



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

Tuesday, 5 July 2022

Dear Councillor / Honorary Alderman,

Meeting of the Council – Wednesday, 13th July, 2022

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the Council which will be held at 10.00 am on Wednesday, 13th July, 2022, in The Council Chamber, Level 2, Town Hall Extension.

1. The Lord Mayor's Announcements and Special Business

- Queens Birthday Honours List
- One Minute's Silence - Srebrenica

2. Interests

To allow members an opportunity to declare any personal, prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interest they might have in any items which appear on this agenda; and record any items from which they are precluded from voting as a result of Council Tax or Council rent arrears. Members with a personal interest should declare that at the start of the item under consideration. If members also have a prejudicial or disclosable pecuniary interest they must withdraw from the meeting during the consideration of the item

3. Minutes

To submit for approval the minutes of the meeting held on 18 May 2022

7 - 20

4. Appointment of Executive Members and their Portfolios

Report of the Executive Leader attached

21 - 26

5. Notice of Motion - Active Travel to School

Walking and wheeling to school can help children and parents have a healthy and active lifestyle, as well as supporting their independence, development and essential road safety awareness. Each morning and afternoon the streets around our schools are dangerous, congested places where many parents and carers – fearful of the dangers of traffic - drop off their kids by car.

Over the last 10 years, the percentage of trips to school by car in the North west increased from 35% in 2012 to 56% in 2020, and walking decreased from 47% to 30%. Almost a quarter (23%) of

cars on the road at peak times (08:35hrs) are taking children to school. 250 million car journeys in Greater Manchester are less than 1KM, the equivalent of a fifteen-twenty minute walk or five-ten minute cycle ride. Many of these journeys are for the school run. Department for Transport - National Survey.

Reducing traffic immediately outside the school gates will improve air quality, reducing the harmful effects of PM2.5 and NOx on the health of children and adults.

This council notes our existing commitment to improve air quality across the city and to work with schools to improve walking, cycling and wheeling and anti-idling initiatives. To further encourage more active travel to school. We will:

- Require every ward to make two commitments within their Climate Change Plan to improve and support active, sustainable travel to school.
- Increase participation in every ward in the 'Living Streets WOW' walking to school scheme, ModeshiftSTARS and Sustrans Big Walk and Wheel.
- Develop a good practice school streets toolkit that enables schools to facilitate a safer school streets project.
- Actively promote World Car Free Day on 22 September 2022 and to encourage active travel to school initiatives on this day, to include all forms of walking, cycling, scooting and wheeling.
- Call on the government to recognise the importance of behaviour change interventions to reduce air pollution around schools and, to invest in enabling communities and residents to understand the impacts of their actions on air quality and what they can do to reduce it.

Proposed by Councillor Benham, seconded by Councillor Stogia and also signed by Councillors Chambers, Lovecy, Wilson and Stanton

6. Proceedings of the Executive

27 - 36

To submit the minutes of the Executive on 1 June 2022 and 29 June 2022 (to follow) and in particular to consider:

Exe/22/45 Capital Programme Update

The Executive:-

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

- Neighbourhoods - Hough End Masterplan. A capital budget increase of £11.905m, funded by £4m Grant, £5.499m by borrowing on an invest to save basis funded by joint funds held by Manchester City Council and Sport England,

£1.832m by borrowing on an invest to save basis and
£0.574m borrowing.

Exe/22/50 Capital Programme Outturn 2021/22

Recommend that Council approve:

- The proposed virements over £0.5m within the capital programme (Appendix C of the report considered).
- The following changes to Manchester City Council's capital programme
 - Public Sector Housing – Northwards Housing Capital Programme 2022/23. A capital budget increase of £2.475m in 2022/23, £21.047m in 2023/24 and £7.599m in 2024/25 is requested, funded by an RCCO from the HRA.
 - Corporate Programme – Elizabeth Tower GP surgery. A capital budget increase of £2.6m in 2022/23, funded by RCCO from Integration Reserve.

7. Questions to Executive Members and Others under Procedural Rule 23

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

8. Scrutiny Committees

37 - 82

To note the minutes of the following Scrutiny Committees:

Communities & Equalities (to follow)	–	24 May & 21 June 2022
Resources & Governance	–	24 May & 21 June 2022
Health	–	25 May & 22 June 2022
Children & Young People (to follow)	–	25 May & 22 June 2022
Environment & Climate Change	–	26 May & 23 June 2022
Economy	–	26 May & 23 June 2022

9. Proceedings of Committees

83 - 130

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

Audit	-	12 April & 14 June 2022
Constitutional & Nomination	-	13 July 2022 (to be tabled)
Health & Wellbeing Board (to follow)	-	23 March & 6 July 2022 (to follow)
Licensing & Appeals	-	6 June 2022
Planning & Highways (to follow)	-	31 May & 30 June 2022 (to follow)
Standards	-	16 June 2022

10. Key Decisions Report

131 - 134

The report of the City Solicitor is enclosed.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Joanne Roney', written in a cursive style.

Joanne Roney OBE
Chief Executive

Information about the Council

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

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

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

Agenda, reports and minutes of all Council meetings can be found on the Council's website www.manchester.gov.uk

Members of the Council

Councillors:-

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

Honorary Aldermen of the City of Manchester –

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

Further Information

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

Andrew Woods

Tel: 0161 234 3011

Email: andrew.woods@manchester.gov.uk

This agenda was issued on **Tuesday, 5 July 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, 18 May 2022

Present:

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

Councillors:

Abdullatif, Akbar, Azra Ali, Ahmed Ali, Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Amin, Andrews, Appleby, Baker-Smith, Bano, Bell, Benham, Bridges, Butt, Chohan, Collins, Connolly, Craig, Curley, M Dar, Y Dar, Davies, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Flanagan, Foley, Gartside, Good, Grimshaw, Hacking, Hassan, Hewitson, Hilal, Hitchen, Holt, Hughes, Hussain, Igbon, Ilyas, Iqbal, Jeavons, Johns, Johnson, Kamal, Karney, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, J Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, McHale, Midgley, Moran, Newman, Noor, Nunney, Ogunbambo, B Priest, H Priest, Rahman, Raikes, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reid, Riasat, Richards, I Robinson, T Robinson, Rowles, Russell, Sadler, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, Simcock, Stanton, Taylor, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

Honorary Aldermen of the City of Manchester –

Mrs Nilofar Siddiqi

CC/22/34 Welcome to new Councillors

The Lord Mayor welcomed newly elected councillors to the meeting and congratulated those councillors who had been re-elected.

CC/22/35 The Lord Mayor's Special Business – Death of former Councillor Sheila Smith

The Lord Mayor reported that former Councillor Sheila Smith had died. Sheila Smith was elected as a councillor for Bradford ward in 1987 and served as Deputy Lord Mayor and Lord Mayor in 1994/95.

The Council held a minute silence in memory of former Councillor Sheila Smith.

CC/22/36 The Lord Mayor's Special Business – Submission of Constitutional and Nomination Committee minutes – 18 May 2022

The Lord Mayor agreed to the submission of the Constitutional and Nomination Committee minutes held on 18 May 2022.

CC/22/37 Motion without Notice

The Leader of the Council moved a motion without notice to from the order of the Council business (Council Procedure Rule 19.1(e)), to withdraw from the summons Item 9 - Establishment of a Housing Advisory Committee.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Karney.

Resolution

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

Decision

To withdraw from the summons, Item 9 - Establishment of a Housing Advisory Committee.

CC/22/38 Election of Lord Mayor

The Lord Mayor invited nominations for the office of Lord Mayor for the forthcoming municipal year.

Councillor Donna Ludford was nominated and the Council voted by acclamation. The Lord Mayor declared that Councillor Donna Ludford was elected Lord Mayor of Manchester for the forthcoming municipal year.

Councillor Ludford then read out the Declaration of Acceptance of Office. The Council adjourned briefly while the new Lord Mayor was robed.

When the meeting resumed, the Lord Mayor Councillor Donna Ludford took the Oath of Allegiance and was invested with the badge of office.

The Lord Mayor then observed the investiture of the Lord Mayor's Consort, Councillor Sean McHale.

In the absence of the City Solicitor, an officer authorised by the City Solicitor oversaw and confirmed the election and investiture of the Lord Mayor.

CC/22/39 Chair

The Right Worshipful, the Lord Mayor, Councillor Donna Ludford (In the Chair)

CC/22/40 Thanks to the Retiring Lord Mayor

A vote of thanks to the retiring Lord Mayor was moved by Councillor Karney.

The Lord Mayor presented a Former Lord Mayor badge to the retiring Lord Mayor. The Lord Mayor's Consort presented the retiring Lady Mayoress Consort, Carole Judge, with her commemorative badge.

Councillor Judge then addressed the Council.

Decision

To extend the sincere thanks of the Council to Councillor Tommy Judge, the retiring Lord Mayor, for his valuable services to Manchester during his term of office, and to

Carole Judge, the retiring Lady Mayoress, for the work she had undertaken to support the retiring Lord Mayor.

CC/22/41 Lord Mayoral Address

The Lord Mayor gave her mayoral speech to the Council.

CC/22/42 Appointment of Deputy Lord Mayor

The Lord Mayor invited nominations for the office of Deputy Lord Mayor for the forthcoming municipal year. Councillor Yasmine Dar was nominated and the Council voted by acclamation. The Lord Mayor declared that Councillor Yasmine Dar be had been appointed.

Councillor Yasmine Dar read out the Declaration of Acceptance of Office and was invested with the badge of office.

In the absence of the City Solicitor, an officer authorised by the City Solicitor oversaw and confirmed the appointment and investiture of the Deputy Lord Mayor.

CC/22/43 Minutes

Decision

The Minutes of the Council (budget) meeting and two extraordinary meetings held on 30 March 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Lord Mayor.

CC/22/44 Seniority of Councillors

The Council noted the revised list of seniority of councillors following the election held in May 2022.

The seniority of the members of the Council as of 12 May 2022 is appended to these minutes.

CC/22/45 Leader of the Council

The Lord Mayor invited nominations for the appointment of Leader of the Council.

Councillor Rahman proposed Councillor Bev Craig as Leader of the Council. Councillor Midgley seconded the proposal.

No other nominations were received.

After the Council voted on this, the Lord Mayor declared that Councillor Bev Craig was elected Leader of the Council.

The Leader of the Council then addressed the Council and highlighted the Council's priorities and work needed to build on the City's success and to move forward to ensure a safe, healthy and prosperous future for all its residents.

CC/22/46 Appointment of Chairs and Committee Membership 2022/23

Decision

The Council approved the recommendations made by the Constitutional and Nomination Committee on 18 May 2022 regarding the appointment of chairs and membership of the Council's committees for the 2022/23 municipal year (see below).

CC/22/47 Appointment to the Combined Authority, Joint Authorities and Joint Committees 2022/23

Decision

The Council approved the recommendations made by the Constitutional and Nomination Committee on 18 May 2022 regarding Council's appointments to the Combined Authority, joint authorities and joint committees for the 2022/23 municipal year (see below).

CC/22/47 Review of Members Allowances

The Council considered the report of the City Solicitor that contained the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) regarding the Council's Members' Allowance Scheme. The report included the IRP report (Appendix 1) and the Guidance issued by the Secretary of State (Appendix 2). The Council was requested to decide whether or not to implement the recommendations of the IRP in whole, in part or not at all.

Decision

1. That the Members Allowances Scheme be agreed as detailed in the report submitted and be implemented, with effect from 1 April 2022. The exception to this is that the implementation of indexation be from 1 April 2021 for a four-year period ending 31 March 2025.
2. That the City Solicitor be instructed to amend the Council's Members' Allowance Scheme, set out in Part 7 of the Council's Constitution, to give effect to the decision of Council.

(Councillor Leech abstained from voting on the item.)

CC/22/48 Dates of Council meetings 2022/23

The Council considered the dates of Council meetings for the forthcoming municipal year 2022/23.

Decisions

1. To agree the following dates of ordinary meetings of the Council in 2022/2023:

Wednesday 13 July 2022
Wednesday 5 October 2022

Wednesday 30 November 2022
Wednesday 1 February 2023

Friday 3 March 2023 (Budget)

Wednesday 29 March 2023

2. To agree that the Annual Meeting of the Council 2023 will be on 17 May 2023.

Appendix 1

Seniority of Councillors (as at 18 May 2022)

Seniority by Office:

The Right Worshipful, The Lord Mayor (Councillor Donna Ludford)

The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Yasmine Dar)

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Bev Craig)

The Leader of the Opposition -

Seniority by length of service:

Councillors:

Patrick Karney

Basil Curley

Eddy Newman

Glynn Evans

Susan Cooley

Paul Andrews

Bernard Priest

Joanne Green

John Flanagan

Tom Judge

June Hitchen

Abid Chohan

Naeem Ul-Hassan

John Leech

Andrew Simcock

Veronica Kirkpatrick

Luthfur Rahman

Suzannah Reeves

Rabnawaz Akbar

Suzanne Richards

Julie Reid

Tracey Rawlins

Aftab Razaq

Bev Craig

John Hughes

Carmine Grimshaw

Shelley Lanchbury

Joan Davies

Nasrin Ali

Ahmed Ali

Luke Raikes

Angeliki Stogia

Shaukat Ali

Joanna Midgley

Afia Kamal

Tina Hewitson

Donna Ludford

Sarah Russell

Azra Ali

Sandra Collins

Yasmine Dar

John Hacking

James Wilson

Mandie Shilton-Godwin

Emily Rowles

Dzidra Noor

Basat Sheikh

Paula Appleby

Dave Rawson

Garry Bridges

Lee-Ann Igbon

Paula Sadler

Emma Taylor

Mahadi Mahamed

Hannah Priest

Zahra Alijah

Chris Wills

Jill Lovecy

Ali Ilyas

Annette Wright

William Jeavons

Sam Lynch

Sean McHale

Majid Dar

Eve Holt

Sam Wheeler

Adele Douglas

Gavin White

Fias Riasat

Jon-Connor Lyons

Marcus Johns

Tim Whiston

Shazia Butt

Greg Stanton

Jade Mary Doswell

Amna Saad Omar Abdullatif

Becky Chambers

Julie Connolly

Debbie Hilal

Rob Nunney

Thomas Robinson

Ekua Bayunu

Muqqadash Bano

Julia Baker-Smith

Zahid Hussain

Linda Foley

Matthew Benham

Alan Good

Jawad Amin Mohammed*

Angela Gartside*

Astrid Johnson*

Irene Robinson*

Erinma Bell*

Murtaza Iqbal*

Angela Moran*

Olusegen Ogunbambo*

Notes:

Seniority is calculated on total aggregated length of service as a member of the Council. The seniority of the members marked * are without previous service as

councillors for Manchester, was determined by a ballot conducted by the Lord Mayor on 12 May 2022.

Appendix 2

Membership of Committees 2022/23 and Appointment of Chairs of Committees

Chairs and Deputies

Scrutiny Committees:

Young People and Children	Councillor Reid
Communities and Equalities	Councillor Hitchen
Economy	Councillor Johns
Resources and Governance	Councillor Simcock
Environment and Climate Change	Councillor Shilton-Godwin
Health	Councillor Green

Chairs and deputy chairs of the non-executive committees for the next municipal year:

Committee	Chair	Deputy Chair
Audit		
Planning & Highways	Councillor Curley	
Licensing and Appeals	Councillor Grimshaw	Councillor Connolly
Licensing Committee	Councillor Grimshaw	Councillor Connolly
Licensing Policy	Councillor Grimshaw	Councillor Connolly
Constitutional and Nomination	Councillor Karney	
Personnel	Councillor Akbar	

Membership of Committees

Scrutiny Committees

Children and Young People (at least 10 members)

Councillors -

Abdullatif	Alijah	Amin	Bano	Cooley
Gartside	Good	Hewitson	Judge	Lovecy
Reid (Chair)	Sadler	Sharif Mahamed		

Co-opted Members

Representative of the Diocese of Manchester – Vacant*

Representative of the Diocese of Salford – Mrs Julie Miles*

Parent governor representative – Dr Walid Omara*

Parent governor representative - Gary Cleworth*

Parent governor representative - Katie McDaid*

Secondary sector teacher representative – Saba Itaf

Primary sector teacher representative – Laura Smith

* denotes members with voting rights on education matters

Communities and Equalities (at least 10 members)

Councillors -

Azra Ali	Benham	Chambers	Connolly	M. Dar
Evans	Hilal	Hitchen (Chair)	Hussain	Iqbal
Johnson	Ogunbambo	H Priest	Rawson	Whiston
Wills	Wilson			

Environment and Climate Change (at least 10 members)

Councillors -

Chohan	Doswell	Holt	Hughes	Ilyas
Jeavons	Lyons	Nunney	Razaq	Sheikh
Shilton-Godwin (Chair)	Wright			

Economy (at least 10 members)

Councillors -

Bayunu	Bell	Good	Johns (Chair)	Moran
Noor	Raikes	I Robinson	Taylor	

Health (at least 10 members)

Councillors -

N Ali	Appleby	Curley	Green (Chair)	
Johnson	Karney	Mchale	Newman	Reeves
Riasat	Richards	Russell	Wheeler	

Resources and Governance (at least 10 members)

Councillors -

Andrews	Davies	Good	Kirkpatrick	Lanchbury
B. Priest	Rowles	A Simcock (Chair)	Wheeler	

Non-Executive Committees

Art Galleries Committee - In addition to the members of the Council, 7 persons are to be nominated by University of Manchester.

Councillors -

Akbar	Bridges	Craig	Midgely	Johnson
Rawlins	White	Rahman	T Robinson	Igbon
Hacking	7 x Co-opted			

Audit Committee (11 members plus 2 independent co-opted)

Councillors -

Curley	Flanagan	Good	Lanchbury	Russell
Simcock	Wheeler			
Dr D Barker	Mr S Downs			

(Co-opted member)	(Co-opted member)			
-------------------	-------------------	--	--	--

Planning and Highways Committee (up to 15 members)

Councillor

Andrews	Shaukat Ali	Baker-Smith	Curley (Chair)	Y. Dar
Davies	Flanagan	Hitchen	Kamal	Leech
Lovecy	Lyons	Riasat	Richards	Stogia

Licensing and Appeals Committee (not less than 10 and not more than 15)

Councillors -

Evans	Grimshaw (Chair)	Hughes	Jeavons	Hewitson
Judge	Connolly (Deputy Chair)	Andrews	Hassan	Reid
Flanagan	Riasat			

Licensing Committee (not less than 10 and not more than 15)

Councillors -

Evans	Grimshaw (Chair)	Hughes	Jeavons	Hewitson
Judge	Connolly (Deputy Chair)	Andrews	Hassan	Reid
Flanagan	Riasat			

Licensing Policy Committee (up to 6)

Councillors -

Rawlins	Davies	Grimshaw (Chair)	Flanagan	Leech	Evans
---------	--------	------------------	----------	-------	-------

Standards Committee (6 members of the Council, 1 Ringway Parish Councillor and 2 Independent members)

Councillors -

Andrews	Evans	Connolly	Lanchbury	A Simcock
Nunney				
Nicole Jackson (Co-opted Independent Chair)	Parish Councillor Christopher O'Donovan (Ringway PC)	Geoff Linell (Co-opted Independent)		

In accordance with Article 9 of the Council Constitution, to recommend the appointment of Councillor Andrews for the purpose of answering questions at Council on the work of the Standards Committee.

Personnel Committee - Membership formula comprises the Leader of the Council, all members of the Executive, one Assistant Executive Member (Finance and Human Resources*) and such opposition group representation as is necessary to meet political balance requirements.

Councillors -

Akbar	Bridges	Craig	Rawlins	Leech
Midgely	Rahman	Hacking	White	
Stanton*	T Robinson	Igbon		

Employee Appeals Committee (Formulaic Membership)

An Executive Member with a relevant portfolio (i.e. Executive Member for the service in which the employee was working or the Executive Member with a portfolio relevant to the specific subject area of the appeal) or an appropriate Assistant Executive Member.

Two members drawn from the Council's Executive Members or their Assistant Executive Members, or elected members drawn from a prescribed 'pool'; the nominated members are –

- Councillor Evans
- Councillor Reid
- Councillor N Ali
- Councillor Cooley
- Councillor Connolly
- Councillor Shilton-Godwin
- Councillor Wheeler

Constitutional and Nomination Committee (10 members)

Councillors -

Curley	Karney (Chair)	Lanchbury	Richards	Leech
Flanagan	Rahman	Reeves	Craig	

Health and Wellbeing Board

To recommend membership as follows:

- (Leader of the Council) (Chair)
- (Executive Member for Health and Social Care) (MCC)
- (Executive Member for Early Years Children and Young People) (MCC)
- Dr Ruth Bromley, Chair Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
- Katy Calvin-Thomas - Manchester Local Care Organisation
- Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust
- Rupert Nichols, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust
- Mike Wild, Voluntary and Community Sector representative
- Vicky Szulist, Chair, Healthwatch
- Dr Tracey Vell, Primary Care representative - Local Medical Committee

- Paul Marshall, Strategic Director of Children's Services
- David Regan, Director of Public Health
- Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services
- Dr Murugesan Raja Manchester GP Forum
- Dr Geeta Wadhwa Manchester GP Forum
- Dr Doug Jeffrey, Manchester GP Forum
- Dr Shabbir Ahmad Manchester GP Forum (substitute member)
- Dr Denis Colligan, Manchester GP Forum (substitute member)

Appointment of Lead Members

LGBT Men's Lead	Councillor Wills
LGBT Women's Lead	Councillor Baker-Smith
Race	Councillor Hussain
City Centre	Councillor Karney
Disability	Councillor Curley/ Councillor Flanagan
Age Friendly Manchester	Councillor Newman
Women	Councillor Lynch/ Councillor Chambers
Active Travel	Councillor Shilton Godwin
Mental Health Champion	Councillor Douglas
Race Women	Councillor Igbon
Trauma Informed	Councillor Doswell

Membership of Committee 2022/23 and the Appointment of Chairs of Committees

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that provided information about the Council's appointments to the joint authorities and joint committees. The Committee was invited to review the appointments and make recommendations to Council about the Council's representatives for the 2022/23 Municipal Year. The report also requested the Committee to make recommendations to the joint authorities about the appointment of spokespersons to answer questions at Council meetings.

