



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

**Tuesday, 4 July 2023**

Dear Councillor / Honorary Alderman,

### **Meeting of the Council – Wednesday, 12th July, 2023**

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the Council which will be held at 10.00 am on Wednesday, 12th July, 2023, in The Council Chamber, Level 2, Town Hall Extension.

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

**2. Interests**

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

**3. Minutes**

To submit for approval the minutes of the meeting held on 17 May 2023

15 - 26

**4. Notice of Motion - Freedom of the City for Pep Guardiola**

All 3 domestic trophies were won by Manchester clubs, with Manchester United winning the Football League Cup and Manchester City winning the FA Cup, while Manchester City won the Premier League for the third season in a row.

City then completed "The Treble" by beating Inter Milan in Istanbul, to win the Champions League, and become only the second English Football Team to complete the treble, after Manchester United's success in 1999.

Council notes that Freedom of the City was granted to Sir Alex Ferguson following United's unprecedented treble success in 1999.

Council further notes the contribution that City Manager Pep Guardiola has made in turning City into the most successful

English football team since his arrival in Manchester in 2016, winning 1 Champions League, 5 Premier Leagues, 2 FA Cups and 4 League Cups, and equalling Alex Ferguson's treble success.

In recognition of his achievements and subject to Pep Guardiola being minded to accept, Council resolves to hold, in accordance with Section 249 of the Local Government Act 1972, a special meeting of the Council at which consideration shall be given to awarding the Freedom of the City to Pep Guardiola.

**Proposed by Councillor Northwood, seconded by Councillor Leech and supported by Councillors Bayunu, Good, Johnson and Kilpatrick**

**5. Notice of Motion - Introduction of capped fees on public transport**

The recent global Pandemic served as a stark reminder of the growing inequalities in our society under this Conservative Government. A recent report by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation found that the average person needs to spend £35 a week more than the Universal Credit allowance to stay alive. For disabled people these costs are higher.

This Council recognises that disabled people have been impacted disproportionately by The Pandemic and by the on-going Cost of Living Crisis.

This Council notes that the Government has given little recognition to the added pressure placed upon budgets for disabled people.

This Council further notes the work of Greater Manchester Combined Authority to lessen the burden of public transport costs by introducing capped fares of a minimum of £2 across the region and supporting concessionary travel passes across the network.

This Council resolves:-

To call upon GM Mayor Andy Burnham to reiterate that fares are capped at a maximum of £2 and not a flat fee of £2 and extend concessionary travel to include carers to ensure a public transport network that is inclusive and accessible to all.

**Proposed by Councillor Rawlins, seconded by Councillor Taylor and supported by Councillors Andrews, Cooley, Craig, Evans and Flanagan**

**6. Notice of Motion - Local Authority of Sanctuary**

This Council notes that:

Manchester is a proudly diverse city that speaks over 200

languages and has over many generations, drawn people from across the world to call Manchester home. For hundreds of years Manchester has been a city of sanctuary for those fleeing persecution and building for a better life. We recognise the valuable contribution that all these communities have made to our economic, social and cultural life over many years

We have a proud record in this city of fighting for a compassionate and fair Asylum system and Manchester has played a full and active part in supporting government schemes to host and support people seeking asylum and refugees including the Afghan Resettlement Programme, Homes For Ukraine and Asylum Contingency Hotels and dispersed accommodation.

Manchester Libraries gained Libraries of Sanctuary status in June 2021 in recognition of the warm welcome and volunteering opportunities they offer to asylum seekers and refugees and the commitment to celebrating diversity and spreading understanding of their lives.

We have a range of voluntary, community and faith groups who work tirelessly to support the needs of asylum seekers and refugees in our city and build community cohesion and we value and support their endeavours.

The government has created an ever-increasing hostile environment for refugees and people seeking asylum. The 'Illegal Migration Bill' epitomizes this and will make migrants criminals for simply landing on our shores.

People seeking asylum are not allowed to work. This is a waste of talent and skills and leads to loneliness and isolation. They are prevented from supporting themselves and their families and making an economic contribution. Recent research suggests that lifting this ban could save the UK billions of pounds per year and add to tax revenue.

The impact of the asylum system on unaccompanied children and young people devastates lives. Long waits to get access to legal representation and an asylum decision affects their mental health, education and sense of hope for the future.

In June 2023 Councillor Bev Craig, alongside Andy Burnham and the other 9 GM Council Leaders wrote to the Home Secretary Suella Braverman MP to express concerns about asylum and immigration and set out a series of calls for change in national policy.

Thirteen years of unfair Conservative and Coalition government cuts and austerity have had a huge impact on all our communities and our ability as a council to provide fully funded services for all who need them.

This Council resolves to:

- (1) Continue to provide welcome and support to refugees and migrant communities who have fled violence and persecution to seek safety in Manchester.
- (2) Join the network of towns and cities which promote the inclusion and welfare of people who are fleeing violence and persecution to become a recognised 'Local Authority of Sanctuary'
- (3) As leaders of the city, we will challenge anti migrant rhetoric and attitudes and continue to promote the wonderful diversity of our city and communities. We will also work to strengthen links between refugees, those seeking asylum and local communities.
- (4) Celebrate the contribution of asylum seekers, migrants and refugees to our city through events like Refugee Week and Windrush Day.
- (5) Continue to work with organisations in the city who provide support to asylum seekers and refugees and nurture and grow these vital partnerships.
- (6) Support the campaign to 'Lift The Ban' so that asylum seekers are allowed to work and put their skills and talents to good use whilst awaiting their asylum decision.
- (7) Call on the government to:
  - Adopt and implement all of the policy recommendations listed in the Joint Greater Manchester letter in June 2023 to the Home Secretary as ways to improve the ability to support all of our communities and halt the Illegal Migration Bill
  - Improve and make fairer the asylum system and work harder to clear the backlog of asylum claims that are causing so many people to live in uncertainty and fear.
  - Reform the No Recourse to Public Funds condition which causes destitution and misery for so many
  - Increase funding to local authorities so that we can provide properly funded support services and invest in projects that improve community cohesion

- Ensure that children in the asylum system are treated as children and that their wellbeing is paramount. That they have legal representation and that decisions on children's asylum claims are made within six months
- (8) Write to our local MPs to ask for their support in this lobbying and to make the case to the government in Parliament.

**Proposed by Councillor Midgley, seconded by Councillor Sharif Mahamed and supported by Councillors Andrews, Benham, Cooley, Craig, Fletcher, Foley, Green, Hilal, Igbon, Priest, Rawlins, Rawson, Reid, T Robinson, Sadler, Shilton Godwin Taylor and White**

**7. Notice of Motion - Daring more democracy: A Greater Manchester Assembly**

This motion is put forward in the context of the so-called 'Trailblazer' Deeper Devolution Deal between the UK Government and the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA).

Now that we have such an extended deal, which explicitly addresses issues of governance and accountability alongside 'new levers, functions and responsibilities' (Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) Policy Paper March), it is the right time to address the democracy implications of devolution for Manchester within the Greater Manchester structures.

**Objectives**

To replace the Greater Manchester Combined Authority with a new devolved Greater Manchester Authority, which will include a directly-elected assembly. The role and function of the new authority and assembly will be comparable to that of Greater London Authority (GLA) and London Assembly (LA), and will have similar power to scrutinise and challenge decisions made by the mayor. Funding for this more substantial authority and these expanded powers will be made available by central government. Election of the assembly will be by a mixed-member proportional system, similar to that used in London, the exact details of which will be established by a government commission.

Council notes that:

- The population of Greater Manchester is substantial: half that of Norway, over half that of Ireland, and is almost as large as that of Wales.
- Although directly elected, the metropolitan mayor is answerable to ten local authority leaders who are not directly elected but appointed as group leader by their own

party processes. This creates a clear deficit of democracy. This is not only because of direct election through a First Past the Post (FPTP) system in the local authority but also because of possible post-electoral arrangements affecting the leadership of a given local authority. The ten party-elected leaders cannot be expected to fully represent the range of views of almost three million people. An Assembly such as GLA's will allow for a fuller say for voters.

- The Mayor of Greater Manchester has himself publicly called both for more devolution of powers from Westminster England-wide, and for electoral reform away from FPTP representation.
- The Deeper Devolution Deal brings GMCA closer into alignment with the GLA in questions of powers, responsibilities and priorities – if not in terms of per capita funding – but makes no suggestion for concomitant structural change in relation to representation.
- The GMCA is now in receipt of a single funding settlement.
- GDP per capita across Greater Manchester is approximately half that of Greater London.

Council resolves:

- (1) To request that the council leader will write to the Permanent Secretary for the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, calling for:
  - A government commission to establish the exact makeup of a new Greater Manchester Authority and Greater Manchester Assembly, under instruction to use the London Assembly and its mixed-member electoral system as a guiding model. This would include powers given to the Assembly similar to those of the London Assembly, to scrutinise and challenge the mayor's decisions, and (with a supermajority vote) to amend the mayor's budget or to reject strategic decisions.
  - Legislation for the findings of the commission to be put to a legally binding confirmatory referendum across Greater Manchester, which (if successful) would establish the new authority and assembly, replacing the GMCA and existing devolution settlements.
  - Due to the economic imbalance between the two city regions, the legislation would include requirement for central government to provide sufficient annual funding via an increased single funding settlement, so that the GMA has a comparable per-capita budget to the GLA while keeping council tax precepts at a similar rate to those for the GMCA.

- (2) To request that the council leader will write to leaders of the other nine Greater Manchester councils and to the Mayor of Greater Manchester, asking for them to publicly support this call.

**Proposed by Councillor Johnson, seconded by Councillor Wiest and supported by Councillors Bayunu, Nunney and Leech**

**8. Notice of Motion - Honour of Freedom of the City to Pep Guardiola**

To celebrate Manchester City Football Club winning the historic treble, Manchester City Council has begun the process to offer the honour of Freedom of the City to Pep Guardiola.

Manager Pep Guardiola has now won 14 major trophies since joining the club in 2016 – a collection comprising five Premier League titles, two FA Cups, four League Cups, one Champions League and two Community Shields – and he becomes the first manager to win two European Trebles (Barcelona 2009 and City 2023). It is only the tenth occasion a European side has won a Treble.

Manchester City has been a football club transformed, and fans red and blue alike can see what this has brought to the city of Manchester.

To celebrate the contribution Pep has made to the city, not just through the historic treble but his spirit of leadership, should he be agreeable the Council will call a special meeting of the council.

**Proposed by Councillor Craig, seconded by Councillor Richards and supported by Councillors Green, Karney, Midgley, Rahman and Reeves**

**9. Notice of Motion - People at the Heart, delivering a park for Ancoats and New Islington**

This Council recognises:

- The importance of publicly owned parks which allow kids to play, dogs to run around, and for all residents to be able to enjoy, and recognising the vital importance of public parks in the city centre for our mental and physical health.
- That the City Centre population is expected to shortly hit 100,000 people up from 17,000 in 2011.
- That the pollution across the City Centre is regularly above WHO safe limits. Central parks also help reduce the impacts of urban heat islands by offering shade. Unfortunately the Council has approved decisions that rip up well-used green spaces such as New Islington Green.

Although the development of Mayfield Park is welcomed, this isn't sufficient and isn't a publicly owned park.

In just 6 weeks in January and February 2023 nearly 600 local residents responded to the 'Former Central Retail Park Consultation 2023' in good faith with the legitimate expectation of being listened to.

A Council that is serious about tackling the Climate Emergency, that proudly follows the Our Manchester approach to engaging with the public, and who is led by a local Labour Party promising to put "people at the heart of everything we do" should support building a public park on the largest derelict publicly owned plot of land in the city centre, putting public resources to the best public use.

Although a precise breakdown of respondents has – unusually – not been provided, it is clear from the SRF Update report published on the 21st March 2023 that the overwhelming majority of respondents wanted to either a) include a proper park on this publicly owned land or b) at least significantly increase the size of the green space in the SRF.

The SRF Update report was published late and on Tuesday 21st March just ahead of the Executive Meeting. Until this was published there was no indication that the Council would fail to listen to the consultation feedback about incorporating a proper park as part of the updated plans.

On Wednesday 22<sup>nd</sup> March the Council's Executive agreed to minor amendment of other parts of the SRF - but refused to actually respond to or address concerns of the overwhelming majority of respondents on the need to incorporate a proper park in the plans. Until this decision there was no indication that the Executive would ignore and fail to act on the very clear consultation feedback.

Accordingly the Council Resolves to:

- (1) Act on the clear feedback provided by nearly 600 residents to the Former Central Retail Park SRF and include provision to build the first publicly owned park in the city centre in over a hundred years within the Updated SRF and note that the park should indicatively consist of a contiguous 20% of the available site excluding hard landscaping proposals.
- (2) Request the Leader and relevant Officers to include proposals for the new park in any conversations with interested developers including the Government Development Agency who have reportedly expressed



interest in the site.

- (3) Note that the above proposed motion does not entail any direct costs and has no immediate budgetary implications. As asserted by the Leader, Councillor Craig, any final determination of the scale or scope of the green space will be determined through the planning process. This aims to guide that process to better deliver on the priorities expressed by residents through the formal mechanisms to influence such decisions but which have hitherto been ignored.

**Proposed by Councillor Good, seconded by Councillor Northwood and supported by Councillors Bayunu, Johnson, Kilpatrick, Leech and Wiest**

**10. Notice of Motion - Fair Tax Declaration**

Under this Conservative Government tax avoidance has increased, meaning less tax raised to help our vital public services rebuild out of the pandemic and the subsequent global energy crisis. Shadow Chancellor, Rachel Reeves MP, estimates that this gifts the biggest multinationals £131m per week that could be spent on the NHS. The demand on organisations to pay the right amount of tax in the right place at the right time has never been greater. Last year, data from the Institute for Business Ethics saw 'corporate tax avoidance' topping the UK public's list of concerns around business conduct for a tenth successive year. Pursuing better tax conduct benefits everyone by strengthening public services. It is a common-sense agenda since tax receipts help fund vital public services like education, health and social care and policing, making our society fairer, safer and more resilient. We can't build back better, let alone face the challenges of the future, without a properly funded public sector.

Manchester's Labour Council has led the way through its progressive Ethical Procurement Policy for many years, becoming national best practice for how to do business to maximise social value. The Council became an accredited Living Wage Employer in 2019. It already endorses several causes/initiatives within the Ethical Procurement Policy including the Care Leavers Covenant, the Armed Forces Covenant and the Fair Payments through the supply chain.

The Council has also signed up to various employment charters including the Unison Living Wage for Social Care, the Unite the Union Construction Charter, and the Co-op's calls to end modern slavery. We have been in discussions with the Fair Tax Foundation and this motion confirms our support of the Councils for Fair Tax Declaration.

The Council resolves to:

- (1) lead by example and demonstrating good practice in our tax conduct, right across our activities;
- (2) ensure contractors implement IR35 robustly and pay a fair share of employment taxes;
- (3) avoid offshore vehicles for the purchase of land and property, especially where this leads to reduced payments of stamp duty;
- (4) undertake due diligence to ensure that not-for-profit structures are not being used inappropriately as an artificial device to reduce the payment of tax and business rates;
- (5) demand clarity on the ultimate beneficial ownership of suppliers and their consolidated profit and loss position;
- (6) promote the Fair Tax Mark certification for any business in which we have a significant stake and where corporation tax is due;
- (7) ask the Leader of the Council to work with the LGA to lobby government to amend the legislation to allow council's the ability to either penalise poor tax conduct or reward good tax conduct;
- (8) call on the government to close the loopholes on tax avoidance.

By adopting these, Manchester plans to continue to lead by example

**Proposed by Councillor Wills, seconded by Councillor Hilal and supported by Councillors Butt, Noor and Ogunbambo**

**11. Proceedings of the Executive**

27 - 34

To submit the minutes of the Executive on 31 May 2023 and 28 June 2023 (to follow) and in particular to consider:-

**Exe/23/52 Capital Programme Update**

The Executive:-

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

- Public Sector Housing – Social Housing Decarbonisation Boiler Replacement. A capital budget increase of £14.095m, funded by HRA Reserve.
- Public Sector Housing – Operational Housing Programme 2023-24. A capital budget increase of £16.769m, funded by

HRA Reserve.

**Exe/23/56 Capital Outturn 2022/23 and Capital Programme Update**

The Executive:-

- (1) Recommend that the Council approve the virements over £0.5m between capital schemes to maximise use of funding resources available to the City Council as set out in Appendix C.
- (2) Recommend that the Council approve the following changes to the Council's capital programme:-
  - ICT - Council Chamber AV Equipment. A capital budget increase of £0.520m, funded by borrowing.
  - Contingency – Inflation. An increase to the inflation contingency by £22.4m, funded by borrowing.

**12. 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.

**13. Scrutiny Committees**

35 - 118

To note the minutes of the following committees:

- Economy & Regeneration – 23 May and 20 June 2023
- Communities & Equalities – 23 May and 20 June 2023
- Children & Young People – 24 May and 21 June 2023
- Health – 24 May and 21 June 2023
- Resources & Governance – 25 May and 22 June 2023
- Environment, Climate Change & Neighbourhoods – 25 May and 22 June 2023

**14. Proceedings of Committees**

119 - 160

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

- Personnel Committee – 31 May 2023 and in particular, to consider:

**PE/23/6 Creation of a new post - Director of Communities**

The Committee recommends to Council the creation of new post, Director of Communities grade SS4 Grade (£101,996

to £112,411).

- Planning and Highways Committee – 13 April and 1 June 2023
- Health and Wellbeing Board – 7 June 2023
- Audit Committee – 13 June 2023
- Standards Committee – 15 June 2023 and in particular, to consider

**ST/23/13 Review of the Operation and Efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol**

The Committee recommends that full Council adopts a revised Code of Conduct for Members.

**ST/23/14 Review of the Operation and Efficacy of the Use of Resources Guidance for Members**

The Committee Recommends to full Council the adoption of the revised guidance

- Constitutional and Nomination Committee – 12 July 2023 (to be tabled)

**15. Key Decisions Report**

The report of the City Solicitor is enclosed.

161 - 164

---

Yours faithfully,



**Joanne Roney OBE**  
**Chief Executive**

## Information about the Council

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

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

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

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

## Members of the Council

---

### Councillors:-

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, Brickell, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Chohan, Collins, Connolly, Cooley, Craig, Curley, Davies, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Flanagan, Fletcher, Foley, Gartside, Good, Green, Grimshaw, Hacking, Hassan, Hewitson, Hilal, Hitchen, Holt, Hughes, Hussain, Igbon, Ilyas, Iqbal, Johns, Johnson, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, J Lovecy, Lynch, Lyons, McCaul, McHale, Midgley, Moran, Muse, Noor, Northwood, Nunney, Ogunbambo, H Priest, Rahman, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reeves, Reid, Riasat, Richards, I Robinson, T Robinson, Rowles, Sadler, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, Simcock, Stogia, Taylor, Wheeler, Wiest, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

### Honorary Aldermen of the City of Manchester –

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

## Further Information

---

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

Andrew Woods

Tel: 0161 234 3011

Email: [andrew.woods@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:andrew.woods@manchester.gov.uk)

This agenda was issued on **Tuesday, 4 July 2023** by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Manchester City Council, Level 2, Town Hall Extension (Library Walk Elevation), Manchester M60 2LA

This page is intentionally left blank

## **Council**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 17 May 2023**

#### **Present:**

The Right Worshipful, the Lord Mayor Councillor Ludford – in the Chair

#### **Councillors:**

Y Dar, Abdullatif, Akbar, Azra Ali, Ahmed Ali, Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Amin, Andrews, Bano, Bayunu, Bell, Benham, Brickell, Bridges, Butt, Chohan, Collins, Connolly, Cooley, Craig, Curley, Davies, Douglas, Evans, Flanagan, Fletcher, Foley, Gartside, Good, Green, Grimshaw, Hacking, Hassan, Hewitson, Hilal, Hitchen, Holt, Hughes, Hussain, Igbon, Ilyas, Iqbal, Johns, Johnson, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, J Lovecy, Lynch, Lyons, McCaul, McHale, Midgley, Moran, Muse, Noor, Northwood, Nunney, Ogunbambo, H Priest, Rahman, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reeves, Reid, Riasat, Richards, I Robinson, T Robinson, Sadler, M Sharif Mahamed, Shilton Godwin, Simcock, Taylor, Wiest, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

#### **CC/23/34 Welcome to new Councillors**

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

#### **CC/23/35 Election of the Lord Mayor of Manchester**

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

Councillor Dar 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 Yasmine Dar took the Oath of Allegiance and was invested with the badge of office.

The Lord Mayor then observed the investiture of the Lady Mayoress, Amina Dar and Lord Mayor's Consort, Majid Dar

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

#### **CC/23/36 Chair**

The Right Worshipful, the Lord Mayor, Councillor Yasmine Dar (In the Chair).

**CC/23/37    Vote of Thanks**

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 Mayor's Consort, Sean McHale, with his commemorative badge.

Councillor Ludford then addressed the Council.

**Decision**

To extend the sincere thanks of the Council to Councillor Donna Ludford, the retiring Lord Mayor, for her valuable services to Manchester during her term of office, and to Sean McHale, the retiring Lord Mayor's Consort, for the work he had undertaken to support the retiring Lord Mayor.

**CC/23/38    Lord Mayoral Address**

The Lord Mayor gave her mayoral speech to the Council.

**CC/23/39    Appointment of the Deputy Lord Mayor**

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

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

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

**CC/23/40    Minutes****Decision**

The Minutes of the Council meeting on 29 March 2023 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Lord Mayor.

**CC/23/41    Seniority of Councillors**

The Council noted the revised list of seniority of councillors following the election held in May 2023.

The seniority of the members of the Council as of 17 May 2023 is appended to these minutes.



**CC/23/42 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/23/43 Scrutiny Committee remits**

The Council considered a report that proposed changes to the remit of scrutiny committees and the change in name of two committees.

**Decisions**

The Council;

- (1) Agree and adopt the proposed changes to the remits of the Council's Scrutiny Committees as set out in Appendix 2 of the report with immediate effect.
- (2) Agree the renaming of the Economy Scrutiny Committee to the Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee and the Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee to Environment, Climate Change and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Committee.
- (3) Authorise the City Solicitor to make any amendments to the Council's Constitution that are consequential to the changes to the remits of the Council's Scrutiny Committees and the renaming of the Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee and the Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee.

**CC/23/44 Appointment of Council Committees and Chairs****Decision**

The Council approved the recommendations made by the Constitutional and Nomination Committee on 17 May 2023 regarding the appointment of chairs and membership of the Council's committees for the 2023/24 municipal year (see below).

**CC/23/45 Appointments to the Combined Authority, Joint Authorities and Joint Committees**

**Decision**

The Council approved the recommendations made by the Constitutional and Nomination Committee on 17 May 2023 regarding Council's appointments to the Combined Authority, joint authorities and joint committees for the 2023/24 municipal year (see below).

**CC/23/46 Dates of Council meetings**

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

**Decisions**

The Council

- (1) Agrees the following dates of ordinary meetings of the Council in 2022/2023

Wednesday 12 July 2023	Wednesday 4 October 2023
Wednesday 29 November 2023	Wednesday 31 January 2024
Friday 1 March 2024 (Budget)	Wednesday 27 March 2024

- (2) To agree that the Annual Meeting of the Council 2023 will be on 15 May 2024.

**Seniority of Councillors (as at 17 May 2023)****Seniority by Office****The Right Worshipful, The Lord Mayor****The Deputy Lord Mayor****The Leader of the Council****The Leader of the Opposition****Seniority by length of service:**

Patrick Karney	Donna Ludford	Shazia Butt
Basil Curley	Azra Ali	Jade Mary Doswell
Glynn Evans	Sandra Collins	Amna Saad Omar
Susan Cooley	Yasmin Dar	Abdullatif
Paul Andrews	John Hacking	Becky Chambers
Joanne Green	James Wilson	Richard Kilpatrick**
John Flanagan	Mandie Shilton Godwin	Julie Connolly
Tom Judge	Emily Rowles	Debbie Hilal
June Hitchen	Dzidra Noor	Rob Nunney
Abid Chohan	Basat Sheikh	Thomas Robinson
Naeem Ul-Hassan	Paula Appleby	Ekua Bayunu
John Leech	Dave Rawson	Muqqadash Bano
Andrew Simcock	Garry Bridges	Julia Baker Smith
Veronica Kirkpatrick	Lee-Ann Igbon	Zahid Hussain
Luthfur Rahman	Paula Sadler	Linda Foley
Suzannah Reeves	Emma Taylor	Matthew Benham
Rabnawaz Akbar	Mahadi Mahamed	Alan Good
Suzanne Richards	Hannah Priest	Jawad Amin Mohammed
Julie Reid	Zahra Alijah	Angela Gartside
Tracey Rawlins	Chris Wills	Astrid Johnson
Aftab Razaq	Jill Lovecy	Irene Robinson
Bev Craig	Ali Ilyas	Erinma Bell
John Hughes	Annette Wright	Murtaza Iqbal
Carmine Grimshaw	Sam Lynch	Angela Moran
Shelley Lanchbury	Sean McHale	Olusegen Ogunbambo
Joan Davies	Eve Holt	Anastasia Wiest*
Nasrin Ali	Sam Wheeler	Phil Brickell*
Ahmed Ali	Adele Douglas	Anthony McCaul*
Angeliki Stogia	Gavin White	Richard Fletcher*
Shaukat Ali	Fias Riasat	Abdigafar Mohamed
Joanna Midgley	Jon-Connor Lyons	Muse*
Afia Kamal	Marcus Johns	Chris Joanne
Tina Hewitson	Tim Whiston	Northwood*

## Appointment of Chairs of Committee and Committee Membership

### Executive Standing Consultative Panel

#### *Councillors -*

Ahmed Ali	Butt	Chambers	Douglas	Foley
Johnson	Leech	Moran	Lynch	

### Chairs and Deputies

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

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Chair</b>	<b>Deputy Chair</b>
Audit	Councillor Lanchbury	
Planning & Highways	Councillor Lyons	
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 -*

Reid (Chair)	N. Ali	Alijah	Amin	Bell
Cooley	Fletcher	Gartside	Hewitson	Judge
Lovecy	Ludford	McHale	Nunney	Sadler

#### *Co-opted Members*

- Representative of the Diocese of Manchester – Canon Susie Mapledoram \*
- Representative of the Diocese of Salford – Julie Miles\*
- Parent governor representative – Yacob Yonis\* (term ends 02/02/2025)
- Parent governor representative – Gary Cleworth\* (term ends 02/02/2024)
- Parent governor representative – Katie McDaid\* (term ends 30/11/2023)
- Secondary sector teacher representative – Saba Iltaf (term ends 30/11/2023)
- Primary sector teacher representative – Laura Smith\* (term ends 30/11/2023)

\* denotes members with voting rights on education matters

**Communities and Equalities** (at least 10 members)*Councillors -*

Hitchen (Chair)	Azra Ali	Appleby	Good	Ogunbambo
Priest	Rawson	Sheikh	Whiston	Wills

**Environment, Climate Change and Neighbourhoods** (at least 10 members)*Councillors -*

Shilton Godwin (Chair)	Chohan	Collins	Doswell	Holt
Ilyas	McCaul	Razaq	Wiest	Wright

**Economy and Regeneration** (at least 10 members)*Councillors -*

Johns (Chair)	Baker-Smith	Bano	Benham	Hussain
Iqbal	Northwood	Richards	I Robinson	Sharif Mahamed
Taylor				

**Health** (at least 10 members)*Councillors -*

Green (Chair)	Bayunu	Curley	Hilal	Karney
Muse	Reeves	Riasat	Stogia	Wilson

**Resources and Governance** (at least 10 members)*Councillors -*

Simcock (Chair)	Abdullatif	Andrews	Brickell	Connolly
Davies	Evans	Kilpatrick	Kirkpatrick	Lanchbury
Rowles	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. (14 elected members)

*Councillors -*

Rahman (Chair)	Akbar	Bridges	Craig	Hacking
Igbon	Johnson	Midgley	Rawlins	T Robinson
White				

**Audit Committee** (up to 11 members plus 2 independent co-opted)*Councillors -*

Lanchbury (Chair)	Curley	Kilpatrick	Noor	Simcock
Stogia	Wheeler	Dr D Barker (Co-opted member)	Mr S Downs (Co-opted member)	

**Planning and Highways Committee** (up to 15 members)

*Councillors -*

Lyons (Chair)	Shaukat Ali	Andrews	Chohan	Curley
Davies	Gartside	Hassan	Hewitson	Hughes
Johnson	Kamal	Lovecy	Ludford	Riasat

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

*Councillors -*

Grimshaw (Chair)	Connolly	Abdullatif	Andrews	Davies
Evans	Flanagan	Hewitson	Hilal	Hughes
Judge	Muse	Reid	Riasat	

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

*Councillors –*

Grimshaw (Chair)	Connolly	Abdullatif	Andrews	Davies
Evans	Flanagan	Hewitson	Hilal	Hughes
Judge	Muse	Reid	Riasat	

**Licensing Policy Committee** (up to 6 members)

*Councillors -*

Grimshaw (Chair)	Davies	Evans	Flanagan	Leech	Rawlins (Executive Member Environment and Transport)
---------------------	--------	-------	----------	-------	--

**Standards Committee** (6 members of the Council, 1 Ringway Parish Councillor and 1 Independent member and 1 independent person)

*Councillors -*

Andrews	Connolly	Evans	Good	Lanchbury
Simcock				
Nicole Jackson (Co-opted Independent Chair)	Parish Councillor Christopher O'Donovan	Geoff Linell (Co-opted Independent) <i>Appointed</i>	Sarah Beswick (Co-opted Independent)	

<i>Appointed from 18 November 2022 for 4 Years</i>	(Ringway PC)	<i>from 18 November 2022 for 4 Years</i>	person)	
--	--------------	--	---------	--

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, the Deputy Executive Member for Resources and Finance.

