aim reducing gambling related harms, our approach focuses on preventing gambling harms from occurring, as well as improving how we support our residents who are already experiencing harms, either directly or as a result of someone else's gambling. The renewal of licensing policies presents an opportunity for local authorities to embed these principles. Licensing leads across Greater Manchester have agreed to take a common approach to refreshing gambling licensing policies.
- 2.13 The following people and organisations have been consulted in preparing the statement:
- [to be completed with summary of consultees in final policy]
- 2.14 The Authority consulted upon this Policy before finalising at a full Council meeting held on the [date to be included in final policy].

Manchester

- 2.15 Manchester is the original modern city and the economic engine of the North West. With a concentration of people and business activity without parallel in the northern England, Manchester's high economic productivity is essential to the North and the City Region. Manchester is at the heart of Greater Manchester and it is the North West's regional centre for finance, commerce, retail, culture and leisure, and is home to a major international airport and one of the largest student populations in Europe.
- 2.16 Manchester has undergone a remarkable transformation since the mid 1990s. High quality new buildings and strong urban design have helped create a distinctive and contemporary City Centre. The City has also been home to many successful regeneration projects including the redevelopment of Hulme, which acted as a model for Manchester's approach to regeneration, and the creation of Eastlands.
- 2.17 Manchester has led the revival of city centre living. This level of indigenous population has added not only to the economy of the City, but also to its vitality, offering animation and activity around the clock.
- 2.18 Manchester is dynamic and creative because it is incredibly diverse with a rich mixture of cultures, origins, languages, customs and lifestyles. People are welcomed from all over the world for the contribution they can make. The gay community and black and minority ethnic groups have helped shape the City's success and style.
- 2.19 As the central hub of the regional transport network, Manchester is easily accessible and provides a fifth of all jobs in the City Region. Manchester's economic growth has been driven by the rapid expansion of a number of sectors including commercial and professional services, science and research, culture and media, advanced manufacturing and ICT. It is now one of the top European cities for business locations.
- 2.20 Manchester is a centre of excellence for research and learning. It is home to several institutions of higher education including the University of Manchester, the Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU), the Royal Northern College of Music, the Central Manchester University Hospitals and the University Hospital of South Manchester.
- 2.21 Manchester has one of the largest student populations in Europe, with over 90,000 students at Greater Manchester's five universities, and over 380,000 students at the 22 Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) within an hour's drive. There were 74,164 students enrolled at one of Manchester's three HEIs in 2017/18, of which 48,393 had a term time address in Manchester (HESA). Of the remaining c.25,000 students, a significant proportion live at home with their families across Greater Manchester and beyond.
- 2.22 Manchester universities have a high retention rate of students, with over 50% of students staying in the city after graduating.
- 2.23 Despite the high levels of students, Manchester also has a higher proportion of residents with no formal qualifications which acts as a major barrier to accessing the jobs available.
- 2.24 Manchester has a relatively high rate of worklessness, due to high unemployment amongst those registered as disabled and the proportion of the population dependent upon income support. Many of the residents claiming out of work benefits are lacking the appropriate skills which would help them secure the growing number of job opportunities in the City. The skills gap between residents and available work is a key challenge for Manchester.

- 2.25 We keep records of the [data and intelligence about income and welfare benefits](#).
- 2.26 As of October 2020, there were 34,515 unemployed in Manchester. This figure is made up of residents in Manchester claiming Jobseekers Allowance (JSA) and Universal Credit (UC) and representing 8.86% of residents aged 16-64.
- 2.27 Whilst the economy has been restructured and new jobs are being created, the City is still tackling the social, physical and environmental legacy of years of economic decline. According to the 2019 Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD), [Manchester ranks 6 out of 326 local authorities in England](#), where 1 is the most deprived.
- 2.28 The health of Manchester's residents is also amongst the worst in the country, On 30 June 2021, the Institute of Health Equity published the [results of its work with Greater Manchester](#). The work with Greater Manchester, to inform and support action on health inequalities, began in 2019. It was already the case that health in Greater Manchester, along with the rest of the North West, had suffered more than areas of England in the South during the decade of austerity and regressive funding allocations. Then came the pandemic, and made it all worse: exposing the underlying inequalities in society and amplifying them. Covid-19 mortality was 25% higher in Greater Manchester than in England as a whole, and the social gradient in mortality from covid-19—a close link between deprivation and mortality—was steeper in Greater Manchester. The effect of the pandemic was dramatic. During 2020, life expectancy fell by 1.2 years in women in the North West and 1.6 years in men; compared to a fall in England of 0.9 and 1.3 years.
- 2.29 Manchester has achieved exceptional growth over the past two decades, with very significant increases in the city's population and sustained economic growth, helped by major investment and strong partnerships. The city's assets, infrastructure, innovation, population and skills have enabled the city to be more resilient to the last recession than many other parts of the UK, and have powered growth over the past decade.
- Population: Strong level of population growth as more graduates and young adults are attracted by new housing and career opportunities in the city, increasing the number of residents aged 25–39. Source: Manchester City Council Forecasting Model S2020 (forecast does not include impact of COVID-19)
 - 627,000 residents expected by 2025
- 2.30 Developing a more inclusive economy and society is a key challenge identified in the city's Our Manchester Strategy. This means connecting all the citizens of Manchester to the opportunities of economic growth and tackling the significant inequalities among Manchester's diverse communities.
- 2.31 Deprivation, poverty and health outcomes were significant challenges before COVID-19, and the pandemic has heightened inequalities right across the city:
- Family poverty: 45,150 children living in poverty, after housing costs taken into consideration in March 2019. Affecting around 40.6% of those aged under 16, this rate is significantly higher than the UK average. COVID-19 update: During May 2020 at the height of the pandemic, 3,177 households signed up to receive food response support. Source: Research by the Centre for Research in Social Policy at Loughborough University for the End Child Poverty Coalition
 - Rough sleeping: 91 people were counted as sleeping rough in Manchester city centre in 2019, compared to 123 in 2018. However, as a rate per 10,000 households (4.2) this is more than twice the national average (1.8).

- Unemployment benefits: Significant increase in ONS claimant count between March 2020 and August 2020; unemployment claimant rate almost doubled, from 4.6% to 9.1%.
- 2.32 Manchester is at a critical point, due to the combined challenges of the continued impacts of COVID-19, the UK exiting the EU, and the uncertainties in our well-established international relationships and trade. Adapting and mitigating the impact of climate change is a major challenge given the city's zero-carbon ambitions, but also an opportunity to build into our recovery plans.
- 2.33 Our Economic Growth Plan sets out the importance of investing in our people, our places, and our prosperity to continue to strengthen our role in driving economic growth throughout the North and beyond the boundaries of the city. The next phase of public-service reform and health and social-care integration will require redoubling efforts to connect all our residents to the opportunities of economic growth and reduce demand

Our Manchester Strategy

- 2.34 The [Our Manchester Strategy](#) was formally adopted by the Council in January 2016 and was launched in March 2016, setting out our long-term vision for Manchester's future and providing a framework for action by us and our partners across the city.
- 2.35 The overarching vision is for Manchester to be in the top flight of world-class cities by 2025:
- With a competitive, dynamic and sustainable economy that draws on our distinctive strengths in science, advanced manufacturing, culture, creative and digital business, and that cultivates and encourages new ideas
 - With highly skilled, enterprising and industrious people
 - A city connected internationally and within the UK
 - A city that plays its full part in limiting the impacts of climate change
 - A city where residents from all backgrounds feel safe, can aspire, succeed and live well
 - A clean, attractive, culturally rich, outward-looking and welcoming city
- 2.36 Halfway through the original Strategy, we reset priorities for the years to 2025, acknowledging – but looking beyond – current challenges, to make sure the city achieves its ambition.
- 2.37 The reset of our goals is based on over 3800 consultation responses during summer 2020.
- 2.38 Our communities want a renewed focus on young people, our economy, health, housing, our environment and infrastructure.
- 2.39 Through each priority runs Manchester's commitment to build a more equal, inclusive and sustainable city for everyone who lives, works, volunteers, studies and plays here. Only by working together can we achieve our vision by making an impact on our priorities of making Manchester:
- A thriving and sustainable city
 - A highly skilled city

- A progressive and equitable city
 - A liveable and zero-carbon city
 - A connected city
- 2.40 We'll be tracking progress of the strategy year-on-year in the [State of the City](#) report.
- 2.41 Implementing the strategy is overseen by the Our Manchester Forum made up of partners from across the city.
- 2.42 Our detailed plans for supporting the delivery of our high-level framework for action are:
- Developing a More Inclusive Economy – Our Manchester Industrial Strategy – establishes priorities for the city to create a more inclusive economy that all residents are part of and can benefit from. Crucial to it are: the Manchester Economic Recovery and Investment Plan; and the Greater Manchester Good Employment Charter.
 - Work and Skills Strategy – aims to develop a work and skills system that meets the needs of all businesses, and support residents from all backgrounds to get skills and attributes employers need.
 - Children and Young People's Plan–Our Manchester, Our Children 2020–2024 – how the city will build a safe, happy, healthy and successful future for children and young people.
 - Manchester: A Great Place to Grow Older – Manchester's vision to continue being an Age Friendly city.
 - Family Poverty Strategy 2017–2022 – aims for everyone in the city to have the same opportunities and life chances, no matter where they are born or live.
 - Our Healthier Manchester Locality Plan – details the strategic approach to improving health outcomes for residents whilst creating sustainable health and care services.
 - Manchester Population Health Plan 2018–2027 – long-term plan to tackle entrenched health inequalities.
 - Local Plan – the spatial framework for the city setting out development guidance; due to be published in 2023.
 - Residential Growth Strategy 2015–2025 – guides Manchester's approach to housing development and supply.
 - Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020–2025 – how we plan to tackle climate change and reduce the city's carbon footprint.
 - Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy – improving green spaces and waterways.
 - Digital Strategy – how we will achieve our digital ambitions.
 - City Centre Transport Strategy – key transport policies and opportunities for the future.
 - Clean Air Plan – proposals to decrease air pollution in Greater Manchester.

- Greater Manchester Strategy – the city region’s ambition to make Greater Manchester the best place to grow up, get on and grow old.