1. To agree the following appointments to serve on the Combined Authority and joint authorities and to recommend the appointment of the Council's representatives for the 2022/23 Municipal Year as listed below.
2. To agree the appointment of spokespersons to answer questions about the work of the joint authorities at meetings of the Council as indicated.
3. To agree the appointment of members to the GMCA Executive Board, GMCA Police and Crime Panel, GMCA Statutory Functions Committee.
4. To agree the appointment of members to the School Forum and the Manchester Port Health Authority.
5. To remove of Councillor Ahmed Ali from the Fostering Panel

Appointments to Joint Authorities and Joint Committees

To appoint the following members to serve on the Joint Authorities and joint committees for the 2022/23 Municipal Year:

Greater Manchester Waste and Recycling Committee

Councillors Rawlins and Shaukat Ali

Greater Manchester Combined Authority

Councillor Craig (Councillor Rahman - Deputy Leader as a substitute)

GM Transport Committee

Councillor Noor (Substitute Councillor Wills)

Councillor Hassan (Substitute Councillor Judge)

AGMA Executive Board

Councillor Craig (Councillor Rahman - Deputy Leader as substitute)

AGMA Statutory Functions Committee

Councillor Whiston (Councillor Flanagan as substitute)

Greater Manchester Police and Crime Panel (1 member)

Councillor Rahman

Greater Manchester Health Scrutiny Panel (1 member)

Councillor Collins (substitute -)

Greater Manchester Audit Committee

Councillors Lanchbury and Russell (2 vacancies)

Appointments to GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee (current structure under review)

Councillors Banu, Foley, Sadler, Shilton-Godwin and Stanton

Other bodies for the 2022/23 municipal year:

Manchester Port Health Authority

Councillors Evans, Lanchbury, Andrews and Johnson

Schools Forum

Councillor Reid (1 substitute)

GM Culture and Social Impact Fund Committee

Councillor Whiston (1 substitute)

GM Work and Skills Executive

Councillor White

Health and Social Care Partnership

Councillor Craig (1 substitute)

Health and Social Care – Joint Commissioning Board
Councillor Midgley

Clean Air Charging Authorities Committee
Councillor Rawlins (Councillor Foley as substitute)

Air Quality Administration Committee
Councillor Rawlins (Councillor Foley as substitute)

Draft Joint Development Plan – Places for Everyone Committee
Councillor Rawlins

Police and Crime Panel Steering Group
Councillor Rahman

Planning and Housing Commission
Councillor White

GM Pension Management
Councillor Andrews

Peoples History Museum
Councillor Douglas

North-West Employers
Councillor Hacking

Manchester Airport Consultative Committee
Councillors Baker-Smith and Judge

**Manchester City Council
Report for Information**

Report to: Executive – 1 June 2022
Council – 13 July 2022

Subject: Appointment of Executive Members and their Portfolios

Report of: The Executive Leader

Summary

In accordance with Articles 7.4(a) and 7.5(a) of the Constitution, the appointment of the Deputy Leader and Executive Members takes effect on receipt of the Leader's written notice by both the person who the Leader is appointing as Deputy Leader and as Executive Member(s) and the Monitoring Officer.

The Monitoring Officer keeps a written record of the appointment of the Deputy Leader and Executive Member(s) and the Leader is required to report these appointments, including their portfolio, to Council and the Executive at the earliest opportunity.

Recommendations

The Executive is requested to note the appointment of the Deputy Leader(s) and Executive Members.

Council is request to note the appointment of the Deputy Leader(s) and Executive Members.

Wards Affected - All

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

Not directly applicable

Our Manchester Strategy outcomes	Contribution to the strategy
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities	Not directly applicable
A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city's economic success	Not directly applicable

A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities	Not directly applicable
A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work	Not directly applicable
A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth	Not directly applicable

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

- Equal Opportunities Policy
- Risk Management
- Legal Considerations

Financial Consequences – Revenue

None

Financial Consequences – Capital

None

Contact Officers:

Name: Mike Williamson
Position: Governance and Scrutiny Support Manager
Telephone: 0161 234 3071
E-mail: michael.williamson@manchester.gov.uk

Background documents (available for public inspection):

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

- “Notice of the membership of the Executive and portfolio Responsibilities” – record completed by the Leader following Article 7.5(a) review, 17/05/2022
- Manchester City Council Constitution, as adopted by the Council on 3 February 2021 (and amended April 2021).

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The Executive Leader ("the Leader") and the Executive carry out all of the local authority's functions which are not the responsibility of any other part of the local authority, whether by law or under the Council's Constitution.
- 1.2 The Executive will consist of the Leader together with between two and nine councillors appointed to the Executive by the Leader (one of whom will be appointed by the Leader to act as Statutory Deputy Leader).
- 1.3 In addition to the Deputy Leader, the Leader will appoint between one and eight further Executive Members to hold such Portfolios as the Leader shall determine.

2. Background

- 2.1 In accordance with Article of the Constitution 7.4(c) when appointing a Deputy Leader, the Leader must give written notice of such appointment to both the person who he/she is appointing as Deputy Leader and the Monitoring Officer.
- 2.2 The appointment of the Deputy Leader will take effect on receipt of the Leader's written notice by both the person who the Leader is appointing as Deputy Leader and the Monitoring Officer.
- 2.3 When appointing an Executive Member(s), in accordance with Article of the Constitution 7.5(a), the Leader must give written notice of the appointment and of the Portfolio to both the person who he/she is appointing as an Executive Member and to the Monitoring Officer.
- 2.4 As above, the appointment of the Executive Member(s) will take effect on receipt of the Leader's written notice by both the person who the Leader is appointing as an Executive Member and the Monitoring Officer.
- 2.5 The Monitoring Officer is also required to keep a written record of both the appointment of the Deputy Leader and of an Executive Member(s).
- 2.6 In regard to both the appointment of a Deputy Leader and the appointment of an Executive Member(s), the Leader is required to report these appointments (including their Portfolio), to Council and the Executive at the earliest opportunity

3. Appointment of Executive Members, Deputy Executive Members and their Portfolios

- 3.1 The Leader has notified the Monitoring Officer and relevant Councillors of the following appointments and portfolios

Portfolio	Member	Leads on
Leader	Councillor Bev Craig	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications • External Relationships

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GMCA • Governance and Devolution • Inclusive Economic Strategy and Development • International Strategy Overall Leadership of the Council • Oversight on Major Regeneration Projects • Promotion of the City Locally, Nationally and Internationally • Strategic Policy Coordination
Deputy Leader A (Statutory)	Councillor Luthfur Rahman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capital Projects such as Factory and Town Hall • Civil Contingencies and Emergency Planning • Corporate Property • Crime and Safety (policing, community safety partnership, tackling youth violence) Cultural Strategy • Future Council Programme Oversight • Lord Mayors Office Liaison
Deputy Leader B	Councillor Joanna Midgley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advice Services • Domestic Violence and Abuse • Homelessness • Inclusion and Equalities • Member Development • Reducing Poverty and Tackling Inequalities • Refugees and Asylum Seekers • Voluntary and Community Sector
Early Years, Children and Young People	<p>Councillor Garry Bridges</p> <p>Councillor Shazia Butt (Deputy Exec Member)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-16 Education - A place in a good school for all our children • Corporate Parenting • Delivering Ofsted Improvements including Safeguarding, Fostering and Adoption and reducing the number of looked after children Every Help and Bringing Services Together (BST) • Lead Member for Children's Services (LMCS) • Play

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special Education Needs and Disabilities (SEND) and Inclusion • Youth Services, Engagement and Provision
Healthy Manchester and Social Care	<p>Councillor Thomas Robinson</p> <p>Councillor Sandra Collins (Deputy Exec Member)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adult Social Care (older people) • Early Intervention and Prevention • Health and Care Integration • Learning Disabilities and Mental Health • Mental Health and Wellbeing • Public Health and Tackling Health Inequalities • The Local Care Organisation
Finance and Resources	<p>Councillor Rabnawaz Akbar</p> <p>Councillor Greg Stanton (Deputy Exec Member)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Digital Strategy • Finance (budget, capital programme, revenue and benefits) • Human Resources and Organisational Development • Internal IT • Legal • Procurement and Social Value
Environment and Transport	<p>Councillor Tracey Rawlins</p> <p>Councillor Linda Foley (Deputy Exec Member)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Quality • Biodiversity • Climate Emergency and Tackling Climate Change • Food Sustainability • Transport Strategy and issues, Highways and Parking • Walking and Cycling • Zero Carbon
Vibrant Neighbourhoods	<p>Councillor Lee-Ann Igbon</p> <p>Councillor Ahmed Ali (Deputy Exec Member)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bereavement Services • Bringing Services Together and Place Based Reform • Cleaner Streets (waste, recycling, street cleansing) • Licensing and Enforcement (licensing, litter, etc.) • Markets and Other Traded Services • Neighbourhood Plans • Markets and Other Traded Services

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood Plans • Parks and Allotments
Housing and Development	<p>Councillor Gavin White</p> <p>Councillor Sam Lynch (Deputy Exec Member)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing Management • Planning • Private Rented Sector and Enforcement • Regeneration Projects and Investment in District Centres • Residential Growth • Strategic Housing
Skills, Employment and Leisure	<p>Councillor John Hacking</p> <p>Councillor Adele Douglas (Deputy Exec Member)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Digital Exclusion • Events • Leisure and Manchester Active • Libraries and Literacy • Post 16 Skills Strategy • Sports and Sport Development • Worklessness and Good Employment

4. Recommendations

4.1 The recommendations are set out at the beginning of this report.

Executive

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 1 June 2022

Present: Councillor Craig (Chair)

Councillors: Akbar, Bridges, Hacking, Igbon, Midgley, Rahman, Rawlins, T Robinson, White

Also present as Members of the Standing Consultative Panel:

Councillors: Ahmed Ali, Butt, Collins, Douglas, Foley, Johnson, Leech and Lynch

Apologies: Councillor Stanton

Exe/22/41 Minutes

Decision

The Executive approved as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 16 March 2022.

Exe/22/42 Appointment of Executive Members and their Portfolios

The Executive Leader advised that in accordance with Articles of the Constitution 7.4(c) and 7.5(a), she had given notice to the Monitoring Officer and Members in question of her appointment of Deputy Leader and Executive Members (and associated portfolios).

Decision

The Executive note the appointments of Deputy Leader and Executive Members.

Exe/22/43 Ofsted Inspection of Children's Services.

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Strategic Director Children's Services, which reflected on the recent Ofsted Inspection of Local Authorities Children's Services (ILACS) of Manchester's Children's Services. The report advised of the overall judgement of Ofsted and provided an action plan in response to the findings on what needed to improve.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People advised that Ofsted had judged Manchester's Children's Services overall effectiveness as "Good", placing Manchester children's services amongst the top performing Children's Services in the Northwest of the country, with Ofsted identifying several reasons for this judgement, including ongoing financial commitment to the recruitment and retention of social workers, effective quality assurance and performance management arrangements and strong political and professional leadership.

This rating was in sharp contrast to recent previous inspection results in 2014 and 2017 where services were judged to be inadequate and required improvement to be good respectively and the Leader expressed her thanks and gratitude to those involved in Children's Services and across the Council who had worked over the last number of years to achieve this improved rating.

Despite the judgement, the service was not complacent, the approach to service improvement since the last full inspection in 2017 had been to initiate reform of services that required improvement, develop and implement evidence-based interventions, revise its approach to commissioning, build a comprehensive workforce development and career progression strategy and use quality assurance frameworks and other methods to scrutinise the evidence of impact of these change activities on children and families. These approaches, in addition to the Ofsted action plan, would support the Service's ongoing approach to continuous improvement.

Councillor Leech sought clarification as to what groups of children would be included in the Action Plan.

Decision

The Executive note the report and action plan.

Exe/22/44 Our Manchester Progress update

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

The Leader made reference to the use of the term Manchester Living Rent within the report and explained that this would be a way to increase the homes that all Manchester people could afford. She explained that it would be set below Local Housing Allowance (LHA) levels and would also be cheaper to residents than the standard Government definition of Affordable Housing (80% of market value for a particular area). In essence it would mean that regardless of where a home was in the city, it could be affordable to anybody and it was a clear and straightforward way of describing what the Council meant when it had pledged to provide low cost homes that people could afford.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development reported on the Rodney Street development, the first planned development by the Council's new housing delivery company This City, delivering 128 new homes, all of which will be built to low carbon standards, with 30% available at the Manchester Living Rent. He also reported that a planning application had been submitted for more than 700 new homes, with around half of them to be affordable with a range of tenures, alongside a new high school a community hub and green spaces, to be built on the Former Jackson's Brickworks site, a disused brownfield site in east Manchester.

The Deputy Leader reported on the continued support that the Council and its partners were providing for any Ukrainians escaping the invasion of their country. A

meet and greet point staffed by a council duty officer and volunteers from across the authority had been established at Manchester Airport, with the British Red Cross on call if further support was required. More than £60,000 had been raised by the MCR Ukraine Welcome Fund, set up by the We Love Manchester charity in partnership with Manchester City Council, to help assist arriving Ukrainians. The first grant of £30,000 had been awarded to Ardwick-based charity Europia. It would fund a dedicated support worker to co-ordinate advice and practical support for arrivals and contribute towards a hardship fund which the support worker would help administer. As of May 16 2022, 177 would-be sponsors under the government's Homes For Ukraine scheme had come forward and 42 of a potential 449 beneficiaries had arrived in the city.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport reported that the Council had secured £4.9m in Government funding for further work to reduce carbon emissions from more council-owned buildings with a further Council contribution of £1m which would deliver an almost £6m scheme to cut emissions from seven buildings. The move was another step towards the Council's goal of halving its direct carbon emissions by 2025 as it works towards becoming zero by 2028 – in line with the citywide target. She also reported that consultation was underway on proposed walking and cycling improvements in the city centre (Active Travel) with the proposals aim to support the ambition set out in the Council's City Centre Transport Strategy for 90 per cent of morning peak time journeys into the city centre to be made on foot, by cycle or using public transport by 2040.

In relation to the decarbonisation scheme, Councillor Leech asked whether any re-calculation on the long term savings on cost of energy had been undertaken given the soaring increases in energy costs. He also asked whether there was any substance in a tweet made by the Rt Hon James Grundy MP for Leigh, stating that that Greater Manchester Clean Air Zone was to be shrunk to Manchester city Centre and whether this would have any impact on the Active Travel proposals. He also commented on the challenges residents had reported to him on accessing the checks required for taking in Ukrainian refugees, including being required to pay for electrical safety checks.

Councillor Johnson asked for clarity on whether the Council was on track for achieving its target of becoming carbon zero by 2038.

The Deputy Leader acknowledged that there had been some challenges for residents who were taking in Ukrainian refugees and requested that Councillor Leech provided details of these issues so that she could investigate and resolve.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport advised that she would arrange a specific briefing for all Elected Members around the decarbonisation target for both the Council and the City. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer commented that in terms of energy price calculations, when the bid for the further government funding had been finalised, it had been estimated that this would save £33,000 per annum and this was being re-calculated at present. In terms of the Council's action plan for achieving zero carbon, this was currently on track and was regularly scrutinised by the Council's Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee.

The Leader commented that it was still Manchester's and Greater Manchester's position to submit a proposal of a non-charging clean air zone plan by 1 July 2022.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People welcomed the proposals for a new High School within the planning application for the Former Jackson's Brickworks site and reported that more than 40 organisations had pledged their support to 2022 Our Year, a year-long campaign to create an array of activities, opportunities and experiences for the city's children and young people and help create a lasting legacy which would make Manchester one of the best places to grow up in. There was a packed programme of events, activities and opportunities underway and a flavour of these were referred to.

Decision

The Executive note the report.

Exe/22/45 Capital Programme Update

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

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

- Neighbourhoods - Hough End Masterplan. A capital budget increase of £11.905m was requested, funded by £4m Grant, £5.499m funded by borrowing on an invest to save basis funded by joint funds held by Manchester City Council and Sport England, £1.832m funded by borrowing on an invest to save basis and £0.574m borrowing for the erection of a two-storey extension to form sports field changing rooms, cafe facilities, flexible club/social/training rooms and gym space following the demolition of the existing building on site, formation of two 3G football turf pitches as well as associated floodlighting and fencing together with a reconfiguration of natural turf pitches, with associated 67 space car park and an additional 60 space overflow car park.

The proposals which did not require Council approval and only required Executive approval were those which were funded by the use of external resources, use of capital receipts, use of reserves below £10.0m, where the proposal could be funded from existing revenue budgets or where the use of borrowing on a spend to save basis is required. The following proposals required Executive approval for changes to the City Council's capital programme:-

- Children's Services – Education Basic Need Grant. A capital budget increase of £4.056m in 2023/24 was requested, funded by Government Grant. The grant

was paid to local authorities to support the capital requirement for providing new pupil places by expanding existing maintained schools, free schools, or academies, and by establishing new schools. The grant was not time-bound so that the Council could make the best decisions for the city. The Council had received an allocation of £4.056m for 2023-25 and projects brought forward where a need was identified.

- Children's Services - Schools Capital Maintenance Programme. A capital budget increase of £4.264m in 2022/23 is requested, funded by Government Grant. The Council received grant funding each year from the Department for Education for maintenance to the school estate. Funding would be used to address condition needs identified in the Council's estate of maintained schools which included community, voluntary controlled and foundation schools.
- Children's Services – High Needs Provision. A capital budget increase of £7.658m in 2022/23 and £8.769m in 2023/24 was requested, funded by Government Grant. The Council received funding from the Department of Education to support the provision of new places and improve existing provision for children with special educational needs and disabilities or requiring alternative provision. The Council has received an allocation of £16.427m allocated over 2022-23 and 2023-24.
- ICT – Registrars EPOS Solution. A capital budget decrease of £0.141m in 2022/23 is requested and approval of a corresponding transfer of £0.141m to the revenue budget, funded by Capital Fund. The scheme would replace the current unsupported electronic point of sale (EPOS) and stock control system with a fit for purpose solution to enable Registrars to continue taking payment and managing the certificate stock on a supported system.
- Growth and Development – Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme (PSDS) Phase 3. A capital budget increase of £4.648m in 2022/23 is requested, funded by Government Grant. A capital virement from approved budgets of £1.550m is also requested, funded by Borrowing via the Carbon Reduction Programme. The Zero Carbon Estate Programme had secured grant funding from the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme Phase 3 to deliver a range of energy efficiency and generation measures in Council owned buildings across the City. This project was being delivered specifically to reduce energy consumption within the estate with each building includes measures to decarbonise heat through the installation of Air Source Heat Pumps as a minimum, where feasible additional energy efficiency and generation measures such as LED Lighting & Controls and Solar PV had also been included. All works were required to be completed by the end of March 2023 to qualify for the PSDS Phase 3 grant funding and match funding was required.
- ICT – SAP Review. A capital budget decrease of £0.147m in 2022/23 is requested and approval of a corresponding transfer of £0.147m to the revenue budget, funded by Capital Fund. This proposal was to complete the discovery exercise to determine the correct technology mix to support the future strategic direction of both HR and Finance functions. The work would determine business

requirements from a functional and non-functional perspective and underpin the pre-development work to follow.

- Corporate Services - HR and Finance System Replacement Project. A capital budget increase of £0.525m in 2022/23 and £0.900m in 2023/24 was requested, funded by RCCO – Transformation Reserve. The programme was a once in a generation opportunity to upgrade the Council's core finance and HR systems to help drive change to the way it operated its services, managed and reported performance, and interacted with suppliers. The current system, implemented in 2006, would no longer be supported after 2027. The programme was therefore necessary to move Finance, Human Resources and Procurement (procure-to-pay) functions from the current SAP system. This capital scheme would fund and create new roles to support a dedicated programme working group to undertake pre-development work to prepare the organisation for the significant business change associated with replacing finance and HR systems as well as delivering the operational improvements and training associated with the Council's Future Shape programme. .

The report highlighted that there had been increases to the programme totalling £2.668m as a result of delegated approvals since the previous report to the Executive on 16 March 2022 and if the recommendations in the report were approved the General Fund capital budget would increase by £42.437m across financial years which would also result in an increase in the prudential indicator for Capital Expenditure in corresponding years.

Approval had also been given for the following capital budget virements:-

- £2.169m to be allocated for Schools Maintenance work, from Government Grant received, to be carried out in 2022/23;
- £0.496m from the Asset Management Programme (AMP) for additional funding for the Manchester Equipment and Adaptations Partnership Relocation (Aids and adaptations) project;
- £0.120m from Education Basic Need funding for the Manchester Secondary PRU (Pupil Referral Unit) to reduce the cost-of-service delivery and improve the quality of estate;
- £0.093 from grant funding within the Schools Maintenance budget for Peel Hall Primary Emergency Heating Works

The report also provided an update on the Shared Ownership and Affordable Homes Programme (SOAHP) grant award. Since approval of the budget the Council's bid for funding had been approved, thereby, securing a contribution of £6.89m towards the cost of delivering the Council's element of the scheme which was intended to be used to displace the equivalent amount of the HRA funding which had been allocated to deliver the Scheme.

Councillor Leech sought clarity as to whether the £6.89m secured towards the cost of delivering the Council's Shared Ownership and Affordable Homes Programme (SOAHP) would mean that other schemes could be brought forward sooner.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development clarified that there was the potential to bring forward other schemes this as this funding would offset some of the HRA funding which could result in other schemes, such as Silk Street be brought forward

Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Recommend that Council approve the following changes to Manchester City Council's capital programme:
 - Neighbourhoods - Hough End Masterplan. A capital budget increase of £11.905m, funded by £4m Grant, £5.499m by borrowing on an invest to save basis funded by joint funds held by Manchester City Council and Sport England, £1.832m by borrowing on an invest to save basis and £0.574m borrowing.
- (2) Approve the following changes to the Council's capital programme:
 - Children's Services – Education Basic Need. A capital budget increase of £4.056m is requested, funded by Government Grant.
 - Children's Services - Schools Capital Maintenance Programme. A capital budget increase of £4.264m is requested, funded by Government Grant.
 - Children's Services – High Needs Provision. A capital budget increase of £16.427m is requested, funded by Government Grant.
 - ICT – Registrars EPOS (electronic point of sale) Solution. A capital budget decrease of £0.141m is requested and approval of a corresponding transfer of £0.141m to the revenue budget, funded by Capital Fund.
 - Growth and Development – Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme Additional Funding. A capital budget increase of £4.648m is requested, funded by Government Grant. A capital virement of £1.550m is also requested, funded by Borrowing via the Carbon Reduction Programme.
 - ICT – SAP Review. A capital budget decrease of £0.147m is requested and approval of a corresponding transfer of £0.147m to the revenue budget, funded by Capital Fund.
 - Corporate Services - HR and Finance System Replacement Project. A capital budget increase of £1.425m is requested, funded by RCCO – Transformation Reserve.
- (3) Note the increases to the programme of £2.668m as a result of delegated approvals.

- (4) Note the virements in the programme of £2.878m as a result of virements from approved budgets.
- (5) Note the update on Shared Ownership and Affordable Homes Programme (SOAHP) grant award.

Exe/22/46 Global Revenue Outturn 2021/22

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which set out the final outturn position for the Council's revenue budget in 2021/22. It also highlighted the movements from the previous forecast for the year, which was reported to the Executive in February 2022, based on the position as at the end of December 2021.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources reported that the final outturn position was an underspend of £1.2m for the year and whilst the impact of COVID 19 was still being felt, the financial impact had not materialised at the level initially forecast when the budget was set. Of the approved £41.717 savings for 2021/22, £39.702m (95.2%) had been delivered with £2.015m (4.8%) not being achieved in year as planned. The impact of this had been mitigated during the year and alternative savings were identified where original plans had not been achieved recurrently.