*Councillors -*

Akbar (Chair)	Bridges	Craig	Hacking	Igbon
Midgely	Leech	Moran	Rahman	Rawlins
T Robinson	White			

**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 Deputy Executive Member.

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

- Councillor Ahmed Ali
- Councillor Nasrin Ali
- Councillor Douglas
- Councillor Foley
- Councillor Lynch
- Councillor Reid
- Councillor Shilton Godwin
- Councillor Wheeler

**Constitutional and Nomination Committee** (10 members)

*Councillors -*

Karney (Chair)	Craig	Curley	Flanagan	Green
Leech	Midgely	Rahman	Reeves	Richards

**Health and Wellbeing Board**

Manchester City Council	Leader of the Council
Manchester City Council	Executive Member for Healthy Manchester

	and Adult Social Care (Chair)
Manchester City Council	Executive Member for Children and Schools Services
Manchester City Council	Deputy Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care
Manchester City Council	Director of Public Health
Manchester City Council	Director of Adult Social Care
Manchester City Council	Director of Children's Services
Manchester NHS Foundation Trust	Chair
Greater Manchester NHS Mental Health Trust	Chair
Manchester Local Care Organisation	Chief Executive
NHS Greater Manchester Integrated Care	Place Lead/Deputy Place Based Lead
Manchester Healthwatch	Chair
Manchester VCSE	Chief Executive, Manchester Alliance Community Care
Manchester GP Board	Three representatives covering North, Central and South Manchester

- Councillor Craig (Leader of the Council)
- Councillor T Robinson (Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care) (MCC) (Chair)
- Councillor Bridges (Executive Member for Children and Schools Services) (MCC)
- Councillor Chambers (Deputy Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care) (MCC)
- David Regan, Director of Public Health
- Paul Marshall, Strategic Director of Children's Services
- Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services
- Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust
- Bill McCarthy, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust
- Katy Calvin-Thomas - Manchester Local Care Organisation
- Tom Hinchcliffe, Deputy Place Based Lead
- Amanda Smith, Chair, Healthwatch
- Mike Wild, Voluntary and Community Sector representative
- Dr Murugesan Raja Manchester GP Board
- Dr Geeta Wadhwa Manchester GP Board
- Dr Doug Jeffrey, Manchester GP Board
- Dr Shabbir Ahmad Manchester GP Board (substitute member)
- Dr Denis Colligan, Manchester GP Board (substitute member).



**Appointments to the Combined Authority, Joint Authorities, Joint Committees and Boards****Greater Manchester Combined Authority**

Councillors Craig and Councillor Midgley (substitute)

**Greater Manchester Waste and Recycling Committee**

Councillors Igbon and Shaukat Ali (substitute)

**GMCA Audit Committee**

Councillor Lanchbury

**Greater Manchester Transport Committee**

Councillor Rawlins

**GM Culture and Social Impact Fund Committee**

Councillor Whiston

**Integrated Care Partnership**

Councillors Craig and T Robinson (substitute)

**Clean Air Charging Authorities Committee**

Councillors Tracey Rawlins and Foley (substitute)

**Air Quality Administration Committee**

Councillors Tracey Rawlins and Foley (substitute)

**Greater Manchester Clean Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Shilton Godwin

**GM Homelessness Programme Board**

Councillor Midgley

**Green City Region Board**

Councillor Rawlins

**AGMA Executive Board**

Councillors Craig and Midgley (substitute)

**Draft Joint Development Plan – Places for Everyone Committee**

Councillor Rawlins

**AGMA Statutory Functions Committee**

Councillors Whiston and Flanagan (substitute)

**GM Police, Crime & Fire Steering Group**

Councillor Rahman

**GM Police, Crime and Fire Panel**

Councillor Rahman

**GM Health Scrutiny Committee**

Councillor Hussain

**Planning and Housing Commission**

Councillor White

**GM Pensions Fund Management Panel**

Councillor Moran

**People History Museum**

Councillor Douglas

**Manchester Airport Consultative Committee**

Councillors Judge and Taylor

**Manchester Port Health Authority**

Councillors Evans, Lanchbury, Andrews and Bayunu

**North West Employers**

Councillor Hacking

**Schools Forum**

Councillor Reid

**Appointment of Lead Members**

<b>LGBT Men's Lead</b>	Councillor Wills
<b>LGBT Women's Lead</b>	Councillor Baker-Smith
<b>Intergenerational Issues</b>	Councillor Iqbal
<b>Race</b>	Councillor Hussain
<b>City Centre</b>	Councillor Karney
<b>Disability</b>	Councillor Flanagan
<b>Age Friendly Manchester</b>	Councillor Davies
<b>Women</b>	Councillor Chambers
<b>Active Travel</b>	Councillor Shilton Godwin
<b>Mental Health Champion</b>	Councillor Douglas
<b>Carers Champion</b>	Councillor Collins
<b>Race Women</b>	Councillor Igbon
<b>Trauma Informed</b>	Councillor Doswell

## **Executive**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 31 May 2023**

**Present:** Councillor Craig (Chair)

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

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

**Councillors:** Ahmed Ali, Butt, Chambers, Foley, Leech, Lynch and Moran

**Apologies:** Councillors Douglas and Johnson

**Also present:** Councillor Wright (Hulme Ward Councillor)

#### **Exe/23/47 Minutes**

##### **Decision**

The Executive approved as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 22 March 2023.

#### **Exe/23/48 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/23/49 Corporate Priorities 2023/24**

The Executive considered a report of the Leader of the Council, which set out the Council's Corporate Plan priorities for 2023/24, how these aligned with the Our Manchester Strategy and in particular the commitments made in "A Fairer, Greener Future: People at the heart of everything we do", Manchester Labour's 2023 election manifesto.

The report explained that "A Fairer, Greener Future: People at the heart of everything we do" contained five core pledges, which alongside the Councils Corporate Plan priorities and approved budget for 2023/24, would determine the priorities for the Executive as a whole and for each individual Executive Member.

In relation to Corporate Priority 3 (Young People), Councillor Leech sought clarification as to what proportion of children attended a school which was deemed not be graded "good" or better by Ofsted and noted the challenges schools faced in

maintaining “good” or better ratings from Ofsted. He also enquired what measures would the Council be taking to ensure housing developers undertook appropriate viability assessments for the delivery of affordable housing in new developments, in relation to Corporate Priority 5 (Housing)

## **Decisions**

The Executive:-

- (1) Note the key elements that will inform its priorities for the current municipal year.
- (2) Adopt the commitments made in the Manchester Labour 2023 manifesto as priorities for the Executive.

### **Exe/23/50 Our Manchester Progress update**

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

The Executive Member for Growth and Development reported that two planning applications had been submitted for the city’s emerging Red Bank neighbourhood, part of the wider Victoria North scheme. The plans, submitted by developer Far East Consortium as part of the Victoria North joint venture partnership with the Council, represented one of the largest residential schemes to be brought forward in Manchester in recent years and set out the ambition to transform more than 30 acres of largely brownfield land into a vibrant neighbourhood of 4,800 homes alongside commercial and social facilities to support the local community.

As well as this, a planning application had been submitted to create affordable ‘Later Living’ homes on the site of the former Chorlton Leisure Centre. The new development would provide 50 apartments (a mix of one bed and two bed) for the over 55’s. Seven of the apartments would be for sale by shared ownership, three would be neighbourhood apartments providing step up accommodation, with the remaining 40 capped at the Manchester Living Rent. Lettings would be prioritized to over 55’s with a housing priority need, including those wishing to right-size and free up a social rented family home in the local area for families on the housing waiting list.

The Executive Member for Growth and Development also reported that the Council had secured £21m in funding for retrofitting schemes to make existing homes more energy efficient. The Department for Energy Security and Net Zero (DESNZ) had awarded £11m through the Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund (SHDF) to support the retrofitting of the Council’s housing stock, sourced through a combined bid made by Greater Manchester Combined Authority. In addition to this, the Council had successfully bid to DESNZ for another £10m in funding through its Home Upgrade Grant 2 (HUG2). The Council was developing the details and would set out in the coming months the locations and properties which would be targeted and included, in line with eligibility criteria for the funding.

The Executive Member for Growth and Development reported that a further 700 private sector homes now required a landlord licence following the expansion of the city's Selective Licensing regime to five new schemes across four neighbourhoods. All residents in properties that now required a licence would receive a letter explaining that licensing was now in operation and that their landlord would be required to apply. Landlords would be contacted by the Council and were encouraged to apply for a licence at the earliest opportunity with an early bird discount being offered to all applications through until 8 August 2023.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport reported that as part of the ongoing Manchester to Chorlton Cycleway project, the Council had been working to create a continuous link from the city centre to Chorlton. Over recent months a new CYCLOPS junction had been built, providing a way for cyclists, pedestrians and vehicles to safely travel through the junction whilst remaining segregated from one another. This was intended to both smooth journey times through the junction, but also to improve people's safety during their travels. As part of this project, some changes had been made to the existing road layout, with Shrewsbury Street being closed at Upper Chorlton Street, as well as a ban on motor traffic turning left from Chorlton Road into Moss Lane West.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure reported that Manchester had been put forward as one of eight host cities in a bid to bring the EURO 2028 football tournament to the UK and Ireland. If successful, the bid would see the Etihad Stadium host matches in the competition along with nine other stadiums in London, Cardiff, Liverpool, Newcastle, Birmingham, Glasgow and Belfast. In addition, the city was already confirmed as one of only four cities in the world to host the group stages of The Davis Cup. Hosting the matches in Manchester was part of the Lawn Tennis Association's strategic vision to broaden access to the sport and complements the city's range of high quality tennis facilities.

Councillor Leech sought clarification as to what percentage of the Redbank development within Victoria North scheme would be affordable housing and he also sought clarification as to how the Council assessed the success of CYCLOPS junctions.

The Executive Member for Growth and Development confirmed that at least 20% of the Redbank development would be affordable housing. The Executive Member for Environment and Transport stated that monitoring of the impact of CYCLOPS junction would take place over the next few months which would help determine its success.

## **Decision**

The Executive note the report.

## **Exe/23/51 Global Revenue Outturn 2022/23**

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 2022/23. It

also highlighted the movements from the previous forecast for the year, which was reported to the Executive in February 2023, based on the position as at the end of December 2022.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources reported that the final outturn position was an overspend of £4.5m for the year. The main drivers of the overspend were the higher than budgeted for pay award, pressures on Children's safeguarding services, Home to School Transport demand and price pressures, and lower than budgeted for parking income, driven by changes to commuter behaviour post-pandemic. An overachievement of investment income and underspends across the Corporate Core partly offset these pressures.

Since the last reported position to Executive in February 2023, based on information to the end of December, the overspend had increased by c£1m. This increase was largely made up of emerging pressures in both Adults and Children's services which are set out in this report, offset by improvements in other Directorates.

Whilst it had been possible to set a balance budget for 2023/24, the financial position beyond this would be challenging with significant budget shortfalls after the application of smoothing reserves and alongside uncertainty about the future funding settlement. The scale of the gap was set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy report to Executive February 2023.

It was proposed that in order to maintain the General Fund reserve at the recommended level of around £25m a transfer of £2.723 from Smoothing reserves was made. This would result in a closing 2022/23 General Fund reserve balance of £25.850m and a balance of £48.731m on the Smoothing reserve.

Councillor Leech sought clarification as to whether the overspend in Adult Services was as a result from providers not expecting to have to pay the fee uplift and real living wage. He also sought clarification as to how the shortfall in parking income would impact on projections for this year.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer commented that it was anticipated all providers would sign up to providing the real living wage and would check on the number that had not yet signed up to it. In relation to parking income, this would be monitored carefully to see if there would be any impact in this financial year.

## Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Note the outturn position of £4.5m overspend.
- (2) Approve the proposed budget increases following grant notifications as set out in the report
- (3) Approve the carry forward request totalling £674k
- (4) Approve the use of reserve funding as set out in the report.

## Exe/23/52 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.

The proposals which required Council approval were those which were funded by the use of reserves above a cumulative total of £10 million, where the use of borrowing was required or a virement exceeded £1m. These included the following proposed changes:-

- Public Sector Housing – Social Housing Decarbonisation Boiler Replacement. A capital budget increase of £2.550m in 2023/24 and £11.545m in 2024/25 was requested, funded by HRA Reserve, to enable the Council to move from gas to renewable forms of heating for properties which would come up for replacement within the next two years as well as bring forward other properties.
- Public Sector Housing – Operational Housing Programme 2023-24. A capital budget increase of £8.646m in 2023/24, £7.155m in 2024/25 and £0.968m in 2025/26 was requested, funded by HRA Reserve, for the continuation of essential health and safety work, security improvements and environmental improvements across the Council's Housing estate.

The proposals which 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:-

- Private Sector housing – Home Upgrade Grant (HUG) 2. A capital budget increase of £4m in 2023/24 and £6m in 2024/25 was requested, funded by Government Grant, to provide energy efficiency and clean heating upgrades to improve energy performance for owner occupied and private rented sector off gas grid (no have mains gas for heating) and low energy performance (EPC D-G) properties occupied by fuel poor households.
- Growth and Development - Back of Ancoats Mobility Hub (AMH) & Public Realm. A capital budget increase of up to £2.3m in 2023/24 was requested, funded by Capital Receipts, to provide the essential changes required to the Ancoats Mobility Hub to ensure the full scheme could be delivered, without impacting on the delivery of the wider public realm project.

The report highlighted that there had been increases to the programme totalling £2.325m as a result of delegated approvals since the previous report to the Executive on 22 March 2023.

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

- £0.057m to be allocated from Highways Patching budgets for additional repaving works outside Sinclair's Oyster Bar, adjacent to Exchange Square, following the re-paving of the main square of Exchange Square in 2022.
- £0.121m allocation from the Parks Development Programme for city wide tennis improvements
- £0.108m allocation from the Parks Development Programme for the Wythenshawe Cycling Hub to improve the visitor experience, visitor safety, encourage a longer dwell time, and improve access to park facilities

If the recommendations in the report were approved the General Fund capital budget would increase by £43.164 m across financial years which would also result in an increase in the prudential indicator for Capital Expenditure in corresponding years.

## Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Recommend that the Council approve the following changes to Manchester City Council's capital programme:
  - Public Sector Housing – Social Housing Decarbonisation Boiler Replacement. A capital budget increase of £14.095m, funded by HRA Reserve.
  - Public Sector Housing – Operational Housing Programme 2023-24. A capital budget increase of £16.769m, funded by HRA Reserve.
- (2) Under powers delegated to the Executive, approve the following changes to the Council's capital programme:
  - Private Sector Housing – Home Upgrade Grant (HUG) 2. A capital budget increase of £10.0m, funded by Government Grant.
  - Growth and Development - Back of Ancoats Mobility Hub & Public Realm. A capital budget increase of up to £2.3m, funded by Capital Receipts.
- (3) Note the increases to the programme of £2.325m as a result of delegated approvals.
- (4) Note the virements in the programme of £0.286m as a result of virements from approved budgets

## Exe/23/53 Purpose Built Student Accommodation

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided an update on the provision of Purpose-Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) in Manchester and issues that had arisen since the last



report in December 2020. It also recommended that the Executive agreed to the establishment of a pipeline of schemes as set out in the report in order to address a projected shortfall of accommodation up to 2030.

The Executive Member for Growth and Development advised that providing a residential offer for students to address needs had been a long-held Council objective as part of its Housing Strategy and planning policy framework. It had been broadly recognized and accepted that there was a shortage of PBSA in Manchester. This was brought clearly into focus at the beginning of this academic year when some Manchester students could not be housed in PBSA in the City. This was in part a result of the Universities closing some sub-standard accommodation but also because sufficient new accommodation had not been delivered in appropriate locations.

Projections estimated that demand for new PBSA could be between 5440 bedspaces (representing a 1% growth per annum) and 11320 (representing 2% growth per annum) up to 2030. Whilst actual demand would depend on a number of factors, it was considered that around 750 new bed spaces were required per annum up to 2030.

20 sites had been identified which could potentially support around 12,500 PBSA bedspaces. Their suitability, availability and deliverability had been assessed to establish whether they were capable of meeting bedspace requirements, in line with identified and projected need. In order to establish a pipeline, each site had been categorised via a traffic light system. Sites that had planning permission were categorised as green. Sites that were amber required further action before they could be established as a fully defensible part of the pipeline, but there was a realistic prospect of delivery.. All sites identified as amber or green were considered to form part of the City Council's pipeline of potential PBSA sites.

Councillor Wright (Hulme Ward Councillor) addressed the meeting, raising concerns around the inclusion of particular sites within the report which could then be used to justify planning applications opposed by the local community and ward councillors. In addition she commented that there should be no reference to any site that would have a detrimental impact on the repeated request to have the Aquarius area being designated as a residential part of Hulme in the new Local Plan. Her largest concern was the proposed inclusion of the Gamecock Pub as a potential site, given this was a live planning application to which there had been repeated opposition by the local community. As such she requested the Executive removed the Gamecock Pub as a potential site for PBSA from the list.

The Executive Member for Growth and Development and the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) both reiterated that the list of schemes within the report were not an exhaustive list, and some may not be brought forward. The purpose of the report was to demonstrate that there was sufficient opportunity, and there was no obvious need to significantly depart from Policy H12 which had largely been effective in managing the supply of PBSA. It was noted that other schemes may also be progressed that were not on the list but nevertheless complied with policy H12.

The report had also been considered by the Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 23 May 2023, with the Committee endorsing the recommendations asked of the Executive subject to the amendment of recommendation (2) to read *“Consider the list of schemes set out in the report as the pipeline that will deliver the required amount of PBSA up to 2030, pending consultation with ward members”*.

## **Decisions**

The Executive

- (1) Note the changes that have taken place regarding the provision of Purpose-Built Student Accommodation since December 2022.
- (2) Endorse the list of schemes set out in the report as the pipeline that will deliver the required amount of PBSA up to 2030 pending consultation with ward members.
- (3) Endorse the approach set out in the report to help guide the decision-making process in advance of the review of the Local Plan and request the Planning and Highways Committee take this approach into account as a material consideration until the Local Plan has been reviewed.

## **Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of meeting held on Tuesday, 23 May 2023**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Johns (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors Baker Smith, Benham, Hussain, Iqbal, Northwood, I Robinson and Taylor

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Craig, Leader of the Council

Councillor Hacking, Executive Member for Skills, Employment and Leisure

Councillor Igbon, Executive Member for Vibrant Neighbourhoods

Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Development

Councillor Abdullatif

**Apologies:** Councillor Richards

#### **ERSC/23/20 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

That the minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 9 March 2023 be approved as a correct record.

#### **ERSC/23/21 Purpose-Built Student Accommodation**

The committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) which provided an update on the provision of Purpose-Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) in Manchester and issues that had arisen since the last report in December 2020.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- An introduction and background to student accommodation;
- The key considerations against which a proposal for new PBSA are tested;
- Recent changes, including acknowledgment that there is a shortage of PBSA in Manchester;
- Details of twenty sites which had been identified and assessed by Deloitte LLP, in consultation with officers, to determine whether there is the potential to meet anticipated demand for PBSA in line with Policy H12, including an assessment of the number of beds these sites could accommodate; and
- The deliverability criteria against which these sites had been assessed.

Key points and queries that arose from the committee's discussions included:

- How the Council's approach to PBSA would consider oversaturation in nearby communities;
- Consultation on the proposed schemes;
- The demand for PBSA amongst second- and third-year students;
- How the Council ensured that sufficient infrastructure and amenities, such as GPs and dentists, are in place where PBSA was built;
- The appropriateness of Policy H12, citing a recent Planning Inspector decision to allow a PBSA appeal at Deansgate South;
- Noting increases in the number of students continuing to live at home whilst studying; and
- Expressing concerns with the affordability of PBSA.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development introduced the item and explained that the Council wanted to ensure an appropriate plan for good-quality student accommodation in suitable locations for students and other communities in Manchester. He acknowledged a challenge in capacity and informed the committee that discussions had been held with universities to bring forward developments within the university estate to help meet demand. He also explained that a shortfall in PBSA impacted the wider housing market as students moved to private rental properties which led to increased rents, higher demand and less availability, particularly for family homes.

The committee was also advised that a site at Whitworth Park was incorrectly listed in the report as being in Hulme ward. This would be amended to state that it was in Ardwick. The Chair also highlighted that Cambridge St Circus was incorrectly listed as being in the Piccadilly and Hulme wards and that this should be Deansgate and Hulme.

Councillors Igbon and Abdullatif addressed the committee in their capacities as ward members for Hulme and Ardwick. Councillor Igbon explained that Manchester embraced the contributions of universities and students to the city but stated that the report did not highlight existing PBSA in Hulme. She stated that PBSA should not consume existing communities and requested that the Committee recommend to the Executive the removal of the Gamecock Pub and McDougall Site from the list of sites for potential PBSA.

Councillor Abdullatif echoed Councillor Igbon's sentiments and reiterated the impact of PBSA on communities in Hulme and Ardwick, particularly in densely populated areas. She expressed concerns that there had been no consultation with residents on the number of bedspaces at proposed sites and challenged the need for PBSA to be located near to university buildings given the extensive public transport network in Manchester. She requested that the committee did not endorse the list of schemes to the Executive.

In response to a query by the Chair regarding oversaturation in communities as a result of PBSA, the Executive Member for Housing and Development explained that

there was a need to increase the capacity of student accommodation in the city but that it was important to be mindful of existing communities.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development explained that the sites listed were at varying stages within the planning process, with some built and occupied already. He acknowledged concerns over a lack of consultation with residents and members but stated that consultation would be undertaken at an appropriate point in the planning process.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) stated that the report was the result of a desktop exercise to test the appropriateness of policy H12 and to demonstrate the abilities within specific areas of the city to meet a pipeline of demand for PBSA. She emphasised that the sites listed would be subject to due process and would be individually assessed on their merits, including supporting infrastructure.

In response to a query around the appropriateness of policy H12, the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) stated that the Council believed there was sufficient capacity to meet future demand for student accommodation, countering the recent findings and recommendations of the Planning Inspector. The Assistant Director of Planning also explained that the list of sites was not definitive or exhaustive but sought to demonstrate that there were a number of sites which could possibly be put forward for planning permission to meet demand in line with policy H12.

The Assistant Director of Planning noted the importance of affordability and explained that this would be examined through the review of the Local Plan. He advised the committee that there were several schemes in development which had an element of affordability secured through Section 106 agreements.

The committee was also advised that there was currently no policy to provide infrastructure and amenities within the proximity of PBSA, but the Assistant Director of Planning explained that this could be provided through major regeneration schemes as demonstrated at Great Jackson Street. He also stated that discussions were underway to build a doctor's surgery at Upper Brook Street, subject to the scheme being approved.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) expressed confidence in the short-term demand for PBSA and explained that this would be monitored continuously. She reiterated the Executive Member's comments that additional PBSA would increase capacity in the private-rented sector for other households. She stated that the Council would consider alternatives such as co-living accommodation, although this would not be specifically targeted at students.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development explained that the Council worked with universities and accommodation providers to ensure consultation was

undertaken. He stated that around 25,000 students lived at home whilst studying at a Higher Education Institution (HEI) in Manchester and that there had been a shift in demand for PBSA amongst second- and third-year students. He reiterated that this was a desktop study but that there had been conversations between the Council, universities, and student bodies to inform the approach to PBSA.

**Decision:**

That the committee

1. notes the changes that have taken place regarding the provision of Purpose-Built Student Accommodation since December 2022;
2. endorses to the Executive the approach set out in the report to help guide the decision-making process in advance of the review of the Local Plan and request the Planning and Highways Committee take this approach into account as a material consideration until the Local Plan has been reviewed; and
3. recommends that the Executive amend recommendation 2 to read *“Consider the list of schemes set out in the report as the pipeline that will deliver the required amount of PBSA up to 2030, pending consultation with ward members”*.

**ERSC/23/22 Economy Dashboard**

The committee considered a report of the Head of Performance, Research and Intelligence which presented the Economy Dashboard. The Economy Dashboard contains a range of data and intelligence on key aspects of Manchester’s economy.

Key points and queries that arose from the committee’s discussions included:

- Suggesting it would be useful for future dashboards to provide a breakdown of annual median income by decile; and
- Noting trends in each section except for support provided through the cost-of-living advice line and the makeup of households accessing support, and requesting context for this.

The Head of Performance, Research and Intelligence accepted the committee’s suggestions. He advised that information within the Economy Dashboard on the cost-of-living advice line was part of a wider suite of monitoring trends and activity and that this could be included in future reports to the committee.

**Decision:**

That the report be noted.

**ERSC/23/23 Overview Report**

The committee received a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit.

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:**

That the committee note the report and agree the work programme, noting the above comments.





## **Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of meeting held on Tuesday, 20 June 2023**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Johns – in the Chair

Councillors Bano, Hussain, Iqbal, Northwood, Richards, I Robinson and Taylor

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Craig, Leader of the Council

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment and Transport

Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Development

Councillor Simcock, Chair of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

Councillor Shilton Godwin, Ward Councillor for Chorlton Park

Nick Roberts, Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM)

Danny Vaughan, TfGM

**Apologies:** Councillor Benham

#### **ERSC/23/24 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 23 May 2023 be approved as a correct record.

#### **ERSC/23/25 Update on Public Transport**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) which provided an update on the current/recent performance and future plans for public transport in Manchester.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- The Bee Network, a fully integrated transport network for Greater Manchester;
- Bus performance;
- Bus franchising;
- Metrolink performance; and
- Rail performance and future plans.

Key points and queries that arose from the committee's discussions in relation to buses included:

- How could Councillors be involved in shaping bus routes when bus franchising was introduced;

- The replacement and retrofitting of buses to make them compliant with clean air standards while the Greater Manchester's Clean Air Plan was under review by the Government;
- Improving bus stops, including whether real-time information could be displayed;
- To request that the content of future reports be more explicitly related to Manchester and its wards and areas of the city and the connection to the priorities of Making Manchester Fairer;
- The Bee Network Customer Centre and app and accessing information in community languages;
- Welcoming the increase in bus passengers; and
- The safety of bus passengers and drivers.

The Ward Councillor for Chorlton Park advised that the bus network should be extended, noting that some residents were excluded from bus services due to the distance from their home to the nearest bus stop. She also highlighted the impact on residents of Little Gem bus company ceasing operation.

Nick Roberts from TfGM explained how Little Gem had informed TfGM that they would be ceasing operation from the following day and how TfGM had worked to communicate this to bus users and to try to find a suitable alternative bus company to provide the contracted services. He advised that it was hoped that a suitable alternative bus operator would be in place soon. He stated that this case demonstrated the instability of the current market and that the new model of a franchised service should lead to improvements, with greater stability and control. He reported that the first stage of the franchised network was intended to maintain stability in the short term, with a similar network to that at present, while information was being gathered. Once this information was gathered and analysed, it was likely that there would be a review of the network, taking into account both commerciality and social need, and that this would include an element of consultation. He informed Members that good progress had been made in retrofitting buses and that he was not aware of any pause on this work due to review of the Clean Air Plan, although he would check on this. He reported that real-time information was available at some locations, in particular bus stations, and that consideration could be given to introducing this at popular bus stops but that many people had smartphones which they could use to access this information. In response to further comments on the importance of real-time information, he stated that the Bee Network app would be key in providing information. The Executive Member for Environment and Transport reported that the Bee Network Delivery Committee was discussing these issues and that, as a Member of that Committee, she was highlighting the importance of the Bee Network app being accessible and that not all public transport users had smartphones. She encouraged Members to use the online briefings to ensure that their voices were heard and stated that she would also feed back Members' views to the Bee Network Delivery Committee. She stated that she would take forward the Member's point about community languages with the relevant officer.

Danny Vaughan from TfGM reported that TfGM already ran a customer service centre and explained how this would be enhanced to be able to respond to any issues customers had across the transport network. He outlined some of the plans for the Bee Network app, including journey planning and real-time information, improved information on disruptions, purchasing bus and tram and multi-modal tickets and a mechanism for passengers to feedback on their journey experience. He reported that further information on accessibility, including community languages, could be included in a future report. In response to a Member's question, he reported that information had previously been produced about the level of carbon reduction which had resulted from investment in the Metrolink, represented as the number of car journeys taken off the road, and that it should be possible to translate future investment into figures in a way which was relatable for the public.

Nick Roberts from TfGM reported that bus passenger numbers had recovered since the pandemic but had not returned to pre-COVID levels. He outlined how travel patterns had changed and highlighted the impact of home working. He reported that it was hoped that bus franchising, including branding, marketing, fare initiatives and improved information, as well as identifying new markets and planning services to meet those demands, would increase passenger numbers. In response to a Member's question, he advised that school bus services would be franchised. He agreed that it was important for bus drivers to understand the needs of children and respect young people and stated that he would check on the training for bus drivers in relation to this. He highlighted the work of the TravelSafe Team, tackling Anti-Social Behaviour and working with the police.

In response to a Member's questions about work to improve bus performance, the accessibility of buses, including verbal announcements, the low level of demand for the East Manchester Local Link service and work to reduce congestion and delays due to roadworks, Nick Roberts proposed to provide a written response to the Member after the meeting. The Member agreed to this but stated that a response to the question on accessibility should be provided publicly. The Executive Member for Environment and Transport reported that the minimum standards for the new, yellow buses would include visual and audio announcements and she supported the Member's comment that consideration of accessibility issues was broader than access for wheelchair users. She advised that further information on this would be provided.

The Interim Head of Infrastructure and Environment drew Members' attention to the £1.2 billion worth of transport investment for local roads, bus, train and tram services referred to in the report and advised that this investment would help to improve the reliability of bus services.

Danny Vaughan provided an update on Metrolink since the Metrolink Service Performance Report, included at appendix 2 in report, had been produced in March 2023. He reported that patronage of the Metrolink network was increasing and was now at about 90% of pre-COVID levels. He reported that revenue was not at pre-

COVID levels but costs had increased significantly, in particular energy bills, and that, while subsidies had not been required prior to the pandemic, dialogue was ongoing with the Government about subsidy levels. He reported that the results of a customer satisfaction survey had been broadly positive but the main areas of concern raised had been anti-social behaviour and capacity. He outlined work to tackle anti-social behaviour on Metrolink, including increasing frontline staff. He stated that performance had improved, while highlighting recent issues and forthcoming track renewal work which would affect services. He highlighted plans for service improvements, as driver vacancies were being filled. He also reported on possibilities to expand the Metrolink network and develop tram-train rapid transit.

Key points and queries that arose from the committee's discussions in relation to Metrolink included:

- Would the Ashton line return to a 6-minute service;
- Passengers being charged the "incomplete journey fare" if they forgot to tap out at the end of their journey;
- Would early morning services be reintroduced to Manchester Airport, for workers and travellers;
- Anti-social behaviour on trams, including vaping, including whether TravelSafe officers should travel in smaller groups on more trams;
- Making information clearer for visitors to Manchester; and
- The lift at Castlefield/Deansgate Metrolink not working.

In response to a Member's question, Danny Vaughan confirmed that open data would continue to be available after the move to the Bee Network app. He reported that marketing campaigns had been used to remind people to tap out at the end of their journey, although he highlighted that, depending on the zones travelled through, forgetting to tap out would not necessarily result in a higher charge. He reported that Metrolink would be looking into taking into account the overall daily cap when making this charge and autocompleting for passengers who made regular journeys. He advised that there were currently no plans to reintroduce early morning services to Manchester Airport but that it had not been ruled out, whilst noting that it had not been particularly well used, that most of the people using it travelled between 5.30 and 6 am and that there were bus options for most areas. He confirmed that a 6-minute service would be restored on the Ashton line as far as the Etihad Stadium. He reported that TravelSafe officers and Customer Service Officers currently tended to travel in groups, targeting hotspots. He advised that recruitment was currently taking place and that 40 to 50 additional customer service staff should be working on the network by September so passengers should see greater staff visibility. He agreed with a comment from the Chair about improving information for visitors, stating that customer information should be reviewed and not assume a level of understanding about Manchester and the Metrolink.

In response to a Member's comments, the Chair proposed that the Committee receive a report on Heavy Rail later in the year.

The Leader reported that colleagues at TfGM had done a great job in making the case in relation to HS2. She expressed disappointment that the plans for Platforms 15 and 16 at Piccadilly Station had been withdrawn and stated that the Council would continue to lobby, particularly through Transport for the North and the Joint Greater Manchester Rail Taskforce, for plans to address the capacity issues.

#### **Decisions:**

1. To request an annual update on public transport from TfGM, including Manchester-specific information, information on the geographical spread of services across the city, links to the Making Manchester Fairer priorities and information on the capital investment programme.
2. To request a report on rail, to include HS2, Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) and the Northern Hub (Platforms 15/16).

#### **ERSC/23/26 The Greater Manchester Trailblazer Devolution Deal and its implications for Manchester, including Adult Skills and Technical Education**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) which provided a summary of the recent Greater Manchester Trailblazer deal and its implications for Manchester.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- The background to the Deal
- The four priority areas within the Deal which were:
  - Single Settlement;
  - Housing and Regeneration;
  - Transport; and
  - Skills;
- Considerations for Manchester in relation to these priority areas; and
- Additional announcements.

Key points and queries that arose from the committee's discussions included:

- To welcome the devolution of powers to the city region;
- What was being done to ensure that the city region was in the best possible position if there was a change of government, in terms of retaining the commitments in this deal;
- Was the £150m of brownfield funding intended to enable the delivery of current housing targets or to stretch them further;
- To ask for more information on what the Housing Quality Pathfinder might mean in practice; and

- To request a report on the development of a Manchester Baccalaureate (MBacc).

In response to a question from the Chair, the Leader stated that more progress had been made in achieving devolved powers for areas within the control of the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) than for other Government departments. She cited as an example that Greater Manchester had asked for control in the post-16 educational sector and influence in the pre-16 sector and had not been given either of these, although the Department for Education had agreed to look at a partnership in the post-16 sector, which would give the city region more influence in post-16 education and skills.

The Leader advised that she felt there was very little in the deal that a future Government would not continue with; however, she advised that the Shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer had announced that a Labour Government would make major reforms to or scrap business rates so work was taking place to understand what that would mean for Greater Manchester. She advised that a future Government would also need to consider devolution across different geographical areas and what powers cities themselves should have, informing Members that the Core Cities were leading on work in relation to this. In response to a question about the rail partnership, she stated that this was not the devolved control and capital, that the city region had wanted and that it was still an emerging partnership, which the city region would work hard on.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) reported that the £150m of brownfield funding was to help deliver the existing pipeline of homes and linked to a target of 7000 new homes within 3 years and that it was important to demonstrate to Government that Greater Manchester could achieve more with greater flexibility and certainty of funding. In response to a Member's question, she stated that this should include affordable housing and net zero housing. In response to a Member's question, the Executive Member for Housing and Development outlined some of the other sources of funding available for housing development.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) reported that there were few details on the Housing Quality Pathfinder at present but that DLUHC had been looking at what additional powers could be developed to help drive better quality in the Private Rented Sector so Greater Manchester and the West Midlands could potentially trial these. She reported that the Mayor of Greater Manchester would have powers to approve large-scale landlord licensing, rather than the Secretary of State.

In response to a question from the Ward Councillor for Chorlton Park about the future relationship between Manchester and Greater Manchester, including in relation to scrutiny, the Assistant Chief Executive reported that work was taking place within the GMCA around its decision-making, governance and scrutiny structures in light of this deal and that the Council would be working with the GMCA

on this, which might need to include consideration of how scrutiny at a Manchester level fitted in with scrutiny at a Greater Manchester level.

The Leader outlined how the Council was ensuring that Manchester was not disadvantaged financially by the deal and the new funding arrangements, including seeking assurance from Government that the Greater Manchester councils could bid for new funding which became available and making the city's case for a fair share of the funding for Greater Manchester, taking into account its characteristics, including a much larger population and higher levels of deprivation. In response to a question from the Chair of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee about whether the other 9 Greater Manchester authorities agreed with this division of funding, she reported that funding per head of the population was a well-established approach and that, when addressing issues such as poverty and inequalities, this would sometimes require funding to be targeted rather than divided equally across all areas, and that this would direct more funding towards Manchester.

The Chair stated that Members wanted a further report on the MBacc but there would need to be a discussion about the most appropriate scrutiny committee to receive this report. The Leader reported that the conversation on developing the MBacc was intended to help identify what good technical pathways into jobs would look like, particular post-16, and how schools could support that. The Chair proposed that this item be added as a 'to be scheduled' item on the Committee's work programme and advised that he would speak to the Chair of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee about which Committee would receive it.

### **Decision:**

To add the MBacc as a 'to be scheduled' item on the Committee's work programme and to note that the Chair will speak to the Chair of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee about which Committee will receive it.

[Councillor Johns declared a personal interest due to writing on devolution for his work.]

### **ERSC/23/27 Headlines from the 2021 Census**

The Committee received a report and presentation of the Assistant Chief Executive which summarised the headline outputs that had been released from the 2021 Census so far, specifically describing the change in resident population, the concerns the Council had in terms of missing population, and an overview of how the Census results were generally used to support decision making.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Key results from the 2021 Census;
- Concerns with the Census results;

- The Manchester City Council Forecasting Model (MCCFM);
- Using population statistics to inform service planning; and
- The importance of the Census and population statistics.

Key points and queries that arose from the committee's discussions included:

- Funding implications of the population undercount in the Census 2021;
- The Manchester City Council Forecasting Model (MCCFM); and
- Opportunities for Ward Councillors to engage with this work at a ward level, including feeding back information.

The Assistant Chief Executive reported that the Council was in discussions with Government officials and the Office for National Statistics (ONS) about the undercount and funding implications, had offered to share the MCCFM with them and was lobbying hard to get this undercount taken into account in the funding formulas.

In response to a Member's questions about the MCCFM, the Head of Performance, Research and Intelligence reported that this was a recognised model, which had been through testing and review, and had been procured by the Council a number of years ago. The Performance and Insight Manager reported that the Council had used a number of different data sources to ascertain the population numbers that should have been expected in the Census. She described how the model had been developed by an eminent demographer and the methodology that Manchester was using and stated that Manchester's approach had been peer reviewed. The Member welcomed this work.

The Head of Performance, Research and Intelligence reported that a lot of work was taking place with Neighbourhood Teams and other agencies to understand the local context but acknowledged a suggestion that more could be done with Ward Councillors and stated that he would take this forward. In response to a Member's question, the Performance and Insight Manager outlined some of the data sources used including Child Benefit, Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs), Council Tax, Higher Education Statistics Agency (HESA) and the electoral roll. She reported that the Council had a ward data bank and that a lot of ward-level data was available, which could be shared with Members.

In response to a question from the Chair about data in the Census such as ethnicity, sexual orientation and gender identity, the Assistant Chief Executive reported that the detailed information within the Census was being used, albeit with the caveat that there were people missing from these figures. The Performance and Insight Manager advised that there was a concern that a higher proportion of the people missing from the Census data were likely to be from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups. She reported that the Council was building up information from other sources, such as the school census, on issues such as ethnicity and language.



**Decision:**

To note the report.

**ERSC/23/28 Overview Report**

The committee received a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit.

The Chair noted that the Committee had requested that an item on the MBacc be added to the 'to be scheduled' list on the work programme and had also requested a report on rail, which should include HS2, Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) and the Northern Hub (Platforms 15/16).

**Decision:**

That the committee note the report and agree the work programme, noting the above comments.



## Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 23 May 2023

#### Present:

Councillor Hitchen - In the Chair

Councillors Azra Ali, Appleby, Good, Ogunbambo, Priest, Rawson, Whiston and Wills

#### Also present:

Councillor Midgley, Deputy Leader

#### CESC/23/19            Minutes

#### Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2023 as a correct record.

#### CESC/23/20            A short update report on migration services in Manchester, including Afghanistan, Ukraine and Asylum

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Housing Services which provided an update on Council support and services to Afghanistan and Ukraine migrants in Manchester. It also provided an update on asylum dispersal in the city and on the emerging Sudanese situation, Hong Kong British Nationals (Overseas) and Chagossians.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The Afghanistan Service;
- Ukraine Service;
- Local Authority Housing Fund;
- Welcome Desk for Ukraine Nationals;
- Asylum Contingency Hotels;
- Asylum Dispersed Accommodation;
- Sudanese Refugees;
- Hong Kong British Nationals (overseas); and
- Chagossians.

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

- To welcome the work that the Council was doing to support people fleeing from conflict and other difficult circumstances and to thank officers involved in this work, including those who used their volunteering days to help;
- That people hosting Ukrainian families broadly reported positive experiences of the support from the Council in relation to this;
- Concern about Government plans to temporarily exempt asylum accommodation from House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) licensing requirements, noting that the Regional Strategic Migration Partnership and Greater Manchester Combined Authority were coordinating a response to the

Government on this and asking about a response from the Council and the Committee;

- To request that care be taken to ensure that no identifying details, such as employers, were included in case studies;
- Support for Afghan families who were re-located outside of Manchester;
- The potential impact of Serco's request for the moratorium on the procurement of dispersed accommodation in the M8, M9 and M40 postcode areas to be lifted and to request an update on this; and
- The impact of ending the use of temporary hotel accommodation including whether some people would become homeless.

The Deputy Leader agreed that the plans to temporarily exempt asylum accommodation from HMO licensing requirements were very concerning and supported a request to respond as a Council, saying that she would discuss this with the Executive Member for Housing and Development. The Chair requested that the Committee's concerns be included and that the Committee endorse the response, to which the Deputy Leader agreed.

The Strategic Lead for Homelessness reported that there was a support package for Afghan people when they moved from contingency hotels into alternative accommodation and that there was funding for up to three years for that support. She reported that the Council would be providing that support for people accommodated within Manchester and was working with other local authorities in relation to support for people placed in their areas, although, unfortunately, not all local authorities were as willing to provide support. She advised that Manchester City Council would provide some transition support if the local authority in the area they were moving to was not providing support. She reported that the Council also worked with people before the move to ensure that they were tenancy-ready and to help with other issues such as needing furniture, regardless of where they were moving to within the country. In response to a Member's question about support with qualification conversions, she confirmed that the Council was helping and encouraging people into employment as much as possible.

The Refugee, Asylum and Evacuee Manager informed Members about qualification conversion support which had been procured for Ukrainian nationals and extended to Afghan nationals. In response to a further question, she outlined how the skills, qualifications and work experience of Ukrainian arrivals were assessed through discussions with the individuals and fed back through regular meetings with Regional Strategic Migration Partnership colleagues.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Lead for Homelessness stated that, until the Welcome Desk at Manchester Airport closed in March 2023, Ukrainian Nationals had been provided with the £50 and sim cards from the British Red Cross on arrival. She advised that any new arrivals were still able to claim £50 and that she would ensure that staff were informing anyone who arriving in the UK since the closure of the Welcome Desk. She reported that the Council was also providing sim cards and £200 in an initial payment. In response to a question about opening UK bank accounts, she stated that a lot of Ukrainian nationals were using online services such as Monzo, which did not have the proof of residency requirements of high street banks; however, the Council could provide a letter as evidence to assist Ukrainian

nationals with opening a UK bank account, if they wished to do so, and she asked Members to inform her if they were aware of anyone struggling to open a bank account so that her team could provide assistance.

The Strategic Lead for Homelessness reported that the decision to introduce a moratorium in specific Manchester postcodes had been a political decision and a decision to lift it should be a political decision too. She advised that the Home Office and Serco were writing business cases to the Minister for them to decide whether to take this request forward through a formal conversation with the MP for Blackley and Broughton. In response to a comment from the Chair, she stated that she would request that the MP for Manchester Central be included in this conversation. In response to the question about the closure of bridging hotels, she outlined the support that her staff were providing to Afghan people in these hotels to help them to overcome the barriers to moving on and help them understand their options. She highlighted the section in the report about the Local Authority Housing Fund and the additional properties being made available. She stated that she was confident of being able to work with people to find suitable accommodation and highlighted work to overcome people's concerns about moving to areas they did not know; however, as a back-up, her service was also working with other Greater Manchester authorities to discuss how they would deal with people presenting as homeless. In response to a Member's question, the Accommodation and Support Manager stated that 115 families and 52 single people were in bridging hotels

The Director of Housing Services highlighted that this was a fast-moving area, impacted by Government policy changes, which added to its complexity, and discussions were taking place about the need for a longer-term view from the Government. He advised that raising housing standards was also key. In response to a Member's question, he stated that information on housing supply issues could be included in the report on Homelessness, which was scheduled for the following month's meeting.

A Member requested further information on the Council's engagement with the Chagossian community, noting that this community was mainly concentrated in his ward of Sharston. The Refugee, Asylum and Evacuee Manager stated that the Council had undertaken some preliminary work with the Chagossian community in Manchester and, while they generally did not tend to engage much with national and local government, a link had been made with them and, as some Chagossians applied for and were granted British citizenship, that would be likely to encourage increased engagement. The Chair suggested that the Member speak with the Refugee, Asylum and Evacuee Manager outside of the meeting to discuss further how this work could be taken forward within his ward.

The Chair recognised the hard work taking place, including the role of the voluntary and community sector, and highlighted the importance of Manchester being a welcoming city.

**Decisions**

1. To request that the Committee's concerns, through a letter from the Committee, be included in the Council and Greater Manchester responses to the Government's plans to temporarily exempt asylum accommodation from HMO licensing requirements.
2. To receive a further report at an appropriate time, to include an update on the proposal to lift the moratorium on the procurement of dispersed accommodation in the M8, M9 and M40 postcode areas.

**CESC/23/21          Overview Report**

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

**Decision**

To note the report and agree the work programme.

## Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 20 June 2023

**Present:**

Councillor Hitchen (in the chair)

Councillors Azra Ali, Appleby, Good, Ogunbambo, Priest, Rawson, Sheikh and Wills

**Also present:**

Councillor Joanna Midgley, Deputy Leader

**Apologies:** Councillor Whiston

#### **CESC/23/21            Interests**

Councillor Priest declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in item 8 and would remain in the meeting.

#### **CESC/23/22            Minutes**

The Chair requested an update on a recommendation made at the previous meeting which requested that the Committee's concerns be included in the Council and Greater Manchester responses, through a letter from the Committee to the Government's plans to temporarily exempt asylum accommodation from HMO licensing requirements. In response, the committee was advised that this was currently being drafted and discussions on the detail and wording of the letter had taken place. This would be progressed outside of the meeting and a further update provided to the next meeting.

**Decision:** That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 23 May 2023, be approved as a correct record.

#### **CESC/23/23            Update report on the Homelessness Service**

The committee received a report of the Director of Housing Services which provided an update on the Council's Homelessness Service and the improvement and transformation happening across the service in an increasingly challenging social and economic context.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- The key metrics for the Homelessness Service;
- The progress made to reduce bed and breakfast placements, especially for families, and wider temporary accommodation placements that have been achieved since last discussed at the meeting in January 2023;
- Changes to the Manchester Allocation of Social Housing Policy;

- Accessing the homelessness service;
- Leasing schemes including for families;
- Support available for housing-related issues and domestic abuse;
- The Rough Sleeping Accommodation Programme (RSAP) and the Single Homelessness Accommodation Programme (SHAP) and
- An ongoing review of the Council's Homelessness Strategy.

Key points and queries that arose from the committee's discussions included:

- Welcoming the reduction in the number of families placed in bed and breakfasts for temporary accommodation;
- The support available for those facing or experiencing homelessness where English was not their first language;
- Requesting a breakdown by gender and gender identity of those in temporary accommodation;
- Commending the cross-Council approach of the service;
- Where around 400 properties to be used in three leasing schemes would be located in the city;
- How much money had been saved by reducing the use of bed and breakfast placements for temporary accommodation;
- Requesting that a future report included further explanation as to why a high percentage of Black people faced and experienced homelessness;
- Welcoming the work undertaken with Manchester Communications Academy, and querying whether this could be rolled out to other schools within the city;
- Whether any extra resources were needed for the Housing Options team;
- Requesting further information on payments to providers for rent, repair, and furniture allowance under the temporary accommodation leasing scheme;
- The support provided to those placed in temporary accommodation outside of Greater Manchester;
- The support available to residents in areas where temporary accommodation is located;
- How the voluntary sector was involved in the Council's outreach approach, and what the Homeless Partnership was;
- Noting that Manchester had a higher percentage of people facing or experiencing homelessness compared to other Greater Manchester authorities, and querying why this was; and
- The proposed timeframe for ending the use of bed and breakfast placements as temporary accommodation.

The Deputy Leader highlighted the ongoing good work to reduce the number of rough sleepers in Manchester and the turnaround in the number of people, particularly families, being temporarily placed in bed and breakfast accommodation. She explained that there were currently two families who had been in bed and breakfast accommodation for over six weeks, compared to 131 when last reported, and one family placed outside of Greater Manchester, compared to 92 previously.



She stated that the Council continued to focus on preventing homelessness and reducing the number of people in temporary accommodation.

The Assistant Director of Homelessness stated that bed and breakfast placements could never be suitable for homeless families and explained that the law stipulated that such placements should only be used in exceptional circumstances and for no longer than six weeks. He stated that the number of people in temporary accommodation peaked in February 2023, with 814 households in bed and breakfast placements. There were currently 241 households in bed and breakfasts, of which 227 of these were families.

In response to queries, the committee was informed that the Council had Right to Protect (RTOP) workers who worked specifically with refugees to prevent homelessness. The Strategic Lead for Homelessness also explained that support included Language Line, dual-language support workers and interpreters, and that the Council recognised that some residents may have additional needs and cultural differences. She explained that additional visits were undertaken to address these needs and to highlight any difficulties and additional help that may be required. Members were also informed that any information provided to those presenting as homeless could be translated and could be provided in simple written English and through visually accessible provision, although the Strategic Lead for Homelessness stated that this would be looked into further outside of the meeting.

It was also clarified that appropriate interpreters would be provided for British Sign Language speakers.

A breakdown of those in temporary accommodation by gender and gender identity requested by members would be provided following the meeting.

The Assistant Director of Homelessness stated that the short-term leasing scheme initially intended to provide 200 units of temporary accommodation for families as there were 227 families in bed and breakfast placements. He explained that it was unlikely that 200 family-sized units would be required as the number in bed and breakfast accommodation had reduced significantly. He further stated that discussions were ongoing with housing associations to manage 140 longer-term tenancies and 50 units for rough sleepers. Many of these properties were empty and would be brought back into the market with improvements and would be intensively managed.

The Assistant Director of Homelessness stated that there needed to be a better spread of temporary accommodation across the city, particularly in south Manchester. The Strategic Lead for Homelessness noted that the Council looked to keep new properties away from areas with existing temporary and dispersed accommodation and highlighted the example of Etrop Grange in south Manchester, which provided accommodation for rough sleepers. It was explained that the new

temporary accommodation units were still being procured and detail of where these were located could be provided when available.

The Director of Housing Services stated that a £4million reduction in expenditure on bed and breakfast placements had been factored into the service's budget for 2023/24 and he was confident that this would be met.

In response to a query regarding why a high percentage of Black people faced and experienced homelessness, the Director of Housing Services acknowledged this stark figure and informed the committee that the service was working closely with the Making Manchester Fairer team to reduce inequalities.

The Strategic Lead for Homelessness noted the excellent work undertaken by Manchester Communications Academy and stated that the Homelessness service wanted to work closely with colleagues in Education to share best practice and learning and roll this out more widely across the city. She also stated that the service wanted to visit core cities and other forums that the Council worked with through the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) to showcase this work.

The Deputy Leader explained that she had visited Manchester Communications Academy earlier in the week and praised the work of the school.

In response to a member's query regarding whether any extra resources were needed for the Housing Options team, the Assistant Director of Homelessness explained that there were a number of vacancies in the Housing Solutions team which impacted upon telephone performance and homeless prevention. He stated that 12 new employees were due to start their roles imminently and that a second round of recruitment would be undertaken shortly with a goal of recruiting an additional 20 staff members in total to be in post within a few months. He hoped that this would strengthen the Council's ability to prevent homelessness moving forward.

Members were advised that there was a definite value within the rental charge that the Council would pay for repairs and furniture. Exact figures would be provided following the meeting.

In response to a question regarding the support provided to those placed in temporary accommodation outside of Greater Manchester, the Assistant Director of Homelessness advised that there was currently one family placed outside of Greater Manchester and that the Council's Housing Support Service would continue to provide assistance as they would for families in temporary accommodation within Greater Manchester. He stated that discussions had taken place with colleagues in Children's Services to ensure that timely referrals could be made to social care services in the local authority area where a family was temporarily placed.

The Assistant Director of Homelessness also explained that temporary accommodation managers engaged with local residents in areas where temporary accommodation was located. He acknowledged that there was further work to be done in this area.

The committee was informed that the core outreach service for rough sleepers was a Council-ran service but there were also several external outreach services, such as Outreach in the Community in south Manchester, which provided indoor day centres and played a key role in assisting the Council. He noted that the Council was less advanced in engaging with the third sector in their work with homeless families, compared to rough sleepers, but this would be addressed in the development of the Homelessness Strategy.

The Assistant Director of Homelessness praised the work and commitment of the Manchester Homeless Partnership and explained that several senior officers within the voluntary sector were appointed to different Partnership boards and could influence how services were delivered in Manchester. The Strategic Lead for Homelessness expanded on this and explained that there were several action and task-and-finish groups within the Partnership whose members had lived experiences of homelessness. These groups shared ideas and good practice with the Council and other stakeholders.

In response to a point raised that Manchester had a higher percentage of people facing or experiencing homelessness compared to other Greater Manchester authorities, the Assistant Director of Homelessness suggested that other Greater Manchester authorities were not directly comparative with Manchester's figures and stated that the amount of homelessness was rising across the country in comparison to Manchester, where numbers were decreasing. Members suggested that Manchester's homeless statistics should instead be benchmarked against other core cities such as Leeds and Birmingham.

Members were also advised that there was no set timescale for ending the use of bed and breakfast placements as temporary accommodation as this practice was unlawful and needed to be brought to an end at the earliest opportunity.

The Chair thanked officers for their work and requested that this be relayed to the wider Homelessness service.

**Decision:**

That the committee

1. notes the report;
2. requests that a future update report on homelessness include explanation as to why high numbers of BAME residents experience homelessness; and

3. requests that further information on the location of leasing scheme properties be provided when available; and
4. requests that a future report be provided to the committee on the support provided to communities in areas where leasing scheme properties will be located.

**CESC/23/23                      Draft Terms of Reference for Anti-Social Behaviour Task and Finish Group**

The committee received draft terms of reference for a Task and Finish group on crime and disorder, which the committee indicated they wished to establish.

Members discussed and made suggestions on the objectives, scope, and key lines of enquiry for the Task and Finish Group and put forward nominations for membership.

The final terms of reference would be presented at the first meeting of the Task and Finish Group.

**Decision:**

That

1. the committee agrees to establish a Task and Finish Group on Anti-Social Behaviour, and
2. the membership of this Task and Finish Group consists of Councillors Hitchen, Azra Ali, Appleby, Doswell, Good, Ogunbambo, Sheikh and Wills.

**CESC/23/24                      Overview Report**

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

**Decision:**

That the report be noted, and the work programme agreed.

**CESC/23/25                      Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) Infrastructure Contract Update (PART A)**

The committee received a report of the Assistant Chief Executive which provided an update on the review of the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) infrastructure contract and subsequent process taken for the contract in preparation for re-procurement in 2023.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- An introduction to the VCSE sector in Manchester and background to the infrastructure contract;
- Key findings of the external, independent review into Manchester's VCSE support provision;
- Development of the new infrastructure specification, which would identify four main areas of support; and
- The timeline and next steps for the infrastructure review.

Key points and queries that arose from the committee's discussions included:

- Who the Commissioners of the contract would be, and whether this would include people from the BAME community;
- How new VCSE organisations could access support through Manchester Community Central (Macc)
- How the Council could support smaller VCSE organisations, particularly with evaluation of the projects they deliver;
- How the Council could support organisations with bid-writing and other skills;
- How the Infrastructure Contract will address and target poverty and lack of access to services;
- How BAME VCSE organisations would be supported;
- Noting that smaller VCSE organisations often had large overhead costs, and querying whether funding would be provided in instalments or as an up-front lump sum;
- Whether the new Infrastructure Contract would form part of the additional £120k allocated for the development of VCSE organisations amongst BAME community groups; and
- Suggesting that the Council provide support for smaller VCSE organisations to become sub-contractors to other providers.

The Deputy Leader introduced the item and explained that the VCSE Infrastructure Contract had been in place for over 10 years, which strengthened the local VCSE sector, and she expressed her thanks to the Policy and Programmes Manager (Communities and VCSE) and his team for their work on the Contract.

The Assistant Chief Executive stated that infrastructure support provided partnership and practical support to VCSE organisations around volunteering opportunities, developing connections between organisations, and advocated for the sector. He explained that the current Infrastructure Contract was awarded to Macc and was jointly funded by the Council and NHS, who had committed their involvement for the

current financial year. Discussions with the NHS were ongoing regarding future funding.

He explained that, as part of the review into the new infrastructure specification, the Council was trying to respond to the experiences, feedback, and priorities of the VCSE sector and that there had been significant consultation on this. An independent review had also been undertaken, which recognised that the sector wanted a greater focus on capacity-building and practical support for their organisations. There would also be a focus on ensuring that the support offered by the provider was accessible and culturally appropriate for all communities. Feedback from the sector also indicated that there needed to be greater support in specific areas of the city, such as North Manchester and parts of East Manchester where the sector was less developed.

The Assistant Chief Executive also stated that further member engagement on the Infrastructure Contract was proposed and that members had been invited to a meeting on this taking place in the following week.

In response to a member's query, it was advised that a group of officers would be responsible for awarding the Infrastructure Contract and this group would be representative of different backgrounds and protected characteristics.

The Policy and Programmes Manager (Communities and VCSE) provided assurances that Macc was publicly accessible to all VCSE organisations with tiered and general offers to groups. Membership to Macc was also open to all VCSE organisations. The Deputy Leader explained that organisations could book 15-minute sessions online to learn more about the services provided and to begin the process of receiving a tailored support package.

The Assistant Chief Executive stated that the Our Manchester VCSE process was the main grant funding administered by the Council, but other grants were also available. He stated that this funding had been awarded to small, medium, and large VCSE organisations but he recognised that larger organisations could have access to more funding opportunities and had more resources at their disposal compared to smaller groups.

In response to a query regarding how the Council could support organisations to improve skills, the Policy and Programmes Manager (Communities and VCSE) explained that the Council liaised with organisations in receipt of the Our Manchester VCSE Fund or Supporting Communities Fund upon receipt of their monitoring information to support their evaluations and the standard of information provided. The Assistant Chief Executive welcomed the point around evaluation raised by the member and stated that officers would take this forward during procurement discussions.

The Assistant Chief Executive explained that the infrastructure support provider would be required to undertake targeted work in areas of the city which experienced poverty and had less access to services. He cited the work of North Manchester Together as a good example of how the VCSE sector can be developed in certain areas.

The committee was advised that Our Manchester VCSE funding would be provided in instalments over 3 years with annual delivery monitoring. The Infrastructure Contract funding would also be provided in instalments over a 5-year period.

In response to the Chair's enquiry regarding how the Council could support organisations with bid-writing and other skills, the Policy and Programmes Manager (Communities and VCSE) stated that there was a strong emphasis within the review of the specification to acknowledge feedback from the sector and to meet their needs. Bid-writing and fundraising would be included in this work and there would be an encouragement of partnership working to extend provisions into difficult-to-reach communities. The Assistant Chief Executive stated that providing targeted support for BAME-led and BAME-focused organisations was also an important part of the infrastructure contract specification. He explained that £120k had been allocated to a Development Fund to help these groups to develop VCSE organisations, which was separate to the Infrastructure Contract.

The Assistant Chief Executive stated that advice for smaller VCSE organisations on how to become sub-contractors for other providers could be provided through business development support, which the provider would be expected to undertake.

**Decision:**

That the report be noted.

**CESC/23/26            Exclusion of Press and Public**

**Decision:**

That the press and public be excluded during consideration of the following item which involved consideration of exempt information relating to the financial or business affairs of particular persons and public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

**CESC/23/27            Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE)  
Infrastructure Contract Update (PART B)**

The committee received a confidential report of the Assistant Chief Executive which provided supplementary information to item 8.

Members discussed the current Infrastructure Specification and considered the proposed inclusions in the revised Specification, including the purpose and outcomes of the Specification and the service and monitoring requirements.

**Decision:**

That the supplementary information be noted.



## Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2023

#### Present:

Councillor Reid – in the Chair  
Councillors Alijah, N Ali, Amin, Bell, Cooley, Fletcher, Gartside, Hewitson, Judge, Lovecy, Ludford, McHale, Nunney and Sadler

#### Co-opted Voting Members:

Mr Y Yonis, Parent Governor Representative

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

Miss S Iltaf, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

#### Also present:

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People  
Councillor T Robinson, Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care

Councillor Bano, Ward Councillor for Whalley Range  
Tracey Forster, Lead Manager, Children's Community Health Services (CCHS)  
Nicola Marsden, Assistant Director, CCHS  
Louise Lee, Lead Allied Health Professional, CCHS

#### Apologies:

Canon S Mapledoram, Representative of the Diocese of Manchester  
Ms L Smith, Primary Sector Teacher Representative

#### **CYP/23/19                      Minutes**

The Chair welcomed the new Committee Members.

#### **Decisions**

1. To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2023.
2. To receive the minutes of the meeting of the Ofsted Subgroup held on 15 March 2023.

#### **CYP/23/20                      Early Years and Health Visiting Service**

The Committee considered the presentation of the Assistant Director (Children's Services), the Strategic Lead (Early Years) and Tracey Forster, Lead Manager (Children's Community Health Services), Central Manchester NHS Foundation Trust which provided an overview of Early Years and Health Visiting.

Key points and themes in the presentation included:

- Start Well Strategy and Partnership Board;

- Start Well presenting needs;
- Start Well data and impact; and
- Family Hubs Programme.

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

- To welcome the joined-up approach and all the different aspects of this work;
- Skills development for staff to help children who are presenting with high needs but have not yet been diagnosed with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND);
- Identification of children with dyslexia and dyspraxia;
- How were Housing colleagues, including social housing providers, involved in this, noting the impact of housing issues on families;
- Concern about recruitment and retention issues with Health Visitors, noting that this was a national problem;
- The location of Family Hubs and how accessible they would be for families; and
- Children arriving from Afghanistan who did not speak English and needed support.

In response to a Member's question about the Making Manchester Fairer Kickstarter Programme referred to in the presentation, the Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People reported that this had only been formally signed off two days ago and that Councillors would be informed about how this would be rolled out. He suggested that the Committee receive a report on Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) and families fleeing Afghanistan and other countries where they were facing conflict or persecution, to which the Chair agreed. He highlighted some of the challenges facing Manchester families and some of the work the Council was doing to address this, including stating that he would send Members information on what was happening in Baby Week.

The Assistant Director (Children's Services) confirmed that her service would engage with Ward Councillors in relation to the roll-out of the Kickstarter Programme. In response to a question from another Member, she outlined how the Thriving Babies programme, which provided more intensive support to parents, linked in with the Early Help and Early Years Services, highlighting the increased investment in midwives to identify at an earlier stage parents who would need this more intensive support, and noting that, once they had progressed through the Thriving Babies programme, families would then still need some support from the Sure Start and Children's Centre Core Offer which, having built trust through the Thriving Babies programme, they would feel more able to access.

The Strategic Lead (Early Years) outlined work to increase the skills of the Early Years workforce to work with children with Personal, Social and Emotional issues and identify whether they needed specialist support and to identify children who needed extra support with communication and language and refer them to specialist services, where necessary. The Assistant Director (Children's Services) reported that Education colleagues were leading on work in relation to the Autism and

Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) pathway and that further information on this could be provided.

The Assistant Director (Children's Services) reported that housing colleagues were involved in this work in a number of ways, including strategic involvement at board-level, joint work to identify families in need of extra help and support and work to respond to damp and disrepair problems. She highlighted local partnership working between hubs and housing providers, work to make connections in the private rented sector, practical support for families and work to reduce the number of families in temporary accommodation.

The Strategic Lead (Early Years) outlined some of the considerations taken into account when deciding on the location of the Family Hubs, including demographic data, cost-of-living priority wards, Early Years Foundation Stage outcomes, health outcomes, areas of multiple deprivation and the number of children eligible for the two-year-old offer; however, she advised that, while there would be buildings known as Family Hubs, services would be delivered across localities, rather than just from those buildings.

The Director of Education reported that there were currently higher levels of development delays in young children, including gross and fine motor development and speech and language. She advised that one of the biggest challenges at present was identifying what was delayed development because of the impact of the pandemic and what was due to an underlying disability. She reported that a lot of work was taking place in relation to this, including training for schools staff, webinars on the legacy of COVID-19 and access to educational psychologists, as well as targeted work in some schools, including ten intensive support schools which were receiving additional funding for interventions and additional access to speech and language therapy and educational psychology and 48 further schools which were receiving additional speech and language therapy and educational psychology support. She advised that the work at the moment was focusing on giving children what they needed to reach their developmental milestones rather than labelling them as having SEND at this stage as it was difficult to know which children did have SEND and which were not achieving their milestones due to the pandemic.

The Chair welcomed the progress made, the wide-ranging services and continuing improvement. She welcomed that the Council had retained Sure Start Centres when central Government had cut its funding. She praised the Imagination Library in Gorton and suggested that this should be available across the city. She expressed concern about the impact of lockdown on babies and young children and that some children were still not accessing the Early Years Offer. She also highlighted concerns about housing and home safety, advising that she had asked for further information on the impact of selective licensing in relation to her own ward. She also highlighted the importance of support for mothers with breastfeeding.

In response to a Member's comment about the number of Health Visitors and suggestion that the Government should be lobbied on this issue, the Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People advised that this was part of a wider problem with a lack of Government strategy on the NHS workforce, rather than being limited to Health Visitors. He suggested that he discuss with the Executive

Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care how to proceed with this. The Chair highlighted that there were also issues with recruiting childcare workers. She suggested that a broader workforce strategy report, including health visiting and childcare workers, could be requested, noting that consideration would need to be given to which scrutiny committee would receive this report.

### Decisions

1. To request a further report at an appropriate time.
2. To request that the Committee receive a report on Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) and families fleeing Afghanistan and other countries where they were facing conflict or persecution.
3. To request a report on workforce strategy, noting that further consideration will be needed on the scope of the report and which scrutiny committee should receive it.

[Councillor Alijah declared a personal interest, having accessed Early Help Services.]

### **CYP/23/21 Children's Community Health Services (CCHS)**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided an overview of CCHS and a short summary of its response to the COVID-19 pandemic, considered the national and CCHS position post-COVID-19 for children and shared the current areas of focus for CCHS.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- CCHS within the Manchester Foundation Trust and Manchester Local Care Organisation;
- An overview of CCHS;
- The CCHS response to the COVID-19 pandemic;
- Post COVID-19/living with COVID-19, the national position for children and the CCHS position;
- CCHS areas of focus; and
- Partnership workstreams.

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

- The Asthma Friendly Schools Project
- The take-up of baby immunisations;
- The Impact of the pandemic on young people's social and emotional development and the impact of dealing with this on the mental health of staff in schools and Alternative Provision;
- The impact of poverty and the cost-of-living crisis on children and families;
- The response to child obesity; and
- Children using e-cigarettes.

Nicola Marsden, Assistant Director, CCHS, reported that factors affecting the schools identified for the Asthma Friendly Schools Project were lack of green space and busy roads, which impacted on asthma. The Assistant Director (Children's Services) informed Members about partnership work on asthma, including Adult Social Care and Neighbourhoods Directorate, which was focused on prevention.

Nicola Marsden reported that GPs were responsible for baby immunisation and that there had been a lower uptake since the pandemic and that work was taking place at a local and national level to ensure positive, consistent messaging on immunisation. In response to a question about the HPV vaccine, she advised that there were concerns about the level of uptake of this, along with other vaccines; however, this was about to change from a two-immunisation programme to a one-immunisation programme which should have a positive impact on uptake. She also confirmed that, since 2018, the HPV vaccine had been available to both boys and girls. She recognised the Member's comments about the impact of the pandemic on young people's social and emotional development, commenting that similar issues were being seen by Health teams, and advised that the Healthy Schools Team were supporting schools with these issues. She advised that a lot of studies were taking place on the mental health impact of the pandemic.

In response to Members' comments and questions in relation to eyesight, Tracey Forster, Lead Manager, CCHS reported that a vision screening programme took place in Reception year and she noted that increased use of small screens during the pandemic, as well as increased screen time, could possibly induce myopia at an earlier age. The Chair stated that schools should encourage families to get their children's vision tested regularly.

In response to a Member's question about "ghost children", children who had not returned to school after the pandemic, the Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People suggested that this be considered in a separate report, to which the Chair agreed.

In response to a question about hearing tests, Nicola Marsden reported that there was a national programme for vision and hearing in Reception year and that there was also an audiology service available from newborn to 18 years of age and that health professionals going into schools could provide advice and signpost to services, as appropriate. In response to the question about obesity, she reported that Healthy Schools Programme shared positive messages and information on healthy eating and that the National Child Measurement Programme in Reception and Year 6 identified obesity issues. She informed Members about the Healthy Weight Team, which helped children who were severely obese through a 12-month programme of support for the child and their family, stating that the staffing team for this had been increased. She advised that the school nursing team and GPs could also provide help and advice. In response to the question about children vaping, she advised that healthy lifestyle messages were being shared and that initial research on the effects of e-cigarettes was concerning.

**Decision**

To receive a report on school attendance and, in particular, work taking place in relation children who have not returned to school after the pandemic.

[Councillor Nunney declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as an employee of Manchester Foundation Trust and left the room for this item.]

**CYP/23/22                    Re-establishment of the Ofsted Subgroup**

The Committee considered the report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which provided the Committee with the proposed terms of reference and current work programme for the Subgroup. The Committee was asked to re-establish the Ofsted Subgroup for the municipal year 2023 - 2024 and agree the terms of reference, work programme and membership of the Subgroup.

**Decisions**

1. To re-establish the Ofsted Subgroup for the 2023 - 2024 municipal year and agree the terms of reference and work programme.
2. That Councillor Lovecy be appointed as Chair of the Ofsted Subgroup and that Councillors Bano, Bell, Fletcher, Hewitson, Ludford and Reid and Mr Yonis be appointed to the Subgroup.

**CYP/23/23                    Overview Report**

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

**Decision**

To note the report and agree the work programme.

## Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2023

#### Present:

Councillor Reid – in the Chair  
Councillors Alijah, N Ali, Amin, Bell, Fletcher, Gartside, Hewitson, Judge, Ludford, McHale and Nunney

#### Co-opted Voting Members:

Mr G Cleworth, Parent Governor Representative  
Mr Y Yonis, Parent Governor Representative

#### Also present:

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People  
Councillor Butt, Deputy Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People  
Councillor Shilton Godwin, Chair of the Environment, Climate Change and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Committee  
Councillor Muse, Ward Councillor for Ardwick  
Luke Prosser, Loreto College  
Helen Green, Loreto College

#### Apologies:

Councillors Lovecy and Sadler  
Canon S Mapledoram, Representative of the Diocese of Manchester  
Ms L Smith, Primary Sector Teacher Representative

#### **CYP/23/24                      Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2023.

#### **CYP/23/25                      Update: Education Climate Change Action Plan 2022-24**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided an update on work done by the Council to support the Education sector with decarbonisation since the publication of the Education Climate Change Action Plan in October 2022. It also outlined the plans for this work moving forwards, with the action plan refreshed bi-annually following on from several review points within the two years.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Background information;
- Progress to date in relation to:
  - Campus;
  - Culture;

- Community; and
- Curriculum; and
- Future opportunities and intentions.

The Committee also received a presentation from Luke Prosser and Helen Green from Loreto College about the College's sustainability journey.

Key points and themes in the presentation included:

- The College's Sustainability Strategy;
- The reasons for introducing it; and
- How it was being achieved.

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

- To thank the representatives from Loreto College for their presentation and to welcome the work being done by the College;
- The environmental impact of journeys to school and what more could be done to promote behaviour change, particularly in relation to promoting active travel;
- Sharing good practice with other schools; and
- Decarbonisation of the schools' estate and the bid for funding for this work.

In response to a question from the Chair about twinning with schools in other countries, Helen Green from Loreto College reported that the College had international schools in countries such as India which the College engaged with and that they would be looking at what work they could do with them from an environmental perspective. She advised that Loreto also had other English schools, including one in Chorlton, and that the College, and Luke Prosser, in his role as Sustainability Manager, were leading on work with those schools on climate change. Luke Prosser explained that the Principal had given him freedom to work with anybody to tackle climate change and that he was open to any ways that he could help and share best practice. In response to a Member's question, he outlined the College's in-house carbon literacy training.

In response to a question from the Chair on allotments, the Project Manager (Educational Climate Change) informed Members that, from September, the National Education Nature Park would be rolled out across all Manchester schools to teach pupils about biodiversity and that biodiversity could be found in school grounds, and that the Department for Education would be providing some funding to improve biodiversity on school grounds. He explained how best practice was being shared through the green schools networks and a dedicated page on the Schools Hub. In response to questions about journeys to school, he informed Members about the Green Bee Relay, which encouraged active travel, the Governance Review Board which was being established and would be look at strategic issues like active travel on a wider scale, and the impact of the introduction of Our Pass, which provided free travel for 16 to 18-year-olds.

The Director of Education advised that ideally children should go to a local school and that most Manchester children did go to a local school; however, she advised



that, if they could not, they were entitled to a free travel pass. She reported that a lot of secondary school pupils travelled to school by bus but that, at primary, even if the school was local, a lot of pupils were taken by car and that a culture change was needed, using a range of methods such as challenges, competitions and pilot schemes.

The Chair expressed concern that the current allocation of school buses was unfair. She stated that she and the Chair of the Environment, Climate Change and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Committee had been raising this issue but that, with the introduction of bus franchising, Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) did not want to significantly change the bus network at present; however, she advised that they would continue to raise this. She also expressed concern that there would be a shortage of secondary school places in 2024, resulting in some children having to travel further. She highlighted the issue of homeless families being placed in temporary accommodation further away from their children's schools, while recognising the improvements being made in relation to homeless families.

The Project Manager (Educational Climate Change) reported that the five schools chosen for funding bids had been chosen on the basis of having the oldest boilers that were most in need of replacement and he explained how there would be an initial bid for low carbon skills funding which, if successful, would help with the design of the boilers and support the application for the public sector decarbonisation funding. In response to a question from the Chair of the Environment, Climate Change and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Committee about the levels of engagement from schools with climate change initiatives, he stated that schools had a number of competing demands on them and the networks were quite new so he was relatively happy with the initial uptake but was committed to continuing to work to build on this. He stated that the audit taking place in September to gauge the number of schools with a climate action plan would be useful for providing targeted support.

The Director of Education reported that the Council only had a small building maintenance budget for local authority-maintained schools but was linking in with the wider Council to access additional funding in order to do more. She stated that this had included doing condition surveys of schools which meant that, when new funding became available for school buildings, the Council already had information on which schools most needed this.

## **Decisions**

1. To support the approach outlined within the Campus workstream, with the establishment of locality green school networks in North, Central and South Manchester to engage more schools in this work.
2. To recommend that consideration be given to partnering schools with allotments and parks.
3. To note that the Chair, along with the Chair of the Environment, Climate Change and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Committee, will continue to engage with TfGM on the allocation of school buses.

## **CYP/23/26                      New Arrivals and Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children (UASC)**

The Committee considered the report and presentation of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which highlighted Children's Services' and partners' response to the step change increase of Unaccompanied Asylum-seeking Children and young people (UASC) coming into Manchester.

Key points and themes in the report and presentation included:

- Background information;
- Profile and demographic; and
- Responding and meeting the needs of Manchester's UASC.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People highlighted the problem of children who were initially assessed by the Home Office as being adults and placed in dispersal accommodation with adults and reported that the Council was lobbying on this issue.

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

- To welcome the work that the Council was doing to support UASC;
- To seek clarification on the process for age assessments;
- The education of UASC; and
- What happened while the young person was waiting for the age assessment to be completed.

In relation to age assessments, the Assistant Director (Children in Care and Care Leavers) explained that the Home Office undertook an initial screening, but that about 20% of these would be incorrect. She reported that, when they arrived in Manchester, either as a spontaneous arrival or via a dispersal hotel, her team undertook a brief enquiry to determine whether, in their professional opinion, they were presenting as under 18, in which case the Council had a duty to accommodate them. She advised that the team's social workers, who were trained in age assessments, then carried out an assessment process, which could take up to 45 days, based on observation, what the young person said and the relationship with the social workers involved in their assessment. The final assessment on the young person's age was then communicated to the Home Office. In response to a Member's question she reported that, if the person presenting could be a child, they were given "benefit of doubt" and accommodated while the assessment was being carried out. In response to a Member's question about how culturally aware and trauma-informed the social workers undertaking these assessments were, she reported that the New Arrivals team were from varied backgrounds and different countries of origin, including two former UASC, whose experiences had been invaluable. She advised that the whole team had been trained on trauma-informed practice and worked closely with the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS).

The Assistant Director (Children in Care and Care Leavers) reported that, at the point of determining a young person's age, if they were of school age, her team would work closely with the Virtual School to get them on a school roll and into school as soon as possible. She advised that, for those over school age, ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) provision was a priority, again working with the Virtual School. In response to a comment from the Chair about the Communicate School, she stated that she would look into this. In response to a Member's question about high numbers of new arrivals being allocated to a specific school, the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services reported that this was more likely to relate to families with children arriving in the city rather than UASC but that, if the Member wanted to raise an issue about a specific school, this could be picked up after the meeting.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Lead for Homelessness and Migration confirmed that her service engaged with charities and with local colleges. She reported that the demand for ESOL courses in the city outstripped supply and that work was taking place to lobby on this issue and look for ways to increase funding for and provision of ESOL courses. In response to a question from the Chair, she reported that more males than females were coming into the UK seeking asylum. She stated that dispersal hotels were usually single sex and the ones in Manchester were for males, which was also part of the reason for the disparity in numbers.

In response to a question from the Chair about trafficking, the Deputy Strategic Director of Children's Services reported that this was part of the multi-agency complex safeguarding work and that he would ensure that information on trafficking was included in the next report that the Committee received on complex safeguarding.

## **Decisions**

1. To note the impact of the increase in volume of UASC coming into the city and the wider socio-economic impact.
2. To endorse the decision that Manchester will 'opt out' of the National Transfer Scheme and will refer young people into the scheme as a response to our increase in number of UASC into the city, whilst acknowledging that this decision can be reviewed as young people naturally 'age out' of the system.
3. To recognise the service's response, whilst acknowledging the strength of the partnership work that has wrapped around our young people, in a 'child first' approach.

## **CYP/23/27                      Fostering Recruitment and Retention Strategy 2023-25**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which set out the Council's ambitions for the recruitment and retention of foster carers in Manchester. It identified the Council's recruitment targets and support offer and how it aimed to recruit and retain more foster carers for children who needed foster families.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Being a Fostering Friendly Employer;
- The Our Manchester Offer to foster carers;
- Recruitment data;
- Looked After Children/needs analysis;
- Ambition for 2023 - 25;
- Ongoing work undertaken by the Recruitment and Assessment Team; and
- The development and implementation of the Mockingbird Family Model (MFM).

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

- To welcome the fantastic work that the Council was doing; and to recognise the vital role of foster carers and to express the Committee's thanks;
- To welcome that the Council now had Fostering Friendly Status;
- Noting a previous campaign to recruit foster carers from the Muslim community, were there any particular communities that were being targeted for foster carer recruitment, such as the Somali community;
- What were the barriers to fostering;
- Noting that the lack of a spare bedroom in their home prevented a lot of people from becoming foster carers; and
- What support was being provided to foster carers due to the cost-of-living crisis.

The Fostering Service Lead reported that there was a need for more Black African and Black Caribbean foster carers and that work was taking place, linking in with AFRUCA, to promote fostering in those communities. She stated that she would be happy to link in with any Councillors about promoting foster carer recruitment in local communities. In response to a Member's question, she stated that the Council had made enquiries with other organisations to get them interested in gaining Fostering Friendly Status and that it was hoped to hold a launch to promote this further.

The Assistant Director (Provider Services) stated that it could take an individual up to 5 years from first considering fostering and making enquiries to becoming a foster carer, because of the consideration given to making the decision, rather than because of delays by the Council. She stated that barriers were often specific to the individual but could include housing, the impact of fostering and increasingly being able to work from home, which could also impact on the availability of a spare bedroom. She highlighted the role of the Mockingbird Family Model in providing support to foster carers. She informed Members that a one-off additional payment had been made to foster carers to support them with the increased cost of living and that there was an annual increase in the level of remuneration for foster carers. In response to a question from the Chair, she stated that every local authority had a different offer and pay structure but Manchester's was competitive and one of the highest in Greater Manchester.

In response to a question from the Chair about supported lodgings becoming subject to regulation, the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services suggested that the Committee receive a report on the work to prepare for this, to which the Chair agreed.

The Chair suggested that different recruitment methods, such as using empty billboards, be used to recruit foster carers and that there should be increased use of kinship carers.

### **Decision**

To receive a report on supported lodgings becoming subject to regulation and the work taking place to prepare for this.

### **CYP/23/28                      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.



## Health Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2023

#### Present:

Councillor Green – in the Chair  
Councillors Bayunu, Curley, Hilal, Karney, Muse, Reeves and Wilson

**Apologies:** Councillors Riasat and Stogia

#### Also present:

Councillor T. Robinson, Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care  
Councillor Chambers, Deputy Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care  
Tom Hinchcliffe, Deputy Place Based Lead – Manchester, NHS Greater Manchester Integrated Care  
Andrew Maloney, Deputy Chief Executive, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust  
Maria Nelligan, Executive Director of Clinical Transformation/Interim Chief Nurse, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust  
John Foley, Interim Chief Operating Officer, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust  
Paul Baker, Community for Holistic, Accessible, Rights Based Mental Health (CHARM)  
Angela Mugan, CHARM  
Rachel Tully, CHARM  
Craig Hamilton, CHARM  
Jeff Evans, CHARM  
Patricia Gail Oluwabusola, CHARM  
Annabel Marsh, CHARM  
Angela Young, CHARM

### HSC/23/23 Minutes

#### Decision

To approve the minutes of the meetings held on 8 March 2023.

### HSC/23/24 Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust: Improvement Plan Update

The Committee considered the report of the Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust that provided an update on the Trust's Improvement Plan.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing a history and context of the Trust;
- Information on the Care Quality Commission rating;
- An update on the review of the Trust and the Executive Leadership team;

- Data relating to the 2022 Staff Survey;
- An overview of immediate improvements initiated;
- An overview of the GMMH Improvement Plan and the areas for priority focus;
- Information on the Manchester City Council/GMMH S75 Partnership Agreement and Improvement Programme;
- Key messages;
- An overview of Community Mental Health Teams in Manchester;
- Analysis of engagement activity, topics for further consideration and next steps; and
- Consideration of the factors that were identified as risks to delivery of the Improvement Plan.

The Committee then heard from a number of representatives from CHARM (Community for Holistic, Accessible, Rights Based Mental Health) who had been invited by the Chair to participate and contribute to the meeting. Representatives from CHARM provided personal testimony as to their lived experience of mental health services in Manchester. They spoke of the need to consider mental health in terms of it being a human rights issue; calling for a fundamental change in the culture at the Trust, including adopting reflective practice across all levels at the Trust; improving how they communicated with carers and families; calling for appropriate trained staffing; the need for mental health to have the parity of esteem as physical health; the coproduction of services needed to be meaningful and hear and listen to the voice of service users, their families and carers; calling for an end to restrictive and oppressive practices on wards; the delays in being able to access appropriate services and the detrimental impact this had on individuals and their health outcomes; describing the disproportionate adverse experience of African and Caribbean citizens, especially in regard to the issue of overmedication; calling for the Trust to respond to the allegations of institutional racism and to use qualitative and quantitative data to report improvements; and noting the detrimental impact individuals experienced when they were 'stepped down' from Community Mental Health services.

The Committee expressed their appreciation for all of the contributors from CHARM for sharing their powerful testimonies.

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

- Expressing disappointment that the current Chief Executive had not attended the meeting to address the Committee prior to his imminent departure from the Trust;
- Noting that when reviewed the BBC Panorama programme demonstrated the senior leadership that was absent from the Edenfield Unit;
- Calling for a culture change at the Trust and noting that this was not explicit in the plan;
- Discussing the issue of health inequalities;
- Calling for absolute transparency by the Trust when reporting to the Committee, adding that future updates needed to provide significantly more detail across the different work streams;
- More detailed information was requested on the work to date and planned on the five Improvement Plan workstreams;



- Noting that detailed information in relation to staff feedback was requested in any future update report;
- The need to articulate the tangible anticipated milestones and outcomes that would be realised by the Improvement Plan;
- Noting referrals to Community Mental Health Teams were 73% higher in 2022/23 than pre pandemic and commenting that this was a significant pressure on resources;
- Noting that staff recruitment and retention was an issue and asking if the Financial Plan that included a 4% efficiency ask would undermine any planned improvements; and
- The Committee reiterated their appreciation to all of the representatives from CHARM for attending the meeting and sharing their experiences.

The Executive Director of Adult Social Services described the steps that had been taken by partners across the system to support the Trust. This had included the establishment of regular weekly meetings at a senior level; the redeployment of staff to support teams; utilising the Integrated Control Room; requesting that internal Audit undertake a review of GMMH; improved and strengthened governance arrangements in accordance with Care Act requirements; meeting with Mental Health Social Work staff; and a commitment from all partners across Greater Manchester to work collaboratively to drive improvements at the Trust on behalf of the residents and their families accessing mental health services.

The Deputy Place Based Lead – Manchester, NHS Greater Manchester Integrated Care reiterated the previous statement by advising that resources and support had been provided across Greater Manchester to support the Trust and there was a commitment by all partners to support the Trust to deliver the Improvement Plan.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care reiterated his stated commitment to work with the Trust to drive improvements. He stated this remained a personal and political priority. He stated that he recognised that the Trust was on a journey of improvement and acknowledged the work described, however he called for a sense of urgency to deliver the required improvements. He stated that he was not confident that Manchester residents were receiving the level of service they deserved, and improvements had to be realised. He acknowledged that a new Chief Executive had been appointed and many of the senior posts were currently interim appointments. He advised that it was anticipated that all the senior posts would be appointed to by the end of the year and he recommended that the Trust be invited back later in the year to provide another update on the Improvement Plan.

The Deputy Chief Executive, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust stated that there was a significant amount of detailed work that underpinned the Improvement Plan as described in the document submitted to the Committee. He advised that further information would be provided to the Committee. He stated that the Improvement Plan provided a fundamental building block to drive and deliver improvements across the whole service. He stated that the Plan was deliverable and all at the Trust acknowledged the need to deliver on this, using all resources available to deliver at the correct pace and in the right order. He stated that positive feedback had been received from staff and the new Chair of the Trust was highly visible in his role.

The Deputy Chief Executive, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust further commented that he acknowledged the point raised in regard to the issue of meaningful coproduction of services and referenced a number of forums and working groups that had been established. In regard to the issue of Health Inequalities he stated that the Trust did have a strategy and they were working to embed this across the wider improvement strategy. In response to the comments regarding culture change he stated that they were engaging with an external body to review this with a view to informing the Improvement Plan, noting that there were many good examples of best practice in regard to this. He added that delivering an improved culture would in turn attract high quality staff to work for the Trust. With specific reference to the 4% efficiency ask he advised that this would be targeted and realised away from care, adding that delivering the Improvement Plan would drive efficiencies and support front line services.

The Executive Director of Clinical Transformation stated that there was a detailed Action Plan behind every work stream described. She stated these plans had been submitted to the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and stated that the CQC would reinspect the Trust. She advised that the Trust held monthly meetings with the CQC and initial feedback indicated that they were satisfied with the improvements delivered. She added that the CQC could also undertake an unannounced inspection visit. She stated that further detail on this area of activity would be included in any future update report. Members noted that it was this level of detail that the Committee required. She further described that work had been done to strengthen leadership at a ward level. She acknowledged the comments regarding recruitment and retention of staff, adding that this was a national issue. She stated that work was underway with NHS England to review staffing across all levels. She stated that there was a programme of strengthening professional nursing leadership; the intention to employ staff with lived experience; developing staff and supporting non-registered staff using regular supervision, training and appraisals.

The Executive Director of Clinical Transformation commented that meaningful coproduction and person-centred care was core to improving services. She stated that every Board meeting started with a patient story. She advised that a Service Users Care Council had been established and this group fed directly into the Board, adding that this was another initiative that would influence positive culture change.

In response to a specific ask by CHARM for the Committee to establish a subgroup to consider mental health, the Chair stated that she would consult with the Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care and other relevant stakeholders to consider the scope and remit of any subgroup.

The Chair stated that a future update from the Trust would be included in the Committee's work programme for consideration at a meeting later in the year.

## **Decision**

The Committee recommend that;

1. The Chair consult with the Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care and other relevant stakeholders to consider the scope and remit of any subgroup to consider mental health.
2. An invitation be sent to the current Chief Executive and his Interim replacement to attend the next meeting of the Committee to respond to questions from Members.

### **HSC/23/25 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.

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report and agrees the work programme.



## Health Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2023

#### **Present:**

Councillor Green – in the Chair  
Councillors Curley, Karney, Muse, Riasat and Wilson

**Apologies:** Councillors Bayunu, Hilal and Reeves

#### **HSC/23/26 Urgent Business – The Recent Heatwave**

The Chair introduced the item of urgent business by inviting the Director of Public Health to update the Members on the local health system response to the recent heatwave.

The Director of Public Health informed the Committee that a new Heat-Health Alerts (HHAs) system had been introduced by UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) and the Met Office.

On the 7 June, the UK Health Security Agency and the Met Office had issued the first heat-health alert of the year, noting that as of Tuesday 13 June, the HHAs issued by UKHSA had been extended until 9am, Monday 19 June. All regions of England had been placed under a yellow alert for this period.

He advised that a yellow alert meant that any impacts included the increased use of health care services by vulnerable populations and an increase in risk to health for individuals over the age of 65 or those with pre-existing health conditions, including respiratory and cardiovascular diseases. There was also the potential for indoor environments, including health and care settings, to become very warm.

Information and relevant updates on Heat-Health Alerts can be viewed on the following website:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/heat-health-alerts-issued-by-ukhsa-and-the-met-office>

The Director of Public Health advised that all front-line services could register to receive these alerts, adding that an audit of all Manchester GP practices who had registered would be undertaken. He advised that timely information and advice would be shared locally with partners via trusted sources. He commented that planning across the system was underway for the response in the event of a red alert being issued and a briefing note on this would be shared with all elected Members. He added that ward specific analysis as to the impacts of extreme weather was being undertaken to inform all future planning.

The Director of Public Health stated that data on the excess deaths resulting from extreme weather for 2020 indicated that there had been two and half thousand excess deaths in that year. He added that the data for 2022 was not yet available, however it was anticipated that this figure would be higher. He commented that

anecdotal evidence indicated that there had been an increase in presentations at primary and secondary care settings during the recent heatwave. He concluded that the key public health messages, such as drinking water regularly, closing curtains to keep the direct heat out and using sunscreen remained, in addition to other messaging around associated risks such as the dangers related to open cold-water swimming.

Members of the Committee reiterated the importance of the use of sunscreen and commented that residents should shop around for this product as the prices charged by different retailers for this product could vary significantly.

### **Decision**

To note the oral update.

### **HSC/23/27 Minutes**

### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2023.

### **HSC/23/28 Adult Social Care Community Capacity Market Development and Commissioning**

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director of Adult Social Services that provided a further update on the Better Outcomes Better Lives (BOBL) Transformation Programme and an update on Adult Social Care Commissioning, including the latest refresh of the Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO) Commissioning Plan.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and update in relation to BOBL across a range of activities;
- A description of the central aims of the MLCO Commissioning Plan;
- Consideration of the other commissioning priorities and developments 23/24; and
- Conclusions.

The Committee also received a video presentation submitted by Darren Knight, Chief Executive, George House Trust that provided testimony of working with commissioners.

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

- Welcoming the format of the report and the use of plain English;
- Recognising the benefits of integrated health and social care teams and services;
- What planning was being given to respond to future demands on services, noting the ageing population;
- How would the work described address health inequalities;

- Could a citizen or a professional acting on their behalf request a reassessment of their individual care needs in the event of a change in their circumstances; and
- Noting the challenge presented by staff recruitment and retention across the care sector and what was being done to address this.

The Assistant Director, Commissioning stated that consideration was given to planning for future demands and demographic trends. She commented that commissioners were alert to the issue of residents with complex long-term conditions and disabilities; and those residents due to transition into Adult Social Care (post 18). She stated that using evidence-based analysis this then informed all considerations and future planning, noting that wider issues and solutions, such as appropriate housing adaptations were considered. She drew Member's attention to the Extra Care Housing report that had been considered by the Committee at their meeting of 22 June 2022 as one example of this approach and planning. She commented that commissioning was responsive to gaps in provision and referenced how feedback from frontline Social Workers was captured and informed this decision-making process. The Director of Market Development referred to the activities to engage with providers to identify pressures and understand capacity across the sector. He referred to the Innovation Labs that had been established to facilitate and support this ongoing dialogue, adding that the citizen's voice was evident in these conversations with providers.

The Director of Market Development further commented that the pandemic had exacerbated staffing issues that had already existed across the external care market. He described that improved relationships and dialogue with the external care sector had been established. He advised that the Council had supported with the hosting of job fairs to support the sector and many employers were now paying the Living Wage, in addition test and learn pilots had been delivered to support and develop staff, commenting that this would contribute to staff retention. He commented upon the improved relationship and understanding that now existed between commissioners and the external care provider market.

The Assistant Director, Commissioning advised that work had been done to consider inequalities mapping and to understanding the needs of various communities, and they were working with the newly appointed Joint Director, Equality, Inclusion and Engagement to consider how this area of work could be strengthened, particularly in relation to hidden need. She added that Equality Impact Assessments would inform all decision making. She further commented that coproduction and lived experience were central to commissioning and there was a commitment to this, adding that recruitment to a post to specifically support this work was currently underway and further information on this activity would be provided in future update reports to the Committee. The Director of Public Health stated that a comprehensive update report on the Making Manchester Fairer Plan was due to be considered by the Committee at their October meeting.

In response to a question from a Member, the Assistant Director, Commissioning stated that BOBL was predicated on strength-based conversations with citizens to understand what was important to the person to support their independence and wellbeing so as to then deliver the appropriate support for that individual. She advised that there was a duty under the Care Act to undertake a review of a package

of care with a person, adding that individuals or professionals could request a care assessment again if their needs changed. She commented that the learning of the Unpaid Carer Survey model would be developed and rolled out more widely with a view to assessing citizen satisfaction. She further referred to the Early Help Offer in North Manchester that could act as a triage service for citizens to identify means of immediate, low-level support that could be accessed pending a full formal assessment.

The Chief Executive of the Manchester Local Care Organisation described the positive outcomes of the integration of health and social care across Manchester. She advised that BOBL provide a sound foundation on which to engage with NHS partners to create and deliver services that responded to citizens needs and utilise all available resources.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **HSC/23/29 Manchester Safeguarding Partnership Annual Report 2021-22**

The Committee considered the report of Manchester Safeguarding Partnership Adults Executive Chair, that provided a summary update on the Manchester Safeguarding Partnership (MSP) Annual report. The Annual report was appended to the report.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- An introduction, describing that the MSP was a partnership of adult and children's safeguarding;
- Describing the Partnership arrangements;
- Communication and engagement;
- Safeguarding effectiveness and scrutiny;
- Safeguarding practice reviews;
- Learning and development;
- Complex safeguarding;
- Neglect; and
- Homelessness.

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

- Welcoming the openness and honesty within the report;
- Recognising the significant impact the pandemic had on safeguarding;
- Enquiring if the information and data that described the outcomes of this work would be included in the 2022/23 report;
- Recognising the importance of coproduction; and
- How did the work of safeguarding in Manchester compare to that in the other nine authorities across Greater Manchester.

The Assistant Director, Adult Social Care advised that the production of the 2022/23 report had been delayed for a number of reasons but was currently being finalised



and would be presented to the Committee at an appropriate time. He advised that the 2022/23 report would discuss the outcomes, impact and evaluation of this work for Manchester residents. He described that the 2022/23 report would also include the new Strategic Plan that was evidence based and responded to the safeguarding issues that had arisen and been acutely intensified as a result of the pandemic. He further informed the Committee that the Strategic Plan also captured and articulated the citizen voice and experience. He commented that the report would also update the Committee on the improved and strengthened governance arrangements that had developed following an independent review.

The Assistant Director, Adult Social Care commented that there were many common safeguarding themes that existed across all the Greater Manchester authorities, however Manchester had its own unique, bespoke and complex challenges. He said that the new governance arrangements acknowledged and responded to this complexity. He added that Manchester was a member of the Northwest Safeguarding Alliance that provided a forum to share learning and experience.

In response to a specific question about the relationship between the NHS Greater Manchester Integrated Care System and safeguarding, the Director of Public Health advised that this would be captured in the report that was scheduled for consideration at the September meeting.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **HSC/23/30 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 discussions were ongoing to agree the scope and remit of the Mental Health Subgroup that was recommended at the May meeting. She advised that if Members were interested in joining the Subgroup they should contact both herself and the Scrutiny Support Officer.

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report and agrees the work programme.



## Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 25 May 2023

**Present:**

Councillor Simcock (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Andrews, Brickell, Connolly, Davies, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick and Lanchbury

**Also present:**

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Finance and Resources  
Councillor Moran, Deputy Executive Member for Finance and Resources

**Apologies:** Councillors Evans and Wheeler

#### **RGSC/23/21            Interests**

Councillor Julie Connolly declared a prejudicial and pecuniary interest in items 5 and 8 and would leave the meeting for the duration of discussions.

#### **RGSC/23/22            Minutes**

**Decision:**

That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 7 March 2023, be approved as a correct record.

#### **RGSC/23/23            Commercial Update (Part A)**

The committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which provided an overview of key aspects of the Council's commercial portfolio as well as outlining the governance and assurance activity which took place before, during and post completion of commercial transactions.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Commercial governance and assurance, including strategic oversight of companies, Joint Ventures, and charities;
- Directorship training facilitated for members and officers;
- The Due Diligence Framework, which provided financial and reputational assurance to the Council via the analysis of the performance and sustainability of the organisations which the Council were currently working or proposing to contract with;

- The regulation of commercial activity;
- The purpose of Public Interest and Best Value Reports; and
- Risk management.

Key points and queries that arose from the committee's discussions included:

- How confident officers were in the governance of the Council's commercial activities, citing a recent announcement of a government audit into Teesworks in Teeside;
- How many individuals were still to undertake directorship training;
- Whether directorship training was available prior to being appointed for those considering the position;
- If a list of those who had undertaken directorship training was available;
- Whether the Council reported on the diversity of boards which members and officers were appointed to;
- The impact of the Subsidy Control Act;
- Noting that the Due Diligence Framework was applied to 'gold' contracts, and querying the approach to non- 'gold' contracts;
- How the Council was being proactive in managing reputational and financial risk through its investments and holdings;
- Whether the Council made any savings with regard to culture and leisure during the Covid-19 pandemic; and
- Suggesting that a public notice is included on the website to explain why the Council appoints to boards.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer explained that the Council had a successful record in development and regeneration activity. She stated that the governance arrangements in place were robust and continuously monitored and that the Council sought to identify and review good practice from others.

The Chair highlighted a recent news article which disclosed that a review into allegations of "corruption, wrongdoing and illegality" at the Teesworks redevelopment scheme in Teeside had been ordered by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. In response to a query regarding officers' confidence in the governance of the Council's commercial activities, members were advised that there were robust governance arrangements in place around transactions, partnerships and ventures. The Head of Commercial Governance explained that the Due Diligence Framework was used to monitor schemes with regular updates on progress of entities and their stability. She also stated that the Commercial Board received regular updates on major property transactions and regeneration projects and were sighted on the activity and performance of these.

The Head of Commercial Governance advised members that there were less than 10 individuals still to undertake directorship training and that a regular overview of memberships was maintained to ensure any new appointees were fully trained. She

stated that the directorship training programme had been well received with a lot of positive feedback.

In response to a query around the diversity of boards, the Head of Commercial Governance stated that this would be a focus for the team in the year ahead. She stated that officers had an understanding of diversity across boards, but work was needed to strengthen knowledge and understanding.

Members were also advised that directorship training could be undertaken by those considering a Board position prior to being appointed.

The Head of Commercial Governance explained that some members and officers held directorships on multiple Boards, and this was registered through the declaration of interests process and company board registrations, which were public record on the Companies House website. This information would be circulated following the meeting.

In response to queries, the committee was informed that the Subsidy Control Act was introduced at the beginning of 2023 and the Council had an active working group which was examining the implications of the Act. It was also stated that the Council was required to complete a database to publicly outline what subsidies the Council had given to third parties.

The Head of Commercial Governance also stated that 'gold' contracts were those of significant value to the Council and were used to test the fitness of the Due Diligence Framework. She stated that the Framework was now being applied to 'silver' contracts and further detail on the type of contracts this covered would be provided following the meeting. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer also stated that a report on the Council's Major Contracts Oversight Board would be provided to a future meeting of the committee.

Members were advised that the Council reviewed the Public Interest Reports and Best Value Reports of other local authorities to assess whether Manchester's approach was appropriate.

In response to a member's query regarding lower spend on culture and leisure during the pandemic, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer explained that the government reimbursed local authorities for any additional costs incurred as a result of the pandemic and the Council had utilised the entirety of this funding. She explained that this did not, however, cover the loss of commercial income such as parking and leisure services revenue. She stated that the Council's reserves had been built up for a number of reasons, such as the Covid Outbreak Management Fund (COMF) and additional grants and relief schemes for business rates.

In response to a suggestion made by a member, the Head of Commercial Governance confirmed that the Council did not currently have any published

information to explain why some members and officers were appointed to Boards but that this could be considered.

**Decision:**

That the report be noted.

**RGSC/23/24            Overview Report**

The committee received a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which provided details of key decisions that fell within the Committee's remit. 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:**

That the report be noted.

**RGSC/23/25            Exclusion of Press and Public**

**Decision:**

That the press and public be excluded during consideration of the following item which involved consideration of exempt information relating to the financial or business affairs of particular persons and public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

**RGSC/23/26            Commercial Update (Part B)**

The committee received and considered a confidential report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which provided further detail of the structure, financing and terms of the Council's commercial activity, supplementary to item 5.

**Decision:**

That the report be noted.

## Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 22 June 2023

#### Present:

Councillor Simcock (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Andrews, Brickell, Connolly, Davies, Evans, Kilpatrick, Lanchbury and Wheeler

#### Also present:

Councillor Rahman, Statutory Deputy Leader  
Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Finance and Resources  
Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Development  
Councillor Moran, Deputy Executive Member for Finance and Resources  
Councillor Karney, Chair of the Constitutional and Nomination Committee

**Apologies:** Councillor Kirkpatrick

In opening the meeting, the Chair reminded members that there would be a site visit to the Town Hall on Monday 10 July at 2pm.

#### **RGSC/23/27            Interests**

Councillor Julie Connolly declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 7 and would remain in the meeting for the duration of the discussion.

#### **RGSC/23/28            Minutes**

#### **Decision:**

That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 25 May 2023, be approved as a correct record.

#### **RGSC/23/29            Elections Act 2022 and the 4 May 2023 Local Election - Progress Report on its Impacts**

The committee considered a report of the Chief Executive which provided a full update on how the new duties of the Elections Act 2022 impacted on the local election on 4 May 2023.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background to the Elections Act 2022;
- Figures on the number of applications for a Voter Authority Certificate (VAC) received by the Council;

- The number of enquiries received by the Contact Centre before and on Polling Day;
- 60, 742 electors voted in person at the election out of a total of 313,519 eligible;
- 1,060 polling station electors were not initially issued with a ballot paper but later returned with accepted ID;
- 589 polling station electors applied for but were not issued with a ballot paper by close of poll;
- The Electoral Commission were collating data from all 230 councils who held elections in May to produce a report evaluating the full impact of the voter ID requirement and a report on the key findings of this would be provided to the Scrutiny Committee when it is published;
- The reasonable equipment provisions that were in place at polling stations;
- The impact of the communications campaign; and
- The changes expected from July 2023 as a result of the second tranche of legislation through the Act.

Key points and queries that arose from the committee's discussions included:

- Thanking the Elections team and all staff who worked on polling stations and the count;
- How many people in Manchester had been charged with voter fraud in the last 10 years;
- The costs incurred by Manchester City Council as a result of involvement in Greater Manchester's communications campaign;
- Requesting further information on the gradual move to online postal voting applications as stipulated in the Elections Act 2022;
- What ongoing communications there would be to encourage electors to apply for VACs; and
- Noting that a new parliamentary boundary map was expected to be released imminently and querying whether discussions with neighbouring authorities regarding cross-boundary constituencies were underway.

In opening the item, the Chair stated that the introduction of voter ID was a wholly unnecessary, politically motivated scheme that had cost millions of pounds, but he congratulated council staff for their efficiency and consideration in dealing with VAC applications. He also paid tribute to the electorate who adhered to the change in requirements.

The City Solicitor also expressed her thanks to staff and acknowledged the challenges that the changes arising from the Elections Act 2022 posed. She stated that representatives from central government, the Electoral Commission, the Association of Electoral Administrators (AEA), a London authority and a Scottish authority observed Manchester on polling day, and all praised the work and good practice within polling stations, with some national organisations noting this work to



share across the country. She noted further challenges arising within the coming year, including changes to postal and proxy vote applications which the Council was awaiting further guidance on. A polling district review would also be undertaken after new parliamentary boundaries came into effect in December 2023. The City Solicitor stated that further engagement would be undertaken with communities to enfranchise more electors.

The Statutory Deputy Leader stated that the introduction of voter ID was an attempt to disenfranchise people, particularly the working class and young people. He stated that the national advertising campaign was poor and that there was little attempt to notify people of the changes. He expressed his belief that one voter turned away from a polling station was one voter too many. He paid tribute to the Elections team for their work in what he stated were difficult circumstances but called on the government to reverse the policy and build trust in politics to encourage more residents to exercise their democratic right.

In response to a member's query regarding how many people in Manchester had been convicted of voter fraud in the last 10 years, the City Solicitor explained that she was not aware of any individuals who had been convicted of voter fraud within the last 10 years, but this would be confirmed to members following the meeting. She stated that the number of people convicted nationally was also very low.

The Head of Strategic Communications explained that there was a cross-Greater Manchester (GM) approach to communications which the Council supplemented with specific activity in Manchester to reach those most likely to be affected by changes imposed by the Act. He stated that the cost of the GM-wide campaign was £93k, to which Manchester City Council contributed £17k. Additional expenditure was also incurred by the Council, including banners for display outside of polling stations and 12 additional translations, to a total £50k. The Head of Strategic Communications explained that this additional expenditure was felt to be necessary and important given that the 2023 local election was the first since the changes had been introduced.

The Electoral Services Corporate Delivery Manager explained that the Council was awaiting further information from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC), which was currently undertaking beta testing of the online postal vote application portal. Assurances were provided that paper application forms would still be available and further information would be provided once available.

In response to a query regarding what ongoing communications there would be to encourage electors to apply for VACs, the committee was advised that this would continue to be promoted through the annual canvass period. The Elections and Electoral Registration Policy Officer explained that an engagement campaign was being developed to run throughout the summer as part of consultations on the polling district review and the annual canvass. He stated that the Council was working with

Macc and the Our Manchester VSCE Fund, universities, Age Friendly Manchester, Breakthrough UK to reach disabled groups, the Council's Neighbourhoods service, homelessness services and the care and veterans' sectors on this to reach a wide range of communities and groups. Members also requested that further information on this be shared with councillors to distribute at events.

The City Solicitor confirmed that there would be six different cross-boundary parliamentary constituencies as a result of the boundary review and acknowledged that this would add a complexity to parliamentary elections. The Electoral Services Corporate Delivery Manager explained that regular meetings with neighbouring authorities were held through Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA). She stated that the new boundaries would only come into effect once a parliamentary election was called. A report on how the Council was preparing for these changes would be provided to the next meeting of the Constitutional and Nominations Committee.

The Chair of the Constitutional and Nominations Committee stated that only 10 people in the UK had been taken to court over suspected voted fraud in the last 5 years, none of which were in Manchester. On behalf of the Constitutional and Nominations Committee, he thanked staff who worked on the elections and stated that it would be difficult to fully understand the number of electors who were dissuaded from voting as a result of the requirement to present ID.

### **Decision:**

That the report be noted.

### **RGSC/23/30      Our New Finance and HR System**

The committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Director of Human Resources, Organisational Development and Transformation (HRODT) which provided an update on the work undertaken so far to replace the SAP HR and Finance system, the procurement approach and timescales, and the risks and opportunities presented by this implementation.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background to SAP, which was implemented in 2006;
- The programme vision and how this project aligned to the Digital Strategy;
- The approach to implementation, including governance and scrutiny processes;
- How the replacement system would be procured, designed, configured, and implemented;
- Lessons learned from other system implementations; and
- Next steps and the timeline for the project.

Key points and queries that arose from the committee's discussions included:

- Whether the Head of Internal Audit would be consulted on the project;
- Requesting that a short note on the controls within the new system be provided to the Audit Committee at the appropriate time;
- Whether a robust testing period would be planned and whether feedback on any issues would be provided to the Audit Committee;
- Acknowledging that the current system had been in place for 17 years;
- Noting that the programme team had engaged with other Local Authorities implementing new Finance and HR systems, and querying what other learning methods were available;
- Seeking clarification on what was meant by '*transformation*' and '*vision*';
- Requesting further information on STAR Procurement, who were commissioned to provide tailored professional advice and support; and
- Noting the procurement timeline and querying whether this was challenging.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that the replacement of the HR and Finance system was fundamental in delivering improvements to how the Council worked. She stated that she was responsible for the project overall and would provide visible and proactive leadership. She expressed her thanks to the Deputy City Treasurer and the Director of HRODT and their teams for their work on the project thus far.

The Director of HRODT stated that the project provided a great opportunity for the Council to continue its transformation journey. He stated that there would be an emphasis on supporting staff through this change and ensuring that officers were equipped with the necessary digital skills to use this new technology.

The Deputy City Treasurer explained that the tender was now out to market and requests to participate from a number of suppliers had been received. These were currently being evaluated with an anticipated six suppliers being invited to tender by the Programme Board. The evaluation of this would be undertaken throughout the summer with an appointment anticipated to be made in December 2023. He stated that the transactional aspect of the system was scheduled to go live on 1 April 2025.

In response to a member's query, the Deputy City Treasurer explained that the Head of Internal Audit was aware of the programme and would be responsible for the approval of financial controls within the new system.

The Deputy City Treasurer also confirmed that a 3-month testing period had been factored into the implementation plan.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that there had been several major upgrades to the SAP system since its implementation in 2006 and that it was fully Public Services Network (PSN) compliant. The system would become defunct after 2027, which was why work was already underway to implement a new system.

She also stated that the Council would not endeavour to make any new system as bespoke as SAP.

Members were also advised that as part of any procurement within ICT, the Council identified lessons learnt from other authorities. There were also Treasurers' and ICT Directors' Networks where good practice and learning was shared.

The Deputy City Treasurer explained to the committee that STAR Procurement was a shared service between Stockport, Trafford, Rochdale, and Tameside authorities and was used by the Council where additional capacity in a procurement process was required.

In response to the Chair's query regarding whether the deadline for implementation was challenging, the Deputy City Treasurer stated that the timescales within the project plan were sufficient and provided some degree of flexibility.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources concluded by stating that the implementation of the new system was a significant piece of work that would provide a once-in-a-generation change to impact the future shape and work of the Council. He explained that Councillor Rahman and himself would have political oversight for this work.

**Decision:**

That the report be noted.

**RGSC/23/31 Major Contracts**

The committee received a report of the Head of Integrated Commissioning and Procurement and the Strategic Lead – Commissioning which provided an update on the Council's key contracts, the approach to procurement of these contracts and assessments of how to source contracts due for renewal and/or extension.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- An introduction to major contracts, how they are classified as major contracts and a summary of oversight arrangements;
- Background to the Major Contracts Board;
- An overview of the procurement pipeline and recommissioning status of the major contracts; and
- Next steps for the work on major contracts and the contract management programme of work more generally.

Key points and queries that arose from the committee's discussions included:

- Noting the brevity of the report;

- Requesting that milestones be built into the Board's work programme to enable the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee to comment on the procurement of contracts;
- Whether progress updates on the Housing Repairs Contract could be provided to the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee at 12- and 24-month points;
- Requesting that a report on the Housing Repairs Contract be provided to the Scrutiny Committee;
- How many contracts had plans to be insourced;
- Emphasising the democratic will of the Council to insource services, and querying what obstacles there were to this;
- Requesting that a future report includes an appendix with more detailed information on each contract;
- Whether trade union consultation had been considered by the Joint Consultative Committee (JCC); and
- Noting that the implications of the new Procurement Act could fall within the remit of the Audit Committee and requesting that both the Chair of Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee and the Chair of Audit Committee are kept informed.

In introducing the item, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer apologised for the lateness of the report, advising that there was currently limited capacity within the Procurement team and that lessons would be learnt. She explained that the work of the Major Contracts Oversight Board work aligned with the developing insourcing policy. It ensured that the Council worked ahead of schedule on the contracts pipeline and had sufficient lead-in time to consider all options and undertake feasibility studies in advance of contracts expiring. It also focused on ensuring that the appropriate contract monitoring mechanisms were in place. She provided assurances that the Biffa waste service contract was within the remit of the board and had been considered recently.

In response to a member's request, the Strategic Lead – Commissioning stated that the Board would meet the week after and would ensure that the work programme aligned with that of the Scrutiny Committee. He also stated that the Board was examining general updates on the performance of major contracts in addition to future procurement.

In response to a request for 12- and 24-month progress updates on the Housing Repairs Contract, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that she would discuss with the Executive Member what the appropriate mechanism would be for sharing this information with the committee.

The Strategic Lead – Commissioning explained that there were delivery assessment models being progressed or shortly being progressed for all contracts soon to be procured or recommissioned. He recognised that there were time pressures impacting some contracts and that some were unsuitable to be insourced, such as where there are only single providers within the sector.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources reiterated that the viability of insourcing was a key part of the delivery model assessment of contracts and clarified that there was no resistance to insourcing amongst officers. The Executive Member for Housing and Development stated that the Executive and officers recognised the motion on insourcing passed at Full Council in February 2023 and cited bringing Northwards housing stock under the Council's control as an example of the commitment to insourcing.

In response to a request for a report on the Housing Repairs Contract, the Strategic Lead – Commissioning stated that he would consult with the Director of Housing Services and the Executive Member for Housing and Development on this.

It was also confirmed that the Joint Consultative Committee had discussed consultation with trade unions and that the draft policy had been shared with them. Further detailed conversations would be held over the summer.

**Decision:**

That the Committee

1. notes the report, and
2. requests that a more substantial report be provided at the next update and includes an appendix with more detailed information on each major contract and whether insourcing would be viable.

**RGSC/23/32            Ethical Procurement Policy and Fair Tax**

The committee received a report of the Head of Integrated Commissioning and Procurement and the Strategic Lead – Commissioning which provided an update on the Council's ethical procurement and fair tax assessments in procurement and development decision-making.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- The purpose and objectives of the Council's Ethical Procurement Policy;
- New national procurement regulations were expected to take effect from October 2024;
- Under current procurement legislation, local authorities are unable to exclude companies from supply chains on the grounds of tax practices unless they have been prosecuted and convicted of a specific offence;
- The advantages and drawbacks of the Council signing up to the Fair Tax Charter; and
- The suggested approach to progressing the Fair Tax agenda.

Key points and queries that arose from the committee's discussions included:

- Whether Fair Tax was classed as a non-commercial matter, which would allow a supplier to challenge a decision to award a contract;
- How regulations prohibiting local authorities from excluding companies from supply chains on the grounds of tax practices unless they have been prosecuted and convicted of a specific offence impacted current due diligence practices; and
- What powers public sector organisations had to exclude companies from supply chains on the grounds of poor reputation, citing the cladding crisis as an example.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources stated that the Council's Ethical Procurement Policy had been in place for over 10 years and that the government's new procurement regulations were expected to be announced in July 2023 and implemented in October 2024. He stated that the Ethical Procurement Policy went as far as it could within the current legislation and highlighted how the Council was a Living Wage accredited authority and had signed up to several charters, including Unison's Ethical Care Charter and the Unite Construction Charter. He explained that the Council was focussing on the Fair Tax agenda and due diligence work was currently being undertaken on all Joint Ventures that the Council had entered into, following engagement with the Fair Tax Foundation. He also explained that the Council was exploring the possibility of embedding Fair Tax principles when reviewing procurement processes and that the Labour Group was considering submitting a motion to Full Council that would reinforce the commitment to the Fair Tax agenda.

In response to members' queries, the Strategic Lead – Commissioning stated that Fair Tax was generally a non-commercial consideration but that tax compliance with UK law could be used as grounds to exclude a company from the supply chain. He also explained that there was a standard questionnaire used across the public sector which was set by the government and included questions around tax compliance.

It was acknowledged that ultimate ownership of a company could be challenging to ascertain but this was included in the questionnaire.

The Strategic Lead – Commissioning explained that the standard questionnaire provided more scope to disregard tenders where there have been previous breaches of the law and the new procurement regulations would give more scope to exclude suppliers on ethical grounds and past performance than the current provisions allowed.

Members were advised that reputational issues were classed as non-commercial matters but that the Social Value Policy assisted the Council to work with suppliers who shared similar values and ethics. The Strategic Lead – Commissioning stated

that discussions could be held outside of the meeting if members had specific concerns.

**Decision:**

That the report be noted.

**RGSC/23/33            Social Value**

The committee received a report of the Head of Integrated Commissioning and Procurement and the Strategic Lead – Commissioning which set out the Council's approach to social value.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background to social value;
- The social value governance and programme;
- An overview of social value in commissioning and procurement;
- Social value key performance indicator (KPIs) targets and actuals to date for the Our Town Hall project;
- Issues and next steps; and
- Case studies of social value within the Highways service.

Key points and queries that arose from the committee's discussions included:

- Welcoming the work, particularly that in North Manchester;
- Why the KPIs around new apprentices up to level 3 and existing apprentices employed were below target, and requesting that this be referenced in the Our Town Hall Project Update report scheduled for July;
- How social value projects can help with community cohesion where new developments are built in existing communities;
- Noting that social value can help to improve contractors and career progression;
- How social value within procurement can be tracked and monitored;
- Whether a communications plan was in place to publicise the good work being driven through social value;
- How information on social value was captured where the Council had worked with the same suppliers as other organisations; and
- How delivery on the KPIs for the Factory International project would compare with those for Our Town Hall.

The Deputy Executive Member for Finance and Resources stated that the Council's commitment to social value began in 2007 and that Manchester had the largest social value and zero carbon weightings in their procurement process than any other local authority in the country, which demonstrated how the Council was a pioneer in social value. She explained that the Council had dedicated policies and governance



structures to ensure that social value was embedded into procurement and commissioning processes. She stated that social value had provided an innovative way to support deprived communities against a backdrop of funding cuts.

The Social and Economic Project Manager informed the committee of several projects he had worked on to deliver social value with different contractors, education settings and Council teams.

In response to a member's query regarding the number of apprentices employed on the Our Town Hall project, the Strategic Lead – Commissioning stated that he would confirm this with the project team.

The Social and Economic Project Manager explained that a community group had been established to engage on masterplans and that a review was being undertaken on how to improve community engagement.

The Strategic Lead – Commissioning acknowledged the importance of tracking social value achievements in procurement. He stated that the Council had a dedicated tool for tracking social value on larger contracts such as construction and highways. He recognised that there was a challenge in tracking this across a multitude of contracts, but this was included in the service's programme of work. A new contract management system was being implemented and would have the capability to track KPIs. Officers were also considering a measuring tool for medium-sized contracts and how to collate more case studies.

The committee was also advised that the Social Value Fund consisted of monetary contributions made by suppliers and had been used for a number of projects overseen by the Social Value Governance Board. However, it was noted that some of the biggest contributions to social value were made through the creation of jobs and opportunities.

In response to a query regarding whether a communications plan was available, the Social and Economic Project Manager explained that an annual report was provided to the Regeneration and Economic Board and could be shared with members following this. Organisations that the Council worked with also created their own annual reports, which could be shared. Weekly updates were provided to the Growth and Development team and the communications group met monthly.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that achievements of zero carbon work were highlighted by the communications group and the Council's communications team to capture information and produce a newsletter. She noted that this could be implemented for social value achievements.

In response to the Chair's query regarding the KPIs for Factory International, it was advised that a report on this was considered by the Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee in March 2023 and provided further detail.

The Strategic Lead – Commissioning explained that social value was monitored on a project-by-project basis and good practice was shared, particularly in the construction sector, but he noted that it was an area for development.

**Decision:**

That the report be noted.

**RGSC/23/34            Overview Report**

The committee received a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which provided details of key decisions that fell within the Committee's remit. The report also included the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to amend as appropriate and agree.

The Chair sought assurances that the reports scheduled for the next meeting would be published on time with the exception of The Factory International Project report. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer confirmed this.

In response to a member's query regarding whether an update on the naming rights for Factory International would be included within the report, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer confirmed and stated that this information would be provided in a Part B report to be discussed in closed session.

**Decision:** That the report be noted.

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

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 25 May 2023**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Shilton Godwin – in the Chair  
Councillors Chohan, Collins, Doswell, Holt, Ilyas, McCaul and Wiest

**Apologies:** Councillors Razaq and 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  
Samantha Nicholson, Director of Manchester Climate Change Agency  
Michael Wilton, Chair of Manchester Climate Change Partnership

### **ECCNSC/23/29 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 9 March 2023 as a correct record.

To note the minutes of the meeting of the Climate Change Ward Action Plans Task and Finish Group held 23 March 2023.

### **ECCNSC/23/30 Manchester Climate Change Framework (2022 Update) – Progress Report**

The Committee considered the report of Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency (MCCA) and the Chair, Manchester Climate Change Partnership (MCCP) that provided an overview of progress being made to deliver the recommended actions in the 2022 Update to Manchester's Climate Change Framework (2020-25) which was published in October 2022.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Describing some of the positive actions that had been launched or delivered across the city since October 2022;
- Describing the progress being made to map activity against the recommended actions put forward by the 2022 Update; and
- Discussion of the challenges with capturing and collating robust and meaningful data on climate change activity and emissions reductions.

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

- Welcoming the information that described that the MCCA and MCCP had secured an A List rating for Manchester from CDP. Noting that this positioned the city as

one of only 122 global cities that met the highest standard of leadership and transparency on environmental action and data disclosure. Only 12% of cities that were scored received this rating;

- Asking how optimistic the Partnership was since the update to the Framework six months ago;
- What would the impact of the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme be;
- Welcoming the information regarding the Manchester Climate Pack and the 'story pack' adding that this should be shared with NHS partners across the city so as to avoid any crisis in the event of a period of extreme weather;
- Further information was sought as to the anticipated impact of the Greater Manchester Trailblazer Devolution Deal, published March 2023;
- Commenting that this Trailblazer Devolution Deal should be used to maximise all opportunities, including green skills; and
- The Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging Strategy needed to be inclusive across the city.

The Chair of Manchester Climate Change Partnership provided the Members with a description of the Partnership, commenting that there was a positive range of activity across the partners to address climate change. He advised that membership of the Partnership was expanding, and the work had accelerated which was a very positive development. He commented that the A List rating was very positive for the city, however he commented that currently the city was not on target to remain within its carbon budget, and the message remained that more needed to be done. He stated that more support was required from government on this agenda, in particular to the issue of domestic retrofitting.

In response to comments raised regarding the Airport, the Chair of Manchester Climate Change Partnership stated that Manchester Airport Group (MAG) were members of the Partnership, and a specific subgroup had been established to consider this area of activity. He described that as an operator MAG had a good operating model in terms of carbon emissions and had led nationally on the discussions regarding the issue of alternative, sustainable aviation fuel. He further acknowledged that social change and climate justice was linked to climate change and made reference to the conversation that was ongoing regarding the use of aviation in these terms.

The Director of Manchester Climate Change Agency commented that the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme was welcomed, however it was not at the scale required. She commented that information was shared with NHS partners across the city and the wider Greater Manchester Integrated Care system. With regard to the Trailblazer Devolution Deal she advised that following finalisation of these arrangements a programme of detailed planning and actions would be undertaken, adding that this would include consideration of the issue of skills. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer informed the Members that the Greater Manchester Trailblazer Devolution Deal would not prevent Manchester from applying for future funding streams as and when they became available, and that work would be undertaken with Greater Manchester Combined Authority to maximise the outcomes of the Trailblazer Devolution Deal.

The Director of Manchester Climate Change Agency responded to the number of actions listed in the Updated Framework and advised that the actions were owned by the various stakeholders. The Chair of Manchester Climate Change Partnership added that stakeholders were committed to driving and delivering the actions and further added that the challenge was to understand, quantify and report the impact of these actions.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport stated that a report on the Electric Vehicle Charging Strategy had been considered by the Committee and Executive at their December 2022 meetings. She recommended Members referred to this report and advised that this was one element of the wider approach and consideration being taken in regard to the issue of active travel and carbon emissions.

The Chair noted the comment from the Chair of Manchester Climate Change Partnership regarding the ask of government. She advised that following the March meeting an email had been sent to the Secretary of State for Energy Security and Net Zero inviting him to attend a meeting with the Committee, however this invitation had been declined.

The Chair thanked the guests for presenting the report and responding to Members questions. In noting the report, she recommended that when the Manchester Climate Change Agency/ Partnership 2022/23 Annual Report was submitted for consideration at the Committee's October meeting this report should include information in relation to next steps, clearly defined actions and discussion of the challenges.

## **Decision**

The Committee recommend that when the Manchester Climate Change Agency/ Partnership 2022/23 Annual Report is submitted for consideration at the Committee's October meeting this should include information in relation to next steps, clearly defined actions, and challenges.

### **ECCNSC/23/31      Steps being taken on the Council's procurement and wider actions to support reduction in consumption-based emissions (Scope 3)**

The Committee considered the report of Strategic Lead Commissioning, Integrated Commissioning and Procurement that provided an update on the steps being taken in relation to the Council's procurement and more widely to reduce carbon emissions, specifically emissions associated with the goods, services and works that the council 'consumes'.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background, with a definition of the different emission categories;
- Discussion of the main issues across a range of different activities;
- Providing examples; and

- Discussion of the current challenges, with particular reference to the measurement of Scope 3 emissions.

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

- What monitoring of contracts was undertaken to ensure they were compliant with the 10% environmental weighting in evaluations;
- Was 10% environmental an appropriate weighting;
- Welcoming the information provided that small organisations, including VCSE organisations were putting forward good scoring bids and demonstrating carbon reduction plans;
- An update was requested on the training given to commissioners and procurement staff;
- A view was sought as to the government developing a new procurement portal system in preparation for the Procurement Bill coming into force; and
- Noting that contractors that included vehicle use should be encouraged to adopt appropriate driving practices to reduce environmental impacts.

The Strategic Lead Commissioning responded to the Members comments by stating that all contracts were monitored in accordance with the usual contract management protocols. He advised that dialogue and engagement with providers was important adding that Construction and Highways had a bespoke tool to measure and monitor projects. He stated that the 10% weighting was an appropriate level, commenting that any more could risk quality. He added that no other Authority required more than 10%. He advised that Manchester had led on this approach and positive outcomes were being realised. He acknowledged the comments raised regarding VCSE organisations, stating that a number of engagement events had been delivered and good practice shared. He stated that this approach complimented the VCSE Grant Funding programme so that a consistent message regarding climate change was delivered.

The Strategic Lead Commissioning stated that specific training had been delivered to Commissioners, Contract Managers and Procurement Staff in relation to the 10% environmental weighting. He reported that this built upon the Carbon Literacy Training that had been undertaken by all staff. He stated that the feedback from staff had been very positive, and the intention was to establish an e-learning package for staff, in addition to the informal support that was provided to staff.

The Strategic Lead Commissioning responded to the concern expressed by the Chair in regard to the new government procurement portal. He stated that the exact details were currently unknown, however representation had been made regarding the need to acknowledge local prioritise.

In reply to the discussion regarding specific driving practices he stated that he would look into this following the meeting, however commented that in the example referred to, monitoring data would be built into the contract and specialist software would be used to identify the most efficient routes to realise emissions savings.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

**ECCNSC/23/32      Final Report and Recommendations of the Climate Change Ward Action Plans Task and Finish Group**

The Committee considered the report of Climate Change Ward Action Plans Task and Finish Group that presented the findings of the detailed investigation undertaken by the Group.

The Committee were invited to note the report and endorse the recommendations.

**Decision**

To note the report and endorse the recommendations as listed at section 8 of the report.

**ECCNSC/23/33      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 invited Members to nominate areas of interest that they would like included on the Committee's Work Programme. These suggestions were collected by the Scrutiny Support Officer and the Chair, in consultation with Executive Members, other Scrutiny Chairs and Officers would schedule items that fell within the remit of the Committee.

**Decision**

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





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

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2023**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Shilton Godwin – in the Chair  
Councillors Chohan, Collins, Doswell, Holt, Ilyas, Razaq, Wiest and Wright

**Apologies:** Councillor McCaul

#### **Also present:**

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

### **ECCNSC/23/34 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 25 May 2023 as a correct record.

### **ECCNSC/23/35 Climate Change Action Plan Work Programme 2023-24**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided Members with an update on the work programme for the third year of the Action Plan (CCAP Work Programme 2023-24).

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Describing the actions to be progressed in Year 4 of the Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) 2020-25;
- The achievements and highlights of Year 3 would be detailed in the Annual Report 2022-23 which would be presented to the Committee and the Executive in September 2023 and would then be made available on the Council's website;
- Noting that the actions described were structured across the following five workstreams:
  1. Buildings and Energy.
  2. Transport and Travel.
  3. Reducing Consumption Based Emissions and Influencing Suppliers.
  4. Climate Adaptation, Carbon Storage and Carbon Sequestration.
  5. Influencing Behaviour and Being a Catalyst for Change; and
- Distinguishing between those actions that were Council Actions and those that were City Actions.

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

- What were the identified challenges on delivery of the actions in year 4;

- How was the breadth of good work and progress made communicated to residents of the city, adding that this was important to influence wider behaviour change in relation to climate action;
- Were there enough recycling facilities across the Council buildings estate sufficient to enable all staff to recycle appropriately;
- More information was requested in relation to green skills and housing, with particular reference to Registered Housing Providers across the city;
- Did we use all available levers to influence partners and other sectors across the city to take immediate action to address climate change;
- Noting the reference to the Manchester Food Board and commenting that methane associated with food waste was a significant contributor to climate change;
- Further information was requested in relation to the sustainable materials list that identified carbon and whole life costs for Highways that had been identified as an action in workstream 2; and
- Consideration needed to be given to advertising that was displayed across the city so as not to promote high carbon emission activities or products.

In response to the Members' comments and questions the Zero Carbon Manager described that the key areas and challenges related to buildings and transport. She stated that significant progress had been achieved and reported to the Committee in regard to reducing emissions across the Council owned estate; however, domestic retrofit, across all sectors was a challenge. She described that they worked closely with the Climate Change Partnership and used the experience and outcomes achieved across the Council estate to provide examples of good practice to influence the commercial sector. She described that they were also working with Registered Housing Providers as part of the wider approach to housing retrofit and the Committee noted that they would receive a substantive report on this work at their September meeting, adding that this would also include consideration of skills. She further added that information and updates in relations to transport would be included in the Quarter 1 Update Report that was scheduled for the next meeting.

The Zero Carbon Manager described the approach to promoting the good work to influence behaviour change. She said that they had a dedicated communications strategy that utilised social media. She further made reference to the important work delivered by the Neighbourhood Teams who were supported by dedicated Climate Change Officers. She made reference to the number of green related community events and activities delivered and the work undertaken with schools.

The Zero Carbon Manager commented that all available levers and opportunities, at a local, regional, national and international level, were used to support, promote and influence on the issue of climate change.

The Strategic Lead, Resources & Programmes informed the Committee that the Executive would be considering a report titled 'Large Scale Renewable Energy Generation – Power Purchase Agreement' at their meeting of 28 June. He commented that this was an important development for the Council to further contribute to the reduction in the Council's own direct emissions and increase the provision of additional green energy to the Council. He stated that a report on this area of work would be considered by this Committee at the November meeting.

The Principal Resources and Programmes Officer, Zero Carbon Team added that progress against some aspects of work had slipped for good reason as it was important that local ambitions aligned to wider plans and strategies that were being developed at a Greater Manchester level, making reference to the GM Clean Air Plan and Places for Everyone. She further informed the Members that work was ongoing with the Facilities Management Team to improve staff recycling facilities across the estate, commenting that this could be a challenge in smaller locations where staff were located.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport stated that the Council continued to lobby Government for additional support to enable the Council to drive forward and deliver at pace this important area of work. In regard to the comments regarding methane and food waste she stated that she would pick this up with the Food Board. In regard to the question asked in relation to Highways, she advised that a briefing note on this would be provided for Members. In response to the comments made regarding advertising across the city she said that she would discuss this with the Communications Team.

The Deputy Executive Member for Environment and Transport commented that the work the Council had undertaken in relation to its approach to procurement and climate change was particularly important. She further paid tribute to the Green Summit that had been delivered with schools, adding that this was an example that clearly demonstrated civic leadership.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **ECCNSC/23/36 Staff Business Travel and Active Travel Policy**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Human Resources, Organisational Development and Transformation that provided information on the progress being made towards embedding a culture of sustainable staff travel within the council, as part of the Staff Travel policy.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Noting that the Staff Travel Policy was presented to the Personnel Committee in December 2021 with a subsequent launch of the policy in 2022;
- The relationship to the Our Manchester Strategy;
- Providing a progress update across a range of key initiatives; and
- Case studies.

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

- Welcoming the inclusion of case studies, commenting that these needed to be communicated widely with staff to promote behaviour change;

- Noting that staff working from home had reduced the number of commutes undertaken by staff;
- Welcoming the significant reduction in air miles reported;
- Was there enough appropriate bike storage space available to support staff travelling by bike across all sites;
- Noting that there was currently no reporting system in place that captured staff that walked during business hours as the data was expenses led, but welcomed that consideration to alternative methods of capturing this mode of active travel were under consideration;
- Welcoming that Beryl Bike hire was included in the expenses claim scheme; and
- Could the Cycle to Work Scheme allowance be used to purchase wet weather clothing.

The Director of HROD & Transformation acknowledged the comment regarding the impact staff working from home had on the number of commutes undertaken. He commented that this arrangement was specific to service need, however the use of technology, such as the use of Teams to conduct meetings had contributed to reducing the number of business journeys undertaken.

The Zero Carbon: Workforce Development Manager informed the Committee that an audit of bike storage facilities would be undertaken across the estate to ensure capacity was there to support staff travelling by bike. She acknowledged the comments regarding the need to capture staff walking data and stated that they were working with the Performance, Research and Intelligence Team to progress this. She added that data in relation to tram and bus travel would be included in any future update report to the Committee.

The Zero Carbon: Workforce Development Manager welcomed the positive feedback from the Members in relation to the case studies provided, adding that it was the intention to produce these in a video format that could be cascaded to staff through targeted communications, in addition to the written format. The Executive Member for Environment and Transport welcomed this approach and stated that this could be used to articulate good practice with partners across the city and support the stated ambitions described in 'Workstream 5 - Catalysing Change and Behaviour Change' that was considered under the previous agenda item.

The Zero Carbon: Workforce Development Manager responded to specific questions by advising that services and managers would be supported to set out how they would embed Zero Carbon into service delivery as part of their Service Plans and this included consideration of staff travel. She commented that these plans would be reviewed. The Director of HROD & Transformation stated that sustainable Staff Business Travel that was considered as part of Service Plans would need to then inform future work planning and workloads, acknowledging the comment from a Member regarding expectations placed upon staff if they were travelling to different locations for business but not using a car. It was further confirmed that the car leasing scheme for Ultra Low Emission Vehicles was available to all staff.

The Project Officer (Sustainable Business Travel) informed the Committee that the Cycle to Work Scheme was flexible and could be used to purchase wet weather

clothing and other cycling related products such as locks, parts for repairs etc. He further confirmed that this scheme could also be used to purchase electric bikes.

The Chair when welcoming the reduction in reported business travel commented that it was important to also understand this in the context of reduced staffing levels across the Council that was a result of budget reductions experienced over the years.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **ECCNSC/23/37      Overview Report**

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

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report and agrees the work programme.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Personnel Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 31 May 2023

**Present:** Councillor Akbar (Chair) – in the Chair

**Councillors:** Bridges, Hacking, Igbon, Midgley, Leech, Moran, Rahman, Rawlins, T Robinson and White

**Apologies:** Councillor Craig

#### **PE/23/4 Minutes**

##### **Decision**

The Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on 22 March 2023

#### **PE/23/5 Market Rate Supplements**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of HR, OD and Transformation, which provided a summary of Market Rate Supplements (MRS) currently in place in the Council.

A MRS was a time limited additional payment to the basic salary of a role that had been subject to job evaluation and were determined by the relevant Strategic Director in conjunction with the Director of HR OD and Transformation and needed to be justified with reference to clear supporting evidence.

As of 1 March 2023, there were a total 217 of MRS attached to 38 different roles in the Council. No analysis by gender, ethnicity or any other protected characteristic had been undertaken because the MRS related to posts rather than individual postholders.

The report set out the rationale for the use of MRS across each Council directorate.

##### **Decision**

The Committee note the report.

#### **PE/23/6 Creation of a new post - Director of Communities**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of HR, OD and Transformation, which set out a proposal for the creation of a new Director of Communities post within the Neighbourhoods Directorate.

The Neighbourhood's directorate had an extremely broad and varied set of services. Over the last two years there had been significant changes within the directorate, including the transfer in of Northwards Housing bringing the management of 13,000 council owned social homes in North Manchester back under the direct management

of the Council and aligning it under the Director of Housing Operations within the Council's Homelessness Service.

Following the appointment of the new Strategic Director for Neighbourhoods, a review had been undertaken to determine the optimum reporting arrangements for the services within the Directorate, working within existing resourcing levels. The review, coupled with the departure of the Director of Commercial and Operations, had provided an opportunity to consider the approach and reporting arrangements to ensure that all accountabilities were apportioned more appropriately. In addition, a stronger emphasis on communities, bringing services together, communication and engagement with residents was required and as a result a realignment of resources was required to support this ambition.

It was subsequently proposed that a new Director of Communities post at SS4 Grade (£101,996 to £112,411) should be created to sit alongside the Director of Highways, Director of Housing Operations and the Director of Commercial and Operations. In connection to this it was also proposed to disestablish the post of Director of Commercial and Operations (SS4 Grade) SS4 in order to fund the new post.

### **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Recommend to Council the creation of new post, Director of Communities grade SS4 Grade (£101,996 to £112,411).
- (2) Note the disestablishment of Director of Commercial and Operations Grade SS4.
- (3) Note the re-alignment of services to each Director position.



## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 13 April 2023**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Curley – in the Chair

Councillors Andrews, Y Dar, Flanagan, Hewitson, Kamal, Leech, Lyons, S Ali

**Apologies:** Councillors Baker-Smith, Davies, Lovecy, Riasat and Sadler

#### **PH/23/28      Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding the combined application of 121195/FO/2018 & 121196/LO/2018.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/23/29      Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2023 as a correct record.

#### **PH/23/30      121195/FO/2018 & 121196/LO/2018 - Land at Shudehill Manchester, M4 2AD - Piccadilly Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that presented an application proposing the demolition of all non-listed buildings (with exception of partial retention of the Rosenfield Building facade), partial demolition and alterations to 29 Shudehill, and erection of a new building comprising ground floor plus part 2, part 7, part 8, and part 19 storey to include 175 residential units (Use Class C3) together with flexible ground floor commercial floorspace (Use Class E), new public realm, cycle parking (90 spaces), and other associated works.

The development would redevelop a largely vacant site that contains heritage assets. These make a positive contribution to the street scene, the character of the conservation area and setting of adjacent listed buildings. Their setting and character could be improved through appropriate regeneration. The site is fragmented and disjointed, but the wider townscape of the conservation area has visual cohesion, from its complementary massing, layout and form of its buildings.

The proposals would provide 175 homes and commercial units but the form of development: would not be of an appropriate quality; would not enhance its surrounding to an acceptable level; and would not deliver a coherent development which properly responds to context, or which maintains the areas prevailing character and setting. The harm to heritage assets would not be outweighed by public benefits.

The development would be car free. Cycle parking is proposed but this would be less than 1 space per apartment.

Objections have also been received from Historic England and the Victorian Society. 71 letters of objection have been received from 2 rounds of notification concerned about the use, design and impact on heritage assets impact on amenity including on future residents from existing noise sources (agent of change), servicing and highways impacts, construction impacts and sunlight and daylight impacts. An objection has also been received from and Save Britain's Heritage.

The Planning Officer stated that there had been 3 letters of objection and 1 of support since publication of the initial agenda.

The agent for the applicant addressed the Committee on the application, stating that this was a complex site requiring regeneration. The applicant had worked with Council Officers, and it was with regret that these Officers stated that they could not support the application. The applicant was of the opinion that the scheme should be approved and referred to information of some support within the report. The site was a current blight on the area, was in need of development and the agent stated that they did not share the views of objectors concerning the heritage aspect and scale. Regarding the scale of the project, the agent stated that all heritage assets were considered for retention, but this had been proved impossible. This viewpoint was included and validated by a third-party assessor. The agent expressed that the area was suitable for tall buildings. Regarding the design of the scheme, the agent stated that this had been undertaken by a leading design studio, Buttress, who had applied considerable skill. The façade and design were of a good standard with high quality brickwork proposed. With regard to the heritage aspect of the current plot, the agent stated that it was in need of repair, referring to the nearby Glassworks as an appropriate comparison which managed a mix of old and new in one setting. The agent agreed that there would be some harm from the development, but this would be less than substantial. The report set out other benefits, such as 220 associated jobs and pedestrianised area. In conclusion, the scheme would offer optimum use of this derelict site and would result in less than substantial harm to heritage assets, but this needed to be balanced against the public benefits. It is on the matter of this balance where the applicant disagreed with the opinion of Council Officers as it would outweigh any harm caused. The agent requested the Committee consider the NPPF test to determine the application and bring this site back into use.

The Planning Officer stated that this application was accompanied by a very long officer report, and all issues were covered within it. He stated that the agent had not raised any new issues in their representation at the meeting. The Planning Officer did agree that the scheme constituted less than substantial harm but added that this scheme was at the higher end of such measurements and the public benefits would need to be greater to outweigh this, but the scheme was too large and damaging. The Planning Officer considered the comparison with Glassworks irrelevant. The scheme has brought about long discussions as it is noted that the area needs developing, but not at any cost.

The Chair invited Committee members to ask questions/add comments.

Councillor Lyons stated that he was in agreement with the Planning Officer, in that the harm would be too great. Councillor Lyons stated he would have expected to see some affordable housing on the site to outweigh the harm and put some balance towards public benefit. He questioned if the area was perhaps better for less residential properties, such as hotels/hospitality due to the busy nature of the area with two transport hubs in the immediate vicinity.

The Planning Officer stated that housing/residential units could work in this location adding that there was no policy reason to refuse any such development at this site but did agree that other uses may work.

Councillor Andrews referred to the reasons for refusal on pages 131 and 132 of the printed report and stated that he felt these were adequate for him to move the recommendation of Refuse for both applications.

Councillor Lyons seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to Refuse both applications for the reasons as set out in the reports submitted.

#### **PH/23/31                      135733/FO/2022 - Barlowmoor Clen Gas Governor, Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 7GZ - Chorlton Park Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that presented an application regarding the installation of a replacement kiosk required to house a new gas governor following demolition of existing including installation of replacement weldmesh palisade fencing.

The site is of an irregular size located to the rear of residential properties on Barlow Moor Road and Houghend Avenue and to the west is the Manchester Crematorium with the wider Southern Cemetery beyond, an Electricity substation is located adjacent and to the south of the site. The site is not publicly accessible, with the alleyway that serves it having been subject to a City Council alleygating scheme approved in 2008. The wider area to the south, west and north is predominantly residential in nature whilst to the east is the western boundary of the Manchester Crematorium with the Grade II registered Southern Cemetery beyond. The site is located within the Chorlton Park ward of the city. In order for the replacement infrastructure to be compliant with current technical industry standards and guidance the new infrastructure requires larger clearance areas (3m minimum) around them. As such, the associated housing structure known as a kiosk is required to be larger than those that currently exist on site. The applicant has confirmed that the replacement infrastructure (gas governor) is to be installed under the applicants permitted development rights and it is the Kiosk and associated 2.4m perimeter weld mesh fencing that requires planning permission.

Amongst other matters that are set out within the main body of the report it is considered that the principle of the upgrade of existing energy infrastructure with

suitable mitigation around tree loss is acceptable in this instance.

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

The agent for the applicant, Cadent Gas, addressed the Committee and stated that the company supplied gas services for around 11 million homes and businesses. This was an important development as it currently serviced 20,000 customers. There was a need to keep gas pressure at a premium and the site was currently non-compliant. The kiosk needed to be maintained and inspected and would require dismantling and replacing due to its restricted size. The kiosk and surrounding fencing would be green to be in keeping with surroundings and it was regrettable that the trees on site would have to be lost. Referring to tree loss, the agent confirmed that replacement trees would be provided, as per a condition on the application. Any surrounding vegetation would be removed out of season to prevent habitat loss to wildlife but the needs of the unit to be functional and compliant would outweigh the loss of trees on site. The kiosk would be noise insulated and would be no louder in its operations than the current unit. Diligent planning had been implemented and there were clear public benefits for this upgrade.

The Planning Officer expressed regret about the tree loss associated with the upgrade but confirmed a condition to replace them had been agreed with the applicant.

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

Councillor Lyons asked if Ward Councillors would be consulted on the replacement tree project.

The Planning Officer stated that the replacement scheme had an initial agreement to be planted in Southern Cemetery. Members had been informed.

Councillor Leech asked if the Planning Officer was aware that the Crematorium was adjacent to this site.

The Planning Officer stated that the replacement trees would be either in the area of the Crematorium or Southern Cemetery with appropriate species.

Councillor Leech stated that the Crematorium was privately owned, unlike the Cemetery which was Council land. Councillor Leech expressed surprise that Southway Housing Trust had not been consulted and asked why. He asked about the number of replacement trees, whether this would be 1 for 1, and asked why the clearance of the whole site, rather than work around it, had not been challenged.

The Planning Officer confirmed that notifications had gone to individual addresses, as per Government advice and not to land owners. The number of replacement trees had yet to be agreed and the City Council's own arboriculturist would be involved in selecting the age and appropriate species. The replacement project would be managed within Southern Cemetery and not the Crematorium. Regarding the clearance of the site, the Planning Officer confirmed that this had already taken place. The trees had been assessed and were not considered worthy of a Tree

Preservation order. The loss of trees was to be fully assessed and subject to a condition with full details of replacement tree details to be agreed.

Councillor S Ali moved the recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor Lyons seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to Approve the application, subject to conditions, as set out in the reports submitted.

#### **PH/23/32      134160/OO/2022 - Land to the north of 27 Capenhurst Close, Manchester, M23 2SL - Baguley Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that proposed an outline application with all matters reserved for the erection of one (3 bed) detached dwelling, with associated car parking and landscaping.

This application relates to a rectangular plot of land, approximately 495m<sup>2</sup> in size, which is located to the north of nos. 27 to 33 Capenhurst Close. The site is vacant and remained undeveloped after the Capenhurst Close and Stapleford Close development (F17127, approved 28 April 1982) was completed in the late 1980s.

The applicant is proposing to erect a three-bed detached dwelling on the site. Eleven letters of objections have been received, nine in relation to the original proposal, which was for a pair of dwellings, and two in relation to the proposal now before the Committee. The main concerns raised include impact on the existing on-street parking arrangements, residential amenity, pedestrian/highway safety and existing ecological features.

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

An objector to the application attended and addressed the Committee, stating that they were unhappy with the diagrams relating to the submitted scheme as they included no measurements and were more of a sketch. The objector stated that there were already problems in the area due to traffic on the cul-de-sac. There was a sign against heavy goods traffic and she questioned how construction vehicles would be allowed access, stating that the refuse collection vehicles have difficulty navigating the area. Hospital parking also created issues on the street and the objector stated their right to have 24 hour access for emergency services. Currently, there were pillars at the end of the footpath onto Capenhurst Close to stop motorbikes, quad-bikes and cycles and, if these were removed for construction purposes, the alleyway would become a rat-run. If construction equipment were to be left on-site it would attract vandals and thieves and this was another cause of concern. The objector stated that locals had not been informed of the length of time for any on-site works. In concluding, she stated that traffic was the main concern as the area was already busy.

The Planning Officer stated that this was an outline application, which previously had been for two houses on the site, now reduced to one. The application was in outline and therefore just sought approval for the principle of one house with all details reserved for future applications. All that was being considered today was the application to allow one house on the plot of land. Highways safety had confirmed that the road would not be adversely affected by one new house. Condition 20 within the report covered all aspects of construction vehicles and the associated compound.

Councillor Andrews stated that this was in his Ward and that he knew the area well. He asked the Planning Officer if the consultation for reserved matters application for the build etc. would be shared with local residents.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this would go through a full consultation period.

Councillor Andrews sought further clarification on whether this application would share plans of the house, build materials, construction plan etc.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the designs and layout will be included in a future application. He confirmed that there was a condition for the construction management plan to be submitted, but the developer could be asked for full details of the construction management plan as part of their reserved matters application in future.

Councillor Andrews stated that he wished for anyone to be able to understand the process and checked that, if this application to allow one house to be built on the land was agreed by the Committee today, that any future application to then build the house on the site would come back before the Planning & Highways Committee, should it attracts any objections.

The Planning Officer confirmed Councillor Andrews' comments regarding future arrangements for any subsequent application.

Councillor Leech requested information on the status of the land for surrounding dwellings, seeking to establish if this was public highway land or private road as action could be taken against vehicles on public land. Councillor Leech acknowledged the concerns of residents regarding construction vehicles.

The Planning Officer stated that the driveways are private and would pertain to private issues between the developer and other neighbouring properties and confirmed that they would liaise with any developer on a construction management plan.

Councillor Leech felt that the construction management plan should refer to the areas concerned as private driveways.

The Director of Planning wished to address an area of concern raised by the resident regarding the bollards at the junction of a footpath and the end of the cul-de-sac which would have to be removed to give access to any future property. The Director

of Planning felt that it would be possible to replace a bollard in the future to prevent vehicular access and anti-social behaviour along the footpath. This could be added as a condition should the Committee approve the application.

Councillor Andrews stated that he was not against the proposal for a house on this plot of land but added that the reserved matters application would receive more scrutiny from the Committee. He thanked the Director of Planning for the additional condition regarding a bollard on the footpath and moved the recommendation of Approve with this extra condition attached.

Councillor S Ali seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to Approve the application, subject to the additional condition suggested by the Director of Planning and as set out in the report submitted.





## Planning and Highways Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 1 June 2023

**Present:** Councillor Lyons (Chair)

**Councillors:** Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Curley, Davies, Gartside, Hassan, Hewitson, Hughes, Kamal, J Lovecy and Riasat

**Apologies:** Councillor Chohan, Johnson and Ludford

**Also present:** Councillor Good (Ward Councillor Ancoats and Beswick) – application 133324/FO/2022 & 133323/LO/2022 only

#### **PH/23/33. Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 135419/FO/2022, 133324/FO/2022 and 133323/LO/2022, 135419/FO/2022, 136551/FO/2023, 135647/FO/2022 and 135936/FO/2023

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/23/34. Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 April 2023 as a correct record.

#### **PH/23/35. 135662/FO/2022 - Laystall Street / Great Ancoats Street Manchester M4 6DE - Piccadilly Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that presented an application relating to the erection of a 20 storey building to create a 154 bedroom hotel (Class C1) above 2 basement levels with ancillary café / bar / restaurant and gym and other associated works including highway improvements, cycle parking and creation of accessible parking bay following removal of on site structures.

Seven letters of objection had been received (including three from the same party) and one anonymous letter. The grounds of objections were concerning the design, traffic impacts of reconfiguring the Laystall Street junction, inadequate pre-application consultation and the prejudicial impact of developing this site in isolation of the adjoining site.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report or late representations received.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee stating the design of the building proposed made efficient use of the site whilst not compromising any development on adjacent land. The applicant had an excellent track record and reputation for delivering and operating hotel development across the UK. Proposals were designed to deliver a high quality building, developed in close consultation with Council officers. The proposals had been subject to rigorous townscape and heritage assessments and would meet highest of sustainable construction standards and would reduce the demand for alternative form of visitor accommodation in the city.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Hewitson addressed the Committee and sought clarity on the proposed amendment to the road layout and direction exiting Laystall Street. In connection to this Councillor Davies sought clarity as to whether the proposed change had come from the Council's Highways department as part of a wider programme of changes to road layouts or whether any consultation with local residents had taken place. Councillor S Ali also expressed his concern in relation to the proposed traffic remodelling.

The Planning Officer confirmed that at present traffic exiting Laystall Street could turn left or right. Within the proposals submitted, traffic would only be able to turn left. This proposal had been subjected to traffic modelling and it had been determined that this proposal would have no adverse effect on traffic and would improve the environment for pedestrians around the site. In addition, it was confirmed that the proposed change had been submitted by the applicant and discussed and whist agreed by the Council's Highways Department. the proposal would still need to a formal Section 278 agreement and if it did not pass, alternative proposals would need to be considered, however, this should not affect the application going forward.

Councillor Andrews sought clarity on whether the application would need to be reconsidered by the Committee should the Section 278 agreement not be passed.

The Planning Officer advised that if the Section 278 Agreement was not passed, the application could still go forward subject to a minor modification to the application in relation to the proposed traffic modelling.

Councillor Curley enquired as to whether there was any possibility of increasing the number of proposed disabled parking bays.

The Planning Officer advised that in addition to the proposed disabled bay, the applicant would also be providing a valet parking service a spart of the operational management plan.

Councillor Andrews proposed a motion to approve the application.

Councillor Hughes seconded Councillor Andrews's proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee Approves the application as set out in the report submitted.

**PH/23/36. 135675/FO/2022 - Tariff Street Manchester - Piccadilly Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that presented an application regarding the erection of two residential apartment buildings (Use Class C3) comprising Block 1 -part 9, part 10 and Block 2-12 storey building (comprising of 261 dwellings in total), with ground floor commercial units (Use Class E), associated residents amenity space, cycle parking, landscaping, access, street loading and other associated works following demolition of the existing building on site.

30 letters had been received from three rounds of neighbour notification from a total 24 objectors. The objections related to design, heritage, amenity, servicing, sunlight and daylight, wind impacts on external spaces, highways and non-compliance with the Piccadilly Basin SRF.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee on the application, raising concerns fire safety, specifically in relation to the proposed Block Two, which proposed only one staircase which was non-compliant. Concerns were also made around the wind report, that the application deviated from the SRF, no consultation had been given to local heritage assets and removable of public realms, loss of day light to neighbouring residential properties and overdevelopment of the site

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee, stating that the proposal before committee represented positive discussions with Planning Officers and was in line with key principles within the Piccadilly Basin SRF. The proposals met and exceeded design standards and the proposed scale and massing responded to the historic mills and would deliver well designed accommodation that would be sympathetic to the area. The proposal was consistent with the strategic vision for the area and there would be an initial £250k contribution to affordable housing with a further viability assessment secured to allow this to be reassessed . It was stated that the current site made little contribution to the heritage of the area and the proposal would contribute to the delivery of new homes in the city.

The Planning Officer provided clarification on the issues raised by the objector. Specifically in relation to fire safety, he advised the Committee that this was not an issue for the planning process. It was for the Committee to determine on land use planning issues. It would be for Building Control to determine on fire safety and if changes were needed, this would result in a new application which could be in the form of a non material change, material change or new application, which may need to be subjected to consideration by the Committee again.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Curley addressed the Committee, welcoming the securing of the Section 106 agreement toward affordable housing. He proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of *Minded to Approve* subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement in relation to an initial off site affordable housing contribution, with a future review of the affordable housing position

Councillor S Ali seconded Councillor Curley's proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee is *Minded to Approve* the application subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement in relation to an initial off site affordable housing contribution, with a future review of the affordable housing position.

#### **PH/23/37. 133324/FO/2022 & 133323/LO/2022 - Ancoats Works Pollard Street Norfolk Street Manchester M4 7DS - Ancoats & Beswick Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that proposed the erection of two, part 8, part 4 storey buildings and refurbishment of the southern part of the Ancoats Works building to Pollard Street to form 183 residential apartments and 10 duplex apartments (Use Class C3a) together with flexible commercial space (Use Class E/Sui Generis) (274 sqm) with associated landscaping, car and cycle parking and associated works following demolition and partial demolition of existing buildings.

Listed building consent was also sought for removal of an existing roof structure between Hope Mill and Ancoats Works, the replacement of existing gates fronting Pollard Street, and associated works in connection with the residential led development of Ancoats Works.

Nine letters of objection, and one letter of support had been received from surrounding residents and businesses within Hope Mill. The objections related to, but were not restricted to, a lack of parking, loss of daylight to local businesses, scale and massing, loss of heritage assets and a lack of S106 contribution.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report and late representations received.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee on the application, raising concerns in relation to the size of the development and the impact it would have on the local community. It was stated that the application would remove a local historic landmark and the proposed development had non-descript features. Concern was also raised in relation to size of the development and associated loss of daylight to existing residents and the impact the development would have on the local infrastructure, including increased traffic that the proposed development would have.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee, advising that the proposals would be respectful of nearby listed buildings to ensure heritage assets in the area remained dominant. It was stated that the proposed development met and exceeded design standards and would result in £35m investment into the local

economy. Significant mitigation would be undertaken to protect existing commercial businesses that neighboured the site and extensive landscaping would also take place, providing attractive, safe communal areas for residents

Councillor Good (Ward Councillor Ancoats and Beswick) attended and addressed the Committee. He raised concerns about the lack of affordable housing in the development. The development proposed 193 units with none being affordable, which did not accord with the Council's policy around affordable housing

Further, he raised concerns that there was no proposed parking provision and he also felt that the sustainable transport element was not sufficient as there was little connected cycle infrastructure to the development.

He requested that the Committee reject the planning application in its current form. He stated that to meet Council policy the application should at a minimum provide 20% affordable housing units, or the applicant contribute an equivalent financial contribution (20%) for off-site affordable housing.

The Planning Officer provided clarification on the issues raised by the objector. He stated that the application was not a large development compared to surrounding developments and that the area needed to change as the impact of growth of the city centre continued to move outwards. He advised that the site was unappealing in its current form and contributed little to the area. In relation to affordable housing, he assured the Committee that the Council rigorously tested the viability assessments for all housing development proposals. The profit margin for the development was 17.5% and regardless of what this equated to in monetary terms, Government had set a minimum profit margin of 20% on site, therefore the Council wasn't able to secure a Section 106 Agreement that gave a financial contribution upfront. There would however, a clawback mechanism be put in place.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Lovecy addressed the Committee and sought clarity as to whether the conditions attached to the application would ensure that all of the properties would be effective against becoming AirB&B type usage. She also sought confirmation as to who would have access to the new proposed public realm and what steps were being taken in relation to acoustic and noise mitigation

The Planning Officer advised that the conditions attached to the application would protect against the properties being used as AirB&B. He confirmed that the proposed public realm would be for residents only and acknowledged that the issue around acoustics had been challenging and work had been undertaken to ensure those neighbouring businesses could still operate

Councillor Curley enquired as to whether there was any opportunity for additional disabled parking provision and what mechanism was being used to exclude residents in this development from having to apply and purchase parking permits from the existing scheme.

The Planning Officer advised that a condition could be included to review additional disabled parking if the Committee was minded to agree this. He added that Officers were working with the City Solicitor to identify a mechanism that would exclude residents in this development from applying for a parking permit. This could not be achieved through a Section 106 Agreement but possible a Section 111 Agreement.

Councillor Andrews proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to the completion of the legal agreement associated with planning application 133324/FO/2022 and the inclusion of a condition to review additional disabled parking provision.

Councillor Curley seconded Councillor Andrew's proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application subject to the completion of the legal agreement associated with planning application 133324/FO/2022 and the inclusion of a condition to review additional disabled parking provision.

### **PH/23/38. 135419/FO/2022 - One Medlock Street Manchester M15 5FJ - Deansgate Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the demolition of the existing hotel building and structures and redevelopment of the site to comprise two separate buildings: one 13 storey office building with commercial unit (Use Class E) at ground floor; a part 11, part 38 storey building comprising 1,014 purpose built student accommodation units (sui generis) with ground floor office/community uses (Use Class E, F1 or F2); and associated ancillary internal and external amenity space, hard and soft landscaping and associated highway works.

There had been 11 representations received objecting to the proposed development. The objections related to, but were not restricted to, increased noise and disturbance, scale and massing, over-development, loss of daylight, lack of suitable infrastructure and loss of privacy.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report and late representations received.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. He stated that the site occupied a key location to the southern gateway of the city centre. The application supported the positive change of the wider area as part of the First Street Regeneration Framework. The proposals had been developed through local engagement and working with local teams. The proposed design would provide an improved street level experience, which would be greener and work better for pedestrians and cyclists. The office building proposed would provide over 2200 jobs and there would also be a community hub available for all of the community. The application would also provide high quality purpose built student accommodation for approximately 1000 students. Positive conversation had taken place with

Universities who supported the proposals and would form part of the PBSA pipeline identified by the Council

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Lovecy addressed the Committee and sought clarification as to how the affordable low market rent level was set in relation to the proposed student accommodation

The Planning Officer advised that there was no Council policy position for affordable student accommodation but this would be picked up as part of the review of the Council's Core Strategy. It was reported that 20% of the proposed student accommodation would be at 80% of the market rate with equal access to all facilities.

Councillor Curley commented on responses received from Sport England and use of facilities and asked if any provision could be made to address these.

The Planning Officer advised that there was no policy position that required the Council to address the comments received from Sport England.

Councillor Davies welcomed the proposed landscaping and sought clarification as to whether appropriate traffic modelling had been undertaken in connection to safe cycling provision in the area. She also asked if consideration had been given to the potential increase in traffic arising from the use of Uber and online food delivery companies that could be attributed to student accommodation

The Planning Officer confirmed that the Council was looking at an Active Travel Scheme along the whole length of Medlock Street but this was not yet funded. The proposed development would help make a significant improvement to the local environment in terms of tree planting, the widening of pavements and better use of the site. In addition he advised that travel plans had been updated to account for the potential increase use of ridesharing companies and online food delivery companies

Councillor Davies requested the Committee be provided with a note on how travel plans had been updated to account for the potential increase use of ridesharing companies and online food delivery companies

Councillor S Ali proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to a legal agreement for the provision of on-site affordable accommodation, waste management to be provided by a private contractor and a financial contribution towards off site tree planting.

Councillor Kamal seconded Councillor S Ali's proposal.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Is minded to approve the application subject to a legal agreement for the provision of on-site affordable accommodation, waste management to be provided by a private contractor and a financial contribution towards off site tree planting.
- (2) Requests a note on how travel plans had been updated to account for the potential increase use of ridesharing companies and online food delivery companies

**PH/23/39. 136170/FO/2023 - Land Bounded By River Street To The North, River Street And Vacant Lane To The East, Hulme Street to The South And Plot 10A Of The First Street Masterplan To The West Manchester - Deansgate Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the erection of a 14-storey building comprising of purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) (Sui Generis) and ground floor Food Hall (Sui Generis Use), and other associated works including external amenity spaces, public realm, secure cycle parking, access and servicing arrangements (Plot 10B).

No objections had been received.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. He stated that the proposed development had received no objections from local residents, statutory or non-statutory consultees. The development would provide high quality student accommodation to meet the demand in the area from students. It also aligned to the Council's pipeline of further PBSA and would help draw students out of main stream homes, freeing up these properties and reduce rent pressure for the city's residents. The development would also offer 15% of the total accommodation at an affordable rate. The development was also significantly lower in height than that envisaged in the SRF. Designed well the development would successfully transition from the modern developments of First Street to the traditional mill buildings of Macintosh Village.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Davies addressed the Committee. She welcomed that the proposed development would be sympathetic to the surrounding area. She sought clarification that the proposed 15% of accommodation being at an affordable rate would be for the perpetuity of the development and asked what impact the development would have on traffic in relation to the potential increase in the use of ridesharing companies and online food delivery companies.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the proposed 15% of accommodation at an affordable rate would be required through a Section 106 Agreement and would last for the perpetuity of the development. He also agreed to provide information on how



travel plans had been updated to account for the potential increase use of ridesharing companies and online food delivery companies.

Councillor Kamal proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to a Section 106 to secure affordable student housing and commercial waste disposal.

Councillor Hewitson seconded Councillor Kamal's proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee is Minded to Approve subject to a S106 to secure affordable student housing and commercial waste disposal.

### **PH/23/40. 135834/FO/2022 - Albert Bridge House Bridge Street Manchester M3 5AH - Deansgate Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the creation of a mixed use development comprising two separate components in the form of an office building of up to 19 storeys with ground floor commercial, leisure, food and drink uses (All Use Class E (g)) and/ or drinking establishment (Sui Generis), and, a residential building up to 45 storeys (Use Class C3a) with additional roof top plant, basement car parking, cycle parking, landscaping and public realm, servicing and access arrangements, highway alterations and other associated works following demolition of the existing building complex.

Seven letters of objection and one neutral comment had been received. The objections related to, but were not restricted to, loss of daylight and overbearing, traffic congestion,

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. He stated that the design of the development offered a welcoming and thriving new city centre destinations. The proposed development aligned with the Council's Parsonage Gardens SRF which identified Albert Bridge House as significant redevelopment opportunity for high density commercially led mixed use accommodation. The development would provide approximately 3000 full time jobs and had been designed to deliver best in class, inclusive employment space. The proposed residential accommodation would meet the Home Quality mark standards and the scale and massing of the buildings had been informed by the SRF with consideration to local heritage assets.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer. The development would support the ongoing economic regeneration of the area and form a key part of the city's blue and green infrastructure, providing a 20% biodiversity net gain

Councillor Davies addressed the Committee. She welcomed the success of the Tree Preservation Orders but raised concern in relation to the percentage of parking spaces proposed. She sought clarification as to whether there had been a decision as to whether all the proposed residential accommodation would be for rent or would some be for purchase and whether the proposed ground floor independent retail proposals could be guaranteed as these types of businesses could not often commit to long term leases.

The Planning Officer clarified that there were 12 accessible spaces overall, but if Committee was minded, a condition could be included to review this provision. It was confirmed that all of the proposed residential accommodation would either be for rent or purchase and insofar as the ground floor retail proposals, the applicant would be offering a profit rent or turnover rent to ensure an independent business occupied the space. If not already within the conditions, the Planning Officer proposed a suitable condition could be included in the application

Councillor S Ali proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement in relation to a future review of the affordable housing position, to secure monies associated with highway improvement works along Bridge Street and secure the retention of the project architect and the inclusion of conditions to review the overall provision of residential parking spaces and the rental arrangements for the proposed independent ground floor retail offering.

Councillor Hewitson seconded Councillor S Ali's proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application, subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement in relation to a future review of the affordable housing position, to secure monies associated with highway improvement works along Bridge Street and secure the retention of the project architect and the inclusion of conditions to review the overall provision of residential parking spaces and the rental arrangements for the proposed independent ground floor retail offering.

### **PH/23/41. 136551/FO/2023 - 393 Wilmslow Road Manchester M20 4WA - Withington Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the retention of use of former Hotel (C1) as Temporary Living Accommodation for Single Homeless People (Sui Generis). The applicant proposed to retain the use of the property as short term residential accommodation providing 30 en-suite rooms to single homeless people.

Objections had been received from 24 local residents, Fallowfield Community Guardians and South East Fallowfield Residents Group.

Councillors Wills, Gartside and Chambers had indicated their support for the proposal in principle, subject to consideration of the issues and the attachment of appropriate conditions, as did Withington Civic Society.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the printed report.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee on the application. She stated that she had requested Planning Officers to defer consideration of this application to enable a more in-depth review as to whether the area was the most suitable location to deliver the type of accommodation being proposed. She stated that there was already 12 supported living units within 200 meters of the proposed development and only 21 properties had been consulted on this planning application, all of them bar two, housed mostly students and at least two of them were other supported living accommodation. She felt that more information was needed in relation to police and ambulance call outs in connection with the existing supported living premises in the area before an informed decision could be made. There was also concern about the additional pressures that this development would place on the local infrastructure, such as access to GP surgeries.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. He stated that the applicant had worked in partnership with the Council's homelessness department since March 2020, which had worked very well and wished for this to continue. The site had previously been utilised as nursing home and more recently as a hotel use. The property was currently set up to provide 24 hour support to all residents to help those seeking permanent accommodation. There was a good relationship with direct neighbours and residents. Security staff were on site 24 hours a day seven days a week. The concerns raised by local neighbours were acknowledged and the applicant would seek to minimise any impact. The application would also help reduce the use of emergency temporary accommodation, such as Bed and Breakfast accommodation.

The Planning Officer responded to issues raised by the objector. He advised the Committee that the notification process had gone beyond the Council's statutory requirements and comments received had been taken into account. He added that it was important for the Committee to assess the application on its individual merits and land use planning issues. The existing use of the premises was as a hotel with 30 beds which could be used to home homeless people without the need for planning permission and it was the care package and management facilities to support the occupiers meant that planning permission was now required. The Officer also stated that comings and goings associated with the proposed use would be very similar to a 30 bed hotel but the hotel could also be used for multiple occupancy in each room. As part of the conditions, there would be a requirement for a management regime to be in place which would require the premises to be staffed at all times and occupation would be by referral only.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Lovecy addressed the Committee. She commented that in its current designation the situation could be worse for local residents and felt that with the information provided to the Committee, Members were in a position to make a decision on the application before them.

Councillor Curley leant his support to the application and requested that Officers ensured that a strong management team was put in place to manage the facility. In addition, Councillor Davies sought clarification as to whether there was any condition that could be put in place to ensure the applicant worked closely with the Council's Homelessness team.

The Director of Planning and Building Control advised that there was already a strong relationship between the Council's Homelessness Department and the Operator of the premises and agreed to feedback the Committee's views to officers within the Council's Homelessness Department.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there was a condition in place for a management plan to be submitted and agreed which would include occupancy, arrangements for staffing and accommodation referrals, timings for moving in and out and contracts between occupants and the operator.

Councillor Lovecy asked if it was possible to strengthen this existing condition.

The Director of Director of Planning and Building Control proposed that, if minded, the Committee could approve the application subject to her being able to have discussions with colleagues Homelessness as to how best to strengthen this condition and the subsequently approve the application in consultation with Chair

Councillor Kamal proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor S Ali seconded Councillor Kamal's proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application as set out in the report, subject to the Director of Planning and Building Control discussing with colleagues in the Council's Homelessness Department as to how best to strengthen the condition for a suitable management plan.

*(Councillor Gartside declared an interest in this application as she had fettered her discretion by making her views known as part of the consultation with Ward Councillors. She left the meeting during consideration of the application).*

### **PH/23/42. 135647/FO/2022 - 550 Mauldeth Road West Manchester M21 7AA - Chorlton Park Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the erection of a new Lidl foodstore (Use Class E) with associated car parking and landscaping.

This application was deferred at the meeting of the Committee held on 16 March 2023; where the Committee resolved to be 'minded to refuse' the proposal and requested that Officers bring a report to a future meeting to address their concerns.

which related to highways safety and specifically to traffic management and the impact that this would have on pedestrian and cycle users of the area.

In response to issues raised at the previous meeting, additional information had been submitted by the applicant in order to further address these concerns. The Planning Officer provided a brief outline of the additional measures proposed and advise that both the Council's Highways department and Transport for Greater Manchester were satisfied with what was now being proposed and would add an additional layer of safety for all users of the highway and footway. On this basis, Planning Officers could not provide appropriate planning grounds for refusal.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee on the application. She raised concerns that the amendments to the highways safety had not and could not make the site suitable for a large supermarket. The proposed development was in the middle of a four school campus and would have an adverse impact on pedestrian and child safety as well as an increase in traffic within the locality. It was felt that the updated highway safety proposals still did not mitigate the concerns already raised. The proposed development was expected to increase traffic by up to 300 cars per hour at peak times and it was felt that the new proposals still did not address the concerns raised by the Committee when it first considered the application.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. He stated that the original application had been amended following concerns raised around highways safety. The measures now proposed were in addition to existing safety measures proposed. The applicant was also willing to review traffic patterns in the first three months of operation by way of a condition with a view to ensure it operated in a safe and appropriate manner. He commented that the Council's Highways Department and Transport for Greater Manchester were now satisfied with the additional safety proposals. As previously presented the development would deliver a significant number of tangible benefits to the local community.

Councillor Midgley (Ward Councillor Chorlton Park) state that whilst she recognised the different views on the application from local residents, in her view the additional highways safety mitigations now addressed concerns previously raised. If approved, she hoped the applicant would work with the local community to ensure they were responsible and responsive neighbours.

The Planning Officer reminded the Committee that the current office building on the site provided 105 car parking spaces that could be brought back into use or changed under to retail units under permitted development without the need for the proposed highway safety measures now being proposed, which was a material consideration.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Hughes addressed the Committee. He sought confirmation that the Council's Highways Department were now satisfied with the safety proposals that had been put forward.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the Highways Department was satisfied with the safety measure now being proposed.

Councillor Andrews proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor S Ali seconded Councillor Andrews's proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee approves the application as set out in the report.

### **PH/23/43. 135936/FO/2023 - Bignor Street Park Heywood Park Manchester - Cheetham Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the erection of part single, part two storey building to form purpose-built primary school (Class F1) with associated open space, access, landscaping, boundary treatment and other infrastructure works.

The proposals were subject to notification by way of 395 letters to nearby addresses, a site notice was posted at the site and an advertisement placed in the Manchester Evening News. In response to the neighbour notification four comments were received, two objections to the proposals, one comment in support and one neutral comment.

The Planning Officer advised that the mitigation measures proposed by the applicant following comments received from Sport England, now resulted in the recommendation of the Director of Planning and Building Control being altered to Minded to Approve, subject to the signature of an appropriate legal agreement and conditions, and the signing of a Section 106 agreement securing offsite mitigation for re-provision of play. As such, the application would no longer be required to be referred to the Secretary of State.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. She stated that the proposal would contribute to additional primary school places in the city. The proposed mitigation package addresses the loss of the playing field on site. There would be no significant on the highways network and the proposed development was in accordance with the relevant policies within the Council's Development Plan.

The Planning Officer clarified that in the late representations received, condition 33 was to be removed as this was a repetition of condition 32 and a slight amendment to the wording of condition 4 was also required.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Riasat addressed the Committee, stating that he welcomed the securing of the Section 106 Agreement and was in full support of the application now that all concerns had been addressed. He proposed a motion to approve the officer's

recommendation of Mind to Approve subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement securing offsite mitigation for re-provision of play and the deletion of condition 33 and rewording of condition 4 as outlined by Officers.

Councillor Andrews seconded Councillor Riasat's proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee is Mind to Approve the application, subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement securing offsite mitigation for re-provision of play and the deletion of condition 33 and rewording of condition 4 as outlined by Officers.

*(Councillors S Ali and Hassan declared interests in this application as they had fettered their discretion by having a pre meeting with the applicant at which they made their views on the application known. They left the meeting during consideration of the application).*

### **PH/23/44. 135576/FO/2022 - 88-90 Carmoor Road Manchester M13 0FB - Ardwick Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the demolition of a number of existing buildings, the erection of part three storey, part six storey purpose-built student accommodation (sui generis) with 172 beds in a mix of studio and cluster units, together with ancillary facilities, shared amenity space, site access and other associated works following demolition of existing buildings.

130 representations had been received, 129 of which objected to the proposed development, along with a third-party objection on behalf of Afro Caribbean and Friends Community Association (ACFCA). A further letter of objection had been received from a patron of the community centre following the submission of revised details and a further period of re-notification.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the printed report.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. She stated that the development would deliver high quality student accommodation and already had over 10,000 student beds under its management across the UK. The applicant had met with a number of community representatives and as a result of these discussions the proposed scheme had been significantly reduced to mitigate the impact on the local community centre. The site had been identified as part of the Council's future student accommodation pipeline and would be of a high quality design protected by secure access and 24-hour site management. A travel plan commitment to sustainable travel had also been made by the applicant. The development would also look to provide 20% of all bed spaces being advertised below market rent level in each academic year.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Andrews proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to a legal agreement containing affordable rent obligations for up to 20% of all bed spaces being advertised as being below market rent level in each academic year.

Councillor Kamal seconded Councillor Andrew's proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application, subject to a legal agreement containing affordable rent obligations for up to 20% of all bed spaces being advertised as being below market rent level in each academic year.

*(Councillor Hewitson declared an interest in this application as she had fettered her discretion by having a pre meeting with the applicant at which she made her views on the application known. She left the meeting during consideration of the application).*



## Health and Wellbeing Board

### Minutes of the meeting held on 7 June 2023

#### Present:

Councillor T Robinson, Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care (Chair)  
 Councillor Chambers, Assistant Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care  
 Katy Calvin-Thomas, Manchester Local Care Organisation  
 Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
 Amanda Smith, Chair, Healthwatch  
 Neil Walbran, Healthwatch  
 Paul Marshall, Strategic Director of Children's Services  
 David Regan, Director of Public Health  
 Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services  
 Tom Hinchliffe, Permanent Deputy Place Based Lead  
 Dr Murugesan Raja, Manchester GP Board  
 Dr Geeta Wadhwa, Manchester GP Board  
 Dr Doug Jeffrey, Manchester GP Board

#### Also in attendance:

Ben Squires, Head of Primary Care, NHS Greater Manchester  
 Jenny Osborne, Strategic Lead, Population Health Programmes  
 Sarah Hardman, Assistant Directorate Manager, Dental Hospital  
 Professor Jane Eddleston, Medical Director, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
 Simon Walsh, Procurement Director, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
 Nick Bailey, Director of Workforce, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
 Kate McAuley, Team Leader, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust

#### **HWB/23/08                      Urgent Business**

The Director of Public Health informed the Board that due to reporting deadlines, the Better Care Fund that was referred to at section 2.4 of the report titled 'The Formal Establishment of the Manchester Partnership Board' listed as item 5 on the agenda had been signed off by the Chair. He advised that a note for information relating to this would be circulated to members of the Board following the meeting.

#### **HWB/23/09                      Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2023 as a correct record.

#### **HWB/23/10                      The Formal Establishment of the Manchester Partnership Board**

The Board considered the report of the Deputy Place Based Lead and the Director of Public Health that described that in January 2023, the Health and Wellbeing Board

(HWB) had agreed the changes to the membership and chairing of the HWB. The report also referenced the work to establish the Manchester Partnership Board (MPB) as a hybrid committee of the NHS Greater Manchester Integrated Care Board. The report provided an update on the role, purpose and priorities of the MPB.

The Director of Public Health stated that the Health and Wellbeing Board would remain a statutory committee and would consider the wider determinants of health, utilising and bringing together the expertise and knowledge of all partners. He commented that the HWB would receive update reports from the MPB, adding that they were due to meet formally in public for the first time that afternoon.

The Deputy Place Based Lead added that the MPB was a formal subcommittee of the ICB and had a distinct identity that was separate to the HWB.

The Chair commented that the HWB would be a critical friend of the MPB, adding that the HWB would receive quarterly update reports on the strategic priorities of the MPB. The Chair further noted the comments raised by a Board member who discussed the need for clarity on the process of decision making, adding that he would discuss this with the Chair of the MPB.

## **Decision**

The Board note the report.

### **HWB/23/11            Oral Health and Dentistry**

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health that provided a position statement on the oral health of the city's population and access to NHS dental services. It used a range of data to profile the oral health of Manchester residents, described the provision and use of NHS services, including action to recover from the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, and information on patient and public feedback.

The report further summarised commissioned prevention and oral health improvement services for children and young people, adults and older people. The report placed a focus on health equity, highlighting known gaps in our knowledge and intelligence and the limitations this placed on our ability to understand and address health inequalities, and provided feedback from partners/providers in relation to a range of vulnerable or health inclusion groups.

Noting that the report made a distinction between dental oral health and wider oral health conditions (such as mouth cancer, gingivitis, halitosis etc).

The Board welcomed the comprehensive and detailed report, noting the stark picture it illustrated in relation to oral health across the city. The Board discussed that the work to tackle this was fundamental to the commitment to address wider health inequalities, in particular, noting the detrimental impact poor oral health had on vulnerable residents' health outcomes, with specific reference to Learning Disabled citizens and older citizens. The Board further discussed and recognised the importance of preventative initiatives around the issue of oral health, particularly in

relation to young people. The Board stated that all opportunities and available levers should be used to address poor oral health.

The Head of Primary Care, NHS Greater Manchester advised the Board that work between commissioners and providers continued in an attempt to address this issue, adding that demand on NHS dental services outweighed provision, adding that this was a national issue and not confined to Manchester. He advised that work was ongoing to review the redistribution of provision across Manchester and Greater Manchester following a number of NHS contracts being 'handed back'. He advised that negotiations were ongoing with providers to encourage them to increase the number of NHS patients they would treat. He advised that information on individual practices could be found on the NHS UK website. He further referred to the ongoing discussions at a national level regarding an enhanced tariff to encourage and support practices to increase the number of NHS patients they could accommodate. In response to a request from the Chair he advised that he would provide a written summary of these activities so this could be circulated to all elected members for information.

A member of the Board stated that all partners should support activity and awareness regarding the importance of oral health. The Strategic Lead, Population Health Programmes commented that all partners would be consulted with as the Manchester specific action plan was developed, and she further welcomed the support offered from the Board in relation to this activity.

The Strategic Director of Children's Services welcomed the inclusion of looked after children in the list of groups identified as being vulnerable, adding that he would discuss with the Chair of the Corporate Parenting Panel the need to include consideration of this topic when they had a health themed meeting. In relation to a specific question raised regarding Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) the Head of Primary Care, NHS Greater Manchester advised that he would clarify the position following the meeting.

The Chair stated that explicit consideration needed to be given to the impact of COVID-19 and young people within the action plan. The Chair further recommended that an update report on this and the wider activity be submitted for consideration by the Board towards the end of the year.

## **Decisions**

The Board:

1. Support the development of a Manchester specific action plan to address poor levels of oral health in the local population, drive improvements to NHS dental services and reduce inequalities for the Manchester population.
2. Support the development of GM strategy and action to address locality requirements around oral health promotion and improved access.

3. Request that the Director of Public Health, in consultation with Greater Manchester NHS and the Manchester Local Care Organisation reports back to the Board on progress and the priority actions agreed by the end of the year.

4. Recommend that the Head of Primary Care, NHS Greater Manchester provide a briefing note that describes the actions being taken to improve NHS dental access across the city that can be circulated to all members of the Council.

**HWB/23/12                      Making Manchester Fairer: Tackling Health Inequalities in Manchester 2022-2027**

The Board considered the report of the Deputy Director of Public Health that provided an overview of progress made during 2023 on the Making Manchester Fairer (MMF) Action Plan.

The Board noted that the Anti-Poverty Strategy (APS) had been formally adopted at Executive in January 2023 and was the main route to delivering against the MMF theme of reducing poverty and debt. It set out our vision that the whole of Manchester would work together to reduce poverty and lessen the impact of poverty on our residents. The strategy contained 53 actions across 12 priorities and 4 themes.

The report described that an overarching narrative had been developed by the Communication Teams that reflected that the Anti-poverty strategy was now part of the Making Manchester Fairer plan. This has also included bringing in the immediate Cost of Living support, so that there was a unified stance to the work and made the most of the city's combined networks.

The Board were informed that the first Making Manchester Fairer Programme Board took place in May after an extensive Expression of Interest process that recruited people to the board that were visibly reflective of Manchester's diverse communities (particularly those most impacted by health inequalities) and had a balance of different types of perspectives including organisational, professional and lived experience.

The Board were further informed that the development of governance and approval process for the Kickstarter Schemes allowed for the Children's element of the Supporting children, young people and their families scheme to begin implementation.

Further to the workstream and programme development, a number of theme leads had developed projects and initiatives that were designed to meet the aims and objectives of the actions under their themes and Manchester NHS Foundation Trust (MFT) had developed a Health Inequalities programme.

The Board heard from representatives from MFT who described the many actions and initiatives that had been implemented to address health inequalities. These included the establishment of an Equalities Lead at each site so as to develop local actions to respond to specific local needs; the establishment of an equalities dashboard; MFT acting as an anchor institution and supporting their staff; initiating

programmes to recruit staff from the local population, recognising that this would further support the issue of staff retention and staff acting as advocates for health equity; using patient data to understand the needs of the local population and identify issues or gaps in provision so that interventions and programmes could be targeted by working at a local level with Primary Care Networks and the Manchester Local Care Organisation. The Board were further advised that the Trust was seeking to employ a Consultant in Public Health to inform and support this area of activity. In response to a comment regarding digital exclusion, Professor Eddleston stated that the Trust were very mindful of this issue and due consideration would be given as to how this could be addressed as part of the ongoing work.

The Board welcomed the report and the update reported by the representatives from the Trust, stating that the work described demonstrated a commitment to place based working, the strength of genuine partnership working and an understanding of the needs of the local population that demonstrated that people were at the heart of everything that was described. The Board stated that the outcomes and impact of this approach needed to be reported and articulated, both at a local and national level and the Board was happy to support this. Professor Eddleston commented that she would be happy to provide an update presentation to the Board in six months' time.

The Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust stated that the MFT Board fully supported the vision and the work described. She stated the described approach provided a strong foundation on which to address health inequalities, support residents and end the 'revolving door' of health provision.

The Chair concluded the discussion by thanking the representatives from MFT for attending the meeting. He stated that it had been an important and constructive discussion. He invited MFT representative to attend all future meetings of the Board when Health Inequalities was to be discussed.

## **Decisions**

1. The Board note progress made in implementing the Making Manchester Fairer Action Plan, the incorporation of the Anti-Poverty Strategy within the programme, and the work that is taking place across partner organisations to integrate the Making Manchester approach and principles system wide.
2. The Board recommend that a progress presentation be submitted for consideration in six months' time.



## Audit Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2023

#### Present:

Councillor Lanchbury - In the Chair  
 Councillors Curley, Noor, and Stogia  
 Independent Co-opted member: Dr D Barker  
 Independent Co-opted member: Dr S Downs

**Apologies:** Councillor Simcock

#### Also Present:

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Finance and Resources  
 Karen Murray, Mazars (External Auditor)

#### AC/23/08 Minutes

#### Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2023 as a correct record.

#### AC/23/09 Update on Progress on the Audit of the Final Accounts for 2020/21 and 2021/22 and finalising the Draft Accounts for 2022/23

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that updated the Committee on the progress of the audit of the council's final accounts and outlines the national and local context behind the delays.

The report provided information on:

- The national and local context for the delays to the completion of the audits for the council's final accounts;
- Describing the Manchester City Council position, noting that the Manchester position echoed the national one;
- Noting that Manchester's Annual Accounts were particularly complex due to both the range of joint ventures, the value and complexity of assets held and the requirement to consolidate Manchester Airport Group and Manchester Central into the group accounts.

The report concluded that the completion of the Audits are a statutory requirement and the issues outlined pose a real threat to the reputation of local government. The City Treasurer and the Council's S151 Officer had taken the audit of our accounts extremely seriously and expressed concern about the issues raised with an increase in focus to provide a resolution to ensure the situation is not repeated.

In receiving the report and the verbal update provided by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, the Chair stated that the Committee recognised the significant challenge presented in delivering the final accounts.

The Committee paid tribute to all of the staff in the finance team and the external Auditors for their continued dedication and hard work. This sentiment was reiterated by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, adding that they were a very skilled team and she was immensely proud of them. She acknowledged the comments from the Committee regarding the complexity of the reporting requirements, adding that the issues relating to pensions would not be experienced in future reporting.

She stated that this issue of highways assets was being consulted upon at a national level with a view to clarifying the requirement for once the statutory override has ended, adding that this will continue to be a challenge. She stated that despite this it remained important to deliver accurate and professional accounts, recognising the complexity and breadth of the Council activity.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **AC/23/10 Annual Internal Audit Assurance Opinion and Report 2022/23**

The Committee received a report of the Head of Audit and Risk Management that provided Members with the annual assurance opinion and report on the Council's system of governance, risk management and internal control.

The report provided information on:

- Describing the methodology used to produce the report;
- Providing a narrative as to the overall opinion;
- Describing key strengths;
- Describing risks and issues arising from the audit work;
- Information on the delivery of the audit plan;
- Audit Assurance, Risks and Issues across a range of services and activities; and
- Describing reactive and proactive activities.

In response to questions the Head of Audit and Risk Management clarified the process and follow up work undertaken by the team to ensure that returns are provided by schools to enable completion of the Schools Financial Value Standard return to the DFE. The Chair suggested that consideration should be given to delivering briefings on this and other relevant related activities, such as resilience in schools to Chairs of Governors at their regular briefings organised by the School Governors Team. The Head of Audit and Risk Management acknowledged this comment.

In response to a question raised regarding the audit assurance option offered for Greater Manchester strategies, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that the governance arrangements of these fell within the remit of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee.

Noting recent tragic events, the Committee commented upon the importance of maintenance and repairs within Housing Services, especially in regard to the issue of



damp and mould. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that it had been correct to self-refer to the regulator following the assurance that had been given. She informed Members that an improvement board had been established, chaired by the Chief Executive. She further added that a review of the Housing Revenue Account would be undertaken.

In response to a comment raised regarding the capacity and resources within mental health services, the Head of Audit and Risk Management stated that work was ongoing on these issues.

The Chair welcomed consideration of cyber risk and the related cyber security training mandated for all staff, adding that this training had also been extended to all Councillors. The Chair further commented on the importance of adults' payments and foster care payments, especially in the context of the current economic climate. The Head of Audit and Risk Management stated the challenges related to payments to providers rather than individuals and there was a commitment to address this.

Clarification was sought by a member of the Committee as to the arrangements to protect the Council against claims or legal action taken following any breaches by contractors. The Head of Audit and Risk Management stated that established protocols in relation to risk assessment across a range of activities were established, using the example of the Highways Department to illustrate the steps taken to defend the Council against any potential claims. He advised that third parties would have their own arrangements and systems.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

### **AC/23/11 Annual Internal Audit Plan 2023/24**

The Committee received a report of the Head of Audit and Risk Management.

The report provided information on:

- The context and rationale relating to the production of the Plan;
- The Audit Plan for 2023/24 setting out the areas of proposed audit coverage for the year;
- Describing that the delivery of this plan would be reported to the Senior Management Team and Audit Committee as part of regular audit reporting arrangements;
- Further describing the basis, context, timeframe and structure of the Plan; and
- Describing planned areas of Audit work.

The Chair noted and welcomed the section within the report that discussed the issues of resources to deliver the plan and recognised that the department had undergone a recent restructure.

The Chair asked whether the findings of individual audits were communicated to all relevant parties, especially in regard to any known challenges or barriers. The Head

of Audit and Risk Management commented that this issue of roles and responsibilities were considered as part of an audit, and services were encouraged and learn from each other following and audit to address shared issues and challenges.

In response to a comment raised regarding the Greater Manchester Trailblazer Devolution Deal, the Head of Audit and Risk Management stated that he would discuss this further the GMCA Audit Team regarding assurances. He advised that the points raised by a member regarding consideration of all parking, not just resident parking and road sweeping contracts would be followed up outside of the meeting.

### **Decision**

To approve the Annual Internal Audit Plan for 2023/24, noting the above comments.

### **AC/23/12 Draft Annual Governance Statement 2022/23**

The Committee received the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which has been produced following completion of the annual review of the Council's governance arrangements and systems of internal control.

The report provided information on:

- The background and introduction to the report;
- The format of the Annual Governance Statement (AGS) and the process followed to produce the AGS;
- Communication of the Governance Arrangements; and
- Next steps.

The Chair commented that the committee welcomed the revised and improved format of this annual report.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **AC/23/13 Register of Significant Partnerships 2022**

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an overview of the Register of Significant Partnerships 2022, outlining the review and assurance process which has taken place as part of the annual review.

The report provided information on:

- Any new partnerships which have been added to the register;
- Entries recommended to be removed;
- Information relating to any partnerships where the assurance rating has increased to 'Substantial' since the last review; and
- Providing an update on those partnerships now classed as 'Reasonable' or

'Limited' strength following completion of the latest self-assessment.

Following on from a question raised by a committee member ,the Chair requested that a briefing note be circulated to members of the Committee on the Manchester Schools Alliance, with particular reference to the subscription fees and the services and training for schools that this fee contributes to.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer responded to a comment raised by a member in relation to the arrangements for senior officers identified as Leads for several partnerships by explaining the established governance arrangements. In response to a question asked in regard to AVRO Hollows the Head of Commercial Governance, Assurance and Initiatives stated that there was active dialogue ongoing with the Chair of the AVRO Hollows Board, which included colleagues from Strategic Housing to address identified issues and to seek and assurance that tenants are receiving quality services and that the tenancy management arrangements and standards were robust and transparent.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

[Dr Downs declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest as his partner is employed as the Deputy Director of Finance at the Greater Manchester Mental Health Trust.]

### **AC/23/14 Work Programme**

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 note the report and approve the work programme.



## Standards Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 15 June 2023

#### Present:

Nicolé Jackson, Independent Co-opted Member – In the Chair  
Councillors Andrews, Connolly, Evans, Good, Lanchbury and Simcock

Ringway Parish Council: Councillor O'Donovan  
Geoff Linnell, Independent Co-opted Member

#### Apologies:

Alan Eastwood, Independent Person

#### ST/23/08 Interests

Geoff Linnell, Independent Co-opted Member declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest as he has been recently elected as a Councillor to Nether Alderley Parish Council.

#### ST/23/09 Minutes

In receiving the minutes, a Member requested that an update be provided in regard to Member cyber security training (see ST/22/05 Member Development and Training). The Deputy City Solicitor advised that this would be provided following the meeting.

#### Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2023 as a correct record.

#### ST/23/10 Draft Annual Governance Statement 2022/23

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that contained the draft 2022/23 Annual Governance Statement (AGS) which had been produced 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 within the report.

The Chair welcomed the accessible format of the report, commenting that this was useful for the lay reader. A Member stated that this report had also been recently considered by the Audit Committee and the same opinion had been articulated by Members of that Committee.

A Member stated that he welcomed the section of the report that described:

*'This includes consideration of the CIPFA Financial Resilience Index which shows the Council to be relatively well placed on earmarked reserves and in a reasonably comfortable mid position on the other indicators.'*

The Member commented that this recognition was important and needed to be highlighted.

A Member commented that consideration needed to be given to the wording at the section of the report that discussed data protection to ensure this captured and reported all of the work that is undertaken around this activity. Acknowledging this comment, the Reform and Innovation Manager stated that this would be reviewed.

### **Decision**

To note the report, subject to the above comments.

### **ST/23/11 Planning Protocol**

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that advised on the operation and efficacy of the Planning Protocol. The report described that whilst the Protocol mainly used gender-neutral language, there were some instances where amendment was needed in order to ensure gender-neutral language was used throughout.

In response to a question the Section Planning Manager advised that site visits worked very well, making reference to the protocol.

A Member commented that she welcomed the adoption of gender-neutral terminology and recommended that all Council policies and protocols should adopt this approach when they were reviewed and updated.

### **Decisions**

1. To note the position regarding the operation/efficacy of the Planning Protocol; and
2. To note the proposed amendment to the Planning Protocol.
3. Recommend that all Council policies and protocols should adopt gender neutral terminology when they were reviewed and updated.

### **ST/23/12 Gifts and Hospitality Guidance for Members**

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer that considered the operation and efficacy of the Gifts and Hospitality Guidance for Members.

The Chair noted that the reporting of Gifts and Hospitality received by the Lord Mayor's office was a relatively recent development and was important for the purposes of openness and transparency. She stated that it was her experience that the majority of gifts given were to the city rather than in a personal capacity.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

**ST/23/13      Review of the Operation and Efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol**

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that provided an update on the operation and efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol. The report described that the Monitoring Officer did not consider that any amendment of the Protocol was required at this time. However, should a revised Code of Conduct for Members be adopted by full Council a full review of the Protocol would be undertaken to ensure the Protocol aligned with the revised Code.

A member commented that section 2.1 of the report stated, 'Officer and member relationships are good at MCC' and this recognition was particularly welcomed and important to note.

**Decisions**

To note:

1. The position set out in the report regarding the operation and efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol.
2. That the Protocol will be reviewed in the event that full Council adopts a revised Code of Conduct for Members.

**ST/23/14      Review of the Operation and Efficacy of the Use of Resources Guidance for Members**

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that provided an update on the operation and efficacy of the Use of Resources Guidance for Members.

In response to a question the Group Manager, Legal Services reiterated to Members that any council resource, including council issued mobile phones should not be used for any party-political activity.

**Decisions**

1. To note the report.
2. Recommend to full Council the adoption of the revised guidance as attached.

**ST/23/15      Work Programme for the Standards Committee**

Consideration was given to the report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit that presented the Work Programme for the Committee. The Committee were invited to approve or amend the Work Programme as appropriate.

**Decision**

The Committee note and approve the Work Programme.

This page is intentionally left blank



**Manchester City Council  
Report for Information**

**Report to:** Council – 12 July 2023

**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

<b>Environmental Impact Assessment</b> - 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
3 April 2023	Appointment of a contractor to undertake construction works, as part of the wider Northern Quarter walking and cycling improvement scheme located within the Piccadilly Ward. (Tender ref: Q20524 Northern Quarter Walking and Cycling Area 2 – Stevenson Square)	Construction works are planned to commence on site by the 27 <sup>th</sup> May 2023, therefore the contract award is required to be issued to the preferred bidder by last week of April. This will prevent the delay starting on site.	Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods)	Councillor A Simcock – Chair of Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee
23 May 2023	Approval of delivery of Household Support Fund 4, spending £12.9m government Fund to support households across Manchester impacted by the cost of living crisis and to increase the revenue budget by that amount for the grant received	HSF4 runs from 1 April 2023 to 31 March 2024. Government confirmation of funding and of the scheme requirements were received on 21 February 2023. The time needed to conclude the delivery of HSF3 and set up and deliver other government schemes announced at short notice (Energy Bill Support Scheme Alternative Payment / Alternative Fuel Payment Alternative Funding) resulted in a delay in completing the design of HSF4 meaning that if the scheme were to progress through the standard Key Decision process there would be a delay in the provision of critical support to Manchester residents.	Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer	Councillor A Simcock – Chair of Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee