



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

**Tuesday, 22 March 2022**

Dear Councillor / Honorary Alderman,

### **Meeting of the Council – Wednesday, 30th March, 2022**

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the Council which will be held at 10.00 am on Wednesday, 30th March, 2022, in The Council Chamber, Level 2, Town Hall Extension.

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

- Manchester City Council's accreditation as a 'White Ribbon' Authority.

#### **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 Council (Budget) meeting and two extraordinary meetings held on 4 March 2022.

7 - 32

#### **4. Notice of Motion - Serving the Public**

Last month this Council agreed the budget for the coming budget year.

The budget was based on providing services to our residents and ensuring our residents who are most in need receive the support and best services we can provide for them.

Setting the budget is only the start of the process and we rely on our employees for the actual delivery.

Our Council working together with our Trade Union partners have supported our workforce in the face of an exceedingly difficult two years of the pandemic.

Council employees have worked throughout the pandemic, whether office workers continuing to deliver from home or the huge numbers of front line workers who continued to deliver vital services face to face in our residents homes, on our streets and across all of our city.

Our workforce has not had it easy over the past 12 years, suffering from vicious funding cuts by the Tories, enabled at first by their compliant LibDem coalition partners, leaving Manchester City Council no option but to make cuts to services and reducing our workforce.

Council employees faced the brunt of these cuts and service reductions alongside continued year on year pay settlements that amounted to a pay freeze at best.

Manchester City Council says a heartfelt thank you to all its employees for their contribution in supporting the City during the pandemic.

Elsewhere, front line workers of all kinds have also contributed massively during the pandemic, including public transport drivers, food deliveries, shop workers and many more all here in Manchester delivering for our residents.

Manchester City Council says a big thank you to all employees working for the public for their contribution in supporting the City during the pandemic.

Aiding all this work has been everyone involved with the Voluntary Sector who have been outstanding during the pandemic in providing food, support, and company to our residents. While we regret the government policies that make them necessary, our city's Food Banks have worked tremendously hard to support those hardest hit by the economic failures of the Conservative Government.

Manchester City Council says a big thank you to all in the Voluntary Sector for their contribution in supporting the City during the pandemic.

Council employees keeping our city going and supporting our communities.

Public Sector employees delivering for our residents.

All this followed by the pandemic and the failed austerity agenda of the Conservatives and Liberal Democrats and still our staff continue to deliver at the highest standards and go and above and beyond to support the community that they work and live in.

This Council moves a vote of thanks in recognition of all their hard work and dedication through these most trying of times.

**Proposed by Councillor Connolly, seconded by Councillor Appleby and also signed (via email) by Councillors Andrews, Hassan and Igbon.**

**5. Notice of Motion - Road Safety and Children**

Manchester City Council has declared 2022 the Year of the Child, and is committed to doing all we can to enable children to have a safe and active childhoods in our City. This Council notes our commitment to enabling children and their families to walk and cycle to school and parks, and across the City, and the significant funds already committed to this. Further, we will:

1. Develop a programme of auditing school and park entrance points, to be completed within the next eighteen months, to ensure our records for these are up to date with a mechanism for regularly updating this.
2. Formulate a strategy to create safe crossing points for each of the school and park entrances over a precise timescale to be agreed with the Executive Member for the Environment, but with a view to the work being completed within the next 8 years;
3. Ensure that safe crossing points are an integral part of the Council's Active Travel Strategy which is currently being developed.
4. Lobby central government for funding to enable this plan to be achieved as quickly as possible.
5. Lobby Highways England to prioritise schemes and spending that improve pedestrian and cycle safety in the major road network.

**Proposed by Councillor Russell, seconded by Councillor Shilton-Godwin and also signed by Councillors Baker-Smith, S Judge and Lynch.**

- |   |          |
|---|----------|
| <b>6. Proceedings of the Executive</b>  | 33 - 34  |
| To submit the part-proceedings of the Executive on 16 February 2022 and the minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2022. |          |
| <b>7. Questions to Executive Members and Others under Procedural Rule 23</b>  | 35 - 40  |
| To receive answers to any questions that councillors have raised in accordance with Procedural Rule 23.                   |          |
| <b>8. Scrutiny Committees</b>   | 41 - 120 |
| To note the minutes of the following committees:  |          |

Communities and Equalities March 2022	8 February 2022 and 8 March 2022
Resources and Governance March 2022	8 February 2022 and 8 March 2022
Health March 2022	9 February 2022 and 9 March 2022
Children and Young People March 2022	9 February 2022 and 9 March 2022
Environment and Climate Change 10 March 2022	10 February 2022 and 10 March 2022
Economy 10 March 2022	10 February 2022 and 10 March 2022

**9. Proceedings of Committees**

121 - 144

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

Audit Committee – 15 February 2022

Licensing Committee – 7 March 2022

Planning and Highways Committee – 17 February 2022 and 17  
March 2022

Standards Committee – 17 March 2022

Personnel Committee – 16 February 2022 and 16 March 2022,  
and in particular to consider:

**PE/22/02      Creation of a new post - Director of  
Neighbourhood Delivery and the redesignation  
of the existing post of Director of Policy,  
Performance and Reform to Assistant Chief  
Executive**

The Committee:-

- Recommends to Council the creation of new post, Director of Neighbourhood Delivery at senior salary grade SS4 Grade (£98,592 to £108,853).

And;

**PE/22/06      Pay Policy Statement 2022/23**

- Note the content of the draft Pay Policy Statement and commend it for approval by the Council at its meeting on 30 March 2022.
- Note the organisation's Pay and Grading Structure for the financial year 2022/23 appended to the Pay Policy Statement and commend it for approval by the Council at its meeting on 30 March 2022.

**10. Draft Pay Policy Statement**

145 - 164

The report of the Director Human Resources and Organisational

Development is attached.

**11. Key Decisions Report**

165 - 168

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](http://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, Flanagan, Foley, Good, Green, Grimshaw, Hacking, Hassan, Hewitson, Hilal, Hitchen, Holt, Hughes, Hussain, Igbon, Ilyas, Jeavons, Johns, S Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, 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](mailto:andrew.woods@manchester.gov.uk)

This agenda was issued on **Tuesday, 22 March 2022** 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, 4 March 2022**

#### **Present:**

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

#### **Councillors:**

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

#### **CC/01/14 The Lord Mayor's Special Business – Ukraine Invasion**

The Lord Mayor gave a statement regarding the situation in Ukraine following the unprovoked and illegal invasion of the country by Russian military forces. Reference was made to the Ukrainian community within Manchester and the longstanding links that continue with the Ukraine. The Lord Mayor called upon the Government to ensure the UK does all it can, alongside the EU to welcome, help and support Ukrainian refugees who have escaped the war.

The Lord Mayor also gave recognition to the many Russian people who oppose the invasion of Ukraine and have shown bravery in protesting in their country.

The Lord Mayor stated that the anger felt by the invasion was towards the Russian government and not Russian people and especially not those Russian people living in Manchester.

The Lord Mayor informed the Council that he had written to the Chair of the External Relations Committee in the City of Saint Petersburg to state that in view of the actions of the Russian government, Manchester is compelled to suspend the friendship agreement with St Petersburg. Manchester Council believes that peaceful co-operation between cities can help build bridges of understanding, however while the Russian government continues to act in flagrant defiance of international law it is not possible to continue with the friendship agreement. The Friendship Agreement was signed in 1962 and it is hoped that when the conditions are right that one day it may be resumed.

#### **CC/22/15 The Lord Mayor's Announcement – Extraordinary meetings of Council**

The Lord Mayor reminded members of the Council that two extraordinary meetings of the Council would take place following the meeting. The first meeting would be to consider recommendations for appointments to Council committees and outside bodies. The second meeting would consider a proposal that the Council petitions the HS2 Phase 2b Western Leg (Crewe- Manchester) Hybrid Bill.

### **CC/22/16 The Lord Mayor's Special Business**

The Lord Mayor agreed to the submission of the minutes of the Constitutional and Nomination Committee held on 4 March 2022.

### **CC/22/17 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 2 February 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Lord Mayor.

### **CC/22/18 The Council's Revenue and Capital Budget 2022/23**

The Council met to consider and set the 2022/23 budget, Council Tax resolution for 2022/23 and Collection Fund budget for 2022/23. In doing so, the proceedings of the Art Galleries Committee on 16 February 2022 which provided details of the Art Galleries budget for 2022/23 were submitted for approval. In addition, the part proceedings of the Executive on 16 February 2022 were submitted for approval, which contained details on the following:

- Revenue Monitoring to the end of December 2021;
- Capital Programme Monitoring 2021/22;
- Medium Term Financial Strategy 2022/23 to 2024/25;
- Revenue Budget 2022/23
- Children and Education Services Directorate Budget 2022/23
- Health and Social Care - Adult Social Care and Population Health Budget 2022/23;
- Neighbourhoods Directorate Budget 2022/23;
- Growth and Development Directorate Budget 2022/23;
- Corporate Core Budget 2022/23;
- Housing Revenue Account 2022/23 to 2024/25;
- Capital Strategy and Budget 2020/21 to 2024/25;
- Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2022/23, including Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy

The Council also considered the following reports:-

- Budget Consultation results 2022/23; and
- The Council Tax Resolution 2022/23.



In addition, the Council received the minutes of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee on 28 February 2022, that had considered the Budget Report 2022-2023.

The Lord Mayor provided Council with an explanation of the process to be followed at the meeting to consider and vote on the amendments received and to then consider the documents submitted and in doing so set the Council's budget for 2022/23 by a named vote.

Councillor Craig moved the proceedings of the Art Galleries Committee and part proceedings of the Executive, both held on 16 February 2022, the Revenue and Capital Budgets and the recommendations as detailed in the above reports, which was seconded by Councillor Midgley (Executive Member for Adult Services). Councillor Craig, presented her budget statement for 2022/23 to Council.

Councillor Leech, Opposition Lead Member on Finance, responded to the Leader's budget statement for 2022/23.

The Council then considered three amendments to the Council Budget 2022/23.

The first amendment was proposed by Councillor M Dar. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Battle.

Across Ancoats and Beswick residents raise the problem of commuter and visitor parking on a regular basis. In Beswick following Eastlands development, Labour Councillors secured first the Etihad Parking Scheme and now the wider Eastlands Parking scheme and we will continue to ensure this is extended effectively.

As Councillors we are proud of Ancoats and New Islington and the vibrant new communities that have been created, but too often residents are blighted by commuter parking. For example, I have spoken to many residents on roads such as Weybridge Road, Chippenham Road, Woodward Street and the surrounding area have raised regular problems.

The City Council should bring forward a local parking scheme in Ancoats that benefits residents and is funded from the proceeds of development in the area and complements the residents parking scheme in other parts of the ward and that work begins to bring forward a formal consultation with residents early in the new financial year.

**For the amendment: (83)**

**Councillors:**

Abdullatif, Akbar, Azra Ali, Ahmed Ali, Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Appleby, Baker-Smith, Bano, Battle, Bayunu, Benham, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Chohan, Clay, Collins, Connolly, Cooley, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Y Dar, Doswell, Evans, Farrell, Flanagan, Foley, Good, Green, Grimshaw, Hassan, Hewitson, Hilal, Hitchen, Holt, Hughes, Hussain, Igbon, Ilyas, Jeavons, S Judge, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kirkpatrick,

Lanchbury, Leech, J Lovecy, Lynch, McHale, Midgley, Moore, Newman, Nunney, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Razaq, Reeves, Reid, Riasat, Richards, Robinson, Rowles, Russell, Sadler, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, Stanton, Stogia, Taylor, Wheeler, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

**Against the amendment: (0)**  
**Abstentions (0)**

The Lord Mayor declared the amendment to be carried.

The second amendment was proposed by Councillor Good. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Leech.

To allocate a budget of £1m to enable the Council to deliver additional local road safety and traffic calming schemes in areas of need; to be funded through a transfer from the Bus Lane Enforcement Reserve.

To allocate a budget of £960,000 to enable the Council to continue the Parks in Partnership funding of £30,000 to each of the 32 wards of the city, for a further year, to be funded out of the On-street Parking Reserve.

To allocate an additional £1m to the budget to improve basic services and street cleaning, to bring it in line with the Council's proposed budget for 2023/24 and 2024/25, to be funded from the increase to the business rates reserve.

All proposals in this amendment are one off spending commitments for 2022/2023.

**For the amendment: (4)**

**Councillors:**

Igbon, Leech, Nunney and Good

**Against the amendment: (79)**

**Councillors:**

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

**Abstentions (0)**

### **Not voting (0)**

The Lord Mayor declared the amendment to be lost.

The third amendment was proposed by Councillor S Judge. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Hilal.

To amend the wording in paragraph 2.12 of the Revenue Budget Report relating to the £700k allocated for improving basic services and street cleaning.

### **After -**

has been made available to support a range of additional measures to ensure the city remains a clean and attractive place to live and work and reflect current gaps in provision.

### **Add –**

From the £700k, the Council will allocate £100k to tackling fly tipping and taking rigorous enforcement action against fly tippers. In addition, local and district centres are at the heart of our communities and have a crucial role to play in Manchester's economic recovery, post covid and residents want to see them clean and improved. As part of our drive towards cleaner and greener neighbourhoods the City Council will use a further £300k to provide more regular cleaning and the addition of more bins; improvements that will make a big difference to local communities.

### **For the amendment: (82)**

#### **Councillors:**

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

### **Against the amendment: (0)**

### **Abstentions (0)**

The Lord Mayor declared the amendment to be carried.

The Lord Mayor then invited Council to vote on the budget motion as the substantive budget resolution, and in doing so, sought Council:-

1. To approve the minutes of the Art Galleries Committee on 16 February 2022, to agree the Art Galleries budget for 2022/23.

2. To adopt the part proceedings of the Executive on 16 February 2022, as included in the Council summons and in particular, the Council is recommended to approve as elements of the budget for 2022/23:
  - an increase in the basic amount of Council Tax (i.e., the Council's element of Council Tax) by 1.99% and Adult Social Care precept increase of 1%;
  - the contingency sum of £1.060m;
  - corporate budget requirements to cover levies/charges of £67.853m, capital financing costs of £39.507m, additional allowances and other pension costs of £7.316m and insurance costs of £2.004m;
  - the inflationary pressures and budgets to be allocated in the sum of £23.661m; and delegate the final allocations to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Leader;
  - the estimated utilisation of £9.183m in 2022/23 of the surplus from the on-street parking and bus lane enforcement reserves, after determining that any surplus from these reserves is not required to provide additional off-street parking within the District; and
  - the planned use of, and movement in, reserves.
3. To note the minutes of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee held on 28 February 2022, regarding the consideration of the overall budget proposals and in doing so to note the consideration of the budget by the five scrutiny committees.
4. To note the 2022/23 Budget Consultation Results report.
5. To note the Capital Programme Monitoring 2021/22 report.
6. That in considering the Capital Strategy and Budget for 2020/21 to 2024/25 report to:
  - (1) Approve the budget changes for the capital programme as follows:
    - **Highways – Investment Plan additional year.** It is recommended that the investment plan is extended by a further year prior to the completion for the full business case for what will be required to support the council's road network for the next 3-5 years. This includes funding for road and footwork improvements (£14.129m), drainage repairs (£2m), to develop preliminary designs for funding bids for infrastructure development funding, eg active travel, (£1.5m). A capital budget increase of £17.629m is requested in 2022/23. This will be funded from estimated government grant of £4m and borrowing of £13.629m. Once the final government grant is known the budget will be adjusted accordingly.
    - **Growth – Asset Management Plan additional year.** To fund an additional year of funding for the asset management programme to enable capital replacement and improvement works across the Council's operational and heritage assets and buildings where the

Council has landlord responsibilities. A budget increase of £9.4m is requested funded from capital receipts.

- **Growth – Strategic Acquisitions additional year.** To enable the Council to make acquisitions of land and property which are of strategic importance, a budget increase of £3.0m in 2022/23 is requested, funded from the Capital Fund reserve.
- **Public Sector Housing: Sprinkler Systems – Tower Blocks PFIs.** The scheme will commence the programme of works to tower blocks within the Miles Platting and Brunswick PFI areas. The work will cover 11 tower blocks and the adjoining extra care scheme. A capital budget increase of £0.786m in 2021/22, £1.754m in 2022/23 and £1.474m in 2023/24 is requested, funded by HRA Reserves, also £0.147m in 2022/23 funded by Capital Receipts.

(2) Note the capital programme as presented in Appendix 3 (£329.0m in 2021/22, £533.1m in 2022/23, £255.1m in 2023/24 and £65.9m in 2024/25) which will require prudential borrowing of £708.2m to fund non-HRA schemes over the four-year period for which provision has been made in the revenue budget for the associated financing costs (within limits previously agreed).

(3) Note that the profile of spend is provisional, and a further update will be provided in the outturn report for 2021/22.

(4) Delegate authority to:

- a) The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to approve capital expenditure on schemes which have budget approval.
- b) The Chief Executive and Director of Highways in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment for the approval of the list of schemes to be undertaken under the Highways capital programme.
- c) The Chief Executive and Director of Highways to implement the Highways schemes in accordance with the Capital Approval process and after consultation with the Executive Member for Environment on the final details and estimated costs.
- d) The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to add qualifying spend to save projects to the capital budget accordingly up to a maximum of £5m in 2022/23 and then £5m per year thereafter.
- e) The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to accelerate spend from later years when necessary, within the programme subject to resource availability.
- f) The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to agree and

approve where appropriate the programme of schemes for the delivery of the corporate asset management programme.

7. That in considering the Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2022/23, including Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy report, to:
  - (1) Approve the proposed Treasury Management Strategy Statement, the:
    - Borrowing Requirement listed in Section 7 of the report submitted;
    - Borrowing Strategy outlined in Section 10 of the report;
    - Annual Investment Strategy detailed in Section 11 of the report;
    - Prudential and Treasury Indicators listed in Appendix A of the report;
    - Minimum Revenue Provision Strategy outlined in Appendix B of the report;
    - Treasury Management Policy Statement at Appendix C of the report; and
    - Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation at Appendix D of the report.
  - (2) Delegate to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Member of Executive with responsibility for Finance and Human Resources, the power to pursue any restructuring, rescheduling or redemption opportunities available, including amendments to the Treasury Management Strategy, if the changes require it. Any changes required to the Strategy will be reported to members at the earliest opportunity.
8. That in considering the **Council Tax Resolution 2022/23** report, the Council was asked to:
  1. Adopt the part proceedings of the Executive on 16 February 2022, which contain details of the following:
    - Medium Term Financial Strategy
    - Revenue Budget 2022/23
    - Capital Strategy and Budget 2022/23 to 2024/25
    - Children and Education Services Budget 2022/23
    - Adult Social Care and Population Health Budget 2022/23
    - Neighbourhoods Budget 2022/23
    - Growth and Development Budget 2022/23
    - Corporate Core Budget 2022/23
    - Housing Revenue Account – 2022/23 to 2024/25.
    - Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2022/23, including Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy
  2. Note the position on reserves as detailed in Appendix 2 of the report.
  3. Note that the Council tax determination included at Appendix 3 reflects the budget position.
  4. Note the information on the referenda as detailed in Section 3 of the report.
  5. Approve the Council Tax determination attached as Appendix 3 of the report. The Council Tax determination:

- Calculates the Council tax requirement in accordance with Section 31A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 as amended by the Localism Act 2011.
  - Calculates a basic amount of Council Tax and an amount of tax for each valuation band (the Council element) in accordance with Sections 31B and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992, as amended.
  - Sets an amount of Council Tax for each category of dwellings in each valuation band in accordance with Section 30 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992.
6. Approve the Treasury Management Strategy including Borrowing requirement and strategy, Annual Investment Strategy, Prudential and Treasury Indicators, Minimum Revenue Provision strategy included at Appendix 4.
7. Approve the Collection Fund Budget for 2022/23 as set out in Appendix 5 to the report.

**For the Motion: (81)**

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

**Against the Motion (0)**

**Abstentions (0)**

**Decisions**

1. To approve the minutes of the Art Galleries Committee on 16 February 2022, to agree the Art Galleries budget for 2022/23.
2. To adopt the part proceedings of the Executive on 16 February 2022, as included in the Council summons and in particular to approve as elements of the budget for 2022/23:
  - an increase in the basic amount of Council Tax (i.e., the Council's element of Council Tax) by 1.99% and Adult Social Care precept increase of 1%;
  - the contingency sum of £1.060m;
  - corporate budget requirements to cover levies/charges of £67.853m, capital financing costs of £39.507m, additional allowances and other pension costs of £7.316m and insurance costs of £2.004m;

- the inflationary pressures and budgets to be allocated in the sum of £23.661m; and delegate the final allocations to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Leader;
  - the estimated utilisation of £9.183m in 2022/23 of the surplus from the on-street parking and bus lane enforcement reserves, after determining that any surplus from these reserves is not required to provide additional off-street parking within the District; and
  - the planned use of, and movement in, reserves after any changes are required to account for final levies etc.
3. To note the minutes of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee held on 28 February 2022, regarding the consideration of the overall budget proposals and in doing so to note the consideration of the budget by each scrutiny committee.
4. To note the 2022/23 Budget Consultation Results.
5. To note the Capital Programme Monitoring 2021/22 report.
6. That in considering the Capital Strategy and Budget for 2020/21 to 224/25 to:
- (1) Approve the budget changes for the capital programme as follows:
- **Highways – Investment Plan additional year.** It is recommended that the investment plan is extended by a further year prior to the completion for the full business case for what will be required to support the council's road network for the next 3-5 years. This includes funding for road and footwork improvements (£14.129m), drainage repairs (£2m), to develop preliminary designs for funding bids for infrastructure development funding, eg active travel, (£1.5m). A capital budget increase of £17.629m is requested in 2022/23. This will be funded from estimated government grant of £4m and borrowing of £13.629m. Once the final government grant is known the budget will be adjusted accordingly.
  - **Growth – Asset Management Plan additional year.** To fund an additional year of funding for the asset management programme to enable capital replacement and improvement works across the Council's operational and heritage assets and buildings where the Council has landlord responsibilities. A budget increase of £9.4m is requested funded from capital receipts.
  - **Growth – Strategic Acquisitions additional year.** To enable the Council to make acquisitions of land and property which are of strategic importance, a budget increase of £3.0m in 2022/23 is requested, funded from the Capital Fund reserve.
  - **Public Sector Housing: Sprinkler Systems – Tower Blocks PFIs.** The scheme will commence the programme of works to tower blocks within the Miles Platting and Brunswick PFI areas. The work will cover 11 tower blocks and the adjoining extra care scheme. A capital budget increase of £0.786m in 2021/22, £1.754m in 2022/23 and £1.474m in 2023/24 is requested, funded by HRA Reserves, also



£0.147m in 2022/23 funded by Capital Receipts.

(2) Note the capital programme as presented in Appendix 3 of the report: (£329.0m in 2021/22, £533.1m in 2022/23, £255.1m in 2023/24 and £65.9m in 2024/25) which will require prudential borrowing of £708.2m to fund non-HRA schemes over the four-year period for which provision has been made in the revenue budget for the associated financing costs (within limits previously agreed).

(3) Note that the profile of spend is provisional, and a further update will be provided in the outturn report for 2021/22.

(4) Delegate authority to:

a) The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to approve capital expenditure on schemes which have budget approval.

b) The Chief Executive and Director of Highways in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment for the approval of the list of schemes to be undertaken under the Highways capital programme.

c) The Chief Executive and Director of Highways to implement the Highways schemes in accordance with the Capital Approval process and after consultation with the Executive Member for Environment on the final details and estimated costs.

d) The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to add qualifying spend to save projects to the capital budget accordingly up to a maximum of £5m in 2022/23 and then £5m per year thereafter.

e) The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to accelerate spend from later years when necessary, within the programme subject to resource availability.

f) The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to agree and approve where appropriate the programme of schemes for the delivery of the corporate asset management programme.

7. That in considering the Treasury Management Strategy Statement 2022/23, including Borrowing Limits and Annual Investment Strategy, to:

- (1) Approve the proposed Treasury Management Strategy Statement, the:
- Borrowing Requirement listed in Section 7 of the report submitted;
  - Borrowing Strategy outlined in Section 10 of the report;
  - Annual Investment Strategy detailed in Section 11 of the report;
  - Prudential and Treasury Indicators listed in Appendix A of the report;

- Minimum Revenue Provision Strategy as outlined in Appendix B of the report;
  - Treasury Management Policy Statement at Appendix C of the report; and
  - Treasury Management Scheme of Delegation at Appendix D of the report.
- (2) Delegate to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Member of Executive with responsibility for Finance and Human Resources, the power to pursue any restructuring, rescheduling or redemption opportunities available, including amendments to the Treasury Management Strategy, if the changes require it. Any changes required to the Strategy will be reported to members at the earliest opportunity.

8. That in considering the **Council Tax Resolution** 2022/23 report, to:

1. Note the position on reserves, as detailed in Appendix 2 of the report.
2. Note that the Council tax determination included at Appendix 3 reflects the budget position.
3. Note the information on the referenda, as detailed in Section 3 of the report.
4. Approve the Council Tax determination as detailed in Appendix 3 of the report (see below). The Council Tax determination:

- Calculates the Council tax requirement in accordance with Section 31A of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 as amended by the Localism Act 2011.
- Calculates a basic amount of Council Tax and an amount of tax for each valuation band (the Council element) in accordance with Sections 31B and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992, as amended.
- Sets an amount of Council Tax for each category of dwellings in each valuation band in accordance with Section 30 of the Local Government Finance Act, 1992.

5. Approve the Treasury Management Strategy including Borrowing requirement and strategy, Annual Investment Strategy, Prudential and Treasury Indicators, Minimum Revenue Provision strategy as detailed in Appendix 4 of the report (see below).
6. Approve the Collection Fund Budget for 2022/23 as set out in Appendix 5 of the report (see below).

### APPENDIX 3

#### COUNCIL TAX

#### SETTING THE AMOUNT OF COUNCIL TAX FOR THE COUNCIL'S AREA RESOLVED

1. That the estimates prepared by the Executive at its meeting on 16 February 2022 be approved.
2. That it be noted that the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer acting under delegated powers has determined the amount of 127,620.0 as the Council Tax base for Manchester for the year 2022/23 in accordance with Section 31A (3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 and regulations 3 to 5 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012.
3. That the following amounts can be now calculated by the Council for the year 2022/23 in accordance with Sections 31A to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:
  - (a) £1,601,641,953 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in the Section 31A (2) (a) to (f) of the Act.
  - (b) £1,404,936,333 being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A (3) (a) to (d) of the Act.
  - (c) £196,705,620 being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Sections 31A(4) of the Act, as its council tax requirement for the year.
  - (d) £1,541.34 being the amount at 3(c) above divided by the amount at 2 above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31B(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year.
  - (e) Valuation Bands being the amount given multiplying the amount at 3(d) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwellings listed in different valuation

bands. The band bill is shown in the table below.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£1,027.56	£1,198.82	£1,370.08	£1,541.34	£1,883.85	£2,226.37	£2,568.89	£3,082.67

4. That it be noted that for the year 2022/23 the major precepting authorities have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Precepting Valuation bands

Greater Manchester Mayoral Police and Crime Commissioner Precept:

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£152.20	£177.56	£202.93	£228.30	£279.03	£329.76	£380.50	£456.60

Greater Manchester Mayoral General Precept (including Fire Services):

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£68.63	£80.07	£91.51	£102.95	£125.82	£148.70	£171.58	£205.90

5. That, having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 3(e) and 4 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2022/23 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
£1,248.39	£1,456.45	£1,664.52	£1,872.59	£2,288.70	£2,704.83	£3,120.97	£3,745.17

**1. CALCULATING THE COUNCIL TAX REQUIREMENT**

**Section 31A Calculations**

- 1.1 Section 31A of the Local Government Finance 1992 requires the Council to make three calculations:
- (i) an estimate of the Council's required gross revenue expenditure - Section 31A(2)
  - (ii) an estimate of its anticipated income (excluding that from council tax) and of reserves to be used to aid the revenue account - Section 31A(3)
  - (iii) a calculation of the difference between (i) and (ii) above, (i.e. the Council Tax requirement) - Section 31A(4)
- 1.2 In its Section 31A(2) calculation the Council is required to allow for the following:

**Section 31A(2)(a)** - the estimated revenue account expenditure it will incur during the year in performing its functions.

**Section 31A(2)(b)** - an appropriate allowance for contingencies for the year, e.g. for unforeseen occurrences such as disasters, storm damage, higher than expected inflation etc.

**Section 31A(2)(c)** - any raising of financial reserves for future expenditure - examples of this include payments into a redemption fund, internal insurance etc.

**Section 31A(2)(d)** - any revenue account deficit for a previous financial year which has not yet been provided for.

**Section 31A(2)(da)** – any amount estimated to be transferred from the general fund to the collection fund in accordance with regulations by reference to sums received by the authority in respect of business rates.

**Section 31A(2)(e)** - any amount estimated to be transferred from the General Fund to the Collection Fund in accordance with Section 97(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 - i.e. the Council's share of any collection fund deficit.

**Section 31A(2)(f)** - any amounts estimated to be transferred from the General Fund to the Collection Fund by direction of the Secretary of State under Section 98(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 - including an estimate of the shortfall in the collection of Non-domestic Rates in excess of the allowance.

1.3. In its Section 31A(3) calculation the Council must calculate the aggregate of sums to be put against gross expenditure, namely:

**Section 31A(3)(a)** - estimated income from fees, charges, and government grants (including RSG) plus other sums payable into the general fund (but excluding council tax)

**Section 31A(3)(aa)** – Any amount estimated to be transferred from the collection fund to the general fund in accordance with regulations by reference to sums received by the authority in respect of business rates.

**Section 31A(3)(b)** - any amount estimated to be transferred from the Collection Fund to the General Fund in accordance with Section 97(3) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 - i.e. the Council's share of any collection fund surplus;

**Section 31A(3)(c)** - sums to be transferred from the Collection Fund to the General Fund pursuant to a direction of the Secretary of State under Section 98(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 - including allowances for costs of collection of business rates;

**Section 31A(3)(d)** - the amount of financial reserves/balances which the authority intends to use towards meeting its revenue expenditure

1.4 On the basis of current estimates, the calculations would be as follows:

	<b>HRA</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>	<b>£</b>
<u>Expenditure</u>			
Section 31A (2)(a)	99,617,000	1,325,501,620	1,425,118,620
Section 31A (2)(b)	0	1,060,000	1,060,000
Section 31A (2)(c)	1,702,000	60,633,000	62,335,000
Section 31A (2)(d)	0	9,079,333	9,079,333
Section 31A (2)(da)	0	0	0
Section 31A (2)(e)	0	104,049,000	104,049,000
Section 31A (2)(f)	0	0	0
<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>101,319,000</b>	<b>1,500,322,953</b>	<b>1,601,641,953</b>
<u>Income</u>			
Section 31A (3)(a)	(85,629,000)	(768,953,478)	(854,582,478)
Section 31A (3)(aa)	0	(294,713,000)	(294,713,000)
Section 31A (3)(b)	0	(24,042,000)	(24,042,000)
Section 31A (3)(c)	0	(1,116,855)	(1,116,855)
Section 31A (3)(d)	(15,690,000)	(214,792,000)	(230,482,000)
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>(101,319,000)</b>	<b>(1,303,617,333)</b>	<b>(1,404,936,333)</b>

1.5 **Council Tax Requirement under Section 31A(4)** being the amount by which the aggregate under Section 31A(2) exceeds the aggregate under Section 31A(3) is £196,705,620.

## 2. **CALCULATING THE BASIC AMOUNT OF COUNCIL TAX**

2.1. Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 requires the Council to calculate the basic amount of its Council Tax - this is in effect the Council element of the Band D Council tax.

2.2 This calculated by applying the following formula:  $R \div T$   
Where:

R: is the Council Tax requirement, and  
T: is the approved Council Tax base

2.3 Calculating the Basic Amount of Council Tax

Council Tax Requirement	£196,705,620
Divided by:	
Council Tax Base	127,620.0
<b>Band D Basic Amount of Council Tax is:</b>	<b>£1,541.34</b>

#### APPENDIX 4

#### Prudential and Treasury Indicators 2022/23 to 2024/25

**Note** - last year's approved figures are shown in brackets.

Treasury Indicators	Management	2022-23		2023-24		2024-25
		%		%		%
<b>Estimated Financing Costs to Net Revenue Stream<sup>1</sup></b>		5.8%		6.2%		6.1%
		£m		£m		£m
<b>Authorised Limit - external debt</b>						
Borrowing		1,816.1	(1,737.3)	1,816.1	(1,737.3)	1,816.1
Other long-term liabilities		190.0	(190.0)	190.0	(190.0)	190.0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>2,006.1</b>	<b>(1,927.3)</b>	<b>2,006.1</b>	<b>(1,927.3)</b>	<b>2,006.1</b>
<b>Operational Boundary - external debt</b>						
Borrowing		1,580.2	(1,591.5)	1,698.5	(1,626.3)	1,724.0
Other long-term liabilities		190.0	(190.0)	190.0	(190.0)	190.0
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1,770.2</b>	<b>(1,781.5)</b>	<b>1,888.5</b>	<b>(1,816.3)</b>	<b>1,914.0</b>
<b>Estimated external debt</b>		1,414.3	(1,454.3)	1,572.0	(1,501.8)	1,606.0
<b>Upper limit for total principal sums invested for over 364 days</b>		0	(0)	0	(0)	0
<b>Estimated Capital Expenditure</b>						
Non - HRA		498.2	(286.3)	223.2	(131.9)	51.3
HRA		39.4	(45.5)	31.9	(3.2)	14.6
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>533.1</b>	<b>(331.8)</b>	<b>255.1</b>	<b>(135.1)</b>	<b>65.9</b>
<b>Estimated Capital Financing Requirement (as at 31 March)</b>						
Non - HRA		1,794.5	(1,792.1)	1,895.8	(1,849.6)	1,898.6
HRA		321.0	(301.0)	321.8	(301.8)	322.6

<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,115.5</b>	<b>(2,093.1)</b>	<b>2,220.6</b>	<b>(2,151.4)</b>	<b>2,221.2</b>
--------------	----------------	------------------	----------------	------------------	----------------

<sup>1</sup> Note that for 2021-22 onward these are based on estimated net revenue budgets.

<b>Maturity structure of borrowing during 2021-22</b>	<b>Upper Limit</b>		<b>Lower limit</b>		
	under 12 months	70%	(80%)	0%	(0%)
12 months and within 24 months	70%	(80%)	0%	(0%)	
24 months and within 5 years	60%	(70%)	0%	(0%)	
5 years and within 10 years	60%	(70%)	0%	(0%)	
10 years and above	90%	(90%)	30%	(20%)	
<b>Has the Authority adopted the CIPFA Treasury Management Code?</b>				Yes	

The status of the indicators will be included in Treasury Management reporting during 2022/23. They will also be included in the Council's Capital Budget monitoring reports during 2022/23.

**Definitions and Purpose of the Treasury Management Indicators noted above (Indicators are as recommended by the CIPFA Prudential Code last revised in 2017)**

**Estimated Financing Costs to Net Revenue Stream**

The authority will set for the forthcoming year and the following financial years an estimate of financing costs to net revenue stream. The indicator recognises that ultimately all debts of a local authority fall on the taxpayer, and that therefore when considering affordability, it is important to review the scale of financing costs to net revenue.

**Estimated Capital Expenditure**

The authority sets a capital budget for each financial year, which includes an estimate of the capital expenditure which might be incurred. The figures here also include changes to other long-term liabilities.

**Estimates Capital Financing Requirement**

The capital financing requirement reflects the authority's underlying need to finance capital expenditure and is based on all capital expenditure including that incurred in previous years.

**Authorised Limit - external debt**

The local authority will set for the forthcoming financial year and the following two financial years an authorised limit for its total external debt, excluding investments, separately identifying borrowing from other long-term liabilities. Other long-term liabilities include PFI's, service concessions and finance leases. Due to the introduction of IFRS16 (Leasing) on the 1st of April 2022, more of the Council's lessee leases will be classed as finance leases and will become other long-term liabilities, therefore the value will increase from previous years. Work is underway to



determine the value of this change in accounting standards, but £20.0m has been added to the indicator at this stage and will be reviewed once this work is complete. This prudential indicator is referred to as the Authorised Limit.

### **Operational Boundary - external debt**

The local authority will also set for the forthcoming financial year and the following two financial years an operational boundary for its total external debt, excluding investments, separately identifying borrowing from other long-term liabilities. This prudential indicator is referred to as the Operational Boundary.

Both the Authorised Limit and the Operational Boundary need to be consistent with the authority's plans for capital expenditure and financing; and with its treasury management policy statement and practices. The Operational Boundary should be based on the authority's estimate of most likely, i.e. prudent, but not worst-case scenario. Risk analysis and risk management strategies should be considered.

The Operational Boundary should equate to the maximum level of external debt projected by this estimate. Thus, the Operational Boundary links directly to the Authority's plans for capital expenditure; its estimates of capital financing requirement; and its estimate of cash flow requirements for the year for all purposes. The Operational Boundary is a key management tool for in-year monitoring.

It will probably not be significant if the Operational Boundary is breached temporarily on occasions due to variations in cash flow. However, a sustained or regular trend above the Operational Boundary would be significant and should lead to further investigation and action as appropriate. Thus, both the Operational Boundary and the Authorised Limit will be based on the authority's plans. The authority will need to assure itself that these plans are affordable and prudent. The Authorised Limit will in addition need to provide headroom over and above the Operational Boundary enough for example for unusual cash movements.

### **Estimated external debt**

After the year end, the closing balance for actual gross borrowing plus (separately), other long-term liabilities are obtained directly from the local authority's Balance Sheet.

The prudential indicator for Estimated External Debt considers a single point in time and hence is only directly comparable to the Authorised Limit and Operational Boundary at that point in time. Actual external debt during the year can be compared.

### **Upper limit for total principal sums invested for over 364 days**

The authority will set an upper limit for each forward financial year period for the maturing of investments made for a period longer than 364 days. This indicator is referred to as the prudential limit for Principal Sums Invested for periods longer than 364 days.

The purpose of this indicator is so the authority can contain its exposure to the possibility of loss that might arise as a result of it having to seek early repayment or redemption of principal sums invested.

### **Maturity structure of new borrowing**

The authority will set for the forthcoming financial year both upper and lower limits with respect to the maturity structure of its borrowing. These indicators are referred to as the Upper and Lower limits respectively for the Maturity Structure of Borrowing.

### Local Prudential Indicators

The Council has not yet introduced Local Prudential Indicators to reflect local circumstances but will review on a regular basis the need for these in the future.

## APPENDIX 5

<b>COLLECTION FUND BUDGET 2022/23</b>	<b>2022/23 Budget Estimate £'000</b>
<b><u>EXPENDITURE</u></b>	
<b><u>COUNCIL TAX</u></b> (Surplus) / Deficit Brought forward	(14,791)
Precepts:	
• Mayoral General (including Fire Services)	13,138
• Mayoral Police & Crime Commissioner	29,136
• City of Manchester	196,706
Total Precepts	238,980
<b>Council Tax Total Expenditure</b>	<b>224,189</b>
<b><u>BUSINESS RATES</u></b> (Surplus) / Deficit Brought forward	102,369
Payments/Transfers:	
• Mayoral General (including Fire Services)	2,977
• City of Manchester	294,713
Total Payments/transfers	297,690
<b>Business Rates Total Expenditure</b>	<b>400,059</b>
<b>Collection Fund Total Expenditure</b>	<b>624,248</b>
<b><u>INCOME</u></b>	
<b><u>COUNCIL TAX</u></b>	
Council Tax Income	250,241
Write Off of uncollectable amounts	(980)
Allowance for Impairment	(10,281)
Council tax receivable	238,980
<u>Contribution of Council Tax (surplus) / deficit:</u>	
• Mayoral General (including Fire Services)	(745)
• Mayoral Police & Crime Commissioner	(1,788)
• City of Manchester	(12,258)
<i>(Includes one third of 2020/21 in year deficit)</i>	

<b>COLLECTION FUND BUDGET 2022/23</b>	<b>2022/23 Budget Estimate £'000</b>
Total Contribution to Council Tax (surplus) / deficit	(14,791)
<b>Council Tax Total Income</b>	<b>224,189</b>
<b><u>BUSINESS RATES</u></b>	
Non-Domestic Business Rates Income	334,997
Enterprise Zone growth above baseline	(475)
Cost of Collection Allowance	(1,117)
Losses in Collection	(16,750)
Increase in Provision for Appeals	(18,965)
Business rates receivable	297,690
<u>Contribution of Business Rates (surplus) / deficit:</u>	
• Mayoral General (including Fire Services)	1,024
• City of Manchester	101,345
<i>(Includes one third of 2020/21 in year deficit)</i>	
Total Contribution to Business Rates (surplus) / deficit	102,369
<b>Business Rates Total Income</b>	<b>400,059</b>
<b>Collection Fund Total Income</b>	<b>624,248</b>
<b>MOVEMENT ON FUND BALANCE</b>	
Council Tax (Surplus) / Deficit Carried forward	0
Business Rates (Surplus) / Deficit Carried forward	0
<b>Collection Fund (Surplus) / Deficit</b>	<b>0</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

## Council

### Minutes of the extraordinary meeting held on Wednesday, 4 March 2022

#### Present:

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

#### Councillors:

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

#### **CC/01/20 Membership of Committees and the Appointment of members to GMCA Committees and Outside Bodies**

Consideration was given to the report of the City Solicitor and recommendations contained within the minutes of the Constitutional and Nomination Committee held 4 March 2022.

The Committee made recommendations to Council to agree the following appointments to:

- Council Committees;
- Standing Executive Consultative Panel;
- GMCA (substitute member);
- AGMA (substitute member):

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Appoint</b>
Art Galleries	Councillor Leech
Audit	Councillor Good
Constitutional and Nomination	Councillor Leech
Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny	Councillor Good
Licensing Policy	Councillor Leech
Personnel	Councillor Leech
Planning and Highways	Councillor Leech
Resources and Governance Scrutiny	Councillor Good
Standards	Councillor Good
<b>Standing Executive Consultative Panel</b>	Councillor Leech

<b>GMCA</b>	Councillor Rahman (substitute member)
<b>AGMA</b>	Councillor Rahman (substitute member)
<b>Committees and outside bodies</b>	<b>Remove</b>
Health Scrutiny	Councillor Leech
Manchester Airport Consultative Committee	Councillor Whiston

### Decision

To approve the appointments and changes to the Council Committees, Standing Executive Consultative Panel, GMCA, AGMA and outside bodies, as detailed in the recommendations of the minutes of the Constitutional and Nomination Committee above.

## Council

### Minutes of the second extraordinary meeting held on Wednesday, 4 March 2022

#### Present:

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

#### Councillors:

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

#### **CC/01/21 HS2 Phase 2b Western Leg (Crewe-Manchester) hybrid Bill Petitioning**

Consideration of the report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) and the City Solicitor that set out a procedural matter, specifically, seeking Full Council approval for the City Council to object to elements of the HS2 Phase 2b Western Leg (Crewe- Manchester) hybrid Bill, deposited in Parliament on 24 January 2022.

The Minutes of the Constitutional and Nomination Committee held on 4 March 2022 were submitted recommending to Council that, subject to being satisfied that it is expedient for Manchester City Council to do so, the City Council oppose elements of the HS2 Phase 2b Western Leg (Crewe- Manchester) hybrid Bill, as detailed in the report submitted.

The Council held a named vote.

#### **For the recommendation (80)**

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

#### **Against (0)**

#### **Abstain (0)**

## Decisions

1. To agree that the City Council oppose elements of the HS2 Phase 2b Western Leg (Crewe- Manchester) hybrid Bill introduced into 24 January 2022 session of Parliament as detailed in the report submitted.
2. That approval be given to delegate authority to the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), in consultation with the Leader of the Council and City Solicitor, to take all such steps as may be necessary to give effect to the above resolution including all those steps required for the Council to submit any petition and thereafter to maintain and if considered appropriate authorise the withdrawal of any petition points that have been resolved in respect of the Bill, and to negotiate and/or seek assurances/undertaking/agreements to the Bill.



## Executive

### Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 16 February 2022

**Present:** Councillor Craig (Chair)

**Councillors:** Akbar, Bridges, Midgley, Rahman, Rawlins, White, Butt, M Sharif Mahamed, Ilyas and Taylor

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

**Councillors:** Akbar, Bridges, Midgley, Rahman, Rawlins, White, Butt, M Sharif Mahamed, Ilyas and Taylor

**Apologies:** Councillor Karney

#### Exe/22/12 Minutes

#### Decision

The Executive approved as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 19 January 2022.

#### Exe/22/27 Rogue Studios – lease of former Varna Street school

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which sought approval to the lease of the former Varna Street school in Higher Openshaw for a term of 125 years to Rogue Artists' Studios CIC ("Rogue Studios") at less than the best consideration that could reasonably be obtained.

The grant of a long lease of the former Varna Street Primary School to Rogue Studios would void ongoing maintenance and holding costs on the premises that the Council would initially have to fund if the building was vacated by Rogue Studios and in the event of no immediate disposal of the property otherwise. In addition it offered an opportunity for major capital investment in the premises from outside sources. Without a long term occupier, committed to the maintenance and restoration of the property, it was likely that the Council would become liable for major capital repairs on the listed property in the future in the event the property was not disposed of either to Rogue Studios or on the open market.

#### Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Approve the lease of the former Varna Street school in Higher Openshaw for a term of 125 years to Rogue Artists' Studios CIC ("Rogue Studios") at less than the best consideration that could reasonably be obtained.
- (2) Authorise the Head of Development and the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer to finalise the terms of the transactions as set out in the report.

- (3) Authorise the City Solicitor to enter into and complete all documents and agreements necessary to give effect to the recommendations.

**Exe/22/28 Manchester's Corporate Peer Review**

The Executive received the feedback report from the LGA Corporate Peer Challenge of the Council, which took place between 30 November and 3 December 2021.

During their time with the Council, the team of independent reviewers – consisting of experienced local Government figures from around the country – spoke to over 300 people, including councillors, staff and partners.

In their initial feedback, the independent reviewer recognised Manchester to be a 'first-class council', where the workforce were passionate about improving outcomes for Manchester people and rightly proud to work for Manchester City Council.

In their final report, reviewers called Manchester a 'city of firsts' and highlighted the strength and depth of our partnerships, including health and social care. They also celebrated the improvements the Council had made in Children's Services, the strength of our neighbourhood working and financial leadership.

The next steps would be the production of a clear action plan which would address the key recommendations made by the Peer Review.

**Decision**

The Executive note and welcome the findings from the Corporate Peer Challenge.

**Council meeting – 31 March 2022****Rule 23. Questions for Executive Members (Agenda Item 5)**

---

**1. Question from Councillor Wheeler to the Executive Member for Member for Housing & Employment****Question:**

Could the Executive Member give an update on the work and progress of the council's housing delivery vehicle 'This City' in the Piccadilly Ward?

Received: 25/03/2022 14:55

---

**2. Question from Councillor Wills to the Executive Member for Environment****Question**

Road safety is a top concern for local residents, and for us as Withington Ward Councillors. Last year, following much lobbying - including a petition signed by over 200 residents - we were awarded £250,000 from the Greater Manchester Mayor's Challenge Fund. This is for the Parsonage Road Safer Streets project. The project launched with a series of consultation events. Following these, we now need to see proposals go out for public feedback. Please can the Executive Member confirm the timescale for this?

Received: 25/03/2022 15:45

---

**3. Question from Councillor Wills to the Executive Member for Environment****Question**

Thanks to a 5-year programme of investment by Manchester's Labour Council, many of our worst roads in Withington, Ladybarn and South East Fallowfield have been repaired. Our pavements now need attention. Many are uneven and in need of repair. This is affecting people more and more, especially wheelchair users and parents with pushchairs. Please can the Executive Member confirm what commitment the Council is making towards fixing our pavements.

Received: 25/03/2022 15:45

---

**4. Question from Councillor Nunney to the Executive Member for Environment**

Following the welcome amendment to the budget earlier this month, can Cllr Rawlins give an indication as to how many extra litter bins will be acquired and how they will be fairly allocated throughout the city?

Received: 27/03/22 11:06

---

## Council meeting – 31 March 2022

### **5. Question from Councillor Leech to the Executive Member for Executive Member for Housing**

What assessment has he made of whether publishing developers' financial viability statements has been successful in increasing the number of affordable homes delivered through planning applications?

Received: 27/03/22 23:39

---

### **6. Question from Councillor Leech to the Executive Member for Environment (responsibility for flooding)**

What discussions has she had with the Environment Agency, since the recent storms, regarding the need for further flood mitigation measures?

Received: 27/03/22 23:39

---

### **7. Question from Councillor Leech to the Executive Member for Environment (responsibility for Planning)**

Does the Executive Member agree that local councillors should be allowed to represent the views of their constituents affected by planning applications?

Received: 27/03/22 23:39

---

### **8. Question from Councillor Leech to the Executive Member for Environment (responsibility for Highways)**

Outside of the city centre, in areas where there are already problems with parking and traffic, what is the Council's recommended ratio for off road parking spaces to flats in new developments?

Received: 27/03/22 23:39

---

### **9. Question from Councillor Leech to the Executive Member for Environment (responsibility for Highways)**

How many complaints have been received by the Council, regarding the quality of micro asphalt resurfacing, in each year of the recent resurfacing programme?

Received: 27/03/22 23:39

---

### **10. Question from Councillor Good the Executive Member for Housing and Employment**

#### **Question**

Why does this Council repeatedly grant planning permission for huge residential developments with little to no affordable housing element, and accept paltry financial incentive for developers to do so?

Received 28/03/2022 00:00

---

**Council meeting – 31 March 2022****11. Question from Councillor Good to the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods****Question**

New Islington Estate is privately managed but parts are open 24 hours to the public. Maintenance costs fall to residents in service charge hikes but MCC own the freehold to the land. In the cost of living emergency, why is the Council sitting back while private management charges their residents £800 in one go to do the job we pay Council tax for?

Received 28/03/2022 00:00

---

**12. Question from Councillor Good to the Executive Member for Environment****Question**

Will the Council increase the number of free collections for residents to help address the issue of fly-tipping at source?

Received 28/03/2022 00:00

---

**13. Question from Councillor Good to the Executive Member for Environment****Question**

£4m has been approved for a parking scheme in Ancoats. What details should we expect from the scheme?

Received 28/03/2022 00:00

---

**14. Question from Councillor Good to the Executive Member for Environment****Question**

Will MCC raise the 2-visitor permit limit for the Eastlands Residents' Parking Scheme?

Received 28/03/2022 00:00

---

**15. Question from Councillor Good to the Executive Member for Environment (responsibility for street lighting)****Question**

What is the Council doing to improve Street Lighting?

Received 28/03/2022 00:00

**Council meeting – 31 March 2022****16. Question from Councillor Good to the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods (responsibility for Crime and Anti-Social Behaviour)****Question**

What is Manchester Council's strategy for combating parcel theft?

Received 28/03/2022 00:00

---

**17. Question from Councillor Good to the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods****Question**

Last May Manchester Council promised 6 new parks in Beswick. What is the progress on this?

Received 28/03/2022 00:00

---

**18. Question from Councillor Hilal to the Executive Member for Environment****Question**

Residents at Didsbury Point have recently raised concerns about parking and enforcement in our area; I have regularly visited during the morning & evening peaks to observe and assist – following this what actions have Officers taken on signage, enforcement and traffic phasing to & from Princess Parkway?

Received 28/3/2022 07:27

---

**19. Question from Councillor Stanton to the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods****Question**

Didsbury Library re-opened this week following extensive refurbishments that have breathed new life into our second oldest civic space across the city some two years ahead of schedule. Since the Garden of Contemplation working group formed during lockdown I have been continuously impressed with their cross-community vision for a reinvigorated district centre and fully support their application for PIP funding to refresh the library and war memorial grounds. What update can be given on our commitment to which?

Received 28/3/2022 08:55

---

**20. Question from Councillor Chambers to the Executive Member for Environment****Question**

Litter and fly-tipping blight our community. It really gets us down as local councillors, as it does our residents, to see this inconsiderate and antisocial behaviour. For some

**Council meeting – 31 March 2022**

time, we have been pushing for greater street-cleaning provision in Withington Village. Please can the exec member advise what provision will be put in place?

Received 28/03/22 9:28

---

This page is intentionally left blank



## **Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 8 February 2022**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Hacking - In the Chair  
Councillors Ahmed Ali, Azra Ali, Andrews, Chambers, Connolly, M Dar, Evans, Grimshaw, Hilal, Hussain, S Judge, Rawson, Sheikh and Wills

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Rahman, Deputy Leader  
Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods  
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children's Services

#### **Apologies:**

Councillors Whiston and Wilson

#### **CESC/22/07 Minutes**

The Chair requested that Councillor Grimshaw's apologies be noted for the January meeting.

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2022 as a correct record, subject to the above amendment.

#### **CESC/22/08 Homelessness Update**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which set out the position of the Council's Homelessness Service in terms of how it supported local residents and how the emerging transformation programme was seeking to increase the prevention of homelessness, continue the reduction in rough sleeping, reduce the use of temporary accommodation and support residents, with a wide ranging variety of needs, including that of securing a place to call home.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- National, regional and local context;
- Homelessness Strategy and Partnership;
- Finance;
- Equalities and diversity; and
- Risks and issues.

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

- Comparisons with other core cities;
- Improving inclusion and diversity, including on the Housing Board, noting the high percentage of homeless people who were from ethnic minority groups;

- People, predominantly women and children, becoming homeless due to domestic abuse, while the perpetrator was able to remain in the family home;
- What percentage of homeless families were being placed outside the city;
- That homeless families were being dispersed to particular areas of the city with more affordable rents and the impact of this, for example, on rent levels, school places and access to NHS services;
- Whether a ward-level breakdown could be provided of where families were being dispersed to;
- Praise for the work of the homelessness team;
- To welcome the focus on preventing homelessness;
- What was being done to expedite support for tenants to secure accommodation following notice being given under Section 21 of the Housing Act 1988;
- Support for homeless people with drug and alcohol addictions;
- People who were in overcrowded accommodation and hidden homelessness, for example, young people who were couch surfing;
- What was being done to support younger people, including those living with families where they were no longer welcome;
- That more needed to be done to provide suitable and affordable homes in the city, including social rented properties; and
- How the budget was split between those in temporary accommodation and those sleeping rough.

The Director of Housing Operations reported that the high number of people presenting as homeless in Manchester was not dissimilar to levels in London and other cities. He advised that people were approaching the Council at the point of crisis and that work was taking place to increase early intervention to prevent people from becoming homeless. He acknowledged the importance of increasing diversity across senior decision makers and when listening to the voices of local people. He advised that work would be taking place to address this over the coming months and offered to provide Members with further information. He advised that approximately 30% of temporary accommodation was outside of the city, due to the affordability of properties, but that the preference was to house people within the city and that this would be a focus within the transformation work. He acknowledged that at present temporary accommodation within Manchester was concentrated in particular areas and advised that this would also be looked at as part of the transformation work. He also drew Members' attention to the Housing Strategy which was being developed. He offered to provide Members with the requested ward breakdown. In response to the question about homeless people with drug and alcohol issues, he advised that investment during the pandemic had enabled services to engage with homeless people who had been difficult to engage with in the past and provide wraparound support to them, although there were concerns about how long the funding arrangements would be in place. The Strategic Lead (Homelessness) explained how the circumstances of the lockdown and the vastly reduced number of people going into the city centre had impacted on people living on or begging on the streets of the city centre, disrupting the way they had been living and persuading them to engage with services and enabling them to move on with their lives. She advised that discussions were taking place between different services and Greater Manchester Police to look at how this work could continue and how to prevent these people from falling back into a street-based lifestyle.

The Strategic Lead (Homelessness) informed Members about the work that was taking place to prevent and address domestic abuse, following the introduction of the Domestic Abuse Act 2021, and the funding that had been provided by the government to support the additional responsibilities that local authorities had under this new legislation. She advised that this work included support for the Sanctuary and Safe Space Schemes to enable victims of domestic abuse to remain in their own home. She reported that new contracts had been put in place with organisations so that, where victims did need to leave their home, they had access to support including housing, financial support and specific support relating to domestic abuse. She advised that, where a family had been given notice under Section 21 of the Housing Act 1988, the Private Rented Sector Team was working to identify suitable alternative accommodation in the private rented sector to prevent the need for the family to go into temporary accommodation. In response to a Member's question, she reported that the figures on rough sleepers within the report were part of the national count and included rough sleepers anywhere within the city's boundaries, not just the city centre. She advised that the Council was working closely with Centrepoint to support young people affected by homelessness, including those struggling to live with family, those who were couch surfing and young people with more complex needs.

In response to a Member's question, the Director of Housing Operations advised that there were families of various sizes who needed suitable accommodation. He acknowledged that it was a challenge to find suitably sized social housing and advised that the Council needed to be creative in working with the private sector to source suitable affordable homes. In response to a Member's question about the cost effectiveness of placing families outside of the city, he advised that this would be looked at as part of the transformation work.

The Deputy Leader advised that, although affordable housing and overcrowding were beyond the remit of the homelessness report, these issues, including the Housing Strategy, could be scrutinised at a future meeting of the relevant committee. In response to a Member's question about whether the Council should be using its influence to get partners to build more social rented housing, the Chair suggested that the Executive Member for Housing and Employment could be invited to a future meeting and that the Committee could look at areas where homelessness overlapped with housing.

The Chair thanked officers and voluntary and community organisations for their work in this area.

## **Decisions**

1. To request a ward-level breakdown of the areas of the city that homeless families are being dispersed to.
2. To request information on how the budget is split between those in temporary accommodation and those sleeping rough.

3. To note that the Director of Housing Operations will provide further information on diversity and inclusion, including in relation to the Housing Board.

### **CESC/22/09 Neighbourhood Directorate Budget 2022/23**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which stated that, following the Spending Review announcements and provisional local government finance settlement 2022/23 the Council was forecasting a balanced budget for 2022/23, a gap of £37m in 2023/24 and £58m by 2024/25. The report set out the high-level position. Appended to the report were the priorities for the services in the remit of this Committee, details on the initial revenue budget changes proposed by officers and the planned capital programme. The Committee was invited to comment on the proposals prior to their submission to the Executive on 16 February 2022.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Current budget position;
- Scrutiny of the draft budget proposals and budget reports;
- Next steps;
- Headline priorities for the services;
- Revenue Budget Strategy; and
- Capital budget and pipeline priorities.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods provided an overview of the financial position of the Council, including the uncertainty in future years. He highlighted some of the priority areas within the budget, including funding to address gender-based violence and funding to each ward to address their priorities. The Deputy Leader emphasised the Council's commitment to making Manchester a safe city for women and girls and outlined initial work taking place to address this.

The Executive Member for Children's Services informed Members about the proposal within the budget to invest more money in the commissioning of youth services, highlighting that 2022 had been designated as "Our Year", dedicated to the city's children and young people.

In response to a Member's question, the Director of Housing Operations outlined work to monitor and address the effectiveness of Northwards Housing, particularly in relation to repairs. The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods advised that this related to housing management and that a report on this would be considered by the relevant scrutiny committee.

### **Decision**

To endorse the proposals which are relevant to the remit of this Committee.

### **CESC/22/10 Cultural Impact**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided information on the results of the 2020/21 Cultural Impact Survey which

demonstrated how severely the impacts of the pandemic had been felt within the culture sector. An update on workstreams related to the city's Culture Recovery Strategy outlined the role that culture could play in supporting Manchester's social and economic recovery, and the support needed to make this happen. Officers delivered a presentation which provided further detail on the results of the Cultural Impact Survey.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Cultural Impact Survey 2020/21;
- Manchester Culture Awards 2021;
- Cultural recovery;
- Zero carbon; and
- Cultural Consortium.

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

- Opportunities for young people, including work experience and apprenticeships in the culture sector;
- Improving access to the city's cultural offer, including to people from deprived communities;
- Promoting the city's cultural offer internationally;
- The use of digital platforms for cultural events and how prominent a role this was likely to play post-COVID;
- That culture should be considered in its wider sense, for example, street art;
- The culture should reflect the diversity of the city; and
- That residents should be asked how they felt about culture rather than relying on responses from organisations.

The Deputy Leader reported that access to and participation in culture had been a key focus over recent years and that, while there was further work to be done, significant progress had been made in this area. He drew Members' attention to previous reports that the Committee had received on this work. The Director of Culture advised that there were a number of cultural organisations that offered subsidised tickets, in addition to the city's free cultural content, but that the cost of public transport was a barrier for some people and that engagement officers were looking to provide an increased cultural offer in neighbourhoods.

The Director of Culture outlined the work taking place to introduce young people to careers in this sector, including through the Factory Academy and the MADE cultural education partnership. He advised that the culture sector in Manchester and the work taking place here was being promoted internationally, particularly in international professional networks, including hosting an international congress in Manchester through which it was hoped to increase international co-commissioning and international trade. He also informed Members about research being carried out about the music sector in Manchester. He reported that, during the pandemic, there had been a lot of interest in putting cultural events and content online and that this would continue, noting that this had enabled the sector to connect to people who might not come to cultural venues in the city centre; however, he advised that a lot of people were keen to get back into venues, citing that attendance at HOME had

returned to pre-pandemic levels, and, therefore, he did not envisage digital content replacing physical venues and events. In response to a Member's question, he outlined how the Cultural Consortium would enable a wider range of cultural organisations to be involved in the development of plans for the sector. The Principal Resources and Programmes Officer (Culture) reported that private sector organisations were invited to respond to the Cultural Impact Survey, advising that there was a challenge in getting a balance between gathering enough data for monitoring purposes from the organisations which had received funding and not asking for so much data that it deterred other organisations from responding.

In response to a Member's question, the Director of Culture advised that cultural organisations in the city were responsible for less than 1% of the city's carbon emissions and that the majority of its carbon footprint was from transport and that public transport needed to be improved to address this. He informed Members that residents had been asked about culture as part of the research for the State of the City report and that further information could be provided in a future report to the Committee, if Members wished. He outlined the work taking place to improve diversity, particularly of the leadership of the cultural sector, following on from the findings of the study by consultants The Fifth Sector. In response to a Member's concerns that MADE did not reflect the diversity of the city, he advised that he would pass those comments to the leadership of MADE and provide a response.

The Deputy Leader acknowledged that the cultural sector in the city was not currently representative of the diversity of Manchester but advised that there was a commitment from the sector to improve this and that he hoped that the Committee would be able to see significant progress on this if they looked at this again in a year or two.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

[Councillor Azra Ali declared a personal interest as a Board Member of the Halle.]

### **CESC/22/11            Manchester Libraries Strategy Update**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided an update on the Library Strategy and presented future plans.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Delivering the Library Strategy during the pandemic and beyond;
- Contributing to achieving the zero-carbon target for the city;
- The positive impact of libraries on local residents and communities;
- Equality, diversity and inclusion;
- Examples of the range of services provided by Manchester libraries; and
- Archives.

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

- To note the high levels of satisfaction across the city from the Public Library User Survey and to recognise the excellent job that library staff were doing;
- To welcome the investment in library buildings;
- Cultural diversification of library stock; and
- What could be done to encourage library membership, particularly in deprived areas.

The Head of Libraries, Galleries and Culture informed Members that the service had done a lot of work in recent years to ensure that the library stock reflected the community that it was serving, that this would continue and that local residents would be asked what they wanted in their libraries. He highlighted the proposal to remove library fines, advising that this was a barrier to using the library for some people.

In response to a Member's question about Archives, the Citywide Services Manager informed Members that a new web catalogue of Manchester Libraries' archive would be launched within the next few months and he highlighted that Manchester was the northern hub for the 1921 census which enabled people to access it for free.

### **Decision**

To recognise the important role of libraries and the commitment of library staff and volunteers.

### **CESC/22/12 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.





## **Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2022**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Hacking - In the Chair

Councillors Ahmed Ali, Azra Ali, Andrews, Battle, Connolly, M Dar, Evans, Grimshaw, Hilal, Hussain, S Judge, Rawson, Whiston, Wills and Wilson

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Rahman, Deputy Leader

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods

Chief Superintendent Mark Dexter, Greater Manchester Police (GMP)

#### **Apologies:**

Councillor Chambers

### **CESC/22/13 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 8 February 2022 as a correct record.

### **CESC/22/14 Highway Crime**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided a summary of data and information related to policing roads in the city.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Statistics on people killed or seriously injured (KSI) in road traffic collisions;
- The local strategy for road policing;
- Greater Manchester Police (GMP)'s key operations in relation to road policing;
- The work of the Road Safety Partnership;
- Initiatives that engage with road users; and
- Joint work involving GMP and the Council's Highways Service.

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

- Recognising the importance of this issue, noting the number of people killed or seriously injured on Manchester roads and residents' concerns that local roads were unsafe;
- That residents were most concerned about local residential roads, rather than the city's major roads;
- That residents wanted action to be taken more quickly when they raised concerns about the safety of local roads;
- That more action should be taken in response to community speed watch;
- To request further clarification on the increase in resources for the Roads Policing Unit;

- Concern that many Members and residents were not aware of some of the initiatives referred to, indicating that communications needed to be improved;
- The importance of transparency in what schemes would be considered and where, if funding became available;
- Whether this work would be placing more pressure on neighbourhood policing teams; and
- Could the statistics in the report be broken down to a ward level.

The Head of Network Management reported that the Council had previously had a larger road safety programme but this had been reduced as part of the wider budget cuts; however, he advised that this year £2 million had been identified to fund road safety schemes and that it was hoped that further funding could be identified for a further programme. He reported that the number of road accidents was reducing nationally and at a Manchester and Greater Manchester level and that positive work was taking place to improve safety. He informed Members about Transport for Greater Manchester (TFGM)'s plans for a Road Danger Reduction Strategy and reported that the Council was reviewing speed limits across the city.

In response to a Member's question, Chief Superintendent Mark Dexter from GMP clarified that the second table within the report, under the title "OP Considerate - Number of reports by nature of report" related to reports where footage of an incident, from a vehicle's dashboard camera or a cyclist's helmet camera had been provided. He outlined how GMP, under Operation Considerate, was standardising the process for responding to this type of reporting and taking the opportunity to educate or prosecute drivers, as appropriate. He reported that from 2011 onwards funding for road safety and road policing had reduced, which had affected GMP's ability to support community speed watch, but that this was now changing. He advised Members that issues could be raised through local policing tasking meetings and that local police teams had capacity and capability to do some work on road safety on local residential streets, with the central Roads Policing Unit becoming involved to tackle more sustained or more serious road safety issues or those on major arterial routes. He advised that some incidents related to people who were normally law-abiding but had on occasion driven without due care and attention or slightly over the speed limit but that there was another group of recidivist offenders who were not insured and were also carrying out other offences, including using the car while carrying out these crimes. He reported that this group tended to create the most danger on the roads as this was a persistent behaviour and that targeting these offenders on the arterial routes would also improve safety on local roads as this group tended to drive in a dangerous manner wherever they drove. He informed the Committee that the number of police officers in the Roads Policing Unit was being increased from 60 to 120 and that the recruitment process had already started, with some recruitment taking place outside of Greater Manchester to recruit officers who already had the requisite skills. In response to a Member's question, he advised that this expansion of the unit would take GMP to just below the national average in terms of resources for this area of work.

Chief Superintendent Mark Dexter acknowledged the point about improving communications about road safety initiatives, which he advised should be promoted through neighbourhood teams and community groups. He advised that social media communications were mainly via Twitter but that he would take on board a Member's

comment that active community groups tended to use Facebook rather than Twitter, as well as communicating the initiatives through Greater Manchester councils and local meetings. He agreed with a Member's comment that information should not just be communicated via social media. The Head of Network Management reported that information was communicated to Members via the Members' dashboard and the Highways Bulletin and that more information could be included on road safety. The Chair expressed concern that some Members were not aware of the Members' dashboard. The Head of Network Management advised that he would look into this.

In response to a Member's question about off-road bikes, including quad bikes, Chief Superintendent Mark Dexter outlined the approaches GMP used to address this issue and some of the challenges this presented, for example, the risks involved in chasing someone on a quad bike, who was often young, not wearing a helmet and not trained in using it. He also responded to issues relating to motorbikes, advising that the no-pursuit policy for motorbikes had been abandoned, outlining the circumstances where pursuit might be used, and reporting that helicopters and drones could also be used where appropriate. He advised that he would take back to GMP Members' strength of feeling about the issues that bikes were causing in their wards. In response to a Member's comment about dangerous cycling by cyclists working for takeaway delivery companies, he advised that he would take this issue forward and look at what could be done to address this, working with the companies concerned and through education and enforcement. He informed the Committee about the work taking place to take pressure off neighbourhoods policing teams.

The Head of Network Management reported that a record was kept of all requests for road safety schemes and that his service also undertook an analysis to understand where there were hotspots across the city and that this information was used if funding opportunities arose. A Member commented that it would be useful for Members to be told that the Council had a record of the request for a scheme in a particular area and that, should funding become available, it would be introduced, so that they could communicate this to residents.

In response to a Member's concerns that road safety measures would only be put in place on a road after there had been a fatality or serious collision rather than listening to local knowledge, the Head of Network Management reported that the Council did not currently have funding for highway improvement schemes; however, he acknowledged that accidents were under-reported and agreed that basing decisions solely on these figures was not always the best approach, that the local community was often aware of how dangerous a road was and that, when funding for these schemes was available, decisions on where to place them should be based on risk. In response to a Member's comments, he assured the Committee that, before any road safety schemes were taken forward, his service would engage with neighbourhood teams and Ward Councillors.

In response to a Member's question, Chief Superintendent Mark Dexter advised that GMP had a unit dedicated to tackling the criminal use of cars and stolen cars, which also had an effect on road safety. He advised that GMP's Intelligence Data Bureau was being reformed and this improvement would enable data to be provided at a ward level in future. In response to a Member's question, he reported that GMP had

been involved in approximately 600 police pursuits within the last year which had, sadly, resulted in a few fatalities, which were subject to national scrutiny and governance, including by the Independent Office for Police Conduct.

The Chair thanked officers and Chief Superintendent Mark Dexter and asked the Chief Superintendent to pass his thanks onto GMP officers for the work they did.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

### **CESC/22/15          One Year Extension to the Our Manchester Voluntary & Community Sector (OMVCS) and Development Fund Grants Programmes 2022/23**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform which summarised the approach to extending the grant funding arrangements in place with voluntary, community and social enterprise organisations currently funded through the Our Manchester Voluntary and Community Sector (OMVCS) and Development Fund Grants Programmes. The paper presented the process and timescales for this extension throughout the 2022-23 financial year.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- The process timeline;
- The extension proposal form, which asked funded organisations to answer a series of mandatory questions; and
- The RAG rating of organisations and actions where there were concerns.

The Policy and Programmes Manager (Communities and VCSE) informed Members that the Council intended to undertake a co-design process with key stakeholders over the next year in relation to a further Our Manchester VCS Fund running from 2023 to 2026, subject to budget approval. He suggested that the Committee receive a report on this in the next municipal year.

In response to a Member's comment about how the Council was measuring the funded organisations against zero carbon targets, the Policy and Programmes Manager reported that a light touch approach was being taken as this had not been a specific requirement in the original fund but that he expected the refresh of the scheme to reflect the Council's commitments on zero carbon. In response to a Member's question, he informed the Committee how the organisations that had been awarded funding had been monitored to ensure the money was being spent in the way it was intended, while allowing some flexibility, for example, for some services to be delivered online during the pandemic. In response to a Member's request that the organisations' quarterly monitoring reports be scrutinised by the Committee, the Chair advised that it was not appropriate for the Committee to carry out contract management but that these reports could inform the content of future reports to the Committee.

Committee Members raised a number of questions which related to the forthcoming review of the Fund, including how organisations, particularly smaller grassroots groups, which were not currently in receipt of funding could access funding in the next round, how these groups could be supported to get into a position where they were able to successfully bid for funding, how social enterprise organisations could access the fund, Members' involvement in the review and ensuring that black and Asian communities benefited from the fund.

The Deputy Leader advised that the State of the Sector report provided some of the information Members were interested in and that this would be circulated to the Committee. He reported that he would arrange sessions for Members to input into the review of the fund. The Chair welcomed that Members would be able to contribute to the review.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **CESC/22/16 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.

Members noted that this was Councillor Hacking's last meeting as Chair of the Committee and thanked him for his work over the last four years.

### **Decision**

To note the report and agree the work programme.



## Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 8 February 2022

#### Present:

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

#### Also present:

Councillor Craig, Leader  
Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Employment

**Apologies:** Councillor Rowles

#### RGSS/22/07 Minutes

#### Decision

The Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2022 as a correct record.

#### RGSS/22/08 Corporate Core Budget Report 2022/23

Further to minute (RGSC/21/46), the Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and City Solicitor, which provided a further update on the saving proposals being proposed as part of the 2022/23 budget process.

Key points and themes of the report included:-

- Following the Spending Review announcements and provisional local government finance settlement 2022/23 the Council was forecasting a balanced budget for 2022/23, a gap of £37m in 2023/24 and £58m by 2024/25;
- Overall, the settlement announcement was towards the positive end of expectations and it was expected that mitigations in the region of £7.7m, as previously identified, would be sufficient to balance the 2022/23 budget;
- The budget assumptions that underpinned 2022/23 to 2024/25 included the commitments made as part of the 2021/22 budget process to fund ongoing demand pressures as well as provision to meet other known pressures such as inflation and any pay awards (estimated at 3% from 2022/23);
- Whilst this contributed to the scale of the budget gap it was important that a realistic budget was set which reflected ongoing cost and demand pressures;
- The focus would now be on identifying savings and mitigations to keep the Council on a sustainable financial footing; and
- It was proposed that budget cuts and savings of £60m over three years would be developed for Member consideration which equated to just under 12% of 2022/23 directorate budgets. In addition, £30m of risk-based reserves had been identified as available to manage risk and timing differences.

The Leader advised that whilst there was no major changes to the proposed budget following the report in November, a decade of austerity had resulted in £420 million having been removed from the Council's budget, resulting in a 15% reduction in spending power compared to a national average of 2.4% and if Manchester had had the national average applied to its budget, it would have a further £85 million in its budget today.

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

- The Council found itself in a situation of uncertainty with just having a one year settlement, forcing it to make preparations for massive reductions in budgets which could have been avoided if the Council had received a longer Finance Settlement;
- The Committee applauded the commitment by the Council to continue to provide Free School Meals during school holidays to those who were entitled to free school meals attending schools and early year settings;
- It would be useful to receive more stringent proposals regarding the capital investment to support carbon reduction measures on the Council's corporate estate at a future meeting;
- What progress had been made on the potential naming rights for The Factory and what guarantee was there that the loan to The Factory Trust, provided by way of grant, underwritten by the Council's MIF reserve would be repaid;
- Assurance was sought that in identifying a suitable naming rights partner, the Council would ensure its reputation would not be adversely impacted;
- More information was requested on the HR/OD service redesign saving proposals;
- Had there been any indication whether there would be any associated administration costs to help support the Government's announcement that people would get a £150 council tax rebate in April to help with the cost of energy;
- Was there any indication yet on what the pay award for staff will be yet;
- With the increase in energy and food costs, was the Council expecting an increase in the number of residents that struggled to pay their Council Tax; and
- Were the proposed savings associated with operational property as a result of the Council exiting leases of office space or the sale of council owned buildings.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that there was a report being considered by the Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee that set out the details of the investments made to date into the Council's climate change agenda which supported the Action Plan and proposals for additional investment in the next financial year.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that work was underway in terms of fundraising for The Factory. The partner to assist in finding a suitable naming rights partner had been procured and was working closely with the Council and commercial discussions were underway. The proposal of the loan was to underwrite any cashflow issues from the reserves that was funding the future grant for MIF, which was a deliberate decision to avoid a cost to the Council. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer assured the Committee that comments made by this committee previously in relation to the naming rights had been taken on board



and there was a strong ethical policy that sat alongside the agreements. The Leader emphasised this point, advising that she chaired The factory Board, which received regular updates in terms of how money was being spent as well as the progress being made around the naming rights.

In relation to the proposed HR/OD service redesign saving proposals, it was explained that in terms of the Corporate Core, there were two sets of savings, one being the adjustment to the vacancy factor and the other being through staffing changes as part of a service redesign which would be completed in quarter 4 of 2021/22.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that negotiations on the staff pay award were still taking place and a decision in the percentage increase had not concluded. In terms of the £150 council tax rebate, it was confirmed that there would be new burdens funding, but the allocation had not yet been determined.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer explained that it was difficult to determine what the impact of rising energy and food costs would be at this stage. Those on lower incomes did receive financial Council Tax support and the service also provided additional support around helping those getting into financial difficulty. In relation to the proposed savings associated with operational property, the Council was exiting two office buildings within the city centre.

## Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Endorse the budget proposals.
- (2) Endorse the recommendations that the Executive:-
  - Note the development of the funding agreement set out in Appendix 1.
  - Support the initial underwriting of the Factory Trust fundraising costs by way of a grant agreement, to be met from the Council's existing MIF reserve and reimbursed when fund raising is received, and delegate to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and City Solicitor to finalise the grant agreement, including any conditions for drawdown and repayment.
  - Approve lease arrangements with delegation to finalise the details to Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and City Solicitor.
  - Continue the support to families to provide free school meals for the 2022 Easter Holiday at £15 per pupil per week. Vouchers will be distributed to households on a pupil basis via schools. This will be funded in line with the arrangements set out in Appendix 1 of this report.
  - Note the Chancellors announcement on the proposal for a £150 council tax rebate for all band A-D properties.
  - Delegate to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in conjunction with the Leader of the Council the finalising the detail of the administration of the council tax 'rebate' £150 payment.
  - Delegate to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in conjunction with the Leader of the Council responsibility for designing and implement the discretionary support scheme. The scheme will be reported back to March Executive.

## **RGSS/22/09 Housing Revenue Account 2022/23 to 2024/25**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) and the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which set out the details on the proposed Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget for 2022/23 and an indication of the 2023/24 and 2024/25 budgets.

Key points and themes of the report included:-

- The HRA Budget Position for 2021/22, which as of December 2021, was forecasting that net expenditure would be £11.621m lower than budget, inked to delays in capital projects;
- Although the expenditure is lower than originally forecast, it is still more than the annual income and the forecast in-year deficit of £5.073m will be drawn down from the HRA reserve
- The Budget Strategy 2022/23 - 2024/25,
- The management of Housing Stock and the implications of “Right to Buy” on rental income;
- Details of the various budget assumptions;
- A proposed 4.1% increase to dwelling rents and garage rents
- A proposal to establish a £200,000 hardship fund to support vulnerable tenants; and
- The Reserves Forecast 2022/22 to 2024/25

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

- Whilst welcoming the proposed hardship fund, what was the timeframe for the distribution of these funds;
- Would the hardship fund be available to just Council housing tenants or for also other social housing tenants;
- PFI housing partners should be encouraged to contribute to the hardship funding;
- In relation to investment proposals, was there scope in the budget for any additional HRA council housing;
- Was there any indication from Government of additional funding to assist in the retrofitting of existing properties to achieve zero carbon targets, either direct to Manchester or via the Combined Authority;
- What lobbying was taking place to address the need for further government funding to deliver more social rent homes in Manchester and when was the current round of this policy going to be reviewed;
- How many properties associated with the operational overspend of £0.947 where council properties;
- Clarity was sought on the proposed heating tariffs;
- What was the current level of bad debt and consequently how had it been determined that the ongoing forecast requirement was 1% for the life of the plan;

- What was the capital expenditure on fire safety and what was anticipated to be the level of spend required to meet legislative requirements and the cost of going beyond this requirement to meet any potential future changes in legislation;
- What funding was being allocated on the decent homes programme, with reference around improved kitchen and bathroom facilities

The Director of Housing Operations advised that the process for distributing the hardship fund would be finalised over the coming weeks using the established mechanisms in place for welfare support use during the Covid crisis.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment confirmed that the hardship fund would only be available to tenants in council owned housing stock (Northwards) and those in Council controlled housing stock, including tenants who resided in properties within the two PFI schemes. Other Registered Providers were also establishing their own hardship funds to support their tenants

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment advised that the current budget outlined the two housing schemes and also investment in existing stock in terms of air source heat pumps, thermal insulation and triple glazing and improving existing stock to net zero carbon standards. Further capital outlay into further housing stock was an ambition of the HRA to deliver on the Council's priorities in delivering social rent homes in north and east Manchester.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment advised he would look into when the current policy on government funding for more social rent homes was to be removed. He added a lot of work had taken place on safety improvements to towers blocks and money was set aside on the HRA to continue this work. In addition, he reported that Greater Manchester had been successful in receiving £10.5 million to help with the retrofit works. Details of how this was to be distributed were yet to be announced but Manchester would be lobbying strongly to get a fair share of this.

The Head of Finance agreed to provide details following the meeting on the number social HRA properties that were contributing to the operational overspend. He also advised that as the increase in gas prices was at present unknown, Officers had outlined a range of various pricing models to give an indication of what the increase could potentially be and was based on the volume of consumption against price. He also agreed to confirm why the pay by point of sale for Northwards 2/4 Blocks was not proposed to increase in comparison to other schemes.

The Committee was advised that in relation to bad debt, there had been an underspend for the last few years as the impact of the roll out of Universal Credit and the pandemic had been lower than originally forecasted. Therefore, the business plan had been adjusted for 2022/23 onwards. The forecast provision for bad debt in 2021/22 was around 0.65% of rental income, and so the ongoing forecast requirement of 1% for the life of the plan was a 0.5% reduction from the previous assumption in the business plan. The collection rates and level of bad debts would be kept under review

The Director of Housing Operations advised that the majority of capital programme spend over the last two years had been on fire safety and compliance. In terms of the Asset Management priorities, these had been focussed on decent homes, re-roofing, widow replacement and replacement of kitchen and bathrooms. He agreed to provide the Capital Programme to members of the committee for information.

## **Decision**

The Committee note the report.

### **RGSS/22/10 Strategic Communications three-year strategy and service priorities**

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Strategic Communications that provided an update on the Council's three-year communications strategy, to be adopted from April 2022.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The communications priorities for 2022/23;
- The social media strategy implemented in 2021; and
- Example of the monthly evaluation template.

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

- Did staff from the team work at weekends to deliver messages via social media, noting the importance of accurate civil contingency messaging;
- Was social media used to encourage residents to respond to consultations and used as a platform for people to submit detailed considered responses;
- Would there be the ability for members of the public to upload photographs online when reporting issues or making a request for service to the Council;
- More information was requested on the work of the translation service and calling for the need to promote the work of this service, particularly noting their work in supporting residents during the pandemic;
- Noting that the issue of digital exclusion was an issue for many residents across the city; and
- Did the service work with the Revenues and Benefits Unit.

The Head of Strategic Communications responded to the comments and questions by advising that colleagues did work at weekends; however he noted the specific concerns raised by the Member regarding the recent flooding events and advised that he would look into this following the meeting. He commented that the team worked closely with the local Neighbourhood Teams to assist them with the delivery of key messaging and communications. He advised that clear English and the approved accessibility standards were used in the delivery of communications, adding that they did work with the Revenues and Benefit Unit.

The Head of Strategic Communications recognised the importance of the translation service in delivering this work, particularly during the pandemic and the work underway across the city to address health inequalities, adding that they were

integral to the successful delivery of front-line services. He further made reference to their work when helping support recent arrivals to the city, most recently from Afghanistan. He advised that there were over 200 languages spoken in the city, and the service engaged with local sounding boards to ensure the service responded to the needs of the residents in the city. He suggested that the Committee might wish to consider scheduling a specific report on the work of the translation service.

The Head of Strategic Communications stated that all direct correspondence from residents to the Council via social media was monitored and where appropriate referred to the relevant teams for attention or action. He stated that digital conversations across a range of platforms were reviewed to understand the nature of these conversations that were relevant to the organisation. With reference to consultations, he advised that these had to comply with specific legal guidance.

The Head of Strategic Communications spoke on the issue of digital exclusion and made reference to the range of information and advice that was provided off line. He further discussed the work to improve digital access with both schools and the libraries service. In addition, he mentioned the relationships established with local health providers as a means of strengthening the reach from the Council to vulnerable groups.

The Head of Customer Services advised that the implementation of the RBDXP system, due to be implemented from the summer of 2023 to replace the Council's current CRM system would allow for residents to upload photographs, noting that the current system did not support that function. He further added that this would also be linked to a GPS system to assist with the accurate identification of locations where there was a request for service. He further advised that the possibility of sending a response photograph to demonstrate what action had been taken would be explored.

## **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

### **RGSS/22/11 Future Shape of the Council – Digital, Estates, Ways of Working and ICT strategy**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update on the Future Shape Programme including an update on Development of the ICT Strategy and the Estates Strategy (linked to how we worked) and how they related to the programme.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The Future Council programme objectives and overview of workstreams;
- An overview of the digitally integrated council workstream;
- The role of ICT in the successful delivery of the programme, along with progress to date on the draft ICT Strategy and future target operating model for the service; and
- The role of Estates and ways of working in the successful delivery of the programme.

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

- Whilst supporting the ambitions described it was important to recognise that many residents experienced digital exclusion, as a result of a range of reasons and the need to ensure that residents could contact the Council through traditional methods, such as via a telephone call;
- Noting the importance of reliable WIFI and appropriate devices to ensure staff could undertake their work in an appropriate and safe manner, with particular reference to the important work of Social Workers;
- Information was sought as to the delivery and nature of Social Value as part of this programme of work;
- What security measures were in place for devices, such as laptops that staff were now asked to bring with them to allow them to work in offices and remotely; and
- Requesting that a briefing note be circulated to members of the Committee that described the discussions and agreements reached regarding staff health and safety considerations and mobile working.

The Head of Customer Services recognised the comments expressed regarding the need to maintain the provision of face-to-face appointments and telephone contact as a means for residents to contact the Council. He stated that these would continue to be provided. He advised that the programme described would improve all channels of communications. The Leader commented that in the previous two years the contact centre had taken in excess of 400,000 calls each year and suggested that this would be captured in future update reports to provide an assurance to the Committee.

The Director of ICT stated that he recognised the importance of WIFI for staff, including Social Workers, to enable them to undertake their duties. He described that services and sites, such as district offices where Social Workers were located would be prioritised as part of the implementation plan, noting the global supply issue that had hampered the delivery of the project, however he advised the Committee that this issue had been escalated with the supplier.

The Director of ICT stated that Social Value would be delivered through the contracts awarded in the delivery of this programme, with an emphasis on the Year of the Child. The Leader stated that a more detailed report on the delivery of Social Value across this and a range of projects could be provided for consideration at a future meeting.

The Director of ICT commented that a briefing note could be provided to all Members regarding the proposals for the IT arrangements in the Members work room. The Deputy Leader stated that a fixed PC would be available for Members in the work room.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer informed the Committee that a significant amount of work had been undertaken with Health and Safety colleagues to ensure the devices and laptop bags selected for staff were appropriate and all devices were encrypted, adding that the laptops also replaced the traditional landline, and that where required the appropriate devices were used, such as using mobile phones for Social Workers.

## **Decision**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report.
- (2) Recommends that a briefing note be circulated to members of the Committee that describes the discussions and agreements reached regarding staff health and safety considerations and mobile working.

## **RGSS/22/12 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 included the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to amend as appropriate and agree.

Following a comment from a Member, the Chair asked that an update to the outstanding recommendation, detailed at section one of the report 'Monitoring Previous Recommendations' be provided.

## **Decision**

The Committee notes the report and agrees the Committee's Work Programme.





## **Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 8 March 2022**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors Ahmed Ali, Andrews, Hitchen, Lanchbury, B Priest, Robinson, Simcock and Wheeler

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Craig, Leader

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods

Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Employment

**Apologies:** Councillor Davies, Rowles and Wright

#### **RGSS/22/14 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

The Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on 8 February 2022 as a correct record.

#### **RGSS/22/15 Housing Services Advisory Committee March Update**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) and Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update to the Committee on the proposed new governance arrangements in respect of the Council Housing Stock.

Key points and themes of the report included:-

- The new advisory committee was intended to provide oversight of the housing management and maintenance services (formerly Northwards ALMO);
- The advisory committee would make a significant contribution to empowering tenants and ensuring that North Manchester residents helped shape and hold to account the Council's Housing Service; and
- Set out the responses to the RAGOS recommendations of December 2021.

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

- Would meetings of the Northwards Housing Service Advisory Committee be held in public;
- Would papers for such meetings be made available to all Councillors with Northwards Housing properties in their wards;
- What were the quorum arrangements for these meetings;
- Recognising the number of response from tenants, this engagement and interest needed to be built upon and harnessed; and

- Consideration needed to be given to establishing Neighbourhood Panels to capture local tenant voices that could then feed into the Northwards Housing Service Advisory Committee.

The Director of Housing Operations advised Members that meetings of the Northwards Housing Service Advisory Committee would be held in public, in North Manchester at the request of the tenants. He confirmed that the quorum would be five, comprised of resident and elected members. He confirmed that the papers for these meetings would be shared with all elected Members with Northwards Housing properties in their wards. He advised that the recruitment for the co-opted Member was currently ongoing. In response to a specific question, he confirmed that if the number of Council managed properties increased these proposed governance arrangements would be reviewed.

The Executive Member advised that he did not wish to duplicate work and structures that already existed across neighbourhoods and he did not wish to appear to be prescriptive in how the Advisory Committee operated. He commented that it would be appropriate to ask that the Advisory Committee consider how the wider resident voice was best captured and fed into the Committee, noting the need to capture the diversity of views of all tenants. He advised that information on how this had been progressed would be reported in any future update report to the Committee.

## **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

## **RGSS/22/16 Manchester City Council Peer Review and Action Plan**

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Executive that described that Manchester City Council had requested a Corporate Peer Review from the Local Government Association (LGA) which had taken place from 30 November to 3 December 2021.

Key points and themes of the report included:-

- The overall feedback from the peer reviewers was very positive for both the Council and the city;
- The peer review report highlighted seven areas for improvement that align with the Council's existing Corporate and Business Plan priorities;
- An action plan had been drafted to address these issues; and
- A follow-up visit for the peer reviewers to check in on progress will be arranged for September 2022.

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

- Welcoming the many positive findings of the review;
- Noting that the strength of scrutiny in Manchester was recognised and the Committee paid tribute to all of the officers who supported this important function;
- The need to measure progress and outcomes against the action plan;

- The need to ensure that all staff, regardless of grade were aware of the ambitions of the action plan and their role in delivering this, adding that this needed to be explicit within the actions;
- Welcoming the commitment to address poverty and inequalities; and
- Paying tribute to all staff working across the Neighbourhood Teams and recognising the important work they deliver on behalf of the residents of the city.

The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform advised that the action plan would be shared more widely with partners, including the Our Manchester Investment Board and all managers within the Council would discuss the plan and the key themes with staff and would inform the ongoing 1 to 1's with staff. This would further inform the approach to wider staff development initiatives.

The Leader welcomed the positive comments from the Members and paid tribute to the officers who had facilitated the peer review. She commented that the review had been undertaken in the spirit of a critical friend and they had identified many strengths and positive examples of progress and leadership by the Council to improve outcomes for residents, especially in the context of the budget restraints. She stated that the Council had been identified as being able to adapt and respond positively to challenges. She commented that one of the findings was that the Council needed to talk more positively and promote the many positive initiatives and improvements we had delivered, noting this was very unusual for a peer review to recommend.

The Leader stated that the strength, arrangements and approach to scrutiny in Manchester had been recognised as very positive, noting that scrutiny presented a robust challenge to the Executive.

The Leader commented that it was understood that the work to address inequalities and adverse health outcomes was a strand of work that cut across all aspects of the work of the Council, adding that this was informed and strengthened by the work undertaken with Professor Michael Marmot. She advised that progress against this work to reduce inequities and improve outcomes for residents was captured in the State of the City report and she recommended that each of the scrutiny committees would continue to monitor progress of the action plan throughout the year, adding that consideration would be given to include targets and reports outcomes.

The Leader stated that consideration would continue to be given as to how the Capital Programme Budget aligned to neighbourhood priorities.

## **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

## **RGSS/22/17 Progress Made With Council Motions Over Last 24 Months**

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that provided an update on the progress made in respect of motions that have been passed before Manchester City Council over the last 2 years.

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

- Recommending that an annual report on the Progress Made With Council Motions be submitted to the Committee for consideration;
- The annual report should be circulated to all Members of the Council; and
- Noting that motions passed at Council had influenced Government policy and had articulated the concerns and issues experienced by Manchester residents.

The Leader commented that consideration would be given as how to best to capture all of the activities that arose following the passing of a Council motion, mindful of the difference between officer activity and political activity.

The City Solicitor advised that further information on the recent Spiking motion would be circulated following the meeting.

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report and recommends that an annual update report is submitted for consideration at an appropriate time.

### **RGSS/22/18 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 included the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to amend as appropriate and agree.

The Chair noted that the new Chair and Committee would hold a work programming session at the meeting in May, the first meeting of the new municipal year to consider the Work Programme. Noting the comments and requests for future reports when the Committee considered the previous agenda items.

### **Decision**

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

### **RGSS/22/19 Vote of thanks**

The Committee recognised that this would be the last meeting that Councillor Russell would attend in her capacity as Chair. Members wished to place on record their appreciation for her dedication and commitment to the work of the Committee.

## Health Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2022

#### Present:

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

#### Also present:

Councillor Midgley, Deputy Leader  
Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment  
Sir Richard Leese, Chair Designate of the Integrated Care Board for Greater Manchester  
Dr Manisha Kumar, Executive Clinical Director, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC)  
Dr Raja Murugesan, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
Ed Dyson, Executive Director of Strategy & Deputy Chief Accountable Officer, MHCC

### HSC/22/07 Minutes

#### Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2022 as a correct record.

### HSC/22/08 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.

Key points and themes in the presentation included:

- The latest headline figures for the 7 days ending 2 February 2022;
- An update on the vaccination programme with particular reference to the vaccine coverage, vaccine equity, the 12–17 year old programme and the Overseas Pilot;
- Information on the Communications and Engagement Plans; and
- Pregnancy and COVID-19 and the related targeted engagement work.

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

- Welcoming the report and acknowledging the information that had been provided surrounding pregnancy following the discussion at the previous meeting;
- What was the approach to ensuring those vulnerable residents who required a fourth vaccination were being contacted;
- What advice was being given to enable care homes to safely manage any outbreaks of COVID-19;

- Noting that the vaccination rates in Manchester were low compared to the national data;
- The need to promote and emphasise the message of the wider social responsibility of receiving the vaccination;
- The need to publicise people's experience of suffering with COVID who had not taken up the offer of a vaccination;
- Were Further Education settings included in the communications strategy, adding that work needed to be done to challenge the myths surrounding pregnancy and the vaccination amongst young people;
- Thanking the officers within the Neighbourhood Teams for their continued good work and support they continued to provide to local communities; and
- The need to use trusted voices on social media to disrupt myths surrounding COVID-19 and the vaccination.

The Director of Public Health advised that if an outbreak of COVID occurred in a care home setting each home would be supported to manage the outbreak appropriately, using all of the national guidance.

The Executive Clinical Director, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning acknowledged the comments raised regarding the promotion of the vaccination both in terms of social responsibility and using lived experiences as a lever to encourage people to come forward. She added that any promotional and educational campaign would require sensitivity when using an individual's personal experience to articulate the impact of COVID-19 on both families and individuals.

The Executive Clinical Director further advised that there was an audit underway of GP records to identify those vulnerable patients who would be eligible for a fourth jab, adding that if Members had concerns about an individual, they should encourage them to contact their GP surgery. She further commented that this exercise also assisted with ensuring that all Learning Disabled citizens were supported to obtain their vaccination in an appropriate setting for them.

The Director of Public Health advised that following this exercise of auditing GP records a bench marking exercise could be undertaken to more accurately report on how Manchester compared to other comparative areas on the rates of vaccinations. The Executive Clinical Director added that the work being delivered as part of the Overseas Pilot would also contribute to the accurate recording of the levels of vaccinations within the city.

The Head of Strategic Communications stated that Colleges were included as part of the wider communications strategy, however he would enquire if the specific issue raised by a Member surrounding pregnancy was included. He commented that it was important that the person delivering the message was a trusted voice. He stated that the Council's Communications Tool Kit was shared with trusted community groups and Sounding Boards.

The Head of Neighbourhoods stated that officers continued to engage with residents at local neighbourhood events, including specific COVID vaccination events to understand the reasons and barriers as to why they had not come forward sooner, and this learning and intelligence was collected and reflected upon.

## Decision

To note the presentation and to pay tribute to all staff, including those across the Neighbourhood Teams and partners working to address COVID-19.

### **HSC/22/09 Health and Social Care - Adult Social Care and Population Health Budget 2022/23**

Further to minute (HSC/21/45) the Committee considered the report of the Executive Director Adult Social Services and Director of Public Health which provided a further update on the saving proposals being proposed as part of the 2022/23 budget process.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Following the Spending Review announcements and provisional local government finance settlement 2022/23 the Council was forecasting a balanced budget for 2022/23, a gap of £37m in 2023/24 and £58m by 2024/25;
- The finance settlement was towards the positive end of forecasts and no actions beyond those outlined in November were required to balance next year's budget;
- The settlement was for one year only and considerable uncertainty remained from 2023/24;
- 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 £60m over the next three years;
- £30m of risk-based reserves had been identified as available to manage risk and timing differences;
- A description of the Adult Social Care Priorities;
- An overview of the Manchester City Council Adult Social Care Budget and Manchester Local Care Organisation aligned budget; and
- The capital budget and pipeline priorities.

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

- The need to explicitly articulate the demand on the Adult Social Care budget and the services that the Council is statutory responsible to deliver, in the context of continued austerity and budget cuts;
- The need for a fair, long term financial settlement for the city;
- The budget should be used to address the recognised health inequalities within the city;
- The Government was in denial of challenges faced by the NHS;
- Paying tribute to the Deputy Leader and officers and NHS partners for their continued commitment to protecting the most vulnerable residents within the city; and
- Was there any possibility of further additional one off funding sources.

In response to comments the Director of Finance (MLCO) stated that there were no further additional one off sources of funding, adding that the integrated approach to

the budget ensured that there was an appropriate use of the budget and resources available.

The Deputy Leader commented that whilst the overall settlement announcement was towards the positive end of expectations, this did not constitute being a good settlement and the Council had lost over £400m from its budget since 2010. If the Council had received the average level of cuts in funding, this year it would have at least £85m in its budget. The Council was also still dealing with the legacy of the COVID pandemic and the promise from government that it would compensate local authorities with whatever they needed. She added that it was not possible to undo a decade of cuts with a settlement in one year that was not as severe as anticipated and looking beyond next financial year there was significant worries which meant that the Council needed to continue its call for fair and sustainable funding.

The Deputy Leader commented that whilst the settlement was better than anticipated, the Council still faced a very challenging three year budget position. In 2022/23 the Council would be using the last of its commercial income reserve to help balance the budget and there was a remaining budget gap of approximately £37m in 2023/24 and £58m in 2024/25. As the settlement announcement was for only one year, the Council was facing increasing uncertainty with proposals around fairer funding reforms and the implications of these.

The Deputy Leader commented that the ASC budget accounted for 35% of the Councils overall budget as it was required to provide statutory services and the settlement provided no additional funding for increased demand in ASC. She stated that a fair, sustainable plan was needed in order to plan effectively so as to provide essential services for Manchester residents.

The Chair welcomed the inclusion of addressing climate action within the Population Health Team's priorities for 2022-23. She further commented that the Committee would schedule an item on the Work Programme to consider the Equalities Impact Assessment of the Better Outcomes, Better Lives programme.

## **Decision**

The Committee note the report and endorse a recommendation that the Executive approve these budget proposals.

### **HSC/22/10 An Introduction to the Impact of Climate Change on Health and Healthcare in Manchester**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Public Health that provided an introduction to climate change in Manchester and the city's ambitions and activities to date. The report provided an overview of the impact that climate change was having, and was predicted to have in the future, on the health of Manchester's residents and the potential impacts on healthcare services and facilities in Manchester.

Key points and themes in the report included:



- Providing an introduction and background, noting that in July 2019, Manchester City Council declared a Climate Emergency which recognised the need for the Council, and the city as a whole, to do more to reduce carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions and mitigate the negative impacts of climate change;
- Noting that the Our Manchester Strategy set out the commitment that *‘Manchester will play its full part in limiting the impacts of climate change’* and the subsequent Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25 and its four headline objectives;
- Providing an overview of the reports published recently that had emphasised the link between climate change and its impact on health;
- Recognising the need to consider vulnerability as well as hazard and exposure to climate change if we were able to gain a full appreciation of the risk;
- Discussing the implications of extreme weather events and the activities in Manchester to mitigate against these;
- Noting that air pollution presented a significant public health problem and describing the activities in Manchester to mitigate against this, including an update on the introduction of the Clean Air Zone;
- Providing a discussion on the relationship between food and climate and providing an overview of the work of the Manchester Food Board;
- The relationship between mental health and climate change; and
- Health Care System and Services and the steps taken to reduce emissions.

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

- Welcoming the establishment of the Health and Wellbeing Climate Change Advisory Group, and noting the partners involved in this group;
- Recognising the impact that poor air quality had on health outcomes, particularly for young people and elderly residents;
- The need to acknowledge the harmful effects of particulate matter when considering air quality;
- The need for air quality data to be easily accessible; and
- That a report on the climate change action plans of the local NHS Trusts be considered at an appropriate time, noting that this should include the consideration given to improving the existing estate.

Dr Raja Murugesan, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning advised that he was a member of the Manchester Climate Change Agency and Partnership. He advised that the priority for the NHS currently was post COVID recovery, and this included a green and sustainable recovery with climate change as a consideration of all decision making. He further commented that the harmful effects of particulates and poor air quality was recognised and understood.

The Head of Environment, Planning and Infrastructure advised that the issue of poor air quality was being addressed at a Greater Manchester level, in addition to the Council’s active travel plans and wider connectivity plans for the city, with particular reference to the planned improved public transport links to the Manchester Airport site. He further commented that air quality monitoring data was available on the Greater Manchester Clean Air website.

The Director of Public Health stated that the Manchester Public Health Annual Report 2018 was dedicated to the issue of air quality and would be recirculated to Members following the meeting and that air quality data continued to be monitored and reported. He suggested that a specific report on air quality could be provided to a future meeting for consideration.

The Executive Member for Environment advised that all Members had been involved in the production of their ward Climate Action Plans, noting that the relationship between climate change and health outcomes was understood. She further advised that the Council's Climate Change Action Plan and the Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25 would be refreshed, and health considerations and specific actions would be incorporated. She further advised of local campaigns with schools to promote clean air and other environmental initiatives that had been supported by Neighbourhood Teams, adding that it was the intention to roll out the School Streets initiative across the city. She further advised the Committee that a report on the work of the Manchester Food Board had been considered by the Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee at their meeting of 13 January 2022.

The Chair noted that this was the first time a substantive report on health and climate change had been considered by the Committee. She stated that consideration would be given to scheduling further detailed themed reports on this important issue, noting the various specific issues that had been discussed at the meeting, such as the opportunity to consider the climate change action plans for each of the NHS Trusts in Manchester.

The Chair further stated that the relationship between health and climate change was an important issue and supported the inclusion of the specific work stream within the Marmot Build Back Fairer in Greater Manchester: Health Equality and Dignified Lives to address this.

The Deputy Leader stated that the importance and immediacy of addressing climate change was understood. She stated that she supported the Chair's comments regarding future, deep dive reports on specific issues relating to climate change and health, adding that she would discuss this further with the Chair.

## **Decision**

The Committee recommend that the Chair, in consultation with the Deputy Leader and Executive Member for Environment, agree the topic and scope of future quarterly reports on the issue of health and climate change, such as of interest such as air quality and food. These reports are to be included on the Work Programme and scheduled for consideration at an appropriate time.

[Councillor Appleby declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in this item as she is an employee of the Manchester College]

## **HSC/22/11 The Greater Manchester Integrated Care Board**

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director of Strategy & Deputy Chief Accountable Officer, MHCC that provided an update on the establishment of a

Greater Manchester Integrated Care System / Integrated Care Board (ICB) and Manchester Locality Board.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Subject to legislation passing through parliament, Integrated Care Systems (ICS) would be established in England from 1 July 2022;
- The report described the four aims of the ICS and the national core building blocks of an ICS;
- Greater Manchester would witness a shift from the Greater Manchester Health & Social Care Partnership (GMHSCP) arrangements to a new Greater Manchester ICS and Integrated Care Board (ICB);
- Integrated Care Board would take on the functions of Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs) which would be disestablished on the 30th June 2022;
- Manchester City Council and NHS leaders had both contributed to the developing GM ICS and ICB arrangements and worked to develop locality arrangements for the City of Manchester;
- Describing the arrangements and function of the Manchester Partnership Board, noting that it would comprise of political, clinical and managerial leadership;
- Sir Richard Leese had been appointed Chair designate of the Greater Manchester ICB along with two non-executive directors; and
- An update on the refreshed Manchester Locality Plan which would ensure that local priorities continued to be delivered during the transition to the new arrangements in 2022/23.

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

- Recognising the sound foundations that had been established within Manchester to continue to support the continued integration of health and social care to deliver the best health outcomes for Manchester residents;
- Did the Chair Designate of the Integrated Care Board recognise the concerns expressed that the model would present an opportunity for privatisation of the NHS;
- Who would be responsible for the commissioning of dental services, noting the importance of commissioning preventative dental services;
- Would the new model be more transparent and accountable in its decision making process;
- The need to address the issue of staff recruitment and retention, recognising that this was a local and national issue;
- The need to improve the physical infrastructure of the health service estate, noting that this also related to the climate change report that was on the meeting's agenda;
- The Board needed to reflect the diversity of the city; and
- The need to recognise the significant impact the previous two years had had on staff working in the NHS to respond to the pandemic and any reorganisation needed to be managed sensitively with support offered to all staff impacted by change.

The Chair Designate of the Integrated Care Board stated that the proposed Manchester Locality Plan model and governance arrangements were a positive development to deliver improved health and care. He stated that this built upon the established and trusted relationships across partners in the city. He advised that he recognised the comments raised regarding the privatisation of services, however commented that he did not share these concerns. He further addressed the question regarding transparency and accountability by advising that the establishment of the Locality Boards as part of the GM Operating Model and governance arrangements would be accountable to both the Council and the ICB. He further commented that there would be increased public engagement as the model became established and encouraged local Councillors to be the voice of their residents also.

The Chair Designate of the Integrated Care Board stated that the wider determinants of health were fully recognised and the Marmot Beacon Indicators would be used as a measure to report progress and outcomes, adding that he remained committed to addressing health inequalities in Manchester and the wider city region.

The Chair Designate of the Integrated Care Board acknowledged the comments regarding the estate infrastructure, adding that he had undertaken a number of visits to various sites and witnessed the challenges. He commented that the NHS had been significantly underfunded for a number of years and required appropriate funding from central government. He further recognised the comments regarding the issue of recruitment and retention of staff and the challenge this presented, adding that work was ongoing to best manage and work with existing resources.

The Chair Designate of the Integrated Care Board stated that the removal of competition between local NHS Trusts was a positive improvement, adding that there was now a duty for them to collaborate.

The Executive Director of Strategy & Deputy Chief Accountable Officer, MHCC acknowledged the comments made regarding staff wellbeing during the organisational changes. He commented that this was fully appreciated and recognised.

The Executive Director of Strategy & Deputy Chief Accountable Officer, MHCC referred to the discussion regarding the provision of dental services and noted that the Committee had considered this item at their meeting of 8 September 2021 (see minute ref HSC/21/35). He advised that currently NHS England commissioned dental services, however the legislation did allow for the commissioning of certain functions to be delegated to the ICS.

The Deputy Leader thanked the officers for the report and recognised the significant amount of work that had been undertaken to progress this work. She reiterated the point that Manchester had already established strong partnership working across the city to integrate health and care services. She commented that all partners continued to demonstrate their stated commitment to addressing health inequalities and that the Marmot Beacon Indicators would be used to measure outcomes and progress.

## **Decision**

To note the report and recommend that an update report be included on the Work Programme and scheduled for consideration at an appropriate time.

### **HSC/22/12 Overview Report**

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

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report and agrees the work programme.



## Health Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2022

#### Present:

Councillor Green – in the Chair  
Councillors Appleby, Curley, Hussain, Newman, Reeves, Riasat and Richards

**Apologies:** Councillor Monaghan

#### Also present:

Councillor Midgley, Deputy Leader  
Councillor Reid, Ward Councillor for Gorton and Abbey Hey  
Dr Manisha Kumar, Executive Clinical Director, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
Jay Patient, Be Well Service Manager, Big Life Group  
Ian Green, PCN Coach, Big Life Group  
Steve Quinlan, Link Worker, Big Life Group  
Lynne Warburton, Pathways CIC  
George Ramsay, citizen of Manchester  
Gaynor Heaton, citizen of Manchester

### HSC/22/13 Minutes

#### Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2022 as a correct record.

### HSC/22/14 Living Safely and Fairly with Covid

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Public Health and the Medical Director, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning that described that following recent national announcements the Director of Public Health, council colleagues and other partners had been developing the local Manchester Living Fairly and Safely with Covid draft plan. This draft plan had been circulated to Members for consideration in advance of the meeting.

Key points and themes in the plan included:

- Summary of our Covid-19 response so far;
- Covid-19 Inequalities;
- Epidemiology, including possible future scenarios;
- National Living Safely with Covid-19 Strategy key information;
- Building a shared understanding of what 'living safely and fairly with Covid-19' meant for Manchester – our approach, what we would do and inequalities considerations;
- Local Governance arrangements;
- Our 12-point plan for Living Safely and Fairly with Covid-19 in Manchester; and
- Resource requirements.

The Committee further considered the joint presentation of the Director of Public Health and the Medical Director, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning, that had been circulated to all Members in advance of the meeting that provided an update on COVID-19 activity.

Key points and themes in the presentation included:

- The latest headline figures for the 7 days ending 1 March 2022; and
- An update on the vaccination programme with particular reference to actions taken by Neighbourhood Teams to increase uptake across Wards, vaccine breakdown by ethnicity, case studies and feedback.

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

- To welcome the local Manchester Living Fairly and Safely with Covid draft plan, noting that it included actions to address inequalities and fairer access to services;
- Welcoming the information relating to the newsletter and the inclusion of the trusted voice that had been used to promote the vaccination in local communities, adding this model needed to be rolled out across other areas;
- Noting the prevalence of Covid cases in Manchester and how this could be related to increased social mixing and testing behaviours;
- Was there capacity within the existing teams to respond to any future wave of a Covid variant;
- Noting the removal of free testing and the importance of recognising that Omicrom was still present;
- Were Officers confident that Care Home settings were supported to manage any future outbreaks;
- Further information was sought on the Pakistani Sounding Board.

The Director of Public Health advised that the relaxation of the national restriction rules and the subsequent increase in social mixing would result in an increase in positive cases, adding that the vaccination was the best way to protect people from serious illness. He advised that following the decline in testing the team were now reliant on ONS (Office for National Statistics) data, noting that there were challenges associated with how this data was reported. He advised that the intention was to establish a bespoke local system to accurately monitor infection rates. He advised that a further national announcement was expected in the week commencing 21 March 2022 regarding the provision of LFT testing for vulnerable people, adding that all hospital staff; social care staff and hospital patients continued to be tested. In response to the questions raised regarding Care Homes, he stated that any patient to be discharged into a care home from a hospital was tested and good relationships had been established in Manchester to respond quickly and effectively to any outbreak in a Care Home setting. He further added that this area of work and locally developed response would be subject to a peer review as it had been recognised nationally as good practice.

The Public Health Consultant advised that the Health Protection Team and the Response Hub would be retained in the event they were required as a result of a further wave or variant. She stated that when not in a response mode these teams



would continue their work on wider health protection projects. She commented that the local helpline would be retained to offer advice and guidance to both residents and schools.

The Consultant in Public Health Medicine provided a response to the comment raised regarding the Pakistani Sounding Board by stating that it had been the decision of the members of the Board who had agreed to extend the Board to include members of the South Asian population. She added that following discussions, it was decided to establish a specific Pakistani Sounding Board which was established last year.

The Deputy Leader stated that the Manchester Living Fairly and Safely with Covid draft plan was a comprehensive document that reflected and built upon the learning and good practice developed over the previous two years. She paid tribute to everyone involved in the production of the plan and supported the work described to address inequalities. She reiterated her call to Government for a fair, sustainable funding plan to ensure that the city could deliver on its ambitions for the city and improve the health outcomes for all Manchester residents.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

### **HSC/22/15 Future Delivery of Social Prescribing**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Public Health that provided an overview of delivery of social prescribing in Manchester.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an outline of how the Be Well service worked;
- Examples of good practice in the delivery of social prescribing;
- Highlighting case studies of the benefits of the service for Manchester residents;
- A summary of the findings of the independent evaluation of Manchester's Prevention Programme, and other social prescribing initiatives currently being developed and delivered within both Manchester and Greater Manchester; and
- Describing the next steps in developing and delivering Manchester's social prescribing and wellbeing support provision within the context of the Population Health Covid-19 Recovery Plan and Manchester's Wellbeing Model.

The Committee further received a presentation from Jay Patient, Be Well Service Manager, Big Life Group that provided an overview of:

- The aims and values of the Be Well Service;
- Access;
- Pathways within Be Well;
- Progression within service since initial commissioning;
- Outcomes;
- Examples of good practice; and

- Aims for 2022.

The Committee then heard from George Ramsay and Gaynor Heaton, residents of Manchester. Both spoke eloquently of their experience of engaging with the Be Well service. They articulated the circumstances which led them to engage with the service and the range of positive outcomes that they had achieved as a result. The Chair on behalf of the Committee thanked both contributors for attending the meeting and sharing their experiences.

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

- Recognising the important work of the Be Well service and paying tribute to all of the staff involved;
- What work was being done to support BAME residents;
- Noting that the number of males accessing the Be Well service was relatively low and what was being done to address this;
- Were Coaches Trauma Informed trained and how would they support an individual who was neurodivergent (defined as differing in mental or neurological function from what was considered typical or normal);
- Stating that the term 'disparities' should not be used when referring to health outcomes, adding that the term 'inequalities' was the preferred term and this was supported by Professor Michael Marmot; and
- Noting that from April 2020, 10 of Manchester's 14 PCNs had made formal arrangements for Big Life Group to employ and manage their social prescribing link workers, how would the patients of the 4 that had not made the formal arrangement access social prescribing opportunities.

Jay Patient, Be Well Service Manager, Big Life Group advised that there were many positive examples of where informal support groups had been developed that had built upon local connections and resilience, making particular reference to the South Asian Woman's Group in Longsight. She further clarified that the data in the presentation for the number of referrals for Central and South were combined. In regard to the point raised regarding the relatively lower number of male referrals to the service she advised this was recognised and consideration was being given as to how best promote this service and target the male audience. She further added that they would review the literature that was provided to encourage the take up amongst the male population. The Consultant in Public Health Medicine commented that this gender disparity was reflected across the wider health service and this was not unique to the Be Well service.

Jay Patient, Be Well Service Manager, Big Life Group further advised that the Coaches were from a wide variety of different professional and ethnic back grounds with a broad skills set. She stated that they were Trauma Informed trained. She added that they had established relationships with specialist providers and services to refer anyone who was identified as neurodivergent to ensure that they were signposted to the most appropriate source of support.

The Consultant in Public Health Medicine stated that people could be referred to the Be Well service from other services and not just GPs, adding that the 4 PCNs that had not made formal arrangements for Big Life Group could still refer a patient if they

felt it was appropriate. She further commented that it was anticipated that referrals to and demand for this service would increase, noting the impact of the pandemic and other recent global issues on people's mental health. She stated that consideration needed to be given to how this service could be commissioned in future years and build upon the success reported.

In concluding this item of business, the Chair reiterated the Committee's appreciation to all of the invited guests for attending the meeting and sharing their personal experiences. She stated that the Committee would be inviting a future update report on the service with particular reference to any environmental programmes that were offered, noting the important relationship between green spaces and mental health.

### **Decision**

To note the report and presentation and recommend that a future update report is added to the Committee's Work Programme for consideration at an appropriate time.

### **HSC/22/16 The Gorton Hub**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Lead Neighbourhoods, Sarah Lake, Integrated Neighbourhood Lead for Gorton and Levenshulme (MLCO) and the Head of Corporate Estate and Facilities Management that provided an update on the Gorton Hub, a new Health and Care Hub in the heart of Gorton.

The Hub would provide a real opportunity to make a significant improvement in the management and delivery of public services through co-location and integration within a modern, innovative and efficient environment.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Describing how the Hub would provide an opportunity to make a significant improvement in the management and delivery of public services through co-location and integration within a modern, innovative and efficient environment;
- Progress with the partnership working underpinning the integration of services in the Hub;
- Construction and property update; and
- Noting that the Hub was due to open in October 2022.

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

- What areas would this provision serve and would all elected Members concerned be regularly informed regarding the development of this site;
- How would the success of this model of service delivery be assessed; and
- This positive model needed to be replicated across the city.

The Strategic Lead Neighbourhoods advised that this site would serve residents from the Gorton, Longsight, Levenshulme and Clayton & Openshaw wards, adding that meetings with those ward Members would be convened. He advised that the success of this development would be assessed across three strands, first being a range of Key Performance Indicators to be agreed to measure progress against wider health

determents, the second against improvements in bringing partners together in the Hub, and third, the benefits realised through the land released from the colocation of services. He stated that this would be reported to the Committee at the appropriate time along with a general update on the delivery of the Hub.

The Committee heard from Councillor Reid, Ward Councillor for Gorton and Abbey Hey. She provided a background to the development and the challenges that were presented as a result of the pandemic. She reassured the Committee that despite this and other challenges the site was being progressed with very positive relationships being established with all the multi-agency partners who would eventually occupy the site. She stated that she supported a recommendation that the Committee continue to receive regular progress reports on this project.

### **Decision**

To note the report and recommend that a future update report is added to the Committee's Work Programme for consideration at an appropriate time.

### **HSC/22/17 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 recommended that other than the Covid-19 update report the May 2022 meeting would be dedicated to the annual Work Programming Session.

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report and agrees the work programme, noting the above comment.

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

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 9 February 2022**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Reid – in the Chair  
Councillors Abdullatif, Alijah, Bano, Benham, Collins, Foley, Hewitson, Lovecy, McHale, Nunney and Sadler

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

Mr G Cleworth, Parent Governor Representative

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

Miss S Iltaf, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Rahman, Deputy Leader  
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children's Services  
Councillor Hitchen, Ward Councillor for Miles Platting and Newton Heath  
Lorraine Ganley, Director of Nursing and Professional Lead, Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO)  
Ben Aspinall, COVID-19 Vaccination Programme Lead, MLCO

#### **Apologies:**

Councillor Cooley  
Mrs J Miles, Representative of the Diocese of Salford  
Ms L Smith, Primary Sector Teacher Representative

#### **CYP/22/08                      Minutes**

#### **Decisions**

1. To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2022.
2. To receive the minutes of the meetings of the Ofsted Subgroup held on 24 November 2021 and 19 January 2022.

#### **CYP/22/09    An update on families residing in both bed and breakfast accommodation and homeless accommodation outside of the city boundaries, and the impact on schools and transport**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services and the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which set out the collaborative work undertaken by the Homeless Service and Children's Services to support families who were impacted by homelessness.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Background information;

- School and travel;
- Support for families;
- Reducing the use of bed and breakfast and out of city placements;
- Prevention;
- Apex House as a model;
- Placing families directly into dispersed accommodation;
- Nightly rate accommodation;
- Private Rented Sector;
- Domestic Violence and Abuse;
- Refugee Transitions Outcomes Fund (RTOF); and
- Transformation Programme.

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

- Who funded school transport when a homeless family was moved to a different area;
- The impact on families of living in temporary homeless accommodation and the impact on children of having to leave their area and move elsewhere;
- The importance of intervening early, when families first started struggling to pay their rent, and the roles housing providers and schools could play in this;
- Concern about the impact of rising costs of living and private landlords increasing rents;
- Concern about insufficient housing stock in the city;
- Concern about families in overcrowded housing who were not classed as homeless;
- People, predominantly women and children, becoming homeless due to domestic abuse, while the perpetrator was able to remain in the family home;
- Consideration about the safety of refugee families when allocating housing, for example, if racist, anti-refugee groups were active in the area; and
- To request more information on nightly rate accommodation.

The Ward Councillor for Miles Platting and Newton Heath highlighted how unaffordable rents were for people on the minimum wage. She expressed concern at the length of time that people were in dispersed temporary accommodation. She also expressed concern that people who were found housing in the private sector still did not have secure long-term accommodation, if they only had a six-month secured tenure. She reported that homeless people from other areas were being placed in temporary accommodation in her ward, whereas people from her ward who had become homeless were being placed elsewhere. She advised that consideration should be given to the needs of displaced families and the needs of and impact on the host community. The Chair suggested that figures on homeless families being placed in their ward could be provided to Members through Ward Co-ordination, noting that this disproportionately impacted on certain wards. She also expressed concern about the children who were being moved out of their communities and the impact of that.

In response to a Member's question, the Director of Housing Operations informed the Committee that the Private Rented Sector Team was working to source permanent

accommodation for homeless families in the private sector and to prevent families from becoming homeless through engagement with landlords and families, including providing incentives. He confirmed that links were being made with schools and other services, especially in relation to early intervention to prevent homelessness. He acknowledged Members' comments about the challenges facing families placed in bed and breakfast accommodation, advising that the average length of stay was 20 days but that this was still too long and that the transformation programme aimed to reduce the use of bed and breakfast accommodation. In response to the comments from the Ward Councillor for Miles Platting and Newton Heath, he advised that a mixed model, using both social rented and private sector accommodation, was needed but that housing had to be of good quality with a reputable provider and appropriate for the family. In response to a Member's comments about a specific case in her ward, he offered to provide a response outside of the meeting, if she provided him with further details.

The Director of Education reported that, if a child had an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP), the Council had a statutory duty to fund home to school transport, which could be a taxi or a school bus. If a child did not have an EHCP, she advised that the Council would pay for a travel pass, if required due to distance, although she advised that she was aware of some cases where schools were arranging to collect the child from home, particularly where a family was temporarily being accommodated further away.

The Strategic Lead (Homelessness) informed Members that the Council funded an advice contract which could assist people who were struggling to pay their rent and that there would be a campaign to encourage people to get advice at an earlier stage before they have built up rent arrears. She encouraged Members to promote this to residents at their advice surgeries. She confirmed that there was a clear process for the placement of refugee families which took into account the safety of the area.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services drew Members' attention to previous items that had been brought to the Committee about domestic abuse and advised that he would discuss with the Director of Housing Operations the issue raised about perpetrators remaining in the family home, while the partner and children had to leave.

In response to a Member's question, the Director of Housing Operations reported that Apex House had been more successful than other accommodation in finding settled homes for the families placed there.

The Strategic Lead (Homelessness) informed Members that nightly rate accommodation was where a family was accommodated in a property on an emergency basis, which was paid for on a nightly rate, and that this was being used to reduce the use of bed and breakfast. She advised that her service had just started trialling moving people who presented as homeless directly to temporary accommodation rather than placing them in a bed and breakfast first. In response to a Member's question, she outlined how the Homeless Floating Support Service worked with a range of partners including Early Help, schools and GPs to support families in dispersed temporary accommodation.

The Deputy Leader reported that the transformation process was at the early stages and that he wanted to come back to the Committee in a couple of years' time to show the improvements that had been made in keeping families closer to their communities. The Chair advised that the Committee would continue to monitor this.

### **Decision**

To receive a further report in 6 months' time.

### **CYP/22/10 Children and Education Services Directorate Budget 2022/23**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Children and Education Services) which stated that, following the Spending Review announcements and provisional local government finance settlement 2022/23, the Council was forecasting a balanced budget for 2022/23, a gap of £37m in 2023/24 and £58m by 2024/25. The report set out the high-level position. Included in the report were the priorities for the services in the remit of this Committee. Appended were details of the initial revenue budget changes proposed by officers and the planned capital programme as well as information on the 2022/23 Dedicated Schools Grant. The Committee was invited to comment on the proposals prior to their submission to the Executive on 16 February 2022.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Summary of Council budget;
- Current budget position;
- Scrutiny of draft budget proposals and budget report;
- Next steps;
- Children and Education Services context;
- Budget overview;
- Dedicated Schools Grant; and
- Capital budget.

The Executive Member for Children's Services drew Members' attention to the budget reports which had been submitted to the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee and the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee which included proposals for additional funding for youth services and for Free School Meals over the Easter holidays respectively.

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

- To what extent the budget had taken into account the need for more special school places;
- Funding for improving the condition of school buildings, including school-based Early Years provision;
- To welcome the focus on carbon reduction around schools and to recognise the additional benefits of investing in reducing carbon, such as lower energy bills and improving children's well-being;



- Whether the Council had considered asset transfers for buildings which had previously been Council-run daycare provision but were now commissioned to other providers;
- Concern about home to school transport putting additional pressure on the Children's Services budget, as outlined in the report; and
- Concern about the national insurance increase referred to in the report.

The Director of Education reported that school places for children with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) were funded by the Department for Education (DfE) through the High Needs Block of the Dedicated Schools Grant, which would be increased by £10 million next year. She informed Members about additional special school places which had recently been created and about plans for more to become available from next year. She advised that the Council had a capital maintenance grant each year to assist schools with significantly expensive maintenance issues, such as a new roof or boiler, and so had an understanding of the condition of school buildings; however, she drew Members' attention to proposals to undertake condition surveys of school buildings which, she advised, would formalise this knowledge and enable the Council to plan work for the future. She reported that the DfE was going to be making some funding available for new school buildings and that these conditions surveys would help the Council to provide evidence to the DfE about why some of this funding should be awarded to Manchester. In response to a question from the Chair, she confirmed that the Council only had statutory responsibilities in relation to the maintenance of the buildings of local authority-maintained schools, not academies.

The Executive Member for Children's Services confirmed that a range of different options were considered for buildings used for Early Years daycare provision. He suggested that the Committee might want to receive a report on the condition surveys that were due to be carried out on schools and Early Years buildings, once the work had reached an appropriate stage.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services highlighted the approach that had been taken to budget savings, which had focused on preventative work and cost avoidance rather than cutting services. The Chair welcomed the way that this approach had worked in recent years in reducing costs through early intervention to prevent children and young people from entering the care system.

## **Decision**

To endorse the proposals outlined in the report.

## **CYP/22/11 Annual Virtual School Head's Report**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education which provided an overview of the work that had been undertaken, through the Corporate Parenting Partnership, during 2020-21 to promote the education, employment and training of the Children and Young People in the care of Manchester (referred to as Our Children and Young People), Manchester Care Leavers, Previously Looked After Children who attended education settings within Manchester and Young People supported by the Youth Justice Service.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Key educational headlines for children and young people;
- Attendance at education settings; and
- Key high-level priorities for the Virtual School.

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

- Praise for the work of the Virtual School;
- Access to educational psychologists and training for teachers;
- How Manchester compared with other core cities, for example, in relation to the number of Our Children who were in education, employment or training post-16;
- Whether data was available broken down by ethnicity;
- Our Children and Young People who had Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND);
- The Virtual School's new duties in relation to children and young people with a social worker; and
- What was being done to inform teachers about the work of the Virtual School.

Following a Member's comments about young people becoming involved in crime and serious youth violence, the Chair reported that the Committee had previously visited Wetherby Young Offender Institution and Barton Moss Secure Children's Home. She suggested that the Committee visit them again, as a joint visit with the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee. She suggested that the Committee consider bringing a joint report on knife crime, in conjunction with the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee. The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services highlighted how the use of Personal Education Plans (PEPs) in Youth Justice had improved young people's engagement with education, employment and training.

The Executive Member for Children's Services informed the Committee that a Youth Justice Peer Review had taken place towards the end of 2021 and that they had been very impressed by the work being done in Manchester.

The Virtual School Head reported that the Virtual School commissioned additional educational psychology time for consultation, advice, guidance and training for teachers. She informed Members that the Pupil Premium was paid to schools termly on receipt of a satisfactory PEP outlining how the money would be spent and that additional funding could also be provided to schools, where it was needed, including for staff training to support the needs of the child. In response to a Member's comments about exclusions, she reported that figures for fixed term exclusions for Our Children were currently higher than they wanted it to be but reducing and that permanent exclusions of Our Children were very rare. She drew Members' attention to the Inclusion Strategy which her service had been involved in developing and confirmed the service's aspiration to reduce the number of fixed-term exclusions.

The Virtual School Deputy Head (Post-16) reported that Manchester compared favourably to other core cities, its statistical neighbours and other Greater Manchester authorities in relation to the number of Our Children who were in Employment, Education or Training (EET) post-16. She informed Members that the Virtual School undertook PEPs for those who were not in EET and she outlined how they worked to maximise opportunities for these young people. In response to a question from the Chair, she reported that preventing exclusions post-16 was challenging as the Virtual School was not always informed beforehand but that using the designated teacher model had enabled them to develop stronger relationships, find out about issues earlier on and make alternative suggestions to prevent exclusion.

The Virtual School Deputy Head advised that they collected data on the ethnicity and gender of the children and young people as well as whether they had SEND through the PEP process, that this was monitored and that data could be provided. She also informed Members about training that was being provided to carers, including in relation to SEND, and about the post-16 pilot, which included training colleges and Leaving Care Workers on SEND, as well as attachment and trauma. She reported that the Virtual School provided challenge to schools if they were not recognising that a young person was likely to have SEND and responding appropriately.

The Virtual School Head advised that her team was well known to designated teachers and that it was the designated teacher's responsibility to work with other staff within their school. She highlighted the launch of the Virtual School's website and outlined how they were informing schools about the Virtual School's new duties in relation to children and young people with a social worker.

The Chair reminded Members that all Councillors were Corporate Parents and invited to the meetings of the Corporate Parenting Panel.

## **Decisions**

1. To arrange a visit to Wetherby Young Offender Institution and Barton Moss Secure Children's Home, in conjunction with the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee.
2. To further discuss bringing a joint report on knife crime, in conjunction with the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee.

## **CYP/22/12 COVID-19 Update**

The Committee received a report of Assistant Director of Education which provided an update on the return of children and young people to education following the Christmas break and the arrangements in place in schools and colleges to report and manage COVID-19. The report had a particular focus on the bespoke offer to increase uptake of the vaccine in children and young people aged 12 to 15 and address inequalities therefore reducing disruption to children's education and learning.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Main changes to guidance for schools from January 2022;
- Vaccinations;
- Positive cases in Manchester schools; and
- School attendance.

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

- Concern about lower take-up of COVID-19 vaccines in more deprived areas and in some demographic groups;
- The benefits of "Covid chat" and the role older pupils and members of the community could play in having conversations and answering questions about the vaccination; and
- Why more private schools had received the vaccines first.

The Executive Member for Children's Services reported that the Council had been working with health service colleagues to identify and address barriers to the vaccination of children and young people, highlighting capacity for school immunisation and how consent was gathered. He outlined some of the steps being taken to improve take-up, including a bespoke offer for each school, as well as an out of school offer, alongside an adult offer, and improved communications, including in community languages.

Ben Aspinall, COVID-19 Vaccination Programme Lead from MLCO, explained that the initial school immunisation programme had had to be introduced very quickly, that all Manchester schools had been contacted to ask when this could be timetabled in and that those who had responded first had been scheduled first. In relation to schools where a lower percentage of pupils had taken up the offer of a vaccine, he outlined the work taking place to address this, engaging with the schools, community leaders and the wider community and highlighting the offer for pupils to be vaccinated at other vaccination sites in the community, if they had not been vaccinated when the vaccination service was at their school. In response to a Member's comments about the electronic process for parents giving their consent ("e-consent"), he advised that, while it was quick and easy for some, having listened to stakeholders, schools were now being given the option to use e-consent, paper-based consent forms or a combination of the two.

The Chair expressed concern that anti-vaccination campaigners were also affecting the take-up of the MMR vaccine and advised that the Committee would continue to look at child health, in conjunction with the Health Scrutiny Committee.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **CYP/22/13 Overview Report**

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

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

The Chair welcomed the new Co-opted Member, Mr Cleworth.

**Decision**

To note the report and agree the work programme.



## Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 10 February 2022

#### Present:

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair  
Councillors Chohan, Flanagan, Foley, Hassan, Hughes, Jeavons, Lyons, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin and Wright

**Apologies:** Councillors Holt and Lynch

#### Also present:

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment  
Samantha Nicholson, Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency

### **ECCSC/22/06          Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2022 as a correct record.

### **ECCSC/22/07          Neighbourhood Directorate Budget 2022/23**

Further to minute (ECCSC/21/27) the Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided a further update on the saving proposals being proposed as part of the 2022/23 budget process.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Following the Spending Review announcements and provisional local government finance settlement 2022/23 the Council was forecasting a balanced budget for 2022/23, a gap of £37m in 2023/24 and £58m by 2024/25;
- The settlement was for one year only and considerable uncertainty remained from 2023/24;
- 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 £60m over the next three years;
- £30m of risk-based reserves had been identified as available to manage risk and timing differences;
- An overview of the headline priorities for the service;
- A description of the Neighbourhoods Revenue Budget Strategy;
- A description of the Capital budget and pipeline priorities; and
- A description of the Climate Change Priorities and Investment.

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

- Noting that the Government had failed to adequately fund the Council and they needed to be held to account;

- Supporting the reported Climate Change Priorities and Investment;
- Whilst recognising the varied work and initiatives delivered by officers to tackle climate change and support communities, more needed to be done to publicise this work and communicate this positive work with both residents and Members;
- The need to improve air quality across the city, making reference to those issues caused as a result of poor traffic flow and cars idling;
- The continued call for the Council to act as a catalysis and influencer to escalate the activities and actions needed to address climate change;
- The need to scrutinise the cost effectiveness of the Council's financial contribution to the Manchester Climate Change Agency; and
- Calling for the continued, long term funding of the Climate Change Officer posts.

In response to questions, officers clarified the capital spend reporting that had been presented, the rating of Carbon Literacy training, adding that this training was now mandatory for all staff and information relating to the Cargo Bikes referenced within the report.

In considering the budget proposals, a Member recommended an amendment. He recommended that a Capital Budget of £1m be established for the Executive Member for Environment, with this budget specifically used to support work and initiatives to tackle air pollution across the city. He recommended that this budget could be funded by levying a Section 106 charge of £1000 for all new build homes for sale in Manchester (excluding social housing and a reduced charge for affordable housing).

This recommendation was supported by the Committee.

A further recommendation was proposed that funding be provided to permanently fund the Climate Change Officer posts. This recommendation was supported by the Committee.

## **Decisions**

The Committee recommend that the Executive;

1. Establish a Capital Budget of £1m for the Executive Member for Environment, with this budget specifically used to support work and initiatives to tackle air pollution across the city. This budget could be funded by levying a Section 106 charge of £1000 for all new build homes for sale in Manchester (excluding social housing and a reduced charge for affordable housing).
2. That funding be provided to permanently fund the Climate Change Officer posts.

## **ECCSC/22/08 Refresh of Manchester's Climate Change Framework 2020-25**

The Committee considered the report of the Manchester Climate Change Agency and Partnership that provided a progress update on the refresh of Manchester's Climate Change Framework 2020-2025.



Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Describing that the Framework refresh was to establish more detailed and quantified data around the actions the city needed to take to reduce its direct, energy related emissions and stay within its carbon budgets;
- The work to better understand and address indirect emissions;
- The Framework would also include an update on research to move the city forwards on climate adaptation and resilience;
- The recent research on the intersection between addressing health inequalities and climate action;
- The consultation process; and
- Next steps, noting that the refreshed Framework was expected to be completed in the first quarter of the new financial year (April-June 2022) and launched in quarter two (July-Sept 2022).

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

- The need for Councillors to effectively scrutinise the work and outcomes of the Manchester Climate Change Agency and Partnership;
- How were the progress against the carbon emissions targets and carbon budget for the city reported;
- The need to reiterate the urgency of the climate emergency;
- The need to communicate with residents the scale of the challenge and the need for immediate action;
- Noting the scale of the challenge to adequately insulate homes across Greater Manchester and the need for the government to fund this, particularly in the context of increasing fuel and energy prices;
- The need to include consideration of carbon emissions from transport and not restrict consideration of this subject area to Nitrogen Dioxide (No2) emissions; and
- The need to galvanise and progress actions across the city at speed and scale to mitigate the impending climate disaster, using all levers and influence available to the Council.

The Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency informed the Committee that the progress against the city's carbon budget was reported annually via the annual report that is produced and presented to the Committee. She advised that it would not be possible to produce a meaningful quarterly update due to the complexity of the data reporting and the lags in the data release from a number of sources. She described that the refresh of Manchester's Climate Change Framework 2020-2025 would articulate the scale of the challenge and establish actions against the targets.

The Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency agreed with the comment regarding the importance of communicating with all residents the need to take immediate responsibility and actions to address carbon emissions. She advised that it was important to recognise that people would have a range of different motivations to implement personal behavioural change, so there was not a 'one size fits all' approach to achieve this. She described that they did have a Community

Engagement Programme that was designed to work with and support different community groups on a range of climate change projects. She further made reference to the work of the Youth Board as means of strengthening engagement and communications.

The Executive Member for Environment commented that she noted the comments regarding carbon and transport emissions and advised that a briefing note to Members would be provided following the meeting that described the plans and actions to address this.

The Chair concluded this item of business by paying tribute to all staff working to address climate change. She stated that she recognised the scale of the challenge and the capacity within the Climate Change Agency and Partnership, noting an international global response was required. She further called upon the Government to adequately fund activities to tackle climate change, noting that the larger polluters in the country needed to be prioritised.

The Chair further paid tribute to the Members of the Committee for their continued engagement and scrutiny of the climate agenda, noting that they articulated the voice of residents across the city on this important issue. She commented that the scrutiny process had helped inform and shape the Council's response to addressing carbon emissions and would continue to contribute to the city to becoming zero-carbon by 2038 at the latest.

### **Decision**

The Committee note the report.

### **ECCSC/22/09      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.

### **Decisions**

The Committee note the report and agree the work programme.

## **Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2022**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair  
Councillors Chohan, Flanagan, Foley, Hassan, Holt, Hughes, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin and Wright

**Apologies:** Councillors Good, Jeavons and Lyons

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment

### **ECCSC/22/10          Minutes**

In considering the minutes of the previous meeting the Committee noted that as part of the Council's budget setting it had been agreed to permanently fund the Climate Change Officer posts.

A Member informed the Committee that the funding for the Climate Change Youth Board would be ending and she called for the continued funding of this Board.

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 10 February 2022 as a correct record.

### **ECCSC/22/11          Manchester Green and Blue Strategy and Implementation Plan, including annual update and a report on the Tree Action Plan**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that provided the annual update on the delivery of the Green and Blue Implementation Plan together with information on the delivery of the Tree Action Plan.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Describing the relationship of the Green and Blue Infrastructure (G&BI) Strategy to other Council strategies and action plans;
- The objectives and long-term vision of the Strategy;
- Governance arrangements and G&BI stakeholder Group;
- The contribution the strategy had in relation to the Climate Emergency and Social Inclusion and Equality;
- An overview of the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy Action Plan refresh;
- Describing the Greater Manchester IGNITION Project and the GrowGreen Project;
- The G&BI Implementation Plan 2021 Delivery highlights by Objective; and

- The G&BI Implementation Plan Refresh and Future Priorities.

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

- Welcoming the clear and detailed report and requesting that an easy read version was produced to ensure this was accessible to all residents;
- Welcoming the inclusion of 'Objective Three: Improving access and connectivity for people and wildlife, focusing on: Green routes – neighbourhoods and travel routes';
- Noting that trees planted in residential streets had caused damage to the pavements as the roots had grown, and consideration needed to be given to using the planting technique adopted in Albert Square to reduce this damage;
- An exercise should be undertaken to understand residents' access to green space, calling for equity of access to quality green space for all residents;
- Equitable access to quality green space needed to be considered in conjunction with active travel schemes;
- Welcoming the inclusion of the Bee Line information that was included within report;
- Recognising that planning policies and developments were key to the delivery of quality green space;
- Priority should be given to delivering green schemes in those wards that had historically not benefited from such schemes, adding that officers should support residents and interested community groups to bid for all available funding to deliver green schemes;
- Noting that the recent IPCC report stressed the importance and urgency to address climate change;
- The need to engage local schools on the issue of green and blue space, as part of the wider issue of climate change to influence behaviour change;
- A strategy was required to ensure that all Registered Housing Providers across the city took responsibility for managing the green spaces they were responsible for, noting that the approach adopted was currently inconsistent across the city;
- Consideration needed to be given to promoting the benefits of grass verges as a way of supporting bio diversity and this needed to be communicated so they were not used for car parking;
- Residents and community groups should be encouraged, with the support of local Neighbourhood Officers, to take responsibility for local green spaces,
- An assurance was sought that appropriate consideration had been given to flood risk management as part of the Victoria North development;
- The communications strategy needed to be reviewed to ensure that all of the many positive examples of green initiatives, including those delivered by local business were celebrated as these could then inspire others to replicate or consider what they could do;
- Consideration needed to be given as to which employers we used in the report as positive examples of green infrastructure and employment;
- More information was sought on the approach to allotments, noting work needed to be done to stop the use of harmful pesticides in these locations;
- A ward map of all green spaces and land ownership should be provided to all local Neighbourhood Teams;

- Noting that both Manchester University and the Manchester Metropolitan University had volunteers available to assist with community groups establishing environmental projects; and
- The correct species of tree should be used for the identified location and consideration needed to be given as to how tree planting could support and enhance active travel schemes.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing welcomed the comments from the Committee. She stated that a review of the Core Strategy and Local Plan would be undertaken, and the views of the Committee would be used to inform these reviews. She advised that an audit of open spaces would be undertaken, and this would also consider factors such as access, quality and barriers. She stated that they did work with developers to maximise the delivery of green schemes and provided examples of these, noting that this also included the instalment of green walls and roof top gardens. She further commented that allotments were considered as part of the Parks Strategy however these sites would be captured as part of the open space audit. She further noted the comment regarding the use of the Airport as an example and reassured the Committee that there were many other positive examples that could be used in future reports.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing stated that consideration would be given to providing ward based maps that mapped green space, however she advised that difficulties arose when identifying land that was privately owned. She added that this information would be shared with the relevant Neighbourhood Teams.

In response to an invitation from a Member for a representative from Planning and Building Control to be present at the planned Manchester Earth Summit 2022 conference, the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing committed to sending a representative to the event.

The Senior Policy Officer stated that he would circulate the Principles of Tree Management document to all Members for information, commenting that this document described the approach to street trees, adding that he would discuss the specific issue raised by the Members following the meeting. He further advised that the Tree Action Manchester programme did consider trees and green space in a wider context, such as the recognised health benefits. He further advised that the Our Rivers Our City would progress the work with blue infrastructure in collaboration with key partners.

In response to a specific question asked by a Member the Tree Officer stated that there was no policy of not planting hard standing trees, however the focus recently had been to prioritise soft scaping.

The Senior Policy Officer stated that the Biodiversity Net Gain legislation would be reviewed at a Greater Manchester level to ensure the best outcomes for Manchester could be achieved by adopting the correct policies as a result of this legislation.

The Executive Member for Environment stated that she welcomed the IPCC report and noted the key messages. She stated that she would be meeting with officers to

review a wide variety of work through this lens. She advised that she would circulate a summary of the IPCC report to Members following the meeting. She further commented that she would speak with her other Executive Member colleagues to address the issues raised by Members that cut across different remits, noting the comments regarding Housing Providers and support available to the VCSE sector to bid for funding to support green projects. She further recommended that an update report on the Bee Network is submitted for consideration in the new municipal year.

The Executive Member for Environment commented that she would speak with Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Employment with the view to arranging a briefing for Members on the Victoria North development, adding that work had been undertaken with the Environment Agency to consider flood risk management as part of the development planning.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **ECCSC/22/12      Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing Services - Future Delivery**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) that described that the management of household waste is one of the key functions of the Local Authority and was a service of significant importance to every resident of the city. It was recognised that the current cleansing service standards were inconsistent across the city and did not meet the expectations of Members and residents. The future delivery arrangements for the service needed to ensure that the additional investment identified within the budget generated the maximum return and improvement.

The current contract for waste collection and street cleansing expired in 2038 but had two extension periods (2023 and 2031). As part of the commissioning cycle, the Council had reviewed the priorities for the next period and considered which delivery model could achieve these and Best Value.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and the Policy Framework background;
- An overview of the GM Refuse & Recycling Contract (Pre-2009)
- Information relating to the Greater Manchester Waste Levy;
- An overview of the current service;
- Performance information and feedback;
- A description of the Resources & Waste Strategy (RaWS) for England (2018);
- Service Improvement and the Service Improvement Programme Timescales, noting that this was subject to final approval;
- The delivery model;
- Conclusions and the decision making process; and
- The continuation of the contract with Biffa had been assessed as the most effective option.

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

- Requesting Quarterly update reports on the Waste and Recycling Service, including Biffa performance data;
- The need to monitor activities such as the collection of side waste from communal containers;
- A strategy was required to ensure that all Registered Housing Providers took responsibility for managing and removing waste from all of the spaces they were responsible for;
- A report was requested that described the implications of Household Waste and Recycling Centres' policies and incidents of flytipping;
- Consideration needed to be given to the timely issuing of licenses for the positioning of skips on highways and the lifting of parking restrictions to allow reputable waste management companies to access locations to remove waste;
- More needed to be done to improve recycling rates, noting the impact this could have on carbon emissions and further promotion of the circular economy;
- The sweeping of cycle lanes needed to be improved and be future proofed to manage the demand on this service as more active travel schemes were delivered;
- The need to recognise that the types of waste issues experienced were different in different wards and a 'one size fits all' approach was not appropriate, adding that meetings should be convened with ward Members to understand their specific issues and challenges experienced;
- The staff behaviours of Biffa crews needed to improve to ensure they delivered the levels of service that was expected;
- CCTV should be used to identify perpetrators of fly tipping in hot spots, noting that this would also assist with any subsequent convictions;
- More needed to be done to promote the bulky waste collection service, particularly to residents living in apartment blocks;
- The Customer Relationship Management (CRM) needed to be improved to give both Members and residents confidence when reporting issues relating to waste and fly tipping;
- Noting that it was national Food Waste week;
- Consideration needed to be given to delivering targeted waste and recycling campaigns during specific faith celebrations; and
- Seeking an assurance that a representative from the service would be present at the planned School and Climate Action Conference in June.

The Strategic Lead, Waste Recycling and Street Cleansing supported the recommendation to provide quarterly progress reports, adding that the issues raised relating to side waste in communal bin areas, staff behaviours and the cleansing of cycleways were included within the Service Improvement Plan.

The Strategic Lead, Waste Recycling and Street Cleansing accepted the invitation for a representative from her service to attend the School and Climate Action Conference, adding that Biffa did engage with schools on the issue of waste and recycling. She stated that all channels of communication and engagement needed to be utilised to influence behaviour change.

The Strategic Lead, Waste Recycling and Street Cleansing commented that a review of the bulky waste collection service would be undertaken to understand further the use of this service with the intention to optimise its use. She informed the Committee that the replacement of the CRM system was underway, and her service had been involved in the ask of the new system so as to address the issues identified by the Members and deliver an improved system. She commented recycling rates needed to improve adding further that more needed to be done to promote the circular economy with an emphasis on repair and reuse. She added that more needed to be done to promote and connect residents to these opportunities, adding that this would be a key action to progress.

The Director of Commercial and Operations commented that investment had been made into CCTV systems to tackle fly tipping, adding that the operation of CCTV was subject to specific legal guidance.

The Executive Member for Environment stated that she was committed to improving the service by working with Biffa and the delivery of the Service Improvement Plan. She stated that it was everyone's collective responsibility to reduce the incidents of littering and the appropriate management of waste.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **ECCSC/22/13      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 noted that the new Chair and Committee would hold a work programming session at the meeting in May, in the first meeting of the new municipal year to consider the Work Programme. Noting the comments and requests for future reports when the Committee considered the previous agenda items.

### **Decision**

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

### **ECCSC/22/14      Councillor Igbon**

The Committee recognised that this would be the last meeting that Councillor Igbon would attend in her capacity as Chair. Members wished to place on record their appreciation for her dedication and commitment to the work of the Committee.