Whilst it had been possible to set a balance budget for 2022/23, the financial position beyond this would be challenging with significant budget shortfalls expected and clarity was needed from Government on future local government funding reforms to enable the Council to plan accordingly with adequate resources.

Councillor Leech commented on the consideration of further possible release of reserves to support the budget and help smooth the level of savings required over the next two years. The Leader responded stating that in developing a Medium Term Financial Plan, the Council needed to ensure it did not go bankrupt as a result of government cuts over the last decade.

Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Note the outturn position of £1.161m underspend.
- (2) Approve the proposed revenue budget virements.
- (3) Approve the release of funds approved in budget but not yet allocated to departmental cash limit.
- (4) Approve additional COVID 19 grants to be reflected in the budget.
- (5) Approve the carry forward request totalling £400,000.

Exe/22/47 Gypsies and Travellers - the closure of the Dantzic Street Traveller site

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which sought approval to formally close Gypsy and Traveller Dantzic Street (Cheetham Ward) caravan site as it was no longer occupied and had previously been identified as no longer suitable for meeting the needs of existing residents. The report also provided an update to the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment and a review of the Council's approach to unauthorised encampments.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development reported that in January 2015 the Executive approved the closure of the Dantzic Street Traveller Site, owing to its poor condition. There had been a number of issues with the site over the years and more recently some significant incidents at the site had affected residents.

A full Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) had been developed to assess the impact of the closure of the Dantzic Street site on both the former residents and the wider Gypsy and Traveller community. As part of the process of evaluating the impact, consultation with the former residents of the site, with Irish Community Care, a charity who had been providing support and advocacy of behalf of some of the former resident families, and with national and regional organisations representing Gypsy and Traveller interests and rights had been undertaken.

Councillor Leech, noting the sensitive and difficult issue in finding an appropriate site, sought clarity on what the Council's legal duty was in relation to whether it was required to provide just a permanent site or a permanent site and alongside this a site for temporary stays as the Council often spent a considerable amount of money in cleaning up sites where short term occupancy occurred.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development commented that most of the former residents had expressed a wish to live on a Traveller site again in the future and the outcome of the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment update would inform the future provision of Traveller sites in Manchester.

The Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth commented that the council had a legal duty to meet the needs of the gypsy and traveller community, but in doing so the Council had to take account of encampments and unauthorised encampments and the Policing Bill as well as the views of the residents. He added that there was no legal duty to provide a site for temporary stay

Decisions

The Executive

- (1) Note the current condition of the Dantzic Street site.
- (2) Note that the former residents have left the site and are pursuing 'bricks and mortar' accommodation following unrest within the wider Traveller community.

- (3) Approve the proposal to close the Dantzic Street site as it is no longer suitable as a Traveller site.
- (4) Note the proposal to update the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment to inform the future provision of Traveller sites in Manchester.
- (5) Approve a commitment that those residents who left the site last summer will be offered a plot or pitch on any new permanent site provided in Manchester in the future.
- (6) Note the outcomes of an Equality Impact Assessment.
- (7) Agree that Discretionary Home Loss payments will be made to former plot holders moving into bricks and mortar accommodation.

Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2022

Present:

Councillor Hitchen - In the Chair
Councillors Azra Ali, Benham, Connolly, Evans, Hilal, Johnson, H Priest, Rawson, Whiston, Wills and Wilson

Also present:

Councillor Midgley, Deputy Leader

Apologies:

Councillors Chambers and Iqbal

CESC/22/17 Minutes

Decision

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

CESC/22/18 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.

A Member requested that the Committee continue to look at homelessness during the new municipal year. The Chair advised that there would be work programming session after the meeting and that Members could discuss then how this would be planned into the Committee's work programme.

The Chair drew the Committee's attention to the list of key decisions yet to be taken and asked officers for an update. In relation to the key decision on the provision of a transport service for the Manchester Schools Swimming Programme, the Commercial Manager (Neighbourhoods) advised that this was currently out for procurement. The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) advised that she would check the current position in relation to the Security Services Contract and the Framework Agreement for the Provision of Temporary Accommodation for People with No Recourse to Public Funds and ensure that updates on key decisions were provided in future.

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme, subject to the above comments.

Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2022

Present:

Councillor Simcock – in the Chair
Councillors Andrews, Davies, Good, Lanchbury, B Priest, Rowles and Wheeler

Apologies: Councillor Kirkpatrick

RGSC/21/19 Minutes

Decision

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

RGSC/21/20 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 Committee noted that it would be discussing the work programme for the forthcoming municipal year in further detail in a private session following the meeting, and that an updated work programme reflecting this discussion would be circulated as normal in the papers for the next meeting.

Decision

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

Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2022

Present:

Councillor Simcock – in the Chair

Councillors Andrews, Davies, Good, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, B Priest, Rowles and Wheeler

Also present:

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Finance and Resources

RGSC/22/21 Minutes

Decision

The Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2022 as a correct record.

RGSC/22/22 Revenue and Benefits Update

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update on the activity of the Revenues and Benefits Unit as set out in the October 2021 Scrutiny Report, including details of Covid schemes and cost of living schemes delivered by the service.

Key themes in the report included:

- An overview of Benefits administration, including Council Tax Support and the management of the Welfare Provision Scheme and other discretionary schemes;
- The financial support provided as part of the Test and Trace scheme;
- The financial support provided by the Household Support Fund scheme;
- The financial support provided by the Energy Grant Scheme; Performance in the collection of council tax and how the Council balances collection, whilst working in an ethical way and supporting those residents on a low income; and
- Performance in the collection of business rates, including the financial support provided to businesses through various Business Rates Reliefs and grants.

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

- Was it possible to provide any indication as to how many families and businesses had been supported by the Council's approach to helping those in need;
- It was noted that there were no properties within the Private Rented Sector within Manchester that offered properties for rent close to the Local Housing Allowance (LHA) rate and it was deeply worrying that there had been no uplift in April 2022;

- Was there any significant variations between Council Tax bandings and the uptake in direct debit payments of Council Tax;
- What percentage of applicants were approved in relation to the Welfare Provisions Scheme;
- In relation to the pilot with Oasis Centre in Gorton, what have been the learning outcomes for wider implementation;
- Had there been any occasion where the Council had managed to collect Council Tax at a rate of 95% or more;
- Clarification was sought on how the Council was preventing the £150 Council Tax rebate being paid to those residents with a second home;
- A question was asked on how quickly 'U' banded properties became classified;
- Clarification was sought as to whether Enforcement Agents were bailiffs and how likely was the trial on attachments to earnings to be extended;
- Was there any indication as to how many business the city were lost due to them not fitting the criteria set by Government for its Business Support Scheme; and
- Was there any specific reasons for the low uptake of the CARF funding.

The Head of Corporate Assessments advised that it was difficult to give a precise number as to how many people had been supported as many people had been affected by a range of pressure. He advised that it would be possible to provide a high level figure of the number of households that had received support. The Head of Corporate Revenues advised that the position was similar in relation to business rate support, insofar that it would be possible to provide a figure on how many businesses had received support and the amount of money paid out by the Council, but it would not be possible to provide more detail as to how many businesses had been saved from collapsing.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources commented that it would be fair to acknowledge that the Council would not have been able to help as many residents and businesses without the additional funding from government, but it was not a simple process of just passporting the money on to those families and businesses. It needed to be recognised the amount of work that had gone into the design and implementation processes by the Council in short space of time to enable the distribution of these funds to those most in need.

The Head of Corporate Revenues agreed to provide details to the Committee on the number of households that paid Council Tax by direct debit in each Council Tax banding. He commented that the Council tried to provide residents with multiple ways to establish direct debit payments, not just online, as this was the cheapest way for the council to process Council Tax payments.

The Head of Corporate Assessments advised that he did not have all the available data on the percentage of applicants who were approved in relation to the Welfare Provisions Scheme, but in relation to the first two months of the current financial year, which would be broadly representative of applications approved the figure was at 38%.

The Committee was advised that following the pilot with Oasis Centre in Gorton, the Council was considering rolling out similar provisions at other sites in the future.

Although the number of referrals that had been made at present was fairly low the service had been extremely well received by staff at the Oasis Centre, as well as those residents that have been helped.

The Head of Corporate Revenues commented that in terms of the in year collection rate of Council Tax arrears, the Council had never achieved a rate of 95%, but it was reported that the overall collection rate for Council Tax had been in excess of 96.5% pre pandemic. This rate had reduced to 94.5% during the pandemic and these financial years had been set at 95.5%

In terms of the £150 Council Tax rebate for second home owners, it was explained the Council's data on this was as accurate as it could be but the Council was to some degree reliant on residents informing the Council if they owned a second property. In addition, the technical definition of a second home included rented furnished properties between tenants so any property classified as this would not have been eligible for the rebate.

In relation to the classification of 'U' banded properties, there was currently 4,400 properties on the Academy system, which could range from only having footings to being ready for occupancy and referred to the Valuation office for banding. Properties were added to the system when formal names and addresses had been determined. Completion notices were served when properties became ready for occupation within three months and this provided a date as to when a property became eligible for paying Council Tax.

The Head of Corporate Revenues clarified that the Enforcement Agents were previously referred to as Bailiffs and that the Council did use these to enforce the collection of Council Tax or Business rate debt but commented that the Council had reduced the number of instances where Enforcement Agents were instructed significantly over the last ten years. The Committee was reassured that there was a strict code of conduct of how the Council expected the Agents to conduct themselves and they were never used for those people on Council Tax support. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer agreed to provide the Committee with a fuller response on this issue after the meeting.

The Committee was advised that the Cabinet Office was keen to extend the trial on attachments to earnings but HMRC was not as supportive due to requirement of sharing information. It was noted that the second stage of the trial would not be as successful as the first stage as HMRC had requested more information to match the Council's data against their own, which the Council could not provide as it did not hold it. The Council was working with DWP to provide the information being sought but this was only resulting in matches where the resident had DWP connections and these did not tend to be the higher earners.

The Head of Corporate Revenues advised that the Growth and Skills Hub would possibly have the information on the number of businesses that did not fit the governments criteria for Business Support Scheme. It was agreed that Officers would speak to colleagues in the Growth and Skills Hub for this information and if available would be provided to the Committee

In terms of the uptake of CARF funding, it was not clear as to why the uptake was low. It was reported that £24m had been made available to businesses and so far the Council had written to over 9,000 businesses to make them aware of this available funding.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report.
- (2) Thanks all Officers within the Council's Revenue and Benefits team for their hard work in supporting those most vulnerable in the city.
- (3) Requests that Officers provide the Committee with information on the number of businesses that did not fit the government's criteria for Business Support Scheme and details on the number of households that paid Council Tax by direct debit in each Council Tax banding.

RGSC/22/23 Capital Programme Outturn 2021/22

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer. The Committee had been invited to comment on the report prior to it being considered by the Executive.

Key themes in the report included:

- The outturn of capital expenditure for 2021/22;
- The financing of capital expenditure for 2021/22;
- The major variances between the 2021/22 outturn and the previous Capital Programme monitoring report submitted in February 2022; and
- The revised capital programme budget for 2022/23; and subsequent years as a result of the review of the programme following outturn.

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

- Was the inflation contingency of £28m over the next four years going to be enough given the increasing rate;
- Would it be possible to have a report on how each capital project contributed to a net zero carbon city;
- Could information be provided on the spending towards the new proposed residents parking zone in Ancoats;
- Was the Council still expecting a positive return on investment in regard to The Factory
- How would spending change on Northwards Housing now that it was back within the Council;
- Concern was expressed around the economic volatility Manchester residents were facing and whether there would be an effect on Council borrowing if interest rates were to increase;
- How was social value delivered within the projects;
- Concern was expressed around the cost of inflation to the construction industry;

- Why was there a proposed virement of £1.62m from the Newton Heath High Rise Block
- Could an explanation of maintaining structure of borrowing be given; and
- Clarification was sought as to the why the cost of refitting the Peterloo Memorial was greater than the total cost of the Emmeline Pankhurst memorial.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that it was difficult to accurately assess the level of contingency needed for inflation as the situation was very fast moving and the impact on the supply chain was profound as well. All major schemes had been reviewed but it would be further in the year before there would be clearer picture of the impact of recent increases in inflation would have. The Deputy City Treasurer also comment that most of the capital projects had contingency levels built in and it would be these contingencies that would be used in the first instance and the £28m was for anything that couldn't be covered within the planned contingency levels within each project.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer agreed to share with Committee Members the Council' Low Carbon Build Standard report. In addition, it was explained that each capital project went through a business case process, with a specific part centred around how the project would contribute towards low carbon and other climate mitigation measures.

In terms of the residents parking zone in Ancoats, the scheme would be included in the Council's Capital Programme at the point it became fully approved and the funding in place. At present, this scheme was currently going through consultation and would be added into the programme at the point it was agreed and signed off.

It was reported that the Council was still expecting a positive economic return for The Factory, but it was acknowledged that there was a pressured budget for the project given the inflationary pressures the Council was facing.

In regard to Northwards Housing, some of the work the Council would be doing would be around the Capital Investment Programme for the estate.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer shared the Committee's concern on the impact to residents that the increase in inflation was having. She commented that the Council was not able to mitigate against everything but would work hard to target its resources that it had in the most effective way possible. It was reported that in relation to borrowing, whilst the financing for the current approved programme was affordable, any future capital programme schemes and the ability to deliver some new projects may be constrained by the level of funding available.

The Deputy City Treasure advised that each capital project had a 20% weighting of the tender in relation to delivering social value as part of the project. It was often up to the contractor as to what form this would be delivered but there had been a focus on job creation, apprenticeships, skills training as well as local works and volunteering days. In addition, there was a further 10% weighting around contributing to a low carbon city, both of which were monitored throughout the life of the project.

The Deputy City Treasurer provided an explanation of what was meant by maintaining structure of borrowing and also agreed to provide details on the virement at Newton Heath High Rise Block, but in essence this was due to a potential underspend on the work undertaken. Furthermore, he clarified that the cost allocated to refitting the Peterloo Memorial was the total available funding available figure and would not necessarily cost the total value as stated in the report.

Decision

The Committee note the report.

RGSC/22/24 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.

Decision

The Committee note the report and agreed the work programme.

Health Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 25 May 2022

Present:

Councillor Green – in the Chair
Councillors N. Ali, Appleby, Curley, Johnson, Karney, Newman, Riasat, Richards and Russell

Apologies: Councillors McHale and Reeves

Also present:

Councillor T. Robinson, Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care
Councillor Collins, Deputy Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care

HSC/22/19 Urgent Business – IT Failure at the Northern Care Alliance NHS Foundation Trust (NCA)

The Chair welcomed Councillor T. Robinson, Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care and asked him to address the Committee on the recent IT Failure at the Northern Care Alliance NHS Foundation Trust (NCA).

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care stated that he had met with senior officers to discuss the emerging IT issue that was impacting upon North Manchester General Hospital. He advised that business contingency plans were being enacted and that a comprehensive briefing note would be circulated to all Members by the close of business.

The Deputy Director of Adult Social Services reassured the Committee that teams were working to ensure the continued safe treatment and discharge of patients.

Decision

To note the oral update.

HSC/22/18 Minutes

Decision

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

HSC/22/19 Covid-19 and Vaccination Programme Update

The Committee 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:

- An update on the current Covid data;
- An overview of the Manchester Health Protection System; and
- Information relating to the Manchester Spring Vaccination Plan.

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

- The need to learn the lessons from history and HIV/Aids and how stigma and misconceptions can arise in relation to health issues;
- Consideration needed to be given nationally as to the naming of monkeypox, noting that this could arise to public misconceptions;
- Further information was sought as to the Covid winter booster vaccination programme and if the public would be charged, in a similar way as the flu vaccination was administered;
- Noting that COVID had not gone away and was still prevalent and people needed to be reminded of this;
- Recognising the important role of community vaccination hubs and pop-up events to support the vaccination programme;
- Noting the relationship of the reported cases of COVID and the removal of free Lateral Flow Testing;
- The vaccination levels in Manchester were still relatively low compared to the national average and further information was sought as to the characteristics of those not vaccinated;
- Information on the future of Sounding Boards was requested.

The Director of Public Health addressed the issue of monkeypox by advising that at the time of reporting there were no reported cases in the North West. He advised that nationally there were 71 confirmed cases and that the risk to public health was very low, however the local situation would continue to be closely monitored and he was confident that local systems were in place to effectively respond in the event of an outbreak. In response to the discussion regarding misconceptions and stigma he stated that the team were also working closely with the Communications Team and the local Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) partners to ensure the messaging was appropriate and accurate. He further acknowledged the comments regarding the naming of the disease and he would raise this nationally following the meeting. He advised the Committee that he would keep them updated in regard to monkeypox.

The Strategic Lead Population Health Programmes advised that in terms of the vaccination cohorts the guidance of The Joint Committee on Vaccination and Immunisation (JCVI) was followed. She stated that it was recognised nationally that the wider vaccination system, such as flu and childhood immunisations needed to be streamlined. In regard to future vaccination charging, she said that the approach to this was yet to be decided at a national level. She described that unlike in other areas of the country Manchester continued to deliver a consistent vaccination offer, including the outreach services and pop-up events and that teams of core volunteers still operated and supported such community settings. She said that discussions were ongoing with NHSE regarding the future funding of the estate costs associated

with community services. In regard to the details requested regarding the non-vaccinated she said this information would be shared following the meeting.

The Director of Public Health commented that Sounding Boards had been established under the remit of the work of COVID-19 Health Equity Manchester (CHEM). He stated that these would continue to function this year and that their role and scope was to be reviewed to help identify gaps and support the wider work of health protection. He added that the work of Sounding Boards complimented the wider Marmot work underway across the city to address health inequality.

In response to a question regarding staffing and the reconfiguration of services the Assistant Director of Public Health advised that all the posts were permanent posts and had utilised the capacity within existing teams under existing funding arrangements.

A Member paid tribute to all staff and partners who had worked to protect the residents of Manchester during the pandemic. He said this was contrary to the actions of the government as highlighted in recent press reports and photographs. He called upon the Prime Minister to apologise to the residents of Manchester who had adhered to the Covid rules. He further called upon the Prime Minister to resign. The Committee supported this statement.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care endorsed all the comments from the Committee and welcomed their deliberations and questioning. He further thanked the officers for the quality and breadth of the presentation. He concluded by paying tribute to his predecessor, Councillor Midgley.

The Chair and the Committee expressed their gratitude to all staff, partners and volunteers involved with tackling COVID-19 over the previous 24 months. The Chair expressed her ongoing confidence in all the established systems and staff and praised their ongoing commitment. The Chair further wished Dr Kumar her best wishes and congratulations on her new post and thanked her for her regular attendance at Health Scrutiny and in doing so welcomed Jenny Osborne, Strategic Lead Population Health Programmes to her new role.

Decision

To note the report.

HSC/22/20 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 Committee noted that it would be discussing the work programme for the forthcoming municipal year in further detail in a private session following the meeting, and that an updated work programme reflecting this discussion would be circulated as normal in the papers for the next meeting.

Decision

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

Health Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2022

Present:

Councillor Green – in the Chair
Councillors N. Ali, Appleby, Curley, Johnson and Riasat

Apologies: Councillors Karney, McHale, Newman, Reeves, Richards and Russell

Also present:

Councillor T. Robinson, Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care
Councillor Collins, Deputy Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care
Kathryn Murphy, Director of Nursing and Midwifery, Saint Mary's Hospital
Jen Sager, Quality and Safety, Saint Mary's Hospital
Mr Martin Toal, Extra Care resident
Mr Vic Nuttall, Extra Care resident

HSC/22/21 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 25 May 2022 as a correct record.

HSC/22/22 Covid-19, Health Protection and Vaccination Programme Update

The Committee considered the report and presentation of the Assistant Director of Public Health that provided that latest COVID-19 data and vaccination updates. In addition, the Health Protection slides provided the latest information on the national, regional and local response to the monkeypox situation. The presentation had been circulated to all Members in advance of the meeting.

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

- Noting the recent press reports that described an increase in the cases of COVID-19; and
- The Council should lobby the government for the reintroduction of free testing.

The Strategic Lead Population Health Programmes acknowledged the comments regarding the increase in COVID-19 cases and stated that residents who had not had their spring booster jab should come forward to receive these at the earliest opportunity, especially those vulnerable and older residents. She further commented that key messaging and levers are being used to encourage both older and younger people to take up the offer of the vaccination.

The Assistant Director of Public Health reassured the Committee that work continued across a range of settings to ensure that any future outbreak was managed appropriately. She further reiterated the key public health message that COVID-19

was still in circulation and anyone experiencing symptoms should refrain from entering the work place and work from home where possible.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care advised the Committee that it had always been and remained the position of the Council that free COVID testing should be made available to all Manchester residents.

The Chair thanked the officers for the update and stated that the Committee retained their confidence in all of the teams who had responded to the pandemic. She further commented that from July this regular update would be provided via the monthly Overview Report as an item for information, adding that Members would still have the opportunity to ask questions on the information provided.

The Chair further commented that she welcomed the recent announcement that the World Health Organization was seeking to change the name of monkeypox virus, noting that the Committee had called for this at their previous meeting.

Decision

To note the report.

HSC/22/23 The Ockenden Report - Manchester Foundation Trust's Response

The Committee considered the report and accompanying presentation submitted by St Mary's Hospital, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust that described that Dame Donna Ockenden was appointed to conduct an independent review of maternity services at Shrewsbury and Telford NHS Trust. A report highlighting the initial findings was published in December 2020. Manchester Foundation Trust produced and completed an action plan in relation to its recommendations.

The second and final report into Dame Donna Ockenden's review of maternity services at Shrewsbury and Telford NHS Trust was published on 30 March 2022. It described 15 Immediate and Essential Actions, which must be taken forward by all local maternity service providers. The report described Manchester Foundation Trust's response to the final Ockenden Report.

Key points and themes in the report and presentation included:

- Providing an introduction and context to the report;
- Manchester Foundation Trust response to emerging findings from the first Ockenden report; and
- Manchester Foundation Trust response to emerging findings from the final Ockenden report.

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

- What was being done to support pregnant female prisoners;
- What was being done to support pregnant learning disabled citizens;
- What was being done to support pregnant homeless citizens; and
- What was being done to train, recruit and retain midwifery nurses.

The Director of Nursing and Midwifery, Saint Mary's Hospital stated that a dedicated midwife post had been established to specifically support HMP Styal. She described this post had been established in late 2021 and was beginning to be embedded, noting that this was recognised nationally as an example of good practice.

The Director of Nursing and Midwifery, Saint Mary's Hospital further commented that the Ockenden Report discussed the need to consider vulnerability in the wider context, improve access to services and remove barriers to service. She described that there was a specific Learning-Disabled Safeguarding Group that worked closely with the Manchester Local Care Organisation to address wider care needs of patients.