Powering Recovery

- 2.43 Powering Recovery: Manchester’s Economic Recovery and Investment Plan has been produced by Manchester City Council, in partnership with the private sector, and complements the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and Greater Manchester Local Enterprise Partnership city region proposals.
- 2.44 It sets out what Manchester is doing to sustain the economy and its people, and what Manchester proposes to do in the future in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, as well as other challenges and opportunities. This is a positive statement about Manchester’s future, while recognising the challenges and impact of COVID-19 on Manchester’s people and public/community services.
- 2.45 The opportunities identified in the Our Manchester Industrial Strategy are more relevant than ever; if anything, the need to re-establish economic growth and investment momentum has reinforced the three-pillar approach based on:
- People: Equip residents and workers with the qualifications and softer skills that will enable them to access more opportunities.
 - Place: Ensure sustainable growth is achieved in key assets, including the city centre and around the Airport. Create the conditions that will deliver a more inclusive, zero-carbon economy by investing in transport infrastructure, digital infrastructure and the environment.
 - Prosperity: Create higher-quality job opportunities, including better pay, improved working conditions and flexibility, particularly within the foundational economy.
- 2.46 Establishing sustainable growth in people and skills is a high priority, as is long-term sustainability in our place and assets, which is critical to the future development of the city.
- 2.47 The Manchester Climate Change Framework outlines our strategy towards making Manchester a thriving, zero-carbon, climate-resilient city, which this plan will help to deliver.

3. General principles

- 3.1 In making decisions on premises licences, the licensing authority shall aim to permit the use of premises for gambling in so far as it thinks it:
- In accordance with any relevant code of practice issued by the Gambling Commission;
 - In accordance with any relevant guidance issued by the Gambling Commission;
 - Reasonably consistent with the licensing objectives; and
 - In accordance with the authority's statement of licensing policy
- 3.2 As the licensing authority, we will regulate gambling in the public interest, which will be reflected in this policy statement.
- 3.3 This policy statement does not undermine the right of any person to make representations on an application or to seek a review of a licence where provision has been made for them to do so.
- 3.4 This policy does not override anybody's right to make an application, make representations about an application, or apply for a review of a licence.
- 3.5 Each application will be considered on its merits in accordance with the requirements of the Gambling Act and without regard to demand.

Other regulatory regimes

- 3.6 The licensing authority will avoid duplication with other regulatory regimes, so far as possible. A range of general duties are imposed on the self-employed, employers and operators of gambling premises, both in respect of employees and of the general public, by legislation governing health and safety at work and fire safety. Therefore, such requirements do not need to be included in the policy statement.

Responsible Authorities

- 3.7 Responsible Authorities are generally public bodies that must be notified of all applications and who are entitled to make representations to the Council if they are relevant to one or more of the licensing objectives.
- 3.8 Section 157 of the Act defines those authorities. For this area they are: -
- The Gambling Commission
 - Greater Manchester Police
 - Greater Manchester Fire and Rescue
 - The Planning Authority
 - The authority which has functions in relation to pollution to the environment or harm to human health
 - Manchester Safeguarding Partnership
 - HM Revenue and Customs

- The Licensing Authority.
- 3.9 The contact details of all the Responsible Authorities are available are set out in Appendix 1.
- 3.10 The licensing authority has designated the Manchester Safeguarding Partnership as the body that is competent to advise it about the protection of children from harm. The principles that have been used in making this designation is that the board is:
- responsible for the whole of the licensing authority's area
 - answerable to democratically elected persons

Gambling-Related Harm and Public Health

- 3.11 While gambling is an enjoyable leisure activity for many, previous research has shown that harms associated with gambling are wide-ranging. These include not only harms to the individual gambler but their families, close associates and wider society.¹
- 3.12 Research² suggests that in a city-region like Greater Manchester there are approximately 39,000 people living with a gambling disorder, with a further 118,000 at risk. This is the most up to date data we have available and incorporated an estimate based on GM population demographics using analysis conducted by Leeds Beckett University specifically looking at urban areas. However, we know that self-reported surveys underestimate true prevalence of harm given the unfortunately shame and stigma associated with gambling disorder. For every person who gambles, it is estimated that between six and ten people are 'affected others' and experience similar harms. These may be dependents, parents, partners, friends or colleagues.

Area	Estimate of Adult Population 2016	Estimated number of problem gamblers	Estimated number of 'at risk' gamblers
Greater Manchester	2,148,660	38,676	118,176
Bolton	216,920	3,905	11,931
Bury	145,880	2,626	8,023
Manchester	416,480	7,497	22,906
Oldham	173,900	3,130	9,565
Rochdale	164,820	2,967	9,065
Salford	192,840	3,471	10,606
Stockport	227,920	4,103	12,536
Tameside	173,960	3,131	9,568

1.1 _____

¹ [Gambling-related harms evidence review: summary - GOV.UK \(www.gov.uk\)](http://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/444444/Gambling-related_harms_evidence_review_summary.pdf)

² Kenyon (2017) *Problem Gambling in Leeds: Report to Leeds City Council*. Leeds Beckett. Available at: <http://eprints.leedsbeckett.ac.uk/id/eprint/3945/1/Problem%20Gambling%20Report.pdf>.

Area	Estimate of Adult Population 2016	Estimated number of problem gamblers	Estimated number of 'at risk' gamblers
Trafford	179,920	3,239	9,896
Wigan	256,020	4,608	14,081

- 3.13 Anyone who gambles is vulnerable to harm. Men, younger adults (aged 18-34) and adults from a lower socioeconomic or black and minority ethnic backgrounds are more likely to be classified as gamblers experiencing some level of harm. Gambling related harms are often described at an individual level, however these harms have a wider impact on communities and society with costs to the UK as a whole estimated at being between £260m and £1.16bn.
- 3.14 People living with, or at risk of developing, a gambling disorder may experience stress, anxiety and depression, financial losses, debts and exhibit compulsive behaviours, such as chasing losses. Gambling related harms may accrue over a long period of time or very quickly at a time of crisis, many harms have a lasting legacy beyond initial recovery from gambling disorder. Harms associated with gambling include poor mental health and wellbeing, relationship breakdown, neglect of other priorities in life, poor performance at work or school and criminal activity..The Public Health Gambling Harms Evidence Review³ sets out an overview of the prevalence, risk factors and public health harms associated with gambling and the economic and social burden.
- 3.15 Awareness of gambling harms as an emerging public health problem has increased in recent years, however Public Health are not a responsible authority under the Gambling Act 2005. Nonetheless, the licensing authority will consult the Director of Public Health on all premises licence applications and will advise the Director of Public Health to consider the use of the Gambling Commission's toolkit for public health and safeguarding: <https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/for-licensing-authorities/Licensingauthority-toolkit/Public-health-and-Safeguarding-toolkit.aspx>
- 3.16 Greater Manchester has a gambling harms reduction programme (which aims to reduce the harms caused by gambling to the population. Licence applicants and holders will be expected to show how they are actively protecting the local population from gambling harms with their processes and operations, and consider how the location, opening hours and promotion of their activities can minimize opportunities for harm to the vulnerable groups listed above. Section 5 of this document on protecting vulnerable groups highlights some of the standards licence holders are expected to meet to minimize harm to customers and local residents.
- 3.17 The licensing authority recognises that local authority public health teams can offer insights from those impacted by gambling harms and offer contextual information about treatment and support in the local area and can add value to the licensing application process where there are concerns raised about risk of harm to vulnerable groups locally.
- 3.18 Greater Manchester's gambling harms reduction programme is listening to residents with lived experience of gambling and is commissioning its own research to better

1.1 _____

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/gambling-related-harms-evidence-review>

understand problem gambling in the region. As findings from this research emerge, licence holders will be expected to support the delivery of recommendations to help minimize gambling harms to the local populations.

Determining whether a person is an interested party in relation to a premises licence, or an application for or in respect of a premises licence

3.19 For the purposes of the Gambling Act, an 'interested party' is:

- a) Someone who lives sufficiently close to the premises to be likely to be affected by the gambling premises
- b) Has business interests that might be affected by the authorised activities
- c) Represents persons who satisfy paragraph (a) or (b)

3.20 Whether or not a person is an 'interested party' is ultimately the decision of the Licensing Authority which issues the licence or to which the application is made.

3.21 To determine who lives 'sufficiently close to the premises to be likely to be affected by the gambling premises', we will consider the following on a case-by-case basis:

- The size of the gambling premises
- The nature of the gambling premises
- The distance of the premises from the address of the person making the representation
- The potential impact of the premises (number of customers, routes likely to be taken by those visiting the premises)
- the circumstances of the person who lives close to the premises. This is not their personal characteristics, but their interests which may be relevant to the distance from the premises e.g. 'sufficiently close to be likely to be affected' could have a different meaning for (a) a private resident (b) a residential school for children with truanting problems and (c) a residential hostel for vulnerable adults
- The 'catchment' area of the premises (i.e. how far people travel to visit it).

3.22 Having a 'business interest' will be given the widest possible interpretation and include community and voluntary groups, schools, charities, faith groups and medical practices. The licensing authority will consider the following factors relevant when determining whether a person's business interests may be affected:

- The size of the premises
- The 'catchment' area of the premises (i.e. how far people travel to visit it)
- whether the person making the representation has business interests in the affected catchment area

3.23 In so far as who represents persons who satisfy paragraphs (a) or (b), this would include for example:

- i. Residents' associations and tenants' associations
- ii. Trade associations and trade unions

- iii. Any other person with written permission from somebody who satisfies paragraph (i) or (ii)
- iv. Local councillors and MPs

Exchange of information between the licensing authority and the Gambling Commission (s29 and s30 of GA2005), and the exchange of information between the licensing authority and other persons listed in Schedule 6 of the Act

- 3.24 The licensing authority may share application information received in the course of processing applications with the Gambling Commission, a constable or police force, an enforcement officer, another Licensing Authority, her Majesty's Commissioners of Customs & Excise, The Gambling Appeal Tribunal, The National Lottery Commission, The Secretary of State or Scottish Ministers.
- 3.25 We will abide by the Freedom of Information Act and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) in its safeguarding/release of information or data.
- 3.26 In the context of the Gambling Act, we will retain only that information which relates to the processing of applications for licences, permits, permissions and representations. Applications and representations in respect of applications are both in the public domain and are therefore available on request and may be published as part of our web register. Personal addresses/contact numbers attached with representations may also be released. Information may also be shared with other Gambling Act regulators or other parties prescribed by the Secretary of State.
- 3.27 Licensing authorities have statutory duties to notify the Commission as well as the applicant and other responsible authorities of the grant/rejection of applications (new, variations, transfers etc) as well as the revocation, surrender or lapse of a premises licence using the correct statutory forms.
- 3.28 We will inform the Gambling Commission without delay if:
 - The Licensing Authority receives information that causes it to question the suitability of the person holding/applying to hold an operating licence
 - There are persistent or serious disorder problems that an operator could or should do more to prevent, so that the Commission may consider the continuing suitability of the operator to hold an operating licence
 - If it comes to our attention that: alcohol-licensed premises or clubs or institutes are playing bingo during the course of a week which involves significant stakes and prizes and makes it possible that the £2,000 in seven days is being exceeded.
- 3.29 The licensing authority will act in accordance with the relevant legislation and guidance from the Commission and will adopt the principles of better regulation.

Functions of the licensing authority under Part 15 of the GA2005 with respect to the inspection of premises and the power under s346 of the Act to institute criminal proceedings in respect of the offences specified in that section

- 3.30 Our principal enforcement role under the Gambling Act is to ensure compliance with the conditions of the premises licence and legal requirements in respect of other permissions the licensing authority regulates. However, we will also ensure that any

unlicensed premises which are operating illegally are dealt with appropriately to ensure compliance. Where appropriate, we will work with the Gambling Commission in our enforcement activity. The Council will adopt a risk-based inspection and enforcement programme, which will mean giving greater attention to high-risk premises and a lighter touch for low-risk premises. In all cases we will ensure our inspection and enforcement programme is operated in accordance with any codes of practice issued by the Gambling Commission, in accordance with the Government's Enforcement Concordat and the Compliance Code.

- 3.31 The Council will take account of the Gambling Commission's guidance document issued in February 2015 (or any subsequent amendments) 'Approach to Test Purchasing' when considering making test purchases at gambling premises. The Council will also follow its own policies and procedures regarding the use of underage test purchasers.
- 3.32 This licensing authority will be guided by the Gambling Commission's Guidance for local authorities and will endeavour to be:
- Proportionate: regulators should only intervene when necessary: remedies should be appropriate to the risk posed, and costs identified and minimised
 - Accountable: regulators must be able to justify decisions, and be subject to public scrutiny
 - Consistent: rules and standards must be joined up and implemented fairly
 - Transparent: regulators should be open, and keep regulations simple and user friendly
 - Targeted: regulation should be focused on the problem, and minimise side effects
- 3.33 Where there is a Primary Authority scheme in place, the council will seek guidance from the Primary Authority before taking any enforcement action. At the time of the publication of this policy there were seven Primary Authority arrangements with host local authorities:

Operator	Primary Authority local authority
BACTA	Reading
Coral Racing	Milton Keynes
Ladbrokes	Milton Keynes
Paddy Power	Reading
Rank Group	City of Westminster
Sky Betting & Gaming	Wakefield
William Hill	Reading

- 3.34 Further information, including an index of all Primary Authority arrangements can be found at <https://primaryauthorityregister.info/par>

Commenting on a licence application

- 3.35 If 'interested parties' (see below for definition) or 'responsible authorities' wish to comment on an application for a premises licence relating to the licensing objectives, they can make a 'representation'. The Licensing Authority can only consider representations if made by either an 'interested party' or 'responsible authority'.
- 3.36 A representation is a statement that outlines any comments that the party making the representation wants to be taken into consideration by the Licensing Authority when determining the application. In all cases representations will need to be 'relevant'. The only representations likely to be relevant are those that meet one or more of the following criteria:
- Relate to the licensing objectives
 - Relate to relevant matters in our gambling policy
 - Relate to relevant matters in the Gambling Commission's Guidance to Local Authorities
 - Relate to relevant matters in the Gambling Commission's Codes of Practice
 - Relate to the premises that are the subject of the application
- and
- Are neither frivolous nor vexatious nor will certainly not influence the authority's determination of the application.

Factors that will not be relevant

- 3.37 Any objections to new premises or requests for a review should be based on the licensing objectives of the Act. Unlike the Licensing Act 2003, the Act does not include the prevention of public nuisance as a specific licensing objective.
- 3.38 The licensing authority will not take into account representations that are:
- repetitive, vexatious or frivolous
 - from a rival gambling business where the basis of the representation is unwanted competition
 - moral objections to gambling
 - concerned with expected demand for gambling
 - anonymous
- 3.39 Details of applications and representations referred to a licensing sub- Committee for determination will be published in reports that are made publicly available and placed on the council's website in accordance with the Local Government Act 1972 and the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Personal details will however be removed from representations in the final website version of reports
- 3.40 Names and addresses of people making representations will be disclosed to applicants and only be withheld from publication on the grounds of personal safety where the licensing authority is specifically asked to do so.

Split Premises

- 3.41 The Licensing Authority will always give the closest consideration to whether a sub-division has created separate premises meriting a separate machine entitlement. The Authority will not automatically grant a licence for sub- divided premises even if the mandatory conditions are met, particularly where the Authority considers that this has been done in order to sidestep controls on the number of machines which can be provided in a single premise. The Authority will consider if the sub-division has harmed the licensing objective of protecting the vulnerable. The Authority may also take into account other relevant factors as they arise on a case-by-case basis.

Premises “ready for gambling”

- 3.42 A licence to use premises for gambling will only be issued in relation to premises:
- that the Authority can be satisfied are going to be ready to be used for gambling in the reasonably near future, consistent with the scale of building or alterations required before the premises are brought into use
 - where they are expected to be used for the gambling activity named on the licence.
- 3.43 If the construction of a premises is not yet complete, or if they need alteration, or if the applicant does not yet have a right to occupy them, then an application for a provisional statement should be made instead.
- 3.44 In deciding whether a premises licence can be granted where there are outstanding construction or alteration works at a premises, this authority will determine applications on their merits, applying a two-stage consideration process: -
- 1) Whether the premises ought to be permitted to be used for gambling
 - 2) Whether appropriate conditions can be put in place to cater for the situation that the premises are not yet in the state in which they ought to be before gambling takes place.
- 3.45 Applicants should note that this Authority is entitled to decide that it is appropriate to grant a licence subject to conditions, but it is not obliged to grant such a licence.
- 3.46 When dealing with a premises licence application for finished buildings, the licensing authority will not take into account:
- whether those buildings have to comply with the necessary planning or building consents;
 - fire or health and safety risks.
- 3.47 Those matters should be dealt with under relevant planning control, building and other regulations, and must not form part of the consideration for the premises licence.
- 3.48 It is noted that S.210 of the Act prevents licensing authorities taking into account the likelihood of the proposal by the applicant obtaining planning or building consent when considering a premises licence application. Equally, the grant of a gambling premises licence does not prejudice or prevent any action that may be appropriate under the law relating to planning or building

Applications and plans

- 3.49 The Gambling Act (s51) requires applicants to submit plans of the premises with their application, in order to ensure that the Licensing Authority has the necessary information to make an informed judgement about whether the premises are fit for gambling. The plan will also be used for the Authority to plan future premises inspection activity.
- 3.50 It is the local authority's policy that it will expect applicants for new premises licences and variations to provide a plan showing the indicative layout of the plan including, but not limited to:
- Machines, specified by category
 - Staff counters
- 3.51 We consider that this information is appropriate, in conjunction with the premises' risk assessment, to effectively assess the provision of gambling facilities at the premises. Where this information is not provided, it is more likely that a representation will be made in order to enable the licensing authority to accurately assess the likely effect of granting the application relative to the LCCP and licensing objectives.
- 3.52 The premises plan in itself is only one means by which the licensing authority may seek reassurance that the requirements will be met. It may be that conditions attached to the premises licence regarding lines of sight between the counter and the gaming machines, staffing arrangements or security devices are a more effective method of doing so. Local circumstances and concerns and the layout of a particular premises may well determine what is most appropriate for an individual application.

Tracks

- 3.53 Plans for tracks do not need to be in a particular scale, but should be drawn to scale and should be sufficiently detailed to include the information required by regulations. Some tracks may be situated on agricultural land where the perimeter is not defined by virtue of an outer wall or fence, such as point-to-point racetracks. In such instances, where an entry fee is levied, track premises licence holders may erect temporary structures to restrict access to premises. In the rare cases where the outer perimeter cannot be defined, it is likely that the track in question will not be specifically designed for the frequent holding of sporting events or races. In such cases betting facilities may be better provided through occasional use notices where the boundary premises do not need to be defined.
- 3.54 This authority appreciates that it is sometimes difficult to define the precise location of betting areas on tracks. The precise location of where betting facilities are provided is not required to be shown on track plans, both by virtue of the fact that betting is permitted anywhere on the premises and because of the difficulties associated with pinpointing exact locations for some types of track.
- 3.55 Applicants should provide sufficient information that this authority can satisfy itself that the plan indicates the main areas where betting might take place. For racecourses in particular, any betting areas subject to the "five times rule" (commonly known as betting rings) must be indicated on the plan.

4. Determining Premises Licences

How the Licensing Authority decides whether to grant or refuse an application

- 4.1 Where we receive an application for a gambling premises licence, we will aim to permit the use of premises for gambling where it is considered:
 - a) In accordance with any relevant code of practice issued by the Gambling Commission
 - b) In accordance with any relevant guidance issued by the Gambling Commission
 - c) Reasonably consistent with the licensing objectives (subject to a and b) and
 - d) In accordance with this policy (subject to a – c).
- 4.2 The Licensing Authority has no discretion to either grant or refuse premises licences in circumstances that would mean departing from the above e.g. the committee cannot reject applications on moral grounds.
- 4.3 Each case will be decided on its merits.
- 4.4 The Licensing Authority will not have regard to any demand issues for the premises.
- 4.5 Where an area has known high levels of organised crime the licensing authority will consider carefully whether gambling premises are suitable to be located there and whether conditions may be suitable such as the provision of door supervisors.
- 4.6 Rather than reject applications outright, wherever possible the Licensing Authority will look to work with gambling premises and tackle concerns with licence conditions that uphold the licensing objectives. However, where there are reasons that granting a licence would not be consistent with (a) - (d) above, the application will normally be refused.
- 4.7 In accordance with the Guidance from the Gambling Commission, we will circulate 'clear and comprehensive' reasons for any decision to all parties. We will also cite the extent to which decisions have been made in accordance with the Council's gambling policy and the Guidance from the Gambling Commission.

How the licensing committee decides what conditions to apply to premises licences

- 4.8 Premises Licences may be subject to any or all of the following:
 - Conditions specified in the Gambling Act 2005
 - Conditions specified in the regulations issued by the Secretary of State
 - Conditions attached by Manchester City Council's Licensing Committee following a hearing (where necessary).
- 4.9 With respect to conditions, licensing authorities are able to:
 - Issue licences without modifying conditions set out in the Act and by the Secretary of State
 - Exclude default conditions

- Attach conditions where it is believed to be appropriate
- Conditions may be general in nature (i.e. they attach to all licences of a particular premises type e.g. all casinos) or they may be specific to a particular licence.

4.10 We will ensure that any conditions we impose are:

- Proportionate to the circumstances which they are seeking to address
- Relevant to the need to make the proposed building suitable as a gambling facility
- Directly related to the premises and the type of licence applied for
- Fairly and reasonably related to the scale and type of premises
- Reasonable in all other respects.

4.11 There are also conditions, which the licensing authority cannot attach to premises licences:

- Conditions on a premises licence which make it impossible to comply with an operating licence condition
- Conditions relating to gaming machine categories, numbers, or method of operation
- Conditions that require membership of a club or body. (The Gambling Act specifically removes the membership requirement for casino and bingo clubs and this provision prevents it being reinstated)
- Conditions relating to stakes, fees, winnings or prizes
- Conditions relating to demand for the premises.

4.12 Decisions about conditions will be taken on a case-by-case basis considering Gambling Commission guidance, Gambling Commission Codes of Practice, the Licensing Objectives and our policy.

Determining whether to review a licence

4.13 After a licence is granted, where the day to day operation of a gambling premises is not felt to be 'reasonably consistent with the licensing objectives', a review of the premises licence can be requested at any time.

4.14 A review may be initiated by the Licensing Authority or as a result of an application for review from an interested party or responsible authority. Where it is the Licensing Authority that initiate the review, they may do this for a whole class of premises e.g. all Adult Gaming Centres or in relation to particular premises. The Licensing Authority can review a licence for any reason it thinks appropriate.

4.15 Where an application for review is received from an interested party or responsible authority, as a licensing authority we must decide whether to go ahead with the review. The application for review will be considered based on the following:

- Does the request raise issues other than those found under the Gambling Commission's Guidance, Codes of Practice, the Licensing Objectives or our gambling policy?

- Is it irrelevant, frivolous or vexatious?
 - Is it so minor that the authority will certainly not wish to revoke or suspend the licence or remove, amend or attach conditions?
 - Is it substantially the same as a previous application for review relating to the same premises?
 - Is the application for review substantially the same as a representation made at the time the application for a premises licence was considered?
- 4.16 If the answer to ANY of the above questions is 'yes', the request for review may be rejected. The purpose of the review is to determine if the licensing committee should take any action in relation to the licence. If action is needed, the options are to either:
- Revoke the premises licence •
 - Suspend the premises licence for a period not exceeding three months
 - Exclude a default condition imposed by the Secretary of State (relating to, for example, opening hours) or remove or amend such an exclusion
 - Add, remove or amend a licence condition previously imposed by the Licensing Authority
- 4.17 To decide what action, if any, needs to be taken following an application for review, the licensing committee will make its determination:
- In accordance with any relevant code of practice issued by the Gambling Commission
 - In accordance with relevant guidance issued by the Gambling Commission
 - In so far as it is reasonably consistent with the licensing objectives
 - In accordance with the authority's statement of licensing policy
- 4.18 The committee will also consider any relevant representations and information given at the hearing. Codes or practice and the guidance referred to above may be obtained from the Gambling Commission.

5. Relevant factors when considering applications and reviews

- 5.1 In considering applications for new gambling licences, variations to existing licences and licence reviews the licensing authority will consider the following matters:
- the location of the premises
 - the Local Area Profile
 - the Local Risk Assessment (LRA)
 - the views of responsible authorities
 - the views of interested parties
 - compliance history of current management
 - the hours of operation
 - the type of premises
 - the operation of the premises in accordance with the expectations of the licensing authority, as set out in this policy
 - the physical suitability of the premises
 - the levels of crime and disorder in the area
 - the level of deprivation and ill health in the area
- 5.2 The Licensing Authority believes that this list is not exhaustive and there may be other factors which may arise that could be considered relevant. The Licensing Authority will consider the relevance of any additional factors raised on a case-by-case basis.

Location of the premises

- 5.3 The location of the premises will be an important factor as it can impact on all three of the licensing objectives. The Licensing Authority will consider very carefully applications for premises licences that are located in close proximity to sensitive premises such as:
- Schools, including universities
 - Parks, stations, other transport hubs and places where large numbers of school children might be expected
 - other premises licensed for gambling
 - premises licensed for alcohol
 - children's and vulnerable persons' centres and accommodation
 - youth and community centres
 - health and treatment centres
 - leisure centres used for sporting and similar activities by young persons and/or vulnerable persons
 - religious centres and public places of worship

- 5.4 The Licensing Authority expects each premises to produce and keep on the premises a local risk assessment, covering the areas set out in this policy.

Gambling-related harm

- 5.5 The council, as the Licensing Authority under the Act has a duty to consider applications relating to allowing gambling facilities within the City to ensure that they meet the fundamental principles of the Act. In doing so, the authority must balance the needs of business to profit and grow with the potential impact on those who are vulnerable to being exploited or susceptible to gambling related harm. Therefore, the local context in relation to vulnerability to gambling-related harm will be an important consideration; see Section 3 (Gambling-Related Harm and Public Health).

Local risk assessments

- 5.6 Licensees are required to undertake a local risk assessment when applying for a new premises licence. Their risk assessment must also be updated:
- when applying for a variation of a premises licence
 - to take account of significant changes in local circumstances, including those identified in a licensing authority's policy statement
 - when there are significant changes at a licensee's premises that may affect their mitigation of local risks.
- 5.7 Licensees must assess the local risks to the licensing objectives posed by the provision of gambling facilities at each of their premises, and have policies, procedures and control measures to mitigate those risks. In undertaking their risk assessments, they must take into account relevant matters identified in the licensing authority's policy statement.
- 5.8 In conducting their risk assessment, the Licensing Authority will expect operators to follow the general principles of risk assessment:
- 1) Identify hazards (think about what may cause harm using the information provided below as a guide and any other matters you consider relevant)
 - 2) Assess the risks (decide how likely it is that someone could be harmed and how serious it could be. This is assessing the level of risk). Decide:
 - i) Who might be harmed and how
 - ii) What you're already doing to control the risks
 - iii) What further action you need to take to control the risks
 - iv) Who needs to carry out the action
 - v) When the action is needed by
 - 3) Control the risks (Look at what you're already doing, and the controls you already have in place.) Ask yourself:
 - i) Can I get rid of the hazard altogether?
 - ii) If not, how can I control the risks so that harm is unlikely?
 - 4) Record your findings (record your significant findings), including:

- i) the hazards (things that may cause harm)
 - ii) who might be harmed and how
 - iii) what you are doing to control the risks
- 5) Review the controls. (You must review the controls you have put in place to make sure they are working.) You should also review them if:
 - i) they may no longer be effective
 - ii) Also consider a review if your workers have spotted any problems or there have been any accidents or near misses.
 - iii) to take account of significant changes in local circumstances, including those identified in this policy statement
 - iv) when there are significant changes at the premises that may affect your mitigation of local risks
 - v) Update your risk assessment record with any changes you make.
- 5.9 The Licensing Authority considers the following as significant changes at the premises that may affect your mitigation of local risks:
 - Staffing changes
 - Layout of the premises
 - Changes to gaming facilities provided
- 5.10 The Authority will expect the local risk assessment to consider the urban setting:
 - The proximity of the premises to schools
 - The commercial environment
 - Factors affecting the footfall
 - Whether the premises is in an area of deprivation
 - Whether the premises is in an area subject to high levels of crime and/or disorder
 - The ethnic profile of residents in the area.
 - The demographics of the area in relation to vulnerable groups
 - The location of services for children such as schools, playgrounds, toy shops, leisure centres and other areas where children will gather
 - The range of facilities in the local area such as other gambling outlets, banks, post offices, refreshment and entertainment type facilities
 - Known problems in the area such as problems arising from street drinkers, youths participating in anti-social behaviour, drug dealing activity, etc.
 - The proximity of churches, mosques, temples or any other place of worship
- 5.11 The local risk assessment must show how vulnerable people, including people with gambling dependencies, are protected through:
 - The training of staff in brief intervention when customers show signs of excessive gambling, the ability of staff to offer brief intervention and how the manning of premises affects this.

- Information held by the licensee regarding self-exclusions and incidences of underage gambling.
- Arrangements in place for local exchange of anonymised information regarding self-exclusion and gaming trends.
- Gaming trends that may mirror days for financial payments such as pay days or benefit payments.
- Arrangements for monitoring and dealing with underage people and vulnerable people, which may include:
 - dedicated and trained personnel
 - leaflets and posters
 - self-exclusion schemes
 - window displays and advertisements designed to not entice children and vulnerable people.
- The provision of signage and documents relating to games rules, gambling care providers and other relevant information be provided in both English and the other prominent first language for that locality
- The proximity of premises that may be frequented by vulnerable people such as hospitals, residential care homes, medical facilities, doctor surgeries, council community hubs, addiction clinics or help centres, places where alcohol or drug dependent people may congregate

5.12 The local risk assessment should show how children are to be protected:

- The proximity of institutions, places or areas where children and young people frequent such as schools, youth clubs, parks, playgrounds and entertainment venues such as bowling allies, cinemas, etc.
- The proximity of place where children congregate such as bus stops, cafes, shops.
- Areas that are prone to issues of youths participating in anti-social behaviour, including activities such as graffiti, tagging, underage drinking etc.

5.13 Other matters that the assessment will include as appropriate: -

- Details as to the location and coverage of working CCTV cameras, and how the system will be monitored.
- The layout of the premises so that staff have an unobstructed view of people using the premises.
- The number of staff that will be available on the premises at any one time. If at any time that number is one, confirm the supervisory and monitoring arrangements when that person is absent from the licensed area or distracted from supervising the premises and observing those people using the premises.
- Where the application is for a betting premises licence, other than in respect of a track, the location and extent of any part of the premises which will be used to provide facilities for gambling in reliance on the licence.

- 5.14 Such information may be used to inform the decision the Authority makes about whether to grant the licence, to grant the licence with special conditions, or to refuse the application.
- 5.15 This policy does not preclude any application being made and each application will be decided on its merits, with the onus being upon the applicant to show how the concerns can be overcome.

Local Area Profile

- 5.16 The Greater Manchester Gambling Harms Reduction programme is listening to residents with lived experience of gambling and is commissioning its own research to better understand problem gambling in the region. As findings from this research emerge, license holders will be expected to support the delivery of recommendations to help minimize gambling harms to the local populations. This research and evidence will be available online at: <https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/what-we-do/health/gambling/understanding-gambling-related-harms/> and should be referred to in Local Risk Assessments.

How the premises will operate consistent with the licensing objectives

- 5.17 We expect high standards from all gambling premises. Operators will be expected to demonstrate that they have given careful consideration to the licensing objectives and have appropriate measures in place to uphold them.
- 5.18 The following paragraphs indicate the physical and management factors that the licensing authority may take into account when considering applications for new, varied licence applications and reviews. These are not mandatory requirements but should be used as a guide to applicants and licensees as to the sort of arrangements that it should have in place and demonstrate these are in place through their bespoke risk assessment. Where an applicant or licensee can demonstrate that these factors are not relevant, or alternative arrangements are more appropriate, the licensing authority will take these into account.

Preventing gambling from being a source of crime or disorder, being associated with crime or disorder or being used to support crime:

- 5.19 The Gambling Commission play a leading role in preventing gambling from being a source of crime, through maintaining rigorous procedures that aim to prevent criminals from providing facilities for gambling, or being associated with doing so, as a result of the operating licence procedure.
- 5.20 However, as a Licensing Authority, we will take into account any local considerations that may impact with regard to this licensing objective, particularly in respect to the location of the premises, to ensure the suitability of the gambling premises. When considering whether a disturbance was serious enough to constitute disorder, we will have regard to the individual merits of the situation including, but not limited to, whether police assistance was required and how threatening the behaviour was to those who could see or hear it. We acknowledge that the Gambling Commission highlights in its guidance to local authorities that “disorder is intended to mean activity that is more serious and disruptive than mere nuisance”.

- 5.21 Whilst regulatory issues arising from the prevention of disorder are likely to focus almost exclusively on premises licensing, rather than on operating licences; if there are persistent or serious disorder problems that we consider an operator could or should do more to prevent, we will bring this to the attention of the Commission so that it can consider the continuing suitability of the operator to hold an operating licence
- 5.22 Licensees and applicants will be expected to demonstrate that they have given careful consideration to preventing gambling from being a source of crime and disorder, being associated with crime or disorder or being used to support crime.
- 5.23 In addition to the need to consult a local Crime Reduction Officer, the operators of new premises/premises undergoing a refurbishment should also engage with the police's architectural liaison unit at the design stage to ensure crime prevention and detection.
- 5.24 We encourage that premises liaise with their Neighbourhood Policing Team to develop relationships at a local level and promote effective communication and co-operation. Additionally, operators are expected to actively support and participate in any local business partnership schemes, where any such schemes are in operation, and where such schemes are reasonably consistent with the licensing objectives.
- 5.25 The measures to be considered should include:
- The arrangements in place to control access (preventing unauthorised access shall not be limited to the provision of supervisory personnel; other options may include, but are not limited to, time-lock or maglock entrances)
 - The opening hours
 - The provision of registered door supervisors*
 - The provision of CCTV
 - The number of staff on duty and effective staff training, especially in relation to lone working
 - The provision of toilet facilities
 - Prevention of antisocial behaviour associated with the premises, such as street drinking, litter, activity outside the premises including the management of clients leaving the premises
 - Adequate lighting inside and out (appropriate to the premises in question) to ensure against robbery and other covert activity.

* Only staff directly employed by Casinos and Bingo Clubs have an exemption from SIA registration. Where door supervisors are provided at these premises the operator should ensure that any people employed in this capacity are fit and proper to carry out such duties. Possible ways to achieve this could be to carry out a criminal records (DBS) check on potential staff and for such personnel to have attended industry recognised training.

Ensuring that gambling is conducted in a fair and open way

- 5.26 Generally, this objective will be addressed by:
- The management of the gambling business (in conjunction with the Gambling Commission, who are responsible for issuing and enforcement of the operating licence).

- The personal licence holders proving their suitability and actions (which again is the responsibility of the Gambling Commission)
- 5.27 Where we suspect that gambling is not being conducted in a fair and open way, we will bring this to the attention of the Gambling Commission, for their further consideration, and work in partnership with their officers. In the case of those premises that do not hold an operating licence such as tracks, additional conditions may be required dependent on the risks outlined in the application.

Protecting children and other vulnerable persons from being harmed or exploited by gambling

- 5.28 The Gambling Act defines 'children' as those persons under 16 years of age and 'young persons' as those persons aged 16 or 17 years of age. The term 'vulnerable persons' is not defined and what constitutes harm or exploitation will have to be considered on a case-by-case basis.
- 5.29 Gambling-related harms are the adverse impacts from gambling on the health and wellbeing of individuals, families, communities and society. These harms are diverse, affecting resources, relationships and health, and may reflect an interplay between individual, family and community processes. The harmful effects from gambling may be short-lived but can persist, having longer-term and enduring consequences that can exacerbate existing inequalities.
- 5.30 Regard will be had to current evidence in relation to vulnerability to gambling-related harm. In 2015, Manchester City Council in partnership with Westminster Council commissioned research into this issue and published a report: Exploring area-based vulnerability to gambling-related harm: Who is vulnerable? Findings from a quick scoping review by Heather Wardle, Gambling and Place Research Hub, Geofutures 13th July 2015. Similarly, In 2016 Leeds City Council commissioned Leeds Beckett University to undertake research into Problem Gambling (Problem Gambling in Leeds; Kenyon, Ormerod, Parsons and Wardle, 2016) looking specifically at identifying groups of the society that could be considered (more) vulnerable to problem gambling:
- Younger people, including students
 - Those who are unemployed and/or with constrained financial circumstances
 - Those from minority ethnic groups
 - Those under the influence of alcohol or drugs
 - Problem gamblers seeking treatment
 - Homeless people
 - Those living in areas of greater deprivation
 - Those with other mental health issues and substance abuse/misuse disorders
 - Those with poorer intellectual functioning
 - Custodial and non-custodial offenders
- 5.31 Licensees and applicants will be expected to demonstrate they have carefully considered how to protect children and vulnerable persons from harm and have

adequate arrangements for preventing underage gambling on their premises. The measures that should be considered where appropriate are:

- The provision of CCTV
- Location of entrances
- Restricted opening and closing times to protect residents vulnerable to harm
- Supervision of entrances
- Controlled access to the premises by children under the age of 18
- Dealing with pupils who are truanting, and policies to address seasonal periods where children may more frequently attempt to gain access to premises and gamble such as pre and post school hours, half term and school holidays
- Design layout/lighting/fit out to not attract children or vulnerable persons having a nationally-recognised proof of age scheme – Think 21/25
- The provision of registered door supervisors
- Clear segregation between gaming and non-gaming areas in premises frequented by children
- The provision of adequate signage and notices
- Supervision of machine areas in premises, particularly areas to which children are admitted
- Controlled opening hours
- Effective self-barring schemes
- The provision of materials for GamCare, Betknowmore UK or similar, Citizens Advice Bureau information, local public and mental health and housing/homeless associations, printed in languages appropriate to the customer base.
- Advertising local support services in the area such as Beacon Counselling Trust or the NHS Gambling Clinic.
- The number of staff on duty and effective staff training, especially in relation to the ability to effectively identify and engage with vulnerable persons, including primary intervention and escalation
- A requirement that children must be accompanied by an adult (in premises where children are allowed)
- Enhanced DBS checks of staff
- Obscuring windows where appropriate and labelling premises so it is clear that they are gambling premises
- Self-exclusion schemes

5.32 With reference to those persons with a mental impairment or mental health difficulties, operators would be well-advised to consult a suitable Mental Health Advisor and formulate a policy to protect this category of vulnerable person from being harmed or exploited by gambling

- 5.33 For multi-occupied premises consideration should be given to the arrangements for controlling access to children and the compatibility of the different uses. Separate and identifiable entrances may be required to ensure that people do not drift inadvertently into a gambling area.
- 5.34 Children are not permitted to use Category C or above machines and in premises where these machines are available and children are permitted on the premises the licensing authority will require:
- all Category C and above machines to be located in an area of the premises which is separated from the remainder of the premises by a physical barrier to prevent access other than through a designated entrance
 - adults only admitted to the area where these machines are located
 - adequate supervised access to the area where the machines are located
 - the area where these machines are located is arranged so that it can be observed by the staff or the licence holder
 - prominent notices displayed at the entrance to, and inside, any such areas there indicating that access to the area is prohibited to persons under 18

Expectations of operators: Staffing provision

- 5.35 Staff in licensed gambling premises are recognised as being subject to risk in the workplace from violence and verbal abuse, especially if working alone. In addition, lone workers may not be able to sufficiently serve and supervise the customers, identify and prevent young people from gambling, protect vulnerable persons, deal with customers who may be consuming alcohol and prevent the premises being used as a source of crime or supporting crime.
- 5.36 We expect premises management to recognise and address this as part of their management arrangements, especially at times where it has been identified that there is a spike in crimes around the premises.
- 5.37 We expect there to be an adequate number of staff and managers on the premises to cover key points throughout the day, especially where premises are close to schools/colleges/universities, pubs, bars, shopping centres and stadia.

Expectations of operators: Data gathering and sharing

- 5.38 Keeping track of the incidence and handling of problem gambling in Manchester is a key part of promoting the licensing objectives. We expect all gambling premises to maintain a log and share this and other information with the Licensing Unit upon request.
- 5.39 Data that we consider should be recorded and shared includes (but is not exclusive to) We would expect that all records including time and date along with a short description of the incident and action taken:
- 1) Customer interventions
 - 2) Cases where persons who have decided to voluntarily exclude themselves from the premises have tried to gain entry
 - 3) Mandatory exclusions needing enforcement

- 4) Attempts to enter by those underage in a calendar month
 - 5) Attempts to enter by those underage in the company of adults
 - 6) Attempts to enter by those underage with complicit adults
 - 7) Incidents of 'at risk behaviour'
 - 8) Incidents of 'behaviour requiring immediate intervention'
- 5.40 Where appropriate, we may look to impose premises specific conditions to require this information to be provided to the licensing authority annually. However, we strongly encourage operators to share this information with the licensing authority voluntarily.
- 5.41 A template for this information to be provided is at Appendix 2.

Expectation of applicants: Staff Training and Knowledge

- 5.42 We expect all customer-facing and management staff in premises licensed under the Gambling Act 2005 to have sufficient knowledge to tackle risks associated with gambling and know how to promote responsible gambling. Amongst other elements, staff knowledge should include (where appropriate):
- 1) The importance of social responsibility (Premises may wish to seek an audit from GamCare in order to obtain a certificate of Social Responsibility)
 - 2) Causes and consequences of problem gambling
 - 3) Identifying and communicating with vulnerable persons: primary intervention and escalation, supported by high quality training given the challenging nature of these conversations.
 - 4) Dealing with problem gamblers: exclusion (mandatory and voluntary) and escalating for advice/treatment including local treatment providers
 - 5) Refusal of entry (alcohol and drugs)
 - 6) Age verification procedures and need to return stakes/withdraw winnings if underage persons found gambling
 - 7) Importance and enforcement of time/spend limits
 - 8) The conditions of the licence
 - 9) Maintaining an incident log
 - 10) Offences under the Gambling Act
 - 11) Categories of gaming machines and the stakes and odds associated with each machine
 - 12) Types of gaming and the stakes and odds associated with each
 - 13) Ability to signpost customers to support services with respect to problem gambling, financial management, debt advice etc.
 - 14) Safe cash-handling/payment of winnings
 - 15) Identify forged ID and bar those using forged ID from the premises
 - 16) Knowledge of a problem gambling helpline number (for their own use as well as that of customers)

17) The importance of not encouraging customers to:

- (a) Increase the amount of money they have decided to gamble
- (b) Enter into continuous gambling for a prolonged period
- (c) Continue gambling when they have expressed a wish to stop
- (d) Re-gamble winnings
- (e) Chase losses.

5.43 Above and beyond this we expect managers to have an in-depth knowledge of all of the above and be able to support staff in ensuring the highest standards with regard to protecting children and other vulnerable persons from being harmed or exploited by gambling. In so far as training, we do not intend to duplicate any existing training requirement, such as may be required by the Gambling Commission's Code of Practice.

Expectation of applicants: Gaming machines / layouts

- 5.44 It is an operator's responsibility to ensure staff are able to effectively monitor gaming machine play for a number of reasons that are part of the operator's licence conditions. Age verification, customer interaction and self-exclusion policies all require operators to take into account the structure and layout of their gambling premises.
- 5.45 The Licence conditions and code of practice (LCCP) state: 'Facilities for gambling must only be offered in a manner which provides for appropriate supervision of those facilities by staff at all times'.
- 5.46 A screen or pod around a gaming machine, designed to increase the privacy of the player, could prevent staff in a gambling premises from effectively monitoring gaming machine play
- 5.47 Operators will be expected to be able to evidence to the licensing authority how they have considered the risk to the licensing objectives and implemented effective controls, prior to the introduction of any new machine arrangements.
- 5.48 It will be important to consider the means by which gaming machines are supervised (e.g. line of sight to counter, effective CCTV, mirrors or floor staff) and consider whether that is appropriate for that premises.
- 5.49 Whether amendments to a premises amount to a 'material change' warranting an application to vary the premises licence under s.187 of the Gambling Act is a matter for local determination and the licensing authority will adopt a common-sense approach.

6. Premises-specific considerations

Adult Gaming Centres

- 6.1 Adult gaming centres (AGCs) are premises able to make category B, C and D gaming machines available to their customers. Persons operating an AGC must hold a gaming machines general operating licence from the Commission as well as a premises licence from the Council.
- 6.2 This licensing authority will specifically have regard to the need to protect children and vulnerable persons from harm or being exploited by gambling and will expect the applicant to satisfy the authority that there will be sufficient measures to, for example, ensure that under 18 year olds do not have access to the premises.
- 6.3 Where gambling facilities are provided at premises as a supplementary activity to the main purpose of the premises; e.g. motorway service areas and shopping malls. The council will expect the gambling area to be clearly defined to ensure that customers are fully aware that they are making a choice to enter into the gambling premises and that the premises is adequately supervised at all times.

Casinos

- 6.4 Manchester only has casinos that were previously licensed under the Gaming Act 1968 and have been subsequently converted into Gambling Act 2005 Converted Casino Premises Licences. There are no small or large casinos.
- 6.5 The Gambling Act states that a casino is an arrangement whereby people are given the opportunity to participate in one or more casino games whereby casino games are defined as a game of chance which is not equal chance gaming. This means that casino games offer the chance for multiple participants to take part in a game competing against the house or bank at different odds to their fellow players. Casinos can also provide equal chance gaming and gaming machines.

'No Casinos' resolution

- 6.6 This licensing authority has not passed a 'no casino' resolution under Section 166 of the Gambling Act 2005, but is aware that it has the power to do so. Should this licensing authority decide in the future to pass such a resolution, it will update this policy statement with details of that resolution. Any such decision will be made by the Full Council.

Bingo premises

- 6.7 The Gambling Act 2005 does not contain a definition of Bingo. It is to have its ordinary and natural meaning and the Act does stipulate that "bingo" means any version of that game, irrespective of how it is described. Two types of bingo may be offered:
 - Cash bingo, where the stakes panel made up the cash prize that's won; or
 - Prize bingo, where various forms of prizes is won, not directly relating to the stakes panel

- 6.8 Subject to the rules of individual operators, children and young people are allowed into bingo premises. However, they are not permitted to participate in the bingo and if category B or C machines are made available for use these must be separated from areas where children and young people are allowed.
- 6.9 Where category C or above machines are available in premises to which children are admitted then the council will ensure that:
- all such machines are located in an area of the premises separate from the remainder of the premises by a physical barrier which is effective to prevent access other than through a designated entrance. For this purpose, a rope, floor markings or similar provision will not suffice and the council may insist on a permanent barrier of at least one metre high
 - only adults are admitted to the area where the machines are located
 - access to the area where the machines are located is supervised at all times
 - the area where the machines are located is arranged so that it can be observed by staff
 - at the entrance to, and inside any such area there are prominently displayed notices indicating that access to the area is prohibited to people under 18
 - children will not be admitted to bingo premises unless accompanied by an adult.
- 6.10 The Gambling Commission has provided Guidance for Licensing Authorities and Licence Conditions and Code of Practice which are applied to Operator's Licences. The council will take this into consideration when determining licence applications for bingo premises.
- 6.11 Where certain measures are not already addressed by the mandatory/default conditions, the Gambling Commission Code of Practice or the applicant, the council may consider licence conditions to address such issues.

Electronic bingo gaming machines

- 6.12 Where a premises intends on providing electronic terminals to play bingo, we will expect operators (as part of their application) to provide a breakdown of the number of electronic bingo terminals that will be provided at the premises

Gaming machines at bingo premises

- 6.13 In addition to bingo, the holder of a bingo premises licence may make available for use a number of category B gaming machines not exceeding 20% of the total number of gaming machines on the premises. For example, a premises with a total of 25 gaming machines available for use can make five or fewer category B3 gaming machines available on that premises. Premises that were licensed before 13 July 2011 are entitled to make available eight category B gaming machines, or 20% of the total number of gaming machines, whichever is the greater. There are no restrictions on the number of category C or D machines that can be made available.
- 6.14 Bingo facilities in bingo premises may not be offered between the hours of midnight and 9am. However, there are no restrictions on access to gaming machines in bingo premises.

- 6.15 The LCCP requires (Social Responsibility Code Provision 9) that gaming machines are only made available in combination with the named non-remote activity of the operating licence. So, unless a bingo premises operator offers substantive facilities for non-remote bingo it should not make gaming machines available for use on the premises in question (this does not restrict the provision of gaming machines in line with 6.14 above).
- 6.16 As the licensing authority, we will need to satisfy ourselves that a premises applying for or licensed for bingo is operating or will operate in a manner which a customer would reasonably be expected to recognise as a premises licensed for the purposes of providing facilities for bingo. Equally, we must ensure that a premises licensed for the purposes of providing facilities for bingo is operating as such and is not merely a vehicle to offer higher stake and prize gaming machines.
- 6.17 Therefore, we will expect operators (as part of their application) to provide information on:
- any times they intend to provide gaming machines at any times that bingo facilities are not provided
 - how the premises will be recognised as a premises licensed for providing facilities for bingo
 - A breakdown of gaming machine numbers (by category)
- 6.18 The licensing authority is concerned that later opening hours will attract the more vulnerable, such as those who are intoxicated or who have gambling addictions. The licensing authority will expect applicants can demonstrate that robust measures will be in place to protect the vulnerable and the additional hours are not being sought to take advantage of the gaming machine entitlement.
- 6.19 The licensing authority will use their power to restrict the circumstances in which they are available for use when appropriate by way of conditions. When considering imposing conditions, the licensing authority will take into account, among other factors:
- the size and physical layout of the premises
 - the number of counter positions and staff on the premises
 - the ability of staff to monitor the use of machines by children, young persons under the age of 18 or vulnerable people
- 6.20 The licensing authority will not seek to limit the number of gambling machines by category as this entitled provision is defined in the Gambling Act. However, we will seek to ensure that the number and provision of gaming machines are only provided in a manner which a customer would reasonably be expected to recognise as a premises licensed for the purposes of providing facilities for bingo.
- 6.21 To contain the unavoidable risk to the licensing objectives associated with gaming machines, premises which offer machines must be appropriately supervised.
- 6.22 The licensing authority will information required from an applicant for a new premises or for a variation to an existing premises in order to satisfy themselves as to the matters set out at s153 of the Act. This includes the codes of practice and the Gambling Commission's guidance to licensing authorities.

'Entertainment' Bingo

- 6.23 A phenomenon over recent years has been the evolution of businesses, such as Bongo's Bingo, providing facilities for high turnover bingo (the aggregate stakes or prizes for bingo in any seven day period may exceed £2,000); typically providing equal chance gaming at pubs and nightclubs, in reliance on the alcohol licence held by the premises, and therefore doing so under the rules for exempt gaming.
- 6.24 We note that it is a condition of some such companies' operator's licence that they must notify both the Commission and the relevant LA at least 28 days before any event takes place in new premises, by providing a description of the event taking place, a copy of the premises contract and any amendment to the rules of the bingo.
- 6.25 We would encourage venues hosting such events to promote responsible gambling messaging at them.

Betting Premises

- 6.26 We encourage operators to participate in the Safebet Alliance in order to help ensure the highest standards for the safety and security of staff working at betting premises. Where an operator does not participate in the scheme, it is expected that they can satisfactorily demonstrate the security measures they incorporate are adequate.
- 6.27 Licensed betting premises are only permitted to offer gambling facilities between 7am and 10pm, unless the licensing authority has granted a variation application to extend these hours. The licensing authority is concerned that later opening hours will attract the more vulnerable, such as those who are intoxicated or who have gambling addictions. The licensing authority also has concerns that licensed betting premises operators may seek to extend the permitted hours for the primary purpose of making gaming machines available to customers for longer.
- 6.28 As a consequence, the licensing authority is unlikely to grant variation of hours' applications unless applicants can demonstrate that robust measures will be in place to protect the vulnerable and the additional hours are not being sought to take advantage of the gaming machine entitlement.
- 6.29 The licensing authority will use their power to restrict the number of betting machines (bet receipt terminals), their nature and the circumstances in which they are available for use when appropriate by way of conditions. When considering imposing conditions, the licensing authority will take into account, among other factors:
- the size and physical layout of the premises
 - the number of counter positions and staff on the premises
 - the ability of staff to monitor the use of machines by children, young persons under the age of 18 or vulnerable people
- 6.30 Betting machines - This licensing authority will, as per the Gambling Commission's Guidance, take into account the size of the premises, the number of counter positions available for person-to-person transactions, and the ability of staff to monitor the use of the machines by children and young persons (it is an offence for those under 18 to bet) or by vulnerable people, when considering the number/nature/circumstances of betting machines an operator wants to offer. It is noted that that children are not able to go into premises with the benefit of a Betting Premises Licence.

(Licensed) Family Entertainment Centres

- 6.31 The Act creates two classes of family entertainment centre (FEC). Licensed FEC's provide category C and D machines and require a premises licence. Unlicensed FEC's provide category D machines only are regulated through FEC gaming machine permits.
- 6.32 This licensing authority will specifically have regard to the need to protect children and vulnerable persons from harm or being exploited by gambling and will expect the applicant to satisfy the authority, for example, that there will be sufficient measures to ensure that under 18-year-olds do not have access to the adult only gaming machine areas. Operators should ensure that a proof of age scheme is in force.
- 6.33 This licensing authority will, as per the Gambling Commission's guidance, refer to the Commission's website to see any conditions that apply to operating licences covering the way in which the area containing the category C machines should be delineated. This licensing authority will also make itself aware of any mandatory or default conditions on these premises licences, when they have been published.

Occasional use notices

- 6.34 Occasional Use Notices (OUN) are designed to allow licensed betting operators to provide betting facilities at genuine sporting events, such as point-to point racecourses and golf courses for major competitions, within the boundaries of the identified venue on a specific date.
- 6.35 An OUN must be submitted for EACH day that the betting activity will be conducted on the premises. For example, four notices for four consecutive days of betting and not one notice covering the four days.
- 6.36 We will liaise with the Gambling Commission should we receive an OUN that does not relate to a genuine recognised sporting event to ensure that OUN's are not misused, for example, venues seeking to become tracks through a contrived sporting event, utilising OUNs to solely or primarily facilitate betting taking place on events occurring away from the identified venue.

7. Permits and other permissions

Alcohol Licensed Premises Gaming Machine Permits

- 7.1 Premises licensed to sell alcohol that have a bar and the alcohol is not ancillary to food for consumption on the premises, having more than two gaming machines, will need to apply for a permit and must also notify the Licensing Authority if they have one or two machines. In considering whether to grant a permit, the licensing authority will have regard to the licensing objectives, guidance issued by the Gambling Commission and any other relevant matters. Permits will not be granted to licensees who have failed to demonstrate compliance with the Gambling Commission's Code of Practice.
- 7.2 In addition to the requirements of the Gambling Commission's Code of Practice, the Licensing Authority expects applicants to:
- display adequate notices and signs, advertising the relevant age restrictions
 - position machines within view of the bar in order for staff to be able to monitor the machines for use by under age or misuse of the machines
 - challenge anyone suspected of being under age and refuse access
 - provide information leaflets and / or help-line numbers for organisations such as GamCare and Betknowmore UK.

Prize Gaming Machine Permits

- 7.3 Prize gaming premises will appeal to children and young persons and weight will be given to child protection issues. Therefore, the licensing authority will expect the applicant to demonstrate that they are suitable to hold a permit (i.e. if the applicant has any convictions which would make them unsuitable to operate prize gaming) and the suitability of the premises.
- 7.4 The licensing authority expects applicants to set out the types of gaming machines that they intend to offer and be able to demonstrate that:
- they understand the limits to stakes and prizes that are set out in regulations
 - that the gaming offered is within the law
- 7.5 The Gambling Commission website gives advice on types of permits, conditions, stakes and prizes. See <https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk>

Unlicensed FECs (uFEC)

- 7.6 Unlicensed family entertainment centres (FEC's) will perhaps be most commonly located at places such as airports and at motorway service centres, and will cater for families, including unaccompanied children and young persons. Unlicensed FEC's will be able to offer only category D machines in reliance on a gaming machine permit.
- 7.7 Where a premises does not hold a premises licence but wishes to provide gaming machines, it may apply to the licensing authority for this permit. It should be noted that the applicant must show that the premises will be wholly or mainly used for making gaming machines available for use (Section 238). As a result, it is generally not permissible for such premises to correspond to an entire shopping centre, airport,

motorway service station or similar. Typically, the machines would be in a designated, enclosed area.

- 7.8 Given that the premises is likely to appeal particularly to children and young persons, when considering applications for permits we will give weight to matters relating to protection of children from being harmed or exploited by gambling and are keen to ensure that staff supervision adequately reflects the level of risk to this group. Therefore, we will generally expect such risks to be addressed through effective:
- Staff supervision and training
 - Detailed plan
 - Social responsibility policies
 - Staff being easily identifiable
 - Clear signage
- 7.9 As part of an application for a uFEC, it is our policy that a plan for the uFEC must be submitted.

Small Society Lotteries

- 7.10 A lottery is small if the total value of tickets put on sale in a single lottery is £20,000 or less and the aggregate value of the tickets put on sale in a calendar year is £250,000 or less.
- 7.11 To be 'non-commercial' a society must be established and conducted:
- for charitable purposes,
 - for the purpose of enabling participation in, or supporting, sport, athletics or a cultural activity; or
 - for any other non-commercial purpose other than that of private gain.
- 7.12 This licensing authority will adopt a risk-based approach towards its enforcement responsibilities for small society lotteries. This authority considers that the following list, although not exclusive, could affect the risk status of the operator:
- Submission of late returns (returns must be submitted no later than three months after the date on which the lottery draw was held)
 - Submission of incomplete or incorrect returns
 - Breaches of the limits for small society lotteries
 - The eligibility of society as 'non-commercial'

8. Appendix 1 –Responsible Authorities

Licensing Authority

The Principal Licensing Officer, Premises Licensing

Manchester City Council, PO Box 532, Town Hall Extension, Manchester M60 2LA

Premises.licensing@manchester.gov.uk

Environmental Health

Licensing and Out of Hours Team (Gambling Licences) Level 1, Town Hall Extension, Lloyd Street Manchester M2 5DB

Outofhours.compliance@manchester.gov.uk

Greater Manchester Police

Greater Manchester Police Licensing Partnership Team Level 1, Town Hall Extension, Lloyd Street Manchester M2 5DB

centrallicensing@gmp.police.uk

The fire and rescue authority

North Manchester Fire and Rescue Service (if the premises have a postcode within the ranges M1-M4, M8-M9, M11-M13, M18, M25)

The Fire Safety Manager, Greater Manchester Fire & Rescue Service

Manchester Central Fire Station, Thompson Street, Manchester M4 5FP

northmanlic@manchesterfire.gov.uk

South Manchester Fire and Rescue Service (if the premises have a postcode within the ranges M14-M16, M19-M23, M40, M90)

The Fire Safety Manager, Greater Manchester Fire & Rescue Service

Withington Central Fire Station, Wilmslow Road, Withington, Manchester M20 4AW

southmanlic@manchesterfire.gov.uk

Safeguarding Board

Manchester Safeguarding Children Board, Manchester City Council, Level 4, Town Hall Extension, P.O. Box 532, Manchester, M60 2LA

mscb@manchester.gov.uk

HM Revenue & Customs

National Registration Unit, Portcullis House, 21 India Street, Glasgow G2 4PZ

nrubetting&gaming@hmrc.gsi.gov.uk

Planning

Manchester Local Planning Authority (Premises Licences), PO Box 436, Town Hall Extension, Manchester M60 3NY

planning@manchester.gov.uk

Gambling Commission

Victoria Square House

Victoria Square, Birmingham, B2 4BP

info@gamblingcommission.gov.uk

Applications must be submitted to:

Premises Licensing, Manchester City Council, PO Box 532, Town Hall Extension, Manchester M60 2LA

9. Appendix 2 – Template for data collection

The data collection template is available as an Excel file upon request from the Licensing Unit. The information to be collected (by month) is summarised below:

1) Licensee Interventions

- 1a) The number of gambler interventions (e.g. challenging excessive gambling, advising of gambling help services etc.) that are made in a calendar month. Record a short description of the cause and effect in the template.
- 1b) From the interventions in 1a, the number of interventions that changed a customer's behaviour (e.g. onward referral to support services, limited spend for that session, registered for time/money limits etc.)

2) Self Exclusions

- 2a) Provide the number of self-exclusions during the month (self-exclusion scheme only, not time/money limits)
- 2b) Number of cases per month where persons who have voluntarily self-excluded from the premises have tried to gain entry
- 2c) Number of cases per month who have chosen to return to gambling once their self-exclusion period has ended.

3) Time/money limits

- 3a) Record the number of times time/money limits are voluntarily set on gambling machines per month

4) Incidents on the premises

- 4a) The number of licensee-mandated exclusions made
- 4b) The number of mandatory exclusions needing enforcement due to persons trying to gain entry
- 4c) Incidents of behaviour requiring policing assistance (including where the police were unable to attend)

5) Children and young persons

- 5a) Attempts to enter the premises or gamble by underage persons
- 5b) Attempts to enter the premises or gamble by underage persons accompanied by an adult, including a short description of the incident
- 5c) The number of persons who, having gambled, were unable to prove they were 19 (or 16 for lotteries) when challenged

6) Licensee Interventions

Record a short description of the cause and effect of each intervention made (e.g. challenging excessive gambling, advising of gambling help services etc.)

- Time and date of intervention (dd/mm/yy)
- Reason for intervention
- Outcome of intervention

10. Appendix 3 - Glossary

Term	Description
ATM	Auto teller machine or cash machine.
Betting	Betting is defined as making or accepting a bet on the outcome of a race, competition or other event or process or on the outcome of anything occurring or not occurring or on whether anything is or is not true. It is irrelevant if the event has already happened or not and likewise whether one person knows the outcome or not. (Spread betting is not included within this definition).
Betting Machines / Bet Receipt Terminal	Betting machines can be described as automated betting terminals where people can place bets on sporting events removing the need to queue up and place a bet over the counter.
Bingo	There are essentially two types of bingo: cash bingo, where the stakes paid make up the cash prizes that can be won and prize bingo, where various forms of prizes can be won, not directly related to the stakes paid.
Book	Running a 'book' is the act of quoting odds and accepting bets on an event. Hence the term 'Bookmaker'.
Casino games	A game of chance, which is not equal chance gaming. Casino games includes Roulette and black jack etc.
Chip	Casinos in the UK require you to use chips to denote money. They are usually purchased and exchanged at a cashier's booth.
Coin pusher or penny falls machine	A machine of the kind which is neither a money prize machine nor a non-money prize machine
Crane grab machine	A non-money prize machine in respect of which every prize which can be won consists of an individual physical object (such as a stuffed toy) won by a person's success in manipulating a device forming part of the machine so as to separate, and keep separate, one or more physical objects from a group of such objects.
Default condition	These are prescribed in regulations and will be attached to all classes of premises licence, unless excluded by the Authority.
Equal Chance Gaming	Gaming which does not involve playing or staking against a bank.
Fixed odds betting	If a gambler is able to establish what the return on a bet will be when it is placed, (and the activity is not 'gaming' see below), then it is likely to be betting at fixed odds.
Fixed Odds betting terminals (FOBTs)	FOBTs are a type of gaming machine which generally appear in licensed bookmakers. FOBTs have 'touch-screen' displays and look similar to quiz machines familiar in pubs and clubs. They normally offer a number of games, roulette being the most popular.
Gaming	Gaming can be defined as 'the playing of a game of chance for winnings in money or monies worth, whether any person playing the game is at risk of losing any money or monies worth or not'.
Gaming Machine	Any type of machine allowing any sort of gambling activity including betting on virtual events but not including home computers even though users can access online gaming websites.
Licensing Objectives	<p>The licensing objectives are three principal goals which form the basis of the Act. Stakeholders who have an interest in the Act need to try and promote these objectives. The licensing objectives are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preventing gambling from being a source of crime or disorder, being associated with crime or disorder or being used to support crime. • Ensuring that gambling is conducted in a fair and open way. • Protecting children and other vulnerable people from being harmed or exploited by gambling.

Term	Description
Lottery	A lottery generally refers to schemes under which prizes are distributed by chance among entrants who have given some form of value for their chance to take part. A lottery is defined as either a simple lottery or a complex lottery. A simple lottery is one where people are required to pay to participate and one or more prizes are allocated to one or more members of a class and the prizes are allocated by a process which relies wholly on chance. A complex lottery is where people are required to pay to participate and one or more members of a class and the prizes are allocated by a series of processes where the first of those processes relies wholly on chance. Prize means money, articles or services provided by the members of the class among whom the prize is allocated. (It should be noted that the National Lottery is not included in this definition of lottery and is regulated by the National Lottery Commission).
Money prize machine	A machine in respect of which every prize which can be won as a result of using the machine is a money prize.
Non-money prize machine	A machine in respect of which every prize which can be won as a result of using the machine is a non-money prize. The winner of the prize is determined by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) the position in which the coin or token comes to rest after it has been inserted into the machine, together with the position of other coins or tokens which have previously been inserted into the machine to pay a charge for use, or (ii) if the insertion of a single coin to pay the charge for use enables the person using the machine to release one or more tokens within the machine, the position in which such tokens come to rest after being released, together with the position of other tokens which have previously been so released.
Odds	The ratio to which a bet will be paid if the bet wins, e.g. 3-1 means for every £1 bet, a person would receive £3 of winnings.
Off-course betting operator	Off-course betting operators may, in addition to premises away from the track, operate self-contained betting premises within a track premises. Such self-contained premises will provide facilities for betting on both events taking place at the track (on-course betting), as well as other sporting events taking place away from the track (off-course betting). In essence such premises operate like a traditional high street bookmakers. They will however only normally operate on race days.
On-course betting operator	The on-course betting operator is one who comes onto on a track, temporarily, while races are taking place, and operates at the track side. On-course betting operators tend to offer betting only on the events taking place on the track that day (on-course betting).
Pool Betting	For the purposes of the Gambling Act, pool betting is made on terms that all or part of the winnings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Shall be determined by reference to the aggregate of the stakes paid or agreed to be paid by the people betting 2) Shall be divided among the winners or 3) Shall or may be something other than money. For the purposes of the Gambling Act, pool betting is horse-race pool betting if it relates to horse-racing in Britain.
Regulations or Statutory instruments	Regulations are a form of law, often referred to as delegated or secondary legislation. They have the same binding legal effect as Acts and usually state rules that apply generally, rather than to specific people or things. However, regulations are not made by Parliament. Rather, they are made by people or bodies to whom Parliament has delegated the authority to make them, such as a minister or an administrative agency.
Representations	In the context of the Gambling Act representations are either positive statements of support or negative objections which are made in relation to a licensing application. Representations must be made in time, e.g. during a designated notice period.
Responsible authority (authorities)	Responsible authorities (RAs) are agencies which have been appointed by the Gambling Act or regulations to fulfil a designated role during the licensing process. RAs must be sent copies of all licensing applications and have the power to make representations about such applications. RAs also have the power to ask for licences to be reviewed.

Term	Description
Skill machine / Skill with prizes machine	The Act does not cover machines that give prizes as a result of the application of pure skill by players. A skill with prizes machine is one on which the winning of a prize is determined only by the player's skill – any element of chance imparted by the action of the machine would cause it to be a gaming machine. An example of a skill game would be trivia game machines, popular in pubs and clubs, which require the player to answer general knowledge questions to win cash prizes.
Spread betting	A form of investing which is more akin to betting, and can be applied either to sporting events or to the financial markets. Spread betting is regulated by the Financial Services Authority.
Stake	The amount pledged when taking part in gambling activity as either a bet, or deposit to the bank or house where the house could be a gaming machine.
Statement of principles document	A document prepared by the Authority which outlines the areas that applicants need to consider before applying for gaming permits.
Table gaming	Card games played in casinos.
Tote	"Tote" is short for Totaliser, a system introduced to Britain in 1929 to offer pool betting on racecourses.
Track	Tracks are sites (including horse tracks and dog tracks and stadia) where races or other sporting events take place

Manchester City Council Report for Information

Report to: Council – 1 December 2021

Subject: Urgent Key Decisions

Report of: The 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.

Recommendation

To note the report.

Wards affected: All

Financial consequences for the Revenue budget: None

Financial consequences for the Capital Budget: None

Implications for:

Antipoverty

No

Equal Opportunities

No

Environment

No

Employment

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.
- 2.** Such decisions are to be reported to the Council.

3. Urgent Key Decisions taken since the last meeting of Council

3.1 A list of key decisions requiring exemption from the call in procedure that have been taken since the last meeting of Council is listed below.

Date	Subject	Reason for urgency	Decision Taken by	Approved by
6 October 2021	Release of Free School Meal Funding (£0.600m) for October 2021 half term	Funds need to be allocated to schools urgently in order for vouchers to be distributed to parents before the October half term.	Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer	Cllr Reid (Chair: Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee)
17 November 2021	Household Support Fund – the release of funding to schools for Free School Meals (£1.7M) and households in receipt of Council Tax Support (4.173M)	Any delay would compromise the Council's position by not meeting the expectations in the grant conditions and not support vulnerable families. This may lead to a surplus which would be returned to central government.	The Executive	Cllr Russell (Chair: Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee)
	Road Collapse funding (£2,104,00) to implement traffic regulation orders and appoint the current contractor and to undertake works on road collapses across three sites in the	<p>The road collapse sites caused damage to the highway and nearby properties. The budget requested enabled remedial works and reinstatement at all road collapses where liability is identified as with the Council.</p> <p>Following the usual key decision process would delay repairs to collapses or prevent repairs from progressing which presents a health and safety risk while creating potential damage or further damage to homes and the highway</p>	Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer	Cllr Russell (Chair: Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee)

	City where the Council has a liability			
--	--	--	--	--