## **Economy Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 10 February 2022**

#### **Present:**

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

**Apologies:** Councillor Johns, Shilton Godwin and Stanton

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Craig, Leader  
Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Employment  
Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment  
Brian Henry, Head of MAES  
Lisa O’Loughlin, Principal and Deputy Chief Executive: The Manchester College/LTE Group  
John Thornhill, Chief Executive LTE Group

#### **ESC/22/05 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2022 were approved as a correct record.

#### **ESC/22/06 Growth & Development Directorate Budget 2022/23**

Further to minute (ESC/21/53), the Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided a further update on the saving proposals being proposed as part of the 2022/23 budget process.

Key points and themes of the report included:-

- Following the Spending Review announcements and provisional local government finance settlement 2022/23 the Council was forecasting a balanced budget for 2022/23, a gap of £37m in 2023/24 and £58m by 2024/25;
- Overall, the settlement announcement was towards the positive end of expectations and it was expected that mitigations in the region of £7.7m, as previously identified, would be sufficient to balance the 2022/23 budget;
- The budget assumptions that underpinned 2022/23 to 2024/25 included the commitments made as part of the 2021/22 budget process to fund ongoing demand pressures as well as provision to meet other known pressures such as inflation and any pay awards (estimated at 3% from 2022/23);
- Whilst this contributed to the scale of the budget gap it was important that a realistic budget was set which reflected ongoing cost and demand pressures;

- The focus would now be on identifying savings and mitigations to keep the Council on a sustainable financial footing; and
- It was proposed that budget cuts and savings of £60m over three years would be developed for Member consideration which equated to just under 12% of 2022/23 directorate budgets. In addition, £30m of risk-based reserves had been identified as available to manage risk and timing differences.

The Leader advised that whilst there were no major changes to the proposed budget following the report in November, a decade of austerity had resulted in £420 million having been removed from the Council's budget, resulting in a 15% reduction in spending power compared to a national average of 2.4% and if Manchester had had the national average applied to its budget, it would have a further £85 million in its budget today.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) commented that the 2021/22 budget process had included £393k savings in respect of holding/deleting 11 posts in planning and building control. Whilst the service redesign was expected to be completed in the first quarter of 2022, it would take time to implement the changes and recruit to all the posts. To allow for service delivery, and succession planning it was necessary to amend the structure and invest in some areas, therefore it was anticipated that ongoing savings of c£150k would be realised from reduced staffing costs across planning and building control. This would require alternative savings of £243k to be identified and delivered in 2022/23.

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

- There was concern in relation to the ability to effectively ensure the enforcement of illegal planning if it was still proposed to reduce the number of staff within planning and building control;
- Was it possible to have a breakdown of the proposed savings at a ward or neighbourhood level;
- What opportunities had been identified from the review of Council assets to help tackle the level of savings needed in future years; and
- Had there been any work undertaken around the anticipation of additional costs and pressures on the service as the Council emerged from the impact of covid.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) commented that the original saving of £393k had been identified through existing vacant posts and through the forthcoming service redesign, additional resource would be added to the service to ensure it operated effectively. She also advised that due to the nature of the work of the Directorate, it was difficult to break this down to a ward or neighbourhood level as a large part of the Directorate's budget was made up from staff costs who worked across the city. It was proposed that a more detailed overview of the work of the team could be provided for Members.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment acknowledged the need to improve how the work of the Directorate was reported back to ward members on work in their respective wards.

In terms of Asset Management, it was reported that this was something that the Directorate was actively looking at and a Strategic Asset Management Plan would be implemented this year which would look to ensure that the assets held by the Council across its Development, Operational and Commercial estates were used to maximise the benefits to the city.

The Leader commented that there had been a number of areas as part of the wider budget setting process that had been looked at as to how they would likely be impacted as the Council emerged from the impact of covid, such as the discretionary support the Council had been able to give to residents and the support to businesses. She added that the current competitive environment for government funding was not helpful and was not a long term sustainable approach.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Note the forecast medium term revenue budget position.
- (2) Endorse and recommend that the Executive approve the budget proposals.
- (3) Propose that as part of the Committee's Work Programme setting meeting in May 2022, it receives a report that provides a detailed overview of the Directorate and the teams that sit within it.

## **ESC/22/07 Manchester Work and Skills Strategy Refresh**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Inclusive Economy that provided an update on the development of a new Work and Skills Strategy for Manchester, to replace the previous version which had reached the end of its life.

Key points and themes in the report and accompanying presentation included:

- Providing a context and background;
- The new strategy used the Our Manchester Strategy themes as a structural framework;
- The Work and Skills Strategy would support a range of other city strategies;
- An overview of research and engagement; and
- The timetable for the delivery of the new strategy, noting that this would be presented to Executive for approval in May/June 2022.

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

- Every attempt should be made to ensure all opportunities for employment and retraining were provided to Manchester residents;
- Training opportunities needed to be available to people who were already in employment but wanted to expand their skills set or retrain;
- An exercise should be undertaken to map how this strategy intersected with a range of other Council strategies and identify key priorities;
- Welcoming the inclusion of the real living wage and every lever the Council had should be used to ensure more employers across the city paid this;
- Requesting that papers relating to the work of the Work and Skills Board be circulated to members of the Committee for information;
- The need for parity of esteem between academic and vocational pathways as part of the careers advice service;
- The need to breakdown silo working and encourage improved relationships between the Department of Work and Pensions and Department for Education to ensure that people received the most appropriate support and employment and training pathways;
- The need to promote and articulate the positive experiences and outcomes that could be achieved via an apprenticeship programme;
- The need to recognise that the Digital Inclusion Teams to improve digital skills amongst priority groups, particularly the over 50s, was too prescriptive and needed to address skills gaps and digital behaviours amongst younger people also;
- Supporting the work to address economic inequality and requesting more information on the Poverty Impact Assessment; and
- Would the consultation on the first draft of the strategy include face to face consultation.

The Director of Inclusive Economy stated that entry level jobs and apprenticeships in the Council were ringfenced for Manchester residents. She stated that all levers and spheres of influence were used by the Council to encourage employers and other anchor institutions to support this programme and to pay the Real Living Wage, particularly in the foundation employment sector, supported further by the Greater Manchester Good Employment Charter and using the Shared Prosperity Fund to deliver this programme.

She described that the Our Town Hall Project had delivered a range of good quality work experience opportunities and suggested the Committee might wish to receive a more detailed report on this subject area at a future meeting. She further described that the relationship between good employment and mental health was understood, and this had helped inform the Build Back Fairer in Greater Manchester strategy in line with the recommendations of Professor Michael Marmot that aimed to address a range of inequalities.

The Director of Inclusive Economy advised that consultation on the first draft of the strategy would include face to face consultation. She further advised that key partners were engaged with the Work and Skills Board and she would consult with the Chair on

how best to relay the work of the Board to the Committee, recognising that this would be of interest to Members.

The Director of Inclusive Economy further noted the comment regarding the importance of promoting the many positive aspects of apprenticeships and work was ongoing with schools to ensure the parity of esteem was achieved when delivering careers advice. Recognition was also made to the reference regarding digital skills and behaviours, she advised that this was included in the strategy with the ambition being to ensure all was done to ensure people were ready and equipped to enter the world of employment.

Lisa O'Loughlin, Principal and Deputy Chief Executive: The Manchester College/LTE Group informed the Members on their work to address digital skills and digital access, particularly in the support offered to learners in response to the challenges to online learning that presented during the pandemic.

The Strategy and Economic Policy Manager stated that work was underway to map the intersection between the different strategies and once this exercise was completed this information could be shared with the Members. He further commented that the Poverty Impact Assessment information could also be shared with the Committee once this exercise was completed.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment stated that the promotion of apprenticeships needed to be a continual programme of engagement and communication to articulate the many positive experiences and promote this as an attractive pathway into employment. He said the strategy would be delivered in collaboration with a number of partners in the city that included employers and local businesses.

## **Decisions**

The Committee recommend;

- (1) Recommend that the Director of Inclusive Economy, in consultation with the Chair, agree how the work of the Work and Skills Board is periodically shared with the Committee for information outside of the formal meeting structure.
- (2) Recommend that a report on the delivery of work and skills through the Our Town Hall Project is included on the Committee's Work Programme for consideration at an appropriate time.

## **ESC/22/08      LTE Group Update**

The Committee considered the report of the Principal and Deputy Chief Executive: The Manchester College/LTE Group and the Chief Executive LTE Group that provided an update on key areas of activity.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The Manchester College's progress, performance and contribution to Manchester's work and skills outcomes since the last report to the Economy Scrutiny Committee in 2021;
- Progress update and next steps on LTE Group estates and infrastructure plans including site disposals; and
- Progress on apprentice provision via Total People.

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

- Welcoming the progress reported, in particular in relation to the gender balance of learners and the number of employment placements provided; and
- What support was offered to learners who transitioned from Community Hubs into the Centres of Excellence.

Lisa O'Loughlin, Principal and Deputy Chief Executive: The Manchester College/LTE Group stated that the College had strong, well established relationships with employers that had assisted with securing good quality work experience placements. She stated that whilst COVID-19 had impacted on this she was confident that this would remain, adding that they were seeking to improve the two week placement offer. She further described that their learners were very diverse, and they were regarded as a trusted provider across the city. She stated that the Manchester College worked to challenge and remove the barriers experienced by young people accessing quality employment, noting that they had witnessed an increase in the numbers of females entering the construction industry.

Lisa O'Loughlin, Principal and Deputy Chief Executive: The Manchester College/LTE Group stated that there was a programme established to support learners to orientate and familiarise themselves as they transitioned to the centres of excellence. She further noted that numbers of SEND learners were increasing year on year.

## **Decision**

The Committee note the report.

## **ESC/22/09 Manchester Adult Education Service**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Inclusive Economy and Head of MAES.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- An introduction and background, noting that the vision for MAES continued to be 'To deliver inspirational adult education that connects Manchester's adults to their potential, their community and their future';
- The response to COVID-19;

- MAES performance in 2020/21; and
- The skills challenges in the city.

The key point that arose from the Committee's discussions was: -

- Noting the resources needed to deliver the work and ambition of the service at scale for the benefit of Manchester residents.

The Director of Inclusive Economy commented that the central government funding to deliver adult education had reduced by over 40% during the previous ten years. She described that despite this challenging environment the service remained committed to improving opportunities for residents. She advised that it was recognised that the physical infrastructure of the estate needed to be improved, and monies from the Shared Prosperity Fund would support this. She commented that the Greenheys Adult Learning Centre had been identified as a priority site. She further advised that MAES would continue to strengthen and build upon their relationships with local employers and the Job Centre Plus to promote this offer recognising that they were a visible and trusted provider that were rooted in local communities.

The Director of Inclusive Economy also discussed the wider engagement work that was delivered collaboratively with the Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE). The Chair recommended that a report on this work with the Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise sector be added to the Committee's work programme for consideration at a future meeting.

The Head of MAES informed the Committee that the intention was to increase the Level 3 provision for adults, noting that it was recognised that there was a need for this.

### **Decision**

The Committee:-

- (1) Recommends that a report on the MAES External Review is provided to the Committee for consideration at an appropriate time.
- (2) Recommends that a report on the work delivered in partnership between MAES and the Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise sector is provided to the Committee for consideration at an appropriate time.

### **ESC/22/10 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.

## **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

### **ESC/22/11 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 a Member who enquired when a report on purpose-built student accommodation would be submitted for consideration, the Chair advised that this would form part of discussion on the wider Housing Strategy. She advised this would be considered in the new municipal year.

## **Decision**

The Committee note the report and agree the work programme, noting the recommendations arising from consideration of the previous agenda items.



## **Economy Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2022**

#### **Present:**

Councillor H Priest – in the Chair  
Councillors Bayunu, Doswell, Farrell, Moore, Noor, Shilton Godwin and Stanton

**Apologies:** Councillor Johns and Raikes

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Craig, Leader  
Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Employment  
Councillor Newman, Ward Councillor for Woodhouse Park  
Tim Hawkins, Chief of Staff, Manchester Airports Group  
Jan Bramall, Chief Financial Officer, Manchester Airports Group  
Andrew Dixon, High Speed Rail Programme Coordinator

#### **ESC/22/12 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

The minutes of the meeting held on 10 February 2022 were approved as a correct record.

#### **ESC/22/13 Manchester Airport**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure that provided an update on the role of Manchester Airport in the economy of the city; the current economic situation of the Airport following the impact of COVID-19; and the next steps in the economic future for the Airport.

Key points and themes of the report included:-

- Describing the position of Manchester Airport in the local economy;
- Current economic situation of Manchester Airport;
- Employment, recruitment, and training opportunities at the Airport;
- An update on Airport City, an Enterprise Zone with the capability to provide 5 million sq. ft. of offices, hotels, advanced manufacturing, logistics facilities and retail space;
- Airport future challenges and opportunities.

Further to the report the Committee also received a presentation from the Manchester Airports Group (MAG).

Key points and themes of the presentation included:-

- Describing the impact of COVID on MAG traffic;
- Financial performance pre-COVID;
- Financial estimates, COVID and recovery period;
- Passenger recovery data;
- Focus areas for 2022;
- An update on the Manchester Transformation Programme;
- Opportunities for Greater Manchester, including the Airport Academy and the support to local communities; and
- The path to Net Zero Aviation.

The Chair read from a prepared statement from Councillor Nunney, Ward Councillor for Woodhouse Park who had been invited to the meeting but was unable to attend. His statement referred to the issues experienced by local residents that related to inconsiderate parking and associated litter, the loss of green space and poor air quality associated with both vehicles and aircraft.

The Committee then heard from Councillor Newman, Ward Councillor for Woodhouse Park who addressed the meeting on behalf of himself and his fellow ward Councillor, Councillor Sarah Judge. Whilst acknowledging the positive economic benefits that the airport brought to the area he also spoke of the adverse impacts that were frequently experienced by local residents. Councillor Newman spoke of the inconsiderate and anti-social car parking practices on the public highway, both by individuals attending the airport, taxi drivers and rogue car parking firms operating in the area. He further referred to issues of speeding and noise from vehicles and the use of 'rat runs' that further contributed to poor air quality experienced by local residents. He stated that local elected Members had successfully lobbied the airport to introduce measures to mitigate the impacts described, making reference to a resident parking scheme and localised traffic calming measures and he paid tribute to the positive engagement experienced when liaising with the management team at the airport.

He further made reference to the positive community engagement programmes that the airport had delivered over the previous years that had benefited both local older residents and school children. He further called for the need to ensure that the training and employment opportunities associated with the site benefited the local population and consideration needed to be given as to where recruitment events took place to ensure local residents benefited from these opportunities. He stated that public transport links needed to be improved to the site and he called for additional apprenticeship and training opportunities across the site for local residents. He concluded by stating that on balance local residents did support and welcome the airport and he further commented upon the financial contribution MAG made to the Council to enable it to deliver important services on behalf of Manchester residents.

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

- Noting the increasing cost of fuel could adversely impact the number of people flying if prices increased;

- Stating that there was a tension between increased passenger numbers and the need to address carbon emissions;
- The need to improve public transport links to the airport site, including cycling, noting the need for these at all times of the day due to the nature of shift patterns and to ensure that residents across the city could benefit from employment opportunities at the site;
- Car parking at the airport was expensive and would this be reviewed, noting that this could mitigate some of the issues of inconsiderate parking of vehicles experienced by local residents;
- Noting the need for future green skills and jobs, did MAG engage with the existing educational and research institutions in Manchester;
- Noting the conversation that emerged regarding the appropriate use of language and value of, when discussing the different levels of jobs and not to pit the economy against the environment; and
- The need to ensure that MAG was promoted as an attractive employer that delivered training and job progression opportunities.

Tim Hawkins, Chief of Staff, Manchester Airports Group responded to the comments and questions raised by advising that MAG remained committed to achieving net zero by 2038 and aviation to be net zero by 2050. He stated that MAG was taking a leading role in the development and management of sustainable aviation fuel. He stated that this presented the opportunity to develop links with local research institutions and deliver the related employment and skills opportunities. In regard to passenger numbers and issues relating to future variants and travel restrictions that all impacted on the financial viability of the business, he advised that MAG were working closely with both the Department of Transport and the Department of Health to plan and model for any potential future variant wave, using the lessons learnt from the previous years on the efficacy of travel restrictions. He further recognised the potential impact of rising fuel prices and the subsequent rising costs on air travel, he said that this situation continued to be closely monitored, adding that aviation fuel was purchased a year in advance by operators. He further recognised the issues raised regarding the challenges of public transport links, particularly as the site is a 24-hour operation. He said that they did engage with local operators on the issue and referenced the scheme that was operated to facilitate Stansted airport and that options to replicate this subsidised model were being discussed with local operators in Manchester. With regard to the issue of car parking at the site, he commented that car parking was integral to the business model and the pricing structure was reviewed to consider the correct balance was struck between supply and demand.

Jan Bramall, Chief Financial Officer, Manchester Airports Group discussed the issue of training and employment opportunities at the site. She described that the Airport Academy offered free training programmes. Upon completion, participants were guaranteed an interview with the airport. In 2019, 435 people from in and around Manchester gained employment at the airport as a result of the Academy's support. She stated that MAG were committed to a policy of 'grow your own talent' and they worked closely with the Trade Unions to ensure the jobs offered were attractive across the

piece, noting that this approach also helped with the retention of staff in the very competitive jobs market, noting the previous comments regarding the challenge presented by working shift patterns. She advised the Committee that MAG was committed to the Greater Manchester Good Employment Charter. She further referred to AeroZone, the state-of-the-art education centre on its campus. She stated that this inspired young people and challenged young people to consider the different range of career options and training opportunities available across the industry. She described that this was promoted via a range of mediums and encouraged all Councillors to promote this offer with their existing networks.

The Director of Inclusive Economy said she would encourage MAG to become a Real Living Wage Employer and to support the plans to make Greater Manchester a Living Wage City Region, to ensure that employees across all 10 boroughs are paid a real Living Wage and offered good contracts and working conditions.

In terms of the specific request for data and information relating to the numbers and geographical breakdown of people attending outreach and employment promotional events and the numbers of anticipated job creation would be provided to Members following the meeting.

The Leader stated that she endorsed the comments regarding the appropriate use of language when referring to the different types of employment across the city. She further acknowledged the issues and challenges that arose from the existing fragmented public transport network, noting that the recent announcements relating to bus services would help address the issues described.

## **Decision**

To note the report and presentation.

## **ESC/22/14 Manchester Housing Allocations Policy**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director, Growth & Development that provided an update on the Housing Allocations Policy Review.

Key points and themes of the report included:-

- Manchester's current statutory social housing allocations scheme was implemented in November 2020;
- In addition to the planned full evaluation after 24 months, it was agreed that an interim evaluation should be undertaken after 12 months;
- An overview of the scheme evaluation and analysis; and
- Noting the impact of COVID-19, the evidence to date was that the scheme was working as intended with no unexpected outcomes.

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

- Did all of the Registered Providers in Manchester apply the same policy when allocating properties, noting that this needed to be consistent and equitable;
- What was the approach to dealing with repairs during the pandemic;
- Comparative figures would be informative in future reports;
- What was the criteria for residents wishing to secure a property in a neighbouring authority and did neighbouring authorities have the same or similar letting policies to Manchester;
- What was the approach to housing refugee's and asylum seekers.

The Director, Housing and Residential Growth informed the Members that the issue of outstanding repairs due to the pandemic was a national issue, commenting that only emergency repairs had been undertaken during that time. He commented that this situation was beginning to normalise and plans were developed to deal with the back log, noting that the impact on void property turnaround times was understood.

Officers informed the Committee that all Registered Housing Providers have similar policies and applied the same choice-based lettings system, noting that the vast majority of lettings are to those residents in Bands 1 and 2. Officers stated that the demand on the service far outweighed the supply of available appropriately sized properties, and the turnover of properties was low, adding that the notion of low demand in Manchester was not true. Officers further advised that Manchester applied a two year residency criteria, adding that neighbouring authorities would have similar criteria, commenting that this made it difficult for residents to secure properties in other boroughs. The Chair asked that the residency criteria for all neighbouring boroughs be circulated to Members for information.

The Director, Housing and Residential Growth stated that there was ongoing collaboration and dialogue with all Registered Provers in the city via the Housing Access Board, adding that there was also a regular audit of lettings undertaken to provide an assurance that the correct process and priorities were applied.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment stated that he was confident that the scheme was working as intended, noting that priority was given to supporting the most vulnerable in the city, including the homeless and those victims of domestic violence. He described that demand for housing still outweighed supply and the city required more affordable housing and social housing. He stated that work was ongoing to respond to this demand and the Housing Strategy would be submitted to the Committee for consideration. He stated that the Government needed to do more to support the city to deliver more affordable housing. He further informed the Committee that under occupancy was an issue and work was being progressed to address this so as to release larger properties, making reference to the Extra Care and Age Friendly schemes that were being delivered.

The Leader provided an update on the housing of refugees and asylum seekers, adding that Manchester had responded well in welcoming and supporting asylum seekers

however improved arrangements and support from the Home Office was required, noting that an announcement was expected on the emerging situation in the Ukraine.

## **Decision**

The Committee notes the report and recommends that the residency criteria for all neighbouring boroughs Housing Policy be circulated to Members for information.

### **ESC/22/14 HS2 Phase 2b Western Leg - Environmental Statement Consultation & Hybrid Bill Petitioning Response**

The Committee were invited to consider and comment on the report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) that informed the Executive about the deposit of the HS2 hybrid Bill in Parliament on 24 January 2022; the public consultations on the Environmental Statement (ES) and Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) for the Bill; and outlined the Council's proposed response to these consultations. The report further outlined the key areas on which the Council was proposing to petition against the hybrid Bill, subject to the approval of Council on 4 March to submit a petition.

Key points and themes of the report included:-

- An introduction and background to the HS2 Crewe-Manchester hybrid Bill;
- HS2 Crewe-Manchester hybrid Bill Environmental Statement;
- Describing the key themes and issues identified;
- Immediate next steps;
- Next steps on the wider HS2 programme; and
- Conclusion.

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

- Supporting the ambitions of HS2 to deliver wider connectivity with the North, however calling for the Government's immediate attention to, and due consideration given to the concerns raised by Manchester;
- Supporting the call for an underground, through platform at Piccadilly train station to accommodate HS2 and meet the capacity needs;
- Noting that the proposals offered to Manchester would not be acceptable in London;
- The current HS2 proposals were contrary to the many ambitions and policies that city had to address issues such as improving active travel; addressing carbon emissions; protecting the heritage of the city and supporting biodiversity;
- Further detailed information was required from HS2 on the mitigation proposed to protect Northenden and Didsbury from flooding following the installation of the Withington Golf Club vent shaft;
- The proposed vent at Fallowfield Retail Park, Birchfield Road would adversely impact local residents; and
- The consultation events delivered by HS2 had not been satisfactory.

The Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure commented that all of the concerns expressed by the Members would be articulated in the submission to Government. She stated that they had lobbied HS2 and the Department for Transport on these and other issues as described in the report over a number of years without satisfactory response.

The Leader commented that this was an opportunity to deliver improvements and deliver the ambitions of Northern Powerhouse Rail to deliver a truly connected network, however the current proposals fell short of delivering on the ambitions for Manchester. She stated that the issue of capacity needed to be adequately addressed, adding that this could only be achieved with the installation of an underground, through platform at Piccadilly train station.

### **Decision**

The Committee endorse the recommendations that the Executive:

- (1) Note the deposit in Parliament of the HS2 Crewe-Manchester hybrid Bill and the accompanying ES and EQIA.
- (2) Note and comment on the proposed contents of the City Council's submission in response to the consultations on the HS2 Crewe-Manchester hybrid Bill ES and EQIA.
- (3) Note Council approval to submit a petition to object to aspects of the HS2 Crewe-Manchester hybrid Bill and comment on the proposed areas for the City Council's petition, and
- (4) Delegate authority to the Strategic Director – Growth & Development, in consultation with the Leader and Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport, to finalise the responses to the HS2 Crewe-Manchester hybrid Bill Environmental Statement and EQIA and submit to DfT.

### **ESC/22/15 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.

The Chair stated that she welcomed the reported increase in footfall at both the King Street and St Ann's Square locations; she paid tribute to the work delivered through the Good Jobs Project and the Connect with Us digital roadshow, noting the choice of venues to deliver these was welcomed.

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

### **ESC/22/16 Overview Report**

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

### **Decision**

The Committee note the report and agree the work programme.



## **Audit Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 15 February 2022**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Ahmed Ali - In the Chair  
Councillors Clay, Hitchen, Lanchbury, Robinson and Russell  
Independent Co-opted member: Dr D Barker  
Independent Co-opted member: Dr S Downs

#### **Also Present:**

Alistair Newall, Mazars (External Auditor)  
Karen Murray, Mazars (External Auditor)

#### **AC/22/01 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

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

#### **AC/22/02 Internal Audit Assurance Report Q3**

The Committee considered a report of the Head of Audit and Risk Management which provided an update of progress on the agreed audit plan 2021/22; additional work assigned to the audit service and copies of the audit opinions issued in the period November 2021 to January 2022.

The report included information on:

- The Audit Programme of Delivery
- Resource and Planning Objectives
- Children's Services and Education audit activity including, School Financial Health Checks, Foster Care payments
- Adults Services audit activity including, Client Financial Services (Appointeeships), Direct Payments, Technology Enabled Care, Better Outcomes Better Lives, Adults Management Oversight and Supervisions,
- Corporate Core audit activity including, Information Governance, Information and ICT, Core Systems
- Neighbourhoods; Growth and Strategic Development audit activity including Housing Operations – Governance Arrangements, Approach to Empty Homes and Voids, Victoria North (formerly Northern Gateway), Traffic Signals Maintenance Grant
- Audit activity relating to Procurement, Contracts and Commissioning (PCC) practices including Factory Project Assurance, a follow up review – Children's Placements, Carbon Reduction in Procurement, Contract Management – Adult Social Care, Waivers and Contract Extensions
- Audit Activity relating to Counter-Fraud and Investigations including Proactive activity and Reactive Corporate Cases; and

- Other Investigations including Business Grants, Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Housing Tenancies
- 

Appended to the report were:

- The delivery status of the annual audit plan 2021/22
- Executive summaries November 2021 to January 2022; and
- The basis of Audit Assessments (Opinion/Priority/Impact)

The key lines of enquiry discussed in the meeting were in relation to:

- School Financial Health Checks, in respect of all final reports resulting in a limited assurance opinion
- The approach to Empty Homes and Voids,
- Adults Services: Client Financial Services (Appointeeships),
- Procurement, Contracts and Commissioning - Waivers and Contract Extensions

Members welcomed the proposals outlined in relation to Empty Homes and Voids noting that progress on addressing the matter had likely been impacted on by the global pandemic. The Head of Audit and Risk Management gave clarification that Internal Audit's remit would be on the systems and processes in place to deliver an effective voids management system. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer suggested that it would be helpful for members to receive a report to be scheduled for the new municipal year which outlines actions and progress in terms of the assimilation of Northwards into the Council's Housing Operations Service.

With regard to Adult Social Care Waiver and Contract Extensions, The Head of Audit and Risk Management reported no concerns over compliance but indicated that coordinated work through the Commercial Board was needed to simplify constitutional wording in respect of contract authorisations as it had been deemed too constraining.

Members were informed that it was anticipated that the audit of contract management arrangements (Adults Services) would be complete with a final report issued by early May 2022. Should that timescale be delayed, the Director would be asked to provide an explanation to the Committee at its request.

In light of the proposal to defer planned audit activity of Adult Services Directorate Direct Payments (Client Financial Services) until 2022/23 due to arrangements being in place for that work to be delivered by the relevant professional bodies, Members sought to explore the extent to which audit work was coordinated across Greater Manchester (GM) boroughs to prevent unnecessary duplication. The Head of Audit and Risk Management described a well-established and positive relationship with colleagues in the GMCA citing good examples of coordinated work, though it was recognised that greater coordination may be possible in light of the presence of integrated care systems.

In respect of the assurance opinions relating to School Financial Health Checks, the Committee sought to explore the underlying reasons in light of all of the schools

named in the report having been ranked as 'limited'. Members highlighted this as a concern. The Head of Audit and Risk Management gave assurance that this did not reflect the position across all schools and was confined to a targeted sample of schools where it was understood that focussed audit work was indicated. These were smaller establishments where segregation of duties was more likely to be impacted upon by changed processes and priorities resulting from the global pandemic. He also indicated that this was, in part, a reflection of the criteria for selection of schools for inclusion in audit activity. The Committee discussed the benefits of reciprocal arrangements between smaller schools where challenges around duty segregation were evident as well as the importance of contingency measures which could be achieved through cluster arrangements and / or traded business support functions for instances related to significant staff absence. The Head of Audit and Risk Management agreed to reiterate the benefits of reciprocal arrangements as a possible way forward for schools facing challenges of this type. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer made reference to the monitoring role of the Local Authority's wider finance teams in terms of oversight and management of financial risk for maintained schools, which sit in parallel to the work of the internal audit function. A report which outlines the broad scope of the Local Authority's relationship with schools would be scheduled in the new municipal year to describe those relationships in a bid to address those concerns.

Discussions moved to Appointeeships for Client Financial Services – a member noted that two key actions that had been previously identified had not yet been implemented. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer informed the Committee that the Service Manager had met with herself and the Head of Audit and Risk Management to discuss the audit findings and there was confidence that the right arrangements were in place. A substantive response to outstanding actions were anticipated for early April 2022, adding that the service had recently been audited by the Office of the Public Guardian, the findings of which had been positive in respect of their audit of records management and the associated processes that were in place.

With regard to delivery of the Audit Programme, Members sought assurance that there was sufficient capacity within the team to catch up on planned activity that had not yet started. The Head of Audit and Risk Management gave assurance that the finalisation of the redesign remained on track in terms of planned implementation timescales. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer suggested that the next assurance report would include specific reference to the impact of Business Rates /government grants work and the COVID relief fund in respect of impact on audit programming. The Chair requested that the redesign of Human Resources and Organisational Development should also be included for discussion.

## **Decision**

1. To note the report.
2. To schedule a report which describes the Local Authority's education and finance colleagues' relationship with the maintained schools' sector, in terms of management of compliance, oversight and measures of internal control in the new municipal year.

3. To request that the next scheduled assurance report includes information about Business Rates /government grants assurance work, including the COVID relief fund legacy and the HROD redesign

### **AC/22/03 Outstanding Audit Recommendations Q3**

The Committee considered a report of the Head of Audit and Risk Management which summarised the current implementation position and arrangements for monitoring and reporting internal and external audit recommendations, in line with PSAA requirements.

The report provided information on:

- The standard process for follow up on management actions on high-risk recommendations
- The current implementation position, including outstanding audit recommendations (over 12 months), Significant / Critical Overdue Recommendations (less than 6 months), as well as those not yet overdue.

An overview of all outstanding recommendations was appended to the report.

Key lines of enquiry of enquiry discussed in the meeting were in relation to outstanding recommendations in respect of:

- Mental Health Casework - the development of processes for reconciling safeguarding referrals and the outcomes of these between the Council and the Trust
- Transitions of social care from Children's to Adults Services
- Section 106 agreements

In introducing the report, the Head of Audit and Risk Management referred to a discussion at the Committee's November 2021 meeting about the implementation of recommendations about the frequency of Planning for Permanence meetings. The Deputy Director of Children's Services attended the meeting and explained that the policy around planning for permanence had since been revised to bring about a greater focus on the individual circumstances of the child / young person. These meetings were now scheduled to take place before a child's second review meeting and was felt to imbue more meaning and purpose to that measure. In terms of the frequency of those meetings, a quantitative measure was delivered through a monthly dashboard that is routinely considered by the Corporate Parenting Panel (CPP). A member agreed that the matter had been well debated and carefully considered by the CPP with the issue of finding appropriate placements remaining high on its agenda.

With regard to Mental Health Casework, a member expressed concern that the recommendation had not been implemented, mindful of the length of time that had elapsed. Whilst it was acknowledged that the impact of the global pandemic had more than likely adversely impacted progress, the implication on safeguarding of a vulnerable cohort was highlighted as a concern and that appropriate rigor and scrutiny should therefore be applied. It was also noted that no revised completion

date for this action had been submitted. Members noted that reference to the delay had been attributed to challenges around staff training during the pandemic and the interface between the Council's Liquid Logic and the Trust's own platform. Whilst it was acknowledged that there had been some change to strategy, the detailed reasons for the delay and barriers to implementation remained unclear. The Committee resolved to request that the Director of Adults Services provides a formal update on this specific issue for the next meeting of the Committee. It was also suggested that the response should encompass all of the outstanding recommendations made in connection with Adult Services in light of safeguarding considerations. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer agreed that a formal response from the Director was necessary but gave assurance that in the absence of the outstanding recommendations being implemented, other measures were in place to ensure that cases were appropriately reviewed during the significant additional challenge faced by Adult Social Care colleagues throughout the pandemic .

### **Decision**

1. To note the report
2. To schedule a report for the next meeting of the committee which provides in depth detail on the barriers to implementation of recommendations yet to be implemented for Directorate for Adults.

### **AC/22/04 External Audit Progress**

The Committee considered the report of the External Auditors (Mazars) which set out progress towards completion of the annual external audit and provided a summary of reports and publications which may be of interest to the Committee in its wider governance role.

Karen Murray (Partner, Mazars) introduced the report stating, with regard to the completion of the 2019/20 Whole of Government Accounts (WGA), that updated submissions were received from the Council in December 2021, resulting in completion of the audit within the final deadline. As previously reported, the delays were described as being due to technical difficulties with the interface with the HM Treasury online portal and subsequent output to evidence the trail of audited financial statements. Delays were also due in part to the unresolved audit queries as a result of staff absences which had led to additional audit work resulting in additional fees in line with Public Sector Audit Appointment (PSAA) arrangements.

Work concerning financial statements, audit queries and evidence requests for 2020/21 was still being progressed across a number of account areas, although the number of outstanding areas had significantly reduced. It was reiterated that the most significant and complex area requiring completion was in relation to sample testing of the valuation of Council land, buildings and investment properties, involving input from several external valuers across a diverse asset base. The intention was for Mazars to complete their audit work in time for the Committee's March meeting however the challenges and complexities associated with this particular area of activity presented a risk that that timetable may be unachievable.

In respect of audit work in connection with Value for Money arrangements, changes to the NAO Code of Audit Practice had changed the nature of external audit work for arrangements for 2020/21. This work would be concluded in conjunction with the completion of the activity around financial statements.

With regard to Whole of Government Accounts (WGA) work for 2020/21, the Committee was invited to note that instructions and timetable had not yet been issued resulting in the Council being unable to progress its 2020/21 submission. It was explained that this was because HM Treasury was in the process in seeking to resolve challenges with the system that they use. In addition, Mazars's audit instructions and timetable are issued by the National Audit Office. Those instructions had also not yet been issued and as a result, those delays to the timetable would place additional pressures on the Council and Mazars.

Moving to discussion about the national publications, Ms Murray drew the Committee's attention to a consultation announced by the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) on time limited changes to the Code with effect from the end of March 2022. The aim being to help alleviate delays to the publication of audited financial statements in light of only 9% of Local Authority accounts in England having met the audit publication deadline of 30 September 2021. Ms Murray indicated that the consultation should be considered in conjunction with newly announced measures to improve the timeliness of local audit and accounts as well as confirmation of the audit timetable by the Department of Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC). These include additional funds and an extension of the deadline for publishing accounts.

There was a discussion about the impact of the delays on the 2021/22 external audit. The Committee was informed that some aspects of the audit were possible, though the progression of detailed audit work would be delayed. The associated changes to the audit timetable would need to be worked though in consultation with the Council's finance teams to agree an achievable timetable.

With regard to the anticipated completion date of March 2022, Ms Murray described the challenges and complexities at large in the audit for valuation of land, buildings and properties. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer explained that in recent years there had been a change in emphasis on the importance of valuations, with local government gradually moving towards an audit regime similar to that found within the private sector. For the private sector the treatment of assets on the balance sheet was material, in that collateral may be raised against it. However, in local government bodies, the position differed with regard to public sector assets (eg schools) and this presented a challenge in terms of financial value in local audits, with an associated pressure to provide the same quality of regularly updated valuations across all of the public estate. Turning to the CIPFA consultation referred to by Ms Murray, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer explained that the aim of the consultation sought to establish whether valuations for some public sector assets could be simplified. However, on the assumption that this was not possible a significant investment in work to underpin valuation records of the Council's complex and diverse public sector estate was likely. With regard to the Council's response to the CIPFA consultation, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer informed the Committee that this would be done in collaboration with Core Cities colleagues in

respect of the valuations, however irrespective of the outcome of the consultation it was felt that a material change to the 2021/22 audit was unlikely due to tight timescales.

**Decision**

To note the report.

**AC/22/05 Work Programme and Recommendations Monitor**

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which provided a summary of recent recommendations made by the Committee and the its draft Work Programme.

**Decision**

To note the report.

**AC/22/06 Exclusion of the Public**

A recommendation was made that the public be excluded during consideration of the following items of business.

**Decision**

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

**AC/22/07 2018/19 Audit and Accounts [Public Excluded]**

The Committee received an oral statement from the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer on the 2018/19 Audit and Accounts.

**Decision**

To note the statement.

(Councillor Robinson declared a personal interest as a tenant of Solutions for Brunswick (S4B))





## Licensing Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 7 March 2022

**Present:** Councillor Ludford – in the Chair

**Councillors:** Grimshaw, Hewitson, Connolly, Hassan, Jeavons and Riasat

**Apologies:** Councillor Hughes, Andrews, Evans, Flanagan, and Reid.

#### LHP/22/1 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 October 2021 were submitted for approval.

#### Decision

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Licensing Committee meeting held on 25 October 2021.

#### LHP/22/2 Licensing Update

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that provided a topical update on various Licensing matters.

The Principal Licensing Officer introduced the report, first discussing COVID-19 and the changes this had made for Licensed Premises. Whilst Government restrictions have changed, the Principal Licensing Officer stated that venues have still been asked to exercise caution.

A proposed relaxation in licensing hours for the Queen's Platinum Jubilee weekend was then discussed. This would extend Licensing hours until 01.00am but has not yet received approval from Government.

The Principal Licensing Officer then discussed changes to TEN's and the provisions of the Business and Planning Act 2020. They discussed the extensions to some of the temporary provisions contained within them.

The Principal Licensing Officer then moved on to discuss the Action Counters Terrorism (ACT) training, providing Committee with an update on the progress of this. In-person sessions of the training have begun, with feedback positive about the course.

The Principal Licensing Officer then informed the Committee that a review of the Licensing Policy was underway, with the intention that a consultation will begin shortly. The review aims to decrease the size of the policy, to make it more accessible. The review also aims to ensure that the policy is fit for purpose. The Principal Licensing Officer invited members of the Committee to meet outside of the meeting if they had any ideas on what they wanted to see in the review.

Finally, the Principal Licensing Officer provided an update on Gambling Harms. GMCA had been awarded a sum of money to fund a programme across Greater Manchester, with the aim of preventing and reducing gambling related harm.

The Committee expressed that it was good to hear the update on Gambling Harms. A member of the Committee discussed the experiences of a constituent who had a gambling problem.

A member of the Committee then questioned the impact of relaxing licensing hours for the Platinum Jubilee celebrations and how ACT training can be tailored to individual licensed premises. The Principal Licensing Officer stated that no concerns had been raised to themselves regarding the relaxation in hours causing any additional problems. In terms of ACT training, the content of the course has evolved slightly. It is noted as difficult to relate the training directly to individual Licensed Premises as it is a nationally recognised course. The Principal Licensing Officer stated that those delivering the training have the ability to focus on the key areas of the content for those they deliver to.

The Committee then questioned more on the Gambling Harms update, also asking for further updates on case studies in the area. The Principal Licensing Officer offered to bring case studies and detailed figures before a future committee. They informed the Committee that the Government's White Paper has been delayed but a key facet of the review is social responsibility of gambling operators and this is expected to be addressed in the Paper. An update will be brought to a future Committee.

### **Decision**

The Committee noted the report.

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 17 February 2022**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat, Richards and Stogia

**Apologies:** Councillors Shaukat Ali, Baker-Smith and Kirkpatrick

**Also present:**  
Councillor Hitchens

#### **PH/22/07 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 132429/FO/2021 and 131895/JO/2021.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/22/08 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 January 2022 as a correct record.

#### **PH/22/09 129318/FO/2021 - Development Adjacent The Jolly Butcher Public House, Petersfield Drive, Manchester, M23 9PS - Brooklands Ward**

The applicant was proposing to erect a two storey dwellinghouse on a cul-de-sac off Petersfield Drive. The site is adopted highway and currently allows access to a number of properties on Petersfield Drive and Virginia Close.

This application related to a site, 350m<sup>2</sup> in size, located on the southern side of Petersfield Drive. The site consists of a small cul-de-sac and associated pavements which provides pedestrian and vehicular access to the rear of nos. 64 and 66 Petersfield Drive, as well as pedestrian access to nos. 14 to 18 Virginia Close and the adjoining pub, The Jolly Butcher. The site is an adopted highway. To the north of the site, on the opposite side of Petersfield Drive, there is a single storey commercial terrace, while to the east there is a terrace of three 2 storey dwellinghouses, nos. 62 to 66 Petersfield Drive. To the east of the site stands The Jolly Butcher PH and to the south lies the rear gardens of nos. 14 to 18 Virginia Close.

The applicant was proposing to erect a two storey detached dwellinghouse on the cul de-sac with gardens to the front and rear, with the rear garden being separated

from the dwelling by a two metre wide strip in order to provide two parking spaces and to allow vehicular access to no. 64 and 66 Petersfield Road.

Objections had been received from five households and the adjoining public house. Objections had been raised in respect of the impact on residential amenity, pedestrian and highway safety and the operation of The Jolly Butcher PH.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that there had been an appeal against non-determination in relation to this application and stated that reasons for the Officer's recommendation of Minded to Refuse were included within the report.

No objector to the application attended the meeting or addressed the Committee on the application.

No Applicant attended the meeting or addressed the Committee on the application.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation of Minded to Refuse for the application. Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee agreed the recommendation of Minded to Refuse for the reasons outlined within the report.

(Councillors Davies and Kamal were not present for this item and took no part in the discussion or decision making process).

### **PH/22/10 132429/FO/2021 - Two Parcels Of Land Known As "Trinity Islands" Bounded By The River Irwell, Regent Road, Water Street, Trinity Way And The Railway Manchester M3 4JW - Deansgate Ward**

This application was proposing the erection of four towers ranging from 39, 48, 55 and 60 storeys to form a mixed use development comprising 1950 residential apartments (Use Class C3a) and commercial uses (Use Classes E and Sui Generis: Drinking Establishment) (361 sqm) within the podium level together with public realm, car and cycle parking, access arrangements and highway works, and other associated works.

This 1.78 hectare site, currently bounded by the River Irwell, Liverpool Road, Water Street and Regent Road, comprises large areas of hard standing which have been used for parking and recently as a construction compound for the Orsdall Chord. Trinity Way divides the site into two parcels of land know as site C and site D and are connected via an underpass.

There had been eight objections, two neutral comments and one in support.

The Planning officer had no further information or additional comments to make.

No objectors to the application attended the meeting or addressed the Committee on the application.

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

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions.

A member stated that they noted that this application was a flagship regeneration project but felt there was a judgement call between the amount invested in public realm and the social infrastructure contribution whilst being disappointed in the lack of affordable housing for a scheme of such size and questioned how a reasonable balance can be struck with this type of scheme.

The Planning Officer stated that there were serious challenges for the developer on this site with it being dominated by transport links and within the vicinity of an industrial area. The Planning Officer expressed that this development would have to be desirable in order to work due to these factors or risk failure, adding that lowering the specifications would devalue the scheme. The Planning Officer felt that this site would be an asset to the city with a large amount handed over for public space. £1.5million had been secured to contribute to the creation of a new school and create large job increases. The Planning Officer concluded by stating that further input for affordable housing may be possible due to the 9 year period of development and the potential for costs and values to alter during this timespan.

A member questioned whether the £1.5million towards the school fund was coming from this development alone and also asked if the public space was large enough.

The Planning Officer stated that the creation of the school shell was funded by another development and that the fit out for the school would be covered by the contribution from this application. The Planning Officer confirmed that the public realm was of considerable size, at 40% the size of the Mayfield site.

A member asked about the disposal of food waste.

The Planning Officer confirmed that tenants would be responsible for taking food waste to the ground level.

A member stated that they were disappointed in the lack of affordable housing on site, adding that the school project was also not planned to be on site.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the school would be located at Crown Street.

A member wished to express that there was no bar on affordable housing at any site across the city, including the city centre.

The Chair confirmed this policy.

Councillor Flanagan welcomed this investment and felt that the public space would be a benefit to the city and moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve for the application. Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

## Decision

The Committee agreed the recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to the conditions and the signing of a s106 agreement as detailed in the report.

(Councillor Kamal was not present for this item and took no part in the discussion or decision making process).

### **PH/22/11 131895/JO/2021 - Coleshill Street Manchester M40 8HH – Miles Platting and Newton Heath Ward**

This application was placed before the Committee on 18 January 2022, but committee members agreed to defer determination of the application until the next meeting to allow members to be satisfied that the delivery of affordable dwellings at the site forms part of the development agreement.

Permission was sought to remove condition no.44 attached to planning permission reference 125596/FO/2019 (approved subject to conditions and a section 106 agreement on 10 November 2020), in relation to affordable housing.

The approved scheme for 410 new homes, was accompanied by an Affordable Housing Statement, which outlined that the viability of the scheme had been considered in line with best practice and as such a Viability Assessment was submitted for consideration. There are complex ground conditions on the site, which impact on viability, and it was demonstrated that, in itself, the development could not support affordable housing. Through the involvement of a Registered Provider, however, 114 affordable dwellings are to be provided on the site through grant funding from Homes England.

Since the granting of the planning permission, Homes England has confirmed that the houses would not qualify for funding if they are subject to a planning condition. In this instance the affordable homes would be delivered and secured via the Development Agreement with the City Council and provisions in the leases (fulfilled by virtue of the City Council's landownership interest), rather than by way of condition no.44.

Information was now included within the report to address the concerns of members.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this application had been deferred to allow the Committee to be satisfied that the delivery of affordable housing is controlled via the development agreement. The latest report included a response from the head of development, confirming that the delivery of affordable housing is covered by the development agreement and the late representation detailed that the number and percentage of affordable housing is the same as would have been provided under the original application.

A Local Ward Councillor confirmed that all 3 Ward Councillors were now satisfied with this application.

Councillor Andrews thanked the Planning Officers for fulfilling their obligation in bringing the necessary information back to the Committee and moved the recommendation of Minded to Approve for the application. Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

(Councillors Flanagan and Richards both declared an interest in this item and left the room during the consideration of the application).

### **Decision**

The Committee agreed the recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to the conditions and the signing of a s106 agreement as detailed in the report.





## **Standards Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2022**

#### **Present**

Independent Co-opted Member: N Jackson – In the Chair  
Councillors Andrews, Connolly, Evans, Lanchbury and Simcock  
Ringway Parish Council: Councillor O'Donovan

#### **Apologies:**

Independent Co-opted Member: G Linnell, Councillor Good

#### **ST/22/01            Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held 4 November 2021 were submitted for approval.

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2021 as a correct record.

#### **ST/22/02            Standards Committee - Annual Report**

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that provided an update on the matters within the remit of the Committee since the beginning of February 2021.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and description of the Roles of the Standards Committee and the Council's Monitoring Officer;
- Update on matters within the remit of the Standards Committee since its last Annual Report;
- Update on matters considered by the Committee; and
- Complaints against Councillors, including a summary of the findings.

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

- That Councillors who had yet to update their Register of Interests may wish to consider this. It was noted that a reminder to members on this was scheduled for just after the May elections

#### **Decisions**

To note the report and forward this report to full Council for assurance on standards issues.

#### **ST/22/03            Member Development and Training**

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that provided an update on the operation and efficacy of the Member Development Strategy and training delivered since February 2021. The report sought the Standards Committee's comments on and approval of the Member Development Strategy 2022-24.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- An overview of the Member Development Strategy and its key objectives;
- A description of the delivery of the New Member Induction programme 2021;
- Induction feedback from May 2021;
- Proposals for New Member Induction 2022;
- Member training February 2021 – January 2022;
- Attendance information;
- Findings from the evaluation of training;
- Scheduled training for the remainder of the 2021/22 municipal year;
- Training Programme May 2022- April 2023; and
- Training for co-opted members.

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

- An invitation to the full Induction programme should be offered to new members (it was confirmed that the two members elected at by elections had attended induction sessions )
- GDPR and Cyber Security training was in place for members and it was requested that all members should access this training
- The "Listening In Action" process was currently under review as it was felt this process worked better as a face-to-face meeting which COVID regulations had not allowed for previously
- The recent Peer Review had highlighted the strength of Scrutiny at the Council and member training had played a part in this.
- ICT services were working hard with assisting in the use of technology but there were improvements to be made (it was noted that ICT services had taken on board the varying levels of IT understanding across staff and members)
- That an update would be fed back on the subject of DBS checks for members
- That mandatory training days should be inputted into members' diaries well in advance (ideally at the start of the municipal year to ensure maximum attendance)
- That some training/knowledge around using the Casework software could be offered via training and/or shared between members
- That ongoing support for using IT equipment was to be reviewed
- That members should be consulted on their IT needs to feed back to the ICT service
- That there were some useful comments to take away regarding approach for ICT issues

## Decisions

1. To approve the Member Development Strategy 2022-24.
2. To note the report on training delivered since February 2021.

**ST/22/04 Social Media Guidance for Members update**

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that provided an update on the operation and efficacy of the Social Media Guidance for Members ('the Guidance') as well as the provision of training for members on the Guidance.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background
- Information relating to the Operation of the Guidance; and
- Member training.
- Minor revisions proposed to the Guidance

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

- That it was good to see that none of the complaints on members' conduct were in relation to the use of social media

**Decision**

To note the report, approve the minor revisions and request that the Social Media Guidance for Members (as revised) be circulated to all Members .

**ST/21/05 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.



## Personnel Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 16 February 2022

**Present:** Councillor Rahman (Chair) – in the Chair

**Councillors:** Bridges, Midgley and White

**Apologies:** Councillors Akbar, Craig and Rawlins

**PE/22/1**      **Minutes**

#### Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 15 December 2021 as a correct record.

**PE/22/2**      **Creation of a new post - Director of Neighbourhood Delivery and the redesignation of the existing post of Director of Policy, Performance and Reform to Assistant Chief Executive**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development, which set out the proposal for the creation of a new Director of Neighbourhoods Delivery post within the Neighbourhoods Directorate and the redesignation of the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform to Assistant Chief Executive.

The current Neighbourhoods Directorate played a key role in supporting the delivery of the Our Manchester Strategy. This included the creation of sustainable, safe, resilient, and cohesive neighbourhoods, with good quality green spaces, and accessible culture and sporting facilities. The recent addition of Housing and Homelessness had made the directorate the largest within the organisation with over 1800 staff and with the broadest span of activity.

It was therefore proposed that the number of direct reports into the Strategic Director Neighbourhoods was reviewed and streamlined by creating a new post Director of Neighbourhoods Delivery at senior salary grade SS4 (£98,592 to £108,853). This would bring Neighbourhood teams, Libraries, Galleries and Culture, and Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events, together with Compliance and Community Safety into a single division and would reduce current direct reports from seven to four for the Strategic Director.

It was also proposed that the existing post of Director of Policy, Performance and Reform was redesignated to Assistant Chief Executive on its existing senior salary grade (SS4) to reflect the support, policy work and insight this function provided to the Chief Executive and based on the observations of the recent Peer Review, which in summary asked the Council to consider strengthening the policy and performance capability directly available to the Chief Executive and Senior Management Team.

## Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Recommends to Council the creation of new post, Director of Neighbourhood Delivery at senior salary grade SS4 Grade (£98,592 to £108,853).
- (2) Note the redesignation of the existing post Director of Policy, Performance and Reform to Assistant Chief Executive on existing senior salary grade SS4 Grade (£98,592 to £108,853) and the change in line management arrangements for this post.

### **PE/22/3 New and revised HROD policies (Annual Leave, Domestic Abuse and Special Leave)**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development, which outlined new and revised employment policies for the Committee's consideration: the new Annual Leave Policy and the revised Domestic Abuse and Special Leave Policies.

The new Annual Leave Policy and revised Domestic Abuse and Special Leave Policies had been developed to fill a policy gap where there was no MCC policy on Annual Leave, updated in line with legislation (revised Domestic Abuse Policy) and new contractual entitlements introduced for Safe Leave and Fostering Leave (revised Special Leave Policy). Feedback from the 2019 Race Equality Review has also been incorporated in the revised Special Leave Policy.

Introducing a new Annual Leave policy would result in more consistent and equitable practice across Directorates in agreeing annual leave requests and authorising annual leave carryover. This also linked to the Health and Wellbeing Strategy by encouraging employees to take regular breaks from work and to use their entitlement to annual leave within the annual leave year.

The revised Domestic Abuse Policy now highlighted the new Third Party Abuse and Harassment Policy and the Abuse and Harassment Report Form for reporting incidents of harassment and unwanted contact at work. It also introduced a contractual right to ten days' paid safe leave in a 12 month period for those fleeing abusive relationships.

The Special Leave Policy had been reviewed and updated to widen the definitions of family to take account of different family and cultural obligations. The Policy also now noted that some protected groups may need more special leave if travelling outside the UK when bereaved. In addition, the circumstances where foster carers may request paid special leave of up to ten days in a 12 month period had been defined. This was to support the Council becoming one of the Fostering Network's Foster Friendly Employers

Comments on these proposed changes had been received from the Trade Unions and noted by the Committee

**Decision**

The Committee approve the new and revised policies

This page is intentionally left blank



**Manchester City Council  
Report for Resolution**

**Report to:** Council – 30 March 2022

**Subject:** Pay Policy Statement 2022/23

**Report of:** Director Human Resources and Organisational Development

---

**Purpose of Report**

This report introduces the draft Manchester City Council Pay Policy Statement for 2022/23 and seeks approval of the statement by the Committee prior to its agreement by Council.

The statement is cognisant of the organisational context and the impact of the 2022/23 budget. It sets out the direction of travel in relation to pay for Manchester’s officers for the year ahead in line with the organisational priorities.

The statement has been developed to comply with the legal requirement set out under section 38 (1) of the Localism Act 2011 and takes account of other relevant legislative requirements.

The Statement also includes information on the Council’s ‘Gender Pay Gap’ and work to proactively promote workforce equality, in accordance with the requirement to carry out Gender Pay Reporting set out within The Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties and Public Authorities) Regulations 2017.

**Recommendation**

Council is asked to approve the draft Pay Policy and note the organisation’s Pay and Grading Structure for the financial year 2022/23 as appended to the Pay Policy Statement.

---

**WARDS AFFECTED:** All

<b>Manchester Strategy outcomes</b>	<b>Summary of the contribution to the strategy</b>
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities	The Council’s most senior managers drive the work of the organisation to transform and deliver its obligations and objectives. The Pay Policy Statement proposed sets out arrangements which seek to balance the need for the proper remuneration of its employees to attract and retain the skills needed to deliver the organisation and City’s objectives (Our Manchester) and the cost of this to the communities it serves. It is based on the
A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city’s economic success	
A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by	

unlocking the potential of our communities	principles of fairness, equality and value for money and in line with both relevant legislative requirements and the framework set by the Council's Constitution.
A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work	
A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth	

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

- Equal Opportunities Policy
- Risk Management
- Legal Considerations

---

**Financial implications for the revenue and capital budgets:**

None

---

**Contact Officer:**

Name: Deb Clarke  
 Position: Director of Human Resources & Organisational Development  
 Telephone: 07812 502614  
 E-mail: deb.clarke@manchester.gov.uk

**Background Documents:**

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

Report to Personnel Committee, 29 January 2019: *Senior Pay and Grading Update*  
 Report to Personnel Committee, 13 March 2019: *Pay Policy Statement*  
 Report to Personnel Committee, 11 March 2020: *Pay Policy Statement*  
 Report to Personnel Committee, 17 March 2021: *Pay Policy Statement*

## 1.0 Introduction

1.1 Under section 38 of the Localism Act 2011, local authorities are required to publish a 'Pay Policy Statement' on an annual basis, focused mainly on senior employees. Approval of the Statement cannot be delegated. The Act sets out that a Pay Policy Statement must include:

- A local authority's policy on the level and elements of remuneration for each chief officer<sup>1</sup>
- A local authority's policy on the remuneration of its lowest-paid employees (together with its definition of "lowest-paid employees" and its reasons for adopting that definition)
- A local authority's policy on the relationship between the remuneration of its chief officers and other officers
- A local authority's policy on other specific aspects of chief officers' remuneration: remuneration on recruitment, increases and additions to remuneration, use of performance-related pay and bonuses, termination payments, and transparency

1.2 The scope of the Pay Policy Statement excludes all staff employed in schools.

1.3.1 The Council's current Pay Policy Statement was commended by this Committee on 17 March 2021 and approved by Council on 31 March 2021.

1.4 The 2022/23 Pay Policy Statement aligns to the overall priorities, activities and context of the organisation and wider public sector and seeks to provide transparency around decisions affecting pay and remuneration in this context.

1.5 The Pay Policy Statement forms a key component of the organisation's approach to managing its workforce in general and recognition and reward and is a key contributor to the priorities set out within the Council strategy.

1.6 The statement also includes information on the Council's 'Gender Pay Gap' which, as a public sector organisation, the Council is required to publish annually. Alongside the required tables a supporting narrative has been included which detail ongoing work by the organisation to proactively promote workforce equality in general and gender equality.

1.7 The Statement is one element of the organisation's overarching approach to transparency and accountability. It is supported by comprehensive information on the organisation's structure and the salary for senior posts as well as the equality make-up of the workforce which is available on the Council's website and updated on at least an annual basis.

---

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that Manchester currently does not use the term 'Chief Officer' when describing posts. The statutory definition for the purposes of the statement is set out in the Glossary of Terms within the Pay Policy Statement for background

## 2.0 The Pay Policy Statement

- 2.1 The draft Pay Policy Statement for 2022/23 is appended to this report. The statement summarises the organisation's approach to pay and remuneration for the year ahead.
- 2.2 The Statement does not set policy, but rather summarises the approaches already endorsed by this Committee and seeks to bring together key information in one place for clarity. It will act to help this Committee and the wider public hold the organisation to account for its pay related decisions for the year ahead.
- 2.3 The Pay Policy Statement includes information on the Authority's salary multiple, the ratio between the highest paid officer (the Chief Executive) and the median rate for all officers within the scope of the Statement. As of January 2022, the salary multiple between the highest paid officer (the Chief Executive) and the median rate for all officers within the scope of this policy is 7.84:1. This represents a slight increase on the multiple as set out within the 2021/22 statement (7.7:1). This ratio results from the detailed implementation of the pay policies set out in this document and will vary marginally with time as the shape of the organisation and roles change.
- 2.4 The Localism Act is clear that the statement must be approved by the Council and approval is sought to present the draft statement to Council for endorsement later this month.
- 2.5 Once approved, the Pay Policy Statement will come into effect on 1 April 2022.
- 2.6 The Council remains committed to the national pay structure and the relevant national agreements including those for the National Joint Council (NJC) for local government services, the Joint National Council for Chief Executives and the Joint National Council for Chief Officers. Pay awards for 2021/22 have been agreed for officers within scope of the Joint National Council for Chief Executives and the Joint National Council for Chief Officers at 1.5 %. A pay award for 2021/22 has also been agreed for employees within the scope of the National Joint Council (NJC) for local government services at 2.75% for those on NJC pay point 1 and 1.75% on NJC pay points 2 and above. Discussions with all national negotiating bodies are yet to begin for the 2022/23 period. When national agreement is reached, this will be reflected in the Council's pay and grading structure appended to this statement.

## 3.0 Gender Pay Gap Reporting

- 3.1 The Council is required by law to carry out Gender Pay Reporting on an annual basis in line with the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties and Public Authorities) Regulations 2017.

3.2 The headline figure is a mean gap of 6.6% and median gap of 6.3%<sup>2</sup>. This represents a reduction in the gap between the average pay of men and women from the previous year. This is significantly below the mean and median gap for the UK of 14.9% and 15.4%<sup>3</sup> respectively. The Council is committed to continuing to reduce this differential. Further detail in relation to this is contained within the Pay Policy Statement.

#### 4.0 **Manchester Living Wage**

4.1 Manchester City Council is an accredited 'Living Wage Employer' and as such is committed to paying the Living Wage Foundation's 'real' living wage (also known as the Foundation living wage). In November 2021, the Living Wage Foundation announced the new real living wage hourly rate for the coming year of £9.90 per hour, an increase of 40p per hour. Accredited Living Wage Employers are required to implement the rise within six months. The Manchester Living Wage (MLW) will therefore be aligned to the new real living wage rate from 1 April 2022.

4.2 There is a longer term and continuing challenge to ensure the NJC pay spine can absorb the impact of significant annual increases to the statutory National Living Wage which are forecast to continue. Work is underway at a national level to address this challenge. The National Employers for local government services have written to all local authority Chief Executives and a range of regional meetings are scheduled. Manchester City Council are committed to participating in this discussion and will undertake any work at a local level to ensure we continue to pay the Foundation Living Wage as well as the statutory National Living Wage.

#### 5.0 **Comments of the Director of HROD**

5.1 I have been consulted on the draft Pay Policy Statement for 2022/23 and am confident that it will continue to provide an effective and open framework for the management of pay to all employees across the authority.

#### 6.0 **Comments from the Trade Unions**

To follow

#### 7.0 **Conclusion**

7.1 The development of a Pay Policy Statement and its approval by the Council is a requirement under the Localism Act 2011. The statement appended below is Manchester's ninth annual statement and will support a continued understanding of the organisation's approach to remuneration set within the

---

<sup>2</sup> The difference between the mean and median hourly rate of pay of male employees and female employees

<sup>3</sup> Source: All employees as per ONS, Gender Pay Gap in the UK: October 2021- Provisional

context of the overall direction of the organisation to improve services and, ultimately, deliver better outcomes for Manchester residents.

- 7.2 Members are asked to approve the content of the draft Pay Policy Statement (2022/23).



# **Pay Policy Statement: 2022/23**

## 1. Introduction and Purpose

The Pay Policy Statement sets out the Council's policy regarding remuneration in accordance with the requirements of Section 38 of the Localism Act 2011 (The 'Act') and associated statutory guidance. The purpose of the statement is to provide transparency regarding the Council's approach to setting the pay of its employees and includes:

- The methods by which salaries of all employees are identified
- The detail and level of remuneration of the most senior employees
- The detail and level of remuneration of the lowest paid employees
- The relationship between the remuneration of the highest paid and other employees
- Information in response to the requirement to provide 'Gender Pay Reporting' information in line with the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties and Public Authorities) Regulations 2017

The Personnel Committee of the Council is responsible, on behalf of the full Council, for ensuring the provisions set out in this Statement are applied consistently throughout the Council. The Personnel Committee will also refer to Council any decisions affecting newly graded posts or regraded posts where the salary becomes £100,000 or more.

### ***Scope of this Policy***

This Pay Policy Statement relates to staff employed by Manchester City Council whose remuneration, including rate of pay and terms and conditions, are determined by and within the control of the authority. It therefore does not apply to:

- Staff employed by a third party contracted to work for the authority (although the comments under the sections below on *interim support* and *preventing tax avoidance* should be noted).
- Staff on secondment to or from the authority, where their rates of pay or terms and conditions are not determined by the Authority. The Authority's approach to secondments sets how pay with regard to individuals in this group is managed.
- All staff employed in schools, including temporary teaching staff, support staff and agency staff.
- Staff employed through the authority on behalf of a third party where remuneration and some or all of the other conditions of employment are not determined by the authority.
- Unpaid volunteers or individuals on work experience placements. Such placements are intended to give students and and/or individuals from the Council's social value priority groups experience of working in the public sector. These roles would not normally be expected to last longer than six weeks.

Once approved by the full Council, the Pay Policy Statement will come into effect on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2022 and will be subject to annual review.

### ***Legislative framework***

In determining pay the Council will comply with all relevant employment legislation. The Council is also bound by collective agreements and contractual arrangements which cannot be unilaterally altered.



Relevant legislation includes the Employment Rights Act 1996, Equality Act 2010, Part Time Employment (Prevention of Less Favourable Treatment) Regulations 2000, the Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations 2006 (as amended), Agency Workers Regulations 2010, and the Children & Families Act 2014.

The Council has taken steps to ensure there is no discrimination within its pay structures and that all pay differentials can be objectively justified. Where relevant, legislative obligation will supersede the approach and principles outlined in this statement, for example where terms and conditions are preserved as a result of contracts of employment transferring under TUPE.

## **2. Determining pay**

Salary levels for the workforce are set via analytical mechanisms. The Council operates a job evaluation scheme for officers at Grade 12 and below and a senior job evaluation scheme for roles at Grades SS1 – SS5 including DCX and CEX spot points. The pay and main contractual conditions of all employees of the Council are linked to a national pay bargaining structure relevant to the role (see *Collective Bargaining* below).

Pay can include elements applicable only to a specific group of employees, for example contractual arrangements and terms of the relevant national agreement. This includes, for example, specific allowances and additions to pay (e.g. overtime, flexibility payments, honoraria, which can be time limited and are subject to approval). In limited circumstances, time and cash limited pay protection may be applicable, arrangements for which have been agreed in accordance with relevant local negotiating arrangements.

Other additions to the salary of officers may be made in accordance with the Council's Constitution and stated policies (e.g. car user allowance). Such payments will be made in accordance with the principles of this statement and with approval by the delegated budget holder or approver. All such payments are made in order to support the delivery of effective services and adhere to the principle of value for money.

### ***Collective Bargaining***

The Council has a strong commitment to collective bargaining based on national salary structures and to full and open engagement with its workforce.

The continued requirement for cost reduction by the organisation will mean that in 2022/23 a balance will need to be struck between any proposed increases in individual pay and the need to ensure that workforce expenditure remains in line with the agreed budget for the workforce set in the context of the Living Wage Foundation's Living Wage and market conditions.

There is a continuing challenge to ensure the NJC pay spine can absorb the impact of significant annual increases to the statutory National Living Wage which are forecast to continue. Work is underway at a national level to address this challenge. The National Employers for local government services have written to all local authority Chief Executives and a range of regional meetings are due to begin.

The organisation's overarching strategy will be to ensure the cost of its workforce falls within the budget allocation agreed by the Council in March 2022 as part of the organisation's overall budget for 2022/23 whilst working to ensure the pay structure is able to absorb minimum wage increases in future years.

The Council remains committed to the national pay structure and the relevant national agreements including those for the National Joint Council (NJC) for local government services, the Joint National Council for Chief Executives and the Joint National Council for Chief Officers. Pay awards for 2021/22 have been agreed for officers within scope of the Joint National Council for Chief Executives and the Joint National Council for Chief Officers at 1.5%. A pay award for 2021/22 has also been agreed for employees within the scope of the National Joint Council (NJC) for local government services at 2.75% for those on NJC pay point 1 and 1.75% on NJC pay points 2 and above.

Non-consolidated payments have been included at spine points 1A and 2 to ensure a pay differential at these spine points. See pay structure below.

Discussions with all national negotiating bodies are yet to begin for the 2022/23 period. However, as and when any national agreement is reached, this will be reflected in the Council's pay and grading structure appended to this statement.

The Authority will continue to consult with the trade unions representing its workforce on the impact of any changes in pay.

### ***Policy on Remunerating Chief Officers***

The Council's Chief Officers are the Strategic Management Team which includes the Chief Executive and those officers directly responsible for the key functions of the organisation. This information is currently available on the *Open Data* pages of the Council's website and will be updated on at least an annual basis to reflect changes to pay and the organisational structure and to support the Council's aim of enhancing transparency and clarity. Additional information, in accordance with the Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2011, is also included within the Council's Annual Statement of Accounts.

The Personnel Committee is responsible for making appropriate recommendations to Council for roles where a salary in excess of £100,000 is proposed. Relevant Chief Officers are responsible for determining pay for senior roles alongside the Director of HR and OD. Salary levels are proposed in accordance with an analytical job evaluation process within four pay bandings for SS1-3 and SS5, five bandings for SS4 and additional spot salary levels for the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, and Chief Executive as set out within the appendix to this Statement.

Since 2018/19 progression through the incremental points within these grades has been dependent upon individuals demonstrating overall annual improvements in performance, measured by delivery against a set of corporate and directorate objectives which is set at the start of each year and covers a range of operational and strategic indicators which are monitored throughout the year.

Employment arrangements for chief officers are linked to the relevant national agreements including the Joint National Council for Chief Executives and the Joint National Council for

Chief Officers, and salary values are increased in accordance with any nationally agreed pay awards as determined by the appropriate national Joint Negotiating Committee.

### ***Bonus, Performance and Earn Back***

The Council does not generally pay bonuses for chief officers within the scope of this statement (notwithstanding the link between incremental progression and pay noted above) as it believes that it has sufficiently strong performance management arrangements in place to ensure high performance from its senior officers. Any areas of under-performance are addressed rigorously.

The detail of any bonus payments will also be published in accordance with the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2015 and the Local Government Transparency Code 2015 respectively.

### ***Election Fees***

The Council is required to provide funding to the Returning Officer to discharge statutory functions relating to the administration of local government elections. The Returning Officer will make payments to those officers who undertake specific duties in relation to the elections (including to chief officers) in accordance with their role. The Chief Executive does not receive any additional payment for the role of Returning Officer for local government elections.

It should be noted that any fees which may be payable for duties undertaken in connection with national elections and referenda (such as Parliamentary General Elections or national referenda) or elections undertaken on a regional basis (Greater Manchester Combined Authority Mayoral Election) are not funded by the Council.

### ***Recruitment and Retention***

The Council's policy regarding the recruitment of all officers including senior officers is set out within the Recruitment and Selection Policy (this includes information relating to re-engagement). As indicated above, the Council aims to set appropriate pay levels, balancing costs with the need to attract and retain employees who contribute the appropriate skills, behaviours and experience needed to deliver its functions. From time to time, it is necessary to make additional payments within the Council's remuneration framework in order to secure or retain staff, with the appropriate skills, notably in roles where there is a national or regional shortage of such skills. Payments will be made in line with the Market Rate Supplement policy.

Statutory posts including the Chief Executive and Chief Officers can only be appointed to by a sub-committee of the Personnel Committee.

Non-statutory posts may be appointed to by officers of the council, but consultation with the relevant portfolio member is necessary.

When an individual is appointed to a role remunerated at a higher grade with multiple scale points, whether through internal or external recruitment, the individual will be appointed to the bottom point of the relevant grade. In exceptional circumstances, appointment at a higher scale point can be considered and agreed by the relevant Chief Officer.

### ***Interim Support***

Where the Council is unable to recruit officers, or there is a need for interim support to undertake essential work or provide cover for a substantive post, the Council will engage individuals on a temporary basis.

Such individuals will be sourced through a relevant procurement process in line with legal requirements, financial regulations and standards and the Council's agreed processes. This will ensure the Council is able to demonstrate the maximum value for money benefits from competition in securing the relevant service and full compliance with legal requirements. The Council has made and implemented all the necessary adjustments required to assure compliance with the changes in relation to off-payroll working in the public sector (IR35).

### ***Preventing Tax Evasion and Tax Avoidance***

The Council is fully compliant with the rules governing the prevention of tax evasion. In addition to this, the Council is committed to taking no part in the aiding of any form of tax avoidance. Council employees must take care not to engage in contractual arrangements which could be perceived as being primarily designed to reduce the rate of tax paid by any person or company.

### ***Living Wage Employer***

The Council aims to ensure that wages (salaries) in the City can sustain families and individuals and underpin a thriving economy. In 2015 the Council adopted a Living Wage Policy with the overarching aim to:

*Ensure that Manchester City Council employees, current and potential contractors and suppliers, and Manchester based employers are fully aware of the City Council's commitment to the Living Wage. The City Council firmly believes that increasing the number of people being paid at least the Living Wage will make a significant contribution to supporting residents out of poverty and reducing dependence on in work benefits.*

The Manchester Living Wage embodies the Council's commitment to the Living Wage Policy noted above. The Council is formally accredited by the Living Wage Foundation as a 'Living Wage Employer' and the Manchester Living Wage aligns to Living Wage Foundation's real living wage – referred to as the Foundation living wage in the remainder of this statement.

In November 2021, the Living Wage Foundation announced the new Foundation living wage hourly rate for the coming year of £9.90 per hour, an increase of 40p per hour. Accredited Living Wage Employers are required to implement the rise within six months. The Manchester Living Wage (MLW) will therefore be aligned to the new Foundation living wage rate from 1 April 2022.

### ***Lowest Paid Employees***

The lowest hourly rate of pay for a Council employee will be £10.05 per hour from 1 April 2022 following implementation of the NJC pay award for 2021/22.

### ***Pay Award for 2021/22***

Pay awards have been agreed for 2021/22 for Chief Executives, Chief Officers and all officers covered by National Joint Council (NJC) terms and conditions as detailed above. Discussions with all national negotiating bodies are yet to begin for the 2022/23 period. As and when any national agreement is reached, this will be reflected in the Council's pay and grading structure appended to this statement.

### **3. Employee Cost and Salary Ratios**

The Council does not have a target for the ratio between the pay of the highest earners and other employees. It does not propose to set one, accepting the judgement of the Hutton Report, that such targets serve no useful purpose. However, it will monitor this relationship to ensure that the remuneration of the highest paid is not excessive and remains consistent with the needs of the Council as expressed in this policy statement.

As of January 2022, the salary multiple between the highest paid officer (the Chief Executive) and the median rate for all officers within the scope of this policy is 7.84:1.

This ratio results from the detailed implementation of the pay policies set out in this document and will vary marginally with time as the shape of the organisation and roles change.

### **4. Payments on Termination**

The Council's approach to severance and discretionary payments on termination of employment is set out within its policy on the Local Government (Early Termination of Employment) (Discretionary Compensation) Regulations 2000 and 2006 and the Local Government Pension Scheme Regulations 2007 as agreed by the Council's Personnel Committee. The Council applies this policy to all employees and in all cases. Any changes to this policy, whether permanent or time limited, will be agreed by the Personnel Committee.

In addition to the Council's Severance and Early Retirement (Efficiency) Policy Statement the City Solicitor has the authority to settle, if appropriate and in the interests of the Council, any actual or threatened legal proceedings as set out in Part 3 Section F of the Council's Constitution.

Any severance packages with a value in excess of £100,000 will be approved by Council before they are agreed. This policy applies to severance packages pursuant to a settlement agreement. However, it does not apply in relation to the cost of early access to, and/or enhancement of a retirement pension, where the employee's employment is terminated on grounds of ill health.

Provisions in the Finance (No.2) Act 2017 changed the rules on the taxation of termination payments to remove the distinction between contractual and non-contractual payments in lieu of notice, effective from April 2018. The Council continues to comply with these requirements.

Employers are liable to pay Class 1A national insurance contributions on termination payments above £30,000 that are subject to income tax by the employee. The Council is fully compliant with this requirement.

### ***Exit Pay Cap and pension reforms***

Following revoke of the Restrictions of Public Sector Exit Payments Regulations 2020, it has been expected that further changes will be presented for consultation. There is no timeframe for this at present, and requirements will be incorporated into this statement at the appropriate time.

### **5. Gender Pay Reporting**

The Council is required by law to carry out Gender Pay Reporting on an annual basis in line with the Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties and Public Authorities) Regulations 2017. Reporting is based on a 'snapshot' date of 31 March 2021 and must include:

- the difference between the mean and median hourly rate of pay of male and female employees.
- the difference between the mean and median bonus pay received by male and female employees.
- the proportions of male and female employees who were paid a bonus, and
- the proportions of male and female employees in the lower, lower middle, upper middle, and upper quartile.

It is worth emphasising that a 'Gender Pay Gap' is not the same as an issue of 'Equal Pay'. The Council has a long standing commitment to equality and a sound analytical approach to pay and grading in line with the Single Status Agreement as well as an analytical approach to the evaluation of senior roles. As a result, the Council is confident employees receive remuneration within the same grade when carrying out the same or equivalent work. The gender pay gap therefore does not stem from paying men and women differently. Rather, it is the result of the roles in which men and women work within the organisation and the salaries that these roles attract.

The tables below provide the information the Council is required to publish in line with the legislation cited above and is based on the snapshot date of 31 March 2021.

Table A: Gender Pay Gap

Gender Pay Gap (difference in hourly pay)		
	Mean	Median
Hourly Pay	6.6%	6.3%

The table above shows the percentage difference between the mean (average) and median (middle value) hourly rate of pay of male and female employees. A positive percentage shows that, on average, Female employees are paid less than Male employees. The closer to 0 the lower the Gender Pay Gap.

Table B: Bonus Pay

The Council does not make any Bonus Payments which fall within the definition of Bonus for the purpose of Gender Pay Gap reporting.
---

Table C: Pay quartiles by gender

Gender Split with each Pay Quartile
-------------------------------------

Hourly Pay Quartile	Male	Female
Upper Quartile	38.6%	61.4%
Upper Middle Quartile	34.6%	65.4%
Lower Middle Quartile	36.9%	63.1%
Lower Quartile	25.6%	74.4%

The table above shows the percentage of Male and Female employees in the lower, lower middle, upper middle and upper quartile pay bands. These quartiles have been calculated by working out the hourly pay for each employee and then ranking them in order from lowest to highest paid. This list is then divided (as equally as possible) into four sections to provide the above.

The Council's mean gap of 6.6% (*previous year: 8.0%*) and median gap of 6.3% (*previous year: 7.9%*) is significantly below the mean and median gap for the UK of 14.9% and 15.4%<sup>1</sup> respectively. However, the Council is committed to further reducing its pay gap.

The proportion of low paid staff within the gender pay gap calculations (c.20% in Grades 1 to 3 roles) has a disproportionately high impact on the overall Gender Pay Gap. These roles are often part-time and many of these are term-time-only. Employment in these positions follows the national trend of being predominantly female and has a significant impact on the Council's overall pay gap.

Whilst, as noted above, the key factors here align with the national trend, the Council is committed to undertaking action which will support a positive reduction in the gender pay gap (i.e. through increasing the average pay of women and not reducing overall pay or removing lower paid roles from the organisational structure). Key activities in support of this include:

- The review of ways of working (Our Ways of Working programme) across the organisation to identify and promote increased flexibility is ongoing, supporting employees to more effectively balance home and work commitments, and driving increased flexibility as the norm in roles at all levels of the organisation.
- Apprenticeships are available to new and existing employees with qualifications starting from level 2 (NVQ/GCSE equivalent) to level 7 (post-graduate degree). They are available to people at any stage of their career looking to further develop skills and knowledge.
- The six-month LeadHERship Development coaching programme has been designed specifically to better equip Black, Asian, and Minority Ethnic women to help develop the critical skills of staff with ambitions to lead, influence and mentor. The wider Leadership Development programme also aims to support all employees to develop into leadership positions.
- All workforce policies are subject to Equality Impact Assessment as part of the review process. This ensures that any potential impacts relating to gender are identified at an early stage and addressed to ensure employment approaches are fair for all and specific requirements are built into policy and guidance.

### *Ethnicity Pay Gap Reporting*

<sup>1</sup> All employees as per ONS, Gender Pay Gap in the UK: October 2021 - Provisional

In October 2018, the Government launched its public consultation to bring forward its manifesto commitment to "ask large employers to publish information on the pay gap for people from different ethnic backgrounds". This consultation closed on 11 January 2019 and the government's response to the consultation is yet to be published. The consultation paper did not specify when the obligation might be introduced, however this has been subject to further discussion, most recently in the House of Lords in October 2021.

We recognise that we have gaps in our data with regards to workforce ethnicity and are currently working to reduce these gaps. This piece of work has included working with our staff groups to understand why there were gaps in our data, reviewing and updating the ethnicity classifications in the SAP system and re-surveying all employees. This final part is still underway. This work aims to improve our response rate and will enable future reporting in this area.

We are committed to reporting the Ethnicity Pay Gap but want to ensure we have sufficient data to enable meaningful use of this information. A further push on capturing equality monitoring information will take place in March/April 2022 to address these known gaps with an internal review of ethnicity data gains scheduled for Summer 2022.

A Government consultation has also been launched recently on disability workforce reporting requirements for organisations, this is due to close in March 2022 and will inform how we approach disability pay gap reporting in future.

## **6. Publication**

This Statement will be published on the *Open Data* pages of the Council's Website once it has been approved by Council.

In addition, details of senior posts are available on the Council's website together with information on the organisation's structure and the roles and responsibilities of individual officers. This information will be updated on at least an annual basis.

In order to comply with the regulations in relation to gender pay gap reporting the Council figures will, in addition to publication in this Statement, also be submitted via the dedicated government portal for publication on the designated government website.

Additional information on the organisation's workforce expenditure is set out in the Council's Annual Statement of Accounts.

Detailed information on the equality make-up of the organisation's workforce is also available on the Council's website.



## **Glossary of Terms**

### ***Chief Officer (statutory definition)***

Section 43(2) of the Localism Act defines a 'Chief Officer' for the purposes of the Pay Policy Statement as meaning the following:-

- (a) the Authority's Head of Paid Service
- (b) the Authority's Monitoring Officer
- (c) the Authority's Director of Children's Services
- (d) the Authority's Director of Social Services
- (e) the officer having responsibility for the administration of the Authority's financial affairs
- (f) any officer for whom the Authority's Head of Paid Service is directly responsible; or who, as respects all or most of the duties of his post, is required to report directly or is directly accountable to the Authority's Head of Paid Service; or who, as respects all or most of the duties of his post, is required to report directly or is directly accountable to the Authority itself or any committee or sub-committee of the Authority.
- (g) any officer who, as respects all or most of the duties of his post, is required to report directly or is directly accountable to one or more of the officers listed at points (a) to (f) above.

The definition of 'Chief Officers' excludes any officer 'whose duties are solely secretarial or clerical or are otherwise in the nature of support services'.

### ***Employer Pension Contributions***

Where employees have exercised their statutory right to become members of the Local Government Pension Scheme, the Council is required to make a contribution to the scheme representing a percentage of the pensionable remuneration due under the contract of employment of that employee. The rate of contribution is set by Actuaries advising the Greater Manchester Pension Fund and reviewed on a triennial basis in order to ensure the scheme is appropriately funded. The current rate is 18.5% but will be subject to revision at the direction of the pension fund.

### ***Flexibility Payment***

A flexibility payment is paid for roles where an employee is contractually required to work a regular pattern involving a non-standard rota, working 'over and beyond' normal working hours on a regular five, six or seven days out of seven pattern which includes late and weekend working. A graduated allowance will be included as part of the basic salary for the job, depending on the degree of inconvenience.

### ***Foundation Living Wage***

Also known as the 'real' Living Wage. This is a voluntary rate of pay announced annually by the Living Wage Foundation and is based on an independent assessment of the real cost of living based on a number of indicators, including goods and services, which represent what people need to meet their basic everyday needs.

***FTE - Full Time Equivalent***

This term stands for full-time equivalent (not full-time employee) and translates the total hours worked by part-time employees into the number of equivalent full-time employees.

***Honorarium***

An honorarium is a payment made to an individual in a structured, funded role for specific, time-limited additional duties undertaken on top of their substantive role. This can be a way of developing staff whilst maintaining service delivery. An approval process is in place for any payments made. Any honorarium payment made to an employee at Grade 12, SCP 51 or above, or where the honorarium is ongoing for over 12 months, requires approval by the relevant Chief Officer and the Director of HR and OD.

***Manchester Living Wage***

The Council's commitment to paying a living wage is reflected by the Manchester Living Wage. The Council is formally accredited by the Living Wage Foundation as a 'Living Wage Employer' and the Manchester Living Wage aligns to the Foundation's 'real' Living wage (also known as the Foundation living wage).

***Median Salary***

The authority's median salary is based on the salary which is the numerical 'mid-point' when the organisations salaries are arranged from top to bottom in order of size. It is based purely on the actual salary assigned to the post (assuming the post is worked at 1 FTE). Salaries of vacant posts, casual members of staff, contractors, and other non-employees are not used for the purposes of this calculation. The current median salary is £26,975.

***National Living Wage***

The National Living Wage is the statutory hourly rate of pay for those aged 23 and over.

***On costs***

These are the additional costs of employment, over and above what is paid (or provided) to the employee by way of remuneration. There are two types of on cost, *direct*, which for the purpose of this Statement is deemed to be employer's National Insurance and pension costs and *indirect* which include items such as premises costs, the cost of support functions etc and are not applicable to this Statement.

***Pay / Remuneration***

For the purpose of this Statement 'pay' is referred to as remuneration and is consistent within the definition contained within the Localism Act.

***Pay Bill***

The total sum paid by the organisation inclusive of salary and on-costs.

### ***Salary / Spot Salary***

For the purpose of this Pay Statement, salary refers to its normally accepted meaning i.e. monetary pay.

A spot salary is a salary set at a specific sum, does not form a part of a pay band or contain increments to which the employee is entitled. Spot salaries are normally subject to increase in line with contractual provisions with regard to inflation.

### ***Senior Manager (Senior Officer)***

Any Officer in receipt of a basic salary in **excess** of Spinal Column Point 51.

### ***Severance Package***

Severance packages can comprise of a number of different payments or benefits made in relation to the termination of a person's employment, which include (but are not limited to):

- lump sum severance payments
- redundancy compensation
- termination payments on grounds of business efficiency
- early access to, and/or enhancement of, pension benefits (in respect of this the value is defined as the capital cost to the Council of the early release / enhancement).
- salary paid in lieu of notice

## Appendix A: Pay &amp; Grading Structure 2022/23 (Interim – Pre Pay Award)

Grade	SCP	Basic Pay	Grade	SCP	Basic Pay	Grade	SCP	Basic Pay
Grade 1	1	£18,333	Grade 7	26	£30,984	SS1**	11	£62,531
	1A*	£18,497		27	£31,895		12	£63,773
Grade 2	2	£18,698		28	£32,798		13	£65,048
	3*	£18,887		29	£33,486		14	£67,676
Grade 3	4	£19,264	Grade 8	30*	£34,373	SS2**	21	£70,410
	5	£19,650		31	£35,336		22	£71,820
	6*	£20,043		32	£36,371		23	£73,256
Grade 4	7	£20,444		33	£37,568	24	£76,215	
	8	£20,852		34	£38,553	31	£82,093	
	9	£21,269		35*	£39,571	32	£83,734	
	10	£21,695	36	£40,578	33	£85,409		
Grade 5	11*	£22,129	Grade 9	37	£41,591	SS3**	34	£90,959
	13	£23,023		38	£42,614		41	£100,071
	14	£23,484		39	£43,570	42	£102,071	
	15	£23,953		40*	£44,624	SS4**	43	£104,113
	17	£24,920		41	£45,648		44	£106,196
19*	£25,927	Grade 10	42	£46,662	45		£110,486	
Grade 6	21		£26,975	43*	£47,665	SS5**	51	£129,452
	22	£27,514	44	£48,981	52		£132,822	
	23	£28,226	Grade 11	45	£50,035		53	£138,357
	24	£29,174		46	£51,310		54	£148,701
	25*	£30,095		47	£52,417		DCX	£159,566
		48		£53,639	CEX	£211,584		
		Grade 12	49	£54,793				
			50	£55,970				
			51*	£57,161				

\* Progression subject to competency review

\*\* Progression dependent on individuals demonstrating overall annual improvements in performance

**Please note – Additional non-consolidated payments have been applied at SCP 1A and SCP 2 in order to maintain a differential at these spine points.**

**Manchester City Council  
Report for Information**

**Report to:** Council – 30 March 2022

**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.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Reason for urgency</b>	<b>Decision Taken by</b>	<b>Approved by</b>
01 February 2022	Determination of the Business Rates element of the estimated Collection Fund 2021/22 year-end surplus or deficit	The calculation of the estimated surplus or deficit is finalised using the latest data available during January to support the key decision. Due to the statutory requirement to notify precepting authorities by 31 January 2022 it was requested the decision was exempted from call in.	Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer	Councillor Sarah Russell Chair of Resource and Governance Scrutiny Committee
01 February 2022	The calculation of the Council's Business Rates income.	The calculation uses information from the Business Rates system to support the key decision. This is available mid to late January. Due to the statutory requirement to notify Central Government and the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (for the Fire and Rescue Service) by 31 January 2022 it was requested the decision was exempted from call in.	Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer	Councillor Sarah Russell Chair of Resource and Governance Scrutiny Committee
01 February 2022	The Setting of the Council Tax base.	The calculation of the estimated Council Tax Base is finalised during January to support the key decision required. Due to the requirement to notify precepting authorities by 31 January it is requested the decision is exempt from call in.	Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer	Councillor Sarah Russell Chair of Resource and Governance Scrutiny Committee
18 March	Establishment of a flexible contract for	The council's current contract with Gazprom Energy expires on 31 March and it needs to urgently enter into a	Deputy Chief Executive and	Councillor Sarah Russell

	the supply of gas TC473.	flexible framework in order to ensure a new contract with Corona Energy can start from 1 April. Any later and the lead in times involved would mean that the council would enter into out-of-contract prices with Gazprom, which are typically double the prevailing contract rates.	City Treasurer	Chair of Resource and Governance Scrutiny Committee
--	--------------------------	--	----------------	---