The Director of Nursing and Midwifery, Saint Mary's Hospital commented that Manchester was in a strong position in relation to nurse training and retention. She stated that they had established strong relationships with local education providers and had managed to establish a strong pathway to recruit student nurses from these providers, commenting that in addition to this Manchester benefited from being a vibrant city that attracted nursing graduates. In response to a specific question relating to the diversity of the work force she commented that this data was available and would be provided following the meeting, adding that Saint Mary's had a programme to promote and support BAME staff and there was a mechanism to ensure that the voice and views of BAME staff was heard at all levels of the organisation.

The Chair stated that she welcomed the report and would welcome a future update report at an appropriate time that described progress against the agreed actions. She further requested that this update report include comparative data and how Manchester compared to the Shrewsbury and Telford Hospital NHS Trust. She further requested that the report include an update on advocacy and the voice of the women and families.

Decision

To note the report and request that an update report is provided for consideration at an appropriate time.

HSC/22/24 Extra Care Growth and Developments in Manchester

The Committee considered the report and presentation of the Executive Director of Adult Social Services that described the developments across Extra Care Housing during the past 7 years, culminating in significant growth in provision by working in partnership with Manchester Housing Providers.

Extra Care is purpose-built accommodation with care for people over 55 years of age and is a key enabler for adult social care in increasing suitable housing options for older people to remain in their chosen community, which, through this provision, avoids the need for people with care and support needs to rely on institutionalised care settings such as residential and nursing care.

The Committee then welcomed Mr Martin Toal and Mr Vic Nuttall, Manchester citizens. They both spoke of the circumstance that had resulted in them moving into their respective homes and of the positive experience of living in Extra Care accommodation.

To accompany this item the Committee also viewed a short video tour of Dahlia Gardens Extra Care scheme, courtesy of Southway Housing.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing a background to the report, noting that The Housing for an Age-Friendly Manchester Strategy 2014-2020 set out the vision to increase extra care housing by trebling provision; and
- Describing the benefits and outcomes of Extra Care Housing, including key facts and figures.

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

- Thanking both Mr Toal and Mr Nuttall for attending the meeting and sharing their experience with the Committee;
- Recognising the positive impact this model of accommodation had on both residents and their families;
- Was there enough of this type of accommodation to meet demand in the city;
- Could private owner occupiers access Extra Care accommodation, and if so communication in relation to this needed to be improved;
- Future schemes needed to be codesigned with residents with experience of living in Extra Care accommodation;
- An update was requested in relation to the LGBT Extra Care scheme that was planned for Whalley Range; and
- More needed to be done to promote Extra Care as a viable option for BAME residents.

The Head of Commissioning (Older People) responded to Members' questions and comments by advising that the delivery of the schemes over the previous seven years had been achieved by working with Strategic Housing and housing providers in the city. She described that the accommodation delivered was of high quality and supported people to rightsize. She described that since 2014 the number of units in the city had trebled and there was a pipeline of schemes to grow this provision. She described that the maps describing proposed schemes had been developed using data to map where the older populations currently lived, adding that it was important to acknowledge that the schemes were for the city as a whole.

The Head of Commissioning (Older People) stated that the benefits realised by people living in Extra Care accommodation included decreased levels of depression; loneliness; falls; increased feeling of safety and increased activities. She also advised that this reduced the demand on hospital services. She informed Members that Extra Care was a home for life and they worked with a range of NHS partners to support people to remain living safely in their homes, including Macmillan Cancer Support. She further stated that a further, specific Dementia Extra Care home would

be developed in Manchester to provide specific, appropriate support for people so as to avoid them having to move into residential care.

The Head of Commissioning (Older People) informed Members that owner occupiers were eligible and could apply for Extra Care accommodation and acknowledged that there was a need to consider key messaging on this issue to include owner occupiers and members of the BAME community. She advised that there were good examples of where BAME residents had been engaged on this subject as a viable housing option; however, she acknowledged there was an existing perception amongst some residents regarding this model of accommodation, adding that this was a national issue. The Chair commented that existing Sounding Boards could be used to support this activity and promote Extra Care more widely.

The Head of Commissioning (Older People) acknowledged the suggestion regarding the codesign of future schemes to include residents with lived experience. She advised that Occupational Therapists did work with architects during the design stage and stated that the learning from previous schemes would be built upon to inform future schemes.

The Interim Director of Housing & Residential Growth reiterated the previous comments that commended the joint strategic approach in Manchester to deliver the Extra Care schemes and he further paid tribute to all officers involved with this work for their commitment. He described that this work and approach complimented the Manchester Housing Strategy (2022-2032) that would be considered at the July meeting of Executive. He further provided an update on the LGBT Russell Road scheme and stated that the Committee would be kept informed as this scheme developed.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care stated that the report described a success story for the city and needed to be celebrated. He particularly welcomed the lived experience articulated by the invited residents that had meaningfully contributed to the Committee's deliberations.

Decision

To note the report.

HSC/22/25 Manchester Equipment & Adaptations Partnership

The Committee considered the report and presentation of the Executive Director of Adult Social Services that described that the Manchester Equipment & Adaptation Partnership is a citywide service within Adult Social Care in the Manchester Local Care Organisation.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing a service overview; and
- Discussing the current opportunities, challenges and activity.

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

- Noting the significant positive impact this service had on supporting people and their families;
- How confident were we that the work to reduce the waiting lists and for the waiting time to see an Assessment Officer to be under 4 weeks would be completed by the end of September 2022;
- Communications relating to the service needed to be appropriate, include information in relation to expected timescales and information on how to appeal decisions;
- What was the rate of recovery of minor adaptations when they were no longer required; and
- Noting that a review of the delivery model of both minor and major adaptations would be undertaken, the Committee requested an update report following completion of the review.

The Assistant Director, Targeted Interventions noted the comments from the Members and responded by advising that the team were well established and committed to delivering the best outcomes for Manchester residents. She described that the work of the service was aligned to the Better Outcomes Better Lives work that was regularly reported to this Committee and staff worked closely with the Community Health Teams based in the Manchester Local Care Organisation. She added that she remained confident that the September target to reduce the waiting lists and for the waiting time to see an Assessment Officer would be achieved.

The Assistant Director, Targeted Interventions advised that the review of the delivery model of both minor and major adaptations would inform the future delivery model of this service and an update report describing the findings and recommendations of the review would be submitted to the Committee for consideration at an appropriate time.

The Assistant Director, Targeted Interventions said that all communications relating to the service did comply with all current accessibility guidance, however if there were cases that Members wished to raise with her following the meeting she would look into these further. She said that all applications for the service were appropriately assessed, and timescales communicated to residents. She stated that if a decision was to refuse an application, information relating to the appeals process was provided, adding that officers did work to explain panel decisions to residents. She added that residents could reapply if their circumstance changed.

The Assistant Director, Targeted Interventions stated that Manchester had a very high rate of recycling and reusing equipment when they were no longer required.

Decision

To recommend that an update report describing the findings and recommendations of the delivery model of both minor and major adaptations be included on the Committee's work programme for consideration at an appropriate time.

HSC/22/26 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 requested that a response to the outstanding previous recommendations, described at section 1 of the report be provided for the next update.

In response to the Chair's comments regarding the Care Quality Commission (CQC) rating of Inadequate of a service, the Deputy Director of Adult Social Services advised that discussions were underway with the CQC to determine how best to relay information to the Elected Members for those services that were not Adult Social Care.

Decision

The Committee notes the report and agrees the work programme, noting the requests for update reports arising from consideration of the previous agenda items.

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 25 May 2022

Present:

Councillor Reid – in the Chair
Councillors Alijah, Amin, Gartside, Good, Hewitson, Judge, Lovecy, Sadler and Sharif Mahamed

Co-opted Voting Members:

Mr G Cleworth, Parent Governor Representative

Co-opted Non-Voting Members:

Miss S Iltaf, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative
Ms L Smith, Primary Sector Teacher Representative

Also present:

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People
Andrea Patel, Director of Safeguarding, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC)
Detective Superintendent Chris Downey, Greater Manchester Police (GMP)

Apologies:

Councillors Abdullatif and Bano
Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative

CYP/22/21 Minute's Silence

The Committee held a minute's silence for the victims of the school shooting in Texas and the children of Ukraine.

CYP/22/22 Urgent Business – Ofsted's Inspection of Manchester's Children's Services

The Deputy Director of Children's Services informed Members about the recent Ofsted Inspection of Manchester Children's Services, which had judged the service to be "good". He outlined the main points within Ofsted's report, which had been published the previous week. He highlighted that Manchester now had one of the top performing Children's Services in the north-west of England and that this represented a significant improvement since the last inspection in 2017. He offered to bring to a future meeting a report which included the Council's action plan for addressing the areas for improvement identified in Ofsted's report.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People recognised the years of hard work that had gone into achieving this improvement, particularly in light of the challenges of austerity and the pandemic, and how Council decisions had enabled this. The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services also praised the staff in Children's Services. He emphasised that, while this was a very positive achievement, the service could not be complacent and would strive for continued improvement and to respond to emerging challenges.

A Member congratulated all those involved in this achievement and recognised the important role of frontline social work staff. The Chair highlighted how the service had worked to improve since it had been judged as “inadequate” in 2014 and made reference to the late Sheila Newman who had been the Executive Member for Children’s Services, overseeing the improvement journey until her death in 2018. The Chair also explained the contribution of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee over this period and her own role in the improvement journey. She also thanked the former Council Leader Sir Richard Leese for his commitment with extra funding for social workers, to reduce caseloads.

Decision

To note the verbal report.

CYP/22/23 Minutes

Decisions

1. To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 9 March 2022.
2. To receive the minutes of the meeting of the Ofsted Subgroup held on 2 March 2022.

CYP/22/24 Manchester Safeguarding Partnership (MSP) Annual Report 2020/2021

The Committee received a report of Paul Marshall, in his role as the Chair of the Children Executive Board, which provided an overview of what the MSP had done as a result of the safeguarding arrangements, and how effective these arrangements had been in practice.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Partnership arrangements;
- Communications and engagement;
- Quality assurance and scrutiny;
- Case reviews and learning;
- Workforce development;
- The Independent Chair’s assurance statement;
- Review of MSP Joint Strategic Plan 2020/2021; and
- Strategic priorities 2021/2022.

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

- To welcome the positive achievements outlined in the report, recognising the challenges of the pandemic;

- To request more information on the changes to the quality assurance arrangements;
- Serious Case Reviews and learning from high profile national cases such as the death of Arthur Labinjo-Hughes; and
- Complex safeguarding work relating to young people at risk from serious youth violence, including work with local communities to address this.

The Strategic Lead (Safeguarding and Practice Development) reported that the Partnership had been focused on identifying, understanding and meeting the needs of children and families during the pandemic and making sure that no child fell through the net during that period; however, it was recognised that the focus of the quality assurance function now needed to re-adjust and should extend to looking at the impact and effectiveness of its work. She outlined how learning from high profile national cases was used, checking if the findings from that investigation was true of Manchester, and reported that, when undertaking a review in Manchester, national research would be taken into account.

The Chair highlighted the important role of Health Visitors in identifying and monitoring the welfare of pre-school-age children who were in need of help and protection and suggested that Health Visitors be added to the agenda for a future meeting. Andrea Patel, Director of Safeguarding, MHCC, reported that reviews in Manchester had been positive about the Health Visiting Service but that if any gaps were identified they would be addressed.

The Chair informed the Committee about a project which was taking place in Gorton on complex safeguarding, which involved the local community. The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services informed Members about the multi-agency Complex Safeguarding Subgroup and the links with neighbourhoods teams, GMP and schools. Detective Superintendent Chris Downey from GMP reported that it was a constant challenge to keep young people safe and manage tensions and that he and his colleagues wanted to be able to shift towards understanding the causes of youth violence and focusing on early intervention. He informed Members that he had recently recruited an additional three police officers to work on early intervention regarding serious youth violence and that this work would be supported by Youth Justice and social workers in the Complex Safeguarding Hub. He advised that this work was different from their traditional work on Child Criminal Exploitation and needed a different approach.

In response to a Member's question, Detective Superintendent Chris Downey advised that GMP did look at what similar cities were doing to address youth violence, although still more could be done to learn from good practice elsewhere. In response to another question, he acknowledged that more work needed to be done to engage with local communities, including families affected by serious youth violence and recognised that work with communities had been important in addressing other issues, such as firearm offences. He reported that GMP did communicate with families who had lost loved ones due to youth violence. He advised that, although GMP had a central Independent Advisory Group that covered the whole central area, he felt that a more local approach was needed, including asking local people how they could help with addressing this issue. The Chair highlighted the new Chief Constable's commitment to neighbourhood policing. She

advised that she had already spoken to the Chair of the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee, who would be having an item on Youth Justice at a future meeting, to which she and Members of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee would be invited.

A Member who was a Teacher Representative informed the Committee how her school was engaging with local partners, including mosques, to address challenging behaviour. The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services suggested that officers provide a report on youth participation and engagement to a future meeting.

Members discussed youth provision, including funding cuts, activities over the summer holidays and the challenge of young people not wanting to cross boundaries into other areas to access youth provision. A Member informed the Committee about a boxing club for young people set up by Moss Side firefighters and suggested that Members could visit this. The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People suggested that the Committee receive a report on youth provision at a future meeting and highlighted the additional £500,000 which the Council was investing in youth provision. He also informed the Committee how local Neighbourhood Teams were putting on events as part of Our Year. He said that he could provide further information on this and encouraged Members to speak to the Neighbourhood Teams in their wards about doing this. In response to a Member's comments about issues in his ward, the Executive Member offered to discuss the specific issues outside of the meeting.

In a response to a Member's question about the impact of the pandemic on children and young people's mental health, the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services outlined the mental health support that had been put in place through schools and through both universal and specialist services. He recognised the challenge of responding to traumatised children and suggested that the Committee might want to consider this at a future meeting.

Decision

To consider Health Visiting at a future meeting.

CYP/22/25 COVID-19 Update

The Committee received a verbal update from the Education Business Partner which outlined new developments and significant changes to the current situation, particularly in relation to schools.

The main points and themes within the verbal update included:

- The number of positive cases in schools, which had reduced;
- Recent changes, including the end of free regular testing, the expanded list of COVID-19 symptoms and the change in guidance for people who suspected that they had COVID-19;
- The government's withdrawal of the operational guidance for schools on COVID-19 and the incorporation of COVID-19 management into existing health, health and safety and estates management guidance and the

- publication of a new document for school leaders called the Department for Education (DfE) Emergency Planning and Response document;
- The continued support being provided to schools by the Council's Education Service and its partners;
 - That the Test and Trace Team had become Manchester Health Protection Team and that support would continue and would now cover other diseases, in addition to COVID-19; and
 - That there would be a continued focus on Long Covid, in relation to pupils and staff.

In response to a Member's question, the Director of Education reported that individual schools could decide how quickly they resumed normal activities, such as full assemblies or stay and play sessions, which had been stopped during the pandemic. She advised that some schools had found that some of the practices introduced due to the pandemic were beneficial to the smooth-running of the school and would continue. The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People reported that staff absences could be affecting the resumption of some activities but that he expected activities to return to similar to how they had been pre-pandemic and that Members could speak to him or the Director of Education about any specific cases they were concerned about. In response to a Member's question, the Deputy Director of Children's Services reported that Social Workers had been undertaking face-to-face visits throughout the pandemic, while almost making use of technology.

The Chair advised that the Committee would receive a further COVID-19 update at its next meeting and could then review whether or not it was necessary to continue to have updates at every meeting. She noted that the Committee would be receiving a report on examination results later in the year and would be able to assess the impact of the pandemic on these. She suggested that the Committee receive a report on School Governance at a future meeting.

Decision

To receive a report on School Governance at a future meeting.

CYP/22/26 Overview Report

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

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme.

Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2022

Present:

Councillor Shilton Godwin – in the Chair
Councillors Chohan, Hughes, Ilyas, Jeavons, Lyons, Nunney, Razaq and Sheikh

Apologies: Councillors Doswell, Holt, Wright

Also present:

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment and Transport
Councillor Foley, Deputy Executive Member for Environment and Transport
Councillor Igbon, Executive Member for Vibrant Neighbourhoods

ECCSC/22/15 Minutes

Decision

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

ECCSC/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.

A Member commented that information on climate change and the actions being taken by the Council needed to be prominent on the Council's home webpage. The Executive Member for Environment and Transport stated that she had responded to this question previously at a meeting of full Council and advised that the information referred to was accessible and available on the Council's website. In response to a comment regarding the previous recommendation asking for consideration to be given to the establishment of a Climate Clock in the city, similar to that in Glasgow (see 14 October 2021), the Executive Member for Environment and Transport stated that consideration would be given as to the most appropriate method of messaging on the issue of climate change.

The Committee noted that it would be discussing the work programme for the forthcoming municipal year in further detail in a private session following the meeting, and that an updated work programme reflecting this discussion would be circulated as normal in the papers for the next meeting.

Decision

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

Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2022

Present:

Councillor Shilton Godwin – in the Chair
Councillors Chohan, Doswell, Holt, Hughes, Ilyas, Lyons, Nunney, Razaq, Sheikh and Wright

Apologies: Councillor Jeavons

Also present:

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment and Transport
Councillor Foley, Deputy Executive Member for Environment and Transport

ECCSC/22/17 Urgent Business – Clean Air Plan Policy Review

The Chair introduced an item of urgent business by explaining that the report entitled 'Clean Air Plan Policy Review' had been listed for consideration at this meeting. She advised the Committee that this item had been deferred to the July meeting and invited the Executive Member for Environment and Transport and the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer to outline the reasons for this.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer informed the Committee that the draft response to the Government was not currently available for scrutiny, however this would be presented to the Committee at the July meeting prior to its submission to the Executive. She stated this approach was being adopted across all the ten districts within Greater Manchester. She said that in order to meet the Government deadline of 1 July and enable the individual local authorities to consider it before a final version was submitted, the GM Air Quality Administration Committee, with political representation from each district, had agreed to submit a draft plan to meet the deadline but be clear that it remained a draft until it has been considered by the districts.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport further commented that as soon as the papers were available for the Greater Manchester Air Quality Administration Committee, she would direct Members to these links.

Decision

The Committee noted the update.

ECCSC/22/18 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2022 as a correct record.

ECCSC/22/19 Climate Change Action Plan Work Programme 2022-23

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update on the actions to be progressed in Year 3 of the Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) 2020-25.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The achievements and highlights of Year 2 will be detailed in the Annual Report 2021-22 which will be published in the Autumn of 2022 and will be available on the Council's website;
- Describing that a refresh of the CCAP 2020-25 was currently underway and would be completed in Autumn 2022;
- The refresh would align the CCAP to wider strategies, such as the Local Plan;
- Reiterating that the Council remained committed to maintaining transparency and would continue to publish quarterly progress reports on the Council's website; and
- Providing a description of the actions and priorities against five workstreams.

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

- Welcoming the report and the information provided;
- Reiterating the call made previously by the Committee for an end to the use of Glyphosate as a method of weed control across the city;
- The report did not present any SMART targets for the activities described;
- The need to clearly articulate the progress made to reduce carbon emissions so this was accessible and relevant to residents;
- An update was sought in relation to Carbon Literacy Training;
- The need to meaningfully engage with the Manchester Community Assembly on Climate Change;
- What support was offered by the Council to the Climate Change Partnership; and
- The issue of shading and heat stress across the public realm needed to be included in Workstream 4: Climate Adaptation and Carbon Sequestration. Noting the emerging evidence in relation to the 'heat island' effect of cities and the impact this had on individuals and the wider contribution to the heating of the planet.

In response the Executive Member for Environment and Transport advised the Committee that the policy in relation to the use of Glyphosate would be circulated to all Members for information. She advised that the Council was committed to reducing the use of this and that alternative methods of weed control across different settings were being considered. She noted that the Committee would be receiving a report on this issue at a future meeting. She advised that residents could opt out of having this used in a neighbourhood, on the condition that they would then take responsibility for removing the weeds themselves. She further advised that she would relay the comments from the meeting to Councillor Igbon, Executive Member for Vibrant Neighbourhoods.

The Zero Carbon Manager advised that the Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan was the Council's detailed plan and contained targets and deadlines agreed against actions. The Strategic Lead, Resources & Programmes added that

this report provided an overview of the coming year's priorities and had previously been requested by the Committee, however he noted the way this report and information provided to future meetings would be reviewed, noting the comments from Members. He further stated that the information that was published on the Council's website would be reviewed to ensure that it was appropriate for both Members and residents to access information in relation to the range of actions and activities undertaken by the Council to address climate change.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport advised that both herself and the team remained committed to arranging any briefing sessions or training for Members of the Committee on the activities and work to tackle climate change.

The Strategic Lead, Resources & Programmes informed the Committee that they did engage in continued dialogue with the Community Assembly on Climate Change. Further, he informed the Members that the Council was an active partner, along with the Universities and Bruntwood in the Oxford Road Corridor Partnership. He further commented that these established links with the local Universities facilitated the understanding and implementation of new innovations and understandings to address climate change.

The Strategic Lead, Resources & Programmes advised that he would relay the comments regarding heat stress and the public realm to colleagues in the planning department. The Head of City Policy advised that as part of the Local Plan, consideration was being given to developing policies to deliver zero carbon new build.

The Principal Resources & Programmes Officer informed the Committee that to date 1,400 staff and 54 Councillors were certified as having completed the Carbon Literacy Training. She advised that this training was now mandatory for staff. She further stated that the ambition was for the Council to achieve Gold standard accreditation for this activity, and a dedicated resource had been allocated to deliver this ambition.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that the Committee would be considering the Climate Change Action Plan 2020/25 Refresh at the September meeting and consideration would be given to resilience and adaptation as part of this reporting. She reiterated the commitment that addressing climate change was embedded across all Council decision making.

Decision

To note the report.

ECCSC/22/20 Carbon Reduction Procurement Progress Report

The Committee considered the report of Strategic Lead Integrated Commissioning and Head of Integrated Commissioning and Procurement that updated the Members on the steps that had been taken within the council's procurements to support carbon reduction and highlighted planned next steps.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background, noting that as part of the Climate Change Action Plan, the council was working to reduce the emissions associated with the goods, services and works contracts that the council procured;
- In March 2021, the council added a new 10% evaluation weighting specifically in relation to climate change and the environment as part of the Social Value element of contracts;
- Examples of how this weighting had been applied and the outcomes achieved;
- Providing a summary of the main practical challenges and issues that were having to be addressed; and
- Appended to the report was the Internal Audit Briefing Note that provided a high level overview of the current arrangements in place to support carbon reduction through sustainable procurement.

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

- Welcoming the report and the progress to date, noting that this was an important area of activity for the Council;
- Welcoming the Internal Audit Briefing Note, noting that it was important to engage a 'critical friend' to provide an opinion on this important activity;
- Noting that environmental commitments related to wider activities, in addition to reducing carbon emissions;
- What was being done to support SMEs (Small and medium-sized enterprises), noting that many of these were committed to people and place;
- What monitoring was undertaken to ensure that contractors awarded adhered to delivery on their environmental commitments;
- Were the Questions and Answers used in the awarding of contracts available for the public to access;
- Mindful of commercial sensitivity, anonymised case studies should be included in future update reports;
- Had all the staff involved in the procurement process completed the Carbon Literacy training, noting the extremely high level of technical and innovative information that commissioning officers would need to assess;
- Directing officers to the Competition and Markets Authority 'Green claims code: making environmental claims' guidance as a useful resource; and
- Noting that to avoid accusations of greenwashing, carbon off setting should be deterred.

In response the Head of Integrated Commissioning and Procurement stated that the 10% weighting was for the value of the total valuation score, noting that currently Manchester was pioneering this approach. He stated that the monitoring of the delivery of this by successful contractors was undertaken as part of the ongoing contract management arrangements over the life of the contract, and this was to be standardised across all departments within the Council. The Committee were advised that with the exception of very new staff, all staff involved in the procurement process were Carbon Literacy trained. He further added that work was currently underway to capture and centralise the recording of all data on this activity.

The Head of Integrated Commissioning and Procurement advised that discussions regarding the 10% evaluation weighting in relation to climate change were had with various department Strategic Leads when contract specifications were brought forward prior to tender, noting that there was an escalation process to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer if required.

The Strategic Lead Integrated Commissioning stated that wider environmental benefits, such as delivering green space and supporting biodiversity were considered and assessed, noting that the additional 20% minimum Social Value element of contracts could also be used to support such initiatives. However, the requirement to address carbon emissions was explicit in the tender process as this supported and mirrored the ambitions for the city. He added that carbon offsetting was not promoted and actively discouraged; however, he acknowledged there would be circumstances when this would be used, adding that if this was done it needed to benefit the city.

The Strategic Lead Integrated Commissioning advised that the Growth Company and the Council's Work and Skills Team had established links and support to local SMEs. The Head of Integrated Commissioning and Procurement further added that advice and constructive feedback was also provided to all unsuccessful bidders as to how they could improve any future applications.

The Strategic Lead Integrated Commissioning advised that there was an online toolkit where the type of questions asked could be viewed and this resource also provided a useful narrative for prospective applicants. Noting that bids were commercially sensitive, consideration would be given to providing anonymised examples in future update reports, commenting that there was evidence that suppliers were actively engaging in this programme as carbon reduction plans had been submitted as part of the tender process. He further added that as this work progressed the examples could be used to inform and educate the market so as to embed this understanding and approach.

Both officers described the learning and sharing of good practice from the Manchester experience that was shared across a range of local and national forums, including Greater Manchester procurement colleagues, other Core Cities and the Local Government Association. Officers further acknowledged the comment regarding the Competition and Markets Authority 'Green claims code: making environmental claims' guidance.

The Chair concluded this item by acknowledging the achievements to date and recognising the importance of this activity not only for the city but also the world. She advised that the Committee would request an update report at an appropriate time.

Decision

To note the report and request that an update report is provided for consideration at an appropriate time.

ECCSC/22/21 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.

Members requested that an update be provided for the next meeting for the listed outstanding recommendations. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated she would take this away as an action.

The Chair advised the Committee that she would be attending the July meeting of Economy Scrutiny Committee for the item on Active Travel. She stated that if any Members of this Committee had any questions relating to that item that they would like to raise at that meeting to contact her, and she would raise these on behalf of the Committee.

Decision

The Committee notes the report and agrees the work programme, noting the requests for update reports arising from consideration of the previous agenda items.

Economy Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2022

Present:

Councillor Johns – in the Chair

Councillors Bell, Good, Moran, Noor, Raikes, I Robinson and Taylor

Also present:

Councillor Craig, Leader

Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Employment

Councillor Hacking, Executive Member for Skills, Employment and Leisure

ESC/22/17 Minutes

In moving the minutes, the Chair paid tribute to his predecessor Councillor H. Priest. He thanked her for her dedication and commitment to the work of the Committee during her time as Chair. He further welcomed the new members of the Committee.

Decision

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

ESC/22/18 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.

In response to a comment from a Member regarding the announcements from central government and the support to relieve the increased cost of living, the Leader advised that Manchester Council had always responded quickly to ensure that any support that was made available was directed to residents and local businesses. She stated that further funding was required from Government to make up the funding that had been removed over a number of years and the Council would continue to lobby the Treasury for additional funding to support local residents.

The Director of Inclusive Economy stated that information on the various sources of advice and support services were available on the Council's website.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

ESC/22/19 Economy Dashboard

The Committee considered a report of the Head of Performance, Research & Intelligence that presented the economy dashboard, a document that contains a range of data and intelligence covering key aspects of Manchester's economy. The Leader proposed that the information that was contained within the COVID sit rep item would be incorporated into the Dashboard as part of the wider reporting. The Committee endorsed this proposal.

Decision

The Committee note the report and agree that the data and information provided in the COVID sit rep would be reported via the Economy Dashboard.

ESC/22/20 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 Committee noted that it would be discussing the work programme for the forthcoming municipal year in further detail in a private session following the meeting, and that an updated work programme reflecting this discussion would be circulated as normal in the papers for the next meeting.

Decision

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

Economy Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 23 June 2022

Present:

Councillor Johns – in the Chair

Councillors Bell, Good, Moran, Noor, Raikes, I Robinson and Taylor

Also present:

Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Employment

Councillor Shilton Godwin, Chair of the Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee

ESC/22/21 Minutes

Decision

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 May 2022 were approved as a correct record.

ESC/22/22 Manchester Housing Strategy (2022-2032)

The Committee considered the report of the Interim Director of Housing & Residential Growth that provided an update on the development of the new Manchester Housing Strategy (2022-2032).

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The strategy was the product of an extensive consultation and stakeholder engagement exercise;
- It set an ambitious target to increase housing supply and affordable housing growth in particular;
- The strategy brought together themes from the previous Housing Strategy (2015-21) and the Residential Growth Strategy (2015-25) into a single, holistic document
- The strategy set out a long-term vision which considered how best to deliver the city's housing priorities and objectives, building on progress already made, whilst tackling head on the scale and complexity of the challenges ahead. and
 - Describing the four priorities of the strategy which were to:
 - Increase affordable housing supply and build more new homes for all residents.
 - Work to end homelessness and ensure housing is affordable and accessible to all.
 - Address inequalities and create neighbourhoods where people want to live.
 - Address the sustainability and zero carbon challenges in new and existing housing stock.

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

- The Committee fully supported the strategy;
- The Committee endorsed the ambitions and priorities described, particularly in regard to carbon emissions, equalities and affordability;
- Noting the issue of density, due consideration needed to be given to active travel, appropriate provision of bike parking, biodiversity, green space and the emerging evidence in relation to the 'heat island' effect of cities and the impact this had on individuals and the wider contribution to the heating of the planet;
- What was the relationship with Homes England, noting that financial support from them was required;
- The need for continued scrutiny on the delivery of the strategy;
- The request to scrutinise strategies, such as the emerging Local Plan at the development stage so that the Committee could contribute and inform their development;
- How would the Local Plan impact on the Housing Strategy;
- What was the approach to using existing brown field land to deliver housing as part of this strategy;
- The need to engage with local developers;
- If private landlords left the market as a result of increased regulation would the Council or Housing partners purchase properties;
- Noting the impact the Right To Buy policy had on the levels of social housing across the city;
- Noting that there was a need to develop green skills and training in the city to support retrofit activities at scale and the delivery of future housing developments;
- The need to consider wider infrastructure needs, such as the provision of schools and health services when developing housing plans as these were vital to support neighbourhoods and communities; and
- The need for an estate wide approach to retrofitting.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment welcomed the comments from the Committee and responded to their questions by saying that the Council had a positive relationship with Homes England and dialogue continued with them regarding funding to deliver the ask from Manchester. He stated that he welcomed the continued scrutiny of the delivery of this strategy, and he would discuss this further with the Chair to agree a timetable of reports to the Committee.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment stated that he fully supported the end of Section 21, no-fault eviction notices and the wider implications of the Renters Reform Bill, adding that if private landlords did leave the market due to increased regulation of the sector all options for securing these properties would be considered, especially larger family homes, adding that the increase of purpose built student accommodation could also release larger properties back into the market. He advised that the impact of both austerity and Section 21 notices had significantly contributed to the number of families living in temporary accommodation in Manchester, and that over the years Manchester had lost over 25,000 properties as a result of the Right To Buy policy. He stated that the Government had not provided funding to replace these lost

homes and called for an immediate end to the policy and strongly opposed any extension to this scheme.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment informed the Committee that consideration was given to releasing Brownfield land, using Greater Manchester funding to deliver housing and by extension protect greenbelt land. He advised that all opportunities to maximise the use of Council owned land to deliver housing would be considered in partnership with local Housing Providers.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment advised that the issue of housing was not considered in isolation and the need to deliver wider infrastructure, such as schools, active travel and health services was understood, and that appropriate consideration and planning was given to this. He further stated that he recognised the need for an estate wider approach to retrofitting, noting the issues raised by the Member.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) advised that the Housing Strategy would be taken into account when developing the Local Plan, adding that the Local Plan would help deliver the ambitions described within the Housing Strategy, particularly in regard to the zero carbon build standards and modern methods of construction. She further advised that the issue of green skills and training was understood, and work was being developed with local colleges to respond to this, noting that a Retrofit Academy had been established at the Manchester College Openshaw campus. This provided T levels in construction for new learners and those wishing to retrain or re-enter the work force. She advised that the issue of green skills and employment was a key priority for both Manchester and Greater Manchester. The Chair commented that the issue of green skills and employment would be scheduled into the Committee's work programme.

The Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth advised that the issues raised in relation to bike parking and storage, biodiversity, green space and the 'heat island' effect were discussed with developers and reference was made to the delivery of the Victoria North development and the good practice and models implemented as part of that scheme. He further added that all options for engaging with smaller local developers would be considered.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Support the draft Housing Strategy (2022-2032).
- (2) Agree that the final version of the Housing Strategy (2022-2032) be taken for consideration by the Executive in July 2022.

ESC/22/23 This City: Progress Update

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) that described that in December 2021, the Executive approved a business case outlining the ambitions and intentions of This City, the Council's wholly owned housing delivery vehicle.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction, background and core principals that had driven the creation of This City; and
- Providing an update on progress of both strategic and scheme specific activities in advance of a further report being presented to the Council's Executive in September 2022 on the company business plan.

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

- Supporting the retention of control of rent setting, management and lettings functions;
- The need to recognise and consider the needs of the changing demographic of those choosing to live in the city centre, particularly families;
- How was Public Realm defined;
- An assurance was sought that the bespoke procurement framework for This City was aligned to the Council's procurement policy, especially in relation to Social Value and carbon reduction;
- Appropriate provisions of bike storage and parking needed to be included in any consideration of the issue of parking;
- Requesting that Business Plan that was scheduled to be submitted to the Executive in September be shared with the Committee; and
- The need to include a clause in tenancy and all terms of occupation to ensure that these properties were retained and not sold into the private rented sector.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment said that the issue of the changing demographic of the city centre was recognised by advising that Rodney Street, the first This City scheme to be brought forward as part of the housing delivery vehicle included townhouses that were suitable for families. He further advised that Public Realm would be consistent with the Public Realm strategy and consideration was given to walking and cycling and green space. He further confirmed that bike parking had been considered in the Rodney Street scheme.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment stated that the ambitions and intentions of This City clearly articulated the commitment to address carbon emissions and could be used to influence partners across this city. He further commented that clauses did exist to prevent these properties entering the private rented sector.

The Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth informed the Committee that information in relation to tenancy management and maintenance would be shared following the meeting. He further commented that he would discuss with the Chair the most appropriate way for how the Business Plan that was scheduled to be submitted to the Executive in September could be shared with the Committee. He also commented that the bespoke procurement framework for This City did align with the Council's procurement policy.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) informed the Committee that an asset management plan was being developed to centrally record and understand the nature of all land assets owned by the Council and this data would be used to inform future housing schemes and assist with the auditing of all decision making.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

ESC/22/24 Final Evaluation of the Crumpsall Selective Licensing Area and Proposed Next Phase of Selective Licensing

The Committee considered the report of the Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth and Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) that provided Members with the outcomes of the evaluation of the Crumpsall Selective Licensing (SL) area and to advise Members on the proposed future phases of selective licensing.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background of the schemes, noting that a key theme of the Council's Private Rented Sector Strategy is tackling poor quality management in the Private Rented Sector;
- A description of the implementation of the Crumpsall Scheme;
- An analysis of the property conditions following compliance inspections;
- Information in relation to enforcement activities to address poor property conditions and other related enforcement activity and property management;
- Feedback from Neighbourhood Teams and case studies;
- Information in relation to communications and engagement;
- A summary and lessons learned; and
- Conclusions, noting that the long-term plan was to continue to roll out new phases of SL across the city.

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

- Fully supporting the roll out of Selective Licensing;
- Was there evidence of landlords passing on the cost of licensing to their tenants in the form of rent increases;
- Clarification was sought to how exemptions to licensing was determined;

- Noting the positive impact the introduction of Selective Licensing had on strengthening relationships between residents and the Council;
- The schemes improved residents knowledge of their rights as tenants;
- Welcoming the inclusion of real examples within the report and more needed to be done to promote the positive outcomes of these schemes; and
- Could schemes be extended beyond the five year designation.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment welcomed the Committee's continued support for the further roll out of selective licensing as a tool for improving property standards within the Private Rented Sector. He said that these schemes were an opportunity to engage with both landlords and tenants and had increased tenants' awareness of their rights.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment stated that it was important to raise awareness of these schemes and every opportunity was taken to do so, particularly when action was taken against rogue landlords. He further added that good practice and learning was shared with other Local Authorities. He stated that appropriate consideration was given to ensure that all publicity, information and advice were provided so as to ensure that all residents, particularly for those for whom English was not their first language were made aware of the schemes.

The Compliance and Enforcement Specialist stated that there was no evidence to suggest that rent increases had occurred as a result of landlords passing on the cost of the licence to their tenants, however this continued to be monitored. She further advised that the list of exemptions from licensing was prescribed in the legislation.

The Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth stated that the five year designation for a scheme was again prescribed in legislation and consideration had to be given as to how the improvements achieved are sustained.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Note the report
- (2) Endorse the roll out of the Selective Licensing scheme in the eight areas identified within the report.

ESC/22/25 Overview Report

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

The Chair commented that as there was a report scheduled for the July meeting on the subject of Active Travel the recommendation listed in the recommendations monitor (ESC/22/02 Updates on Sub Strategies of the City Centre Transport Strategy) could be removed.

Decision

The Committee note the report and agree the work programme.

This page is intentionally left blank

Audit Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 12 April 2022

Present:

Councillor Ahmed Ali - In the Chair
Councillors Clay, Good, Hitchen, Lanchbury, Robinson and Russell

Apologies:

Independent Co-opted member: Dr D Barker
Independent Co-opted member: Dr S Downs

Also Present:

Councillor Joanne Midgely (Deputy Leader)
Karen Murray, Mazars (External Auditor)

AC/22/08 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 15 February 2022 as a correct record.

AC/22/09 Accounting Concepts and Policies, Critical Accounting Judgements and Key Sources of Estimation Uncertainty

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which discussed the Authority's accounting concepts, conventions, policies and requirements, critical accounting judgements and key sources of estimation uncertainty to be used in the preparation of the 2021/22 Annual Accounts. The details of a recent emergency Code consultation were also provided for comment.

The report set out a narrative around:

- The basis of accounting policy
- Requirements around disclosure in respect of the application of critical accounting policy judgements
- A list of key sources of estimation uncertainty, including useful lives and valuations of properties which are estimated by qualified valuers, provision for business rate appeals based on claims received and previous experience of the outcome of appeals, the amount of arrears that will not be collected which is estimated based on expectations of the collection of different types of debt and the liability for future pension payments which is estimated by qualified actuaries (provided in an appendix); and
- The details of a consultation on emergency proposals for an update of the 2021/22 and 2022/23 Codes of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the UK, largely driven by 91% of Local Government Accounts being submitted after the statutory deadline. The outcome of the consultation resulted in a deferral of the implementation of IFRS 16 Leases for a further year and reversed the planned changes to the 2022/23 code. Whilst this outcome would

not reduce the burden on Local Authorities, there would be no further complication of the leasing treatment.

The key lines of enquiry discussed in the meeting were:

- The impact of changing interests rates and inflationary factors on matters such as pension liability, asset valuation, collections rates of council tax / business rates etc
- The impact of the cost of living crisis on arrears arising from short term / sundry debtors such as housing rent, council tax and business rates debtors

In respect of changing interest rates on pension liability, the Deputy City Treasurer confirmed that a wide range of variables were routinely monitored and kept under close consideration through a mixture of formulaic measures and actuarial assessments in order to ensure effective management. In view of the complexity within those wide-ranging factors (eg life-expectancy, pay awards, inflationary factors, investment returns) a professional judgement call was necessary to address those uncertainties. In terms of how Local Government pensions were externally audited, Karen Murray (Mazars) explained that the National Audit Office commissioned an external expert to evaluate the approach taken by the five actuaries that are in place with a focus on the assumptions that are made across numerous factors to be satisfied that those assumptions are consistently applied, are within a reasonable range and align with the national position in terms of the approach taken.

With regard to arrears from sundry debtors, the Deputy City Treasurer explained that where the Council is seeking to recovery monies, inevitably there would be those who would default which resulted in the need for an estimate of those that would doubtfully be recovered. Due to the cost of living crisis, in addition to other economic factors, the level of 'write off' was predicted to be higher than usually anticipated and therefore warranted closer monitoring.

Decision

1. To approve the accounting concepts and policies that will be used in completing the 2021/22 annual accounts
2. To note the critical accounting judgements made and key sources of estimation uncertainty
3. To note the outcome of the recent emergency Code consultation

AC/22/10 Internal Audit Plan 2022/23

The Committee considered a report of The Head of Audit and Risk Management which in line with Public Sector Internal Audit Standards (PSIAS) and a Local Government Application Note from the Chartered Institute for Public Finance and Accountancy presented a risk-based plan of Internal Audit activity that is designed to support an annual opinion on the effectiveness of the systems of governance, risk management and internal control. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management

is required to communicate internal audit plans and resource requirements, including significant interim changes, to Strategic Management Team and the Audit Committee for review and approval. The audit plan for 2022/23 set out areas of proposed audit coverage for the year and the delivery of this plan would be reported to SMT and Audit Committee as part of regular audit reporting.

The report set out information about

- Basis for the Plan
- Characteristics of the Audit Plan, including its Context, Timeframe and Structure
- Resourcing of the Plan; and
- Planned Areas of Focus

The key points of discussion in the meeting were:

- The length of time taken to implement the service restructure
- Resourcing and capacity within the team to deliver
- The classification of risk within the Corporate Risk Register
- Staff welfare and wellbeing, noting the impact of the pandemic and other workforce developments

With regard to the time taken to implement the service restructure, the Head of Audit and Risk Management spoke about the complexities about health and safety aspects of the service review which had caused unavoidable delays. In terms of timescales, consultation with staff was expected to commence in early June following which appointments to posts could be made and recruitment progressed to fill vacancies in the new roles expected in July 2022.

There was a discussion about capacity to deliver more complex areas of audit activity once COVID grant related work had ceased. Members commented that they were keen to see those vacancies filled and sought assurance that there was adequate capacity to deliver the comprehensive range of audits scheduled for completion this year with sufficient flexibility to respond to currently unplanned work. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer said that COVID grant related work and more recent government schemes would remain a feature of audit activity as part of a planned lengthy programme of work. Therefore efforts had been made to ensure that there was sufficient capacity with the service to complete this work alongside the programme of scheduled work as part of the Audit Plan. The Head of Audit and Risk Management added that the Plan had been developed based on current staffing levels therefore allowing an element of capacity to respond to risks that could emerge during the year.

There was a discussion about the classification of risk within the Corporate Risk Register, with particular reference to the rating allocated for 'housing needs not being met' (defined as medium risk). The Head of Audit and Risk Management described the process involved for consideration of the Register with the Senior Management Team, adding that a discussion had taken place around that particular definition, which had recently been broadened from the narrower definition of access to affordable housing. A further meeting was therefore planned with the Strategic

Director of Development to explore whether its current rating required an amendment.

With reference to the report's mention of staff training and development, a member acknowledged the increasing demands on staff (particularly in response to the pandemic) and stressed the importance of staff welfare. In response the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer spoke about the dedication and commitment she had witnessed across the workforce to provide the best possible service to Manchester residents during the significant challenge presented by the pandemic. She said that the importance of staff welfare had been discussed at length at a recent Senior Management Team meeting which touched on challenges around competing workforce development priorities as well as recruitment. Actions were being undertaken to ensure that established measures such as staff surveys and the Council's Wellbeing Strategy were well communicated and the importance of the role of managers (with particular reference to responding to signs of stress) were referred to as examples of the types of support available.

Decision

To endorse the Annual Internal Audit Plan for 2022/23.

AC/22/11 Annual Internal Audit Assurance Opinion and Report 2020/21

The Committee considered a report of the Head of Audit and Risk Management which discussed the delivery of the annual programme of audit work designed to raise standards of governance, risk management and internal control across the Council, in accordance with Public Sector Internal Audit Standard 2450.

The report provided Members with the Head of Audit and Risk Management's annual assurance opinion and report on the Council's system of governance, risk management and internal control for 2021/22.

In addition to the scope, purpose and context of the opinion, the report also included information about:

- The overall opinion for the year to March 2022 (cited as 'Reasonable'), including key strengths, risks and issues arising from audit work
- The delivery of the Audit Plan
- Audit assurance, risks and issues
- Children's Services and Education Directorate Opinions
- Adults Services and Public Health Directorate Opinions
- Corporate Core Directorate Opinions, including Information and ICT, Financial Systems, Capital Programme, Commercial Governance, Our Town Hall and the Estates Services Review
- Procurement, Contracts and Commissioning Directorate Opinions, including Carbon Reduction in Procurement, Waivers and Contract Extensions, and Follow Up Review – Children's Placements, Supplier Due Diligence
- Neighbourhoods Directorate Opinions including Governance and Oversight Housing Operations Service, Governance and the Oversight, Management of Void and Empty Properties, Grant Certifications, Highways Compensation Events

- Growth and Development Directorate including the AVRO Hollows Tenant Management Organisation
- Counter-Fraud and Investigations
- Proactive and Reactive Work; and
- An overview of the current position of earlier Audit Recommendations

The key points of discussion in the meeting were:

- The scope and scale of the local audit framework
- Avro Hollows Tenant Management Organisation (AHTMO)
- The Management of void and empty former Northwards properties

The Committee thanked officers for the comprehensive and detailed report and a discussion followed on the changing scope of governance arrangements within local government audit in reflection of the increasing move towards the partnership delivery model.

A member asked for further information about the information provided on the limited assurance opinion issued for the AHTMO, noting that there had been an issue over the logging of requests for minor repairs and fundamental differences in expectations between the Council's Strategic Housing Service and AHTMO regarding basic elements of service delivery. The importance of ensuring local ward members on such issues was also cited. The Head of Audit and Risk Management explained that this largely related to quality assurance measures for service delivery which had resulted in a number of actions being put forward in respect of refining the Modular Management Agreement (MMA) which set out the respective responsibilities of the Council and the TMO. He agreed to liaise with the Strategic Housing Service concerning the request to ensure that local ward members are advised of such issues as a matter of routine.

There was a discussion about the management of void and empty former Northwards properties and the associated actions issued alongside the 'Limited' assurance opinion. A member sought further information on likely timescales for the completion of the audit of void properties, and the implications for charging of Council Tax amongst the other recommendations put forward. The Head of Audit and Risk Management explained that performance had fallen during the pandemic and that it had been acknowledged amongst leaders in the service, that improvements were needed. A completion date of September 2022 had been identified however it was likely that some of those action points could be completed before this date. The Head of Audit and Risk Management agreed to provide further information in the next update to this Committee about the action plan for the auditing of void properties (including how and by whom that would be delivered) and would include specific reference to the management of lost rental income

Decision

1. To note the Annual Assurance Opinion (2020/21)
2. To agree that the next scheduled update on former Northwards properties shall include information on the agreed action plan for the management of void and

empty properties, including the management of lost rental income.

AC/22/12 External Audit Progress (2020/21) Update

The Committee considered a report of the External Auditors (Mazars) which discussed progress towards completion of the external audit of 2020/21 accounts.

Karen Murray (Mazars) reported that there had been a considerable amount of progress, such that Mazars were very close to completion of the work. Three particular areas were yet to be completed, namely the completion of 2020/21 Financial Statements work; the valuation of Property, Plant & Equipment (PP&E) Value for and work around cash balances. Mazars were in the process of working through a recently received set of accounts which it was hoped would help to resolve the small number of outstanding queries. Mazars were also awaiting soon to be announced guidance from the Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) on the consideration of infrastructure assets. Ms Murray indicated that a number of recommendations would be put forward at the point that the audit is completed, in respect of the Council's measures of internal control to help streamline future external audits and facilitate completion more easily.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer confirmed that the audit process had been a particular challenge this year and made reference to no local authority having signed off their accounts at time of the meeting. This was attributable to a number of factors, the most significant of which included changes to the accounting treatments around highways which had been a particular cause of the delay. In addition, the remote close down during the pandemic; single points of failure within the Finance team (due to an unavoidable staff absence); an increased focus on valuations and changes to audit and accounting standards had culminated in issues for all parties. She referred to a piece of work led by the Deputy City Treasurer focussing on lessons learnt which would, in particular, streamline future reporting around cash flow statements.

Discussions moved to whether there would be a knock on effect on the following year's external audit completion. The Chief Accountant provided an overview of the steps necessary to progress the closure of the 2021/22 accounts and the challenges this presented in view of the planned submission date of September 2022. The Committee therefore noted that a delay on completion of the audit was indeed very likely. In respect of capacity within the Finance team to assist with its completion, the Deputy City Treasurer advised that additional resource had been provided within the Council's Finance team, with added support from wider Finance Directorate colleagues. Additionally more input was planned around quality assurance measures prior to submission to the external auditors to ease the process. Ms Murray also referred to capacity issues from the perspective of the external auditors, which was largely attributed to their scheduled programme of work with other entities meaning that pauses in progress were, at times, unavoidable.

Decision

1. To note the progress of the external audit of accounts 2020/21

2. To note that the finalisation of the external audit of 2021/22 accounts was unlikely to meet the September 2022 completion date.

AC/22/12 Risk Review: Adults Assurance Update

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of Adult Services which provided an update on the actions taken to address risk in respect longstanding and partially implemented audit recommendations in relation to Adults Mental Health safeguarding and transitions from Children's to Adults social care.

The report therefore focussed on:

- Actions Taken to Develop the Social Work Transitions in Care Service and a summary of Next Steps; and
- Actions to support the reconciliation of mental health casework records across the Adult Service function and the Greater Manchester Mental Health Trust (GMMHT), as well as additional measures taken to provide added assurance

With regard to Social Work Transitions, significant progress across the system in respect of planning and preparation for the transition to adulthood was reported, which formed part of a wider programme of improvement activity. This included the development of new practice forums, an invigorated multi-agency focus to deliver an impactful and joined up approach to referrals and care delivery. Additionally, a service delivery improvement in respect of Care Act assessments for young people before or within their 18th year instead of at or following a young person's 18 birthday was reported. The Committee was also invited to note external assurance had been provided for the service following an OFSTED inspection of Special Educational Need and Disability (SEND) services in November 2021. The inspection had found leaders' clear vision for improving outcomes for children and young people with SEND; that appropriate and timely interventions were provided and good oversight of delivery including priorities for action had been maintained. Further priorities were also outlined in the meeting regarding earlier identification of young people approaching the transition to adult services and earlier assessment and review functions of young people with an Education Health and Care Plan to support the management of future demands on services. An expansion of the team was also reported in the form of two additional staff members who would be specifically recruited to deliver person focused planning arrangements.

With regard to the reconciliation of mental health casework and safeguarding referrals between social work and health colleagues, reference was made to the challenges of infection control measures arising from the pandemic on service delivery and the impact of GMMH's COVID business continuity plans to manage significantly increased demands on services. The Deputy Director of Adult Services spoke about time that had been invested in actions and resources to mitigate the complexities of reconciling records across two different recording systems, which was at the heart of the issue and was a common feature nationally across integrated health and care forums. Weekly and monthly reporting arrangements outlined in the report underpinned the process of record reconciliation, resulting in confidence that there were no gaps in the data and that the risks of omissions or errors had been addressed. In addition, further steps were being introduced around GMMHT staffing,

which included additional training input with regard to case-management recording as well as the development of the Council's own systems processes which were outlined in the report.

The Committee welcomed the work that had taken place around transitions in care services and stressed the importance of consistent oversight. With specific reference to the impact of the pandemic, a member commented that further efforts may be necessary to address the needs of those young people who had either reached or passed their 18th birthday during that time. In response, the Service Manager - Transitions confirmed that this had been identified as a priority for the service and a proposal was in place to deliver focussed activity to address those gaps, using the input of the newly expanded team as sufficient capacity would exist in the initial stages. Efforts would be made to work with affected families to rebuild a relationship of trust in service provision, including (as an example) the offer of input about their experiences as part of the ongoing journey of service improvement.

Noting that improvements had been reported in respect of timeliness of the first assessments, more detailed performance information was requested. The Service Manager - Transitions confirmed that referrals were prioritised on a needs-led basis and that whilst numbers had initially been low at the time of the introduction of monitored performance indicators, they had since doubled indicating a positive and healthy trajectory. Targets would be determined with the input of the Transitions Board, mindful that pathway planning often required a multi-agency focus where some challenges existed (e.g. the age at which a young person became eligible for a particular health services). With regard to the timeliness of follow up assessments, inter-agency service inputs were highlighted as crucial to the process leading up to those assessments. Further work was therefore planned to enable capacity to meet demand as part of planned practice-led improvement activity. Discussions moved to how future demands on services were determined. The Committee was informed that the Transitions team worked closely with colleagues in the Performance, Research and Intelligence Directorate to gather rich, high quality data on young people with an EHCP to establish whether input from adult social care or health services needed to be arranged to ensure care delivery at the best possible time, adding that feedback indicated that a lack of information, advice and guidance was the biggest source of anxiety for service users as they prepare for adulthood. In response to a question around capacity to deliver a whole system approach, the Deputy Director of Adult Services described the two predominant referral routes into adult social care services, namely transitions from children's social services and adults in later life experiencing levels of frailty. Therefore the service had adopted a range of collaborative interventions to develop an effective demand management strategy, supported by cross – directorate information sharing (which included population modelling) to better understand where and how demand will change in the future.

There was a discussion about the role of parents and carers, the Manchester Parents and Carers Forum and the Parent Carer Board which was co-chaired by the Transitions Service. The Committee was informed that whilst this was not specifically referenced in the report, input from the Forum sat at the very heart of service improvement in recognition of their crucial role.

On the subject of mental health casework, assurance was also sought in respect of

lessons learnt about the reconciliation of care systems as the move towards integrated care delivery continued. The Deputy Director of Adult Services referred to a range of developments that were underway to underpin future data sharing and systems integration in a safe and secure manner. In response to a question about safeguards and the mitigation of potential risks in relying on the manual transfer of casework records, the Deputy Director of Adult Services made reference to end to end safeguarding measures, which involved multiagency and clinical staff at referral meetings, which had been given external assurance following the recent audit. Information about that process would be circulated to the committee for information, in due course. The Deputy Director also agreed to share with the Committee, further statistical performance information on the delivery of staff training for social care and health colleagues, including scope, implementation and its evaluation.

There was a discussion about the delivery of Care Act responsibilities. The Deputy Director of Adult Services explained that those responsibilities had been delegated to GMMH so that multidisciplinary and clinical support to people with a mental health issue was available as part of a coordinated approach to care delivery. She asked the Committee to note that whilst this model provided the best service for the service user, it provided a degree of complexity in terms of the Council's own infrastructure.

The Deputy Leader with responsibility for Adult Services thanked the Committee for its input and spoke about the Service's ongoing transformation, adding that whilst that transformation had not yet concluded, she was reassured by the positive steps that had taken place, acknowledging the strong commitment that existed across the partnerships to deliver the highest quality care.

Decision

To note the assurance updates provided.

AC/22/13 Work Programme and Recommendations Monitor

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which set out its future Work Programme for the forthcoming municipal year.

Decision

To agree the Committee's Work programme for the forthcoming municipal year.

Audit Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 14 June 2022

Present:

Councillor Lanchbury - In the Chair
Councillors Good, Russell Simcock and Wheeler
Independent Co-opted member: Dr D Barker:
Independent Co-opted member: Dr S Downs

Apologies:

Councillor Curley
Councillor Flanagan

Also Present:

Councillor Akbar (Executive Member: Finance and Resources)
Alistair Newall, Mazars (External Auditor)

AC/22/14 Minutes

Decision

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

AC/22/15 Draft Annual Governance Statement 2021/22

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which presented the draft 2021/22 Annual Governance Statement (AGS), following completion of the annual review of the Council's governance arrangements and systems of internal control. The processes followed to produce the AGS were outlined in the report.

In addition to the scope, purpose and context, the report also included information about:

- The document's format and sections of the document, including an outline of improvements that had been made; namely a focus on producing a more easily digestible document with digital accessibility improvements, in particular for those with visual impairments, to align with good practice.
- How Governance Arrangements are communicated;
- A discussion of next steps and the Annual Governance Statement's Timeline

The Reform and Innovation Manager reported good progress in terms of strengthened and effective governance arrangements such that six of the challenges identified in the previous governance statement had been stepped down in respect of the Action Plan for 2022/23 resulting in an overall reduction in the number to be taken forward.

The main points of discussion in the meeting were:

- In view of its responsibilities for governance arrangements and systems of internal control, the frequency with which the Senior Management Team (SMT) discusses governance matters
- Noting the Head of Audit and Risk Management Annual Opinion 2021/22 was cited as 'reasonable', what actions could be taken to reach a position of 'substantial' assurance.
- The role of Trade Unions in consultations with staff where significant developments were underway.
- The role of the Audit Committee in amending the Council's Climate Change budget and the associated policy development.

In respect of the Head of Audit and Risk Management's annual opinion of 'reasonable', he explained that the opinion had been reached largely in reflection of the scale of change and challenge (the financial pressures the council faces, the scale of ambition in the city as well as recent events that had impacted on Local Authority services). Within that context, the position of 'reasonable' was deemed fair in the circumstances, although the aspiration to attain a rating of 'substantial' remained a priority for the Authority.

With regard to the frequency with which the SMT discusses governance arrangements, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer confirmed that this was a fairly regular point of discussion, examples of which included the discussion of the AGS, governance updates, the Corporate Risk Register as well as consideration of major cross-cutting themes, deemed to have a strategic impact.

In respect of the relationship with Trades Unions, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that the Authority had long established a collaborative approach, involving formal engagement and consultation procedures. It was subsequently agreed to give greater prominence to the collaborative the Local Authority adopts with Trade Unions in the Statement.

With specific reference to the Council's agreed Climate Change Action Plan and the agreed budget for carbon reduction targets therein, a member asked about the role of the Audit Committee in amending the Climate Change budget and overall policy development with a view to meeting agreed objectives. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer explained that the AGS reference to the Plan solely focussed on the governance aspects of the Plan – the extracts outlined in the AGS referred to Local Authority's emissions targets (noting that that two Plans were in place; one for the city as a whole and one solely for the Local Authority) and that it was within the terms of reference of the Council's Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee (E&CCSC) to scrutinise performance against the Plan and put forward any recommendations concerning proposed amendments. She added that the (Local Authority's) Plan was considered on a quarterly basis by the E&CCSC and that the Plan for the city as a whole was scheduled to go through governance processes in late September / early October of this year.

Decision

1. To note the draft Annual Governance Statement 2021/22.

2. To agree that greater prominence to the collaborative approach the Local Authority adopts with Trade Unions shall be incorporated into the Statement.

AC/22/16 Register of Significant Partnerships

The Committee considered a report of The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which presented the annual overview of the Register of Significant Partnerships 2021. A copy of the Register of Significant Partnership is attached at Appendix 1.

In addition to the scope, purpose and context of the Register, the report also included information about:

- The process followed for the production of the Register
- Entries added to the Register in 2021
- Proposed removals to the Register
- Partnerships where the assurance ratings have improved
- Partnerships where governance strength rating remains 'Reasonable' or 'Limited' following latest assessment
- Partnerships with a 'Limited' rating
- Partnerships where governance strength rating has reduced from 'Significant' to 'Reasonable', 'Limited' or 'Weak' since the last assessment

The Head of Programme Management Office (Commercial Governance & Directorate Support) introduced the report and highlighted that in light of comments from the Audit Committee, the format, range and robustness of questions in the annual self assessment form had been strengthened. In addition, the ratings themselves had been amended to provide consistency across the approach to ratings to align with other systems of governance (including for example, the Annual Governance Statement).

The key points of discussion in the meeting were:

- The proposed removal of Manchester Health and Care Commissioning Group (MHCCG) from the Register
- The extent to which partnership arrangements with the University of Manchester could be included on the Register
- The 'reasonable' assurance rating for the Manchester Safeguarding Partnership (MSP)
- Governance assurance ratings for Tenant Management Organisations (TMO)
- The timeline for the winding up of Manchester Working Limited (MWL)

In response to the proposal to remove MHCCG from the Register, it was agreed that the new successor body (Greater Manchester Integrated Care Board) shall be added to the Register to facilitate regular feedback to the Committee. The Committee noted that the assessment of the new entity's governance arrangements was in hand and that oversight would be established once the arrangements for the place-based lead for Manchester and its relationship with the Board had been agreed.

Noting that the Council had a number of joint development sites with the University of

Manchester, a member asked about the feasibility of their inclusion on the Register. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer agreed to explore whether any projects / collaborative structures with the University fell within the scope of the Register.

There was a discussion about the 'reasonable' assurance rating for the MSP. The Head of Programme Management Office (Commercial Governance & Directorate Support) advised that a number of activities were taking place to strengthen, governance, scrutiny and accountability within the MSP which indicated a positive trajectory for the entity and had contributed to its 'reasonable' assurance rating.

Noting the positive trajectory of assurance ratings for a number of TMO's on the Register, there was discussion about the importance of maintaining robust governance arrangements for social housing entities within the city. The Head of Programme Management Office (Commercial Governance & Directorate Support) confirmed that the intention was for such entities to remain on the Register and therefore were required to submit evidence on a routine basis. This would sit in parallel with contractual arrangements that were being developed with colleagues in the Council's Audit function to underpin this monitoring arrangement.

In response to a question about the timescale for the winding up of MWL, The Head of Programme Management Office (Commercial Governance & Directorate Support) advised that it was hoped that the next update on the Register would confirm more information on how far the cessation of entity had advanced.

Decision

To note the latest update of the Council's Register of Significant Partnerships

AC/22/17 Internal Audit Service Review Update

The Committee considered a report of the Head of Audit and Risk Management which provided an overview of progress of a service review across the Audit and Risk Management Division, including the background, rationale and implications for the internal audit service.

In introducing the report, the Head of Audit and Risk Management referred to a recent meeting with HR colleagues about the redesigned roles. He indicated that a broad timetable could be shared once those roles had been reviewed by HR colleagues.

There was a discussion about the efficiency of the service as benchmarked by similar authorities. The Head of Audit and Risk Management referred to a number of quantitative and qualitative measures used to capture performance of the audit and risk management function. These included the delivery of the Quality Assurance Improvement Programme, compliance with accepted audit standards, self assessment and feedback procedures and peer review processes as part of external quality assessment procedures.

Decision

To note the service review update and receive further progress reports.

AC/22/18 Risk Management Strategy and Corporate Risk Register

The Committee considered a report of The Head of Audit and Risk Management which provided an update on organisational risk management arrangements; and a copy of the latest refresh of the Corporate Risk Register (CRR).

In introducing the report, the Head of Audit and Risk Management outlined the Strategy and CRR's important role in the Council's governance framework which was routinely discussed at Senior Management and Directorate Leadership level. He highlighted that the Register was scheduled for review later this year and referred to the broad scope and fluidity of risk in terms of how it continues to manifest and impact across the delivery of Council services.

The key points of discussion in the meeting were:

- The extent to which cumulative and / or compounding risk is effectively demonstrated in the Register's three tiered rating system
- The approach taken for the development of risk management targets within the CRR
- The capability / capacity of the workforce with specific reference to the shortage of skills across the workforce, outside of managerial / technical disciplines
- The introduction of cyber-risk as a stand alone item on the CRR
- The prominence of the risks around key suppliers of goods and services

In response to a question about how cumulative risk is communicated in the three tiered system, the Head of Audit and Risk Management referred to some authorities recently introducing the use of purple to capture cumulative / compounding risk which may be considered in the upcoming review of the Register.

There was a discussion about the approach taken for the development of targets for October 2022 – a member noted that in some instances, the targets resulted in those risks being maintained at the current level as opposed to being reduced. The Head of Audit and Risk Management explained that the rationale had been to develop realistic as opposed to aspirational targets, in light of the current uncertainty around financial / fiscal matters, such that it was anticipated that despite appropriate measures being in place, the level of risk remained high. An achievable target of that risk being maintained in short term was therefore in place. Discussions then moved to the target associated with costs of capital and revenue contracts and the implications on pre-existing budget pressures. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer explained that at the point that CRR was being finalised, the Council was in the process of finalising its energy contracts and as such inflation contingencies were in place. This however did not apply to wider risks associated with medium term financial resources where it would remain unclear until December of this year what the next financial settlement would be and what impact that would ultimately have on the Council's budget position.

A member suggested that greater weighting and explicit reference ought to be given to the lack of skilled tradespeople within the workforce in the CRR's analysis of key risks, given the anticipated impacts such a shortfall could have on the performance and delivery of particular services (e.g. maintenance services) as well as a knock on effect on the associated costs of service provision.

In response to a comment about the introduction of cyber-risk as a stand alone item in the CRR, the Head of Audit and Risk Management explained that whilst cyber-risk should not be considered as a new or emerging risk for the Authority, it had previously been embedded within other risks associated with ICT, data governance and information security. A decision had therefore been made to explicitly reference cyber-risk as a standalone category on the CRR.

In response to a comment about the risks related to key supplies, the Head of Audit and Risk Management confirmed that this risk was anticipated to remain on the CRR as aspects of numerous supply chains continued to be impacted upon. This therefore warranted active monitoring and tracking through the CRR as well as other governance instruments such as the Commercial Board.

Decision

To note the assurance provided by the risk management report and approve the Council's Risk Management Strategy.

AC/22/12 Internal Audit External Quality Assessment

The Committee considered a report of The Head of Audit and Risk Management which discussed the requirement to undergo external assessment of internal audit effectiveness in line with Public Sector Internal Audit Standards on a five-year cycle. The Council's next external assessment was due for completion during 2022 and following consideration of a number of options, the proposal was put forward for the Authority's assessment to be undertaken on a Core Cities peer review basis.

The report set out the options that had been considered, including associated costs, the wider benefits of the proposed collaborative approach, as well as information about the scope and approach of the assessments. The Committee was invited to endorse the proposal.

Members welcomed the approach and endorsed the proposal

Decision

To endorse the proposal that the next External Quality Assessment be undertaken on a peer review basis as part of the Core Cities group.

AC/22/13 Work Programme and Recommendations Monitor

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which set out its future Work Programme for the forthcoming municipal year.

A member asked that information about the Council's Whistleblowing Policy be included in the scope of the next Annual Anti Fraud report. The Committee agreed to this.

Decision

To agree the Committee's Work programme for the forthcoming municipal year, subject to the amendment above.

Health and Wellbeing Board

Minutes of the meeting held on 23 March 2022

Present:

Councillor Midgley, Deputy Leader - In the chair
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools Services
David Regan, Director of Public Health
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust
Rupert Nichols, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust
Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services
Dr Geeta Wadhwa, GP Member (South) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Dr Murugesan Raja, Manchester GP Forum
Dr Doug Jeffrey, (South) Primary Care Manchester Partnership
Katy Calvin-Thomas, Manchester Local Care Organisation
Vicky Szulist, Healthwatch

Apologies:

Councillor Craig, Leader of the Council

Also in attendance:

James Binks, Assistant Chief Executive, MCC
Sarah Griffiths, MHCC
Deborah Goodman, GNNH
Michelle Humphreys, MFT
Julie Jakemen, CAHMS, MFT
Vicky Smith, MHCC
Sara Yunus, CAHMS Team
Elaine Astley, Breakthrough UK
Carol Brooks (independent assessor)

HWB/22/06 Appointment of Chair

Councillor Midgley was nominated to Chair the meeting. This was seconded and approved by the Board.

Decision

Councillor Midgley be appointed Chair for the meeting.

HWB/22/07 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2021 as a correct record.

HWB/22/08 State of the City 2021

The Board received a report supported by a presentation from the Assistant Chief Executive presenting the delivery of the Our Manchester Strategy: Forward to 2025. The report also highlights progress made towards the ambitions for the city and the challenges faced. The four themes highlighted in the summary of the report are inclusive economy, inequalities, climate change and housing. The presentation provided further detail across each of the themes that make up the Our Manchester Strategy:

- A thriving and sustainable city
- A highly skilled city
- A progressive and equitable city
- A liveable and low-carbon city
- A connected city

In addition, Katy Calvin-Thomas, Manchester LCO, provided an update from the health and care sector that had included discussions with the Manchester Partnership Board. The Board had given its support to work together in addressing the issues that had been outlined within the report.

Member referred to wider determinants on health and social mobility of those on benefits and/or lower paid employment or unemployed and the impact of increases in prices and what could be done to address it and had social value provided a solution.

It was reported that partnership working was important to tackle these issues and the Work and Skills Strategy help support residents to find work. There are approximately 30,000 long-term out of work within the city that have been difficult to help move into work. Solutions would need partnerships to look at how that group could be targeted for the support needed for their conditions and to retain employment.

Director of Public Health reported that the report on the Marmot work would be submitted to the Board as part of the Work and Health Agenda focus on those suffering from long term conditions. Reference was also made to the Health and Wellbeing Advisory Board and future work topics for the Health and Wellbeing Board to consider and a report would be submitted to a meeting in the new Municipal Year.

A member referred to the Poverty Truth Commission and the importance of involving the people who are long-term unemployed in the journey to understand better their situation and try to support them into finding employment by providing them with employment opportunities. It was reported that partners have employed people with direct lived experience to support those in need. At this point it is only on a small scale and more work is needed to develop this.

The Board noted that as part of the work to achieve a real living wage city, the Council has endorsed the living wage for external providers from April 2022 for care homes and externally supported tenancies within Manchester.

Decision

1. To note the contents of the State of the City 2021 report.
2. To use the report to inform their work for 2022.

HWB/22/09 Living Safely and Fairly with Covid

The Board considered a report of the Director of Health regarding the publication of the National Living Safely with Covid Plan on 21 February 2022. Over the past few weeks, the Director of Public Health, council colleagues and other partners have been developing the local Manchester Living Fairly and Safely with Covid Plan.

The report included a plan based on current understanding of national policy direction on Covid-19 and what the epidemiology (scientific study of Covid-19 and how it is found, spread and controlled) has provided. The plan has been approved by the Executive.

The Health and Wellbeing Board will have the responsibility to review the implementation of the plan during 2022/23 and the City Council and partners are committed to reviewing what has worked to date and learning from experiences so far.

The plan includes:

- 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' means for Manchester – our approach, what we will do and inequalities considerations
- Local Governance arrangements
- Our 12-point plan for Living Safely and Fairly with Covid-19 in Manchester
- Resource Requirements.

Decision

To note the report and plan.

HWB/22/10 North Manchester Strategy

The Board considered a joint report and received a presentation providing an overview of the North Manchester Strategy and an update on the health infrastructure developments that form part of the strategy, namely the re-provision of the Park House mental health facility and the North Manchester General Hospital (NMGH) site redevelopment. North Manchester Strategy is key to the delivery of these ambitions and seeks to achieve civic regeneration through investment and innovation in healthcare and housing and brings together three major planned infrastructure investments in the north of the city:

- The re-provision of Park House mental health inpatient unit on the North Manchester General Hospital (NMGH) site
- The redevelopment of the NMGH site, encompassing a redesigned and substantially rebuilt hospital; Wellbeing and Education Hubs; a 'Healthy Neighbourhood' with residential and commercial space; and a Village Green
- The development of 15,000 new homes (20% affordable), with improved connectivity and amenities at Victoria North.

The Chair invited questions from the Board.

Officers were asked if the provision of a hospice may be included within the proposed plans. Also, has consideration been given the patient flow within the new hospital to ensure that

It was reported that the inclusion of a hospice has been considered although more thought needs to be given to the potential uses of the current site. The issue of patient flow will be considered and best practice and new design will be picked up from other buildings with experience gained from dealing with covid. Reference was made to commitment being made to north Manchester and the ongoing improvements that will make a positive impact on the area and its residents. The limited space at the North Manchester A&E department and the innovative ideas to address the processing of patients arriving at the hospital have shown the resourceful way staff have adapted, however the new A&E must be fit for purpose to provide a successful flow for patients. The point was also made that the potential success of the site as an anchor development could positively impact on social regeneration as well as improving health outcomes in an area of the city that has suffered poor health outcomes for many years.

Decisions

1. The Board noted the report and presentation.
2. The Board endorsed the North Manchester Strategy.

HWB/22/11 Review of Health and Wellbeing Board

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health regarding the review of the Health and Wellbeing Board following last review completed in 2018. Carol Brooks, was commissioned to provide an independent assessment and provide an independent perspective, regarding the current and future, purpose, position and function of the Board.

The Board received a statement from Carol Brooks who was commissioned to undertake the review work on the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment. The statement referred to the six key themes had been identified from the review (Style, Potential and Opportunities, Strengths, Position, Membership and Priorities. The responses received from individual interviews and a broader group discussion raised the following points:

- a need to provide space for discussion and to explore themes in more detail.

- The Board is considered to be transactional with an assumption that there is adequate engagement outside of meetings of the Board.
- There are strong relationships within the Board which exist across that city and the changes brought about by covid have enabled the use of livestreamed meetings for further engagement.
- The business processes used by the Board are seen as good.
- Reference was also made to the position of the Board and how it sees itself and what it should be involved with and contribute on wider issues.
- The membership of the Board was not seen as a priority although more focus could be given to strengthening the VCSE and patient voice, also clinical leadership input.
- Accessing membership of the Board was considered with more clarity needed on functions and member induction.
- Is the Board executive or non-executive.

The Director of Public Health reported that the next steps and keys actions to be taken will look at the interface with the Manchester Partnership Board. A proposed new sub-group will include membership of both Boards, to look at issues in greater detail. The establishment and format of the sub-group is being produced by legal services with the servicing to be provided by GSSU at Manchester Council. Work is ongoing to address the issue of including the patient voice and a more detailed induction process for all members.

The Chair invited questions from the Board.

Members referred to the function of the Board and what changes may be needed to make the Board more effective. Reference was also made to discussions in public and the use of closed sessions as a feature in the proposed new sub-group.

It was reported that suggestions raised in the engagement process had included the need to provide space for more transformation discussions away from a formal setting. The development of the Board will be introduced as part of the review of the governance.

The Board was informed that next steps and key actions will take place during April and June 2022 to help to inform the next stage of the review process.

Decision

The Board note the report and supported the next steps and key actions set out in section 4.

HWB/22/12 Manchester Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) Update

The Board considered a report of the Director of Public Health that provided a recap on the statutory responsibilities of the Health and Wellbeing Board in respect of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) and summarised a number of recent updates to the JSNA topic papers on the mental health and emotional health and wellbeing of children and young people and on disabled people (Social Model of

Disability). It also outlines a proposal to carry out a comprehensive review of the Manchester JSNA in 2022/23.

In introducing the report the Director of Public Health acknowledged the quality of the two reports referred to (Barriers Assessment Children and Young People / Adults and Older People and Assessment Children and Young People Mental Health) and the possibility of their inclusion in the work programme for the proposed new Sub-Group of the Board and Manchester Partnership Board.

The Board received an update from the Children and Young People's Team on the report submitted.

The Board discussed the report and the importance of the work undertaken and the need to include the subject matter within the Board's work programme to ensure the experiences and data acquired is retained and used in a practical manner to bring about change.

Decisions

1. The Board noted the statutory responsibilities in respect of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) and the recent updates to the JSNA topic papers.
2. That the Board support the proposal to undertake a comprehensive review of the Manchester JSNA in 2022/23.

Licensing and Appeals Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 6 June 2022

Present: Councillor Grimshaw – in the Chair

Councillors: Connolly, Andrews, Evans, Hassan, Hewitson, Hughes, Jeavons, Judge, Reid and Riasat

Apologies: Councillor Flanagan

LAP/22/03 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 January 2022 were submitted for approval.

Decision

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Licensing & Appeals Committee meeting held on 24 January 2022.

LAP/22/04 Request for Hackney Carriage Fuel Surcharge

The Committee considered the content of the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing which concerned a request from representatives of the Hackney Trade for a fuel surcharge to be applied on the Hackney Fare, ahead of a wider Fare Review. The report set out all the relevant considerations in relation to this request and the determination of Hackney Carriage Fares.

The Licensing Unit Manager informed the Committee that Section 2 of the report covered the decision making process and governance of all Hackney Carriage Fare variations, in that they are recommended to the Executive who determine the fares. Trade representatives had requested an increase of 60 to 80 pence increase. The Licensing Unit Manager referred the Committee to the table in the report showing fuel increases over time, dating back to April 2017. The Committee were to decide on an increase amount to recommend to the Executive.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions/make comments.

A Committee member asked why 60-80p amount had been the required amount?

The Licensing Unit Manager informed the member that the Trade had detailed this amount.

A Committee member asked if this amount would be put on the fare manually by drivers and if a meter adjustment would be considered.

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that there was a considerable cost for re-calibration of meters as well as the estimated time of 10 days to adjust all meters in the trade across Manchester. Also, there would be another wider Fare Review to

follow so this would potentially double the exercise. The Licensing Unit Manager then informed the Committee that the decision made in 2008 was allowed as a manual alteration and reiterated that this was a temporary review.

A Committee member asked, if the full Fare Review was set for August/September, would this temporary fuel surcharge cover the interim period and what if there was a delay to the full review?

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that there were ongoing negotiations with the airport regarding the wider review charges and any delay would cause a risk to the service but a time limit may be imposed in that the wider review could be brought to Committee in July 2022.

A Committee member noted 2.5 in the report:

If objections are received, then the Licensing and Appeals Committee must consider those objections and set a date for any change to take effect no later than 2 months from the date of the original public notice.

This could put the surcharge back until August 2022, close to the Full Review.

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that this was correct but added that this same practice also applies to the wider review, which would then be moved back to November/December 2022, adding that it is likely that there will be objections to any fare increases.

The Deputy Chair questioned what would happen if the wider review brought about a lesser fare increase, after Committee endorsed this increase to the Executive?

The Licensing Unit Manager expressed that the risk of this was very low as fuel is one component of the formula and there are significant increases expected over time.

The Deputy Chair asked if it was a lower amount, would this have to be agreed.

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that it would be for the Licensing & Appeals Committee to decide.

The Chair requested information on the trade meetings with the airport, noting that talks were ongoing.

The Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that another meeting was imminent, but that the wider review would have to go ahead with or without an agreement.

The Chair asked if the new formula took electric and hybrid vehicles into account and if charges would differ for these types of vehicles.

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that the formula doesn't take these into account and requires further work.

A Committee member noted that electric vehicles will need to be considered for the future, noting that electric prices are due to increase greatly. This member then asked if 60-80p would be a flat for any journey.

The Licensing Unit Manager confirmed this to be correct.

The same member noted that short journeys would be significantly more costly and this would affect disabled and older people as a larger proportion of service users.

Members of three taxi trade unions and associations were invited to comment.

Unite addressed the Committee and stated that this fare surcharge was necessary for the trade. Covid had been a difficult time for drivers on top of the cost of living crisis, trade cost increases, Clean Air plan and MLS requirement. The trade was in crisis as £30 on diesel would now cover 100 miles. The Unite representative stated 20p previously covered 1 mile. The representative thanked Manchester City Council for being very helpful with regard to the trade but expressed that there was still a fine line, adding that the trade is technically public transport, even though operators are called private drivers. The representative mentioned that there had been one fare increase over the last 10 years, that saloon taxi cars make more money than the rest of the trade and asked for this fare surcharge to be recommended to the Executive as an interim measure to help the trade and extend the flexibility shown to the trade throughout the pandemic.

The Committee asked the Unite rep how they had arrived at a 60-80 pence increase, what the trade thought about opposition from the public to increased fares and what the rest of the increase would cover where the percentage is not to cover fuel costs?

The Unite rep stated that it is not based purely on fuel but this is needed ahead of the full review, that the trade faces difficulties regardless of opposition and that shorter jobs would balance out with longer jobs, adding that the trade had the oldest fleet they've ever owned and need to look at the future.

Manchester Hackney Association (MHA) addressed the Committee and stated that there were already standard fare increases at Manchester Airport and Piccadilly, adding that fares can go up or down due to independent costings. MHA also gave mention to the costs for different types of vehicles, £60k for an electric vehicle and £43k for a diesel vehicle, stating a cost of £850 a month over 5 years. The MHA rep spoke of prices for electric charging being increased and only 1 charging hub across all taxi ranks. In final comments the MHA rep expressed that over distance there may be some losses but that, overall, and average day for a driver would balance out with the surcharge added and this would be fair for everyone.

A Committee member noted that the Hackney trade do not have the same flexibility as other companies in amending fares to charge more during busy times and during large scale city events. The same Committee member then asked if drivers tend to buy or lease their vehicles.

The MHA rep stated that the £60,000 was to buy the vehicle outright and the monthly fee was a PCP to lease the vehicle and buy it after 5 years.

The Chair invited the representative from Unite the Union to address the Committee.

The Unite rep stated that they bought the first electric vehicle on the fleet 4 years ago and noted that the charging infrastructure was very poor, informing the panel that a full charge had doubled in cost for the 60 mile capacity of an electric vehicle, making it more expensive than fuel based vehicles. The Unite rep noted the recent increases in diesel from April 2022 to the current day and gave mention of the single increase in surcharges over the last 10 years. Since the pandemic, 50% of drivers had left the trade and this was a cry for help to help those in the trade struggling to make a wage. The Unite rep concluded by stating that 80 pence was the bare minimum required to help the trade survive.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments/ask questions.

Cllr Andrews proposed to move the recommendation of an 80 pence surcharge increase, time limited to the end of September 2022. Cllr Hughes seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed to recommend to the Executive that an 80 pence surcharge be implemented.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 31 May 2022

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

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

Also present: Councillors Bayunu, Igbon, Robinson, Wheeler and Wright

PH/22/20 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 131344/FO/2021, 132489/FO/2021, 132626/FO/2022, 130922/FO/2022, 131859/FO/2021 & 131860/LO/2021, 130387/FO/2021, 132530/FO/2021 and 133030/FO/2022.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/22/21 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14 April 2022 as a correct record.

PH/22/22 131344/FO/2021 - Shell UK Ltd, 1081 Stockport Road, Manchester, M19 2RE - Levenshulme Ward

This application sought permission for the installation of 7 electric vehicle charging points, and 2 jet wash bays, together with related canopies, electricity sub station and associated infrastructure, following revisions to the originally submitted proposal to enable the retention of a significant proportion of the existing grassed area and existing trees to the Cringle Road and Stockport Road frontages.

The Planning Officer had nothing to add to the printed report and thus the Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions.

A member of the Committee queried if the Planning Officer was satisfied that the tree would not be damaged.

The Planning Officer stated that this had been inspected and they were satisfied it would be retained in place.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve the application. Councillor S. Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the recommendation of Minded to Approve.

PH/22/23 132489/FO/2021 - Port Street, Manchester, M1 2EQ -Piccadilly Ward

This application was a proposal for 485 homes with two commercial units in a part-34, part-11, part 9, part 7 storey building with hard and soft landscaping. 210 letters of objection were received from 2 rounds of notification and 34 letters of support. Many did not object to the principle of the site being developed, supporting the creation of more housing with appropriate facilities and are keen to see it brought back to life but object to the form of development.

The objections related to design and scale, heritage and townscape, affordable housing, need and viability, privacy and living conditions of adjacent residents, provision of public realm, traffic, highways and parking, climate change/embodied carbon, compliance with Planning Policy, precedent, and the consultation process.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee of a representation from a Local Ward Councillor who raised concerns at the profit margin of 11% during difficult times for residents, noting that previously approved schemes had had a lower profit. Another Local Ward Councillor had raised concerns that the building would have been too tall, impacting on light and privacy and would impact traffic and pollution. A neighbouring Ward Councillor considered the application domineering in its size. A second neighbouring Ward Councillor felt that the application should offer 20% affordable housing.

An objector, representing a local resident's group, addressed the Committee on the application. They felt that the impact of the application on the local community would be severe, with an inappropriate scale and character for the area. The objector felt the application was not in-keeping with the area, which is home to a conservation area that the application would over tower and overwhelm. The objector stated the application would be at least 20 storeys' higher than any other building in the area. They felt that without a decrease in height, there would be a loss of privacy for residents already in the area and would dim the light in the area. The objector stated that the details provided by the developer had not eased their concerns and they continued to oppose the development in its current form.

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

A Local Ward Councillor addressed the Committee, stating that the application would harm, and have a direct impact, on the area. They felt there was not substantial support for the application and that the objections received far outweighed the support. The Ward Councillor stated that other developments, such as the Chapel Town Street development, in the area had been restricted on height. They felt no evidence had been provided to show that pedestrian routes would be created. In terms of Affordable Housing, the Ward Councillor noted that the developer had stated they would still turn a profit should they have offered 20% Affordable Housing, but they had not committed to that. The Ward Councillor felt a huge amount of work

had gone in to regenerating the area, but this development would harm that progress.

The Planning Officer stated that the issues that had been raised had been addressed in the report. However, they did state that the other development referenced was compliant, at 14 storeys, with the Portugal Street SRF and similarly, this application was compliant with the Piccadilly Basin SRF.

A member sought clarity on if this application would provide a gateway to other applications for taller buildings and if the courtyard referenced in the application was private for residents or open to the public.

The Planning Officer said that there would be a private resident's courtyard at 750m², however there would also be a public space at 1500m² that would be a route through the site from Great Ancoats Street to Port Street. The Planning Officer also re-stated that the size of the building was compliant with the Piccadilly Basin SRF.

The member responded, stating they felt that 34 storeys was still too high for the area. The member felt the application would have a significant impact on the Ancoats and Stevenson Square conservation areas due to its height.

The Planning Officer stated that the harm to heritage was set out clearly in the report, and it was found to have been less than substantial. The Planning Officer said that the public benefits of an application needed to outweigh the harm. They felt they did but acknowledged that was a decision for the Committee.

A member stated that this application was 20 storeys higher than the next tallest building in the area and felt that to be excessive. They felt that should the application have been allowed, other applications would be received for similar or taller buildings. The member also noted their concerns on Affordable Housing and felt that too many developers had been allowed to get away with not building enough.

The Planning Officer re-stated that the size of the building complies with the areas SRF, and any future applications would have to be compliant too.

A member then sought clarity on whether the application would be two or three stories higher than the framework or if it was compliant. The member also noted their concerns regarding viability assessments and their frustration with most applications not offering the 20% Affordable Housing policy.

The Planning Officer responded stating that the framework allows for two buildings on the site, one of 30 storeys and another of 25. This application was for one building at 34 storeys. The Officer also informed the member that the Affordable Housing policy requires 20% across the City, not on each individual development.

Councillor Andrews moved Minded to Refuse. Councillor Flanagan seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed Minded to Refuse on the basis of the scale of the application and the impact on the conservation area.

PH/22/24 132626/FO/2022 - 48 Store Street, Manchester, M1 2WA - Piccadilly Ward

This application proposed 54 homes in a 15-storey building. There were 31 objections and 1 letter of support received. The objections related to: design and scale, townscape, affordable housing, amenity including sunlight and daylight, privacy and living conditions of adjacent residents, traffic, highways and parking provision, loss of trees and biodiversity and the consultation process.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee of a representation received by a Local Ward Councillor, who felt that the Affordable Housing commitment within the application does not comply with Council policy. This representation also stated that given the climate crisis, the removal of 30 trees without replacements was a concern. A second Local Ward Councillor felt the application was too tall and would have a negative impact on the area in terms of traffic and pollution, light and privacy. They also felt the application would impact on the Grade II listed style aqueduct.

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.

A Local Ward Councillor addressed the Committee, stating that they felt the application showed the applicant to have had no knowledge of the local area. The Local Ward Councillor informed the Committee that the proposal was not in-keeping with other buildings in the area as the proposal was for a gold tower next to traditional red-brick buildings. The Local Ward Councillor questioned if the figures on the Council website regarding the Viability Assessment were incorrect and if they were, felt they should be withdrawn. The Local Ward Councillor also addressed an article that stated they had met with the developer and had their concerns addressed, something they stated was false. They stated that there is a policy for the replacement of trees that are cut down by developers and the applicant had not adhered to this by cutting down the trees prior to putting in an application. The Local Ward Councillor felt that, whether deliberate or not, it certainly went against the spirit of what is trying to be achieved with that policy. The Local Ward Councillor stated that the Affordable Housing offered in this development went no way to mitigating the harm the development would do. They requested that the Committee be Minded to Refuse the application but also suggested a site visit.

A second Local Ward Councillor felt it would be beneficial for the Committee to perform a site visit.

The Planning Officer reminded the Committee that around four years ago, they had approved a similar development with similar materials and design, which was two storeys smaller.

A member raised the issue of parking at the site, in particular accessible parking.

Councillor Leech moved a proposal for the Committee to complete a site visit.
Councillor Flanagan seconded the proposal.

Decision

To arrange a site visit to assess the impact of the colour of the proposed building.

PH/22/25 130922/FO/2021 - 46 Canal Street, Manchester, M1 3WD - Piccadilly Ward

This application proposed the erection of a rooftop extension that would be part clad to the rear with glass balustrades to the sides and the front. The extension would be set back from the front elevation by 1 metre and the side elevations by 0.75. The roof would be partially retractable and glazed. The roof terrace would close at 10pm, would have a maximum capacity of 90 covers and would only operate with seated patrons with table service. Waste and deliveries would remain as existing, with access to the external bin storage at the rear via the side elevation for collection daily. The proposal included a stair lift to provide access to the rooftop extension, and the upper floors of the building that were not previously accessible.

The Planning Officer stated they had received support from a Local Ward Councillor on the access improvements this application would bring.

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.

A Local Ward Councillor referenced objections from residents regarding additional noise emanation this proposal would bring. They felt confident that LOOH would be equipped to deal with that. The Local Ward Councillor was pleased that this would become another fully disabled accessible venue in The Village.

A member sought clarity on how the extra waste would be dealt with from this extension.

The Planning Officer stated that there would be no changes to waste provision.

Another member sought clarity on if the extension was both indoor and outdoor, if the 90 covers was the whole roof and that there would not be people using the extension past 22.00.

The Planning Officer informed the member that the LOOH team were happy with what had been proposed.

Councillor Flanagan moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve.
Councillor S. Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the recommendation of Approved for the reasons outlined within the report.

(Councillors Leech and Andrews left the room part way through this item and were therefore unable to take part in the decision-making process).

PH/22/26 131859/FO/2021 & 131860/LO/2021 - 50 Fountain Street, Manchester, M2 2AS - Deansgate Ward

This application proposed the demolition of the modern extension to the Grade II Listed building, retention and refurbishment of the original Victorian facade, the erection of a commercial building (Use Class E) with landscaping, and other associated works. There had been 6 representations.

The Planning Officer noted that a further 3 representations had been received that focussed on how the development was out of touch with the area.

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.

A member informed the Committee of their mixed feelings regarding the application. The member wanted to see floor plates that allow lines between windows on adjacent buildings to continue. The member suggested a site visit could be beneficial for the Committee.

The Planning Officer informed the member that the floor levels of the extension would line up with number 49 Spring Gardens.

Councillor Davies moved a proposal for the Committee to complete a site visit. Councillor Lovecy seconded the proposal.

Decision

To arrange a site visit to assess the impact of the colour of the proposed building.

PH/22/27 130387/FO/2021 - The Former Gamecock Public House, Boundary Lane, Manchester, M15 6GE - Hulme Ward

The application proposed a part 9, part 13 storey purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) building providing 261 student bed spaces. There had been 49 objections from neighbours, an objection from 'Block the Block' a resident-led campaign support by Hopton Hopefuls, Aquarius Tenants and Residents Association, Hulme Community Forum and On Top of the World Hulme, an objection from Hopton Hopefuls, a letter of objection from 2 employees of Manchester University, an objection from the GP practice on Booth Street West, objections from the Guinness Partnership and One Manchester and 3 representations from members

of the public supporting the proposal. A Local Ward Councillor and Local MP had also objected.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that a further 26 representations had been received, that raised similar issues to those that had already been listed in the report. The applicant had also provided further information on how the community hub would have been managed. The Planning Officer informed the Committee that the revised conditions were recommended.

An objector, representing a resident's group, informed the Committee they were there to speak for the ageing residents of the area. The objector stated that residents had a sense of security through the close community feel of the area, however that was being threatened by the prospect of a tower block looming over them. There was a fear amongst residents of extra noise emanation, not just during construction, but from students who would reside in the building in the future. Residents felt they may be driven out of the area. The objector stated that they welcome students into the area, however this application was not in the interests of the community. The objector felt that this application would have been detrimental to the mental health and wellbeing of residents.

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

A Local Ward Councillor addressed the Committee, informing them that all three Local Ward Councillors in the area wanted the application to be refused, or at the very least, a site visit arranged. They noted that applications for this site had been turned down in 2008 and 2012, with the reasons for refusal applying to this application too. The Local Ward Councillor did not consider there to be a need for more student accommodation in Hulme. They informed the Committee that a former student block had been recently redeveloped for a new purpose, highlighting the lack of need. A local campaign group had polled students regarding their accommodation preferences and found that students wanted the independence of privately rented property and parking. The Local Ward Councillor felt the application would be over dominant in the street scene. The nearest neighbours to the application would be two resident social housing blocks, and a new block of the size proposed would impact on their daylight and sunlight, particularly in communal spaces. The Local Ward Councillor also stated that whilst MMU had provided a letter of support for the application, they had given no commitment to use the accommodation for their students.

A second Local Ward Councillor informed the Committee that the development failed to consider the health and wellbeing of current residents and ignored Manchester's ambition of being a zero-carbon city. The developer planned to fell 5 trees, including 1 that was subject to a tree preservation order. The developers had suggested they would replace the trees, but the diminished sunlight caused by the development would make it difficult for them to survive. The Local Ward Councillor informed the Committee that 20% of residents at a nearby housing block had insufficient Vitamin D and a block of this size would exacerbate this. Elderly residents in the area have been trying to develop a community cohesion that is relevant to them. The Local Ward Councillor felt the building plan was bland and uninspiring and did not give sufficient regard to surrounding area.

A third Local Ward Councillor informed the Committee that the current owner of the land chose not to work with community to develop it and that is why it lies derelict. They felt that this development would increase on-street parking in an area covered by permit parking bar one street. Local residents were concerned about the construction phase, having already had issues with previous developments in the area. Two housing providers had objected to the application, along with the Local GP surgery. The proposed 261 bed spaces would only serve to have increased noise emanation.

The Planning Officer stated that the issues raised had already been set out in the report and there was nothing useful to add. However, they did note that one of the previous applications that had been refused, had that decision overturned on appeal.

A member stated they would like to propose Minded to Refuse on two grounds. The first of these was the scale of the proposal on such a small site. The member felt this would be detrimental to the area visually and would dominate the area with its size. Their second ground for Minded to Refuse was that under National Planning Policy Framework, parking should be provided in close proximity to the entrance for those with disabilities. The member felt this could not be seen in the application.

A second member sought clarity on the Community Hub offered as part of the development. They stated that the late representations had informed them that the Community Hub would be available for hire by any Hulme based group but that was subject to the developer or owners' approval. The member felt that this could allow the developer or owner to only allow those groups they liked to use the space. The member then sought clarity on if students living in the accommodation would be eligible for a parking permit in the area and how the application could suggest there is robust evidence for the need of extra student accommodation when a former student block has been recently converted for a different use.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that they could impose conditions on the use of the Community Hub should they be Minded to Approve. Their instinct was that students would not have been eligible for a parking permit but did not have a definitive answer. The Planning Officer then informed the Committee that a report had gone to the Executive in 20/21 that discussed the issue of student need for accommodation. They stated this report provided clear evidence of a number of students choosing to live in mainstream student accommodation both in and around the City Centre.

A member then sought clarity on the affordability of the accommodation, seeking a ballpark figure on the costs for students.

The Planning Officer stated that 20% of the accommodation was aimed at being affordable but could not provide an exact figure on costs.

Councillor Flanagan moved Minded to Refuse. Councillors Leech and Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed Minded to Refuse on the basis of the scale of the application and the parking issues in the area.

**PH/22/28 132530/FO/2021 - 320 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 6XQ
- Old Moat Ward**

The application proposed a change of the use of the ground floor of a long-established hair salon/barbers in the Fallowfield District Centre, to provide a café bar/restaurant at the ground floor with a reduced-scale salon in the basement. The existing 5-bedroom duplex residential flat above the property would be retained.

The proposed café-bar/restaurant provides 31no. covers internally and a further 20no. externally. Additional seating that was proposed on a side alleyway in the applicant's ownership has been deleted from the amended scheme, and cycle parking has been introduced on the front forecourt adjacent to the entrance.

External seating and cycle parking will be separated from the public footpath by railings which enclose the front forecourt space. On the south side, where the forecourt runs along the service road into the side alley, the railings will be erected on a new brick wall. A small (11.2m²) single storey rear extension within the rear yard curtilage is proposed to accommodate WC's. Segregated bin storage for the bar and flat are also in the yard and a new enclosed bin store for the salon is proposed towards the rear of the site.

Access for the basement salon and flat is proposed via the unadopted alleyway and a new entrance in the rear yard. There is no off-road parking associated with the site as at present, but it is well served by public transport along Wilmslow Road.

A total of 1no. letter of support and 7no. objections, including from a local residents' group had been received. Most objectors remain concerned about the prospect of another bar in the area and ongoing issues with noise, disturbance, crime and litter, which they perceive will be further intensified by any approval of the application.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that, since its deferral at the last meeting, the scheme had been revised. This included a reduction in operating hours, a bin store being moved and the drinking area at the front of the site closing at 21.30.

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 Planning Officer stated that the recommendation was to approve with the conditions suggested.

A member sought clarity on the three refuse areas in the application and where they would be.

The Planning Officer informed the member there would be a bin store for the restaurant and living accommodation in the rear yard area, and the salon would have a small area in the alleyway. They explained that a condition of the application is to explore with the applicant how this area could be moved to within the property.

Councillor Richards moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve. Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee approved the application including the conditions, as detailed in the report submitted.

PH/22/29 133030/FO/2022 - Land to the South of Cavendish Road, Manchester - Didsbury West Ward

The proposals relate to the redevelopment of an irregular shaped fenced off and grassed site adjacent to 2,3 and 4 storey residential properties developed as part of the redevelopment of the former Withington Hospital site and single and 2 storey buildings in use as nursing and dementia care homes known as Brocklehurst and Monet Lodge. The application site formed part of the wider former hospital site prior to its redevelopment and previously contained a number of buildings used for support facilities for the wider Withington Hospital complex. The site and land were cleared in the early 2000s and subsequently the majority of the land to the west and south was redeveloped for residential and commercial purposes. The application site has remained in the ownership of the NHS but was not accessible from Cavendish Road, the area was subsequently fenced off from adjacent residential flats within the past two years.

The application relates to the proposed redevelopment of the site for residential purposes accessed via the existing vehicular access from Cavendish Road for the erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings part 2/part 3 storeys in height, with associated car parking and landscaping.

The proposals were subject to notification by way of 34 letters to nearby addresses. In response 12 objections were received, Didsbury West ward members Cllr Debbie Hilal and Cllr John Leech have both made comments objecting to the proposals. The main concerns raised relate to the loss of open green space, overlooking of existing residential properties, potential damage to trees and that the development is a back land development.

The Planning Officer had nothing to add to the printed report.

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.

A Local Ward Councillor addressed the Committee, stating they felt this was a significant improvement on the previous proposal. The Local Ward Councillor

thought there was a slight inaccuracy in the late representations, stating that they felt the access to the land was blocked off at the same time as the Didsbury Point development was built. Residents used this green space, unaware the land belonged to the NHS. The Local Ward Councillor still had concerns that the development would overlook the only outside space of Monet Lodge.

The Planning Officer confirmed that it was private space and it had been fenced off. They stated there was no direct overlooking of Monet Lodge.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve. Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the recommendation of Approved for the reasons outlined within the report.

(Councillor Leech declared a personal interest in the application but addressed the Committee as a ward councillor before leaving the meeting and taking no part in the consideration or vote.)

PH/22/30 Confirmation of the Manchester City Council (Land at car park adjacent to York Street, Didsbury) Tree Preservation Order 2021 - Didsbury West Ward

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

The Planning Officer confirmed that this order had been before the Committee in November 2021.

A Local Ward Councillor stated they hoped members would confirm the Tree Preservation Order. They stated that residents were upset by the removal of trees in the car park opposite. The Local Ward Councillor themselves requested the Tree Preservation Orders to protect these trees from the same fate as they add value to the street scene.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation to confirm the order. Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the recommendation to confirm the order for the reasons outlined within the report.

(Councillor Leech declared a personal interest in the application but addressed the Committee as a ward councillor before leaving the meeting and taking no part in the consideration or vote.)

Standards Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 16 June 2022

Present

Independent Co-opted Member: Nicole Jackson – In the Chair

Councillors Connolly, Evans, Lanchbury, Simcock and Nunney
Independent Co-opted Member: G Linnell

Apologies:

Councillor Andrews

Ringway Parish Council: Councillor O'Donovan

ST/22/06 Interests

Independent Co-opted Member, Geoff Linnell declared that he is a serving councillor on Nether Alderley Parish Council. Although as non-voting members of the committee they are not subject to the rules on Disclosable Pecuniary Interests Nicole Jackson and Geoff Linnell, as Independent Members of the Standards Committee, declared an interest in the item '**Terms of Office of the Independent Members of the Standards Committee and the Independent Persons**'.

ST/22/07 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held 17 March 2022 were submitted for approval.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2022 as a correct record.

ST/22/08 Members Code of Conduct - Company Directorships

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and City Solicitor that provided an overview of the governance / oversight mechanisms which provides assurance that appropriate standards in relation to the Council's Partnership arrangements are being upheld. The report focused on those matters within the remit of the Standards Committee, in particular on the training programme for Members who currently or will in the future take on a role as a director. The training package has been produced following work with The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA). The training sessions which have been ongoing focus on three key themes:

- Provision of clear guidance so that Members have an understanding of their responsibilities when undertaking a role as a Director;
- To ensure that there is a consistency of approach taken by those representing the Council in a Board setting;
- An opportunity to outline some of the key lessons learnt from other Local Authority companies and how Manchester is embedding a positive approach to good practice.

The Chair invited questions from Committee members.

A member referred the training packages as detailed in paragraph 2.5 of report and asked how long the training will take.

It was reported that the current training package has been developed and is provided by CIPFA colleagues. The refresher session is held over a half day and new directorship appointments will be held over a full due to the content to be covered.

A member asked if the training has been designed for those members appointed to positions by the Council or did it include those members who are not appointed by the Council but serve a member of a board of a smaller local organisation, because they are a councillor.

It was reported that the training had been focused on those members appointed by the Council to directorships, however the training can be extended for members acting in the roles as a member. Another area to be included in the training will be the role of trustees.

Officers were asked if there is an expectation for independent members to undertake the training if they are a director or a trustee. The Council currently has independent members serving on Scrutiny Committees and Audit Committee.

It was reported that this is not provided currently, but if this was considered beneficial, it could be an option to explore for inclusion of co-opted members in the training, if this would have a benefit to the work of the Council.

Decision

To note the report submitted and the comments and suggestions raised.

ST/22/09 Annual Governance Statement (AGS)

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that presented the draft 2021/22 Annual Governance Statement (AGS), which has been produced following completion of the annual review of the Council's governance arrangements and systems of internal control.

Local authorities have a legal responsibility to conduct, at least annually, a review of the effectiveness of their governance framework including their system of internal control. Following the review an Annual Governance Statement (AGS) must be produced, approved and published

The Draft AGS will be included in the Council's draft Accounts 2021/22 and will be submitted to Audit Committee on 26 July 2022.

The report was introduced by the Reform and Innovation Manager and reference was made to the amendments made to improve the layout and accessibility of the text

and information. The report referred to the governance challenges in 2021/22 and moving forwards to 2022/23.

Decision

To note the report and the contents of the draft version of the Council's 2021/22 Annual Governance Statement (AGS).

ST/22/10 Review of the Operation and Efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that provides an update to the Standards Committee on the operation and efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol. A copy of the current protocol was appended to the report. The protocol was reviewed in November 2021, when it was determined that no changes were required. Reference was made to paragraph 2.1 of the report and the view of the Monitoring Officer that the existing Protocol is well understood by elected Members and the Monitoring Officer is not aware of any queries or issues that have been addressed through existing procedures. This positive view is also reflected in the findings of the LGA Corporate Peer Challenge report. The Committee was informed that the Member /Officer Relations Protocol is covered in the newly elected member induction training.

The Committee was informed that protocol is now subject to annual review.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member asked if there had been any complaints received under the protocol.

The Monitoring Officer reported that no complaints had been received from officers against an elected member.

Decisions

1. To note the position regarding the operation and efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol as detailed in the report submitted.
2. To endorse the proposed change to the review date section to reflect current practice of annual review of the Protocol.
3. To request the recirculation of the Operation and Efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol to all elected members, following its adoption by Council

ST/21/11 Review of the Operation and Efficacy of the Use of Resources Guidance for Members

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor to provide an update on the operation and efficacy of the Use of Resources Guidance for Members. The Guidance is part of the Council Constitution's and as such is reviewed annually. The Head of Governance introduced the report and outlined the outcome of the latest

review of the Guidance had identified that clarity is required on the use of a councillor's council email address and council telephone, which are Council resources and should not be used on any campaign or election literature. In addition, it has been suggested that the importance of Information Security should be highlighted to elected members with the need for them to complete cyber training to promote the importance of cyber security. The review also updated the guidance to remove information that is no longer relevant.

The Chair invited questions from Committee members.

A member referred to the non-use by Councillors of their Council provided email addresses and phone numbers as detailed in paragraph 1.2 of the report and requested that it be stated within the guidance that this will apply to Councillors all year round and not just the period during local elections. It was confirmed this would be picked up in the Guidance.

Decisions

1. To note the Monitoring Officer's views on the operation and efficacy of the Use of Resources Guidance for Members.
2. To endorse the inclusion, in Paragraph 2 of the Guidance (Resources general provisions), that the non-use of members Council provided email addresses and phone numbers for campaign or election literature purposes, will apply to Councillors all year round.
3. To recommend to full Council the adoption of the revised and amended guidance, as detailed in the report submitted.
4. To endorse the recirculation of the Use of Resources Guidance to all elected members, following its adoption by Council.

ST/21/12 Planning Protocol

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor to advise on the operation and efficacy of the Planning Protocol. The Committee was advised that officers consider the Protocol is working effectively. A complaint received regarding a member had been rejected at Stage 1 of the investigation process. Four other complaints had been received regarding the conduct of ward members who are not members of the Planning and Highways Committee. The Committee was advised that officers will monitor the complaints and if required report on any potential amendments that may require consideration.

The Committee was advised that the proposed change to the cut-off time for the submission of late representations prior to the meeting of Planning and Highways Committee reported to the Standards Committee in November 2021 would be included in the review of the Council Constitution. The proposed cut-off time will be 4:00pm two days prior to the meeting of Planning and Highways Committee.

Decisions

1. To note the position regarding the operation/efficacy of the Planning Protocol.
2. To note the potential amendment to the Planning Protocol.

ST/21/13 Dispensations

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer concerning the review the operation and efficacy of the process for granting dispensations in relation to Members' Interests.

The Monitoring Officer had provided a view of the process and efficacy that stated there are no concerns regarding the level of requests for dispensations by Councillors.

Decision

To note the report.

ST/21/14 The Register of Members' Interests

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer regarding the operation of the Register of Members' Interests. Elected members are required to notify Disclosable Pecuniary Interests to the Monitoring Officer, within 28 days of becoming a Councillor.

The Head of Governance reported that the Monitoring Officer considered that members are aware of the need to continually update their register and members will be provided with guidance regarding the declaration of interest at meetings.

Decision

To note the report.

ST/21/15 The Government Response to the Committee on Standards in Public Life's Review of Local Government Ethical Standards

Consideration was given to the report of the City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer that advised the Committee of the Government's response to the report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life (CSPL) review of local government ethical standards.

The Monitoring Officer provided a comment on each of the Recommendations. The Committee was advised that a report would be submitted to the next meeting with recommendations regarding the Local Government Association (LGA) updated model code of conduct.

(*The meeting was suspended at this point (11:00am) due to a fire alarm within the building requiring the room to be evacuated. The meeting resumed at 11:20am.)

Decision

1. To note the Government's response to the report of the Committee on Standards in Public Life.
2. That the City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer submit a report to the next meeting of the Standards Committee with recommendations regarding the LGA updated model code of conduct.

ST/21/16 Gifts and Hospitality Guidance for Members

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer regarding the operation and efficacy of the Gifts and Hospitality Guidance for Members. The current threshold for the register of gifts and hospitality is £100. The report covered the period 1 October 2021 to 12 May 2022. The Committee was advised that it is proposed that the review of the guidance will take place annually, rather than the current three-year period.

The Lord Mayor's register of gifts and hospitality was appended to the report.

The Committee was advised that the Monitoring Officer was of the view that all members are aware of this requirement and does not consider that any amendment of the Gifts and Hospitality Guidance for Members is required at this time, other than to change the review date provision to reflect that the Guidance is reviewed annually.

Decisions

1. To note the Monitoring Officer's views on the efficacy and operation of the Gifts and Hospitality Guidance for Members.
2. Endorse the proposed change to the review date section of the Gifts and Hospitality Guidance for Members to reflect the current practice of annual review of the same

ST/21/17 Work Programme

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.

A member commented that the Committee should allow business to be submitted on to the Work Programme as required.

Decision

To note the report and agree the Work Programme.

(At this point, the Chair (Nicole Jackson) vacated the chair. Councillor Simcock chaired the meeting for the following item, due to the interest declared. See below.)

ST/21/18 Terms of Office of the Independent Members of the Standards Committee and the Independent Persons

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer that sought the views of the Committee in relation to the terms of office of the two independent co-opted members of the Standards Committee and the Council's two Independent Persons.

The Committee was advised that the current terms of office of Nicolé Jackson and Geoff Linnell as Independent co-opted members of the Standards Committee date from November 2015. Sarah Beswick's appointment as Independent Person (IP) was on the same date and Alan Eastwood's appointment as Independent Person predates this. All appointments have been extended twice until 18 November 2022 whilst awaiting the Government's response to the Committee on Standards in Public Life's (CSPL) recommendation that the term of office of an IP should be limited to 2 years renewable once.

The government response is that it did not accept this recommendation as appropriate for legislation on the basis that it would be likely to be unworkable. The government's view is that it would be more appropriately implemented as a best practice recommendation for local authorities. Discussions with Monitoring Officers indicate that in practice most local authorities would likely find servicing this rate of turnover unachievable. When local authorities have found effective [IPs] who demonstrate the capability, judgement and integrity required for this quite demanding yet unpaid role, it is understandable that they may be reluctant to place limitations on the appointment.

The Monitoring Officer requested the Committee to agree to existing appointments for a further 4-year period and to recruit an additional Independent Person to enable provision of support to members where more than one member is the subject of a complaint.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment on the report.

A member made the point that recruitment may be difficult due to the nature of the role and the experience and skills required and proposed that two Independent Persons be appointed to provide more flexibility for the Council.

The Monitoring Officer agreed that appointing two Independent Persons would be appropriate and advised the Committee that there is no limit on the number to appoint.

Decisions

1. The Committee endorsed the reappointment of Nicolé Jackson and Geoff Linnell (the two independent co-opted members of the Standards Committee) and Alan Eastwood and Sarah Beswick (the Council's two Independent Persons) for a further four-year term, provided they are agreeable to this extension

2. To refer the proposed reappointment of the two independent co-opted members of the Standards Committee and the Council's two Independent Persons to the Constitutional and Nominations Committee and Full Council for a decision to be taken regarding the potential extensions of their terms of office.
3. The Committee endorsed the proposal to advertise and interview for an additional two Independent Person positions and in the event if vacancies arise, advertise and interview to other vacant roles to enable recommendations to full Council on this matter.

(Nicole Jackson and Geoff Linnell, as Independent Members of the Standards Committee, declared an interest in the item and left the meeting before it was considered and did not participate in consideration of the item of business.)

**Manchester City Council
Report for Information**

Report to: Council – 13 July 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

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

N/A

Our Manchester Strategy outcomes	Contribution to the strategy
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities	N/A
A highly skilled city: world class and home-grown talent sustaining the city's economic success	N/A
A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities	N/A

A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work	N/A
A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth	N/A

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

- Equal Opportunities Policy
- Risk Management
- Legal Considerations

Financial consequences for the Revenue budget:

None

Financial consequences for the Capital Budget:

None

Contact officers:

Name: Fiona Ledden
 Position: City Solicitor
 Telephone: 0161 234 3087
 Email: fiona.ledden@manchester.gov.uk

Name: Donna Barnes
 Position: Governance and Scrutiny Support Officer
 Telephone: 0161 234 3037
 Email: d.barnes@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 one of the contact officers above.

None.

1. Background

- 1.1 The Constitution (Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules) establishes a procedure for dealing with key decisions where action needs to be taken immediately for reasons of urgency and is therefore not subject to the normal call-in arrangements.
 - 1.2 The procedures states that the chair of the appropriate scrutiny committee must agree that both the decision proposed is reasonable in all the circumstances, and to it being treated as a matter of urgency.
- 2.** Such decisions are to be reported to the Council.

3. Urgent Key Decisions taken since the last meeting of Council

3.1 A list of key decisions requiring exemption from the call-in procedure that have been taken since the last meeting of Council is listed below.

Date	Subject	Reason for urgency	Decision Taken by	Approved by
19 May 2022	Delivery of Extended Household Support Fund	<p>The Council was expected to deliver a substantial amount of the fund in May and June 2022 to support the residents of Manchester.</p> <p>The aim was to issue £600,000 to schools in the city to provide targeted financial support to families entitled to FSM over the May half-term holiday period. Also to issue circa 50,000 payments of either £50 or £160 to households in the city in receipt of CTS. This amounts to £4.450m. Any delay would have meant that payments would not be received until after June and later in the summer. The Council was keen to get the money out asap to provide some assurance to households to support their budgets</p>	The Executive Leader	Cllr Simcock (Chair of Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee)
20 June 2022	Procurement of additional services and licenses from Trustmarque including the approval of increased expenditure with Trustmarque for these additional Microsoft products.	Any delay in procuring those services in this essential area could have had a devastating impact resulting the Council being unable to provide a defensible position against multiple forms of Cyber Attack.	The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer	Cllr Simcock (Chair of Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee)