



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

**Tuesday, 26 September 2023**

Dear Councillor / Honorary Alderman,

### **Meeting of the Council – Wednesday, 4th October, 2023**

You are summoned to attend a meeting of the Council which will be held at 9.30 am on Wednesday, 4th October, 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 12 July 2023.

13 - 34

**4. Notice of Motion - Call for a General Election now**

Since 2010, Manchester City Council has seen its budget decimated, losing the equivalent of £428 million a year. 13 years of cuts, the most intense and unfair cuts happening to local Government during the Coalition years of 2010-15 have been followed by the Tories mismanagement of the economy. Many local councils across the country are facing the prospect of going bust.

The last 13 years have seen an unprecedented decline in living standards and an increase in the number of children living in poverty. The House of Commons Library cites an increase of over 500,000 children living in poverty between 2011 and 2017/18. This has only got worse through the Cost of Living Crisis with the disastrous freezing of LHA and other benefits.

Public Services have been cut to the bone, and schools and

hospitals are literally crumbling. The Coalition Government of Conservatives and Liberal Democrats, followed by the Conservative Governments short sighted vision for the education of our children, has now 13 years later, to outdated, dilapidated, crumbling and unsafe schools throughout the country. The recent RAAC scandal is one example of the short-sightedness of the Coalition Government's cancellation of the successful Building Schools for the Future, and the Prime Minister further cutting budgets to rebuild schools when he was Chancellor.

We call on every member of the council to condemn the Lib Dem/Tory coalition government for cutting the Building Schools for the Future programme back in 2010.

Therefore this Council resolves to call on the Conservative Government to end 13 years of pain and chaos by calling for a General Election Now.

**Proposed by Councillor Craig, seconded by Councillor Karney and supported by Councillors Akbar, Midgley, Rawlins, Reeves and White**

**5. Notice of Motion - Call on the Council to become a Co-operative**

The Council notes that there are nearly 7,000 independent co-operative businesses across the UK, each owned and democratically run by their customers, employees, suppliers or members of their local community.

Today, the co-operative movement is a significant part of the UK's economy, growing by 21% to £33billion, and outperforming the economy as a whole during the recent recession.

The number of people who own and control the UK's co-operatives has grown by to 17.5m - nearly a quarter of the UK's population. From credit unions to community allotments – the rise in co-operative ownership is a significant development for the UK's business sector, meaning that the number of co-op members continues to outstrip the number of shareholders in the UK.

This Council believes:-

- That the co-operative model provides a sustainable way of providing local government services that empower residents, service users and employees, giving them a fair share and an equal say.
- Local Councils up and down the country have already put these values into practice in a number of ways, for example developing the co-operative sector, resident and employee owned companies and co-operative schools and colleges.

Our social value and ethical procurement policies for all of our contracts has been the envy of many other local authorities and a clear co-operative policy. Not least this has been put into place in the contracts we have tendered for, not least the construction of the Coop Live where many local apprentices have been employed.

- That the Council has the opportunity to “choose co-operative” when considering the future of local services, giving residents and communities more of a say in their area.

Therefore, we call on the Council to become a Co-operative Council by:-

- (1) Working to incorporate co-operative values and principles when planning services and in its engagement with local residents.
- (2) Ask the Council's scrutiny function to scrutinise the Council's engagement with the co-operative and mutual sector in Manchester and in doing so look to make further recommendations for its potential growth.
- (3) Requesting that Officers consider how to improve engagement with local cooperatives, for example through stakeholder events.
- (4) Requesting Officers to explore the setting up of a community asset transfer fund, so that local communities can own and protect their own assets.
- (5) Auditing our contractors and suppliers on how many meet the FairTax Mark standards, pay the Living Wage and continue with and expand our social value and ethical procurement policies and meet appropriate standards on apprenticeships.
- (6) Protecting residents by always working hard to connect residents to jobs and opportunities, and through support on help to work schemes and on tackling poverty and the crisis of the cost of living increases.
- (7) Requesting that Officers explore how the Council can support the possibility of supporting a great number of local Co-operatives, social enterprises and credit unions.
- (8) Supporting the announcement that across Greater Manchester £750,000 will be made available to grow the inclusive economy with more co-operatives and social enterprises.

- (9) Setting up a working group with the Executive Member to look at what more we can do.

**Proposed by Councillor Hughes, seconded by Councillor Reid and supported by Councillors Brickell, Johns, Midgley, Shilton Godwin, Simcock, Rawlins, Whiston and Wills.**

**6. Notice of Motion - Significantly Expand the use of Selective Licensing**

This motion asks Manchester City Council to use the full extent of its powers to improve conditions for renters in Manchester.

In 2020, Manchester City Council launched a revised Private Rented Sector Strategy with aim to see “Manchester’s Private Rented Sector provide a high quality, low carbon, affordable and sustainable offer so that Manchester’s residents have a good choice of quality homes in clean, safe and vibrant neighbourhoods.”

We are midway through the delivery of this ambition and yet across the city in wards from north to south, east to west, we continue to see our residents live in appalling conditions. Overcrowded and in poor state of repair.

One of the actions we have taken is to introduce Selective Licensing.

‘Selective licensing’ is a licence scheme which requires all private landlords operating within a designated area to license any privately rented property within that area.

To date, we have introduced Selective Licensing in small sections of a handful of wards.

Currently only small sections of the following wards are being served:

May 2022 – April 2027

- Ben Street: Clayton and Openshaw
- Hyde Road: Gorton and Abbey Hey
- The Ladders: Gorton and Abbey Hey
- Trinity: Harpurhey

August 2023 – August 2028

- Matthews Lane, Levenshulme
- Great Western Street/Claremont Rd, Moss Side and Whalley Range
- Laindon/Dickenson Rd & Birch Lane, Rusholme
- The Royals, Longsight

Yet some of our residents living within the past schemes reported

long delays in their requests for support, infrequent inspections, and landlords indifferent to the requirements the licences place upon them.

This Council notes:-

That the areas covered by Selective Licensing in the city represent a tiny proportion of the housing in Manchester that could be under the control of the city's Selective Licensing Team.

And

As all the revenue raised by the licences is used to monitor and administrate the scheme, this also represents a tiny proportion of the money that could be available to ensure that this Team has the proper resources to do their job.

This Council is also aware that:-

Liverpool City Council has been able to bring around 80% of its eligible housing into its Selective Licensing Scheme. The money raised means that their Selective Licensing Team is able to offer a robust and effective service to their residents.

This Council therefore resolves to extend the reach of Selective Licensing by:

- (1) Request that the Executive ask national government for permission to extend landlord Licensing city wide.
- (2) Request that the Executive ask for a report ask the officers responsible for the current and past schemes to provide a report to council of its strengths and weaknesses with a summary of the threats and opportunities for expansion.
- (3) Request that the Executive extend the duration of current schemes and revisiting past schemes should evidence emerge that need has not been or is not being met.
- (4) Request that the Executive commit to reaching the target of 100% of properties eligible to have been involved in a Selective Licensing Scheme by 2030.

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

**7. Notice of Motion - Against the Closure of Staffed Ticket Offices**

This Tory Government is again taking action to worsen the lives of ordinary working people already facing a cost-of-living crisis, by denying them widespread and easy access to the purchase of rail

products and best value fares through the proposed closure of ticket offices.

These proposals also place many working people at risk of redundancy and there are no safeguards in place for future job security on our rail networks.

The announcement to carry out a public consultation within such a short time frame was farcical and clearly demonstrates how little interest this government has in the opinions of the majority of people in this country.

This Council is aware that:-

There are a range of products and services available at the ticket office, which may not be available from Ticket Vending Machines (TVMs). This includes refunds, season ticket changes, ranger and rover tickets, bus connections, park and ride, group save, disabled persons discount, season tickets over one month in length, advance fares, rail card purchases, off-peak tickets before 9.30am, changes to ticket classes, seat reservations, cycle reservations, photocards for season tickets, scholar tickets, sleeper bookings and car parking.

Using TVMs is a one-sided process, there is no interaction between customer and retailer like there is in the ticket office. In contrast, ticket office staff can ask customers questions about their journey and requirements to ensure they get the right ticket for their journey and can offer a range of routes and classes.

Many TVMs do not take cash, or permit a part cash, part card payment. Given that people on lower incomes and older and disabled people are more likely to use cash, these groups stand to be disproportionately affected by ticket office closures and may find it difficult to travel as a result.

Unlike ticket office staff, TVMs do not automatically offer passengers the cheapest ticket for their journey, or clearly explain restrictions on certain fares, such as operator-specific tickets.

Ticket Office staff also are best placed to sign post and safeguard facilities and other support for passengers with disabilities/accessibility or other equalities related needs.

Ticket office closures would cause a significant worsening of the facilities and support offered to disabled, Deaf and older people. Already, disabled people face numerous barriers in accessing the rail network and are three times less likely to travel by rail than non-disabled people. Twenty-two percent of the population had a disability in 2020/2 and since 2002/3 the number of people reporting a disability has increased by 3.8million (+35%).

This Council notes: -

That there has been overwhelming opposition to ticket office closures from disabled people's organisations, including Disability Rights UK, National Federation of the Blind UK, Transport for All, RNIB, RNID, Guide Dogs, Scope, Thomas Pocklington Trust, Winvisible, Greater Manchester Coalition of Disabled People and the MS Society.

That disabled people are much less likely than non-disabled people to have access to the internet, and therefore online ticketing is not accessible for many.

That there is substantial demand for the ticket office. While the Government says that 'only' 12% of tickets are sold at ticket offices, in 2022/23, there were 1.5 billion passenger journeys, which equates to around 180 million journeys being facilitated by ticket offices.

The presence of staff is vital for ensuring the railway is accessible to all.

Staffed ticket offices have an important role in supporting passenger safety and security. Ticket offices provide a place of safety for both staff and passengers.

Ticket office staff are trained and experienced in dealing with difficult incidents and the presence of staff deters abusive and anti-social behaviour.

Ticket office staff provide support and assistance to passengers during times of disruption or in response to emergencies and their role often includes carrying out safety and security checks at the station throughout the day.

We further note that:

Passenger watchdogs give us a consistent theme emerging from research, which is that passengers like and value the presence of staff. Having staffed ticket offices supports passenger perceptions and feelings around safety, and closing ticket offices could lead to passengers no longer feeling safe when travelling.

At the House of Commons debate on 6 July, 2023. Our MP, Afzal Khan for Manchester, Gorton gave this plea for our residents.

"The announced closure of 45 railway ticket offices across Greater Manchester, including at Levenshulme and Gorton stations, will be to the detriment of my constituents who depend on them. Just when we should be encouraging travel by rail to reduce our carbon footprint, this measure will push people away from our great British railways. We should be trying to make train

travel easier, cheaper and more accessible, so why are the Government acting against the interests of the public?"

As a Council who declared a climate emergency in 2019 and with a commitment to being Zero Carbon by 2038, this Council expresses gratitude to our local MP for standing up for local people in Parliament and for the climate.

Therefore this Council commits to:-

- (1) Sending a message of solidarity to the RMT, TSSA, and all unions and other organisations who are coordinating action to oppose these measures.
- (2) Thanking all Manchester Councillors who took action coordinated by the unions and other organisations.
- (3) Using all resources at our disposal to raise awareness amongst our residents about how they can continue take action against these measures, including:
- (4) Sending clear messages about the impact of these measures on our city and residents through direct mail, press statements and billboards
- (5) Signposting people to any further online consultations at Libraries and other council owned facilities.
- (6) Working in partnership with all our Manchester MPs and across Greater Manchester, with the GMCA and our GM Mayor, Andy Burnham to oppose these measures.

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

**8. Proceedings of the Executive**

35 - 60

To submit the minutes of the Executive on 26 July 2023 and 13 September 2023 and in particular to consider:

**Exe/23/70 Our Town Hall Project - Progress Update**

The Executive recommend to Council approval of a capital budget increase of £29m for the project, funded by borrowing, to maintain progress with the construction works until the end of December 2023.

**Exe/23/77 Capital Programme Monitoring P4 2023/24**

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



- Aviva Studios, Home of Factory International - a capital budget increase of £22.2m, funded by borrowing.
- Corporate Services - Our New Finance & HRODT System – a revenue budget increase of £17.4m, to be spread across 4 financial years, and funded from the Capital Fund reserve.
- Neighbourhoods – Manchester Aquatic Centre (MAC) – a capital budget increase of £0.640m, funded by borrowing.
- Growth and Development – Piccadilly Garden Design Phase – a capital budget increase of £0.782m, funded by borrowing.

**9. 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.

**10. Scrutiny Committees**

61 - 164

- Economy & Regeneration – 18 July and 5 September 2023 (to follow)
- Communities & Equalities – 18 July and 5 September 2023
- Children & Young People – 19 July and 6 September 2023
- Health – 19 July and 6 September 2023
- Resources & Governance – 20 July, 24 August and 7 September 2023
- Environment, Climate Change & Neighbourhoods – 20 July and 7 September 2023

**11. Proceedings of Committees**

165 - 216

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

- Audit Committee – 25 July and 19 September 2023
- Planning and Highways Committee – 27 July, 31 August and 21 September 2023 (to follow)
- Personnel Committee – 13 September and in particular, to consider:

**PE/23/9 Recruitment to the role of Director of Population Health and Wellbeing**

The Committee request Council agree the recruitment for the role to be at its current substantive grading level of SS4 (£105,566 to £116,346), with the optional inclusion of a market rate supplement up to a fixed maximum of £5,000 to be applied at the discretion of the Director of HROD and Transformation (in discussion with the Chief Executive).

- Health and Wellbeing Board – 20 September 2023

- |  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>12. Review of Members Allowances - GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee</b><br>Report of the City Solicitor attached  | 217 - 264 |
| <b>13. Appointment of an additional Independent Person for consideration of complaints against Members</b><br>Report of the City Solicitor attached                            | 265 - 270 |
| <b>14. Urgent Key Decisions Report</b><br>The report of the City Solicitor is attached.  | 271 - 276 |
| <b>15. Change of Council meeting date - March 2024</b><br>To agree the change of date of the Council meeting in March 2024, from Wednesday 27 March to Wednesday 20 March 2024 |           |

---

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Joanne Roney', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

**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:-

Y Dar (Chair), Andrews (Deputy Chair), Abdullatif, Akbar, Azra Ali, Ahmed Ali, Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Amin, Appleby, 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, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, Marsh, 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, 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, 26 September 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, 12 July 2023

#### Present:

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

#### Councillors:

Abdullatif, Akbar, Ahmed Ali, Azra 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, Ludford, 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/23/47 Motion without Notice - Withdrawal**

The Lord Mayor advised Council that the two notice of motion (Items 4 and 8) on the Council Summons, had been withdrawn by the proposers following the submission of two formal notices to the Chief Executive.

The Lord Mayor announced that a Special Meeting of the Council will be called to consider the conferring the status of Honorary Freeman of the City to Mr Pep Guardiola. The date of the Special Meeting of Council will be advised in due course.

#### **CC/23/48 The Lord Mayors Announcements and Urgent Business**

The Lord Mayor informed the Council that she had agreed to the submission of the minutes of the Constitutional and Nomination Committee held on 12 July 2023.

#### **CC/23//49 The Lord Mayor's Announcements and Special Business - King's Birthday Honours List and award of the Kings award for Voluntary Service**

The Lord Mayor informed the Council that he had written to the following award recipients, who are either Mancunians or live or work in the city to congratulate them on the honour they have received:-

#### **Officer of the Order of the British Empire**

Chris Oglesby - Chief Executive Officer at Bruntwood, for services to Charity and to Regeneration in the North West of England.

### **Member of the Order of the British Empire**

Professor Cathy Parker - Chair of the Institute of Place Management at Manchester Metropolitan University, for services to Education and to Place Management.

Professor Robert Charles Pearson - Former Chair, Clinical Ethics Committee, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, for services to Medicine, Medical Education and to Health Research and Innovation.

Andrew Portersmith - Chief Executive of Music Stuff, for services to Young People and to the community in Manchester.

Alison Ross - Operations and Culture Director at Auto Trader, for services to the Digital and Technology Industry.

### **British Empire Medal**

Anthony McAllister - Football Coach, for services to Association Football and to Young People in Manchester.

### **King's Police Medal**

Emily-Jane Higham - Chief Superintendent for Greater Manchester Police, for Distinguished Service.

### **CC/23/50 The Lord Mayor's Announcements and Special Business - Anniversary of Srebrenica genocide**

The Lord Mayor invited those present at the meeting to observe a minute's silence in memory of the lives lost in the Srebrenica genocide which took place in July 1995.

### **CC/23/51 The Lord Mayor's Announcements and Special Business - Death of former Councillor Abu Chowdhury**

The Lord Mayor informed Council of the sad passing of former councillor Abu Chowdhury. Mr Chowdhury was elected to the Council (Rusholme Ward) in 2004 and served in this role until 2011. Mr Chowdhury was also awarded the MBE in 2001.

The Council observed a minute silence in respect of Mr Chowdhury.

### **CC/23/52 Lord Mayor's Special Business**

The Lord Mayor welcomed representatives of the charity, City of Sanctuary to address the Council about its work. Councillor Midgley addressed the Council and introduced Liz Hibberd (Manager of City of Sanctuary Charity), Tandrima Muzundar (trustee of the charity) and Andrew Muzondiwa (charity service user), Manitia Raqmani (charity service user) and Maria (charity service user) to talk about their personal experiences and the positive impact the City of Sanctuary Charity has made on their lives. The City of Sanctuary Charity is a charity based within Manchester. The work of the charity is to create a culture of welcome and hospitality for those

seeking sanctuary in the city and in doing so to help establish connections, partnerships and create community to promote health and wellbeing. Volunteering at local organisations for those involved has proven to be a successful way of helping sanctuary seekers to connect and become more involved.

The Leader of Council thanked the speakers for their attendance and sharing their experiences and acknowledged the important work of the City of Sanctuary charity in conjunction with the City Council to provide those seeking sanctuary a safe place to help to rebuild their lives.

#### **CC/23/53 Motion without Notice**

A motion without notice to under Procedure Rule 19.1(K) for the suspension of Procedure Rule 14.1, was proposed by Councillor Bayunu and seconded by Councillor Good.

The Lord Mayor put the proposal to the vote. On being put to the vote the Lord Mayor declared that the proposal was lost.

#### **CC/23/54 Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 17 May 2023 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Lord Mayor.

#### **CC/23/55 Notice of Motion - Introduction of capped fees on public transport**

Councillor Rawlins submitted the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Taylor:-

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 maximum 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.

On the motion being put to the vote, the Lord Mayor declared it unanimously carried.

## **Resolution**

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.

## **CC/23/56 Notice of Motion - Local Authority of Sanctuary**

Councillor Midgley submitted the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Sharif Mahamed:-

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 Cllr Bev Craig, alongside Andy Burnham and the other 9 GM Council Leaders wrote to The Home Secretary Suella Braverman 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.

The Lord Mayor reported that the amendment submitted by Councillor Johnson had been received and was accepted by Councillor Midgley.

The amended motion is as follows:

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;
- *Cooperate closely with local authorities including providing advance notice about incoming refugees and asylum seekers, so adequate and timely preparations can be made by the authority to meet their needs upon arrival;*
- Increase funding to local authorities so that we can provide properly funded *council* support services and *local third sector organisations that focus on asylum seekers and refugees, as well as* 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.

On the motion being put to the vote, the Lord Mayor declared it unanimously carried.

## **Resolution**

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;
- Cooperate closely with local authorities including providing advance notice about incoming refugees and asylum seekers, so adequate and timely preparations can be made by the authority to meet their needs upon arrival;
- Increase funding to local authorities so that we can provide properly funded council support services and local third sector organisations that focus on asylum seekers and refugees, as well as 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.

### **CC/23/57 Notice of Motion - Daring more democracy: A Greater Manchester Assembly**

Councillor Johnson submitted the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Wiest:-

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.

### **Resolution**

The motion was put to the Council and the Lord Mayor declared it lost.

### **CC/23/58 Notice of Motion - People at the Heart, delivering a park for Ancoats and New Islington**

Councillor Good submitted the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Northwood:-

- 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 six 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 22nd March the Council 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 request that the Executive consider including 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 Bev 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.

Councillor White submitted the following amendment to the motion which was seconded by Councillor Irene Robinson:-

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
- *Manchester has 154 council parks across the city, including Heaton Park as one of the largest municipal parks in Europe - the majority of our residents can walk to a council owned park in their community within 15 minutes*
- *Over the last 30 years, Manchester has become an even more desirable and popular place to live, work and visit, and the wider 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 22nd March the Council's Executive agreed to minor amendments of other parts of the *Strategic Regeneration Framework* (SRF)— *There have been a number of extensive consultations with local residents about the future use of this site over the last few years – there has been significant response to these consultations that have helped shape the current plans and refreshed, amended and updated SRF that was agreed at the Executive in March 2023.*~~

~~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.~~

~~*In September 2022, the 6.5 acre park and green space at Mayfield opened on a former brownfield site opening up the River Medlock – the new park has been a great success over the last year and hosted the opening event of the Manchester International Festival at the end of June. Parks and green spaces help to reduce the urban heat island effect, and provide shade.*~~

~~*Manchester has over 1.25 million trees – and over 1,000 new trees a year are being planted across the city (7,861 trees in 2022/23) in parks and on grass verges to help improve our environment and reduce air pollution.*~~

~~*The former Central Retail Park in Ancoats was purchased by the City Council in 2017 as a key strategic site for jobs and other strategic objectives on the edge*~~

of the City Centre. The site was used as a testing centre curing Covid-19 whilst a SRF was further developed.

- *Following the latest consultation, the amount of green space and public realm in the plans were significantly increased, and further work was done to link the site in with Cotton Field Park and the Marina at New Islington too – these areas of park and public space are vital elements of an area that has been voted one of the best areas to live and one of the worlds ‘coolest’ neighbourhoods. According to The Sunday Times' official 'Best Places To Live' guide for 2023, Manchester neighbourhood, Ancoats, has been named the 'best place to live' in Manchester after dethroning Altrincham which has held the top spot for years.*
- *There is also wider investment in green space in other parts of Ancoats with work starting soon on an expanded Ancoats Green near to the Poland Street area with a new play park for families, and further investment in green streets, trees and other measures to make the wider area of Ancoats, a safer and even more attractive place to live, and walk around too.*

**Accordingly the Council Resolves to:**

***This 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.~~
  - (1) Support a wider commitment to listening to feedback through our consultation processes and will also continue to advocate for good quality green space and public realm in the development proposals being brought forward for the Central Retail Park site, that link in with Cotton Field Park and the New Islington Marina.*
- Support further work and investment to ensure all Mancunians have good quality and accessible green space and parks close to where they live – and help improve our extensive city-wide network of parks and green spaces, including in Ancoats and Beswick, for the wellbeing and health of all our residents.*
- ~~(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.~~
  - (2) In addition to continuing to advocate for good quality green space and public realm in the development proposals being brought forward for the Central Retail Park site, welcome the recent planning permission for the new play park and the investment in, and expansion of Ancoats Green, and also welcomes the 2 acres of public realm and green space at the Electric Park development*

*between the Ashton Canal and Metrolink Line too in New Islington, in addition to new Mayfield Park too in the wider local area.*

- ~~(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.~~
- (3) *Welcome the 1,000s of high quality, well-paid jobs this site will bring into the City for local Mancunian workers – ensuring that our ‘people at the heart of everything we do’ manifesto pledge is fulfilled by providing more work and aspirational opportunities for local people.*
- (4) *Champion, invest and support all measures to increase sustainable and active forms of travel that will help to reduce congestion and lower air pollution in this part of the city, and continue to support tree planting in the area to help improve air quality too.*

On the amendment being put to the vote, the Lord mayor declared it carried and subsequently, the amendment became the substantive motion.

On the substantive motion being put to the vote, the Lord Mayor declared it carried

## **Resolution**

This council resolves to:

- (1) Support a wider commitment to listening to feedback through our consultation processes and will also continue to advocate for good quality green space and public realm in the development proposals being brought forward for the Central Retail Park site, that link in with Cotton Field Park and the New Islington Marina.

Support further work and investment to ensure all Mancunians have good quality and accessible green space and parks close to where they live – and help improve our extensive city-wide network of parks and green spaces, including in Ancoats and Beswick, for the wellbeing and health of all our residents.

- (2) In addition to continuing to advocate for good quality green space and public realm in the development proposals being brought forward for the Central Retail Park site, welcome the recent planning permission for the new play park and the investment in, and expansion of Ancoats Green, and also welcomes the 2 acres of public realm and green space at the Electric Park development between the Ashton Canal and Metrolink Line too in New Islington, in addition to new Mayfield Park too in the wider local area.
- (3) Welcome the 1,000s of high quality, well-paid jobs this site will bring into the City for local Mancunium workers – ensuring that our ‘people at the heart of

everything we do' manifesto pledge is fulfilled by providing more work and aspirational opportunities for local people.

- (4) Champion, invest and support all measures to increase sustainable and active forms of travel that will help to reduce congestion and lower air pollution in this part of the city, and continue to support tree planting in the area to help improve air quality too.

### **CC/23/59 Notice of Motion - Fair Tax Declaration**

Councillor Wills submitted the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Oganbambo:-

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.

On the motion being put to the vote, the lord Mayor declared it carried

### **Resolution**

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.

## **CC/23/60 Proceedings of the Executive**

The proceedings of the Executive on 31 May and 28 June 2023 were submitted. The Council was asked to give particular consideration to the following recommendations:

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

To recommend that 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**

To 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.

To recommend that Council approve the following changes to Manchester City 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.

## **Decisions**

- (1) To receive the minutes of the Executive held on 31 May and 28 June 2023.
- (2) To approve the virements over £0.5m between capital schemes to maximise use of funding resources available to the City Council
- (3) To approve the following changes to the 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.
  - 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.

### **CC/23/61 Questions to Executive Members and Others under Procedural Rule 23**

Councillor White responded to a question from Councillor Leech regarding the completion date for the review of conservation areas.

Councillor Rawlins responded to a question from Councillor Leech regarding a response on trip claims and the highways inspection regime.

Councillor Igbon responded to a question from Councillor Leech regarding annual expenditure in the past five years on repairs and cleaning up open spaces in parks following the eviction of travellers.

Councillor Rahman responded to a question from Councillor Leech regarding an update on action taken to provide crime statistics on the GMP website.

Councillor Rawlins responded to a question from Councillor Weist regarding work on reducing high emissions advertising methods, products and services.

Councillor Rawlins responded to a question from Councillor Johnson regarding plans to address issues raised in the Clean Cities Campaign technical report on Greater Manchester.

Councillor Igbon responded to a question from Councillor Johnson regarding the clearing of litter prior to grass cutting public spaces within Woodhouse Park.

Councillor Craig responded to a question from Councillor Kilpatrick regarding the revised location of the West Didsbury vent under proposed changes to the HS2 Crewe to Manchester Bill.

Councillor Rawlins responded to a question from Councillor Kilpatrick regarding the protection of trees across the city.

Councillor Bridges responded to a question from Councillor Kilpatrick regarding school admission criteria and checks made to confirm the address used in the school application.

### **CC/23/62 Scrutiny Committees**

The minutes of the following Scrutiny Committee meetings were submitted:

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

## Decision

To receive those minutes submitted

### CC/23/63 Proceedings of Committees

The minutes of the following meetings were submitted:

- Personnel Committee – 31 May 2023  
The Council was asked to give particular consideration to the following recommendation from the minutes:

#### **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

The Council was asked to give particular consideration to the following recommendation from the minutes:

#### **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

The Council was asked to give particular consideration to the following recommendations from the minutes:

### **CN/23/16 Appointments and Changes to Council Committee Membership**

- (1) Recommend Council approve the amendments to committee appointments as follows:-

<b>Committee</b>	<b>Member(s) to be added</b>	<b>Member(s) to be removed</b>
Resources and Governance Scrutiny		Councillor Abdullatif
Children and Young People Scrutiny	Councillor Bano Councillor Muse Councillor Sharif Mahamed	Councillor Cooley
Economy and Regeneration	Councillor Abdullatif Councillor Shilton Godwin	Councillor Bano Councillor Sharif Mahamed



Health	Councillor Cooley	
Environment, Climate Change and Neighbourhoods		Councillor Doswell
Communities and Equalities	Councillor Doswell	
Licensing		Councillor Abdullatif Councillor Davies Councillor Muse
Licensing and Appeals		Councillor Abdullatif Councillor Davies Councillor Muse
Audit		Councillor Wheeler

- (2) Recommend that Council agree the appointment of Councillors Bell and Chohan to the Council's Adoption Panel.

### Decisions

1. To receive those minutes submitted.
2. To approve the creation of new post, Director of Communities at grade SS4 Grade (£101,996 to £112,411).
3. To agree the adoption of the revised guidance in respect of the Operation and Efficacy of the Use of Resources Guidance for Members
4. To approve the changes in appointments to Committees and panels of the Council, as detailed above.

### CC/23/64 Key Decisions Report

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

### Decision

To note the report.

This page is intentionally left blank

## Executive

### Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 26 July 2023

**Present:** Councillor Rahman (Chair)

In accordance with Rule 2.1 of the Executive Procedure Rules, the Statutory Deputy Leader chaired the meeting in the absence of the Leader

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

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

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

**Apologies:** Councillors Craig, Bridges and Lynch

**Also present:**

Councillor Karney (Harpurhey Ward Councillor)

Councillor Hilal (Didsbury West Ward Councillor)

Councillor Kilpatrick (Didsbury West Ward Councillor)

**Exe/23/65 Minutes**

#### Decision

The Executive approved as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 28 June 2023.

**Exe/23/66 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 Housing and Development reported that funding had been approved to decarbonise and upgrade more than 2,000 homes in the city’s biggest ever sustainable homes investment programme. £49.7m would be invested in 1,603 Council-owned homes to improve sustainability through a range of works, which included better property and roof insulation, solar panelling, new boilers or heating systems, and air and ground source heat pumps. Currently, the grant funding was limited to properties rated EPC D or below with the expectation that the measures would improve most properties to EPC C rating and to EPC B in some cases. The programme of work would begin later in 2023 and would be completed by March 2025.

He also reported on the launch of the public consultation on the draft strategic regeneration framework for the new £1.7bn innovation district ID Manchester. The newly published draft Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) set out the scale,

ambition and opportunities that ID Manchester could bring to the city and included a series of place-based principles that would guide detailed plans for development and future planning applications. Once completed, ID Manchester would create over 10,000 new jobs and bring significant economic, social and environmental benefits to the city. The public consultation would run until 8 September with feedback reported to the Council.

He further reported on This City, the Council-owned housing development company, marked its first start on site earlier this month as construction had begun on 128 new low carbon homes at Rodney Street, Ancoats. The development would include 118 apartments across two buildings (a mix of 27 one bed and 91 two bed homes), alongside 10 town houses (eight three bed and two four bed homes) - and would overlook an improved and expanded Ancoats Green. The Rodney Street development would benefit from a wider £32m investment package funded by Homes England in this part of Ancoats, helping to unlock 1,500 new homes and bring the 20-year regeneration story of the area to a close. This included major investment in Ancoats Green that bordered the This City development site alongside new public realm that would connect the community to the green space, the new Ancoats Mobility Hub, and the surrounding neighbourhoods.

The Deputy Leader reported on the continuation of support to residents over the summer in relation to the cost-of-living crisis. A new leaflet had been created which set out the range of support that was on offer over the summer. The Council had also set up dedicated webpages both for financial support as well as the Helping Hands platform which set out a wealth of information for people in need. This continued support played a part in the recently announced Making Manchester Fairer initiative, which was at the forefront of Council policy looking at how systemic inequalities in the city could not only be addressed, but reversed.

The Deputy Executive Member for Early Years, Children and young People, reported that more than eight thousand copies of the same book were being given to all final year primary school children in Manchester this summer to help them settle into their new high schools in September and keep them reading over summer. Pupils would also get a special workbook full of fun, practical activities and challenges related to the book, as part of the shared learning project for pupils as they make their move from primary school. The Year 6 transition read for primary pupils was part of the broader five-year action plan called Making Manchester Fairer, which aimed to address inequalities in the city that can start early on in life and even affect how long people live for, and their opportunities around work and housing.. The Deputy Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure also reported that all Manchester Libraries were participating in the summer reading challenge

The Deputy Executive Member for Resources and Finance reported on the good work being undertaken through the Council's Social Value strategy, with specific reference to the construction of the new Co-op Belle Vue Academy in east Manchester. In total 58 jobs were created, 43% of them going to Manchester residents, and 18 apprenticeships. The project also hosted eight T-level students from Manchester College and 16 work experience placements. Six candidates from Ingeus' Restart Scheme, which supported people looking to take the first step into employment in construction, were also hosted for week-long trials. All six went on to

find employment. In addition the project raised approximately £10,000 for local community groups. The project had delivered a social return on investment of £1.8m and it had generated an economic impact of £30m for the wider area.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport reported that the Council had secured the future of Station South, a much-loved community asset in Levenshulme after agreeing to purchase its freehold. The purchase had been carried out in support of Station South's long-term presence in the area and to ensure that they could continue to deliver their services within the community. Station South had become an important fixture in the neighbourhood, providing a community space for people who cycle as well as other amenities through their café and bar. The move reflected the Council's commitment to supporting cycling as a sustainable transport option which could also play a role in a healthier lifestyle.

### **Decision**

The Executive note the report.

### **Exe/23/67 Revenue Monitoring to the end of May 2023**

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which outlined the projected outturn position for 2023/24, based on expenditure and income activity as at the end of May 2023 and future projections.

The Executive Member for Resources and Finance reported that the current budget monitoring forecasted an overspend of £8.732m, with considerable risks to the position relating to the impact of rising demand and increasing costs.

The main pressures were being felt in the social care budgets reflecting the national pressures in the health and social care sector and trends being experienced across local authorities. There was a £5.2m overspend in Adult Social care which was largely in the provision of long term care arrangements. Demand was above the 2023/24 budget assumptions, notably for older people residential and nursing care and homecare and on supported accommodation for people with learning disabilities and physical disabilities. The forecast £2.7m overspend in Children's Services was largely due to an increase in external residential placement costs. The directorate had a mitigation plan in place which had reduced the forecast overspend from £5.1m to £2.7m by the end of this financial year. Further in year mitigations were also being explored. The main variations in the other service departments totalled £0.8m.

It was reported that £25.2m of savings were agreed as part of the budget process. Of these £15.1m (60%) were on track for delivery, £1.8m (7%) were risk rated medium, and £8.3m (33%) rated high risk in terms of the likelihood of delivery. Officers were working to identify alternative savings where original plans may not be achieved or delayed.

The following budget virements were presented for approval:-

- Pension Saving – a saving of £2.950m from reduced pension costs;

- Transfer of Workplace Adjustment Hub budgets from HROD to Audit, Risk and Resilience – £250k;
- Transfer of £0.580m budget relating to Zero Carbon from Policy and Partnerships allocated to the posts that were delivering the Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) priorities as follows:-
  - HROD - £218k
  - Housing and Residential Growth - £131k
  - Procurement and Commissioning - £124k
  - City Centre Regeneration - £107k.
- The application of £3.5m to support residents through the cost-of-living crisis to the following services where Cost of Living Measures will be implemented:-
  - Revenue and Benefits £1.3m - to increase existing support to residents through Welfare Provision and Discretionary Housing payments.
  - Neighbourhood Teams £1.0m - Food response service.
  - Core - Policy and Partnerships £0.6m - support to voluntary and community groups.
  - Public Health £250k - Community Health Equity for Manchester support to community groups.
  - Homelessness £250k - additional advice offer to support residents.
  - Libraries, Galleries and Culture £45k - to support digital inclusion.
  - Core - Communications £40k - communications and engagement to residents.
- Transfer of the Community Development Team 'Buzz' Budgets from Public Health to Neighbourhoods - £0.817m;
- Transfer of Equality, Diversion and Inclusion to Public Health - £304k; and
- Transfer of budgets between Capital Financing budgets and Service Budgets to simplify accounting arrangements.

Since the 2023/24 budget was approved there have been additional grant notifications which were now reflected in the revised budget as follows:-

- S31 Grant Family Hubs and Start for Life programme 2023-24 - £2.2m
- Additional Early Years funding (within DSG) of £204 million in 2023-24 and £288 million in 2024-25;
- Homelessness Prevention Grant Top-up 2023/24 - £0.969m;
- Council Tax Energy Rebate scheme administration - £317k;
- New Burden's funding – Elections - £159k;
- UK shared prosperity fund – communities and place theme £0.648m in 2023/24 and £175k in 2024/25

Notification had also been received that the Local Authority Housing Fund would be expanded by £250 million for a second round of funding (LAHF R2), with the majority of the additional funding used to house those on Afghan resettlement schemes (ARAP/ACRS) currently in bridging accommodation and the rest used to ease wider homelessness pressures. Indicative funding of £1.120m had been allocated to Manchester as part of the Local Authority Housing Fund (Round 2) to purchase an additional 10 properties, this would require capital match funding of £1.380m which would be funded through HRA capital receipts.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources reported that when the budget was set in February 2023 a total of £14.3m was identified for price and electricity inflation. £2.2m was allocated to Children's for internal placements, £0.5m to Education Home to School Transport and £2.7m to Adults as a contribution to market sustainability. This left £8.8m available for inflation pressures which were to be quantified in year. This was held corporately and allocated in year once the costs are known and the business cases made.

The report also set out inflationary budget requests from Children's services totalling £2.442m for approval. If this request was approved this would leave £6.4m in the corporate price and utilities inflation budget.

Allowance for a 6% pay increase had been allowed for in the budget, costing an estimated £15.6m. In February the National Employers offered a £1,925 pay increase from 1 April 2023 and 3.88% for those above the top of the pay spine. The estimated budget requirement to fund this offer for Council staff was £15.5m for 2023/24, and therefore within the available budget. However, should any pay award above this level be agreed, this would exceed the current provision in the budget.

It was reported that a request for use of Collection Initiatives Reserve, totalling £311k in 2023/24 and £198k in 2024/25 had been reported in the Medium-Term Financial Strategy on 15 February 2023 and was being reported again as costs and plans had now been confirmed. The reserve would be applied over two years for the implementation and supporting costs of GovTech software which would deliver efficiencies through streamlining and automating back-office processes on the council tax and housing benefits/council tax support system.

The Executive was reminded that any overspend this year would be a direct call on the General Fund reserve which would need to be reimbursed in future years, therefore it was important mitigations were identified to bring forecast spend back in line with the available budget.

Councillor Leech raised concern around the £8.3m of savings previously identified as being classified as high risk and queried how realistic it would be for these to be achieved. He also asked that based on the project overspend, what proportion of the general fund reserve would this take up. He also expressed concern about the potential compound impact to future years budgets if the savings could not be achieved this year.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that the savings needed across social care were being subjected to higher than expected demand and cost pressures which could result in the ability to make a cost saving this year difficult. The issues in Childrens Services were similar, and as a result were counteracting all the saving initiatives that were being out in place. Looking at the MTFP for 2024/25, reassessing these pressures would be a key part of this week. In relation to if there was still a budget overspend at the end of the financial year, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that if this was to be met by the General Fund reserve, it would result in the balance of the reserve being below the recommended minimum for a Council the size of Manchester.

## Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Note the global revenue monitoring report and forecast outturn position which is showing a £8.732m overspend.
- (2) Approve budget virements to be reflected in the budget as set out in paragraph 2.7 of the report.
- (3) Approve the use of additional revenue grant funding budget as set out in paragraph 2.8 of the report.
- (4) Approve the use of additional capital grant and match-funding by capital receipts as set out in paragraph 2.9 of the report.
- (5) Approve the use of budgets to be allocated, budget as set out in paragraph 2.10 to 2.13 of the report.
- (6) Approve the use of reserves budget as set out in paragraph 2.14 of the report.

### **Exe/23/68 The Regeneration of Collyhurst - Update**

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided an update on activity undertaken since the previous report to Executive in March 2023 and set out proposals and recommendations for approval in relation to a strategy to secure an Affordable Housing Delivery Partner, who would play a critical role in ensuring that any redevelopment plans brought forward for consideration contained the right mix of housing tenures to meet the needs of existing and future residents.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development reported that Phase 1 - construction of 244 new homes in Collyhurst Village, of which 100 homes would be new City Council social rent properties with the balance being for open market sale, was now underway and was anticipated completed by April 2026 with the first 10 new Council homes completed in 2024/25, and the remainder completed in 2025/26. As agreed previously at Executive, residents whose homes would be demolished as part of the Phase 1 scheme were being supported to move into the new development. Work was underway with the tenants affected, to allocate them specific homes in the new development, clarify timescales for their moves and commence discussions about practicalities.

The March 2023 Executive report advised that a masterplan team had been selected to prepare a detailed masterplan for the Collyhurst Village and South Collyhurst neighbourhoods. Since the last update, the team had been undertaking baseline technical surveys to inform masterplan development and a community engagement strategy has been developed in liaison with local ward members. As part of the Masterplan development, a phasing strategy would be developed to inform and enable more detailed engagement with residents in the future around commitments that could be made. These would ultimately be agreed between the Affordable



Housing delivery partner but could be explored in advance through masterplan option testing.

Based on the work undertaken to date, and through market engagement undertaken, it was proposed to commence an MCC/FEC competitive process to identify an appropriate Affordable Housing Delivery Partner. MCC and FEC were in the process of designing a proposed competitive process to identify an appropriate Affordable Housing Delivery Partner and both parties were agreed in principle that based on potential scope of responsibilities a regulated procurement process would be required. It was considered likely that the partner identification process would have to launch during late Summer 2023, to conclude in Spring 2024.

It was also reported that Homes England had announced on 27 June that grant funding made available via the Government's Affordable Housing Programme (AHP) 2021-26 could be used to fund replacement homes, alongside new affordable homes, as part of wider estate regeneration proposals. This was a welcome shift in Government policy and was something that the Council had been lobbying for over a number of years.

Councillor Karney (Ward Councillor Harpurhey) addressed the Executive. He welcomed the developments taking place in Collyhurst and the proposal that 100 homes would be new City Council social rent properties. He condemned previous government's policies for failing to build affordable homes for those most in need and welcomed the Council's commitment to address this.

Councillor Leech queried what the range of different affordable housing products would be and whether the proposed 20% of affordable housing would actually be achieved and whether these would actually be at the Manchester Living Rent levels.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development advised that as part of Phase 1 of the redevelopment, 130 out of 274 (nearly 50%) were for social rent and that this demonstrated the Council's ambition to delivering affordable housing. He also added that there was also a need for other forms of affordable housing such as shared ownership and rent to buy as ways of getting onto the housing ladder

Councillor Johnson queried how realistic it would be to find appropriate accommodation in the Collyhurst area for those residents who would require rehousing whilst the redevelopment of the area was taking place.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development advised the Council had a commitment to a one move strategy for residents that would be affected which would be outlined in more detail in the Masterplan.

## **Decisions**

The Executive:-

- (1) Note the ongoing work to develop a delivery strategy for future phases of development in Collyhurst.

- (2) Delegate authority to the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) and Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer in consultation with the Leader and the Executive Member for Housing and Development to approve the undertaking and finalisation of a formal, competitive procurement process to identify an Affordable Housing Delivery Partner to support the Collyhurst Regeneration Programme.
- (3) Note that any such process will be subject to consultation with Local Ward Members in advance of implementation.

**Exe/23/69 HS2 Phase 2b Western Leg (Crewe-Manchester) Hybrid Bill - Deposit of a second Additional Provision (AP2) Petitioning**

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which informed Members about the current progress of the High Speed (Crewe – Manchester) Bill (known as ‘HS2 Phase 2b’) in Parliament, and a second ‘Additional Provision’ (AP2) to the Bill. It outlined the key issues within AP2, and the Council’s proposed response to it by means of a petition, together with a consultation response to the Supplementary Environmental Statement (SES).

One of the key issues included within the Council’s petitions was that the proposal within the Bill for a 6 platform surface, turn-back high speed station at Manchester Piccadilly was inadequate for reasons of reliability, capacity, resilience and future proofing, as well as negatively impacting the ability to deliver regeneration both around Piccadilly and out towards East Manchester. The petition requested that this proposal be re-considered in favour of an underground, through station option, which would better serve both HS2 and future Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) services, and bring maximum benefit to both the city and the wider North.

The Department for Transport had submitted a second Additional Provision to the Bill (‘AP2’) on 3 July 2023 detailing further changes to the proposals currently in the Bill. This was accompanied by a Supplementary Environmental Statement (SES), which set out the environmental impacts of, and mitigation measures planned for, the proposed changes. As with the main Bill, parties who were directly and specifically impacted by the AP2 proposals were invited to submit petitions by 15 August 2023, and a consultation on the SES was being undertaken, with a closing date of 31 August 2023.

As with the main Bill petition, the Council was continuing to work closely with GM Partners in preparing their respective petitions. The Council’s petition would be in alignment and consistent with those of other GM partners, whilst emphasising and highlighting issues of particular concern for the city. It was also noted that this petition would cover the changes proposed by AP2 and not seek to repeat the concerns included within the original petition which still stood, except where AP2 impacted those issues. A copy of the full petition would be provided to Members at the time the submission is made.

It was reported that the Council would complete the petition on AP2 and submit it to the House of Commons by the deadline of 15 August 2023. The Council would also complete the response to the SES in time for the deadline of 31 August 2023.

Following submission, the Council would prepare to appear before the Select Committee to make the case for both the outstanding points within its original petition, and the contents of the AP2 petition. It was expected that HS2 Ltd would look to negotiate with the Council leading up to, and throughout, the Select Committee appearances. The Council would seek satisfactory agreements, undertakings and assurances with them to remedy concerns and issues regarding the proposed scheme. Where issues were satisfactorily resolved during negotiation, it may be possible to withdraw these petition points before appearing at Select Committee, in line with the delegated approval granted by Council.

Councillor Hilal (Ward Councillor Didsbury West) addressed the Executive and raised concerns around the proposed site in the Hollies, which was close to properties on Mersey Road and Mersey Meadows. She stated that the construction of the vent shaft would have a considerable impact on these residents which HS2 had admitted to in their AP2 document. She also raised concern in relation to the proposed use of the Islamic Girls School car park as a car park and access route by HS2 which would result in the demolition of the former Sure Start centre and it was doubtful the school would be able to function once its site was being used as a car park for construction vehicles.

Councillor Kilpatrick (Ward Councillor Didsbury West) addressed the Executive and also raised concerns in relation to the proposed vent shaft at the Hollies. Specifically in relation to the proposed access to the vent shaft at Barlow Moor road and the adverse impact this would have on adjacent communities, including the impact on the wider road network and existing or planned facilities. He expressed strong reservations in relation to the proposed impact on the Islamic Girls School and he also raised concerns in relation to residents safety, as the location was still within the flood plain.

Councillor Johnson raised the issue of how HS2 was undertaking consultation with local residents and the use of technical documentation which was difficult for non-specialists to understand and queried whether the Council could assist residents in understanding the documentation being sent.

Councillor Leech raised serious concerns in relation to the proposal to circulate the full AP2 petition to Members at the same time as its submission to the House of Commons as he felt the Council had ignored the views of local ward Councillors in relation to what needed to be included and sought Executive to amend this proposal to enable discussions with local Ward Councillors as to what should be included in the petition response based on the concerns raised at this meeting or that the Executive included a further recommendation that clearly stated the Council opposed the proposed location of the ventilation shaft at the Hollies within the petition response.

## **Decisions**

The Executive:-

- (1) Note the current progress of the High Speed (Crewe - Manchester) hybrid Bill ("the Bill"), as introduced into the 24 January 2022 session of Parliament, as detailed in the report.
- (2) Note the contents of AP2 to the Bill including the supporting SES and the proposed contents of the City Council's petition against aspects of AP2, and the proposed contents of the City Council's petition against aspects of AP2 and the SES consultation response set out in the report.
- (3) Note the delegated authority approved by Council on 4 March 2022 to the Strategic Director (Growth & Development), in consultation with the Leader and City Solicitor, to take all the steps required for the Council to submit any petition and thereafter to maintain and if considered appropriate authorise the withdrawal of any petition points that have been resolved in respect of the Bill, and to negotiate and/or seek assurances/ undertaking/agreements in relation to aspects of the Bill.
- (4) Note that the petition against AP2 is within the scope of the above delegated authority approved by Council on 4 March 2022.
- (5) Note that the full AP2 petition will be circulated to Members at the same time as its submission to the House of Commons by the deadline of 15 August 2023.
- (6) Note that the AP2 consultation response on the SES will be circulated to Members at the same time as its submission to Government by the deadline of 31 August 2023.

(Councillor Chambers declared a personal interest in this item due to her employment with Transport for Greater Manchester)

### **Exe/23/70 Our Town Hall Project - Progress Update**

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which provided an update on the progress of the refurbishment and partial restoration of the Town Hall and Albert Square under the Our Town Hall (OTH) project.

The Deputy Leader (Statutory) reported that excellent progress continued to be made with Social Value, with 57% of the project spend within Manchester (baseline target 40%) and 47% of the workforce being Manchester residents (baseline target 30%) and a social value ROI of £14.6m. Work to develop the detail of how the building would run was picking up pace, including revenue planning and operational strategies and the project was 60% through the existing programme for the construction works, and the quality of the works continued to exceed expectations.

The contract date for completion of the construction works remained 25 June 2024. However, as a result of the ongoing challenges to the programme, the completion date would need to be updated to realistically reflect the latest position. In the meantime, it was now clear that the delays caused by Covid-19 and discovery would be significant and without any mitigation could add two years of delay.

The project had faced an extremely challenging 18-month period with intense pressures on cost and programme. These challenges included significant disruptions from 'uncontrollable' elements such as nesting falcons, Covid-19, extraordinary levels of inflation and unprecedented pressure on the supply chain. The biggest risk to the budget was now the cost of delay. For every month of delay, the project incurred additional costs of circa £1m to £1.5m, depending on the point in the programme at which the delay occurred. At the same time, the hyper-inflation experienced by the project in the post-pandemic period had been significant and remained a risk to all packages yet to be procured, and to those packages that were subject to changes arising from discovery.

It was therefore difficult to give any degree of confidence on the final cost and programme dates until these higher risk works were completed. Given the risks outlined in the report, it was proposed to split a request for additional funding into two parts. Part one would be a request for an additional £29m funding sufficient to cover all financial commitments to the end of 2023.. Without this funding there was a risk that completion would be significantly delayed and post December the biggest remaining cost pressure on the project was linked to programme delay. The position would be much clearer in January 2024, and it was therefore proposed to review the position on target dates for completion and cost and further budget approvals would be sought at that stage.

Councillor Leech sought clarification as to how much likely extra funding would be needed after December 2023 in order for the project to complete as he felt there needed to be clarity as what the total cost was required to complete. He also sought clarification on who was responsible for paying any penalty costs for delays in the project

### **Decision**

The Executive recommend to Council approval of a capital budget increase of £29m for the project, funded by borrowing, to maintain progress with the construction works until the end of December 2023.

### **Exe/23/71 Factory International at Aviva Studios (Part A)**

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided update on the delivery of Aviva Studios including progress with the construction programme; the evolution of Factory International,; the success of the recent MIF23 festival and the conclusion of the naming rights agreement with Aviva for Aviva Studios.

The Deputy Leader (Statutory) advised that Factory International had attracted significant government investment of £106.7m, alongside £9m per annum of Arts Council England revenue funding to ensure the success of the facility. It was noted that the original budget was set in 2015, based on benchmark costs, to secure the government funding package. This was prior to any detailed site investigations or design work and proved to be inadequate to fund a project of this size, scale and complexity. Leaving aside the complexities of the project, adjusting for inflation alone

during this period using ONS construction indices would have increased the budget by c. £40m.

As of July 2023, the building had been sufficiently completed with static completion achieved for operation of MIF23. The remaining snagging and commissioning works were scheduled to be completed by 7 September, therefore, whilst the physical building had been completed in time for MIF23, the overall timescales were later than planned and there had been a number of factors which had contributed to the delay, which had resulted in the requirement of additional £8.7m to cover the cashflow requirements to static completion for construction and client-side fees and support to cover the additional costs experienced by Factory International.

This additional funding would be funded from £620k increased grant from ACE, £7.3m on an invest to save basis to be funded from naming rights income and £782k to reverse the temporary virement for public realm costs.

In addition, there was a capital budget increase request of £1.1m to be funded from capital receipts, to meet the costs of completing the public realm.

It was reported that a long-term partnership had been announced between Aviva, Manchester City Council and Factory International which included landmark support for Manchester's iconic new arts and culture venue to be named Aviva Studios. The multi-million-pound investment by Aviva would support the completion and help make the delivery of the world-class building possible.

Councillor Leech expressed concern over the repeated increases in the budget required to complete the project and specifically questioned why the original budget, set in 2015 based on benchmark costs, was agreed prior to any detailed site investigations or design work and proved to be inadequate to fund a project of this size, scale and complexity. He also asked how confident was the Council in not being required to have to provide additional funding in future years for MIF to take place at Aviva Studios and whether the Council's contribution to the Sinking Fund would be revenue or capital spend.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that the contribution to the Sinking Fund would come from the Asset Management Plan and part of the capital budget and the repairing responsibilities would be split between the Council and the tenant. It was not expected to meet additional costs for future MIF.

## **Decisions**

The Executive:-

- (1) Note progress with the delivery of Aviva Studios, home to Factory International, the wider economic, cultural and social benefits to Manchester and the significant programme of social value commitments.
- (2) Approve a capital budget increase for Aviva Studios of £8.7m to be funded from:
  - £620k increased grant from ACE
  - £7.3m on an invest to save basis to be funded from naming rights income

- £782k to reverse the temporary virement for public realm costs
- (3) Note the capital budget increase of £8.7m will be used to fund the cashflow requirements to static completion for construction and client-side fees and £600k support to cover the additional costs experienced by Factory International.
  - (4) Approve a capital budget increase of £1.1m to be funded from capital receipts, to meet the final costs of the public realm.
  - (5) Note the progress made by Factory International to prepare the organisation to operate Aviva Studios including recruitment, business planning, the sponsorship programme, artistic and cultural programme development and social value benefits, in the lead up to and successful delivery of MIF23, and the formal opening in the autumn.
  - (6) Note the naming rights agreement with Aviva for Aviva Studios
  - (7) Note progress in the development of employment, training and education opportunities and creative engagement programmes as part of Factory International's skills and learning development programme.

#### **Exe/23/72 Exclusion of Press and Public**

##### **Decision**

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

#### **Exe/23/73 Factory International at Aviva Studios (Part B)**

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided an update on the fundraising for the construction project and the conclusion of the naming rights agreement with Aviva for Aviva Studios.

##### **Decisions**

The Executive:-

- (1) Note the terms of the naming rights agreements with Aviva for Aviva Studios.
- (2) Endorse the proposed 50 /50 allocation of all net building related sponsorship and naming rights income (after costs and fulfilment) with Factory International for the 30-year life of the lease.

- (3) Note the long-term relationship with Factory International and the ability to recover a significant proportion of the borrowing costs from naming rights income and other building-related sponsorships.



## Executive

### Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 13 September 2023

**Present:** Councillor Craig (Chair)

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

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

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

**Apologies:** Councillor Rahman and Foley

**Exe/23/74 Minutes**

#### Decision

The Executive approved as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 26 July 2023.

#### Exe/23/75 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 Skills, Culture and Leisure reported that the Council had formally submitted a bid to make Manchester the European Capital of Cycling for 2024. It was hoped that being named the European Capital of Cycling for 2024 would not only recognise the work which had been done to promote cycling in the city but also help leverage further funding and other improvements and encourage even more Mancunians to cycle. He also reported that the National Cycling Centre’s Velodrome re-opened on Saturday 3 September following £27m investment in improvements from the Council, Sport England and Government. As well as improving its facilities, it was now the UK’s first all-electric Velodrome.

Councillor Johnson sought clarity as to whether there were any plans to improve the standard of a number of existing cycle routes that were in need of maintenance.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure next reported on the recent Ofsted inspection of Manchester’s Adult Education Service (MAES). Government inspectors had MAES for its inclusive and ambitious curriculum, high quality education and training and passionate leaders. Ofsted inspectors had graded every aspect of the service Good - from its overall effectiveness, quality of education, and adult learning programmes, through to provision for learners with high needs, and its leadership and management.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure final update was to report on the reopening of Abraham Moss Library and Leisure Centre following a multi-million pound refurbishment. The refurbishment was part of the Council's ongoing sport and leisure investment strategy. Leisure facilities and libraries across the city were being modernised so they could be better equipped to suit the needs of residents.

The Deputy Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure reported that Manchester had been named as the most digitally inclusive city in the UK in a national survey. Analysis of the number of databanks, digital inclusion hubs and digital skills workshops on offer nationally put the city out ahead in the survey carried out by Uswitch mobiles. The findings reflected work which had taken place to combat issues such as digital exclusion, generational poverty and health inequality.

The Deputy Leader reported on the progress which had been made on key themes in the Making Manchester Fairer Action Plan, including cutting unemployment and creating good jobs. In particular the Individualised Placement Support in Primary Care and Ambition Manchester In-Work Progression initiatives were cited which supported those with physical and/or mental disabilities into employment and helped people with low-incomes to progress within their current workplaces or acquire the skills to move into higher-paid roles elsewhere.

The Executive Member for Growth and Development reported on the recently approved planning application to re-develop the former Chorlton Leisure Centre site as an affordable later living housing scheme. The new development would provide 50 apartments (a mix of one bed and two bed) for the over 55s. 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 55s 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 first residents had moved into the Silk Street development of low carbon homes for social rent in Newton Heath. As the first 11 homes were handed over to the council following their completion at the end of July, they had been allocated to local people on the Council's social housing register Manchester Move. Altogether the site would deliver a mixture of 69 homes with 16 of these homes available to people over the age of 55 who were right-sizing from other properties in Newton Heath and North Manchester, freeing up larger properties for social rent

Councillor Leech sought clarification as to whether there would be any financial assistance to those residents who were seeking to down size as part of the Chorlton Leisure Centre redevelopment. The Executive Member for Growth and Development confirmed this would be looked into with the developer.

## **Decision**

The Executive note the report.

## Exe/23/76 Revenue Monitoring to the end of July 2023

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which outlined the projected outturn position for 2023/24, based on expenditure and income activity as at the end of July 2023 and future projections.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources reported that the current budget monitoring forecast was an overspend of £9.6m and that there were considerable risks to the position relating to the impact of rising demand and increasing costs.

The main pressures were being felt in the social care budgets reflecting the national pressures in the health and social care sector and trends being experienced across most Social Care providing local authorities. A £3.7m forecasted overspend in Adult Social care was largely in relation to the provision of long term care arrangements with demand above 2023/24 budget assumptions. Whilst strong progress on the approach to reduce demand through 'prevent, reduce and delay' was being made through the Better Outcomes Better Lives (BOBL) initiative, it was unlikely that the additional demand management savings (£5.5m) envisaged from client social care packages would be delivered. As such the overspend was in part being offset by employee underspends across the Directorate due to difficulties in recruitment.

The forecasted £4.9m overspend in Children's Services was after taking account of £3.9m of mitigations against key pressures. The underlying cost drivers related to higher placement costs for Looked After Children (LAC) and Care Leavers Supported Accommodation, small increases in External Residential and Care Leaver placements numbers, Remand activity, and Home to School Transport pressures. The biggest pressure related to external residential placements and increased complexity of need of the current cohort with placement costs having increased by 44% in the current financial year. Investment in provision for those children with higher levels of needs was underway. Once this work was complete it was expected that this would reduce some of the pressures on the external residential care budgets. The main variations in the other service departments totalled £0.9m.

As part of the 2023/24 budget setting process £25.2m of savings were agreed. Of these £15.1m (60%) were on track for delivery, £1.5m (7%) were risk rated medium, and £8.5m (33%) rated high risk in terms of the likelihood of delivery. Officers were working to identify alternative savings where original plans might not be achieved or delayed.

The report went on to outline the following budget virements which required approval

- The transfer of part year funding for Graduate Management trainees from HROD to directorates totalling £293k

The report also provided details of additional grant notifications that had been received since the budget had been set and which were now reflected in revised budgets:-

- Adults - Market Sustainability and improvement fund £4.055m
- Corporate Core - Household Support Budget £12.906m

- Libraries - Build a business in GM libraries - £0.601m
- City Policy - Innovate UK Net Zero Pathfinder GM £86k 2023/24, £0.516m 24/25, £301k 25/26
- Corporate Core - Transparency Code New Burdens £13k
- Housing - Tenant Satisfaction New Burdens £63k

In addition, when the budget was set in February 2023 a total of £14.3m was identified for price and electricity inflation. £2.2m was allocated to Children's for internal placements, £0.5m to Education Home to School Transport and £2.7m to Adults as a contribution to market sustainability. At period 2 requests from Childrens services totalling £2.4m were agreed, mostly relating to fostering and residential placements. This left £6.4m in the corporate price and utilities inflation budget for inflation pressures. Additional inflation requests were currently being considered and would be brought back to a future Executive meeting for approval.

At this stage it was envisioned that the known increased costs could be contained within the available inflationary budgets made available for 2023/24 however this remained a risk.

It was also reported that allowance for a 6% pay increase was allowed for in the budget costing an estimated £15.6m. In February the National Employers offered a £1,925 pay increase from 1 April 2023 and 3.88% for those above the top of the pay spine. The estimated budget requirement to fund this offer for MCC staff was £15.5m for 2023/24, and therefore within the available budget. Should any pay award above this level be agreed, this would exceed the current provision in the budget.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources concluded that it was very early in the financial year and vigilance was needed given there were significant uncertainties and risks to the position as cost of living and inflationary pressures could increase. Any overspend this year would be a direct call on the General Fund Reserve which would need to be reimbursed in future years. In addition any ongoing impact of the pressures faced this year would need to be addressed in the 2024/25 budget. It was therefore important mitigations were identified to bring forecast spend back in line with the available budget.

Councillor Leech sought clarification as to whether the increase in placement costs within Children's Services were as a result of an increase in overall costs, inflationary pressures or an increase in the demand on this service. He also sought clarification as to the cause of the projected overspend in the Corporate Core as he noted that in previous years, this Directorate had usually produced a budget underspend

## Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Note the global revenue monitoring report and forecast outturn position which is showing a £9.6m overspend.
- (2) Approve budget virements to be reflected in the budget as set out at paragraph 2.9 of the report

- (3) Approve the use of additional revenue grant funding as set out at paragraph 2.10 of the report.

### **Exe/23/77 Capital Programme Monitoring P4 2023/24**

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which provided progress against the delivery of the 2023/24 capital programme to the end of July 2023, the latest forecast of capital expenditure and the major variances since the Capital Programme Outturn report submitted in June 2023 and the proposed financing of capital expenditure for 2023/24 and affordability of the Capital Programme.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources reported that the latest forecast of expenditure for 2023/24 for Manchester City Council was £454.0m compared to the current approved budget of £473.7m. Spend as of 31 July 2023 was £91.9m. The main variances related to the Asset Management Programme, Hammerstone Road Depot, Campfield Redevelopment, Our Town Hall Refurbishment, Home Upgrade Grant, Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund and Varley Street SEND Secondary School. These variances mostly related to timing differences meaning reprofiling would be required.

A more focussed look at the top 10 projects was provided in Appendix A. These projects covered 47% of the total programme. The programme also contained some budgets yet to be allocated to specific projects but reserved for a particular purpose, such as Education Basic Need funding, Housing Affordability Fund, ICT Investment Plan and the budget for inflation pressures. These would be allocated once the specific schemes were progressed and approved, or in the case of inflation the business case showing the impact of inflationary pressures on a scheme completed. They would also then be subject to approval through the Council's capital approval process.

As in previous reports the most significant risk facing the programme and major projects overall was the continued high levels of inflation being experienced. Inflation in the UK in the 12 months to July 2023, as measured through CPI, was currently 6.8%, down from 7.9% in May and from a recent peak of 11.1% in October 2022. Whilst this showed a downward trend which was expected to continue, the figure remained elevated.

The current forecasts showed that the financing costs remained affordable within the revenue budget available including reserves with the capital financing reserves being required to meet the costs associated with the borrowing by 2026/27.

In addition, it was reported that there were schemes that had been developed or had received external funding that were now ready for inclusion in the Capital Programme. 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:-

- Aviva Studios, Home of Factory International - to reach practical completion, a capital budget increase of £22.2m was recommended, funded by borrowing and supported by the Council's share of all future commercial sponsorship income.
- Corporate Services - Our New Finance & HRODT System – a revenue budget increase of £17.4m was requested, to be spread across 4 financial years, and funded from the Capital Fund reserve, to replace the Council's existing HR and Finance System.
- Neighbourhoods – Manchester Aquatic Centre (MAC) – a capital budget increase of £0.640m was requested, funded by borrowing, to fund additional works deemed essential to address build, health and safety issues and safeguard the MACs future operations and services, whilst also ensuring that the building remained complaint to host World-Class Events.
- Growth and Development – Piccadilly Garden Design Phase – a capital budget increase of £0.782m was requested, funded by borrowing, to enable the project cost to progress to end of RIBA Stage 3 / submission of planning application.

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:-

- ICT - Digitising Registrars Certificates – a revenue budget increase of £0.244m was requested, funded from the Capital Fund reserve, to deliver a project that will lead the implementation of imaging software to digitise birth, death and marriage certificates, enabling the Registrars service to streamline and automate the current copy certificate process, increase team efficiencies and improve the service offered to customers.
- ICT - Manchester ContrOCC Client Finance Portal (CFP) and Online Financial Assessments (OFA) Resources – a revenue budget increase of £0.092m was requested, funded from the Capital Fund reserve, to deliver a project that would enable the implementation of the two ContrOCC portals; Client Finance Portal (CFP) and Online Financial Assessment Portal (OFA).
- ICT – Adults Care Management System – a revenue budget increase of £0.258m was requested, funded from the Capital Fund reserve, to implement a new care management system covering; rostering, care monitoring reporting, electronic medication administration record and mileage wizard for the Reablement and Disability Supported Accommodation Services (DSAS) teams within Adult's Services.
- Public Sector Housing – Collyhurst – a budget virement of £3.693m funded from capital receipts, between the Private Sector and Public Sector Housing budgets was requested as the existing budget was no longer required for its original purpose, and there was inflationary pressure in the wider regeneration scheme relating to the construction costs for new homes, a new park and associated infrastructure, and not all of this pressure could be mitigated through value engineering.

Councillor Leech sought clarification as to why the highways budget had been reprofiled and whether this would have any detrimental impact on the maintenance of roads and gullies. He also expressed concern over the increasing level of borrowing

for Aviva Studios and that following its completion the Executive should receive a further report that provided an in-depth detailed analysis as to what the extra funding had been required for.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer clarified that the Council did not borrow funding against individual schemes but rather against the whole capital programme. She also confirmed that there would be a future report to both Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee and the Executive which would provide an in-depth detailed analysis as to what the extra funding for Aviva Studios had been required for

## Decisions

The Executive:-

- (1) Note the Progress against the delivery of the 2023/24 capital programme to the end of July 2023
- (2) Recommends that the Council approve the following changes to the Council's capital programme:-
  - Aviva Studios, Home of Factory International - a capital budget increase of £22.2m, funded by borrowing.
  - Corporate Services - Our New Finance & HRODT System – a revenue budget increase of £17.4m, to be spread across 4 financial years, and funded from the Capital Fund reserve.
  - Neighbourhoods – Manchester Aquatic Centre (MAC) – a capital budget increase of £0.640m, funded by borrowing.
  - Growth and Development – Piccadilly Garden Design Phase – a capital budget increase of £0.782m, funded by borrowing.
- (3) Approve the following changes to the Council's capital programme:-
  - ICT - Digitising Registrars Certificates – a revenue budget increase of £0.244m, funded from the Capital Fund reserve.
  - ICT - Manchester ContrOCC Client Finance Portal (CFP) and Online Financial Assessments (OFA) Resources – a revenue budget increase of £0.092m, funded from the Capital Fund reserve.
  - ICT – Adults Care Management System – a revenue budget increase of £0.258m was requested, funded from the Capital Fund reserve.
  - Public Sector Housing – Collyhurst – a budget virement of £3.693m funded from capital receipts, between the Private Sector and Public Sector Housing budgets

## **Exe/23/78 Hackney Carriage Fares - Interim Review 2023**

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which set out recommendations in relation to Hackney Carriage Fares following a review of these fares by the Council's Licensing and Appeals Committee.

The Executive last reviewed the Hackney Fares in October 2022. Since then numerous other local authorities had further reviewed their Hackney fares and as a result Manchester was now at position 161 out of 344 local authorities ranked by the cost of a 2-mile journey on Tariff One . As many authorities have the same fare however (and discounting the airports tariffs) in real terms Manchester is joint 39th out of 81 different fare tariffs. Either way, Manchester was sitting around halfway on the league table which may be considered fairly low for a major city.

The current methodology used in Manchester for calculating the fares had now been in place for over a decade and the 2022 review highlighted the sensitivity of the current formula to any significant changes in data components or assumptions that reflected policy or market changes, as well as the challenge in obtaining accurate and localised running cost data.

Prior to consideration by the Executive, the proposals had been considered by the Council's Licensing and Appeals Committee and in doing so had recommended:-

- An increase to the unit cost per mile on all tariffs by 8%
- An increase to the waiting time fare by 23%
- An increase to the Day flag tariff to £3.40
- An increase the Night flag tariff to £3.80

In making its decision, the Executive has the authority to: apply all, part or none of the recommended amendments to the Fare Tariff and apply any additional amendment(s) it determined as appropriate.

## **Decisions**

The Executive:-

- (1) Agrees to increase the unit cost per mile on all tariffs by 8%
- (2) Agrees to Increase the waiting time fare by 23%
- (3) Agrees to increase the Day flag tariff to £3.40
- (4) Agrees to increase the Night flag tariff to £3.80
- (5) Notes the decision to make the acceptance of card payments mandatory in Hackney Vehicles

## **Exe/23/79 Manchester Piccadilly SRF Addendum: East Village Central Framework**

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which set out the outcome of a public consultation exercise with residents, businesses and stakeholders, on the draft East Village Central Framework which was an addendum to the Manchester Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF).



The Leader explained that the site identified in the draft East Village Central Framework was centrally located within the Piccadilly SRF area. As well as contributing to the overall objectives within the Piccadilly SRF, the draft framework proposals had been developed to ensure that they will complement the wider economic priorities and regeneration strategy for the city centre.

The report provided details of the response received to the consultation from a key stakeholder, a national charity, a statutory body and local residents

It was noted that the East Village Central Framework responded to the opportunity to review how this strategically significant site could be repurposed and redeveloped in a manner that maximises its contribution to the growth of the city centre. The new commercially-led, mixed use neighbourhood would support the creation of new jobs, homes and public realm in the city centre, for both existing and new residents. The development would be highly connected, functionally and physically, to the wider city centre and adjoining regeneration priority areas and would complement the arrival of HS2 and NPR.

Given the increasing need for new high quality commercial development space, the draft framework would complement the proposed commercial development at Central Retail Park. It would also add further momentum to the development of the Piccadilly SRF, building on the ongoing delivery at Portugal Street East and Mayfield.

## **Decisions**

The Executive:-

- (1) Note the outcome of the public consultation on the East Village Central Framework.
- (2) Approve the East Village Central Framework, as an addendum to the Manchester Piccadilly SRF, and request that Planning and Highways Committee take the framework into account as a material consideration when considering planning applications for the area.

## **Exe/23/80 Strategic approach to developments of social homes via a city-wide New Build Local Lettings Policy**

The Executive considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which proposed a strategic response in the form of a New Build Local Lettings Policy (LLP) for all new developments of social homes to be let at social or affordable rent.

The Executive Member for Growth and Development explained how it was necessary to put in place a strategic response to ensure that new build developments had a mix of residents to help to make them sustainable in the longer term. The aim was to avoid the likely concentrations of dependency and higher-level support needs in new builds while also offering local people a chance of a local home and thereby contribute to achieving sustainable communities for the benefit of all.

This strategic response would result in a New Build Local Lettings Policy (LLP) for all new developments of social homes to be let at social rent or affordable rent. It was proposed that this approach was taken on all new build social developments of 10 or more homes. It was also reported that after five years the effectiveness of the LLP would be reviewed with a view to it being amended, ended or extended for such period as necessary.

Under the LLP:-

- 50% of any development would be let to working households who are in priority housing need on the Manchester housing register;
- 20% of the new development would be let to applicants living in the Manchester City Council boundary area who were in priority housing need on the housing register and had an established connection to the immediate area of the development; and
- 30% of the new development would be let as normal, in accordance with the allocation scheme.

The policy would only apply to what were called “general needs” properties – general housing for most applicants, not specialist housing developed for a particular purpose, such as retirement homes or extra care provision. The policy would also apply only at first let. Having created a mixed community through this policy, all subsequent relets would be to the applicable allocations scheme.

Councillor Leech sought clarification as to whether consideration would be given to applicants living in a geographical area as opposed to the rigidity of a ward boundary. The Executive Member for Growth and Development confirmed that the Policy was to be used as a template and would be applied as appropriate for each scheme, which would include taking into account an applicant’s geographical location to a scheme where appropriate.

## **Decision**

The Executive approve and adopts the New Build LLP with a review of the policy to take place in 5 years

## **Exe/23/81 Climate Change Action Plan Annual Report**

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which presented the third Annual Report of the Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) 2020-25.

It was reported that the Council had remained within its allocated carbon budget for the year 2022-23, using 89% of the budget. Overall the Council had used 57% of its carbon budget for the 2020-25 period and was on track to remain within the carbon budget for this period. In addition, 55% of the actions in the CCAP 2020-25 were working to target and the remaining were work in progress.

Over the course of this 12-month period, in addition to the previous 2 years’ work, the Council had been able to secure over £227m to support delivering the CCAP. This

investment included funding for dedicated resource with the creation of 13 new posts, whilst a number of services also identified opportunities to create zero carbon focused posts, all providing additional capacity to aid delivery of the CCAP.

There would be a number of important milestones on the next stage of the Council's journey to becoming zero carbon. This included:-

- A joint Innovate UK bid with GMCA and Oldham MBC for investment to further explore new net zero finance and funding models;
- Progressing with the procurement of a partner to provide an electricity Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) for the Council's future energy supply; and
- The adoption of Places for Everyone (Joint Local Plan) expected in spring 2024 and the development of the Manchester Local Plan over the next two Years.

Councillor Leech sought clarification on how dependent the Council would be on the joint Innovate UK in achieving its targets for the next reporting period.

### **Decision**

The Executive approve the Climate Change Action Plan Annual Report for 2022 - 2023.

### **Exe/23/82 Winter preparedness in the health system**

The Executive considered a report of the Deputy Place Based Lead, which provided an overview of the key elements of the approach to winter planning 2023/24 alongside organisational updates relating to what would be delivered by partner organisations.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care reported that a full system winter plan would be developed through two urgent care system boards – Manchester and Trafford Operational Delivery Group (ODG) and Urgent Care Board (UCB). A first iteration of the system plan would be shared at the September Urgent Care Board, with a further update in October, and then as required throughout winter. In line with previous years, the Manchester and Trafford System Resilience Team would lead and co-ordinate on all aspects of winter planning and the lessons learnt from winter 2022/23 had been incorporated into the organisational delivery plans.

As with previous years, the locality winter communications plan would be led by the overall GM ICS winter strategy and NHS GM winter communications and engagement plan. There would be an integrated communications and marketing campaign approach that used engaging content across multiple channels including social media, website, internal and stakeholder, outdoor media and digital channels at both a GM and locality level. While the GM approach would allow for consistency across the region, the Council had additional activity planned across Manchester that reflected its diverse population and the health inequalities that existed. This would include additional communications and engagement activity relating to vaccination

programmes and the cost-of-living crisis with both translated materials and easy read materials.

**Decision**

The Executive note the report.

## **Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of meeting held on Tuesday, 18 July 2023**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Johns – in the Chair  
Councillors Abdullatif, Benham, Hussain, Iqbal, Northwood, Richards, I Robinson, Shilton Godwin and Taylor

#### **Also present:**

Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Development  
Councillor Lynch, Deputy Executive Member for Housing and Development  
Jason Hingley, This City

#### **ERSC/23/29 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

That the minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2023 be approved as a correct record.

#### **ERSC/23/30 Manchester Housing Strategy (2022-2032) - Annual Monitoring Report**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) which provided an update on the progress made towards the Strategy's objectives during 2022-23.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Increasing affordable housing supply and building more new homes for all residents;
- Work to end homelessness and ensure housing was affordable and accessible to all;
- Addressing inequalities and creating neighbourhoods where people wanted to live; and
- Addressing the sustainability and zero carbon challenges in new and existing housing;

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

- To welcome the ambition for the city and the progress being made, while recognising that there was significant work still to do and the challenges the Council was facing;
- Domestic violence and the allocation of housing priority bands;
- Barriers preventing local authorities from delivering more social and affordable housing;
- The age of many buildings in Manchester and the challenges with retrofitting;
- The definition of affordable housing;

- The number of people on the waiting list for different types of properties; and
- Consideration of access to amenities such as GPs and shops when planning new housing developments.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development reported that domestic abuse victims were classified as band one and he offered to provide further information on the allocations policy and how this was working. He highlighted the progress in reducing the use of temporary accommodation. In response to Members' comments, he stated that it was very important to develop on the city's brownfield sites to deliver social and affordable housing, although there were challenges with contamination and viability. He outlined the progress being made with retrofitting housing, while stating that more needed to be done and that some of this work was conditional on Government funding. In response to a Member's question, he highlighted that the Council worked with Arawak Walton, the largest independent black and minority ethnic (BME) Housing Association in the North West, which had a long history of working in central Manchester.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development reported that, for planning purposes, the Council had to use the Government definition of affordable housing but that the Council had introduced the Manchester Living Rent, which they believed was truly affordable, and which many of the Council's partners were signing up to. In response to a Member's question about delays in construction of new developments, he advised that work had to start within three years of planning permission being granted. He highlighted some of the challenges with this and stated that, in relation to partners within the Manchester Housing Provider Partnership (MHPP), the Council could have a positive dialogue on overcoming delays, but that this could be more challenging in the case of private developers. In response to a Member's question, he outlined some of the challenges that the Council's partners were facing with building lower carbon buildings, including funding and the legal framework, while stating that MHPP partners had a strong commitment to delivering this and highlighting the mechanisms the Council had to enforce this. The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) highlighted how, in relation to the private sector, the Council had to balance the need for more homes, the need for more affordable homes and the need for carbon net zero homes.

A Member who was also the Chair of the Environment, Climate Change and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Committee (ECCNSC), invited Committee Members to attend the 7 September meeting of her committee for an item on Housing Retrofit. She clarified that targets related to zero carbon and not net zero carbon. In response to a Member's request for information on how much of the carbon reduction budget was being spent on housing, the Chair advised that it was likely that this would be considered by ECCNSC and that he would speak to the Chair of that Committee about it.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) reported that Homes England had experienced uncertainty in recent years about the capital funding they had available to deploy. She highlighted the £150m of brownfield funding over three years to accelerate housing delivery as part of the Greater Manchester Trailblazer Devolution Deal, stating that this work was taking place in partnership with the Greater Manchester Combined Authority

(GMCA), the other nine Greater Manchester local authorities and Homes England. She stated that Homes England also helped the city region with revenue funding for de-risking brownfield sites. She welcomed that, following a recent announcement, the Affordable Homes Programme could now be used for the re-provision of social housing, which would be beneficial in areas such as Victoria North. In response to a question from the Chair about what role the Council could play in enabling residents to access homes in open-market sales, where they were having to compete with investors, she stated that the Council had limited ability to influence this but, for developments where the Council was working in partnerships, such as joint ventures, it was expected that a significant amount of the homes would be for the benefit of Manchester residents.

In response to a question about supply and demand of housing, the Strategic Lead (Housing Strategy and Policy) reported that, due to population growth, there was an under-supply of approximately 500 homes per year in the city so an ambitious housing strategy was needed, considering the different types and tenure of housing needed, different income levels and constraints on the availability of land in different parts of the city. In response to a question about the figure in the report on homes being built close to public transport, he clarified that this meant within 500m of a Metrolink, Rail or Bus Station, and not just a bus stop.

In response to a Member's question the Head of Strategic Housing confirmed that the Enabling Independence Accommodation Strategy would include people with a physical disability. In response to question about cladding, he informed Members about the Building Safety Group, which the Council had established immediately following the Grenfell Fire in London, stating that this had now developed into a Greater Manchester-wide group, led by the Fire Service, and that a lot of work was taking place in relation to building safety; however, he reported that there were hundreds of high rise buildings in the city, many with cladding and wooden balconies, and that some developers had still not signed the Government's pledge to remove cladding. He added that the next challenge would be the safety of medium-rise buildings. He reported that there was information on the Manchester Move website about the number of households on the waiting list, including what band they were in and how many bedrooms they needed, along with estimated waiting times, and he offered to share this link with Members.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) acknowledged the Member's comments about the provision of wider amenities in a city with a growing population. She stated that population growth was monitored, using the Manchester City Council Forecasting Model, and she outlined some of the challenges with planning for amenities in areas with new housing developments, particularly where a number of housing developers were involved, stating that this included challenges with funding where the Government Departments wanted to see that increased demand was there before committing additional resources, rather than looking ahead to the impact of housing developments which were in the pipeline; however, she stated that for large scale development plans, such as Victoria North, the Council was trying to design this in from the outset. The Director of Development reported that the district centre regeneration programmes also enabled new spaces to be created for healthcare infrastructure. In response to a question from the Chair, he explained how the amount of Section 106 funding for housing affordability was calculated and

that it could be used in a different area, reporting that the Council was keen to make the best use of this funding, prioritising social rents, more affordable tenures and low carbon homes.

**Decision:**

That the Committee will receive an update on this work in the next municipal year.

[Councillor Johns declared a personal interest as someone affected by cladding issues, following a reference to this during the Committee's discussion.]

**ERSC/23/31 This City Programme Update**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) which outlined the significant progress to date in the formation, constitution and governance of This City, the Council's wholly owned housing delivery vehicle, and also in the spearheading of the construction of its maiden scheme, Rodney Street, alongside the development of a long-term business plan.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Company formation and initial business planning;
- Phase 1 developments;
- Pipeline of development – Phase 2;
- Investment partnership(s); and
- Recruitment.

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

- To welcome the work taking place;
- Would the rented homes be retained in the rented sector to ensure low-cost rents in the long-term;
- Communication with and involvement of Ward Councillors on Phase 2 development and future phases;
- The housing allocation process for these developments and the importance of building mixed communities; and
- Governance arrangements.

The Deputy Executive Member for Housing and Development confirmed that the rents would be within the Council's control and that the homes would not be eligible for right-to-buy.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development reported that there were outline ideas for Phase 2 but that this would be discussed with local Councillors. He stated that the Council was looking to use a Local Lettings Policy to get a good mixed community in the developments, including using a local connection as part of the criteria. He expressed concern that the Local Housing Allowance had been frozen for a number of years, while market rents were increasing, and called on the Government to increase this. In response to a Member's question, he confirmed that



Ward Councillors would be involved, with Council officers, in the naming of the buildings in their area.

In response to a Member's question about whether the proportion of affordable housing would increase as debts were paid down on individual developments, Jason Hingley, Director of This City, confirmed that this was the intention.

The Director of Development explained the governance arrangements for This City, which included a Strategic Programme Board, a Non-Executive Board and checks and balances on decision-making. He stated that there would be intensive work over the next six months to get an investor partner on board, following which early consultation with Ward Councillors could take place, most likely next year.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development acknowledged the importance of a Member's point about This City being representative of the communities it served, including in leadership roles, stating that there was a degree of diversity in the Non-Executive Board and that this was something that the Council was committed to.

#### **Decision:**

To note the report and that the Committee would continue to monitor this work.

#### **ERSC/23/32 How the Council works with MHPP (Manchester Housing Providers Partnership) and the Private Rented Sector**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) which provided an overview on how the Council worked with partners in the MHPP and within the Private Rented Sector to achieve the Council's strategic objectives. It also provided an introduction to the Council's role as a good landlord following the move to bring the homes previously managed by Northwards Housing back in-house.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- The review of the MHPP;
- How the Council worked with MHPP to deliver affordable homes, improve outcomes for existing residents across Manchester and meet the city's strategic objectives;
- The Private Rented Sector, including selective licensing and short-term lets; and
- The Council's role as a good landlord.

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

- The importance of supporting vulnerable residents to understand their rights, noting that some groups, including refugees, might not be aware of sources of advice, such as Citizens Advice, and might also face other barriers such as language barriers and lack of trust in institutions;

- Selective licensing, including the future for areas where schemes were coming to an end and areas for the next phase;
- Short-term lets and their impact on the local housing market;
- Concern about increasing rents and the freezing of the Local Housing Allowance; and
- Whether MHPP was being used to secure improvements from social housing providers, for example, in the time taken for repairs to be carried out, noting that this seemed to have got worse.

In response to a Member's concerns about a particular street in his ward, the Executive Member for Housing and Development asked to be provided with further information so that this could be addressed, in consultation with the Member.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development reported that Citizens Advice had previously had a strong presence in local communities, including libraries, but that this had reduced, following a funding cut from the Government; however, he reported that Citizens Advice were still providing advice services, including running pop-up advice sessions, and he stated that it was important that people were signposted to this support, using different languages and methods. He highlighted that housing associations provided advice to their tenants on a range of issues and that information on available support, including for people renting in the Private Rented Sector, was on the Council's website.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development stated that selective licensing targeted the lower segments of the private rented sector, as referred to in the table at 4.2 in the report. He reported that there was good evidence of the impact of selective licensing but that schemes ended after 5 years and that the Council was monitoring the situation after these schemes had ended and looking at what other interventions could be used to keep housing standards in these areas higher.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development highlighted the information in the report on short-term lets and the Council's response to the Government consultation on this, in which the Council had asked for greater regulation of this area. In response to a question about whether planning covenants could be used to restrict the use of properties for short-term lets, the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) stated that this could be used where the Council had a land-interest in the development. In response to a further question about whether covenants could also be put in place through the Planning Committee, she stated that she would consult with colleagues in the Planning Department and provide a response.

In response to a Member's question, the Executive Member for Housing and Development informed the Committee about work taking place at a neighbourhood level to get housing providers working together to address local issues, while acknowledging that this was not yet working well in all areas. He acknowledged a Member's comment about the importance of ensuring the provision of purpose-built student accommodation which was affordable and would, therefore, free up family homes for families, stating that this would be addressed through the Local Plan and was monitored by looking at data on Council Tax exemptions. In response to a question about the Private Rented Sector, he advised that he hoped that the Good Landlord Charter would play an important role in improving this sector.

The Director of Housing Services reported that there had been a big spike in calls about damp and mould following the tragic death of Awaab Ishak in Rochdale and that the Council was undertaking a programme of works to address these. He informed the Committee that all of the properties had been visited, provided they had been able to access them, and that the triaging of damp and mould issues had been greatly improved. He offered to provide Members with further data on this. He highlighted the £25m of capital investment which had been approved for key priorities, including Decent Homes.

The Compliance and Enforcement Specialist reported that the Housing Compliance Team had recruited Engagement Officers to work with vulnerable residents and that key leaflets, including on damp and mould, were translated into the most common community languages.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development reported that MHPP was a positive partnership and a useful forum but he acknowledged that a lot of providers had a backlog of repairs for a range of reasons, although officers and Members were putting pressure on providers to address this and to provide a good service to their tenants. He stated that he would feed back a Member's comment about some housing providers not attending meetings. He stated that the list of areas for potential future selective licensing schemes was being reviewed and that Members would be consulted with. In response to a Member's comments about some landlords not accepting tenants in receipt of benefits, he expressed concern about this, stating that it was illegal although hard to enforce and that this needed to be part of the Good Landlord Charter. In response to a question from the Chair, he stated that the Council's housing staff received training to identify other issues, such as welfare concerns or other repair issues, when they went into a tenant's home to carry out a repair. The Director of Housing Services reported that, if a property was requiring multiple repairs, the service would look into the underlying reasons for this and whether there was a need to invest in improvements.

In response to a Member's question, the Chair stated that he would clarify with officers the timing of a report on selective licensing. The Member asked that this include information on the movement of homes upwards from the bottom segments of the private rented sector, in relation to table X at 4.2 in the report.

**Decisions:**

1. To request a more detailed report on the Council's role as a Good Landlord.
2. To receive a report on short-term lets, focusing both on regulating their use and on what additional supply of accommodation can be put in place as an alternative, including information on who is using short-term lets and what they are looking for in their accommodation.
3. To note that the Chair will discuss with officers the timing of a report on selective licensing.

4. To note that the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) will consult with colleagues in the Planning Department and respond "on whether covenants could also be put in place through the Planning Committee", with reference to restricting the use of short-term lets and helping Manchester people to purchase property where they are being outcompeted by external investors.

**ERSC/23/33                      Strategic approach to developments of social homes via a city-wide New Build Local Lettings Policy (LLP)**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) which proposed a strategic response in the form of a New Build Local Lettings Policy (LLP) for all new developments of social homes to be let at social or affordable rent.

The Committee was invited to comment on the report prior to its submission to the Executive.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Background information;
- Developing sustainable communities;
- The proposed New Build Local Lettings Policy, which would apply only to "general needs" properties at first let;
- The effect of restricted lettings; and
- The equalities impact of the policy.

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

- To welcome the report and recognise the important issues it addressed;
- That the name might suggest that it applied to all new build properties;
- Had the percentage allocated to each of the three categories been modelled to check it met the needs of the housing register; and
- Why was living in an adjacent ward taken into account under criteria (i) in the second category but adjacent wards were not taken into account under the other criteria in this category.

The Head of Strategic Housing reported that it was not possible to reflect the numbers on the waiting list. He explained that this policy was an attempt to deal with the new social housing which was becoming available and that the split between the three categories had been agreed with Ward Councillors for Miles Platting and Newton Health, where new social housing had been built. He informed Members that the purpose of this policy was to create a standard lettings policy that could be used for any new build social housing but that it could be adapted for new developments in particular areas, where this was agreed with local Ward Councillors, including amending the criteria in relation to adjacent wards. A Member commented that it would be useful to have a data-informed approach to the split between the three categories. The Head of Strategic Housing stated that he would look into this. He explained that in 2020 any priority relating to working households had been removed from social housing allocation but that a number of Members had highlighted the importance of mixed communities, including working households,

leading to the proposal for 50% of lettings in new builds to be allocated to working households.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development reported that it was useful to have this standard policy as a baseline but that it could be tailored for individual developments, recognising that needs varied across the city.

The Chair commented that it was not clear from the report that this was a standard template which could be adapted for different developments in different parts of the city and suggested that this be made clearer in the report before it was submitted to the Executive.

## **Decisions**

To commend the New Build Local Lettings Policy to the Executive, subject to:

- The information submitted to the Executive providing greater clarity that this is a standard template and that the allocation policy can be adapted for individual developments.
- Improved quantitative information being provided to the Executive when they consider this item.

[Councillor Richards declared a personal and prejudicial interest, having been involved in the development of this policy when she was an Executive Member and left the room for this item.]

## **ERSC/23/34 Overview Report**

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

The Chair highlighted that a report on the Cultural Strategy had been added to the agenda for the February meeting. He advised that he was considering theming this meeting around culture and tourism and suggested that the report on short-term lets be added to the agenda for that meeting and that it also include a general update on hotel accommodation. He recommended that the item on Design for Life and Rightsizing be removed from the "to be scheduled" list, as this had been included in the Housing Strategy report.

## **Decision:**

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



## Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 18 July 2023

#### Present:

Councillor Hitchen (in the chair)

Councillors Azra Ali, Doswell, Good, Ogunbambo, Priest, Rawson, Sheikh, Whiston and Wills

#### Also present:

Councillor Hacking, Executive Member for Skills, Employment and Leisure

Councillor Igbon, Executive Member for Vibrant Neighbourhoods

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

Councillor Davies, Lead Member for Age Friendly

Elaine Unegbu, Chair of the Age Friendly Manchester Older People's Board

#### CEESC/23/29                      Minutes

**Decision:** That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 20 June 2023, be approved as a correct record.

#### CEESC/23/30                      Age Friendly Manchester Refreshed Strategy 2023-2028

The committee considered a report of the Director of Public Health and the Age Friendly Manchester Programme Lead which described how the new Age Friendly Strategy Manchester: A City for Life 2023– 28 built on previous progress, provided a series of responses to the ongoing impact felt by some older people to the pandemic and the struggles faced by the cost-of-living crisis for many people aged over 50 and outlined a series of priorities and commitments to drive better outcomes.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Key statistics around age, population, life expectancy and unemployment amongst over 50s;
- How the refreshed Strategy was developed;
- How the refreshed Strategy aligned with the Council's priorities and other key strategies;
- The themes of the refreshed Strategy:
  - Being heard and age equity;
  - Age friendly neighbourhoods where we can all age in peace;
  - Age friendly services which will support us to age well; and
  - Work and money

- An initial 18-month delivery plan was being developed; and
- How progress would be monitored.

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

- Welcoming the refresh;
- Expressing concern that not all complexities and intersectionalities experienced by older people were reflected in the report;
- The different experiences and challenges faced by 50-year-olds and 80-year-olds;
- The need for more flexibility with regards to rightsizing;
- That the impact on Age Friendly should be included in all committee reports;
- The experiences of older people in the LGBTQ+ community;
- Requesting further information on the delivery plan;
- Requesting background information on the disproportionate effects of age on different groups;
- Querying what activities and services were provided for older people in each ward;
- How the work of the Strategy linked with the Council's Highways service to improve existing highways, public spaces and access;
- What was being done to help older people with the cost-of-living crisis;
- Whether all libraries were accessible by bus;
- Whether increased public toilet provisions would be included in the delivery plan; and
- Requesting further information on the findings of the research undertaken by Manchester University in collaboration with Age Friendly Manchester on the impacts of the pandemic on older people living in areas of multiple deprivation.

The Programme Lead – Age Friendly Manchester explained that the refreshed Strategy provided the vision for the next five years with four key themes. He stated that extensive consultation with older people had been undertaken and built on the progress made over the past 20 years. He stated that the Strategy provided practical responses to the lived experience of older people, such as the cost-of-living crisis and the ongoing impact of the Covid-19 pandemic.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care stated that communities were defined by their older people and thanked officers for their work on this and residents for their involvement and engagement. He also wished to place on record his thanks to former Councillor Eddy Newman who had driven this work in his former role as Lead Member for Age Friendly Manchester.

The Chair of the Age Friendly Manchester Older People's Board explained that she had been involved in the Board for 18 years and highlighted the work undertaken by the Council and the Board. She noted that there was more work to be done, particularly around employment, access and the cost-of-living crisis.



The Lead Member for Age Friendly Manchester highlighted Manchester's Age Friendly approach and that this work was ongoing, highly consultative among a range of groups, and would be continuously developed.

In response to a point raised regarding the need to reflect the different experiences between age groups, the Programme Lead – Age Friendly Manchester acknowledged the different experiences felt by a 50-year-old and an 80-year-old. He stated that there were 3 different age categories, for those up to state pension age, for 66- to 80-year-olds and for over 80s. He stated that the delivery plan included different responses to different age ranges and circumstances. He stated that highlights of the delivery plan could be shared with the committee once developed.

The Programme Lead – Age Friendly Manchester acknowledged difficulties in finding suitable housing provisions for older people but explained that the approach of Age Friendly Manchester was to provide a range of options to suit everyone, noting that social care was not suitable for all older people. Members were advised that the Council was hoping to develop an LGBT-affirmative extra-care scheme in Whalley Range. He also explained that the Council currently works with housing providers to have dynamic and supportive conversations with tenants to best meet their needs.

Further to this, members were informed that the Council worked with Pride in Ageing, which was a foundation-led initiative of LGBTQ+ people working in Manchester to share and promote their lived experiences and to inform foundations such as Pride in Practice. The Programme Lead – Age Friendly Manchester stated that the Council was examining how this work could also be shared within the care sector and that a representative of Pride in Ageing was included in the membership of the Older People's Board.

In response to a recommendation to include an Age Friendly Impact Assessment in all committee reports, the Programme Lead – Age Friendly Manchester stated that this was something he and his team were eager to implement and would provide value to reports. It was highlighted that age was a protected characteristic which was included in the overall Equality Impact Assessment.

The Programme Lead – Age Friendly Manchester explained that work was ongoing to develop the delivery plan with key partners. It was anticipated that a final draft would be available in September for launch in autumn and this could be provided to the committee.

Members were informed that the State of Ageing report would provide detail on the breadths of experiences of older people and would provide a baseline for monitoring progress over the Strategy's lifespan.

In response to a member's query on work with the Highways service, the Programme Lead - Age Friendly Manchester stated that there were examples of

success in changing bus routes as a result of lobbying, for example the rerouting of a bus service in Old Moat and Fallowfield to improve access for residents. He acknowledged that this was challenging to do on a wider scale, but it was hoped that the greater powers over public transport awarded by the devolution trailblazer for Greater Manchester would enable the GM Ageing Hub to have greater influence in shaping such decisions and structural changes to bus routes.

It was stated that information on cost-of-living support needed to be clear and accessible to older people. The Programme Lead – Age Friendly Manchester emphasised that a ‘digital by default’ approach was not encouraged, and that face-to-face dialogue and printed information was available. He stated that libraries were vital in providing these services and a free, biannual newsletter would be relaunched and available from libraries, supermarkets and community centres to share information on the cost-of-living support available.

Members were advised that all libraries within Manchester were of an Age Friendly service standard.

In response to a query regarding whether increased public toilet provisions would be included in the delivery plan, the Programme Lead – Age Friendly Manchester explained that there were opportunities to improve provisions through developments and the use of Equality Impact Assessments. He advised of the ‘Take a Seat’ campaign, which worked with cafes and other facilities to provide free access to toilets and acknowledged that this campaign needed to be rolled out into more neighbourhoods.

The committee was informed that the delivery plan was being developed by those involved in its implementation and that most of these were external partners.

In summarising, the Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care stated that he wanted to raise the work of Age Friendly further up the political agenda. He explained that the Strategy would be considered by the Senior Management Team, the Executive Strategy Group and Full Council and thanked the committee for their comments.

The Chair thanked the Executive Member and officers for their attendance and thanked the Chair of the Age Friendly Manchester Older People’s Board for her 17 years’ service to the Board.

**Decision:**

That the committee

1. notes the report;
2. requests that the delivery plan be provided to a future meeting for consideration; and

3. recommends that Age Friendly be promoted in the Equality Impact Assessments of all committee reports.

### **CESC/23/31            Community Events 2023/24**

The committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided a context for the current operating environment for events and how the ongoing development of the events programme continues to align with the City Council's Events Strategy. It provided additional insight on the Community Events programme and updates on the progress made against previously identified areas of development and improvement to support community events.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background to the Manchester Events Strategy;
- The event programme for 2023;
- The Community Events Fund (CEF) Programme, and the challenges faced by this;
- The funding and geographic spread of the Community Events Programme;
- The eligibility criteria for Community Events Funding;
- Confirmation that bonfire and firework events would not be reinstated going forward;
- How sustainability was considered at events funded by the CEF; and
- Work would be undertaken with the Equalities, Diversity, and Inclusion team to progress to identify how the staging of events can potentially impact on people with protected characteristics who are beyond the event footprint and may fall outside of the direct responsibility of the event organiser.

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

- Welcoming the Council's support of community events;
- Requesting clarification on a number of events listed in the report which received CEF funding but did not appear to meet the criteria for such funding;
- How external businesses and traders attending events are encouraged to comply with the Council's commitment to reducing single-use plastics;
- The need to strengthen sustainability requirements for events, noting that there is no requirement to acknowledge the Sustainability Check when booking Council-owned land for events;
- Whether there would be a public awareness campaign on upcoming legislation to ban retailers, takeaways, food vendors and the hospitality industry providing single-use cutlery, plates and bowls;
- How the geographic spread of events within the city could be improved;
- What events will be included in the programme of autumn and winter activities to replace bonfire displays;
- How income generated by events benefits local communities;

- The need to hold more free events and to diversify the locations where these events are held;
- Why Pride events were included within the report, given that major events fall under the remit of the Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee;
- What local events are delivered in individual neighbourhoods; and
- How many events received CEF funding recurrently and whether this impacted the ability for new events to benefit from this funding.

The Executive Member for Skills, Employment and Leisure explained that the Council's Events Strategy was adopted in 2019 and acknowledged the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and cost-of-living crisis on events across the city. He stated that this had changed the types of and opportunities for events taking place in Manchester and the capacity and venue offers in the city.

The Head of Events Development explained that 13 of the events listed within the report were funded by CEF with the remainder funded or facilitated through other mechanisms. He stated that a separate list of all events funded by CEF could be provided to members, which would demonstrate how these events met the criteria for CEF funding.

Members were advised that the use of the term 'citywide' when referring to primary event location within the report related to where attendees were drawn from. The Head of Events Development highlighted that certain major events were held in one location, such as a park, but attendees would travel from across and beyond the city to attend.

In response to queries around sustainability and single-use plastics, the Executive Member for Vibrant Neighbourhoods stated that a citywide licensing consultation was currently underway with a specific section on sustainability and members would have sight of this before being considered by the Executive. She also explained that a refresh of the Parks Strategy was being undertaken and would examine how the Council acted sustainably and how events were run in line with this.

The Parks Lead highlighted that it was often easier for large-scale commercial events to reduce the use of single-use plastics and cited the Christmas Markets as an example of this and highlighted that Parklife Festival was trialling a cup return scheme. It was hoped that trialling such schemes and measures within large events would create guidance around best practice which could be shared with smaller organisations and community groups.

It was also explained that event bookers would be asked the detail their considerations of sustainability measures from 2024.

In response to the Chair's query regarding whether there would be a public awareness campaign on upcoming legislation to single-use items within the hospitality sector, the Parks Lead stated that marketing and educational material was

still awaited from the government. She advised that early engagement work had been undertaken with businesses across the city to advise them of changes.

The Director of Neighbourhood Delivery recognised that local groups were hosting events across the city regularly which the Council was unaware of and that the Council wanted to support these groups to ensure that events were safe, regardless of their scale. He stated that the Council would be happy to provide advice to any group holding an event.

The Parks Lead advised that local engagement had been undertaken to ensure a winter programme of events and activities that reflected what communities wanted. She explained that a range of activities and events were held in 2022 across all parks which previously held bonfire displays. It was agreed that further detail on this would be provided in a future report.

The committee was advised that the Council had a long-standing history of commercial and community events taking place in parks and this had been a theme in the Parks Strategy launched in 2017. The Parks Lead explained that parks were subsidised through investment from the Council but there remained a need to generate income for maintenance. She stated that revenue from events was used to reduce the gap between income and expenditure and also helped to ensure the quality of parks. It was also stated that the Council was looking at investment plans at a number of sites, including Platt Fields, to promote future opportunities for investment.

The Executive Member for Vibrant Neighbourhoods acknowledged members' points regarding the need for more free events and to diversify the location of these across the city. She noted that access to infrastructure can be a challenge in smaller parks but noted that it was a key consideration in the refresh of the Parks Strategy.

It was clarified that the Events team fund the Manchester Pride Parade and not events within the Gay Village. This funding was used to support road closures and the overall operation of the Parade, which was felt to be justified as a free-to-access element of the Pride weekend.

The Executive Member for Skills, Employment and Leisure explained that larger events had a significant economic impact and so, fell under the remit of the Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee whilst the delivery and operational elements of events formed part of the Council's Events Strategy.

In response to a query from the Chair regarding CEF-funded events which took place across local communities/neighbourhoods and whether these were spread evenly across all 32 wards, the Executive Member for Vibrant Neighbourhoods explained that any events which were held in parks fell under the remit of Environment, Climate Change and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Committee and stated that an update on these kinds of events would be included in the next Parks Strategy report to that committee.

Detail on the number of recurring events in receipt of CEF funding would be provided outside of the meeting.

The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) advised that reports on major events were considered by the Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee due to their economic impact on the city, whereas smaller events were within the remit of this committee due to their impact on and benefits for communities. He noted that there was a limited amount of CEF funding and that more targeted work was needed to identify the scale and demographics of attendees. It was stated that there were lots of neighbourhood-based events which the Council was not involved in and there were no central funding schemes available for these. He provided assurances that the Events and Neighbourhoods teams would continue to explore ways to increase investment opportunities for neighbourhood events.

**Decision:**

That the committee

1. notes the report;
2. requests further information on all CEF-funded events, including how these meet the criteria for funding, their reach and location, and whether these are recurring events;
3. requests that a further report be provided in 6 months; and
4. requests that information on the geographical reach of events be provided for each event included in future reports.

**CESC/23/32            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.

Members requested that the work programme for September's meeting be amended to provide a more detailed scope on the Communities of Identity report and to request that information on how the Council engaged with the student population to promote and ensure their safety be provided in the Community Safety Strategy report. These requests would be relayed to officers.

A query was also raised regarding the date of the first meeting of the committee's Task and Finish Group on crime and antisocial behaviour. Members were advised in response that the Committee Officer would email them outside of the meeting for their availability and that the first meeting would be held in September.

**Decision:**

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





## Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 5 September 2023

**Present:**

Councillor Hitchen (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Doswell, Good, Ogunbambo, Rawson, Sheikh, Whiston and Wills

**Also present:**

Councillor Midgley, Deputy Leader  
Sandy Koujou, Caribbean African Health Network  
Saria Khalifa, NESTAC

**Apologies:** Councillor Azra Ali, Appleby and Priest

#### CESC/23/34 Minutes

In moving the minutes, the Chair requested an update on the committee's request made at the previous meeting for further information on CEF-funded events. The Governance and Scrutiny Team Leader confirmed that this request had been accepted since the agenda was published and that the information would be shared with members at the earliest opportunity.

**Decision:** That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 18 July 2023, be approved as a correct record.

#### CESC/23/35 Communities of Identity

The committee considered a report of the Joint Director of Equality and Engagement - NHS GM Integrated Care (Manchester locality) and Manchester City Council which detailed the inequalities faced by 'communities of identity' within the city and how specific groups accessed and were supported by Council services to improve their experience and outcomes.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- An introduction and background;
- The definition of 'Communities of Identity';
- The Council's intersectional approach to inequality and insights into communities;
- Key learning and areas for development;
- The 3 equality objectives to support the city in becoming more progressive and equitable:
  - Knowing Manchester better
  - Improving life chances
  - Celebrating our diversity
- Examples of how these objectives were being delivered on.

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

- What work was being undertaken to support Bangladesh, Pakistan and African Muslim women to enter the workplace;
- How the Communities of Identity work would improve health outcomes;
- Noting the gap in education and employment opportunities for Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities, and querying how the Council would try to reduce the stigma for this community;
- Noting that there was no mention of class as an intersectionality;
- How the learning from work on Communities of Identity would be utilised in the Council's approach to Equality Impact Assessments;
- Requesting that further information on the SEND activities offered during the school holidays be provided;
- How confident officers were that those groups who work with Communities of Identity were being reached;
- Noting the stark median age at death of Asian/Asian British background males with profound and multiple learning disability and the higher mortality in pregnancy rate amongst Black and Asian women, and querying what could be done to improve this;
- Requesting that quantified data be clearer in future reports;
- Requesting that the financial and revenue implications of delivering this work be included in future reports; and
- Requesting that a benchmarking exercise be undertaken to quantify how well Manchester was doing in its work with Communities of Identity against other core cities.

The Deputy Leader stated that Communities of Identity was last reported on in 2016 and that this report aimed to explain how the Council understands and engages with communities.

The Joint Director of Equality and Engagement expressed her thanks to the University of Manchester, Lancaster University, the Assistant Chief Executive and his team, the Equalities Specialist and a number of Council departments who had contributed to the report. She explained that Communities of Identity referred to 'people who share particular characteristics connected to their heritage, belief system or identities that contribute to their day-to-day lives' and stated that the report focused on communities that experienced greater and more entrenched inequalities, such as those communities which experienced racial inequality, disabled people and older people. Other communities, such as LGBTQI people, were also recognised as having experience of entrenched inequalities and the committee was informed that a more detailed analysis of these experiences would be provided at the next meeting.

The Joint Director of Equality and Engagement highlighted some data sources, such as the recent Census, and noted that there was still work to be done to identify the impacts of inequalities in an intersectional manner and to remove some key barriers.

The Local Offer and Engagement Manager and the SEND Engagement and Young Carers Lead attended the meeting and provided an overview of their work to co-produce a summer activity offer with parents and carers of children and young people with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND).

In response to the committee's queries, the Joint Director of Equality and Engagement explained that work would be undertaken with the Work and Skills team to improve access to the workplace and that some work had already been undertaken to identify the barriers to employment faced by Pakistani and Bangladeshi women. A Joint Strategic Needs Analysis was also being undertaken for the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller community and an Inclusion Health Group had been established to improve engagement. It was noted, however, that more work was required to improve cohesion between Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities and other communities.

Members were advised that Community Health Equity groups had completed a lot of work with particular communities and there was specific work being undertaken around breast screening with Pakistani women, as data indicated there was a lower uptake within this community. The Council was also working with BHA for Equality to assess experiences of primary care.

The Assistant Chief Executive explained that the Census had been a great resource for Communities of Identity and when looking at intersectionality. He highlighted that particular areas of interest could be reviewed in more detail to inform the committee and ongoing work.

In response to a member's query regarding how this learning would inform the Council's approach to Equality Impact Assessments (EIA), the Joint Director of Equality and Engagement stated that a refresh of the approach to Equality Impact Assessments was underway and that this would include detailed guidance with case studies on best practice for completing these Assessments. The Equalities team would also provide support for colleagues undertaking an EIA.

The committee was informed that a lot of work was being undertaken around community engagement. It was acknowledged that communities changed frequently and that there were some established communities and some new and developing ones so there was a need to change and evolve engagement methods. This was a theme under Making Manchester Fairer and focused on building trust with communities to work together.

In answer to a member's query regarding the greater breakdown of ethnicity, the Assistant Chief Executive explained that this was available for each ward through the Census and that this information would be provided outside of the meeting.

In respect of the Chair's queries around health inequalities experienced by Asian, Asian British and Black men and women, the Joint Director of Equality and Engagement explained that the report remained a live document which could be

updated to reflect the Council and local partners' responses to issues. She noted that there were some significantly entrenched structural inequalities within health and that some partners were undertaking work around learning difficulties, including liaising with ethnic minorities with learning difficulties to identify how to better engage with this community.

Further clarity was sought on whether the health outcomes of Communities of Identity were within the remit of this committee or the Health Scrutiny Committee.

She further highlighted that several initiatives were underway across the health service to reduce mortality rates amongst Black and Asian pregnant women and that these figures were decreasing. Work needed to continue to reduce this, and it was highlighted that this would require changes in behaviour and attitude.

In response to the Chair's query around how it would be ensured that delivery models for the Equality Objectives were placed into areas with the most need, the Assistant Chief Executive stated that this would need to be built into the Council's Corporate Plan, business plan, and budget with a recognition that tackling inequalities was of high importance, which he stated the Council had done over the past years. He highlighted the Council's cost-of-living support as an example of this, with granular evidence used to identify where need was greatest and to proportionately target resources to certain areas within Manchester.

The Chair wished officers good luck in their work to deliver the Equality Objectives and thanked guests for their attendance.

### **Decision:**

That the committee

1. notes the progress made to date on delivering the Equality Objectives;
2. expresses their support for the approaches to working with communities and areas for further development outlined in the report;
3. requests further information on class as an intersectionality;
4. requests further information on the SEND activities on offer during school holidays within each ward;
5. requests a greater breakdown of information by ethnicity for each ward;
6. requests that quantified data be clearer in future reports;
7. requests that the financial and revenue implications of delivering this work be included in future reports;
8. recommends that Equality Implications be strengthened within committee reports to highlight how the sufficiency of service provisions within wards are taken into consideration for each report; and
9. requests that a benchmarking exercise be undertaken to quantify how well Manchester is doing in delivering the Equality Objectives against other core cities.

## **CESC/23/36 Domestic Abuse and Safety of Women and Girls**

The committee considered a report of the Strategic Director – Neighbourhoods which summarised recent and current work to address domestic violence and abuse, including implementation of the Domestic Violence and Abuse Strategy and the Domestic Abuse Act 2021 and victim voice work, and provided an update on ongoing work to promote the safety of women and girls in the city.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- 75% of all offences recorded during 2022-23 were against women;
- Strong correlations between high volumes of domestic abuse incidents and areas of the city with the highest deprivation scores relating to income, employment, education and skills, and health and disability;
- The objectives and achievements of the Council's Domestic Violence and Abuse Strategy;
- Training and development work;
- The work of Early Help Hubs;
- Work undertaken with perpetrators which was commissioned in conjunction with GMCA from Talk Listen Change (TLC);
- Work being undertaken to support children and young people affected by domestic abuse;
- Support and services for victims of Female Genital Mutilation (FGM);
- Support and services for male victims of domestic abuse;
- Conduct of Domestic Homicide Reviews;
- The Women's Night-time Safety Charter and Good Night Out Guide; and
- Current issues and challenges, such as demand for the Independent Domestic Violence Advocate (IDVA) service.

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

- Noting that not all buildings in the city's parks were council-owned, and querying whether these facilities would be expected to take part in the Safe Spaces initiative;
- How domestic violence affected LGBT and asylum seeker/refugee communities;
- The importance of talking to primary school children about healthy relationships;
- How staff were trained to be trauma-informed;
- Requesting that members also receive the quarterly Performance Bulletins;
- The high level of repeat offences;
- Noting that, whilst domestic violence can occur anywhere, it was more prevalent in deprived areas;
- What the Council could do in collaboration with housing providers and Greater Manchester Police (GMP) to ensure perpetrators of domestic violence are removed from the home;
- Whether any preliminary findings were available from the work undertaken with the Independent Choices Greater Manchester Domestic Abuse Helpline

to better understand the recent change in distribution of volumes of calls across the city;

- What advice the Council would give to victims of spiking;
- Whether housing providers were also implementing a Sanctuary Scheme and whether this was consistent across the city;
- How the Council could provide quick interventions to those at risk of domestic violence;
- Whether there were areas within parks that were specifically tailored to women and girls;
- How the Council held GMP to account on the time taken to deal with domestic violence cases;
- Whether members could refer individual cases to the Gender Based Violence Board;
- Suggesting that a representative of Greater Manchester Police be invited to attend when considering future reports on domestic violence;
- How the Community Safety team works with the Neighbourhood teams to improve feelings of safety for residents when out at night; and
- Whether trends were noticeable within Domestic Homicide Reviews and what lessons are learnt from these.

The Deputy Leader stated that there continued to be high levels of domestic abuse and that the effect of this on survivors, families and children was traumatic and highlighted the work being undertaken in the city. The Strategic Lead Officer for Community Safety highlighted key issues around domestic abuse in Manchester and the service provision. She noted that there had been a decrease in the number of high-risk incidents which she believed was as a result of early intervention work. It was stated that the work on safety of women and girls was broader than that on domestic abuse but was included within the report as it was fundamental to the societal change required to address domestic abuse.

Representatives from the Caribbean African Health Network and NESTAC attended the meeting to provide an overview of their organisations and the services they provide, which the committee welcomed.

In response to members' queries, the Strategic Lead Officer for Community Safety explained that the Safe Spaces initiative was still in its early stages of development and engagement with the Libraries and Parks teams was underway. Further discussions would need to take place to identify appropriate premises to take part in the initiative and what would be required of staff to deliver this safely. It was confirmed that training would also be provided to the 'Friends of' groups.

The Domestic Abuse Reduction Manager advised that two Greater Manchester-based services had been commissioned to address domestic violence within the LGBTQI community. This included the Safe Accommodation project, which provided access to one-bedroom flats and wider outreach support for LGBTQI people, and an LGBT Independent Domestic Violence Advocate (IDVA) provision. Manchester City

Council was the highest referrer to both of these schemes within Greater Manchester.

The Domestic Abuse Reduction Manager acknowledged the need to promote healthy relationships to young girls as well as boys, as some figures around their behaviour was of concern. Work on addressing this issue in primary schools was being led by Healthy Schools and was included in the Council's Domestic Abuse Strategy action plan.

The committee was informed that the Council was committed to ensuring that staff and partners have access to trauma-informed training. All IDVA staff, domestic abuse providers and MARAC partners were trauma-informed trained.

In response to a request from the committee, it was confirmed that the quarterly Performance Bulletins and Needs Assessments would be shared with members.

The Strategic Lead Officer for Community Safety shared members' concerns over the high level of repeat offences of domestic violence and emphasised the importance of understanding the impact of early intervention work and this would continue to be monitored.

With regards to the powers available to the Council, housing providers and Greater Manchester Police (GMP) to ensure perpetrators of domestic violence are removed from the family home, the Domestic Abuse Reduction Manager explained that there were measures in place to allow the police to remove a perpetrator from a property and Manchester had the highest number of these Orders secured within Greater Manchester. She further explained that the Domestic Abuse Act brought into force Domestic Abuse Protection Orders which GMP would be piloting from June 2024 and would provide more stringent measures to remove a perpetrator for longer and allow the imposition of monitor tags and curfews. The importance of early intervention work was reiterated to help victims remain in their home, community, and support network. Work was ongoing with the Homelessness team to increase access to the Sanctuary Scheme and other security measures.

There had been a significant increase in the number of people accessing the Sanctuary Scheme since 2021 and work was ongoing with housing providers to ensure a consistent approach with their offer. Further information on the approach of housing providers had been requested by officers.

It was confirmed that there were no preliminary findings available from the work undertaken with the Independent Choices Greater Manchester Domestic Abuse Helpline to better understand the recent change in distribution of volumes of calls across the city, but these would be shared once available.

The Strategic Lead Officer for Community Safety advised that work had been undertaken with partners to ensure an appropriate response to incidents of spiking and this would continue to be discussed.

In response to a query regarding possible quick interventions where there is a risk of domestic violence, the Strategic Lead Officer for Community Safety explained that this would be dependent on the individual circumstances.

The safety of women and girls in the city's parks was a major focus for the Parks team and were represented on the Safety of Women and Girls Board, which drove forward work on domestic abuse, sexual harassment, and other forms of Violence against women and girls, to ensure that suitable activities were available in parks. The Strategic Lead Officer for Community Safety advised that there were specific sports and leisure activities commissioned for women and girls.

In response to a question around how GMP were held to account, the committee was advised that there were a number of systems in place such as the Domestic Abuse Partnership Board and a forum for partners to discuss performance and delivery on the Domestic Abuse Strategy action plan. The GM Gender Based Violence Board was also highlighted as an example of a forum to raise issues with the GM Deputy Mayor. The Domestic Abuse Reduction Manager provided assurances that the Council worked closely with GMP on an operational and strategic level.

Members were advised that the Gender Based Violence Board did not review individual cases but that they could email the Community Safety team if they had any specific concerns about cases.

The Community Safety Policy and Performance Manager endeavoured to inquire whether Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) received data on the time taken to deal with domestic violence cases.

Street safety was acknowledged as a focus area within the report and there was significant work being undertaken to improve this, although it was noted that there was limited resource within the Community Safety team, and this needed to be a cross-council piece of work. The Council also worked closely with Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) to ensure safety of residents using public transport and a number of different projects had been funded with officers looking at rolling out similar schemes to those in Oldham and Rochdale. A further report could be provided on this with a focus on women and girls.

In response to queries around Domestic Homicide Reviews, the Community Safety Policy and Performance Manager explained that each Review generated an action plan to be dealt with either by a single agency or the Partnership. These action plans were tracked to identify themes, such as unconscious bias and services making every effort to maintain engagement with people they were working with. These themes are then assessed strategically by a range of partners and agencies.

In closing the discussion, the Chair asked guests what they would like the Council to do to improve domestic violence service provisions across Manchester. Sandy Koujou, of the Caribbean African Health Network, expressed that she would like to



see further help for the programmes already in operation and for the Council to promote the support available for victims and survivors. Saria Khalifa, of NESTAC, explained that she would like the Council to continue to encourage GMP to investigate incidents of domestic violence quickly and efficiently.

The Chair thanked guests for their attendance and their work in the community and thanked officers for their strategic work in championing victims and making Manchester safer.

**Decision:**

That the committee

1. notes the report;
2. requests that quarterly Performance Bulletins be shared with members;
3. looks forward to receiving a future report on the safety of women and girls, including the work and projects being undertaken to promote this across the city and how these are funded;
4. requests further information on the specific sports and leisure activities commissioned for women and girls and the suitable activities available for women and girls in individual parks; and
5. requests that enquiries are made with GMCA regarding data on the time taken for domestic violence incidents to be dealt with by GMP.

**CESC/23/37 Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) Impact Report 2023-26 Update**

The committee considered a report of the Assistant Chief Executive on the impact of the Our Manchester Voluntary and Community Sector grant programme (OMVCS) 2018-2023.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background to the Impact Report;
- The Council had invested £12 million into the OMVCS programme;
- Highlights and findings of the report, such as that over 588,000 service users had been supported across all of the 63 funded organisations;
- How the OMCVS fund aligned with the aims of the Our Manchester Strategy;
- Next steps for monitoring and reporting on the 2023-26 programme of funded activity.

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

- Welcoming the work of the voluntary sector;
- How officers had come to the figure that over 588,000 service users had been supported across all funded organisations, given that Manchester's population was 547,000;

- Whether the issues raised by those groups whose funding bids were unsuccessful had been resolved;
- Whether mentorships through the Conversation 2 Cash programme were followed up on; and
- Whether the mentorship programme could be extended to Wythenshawe; and
- If the progress and achievements of the funded work was monitored and evaluated.

In response to members' queries, the Policy and Programmes Manager (Communities and VCSE) noted that there was a statistical error with regards to the number of service users supported and that this figure represented the amount of contact with residents. The final version of the report would have an amended figure.

Assurances were provided that all issues raised following the allocation of funding had been resolved and that officers had signposted those unsuccessful in receiving funding to alternative support for funding and organisational development. A further report on the refreshed Infrastructure Contract would be provided to the committee in December 2023.

The Policy and Programmes Manager (Communities and VCSE) informed members that Conversation 2 Cash was a programme based in North Manchester which linked grassroots organisations to peer mentors within the VCSE sector to undertake development work. He advised that all peer mentors had received training with mentorships now underway. This was a specific piece of work which was undertaken as a result of the North Manchester inquiry, but the funding profile of the city demonstrated a shift away from funding to North Manchester, although he noted that there was not a robust data set to demonstrate funding contributions across the city. This was an ongoing piece of work and the Policy and Programmes Manager (Communities and VCSE) acknowledged that it was possible for a similar approach to be implemented in the south of the city in future.

In response to a question from the Chair, the Policy and Programmes Manager (Communities and VCSE) stated that there was a commitment to create an end-of-year report on the progress and achievements of organisations in receipt of funding and these could be brought to the committee for consideration.

In closing the discussion, the Chair thanked officers and voluntary organisations for their work. She acknowledged that the Council should have been able to deliver some of the services provided by VCSE groups but were unable to due to government cuts imposed over previous years.

**Decision:**

That the report be noted.

**CESC/23/38 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.

The Chair queried whether a report would be provided to the committee on the new Customer Relationship Management system. Officers agreed to look into this outside of the meeting and would provide an update for members.

**Decision:**

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



## Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2023

#### Present:

Councillor Reid – in the Chair  
Councillors Alijah, Amin, Bell, Gartside, Hewitson, Lovecy, McHale, Muse, Nunney, Sadler and Sharif Mahamed

#### Co-opted Voting Members:

Mr G Cleworth, Parent Governor Representative

#### Also present:

Councillor Rahman, Deputy Leader  
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People  
Councillor Butt, Deputy Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People  
Councillor Hitchen, Chair of the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee  
Superintendent Chris Downey, Greater Manchester Police (GMP)  
Detective Inspector Chris Chadderton, GMP

#### Apologies:

Councillors Bano, Fletcher, Judge and Ludford  
Canon S Mapledoram, Representative of the Diocese of Manchester  
Ms L Smith, Primary Sector Teacher Representative

#### CYP/23/29                      Minutes

#### Decision

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2023.

#### CYP/23/30                      Youth Justice Business Plan 2023/24: Preventing and Diverting Children and Young People from the Criminal Justice System

The Committee considered the report and presentation of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which outlined the vision, priorities, performance, and impact being achieved in preventing and diverting children and young people from the criminal justice system.

Key points and themes in the report and presentation included:

- Vision and strategy;
- Governance and leadership arrangements;
- Youth Justice service model;
- Progress against priorities from 2022/23;
- Impact and feedback;
- Priorities for 2023/24; and
- Innovation and developments.

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

- To welcome the progress made and the joined-up working that was taking place;
- How robust was the diagnosis of Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD);
- Where schemes used mentors, how were they recruited and trained and did they reflect the culture and heritage of the children they were supporting;
- Requesting further detail of the early intervention work; and
- The over-representation of mixed heritage and black boys in the Criminal Justice system and what were officers doing to try to understand their lived experience.

In response to the question about FASD, the Assistant Director (Early Intervention and Prevention) reported that work was taking place to improve awareness of this from the Early Years. She advised that there was a higher prevalence of additional needs among children in the Youth Justice system and she outlined some of the support available, including speech and language therapy and psychotherapy, as well as the role of Personal Education Plans. She stated that it was important to ensure that children had the right diagnosis and to look behind the behaviour and acknowledged that this was an area for further work. In response to Members' questions, she outlined some of the work taking place in different parts of the city to prevent and divert children and young people from the criminal justice system including community pilots, work in schools and Youth Zones and work by Greater Manchester Police (GMP). She informed Members about the key elements of the early intervention work, which included bringing partners together to identify issues early, co-ordination and leadership, restorative practices and mentoring and looking at the wider offer for the family. In response to a Member's comments, she recognised that the role of communities and families was crucial and outlined some of the work taking place. In response to a Member's question, she confirmed that there were plans to use remand fostering in future. In response to a question about supporting young people into employment, she stated that the service worked with Careers Connect and the Virtual School and a range of partners on this. In response to a further question, she said that she could provide the Member with the requested data on the demographic profile of staff.

The Head of Youth Justice reported that Youth Justice mentors were volunteers from the community, that children were matched with volunteers from their own communities, that they tried to ensure that mentors were culturally appropriate and that they were well-trained. He outlined some of the other support his service offered to children which included a musician-in-residence and an artist-in-residence, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS), psychotherapy, including art therapy and drama therapy, specialist Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT) and Restorative Practitioners, who taught children how to problem solve and worked with children on their identity and self-esteem. He stated that this work took place within a participatory youth practice framework and a trauma-informed, strength-based approach.

In response to a Member's question, the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services stated that engagement with children on preventative work needed to start

at the top end of primary school as it was a key stage of transition at which they were becoming more independent and influenced by peers.

Superintendent Chris Downey from GMP informed the Committee about child-centred policing, stating that in many circumstances this included not criminalising the child but that it needed to go beyond this and include taking the right action to prevent them from entering the Criminal Justice system in future, looking at the causes of the behaviour, how to prevent a reoccurrence and consulting with partners to find the right support for the child.

The Head of Youth Justice acknowledged that there was a lot of work to do to address the over-representation of mixed heritage and black boys in the Criminal Justice system. He stated that his service now had a very diverse staff, including in leadership and management roles, which helped to challenge their practice, language and decision-making, and that staff had received extensive training in this area. He stated that the participatory youth practice framework, which underpinned the work of the service, was about fairness, equality, children's rights and understanding children's lived experiences and how that had influenced their presenting behaviours, which staff then articulated to the courts. He stated that his service was collaborating with AFRUCA, to strengthen its approach, including having a Culture and Identity Worker who worked with children on identity and self-esteem. A Member stated that it was important for staff in Youth Justice to receive training to begin to understand and empathise with the lived experience of these children. The Assistant Director (Early Intervention and Prevention) reported that all staff in Youth Justice had attended Let's Talk About Race and Unconscious Bias training as well as work led by staff within the service. The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services reported that the Council was currently undertaking the discovery phase of the Child Friendly City work and that it was likely that identity, including racism and discrimination, would emerge as a key area of importance raised by the children and young people. Therefore, he suggested that the issues raised by the Member could be addressed in the report that the Committee was due to receive on the Child Friendly City work, as this would include how the city was responding to what young people said was important to them.

The Chair suggested that it would be useful for Members to undertake Unconscious Bias training.

In response to a question from the Chair on the use of stop-and-search on young black men, Superintendent Chris Downey acknowledged that this was disproportionate, although in Manchester the data indicated that the use of stop-and-search was intelligence-led, as approximately 20% of stop-and-searches had positive outcomes and around 18% led to arrests, which compared well nationally. He stated that the use of stop-and-search was targeted on crime hotspots and based on intelligence, being proactive in particular areas based on this, but that the result was that young black men were disproportionately stopped and searched and he outlined the work taking place to review why this was happening.

The Chair of the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee welcomed the report, while recognising that there was more work to be done. She asked officers about Manchester children attending schools outside of the city's boundaries and

joined up working across local authority boundaries. She also commented on the importance of embedding the poverty strand of equalities into this work and expressed concern about understaffing in the Complex Safeguarding Hub.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services assured Members that there were protocols for working across local authority boundaries and good relationships and communication with neighbouring authorities.

The Chair highlighted the role of and responsibility of schools in managing pupil behaviour, in partnership with families, communities and partner agencies, and how behaviour by Looked After Children was responded to and how that differed from the ways families might treat their own children who had committed a minor offence at home. She informed Members about the planned visit to Wetherby Young Offenders Institution in September. She expressed concern that a request to visit Barton Moss Secure Children's Home had not been approved. She also commented on the impact of the pandemic and delays in court hearings.

The Deputy Leader emphasised the depth and breadth of the work taking place and the complexity of the context this work was taking place in. He highlighted the impact of child poverty and commented, that, while Making Manchester Fairer would work to address this, more investment from the national Government was also needed.

## **Decision**

That Unconscious Bias training be made available to Members.

## **CYP/23/31                      Serious Youth Violence**

The Committee considered the report and presentation of the Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods which outlined the vision, priorities and performance measures for the city set out in the Serious Violence Strategy.

Key points and themes in the report and presentation included:

- The national and local context;
- Governance and connectivity;
- Serious violence in Manchester;
- The Serious Violence Strategy, including the consultation and learning from reviews;
- Priority areas of activity;
- Implementation plan;
- The Serious Youth Violence Framework, a multi-agency method and holistic approach; and
- Measures of success.

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

- The use of "joint enterprise" against Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic young people;



- The treatment of young people who were arrested;
- The link between school exclusion and youth violence; and
- The context of these problems, including the city's large criminal economy, the demand for drugs from students and young professionals coming to the city, the need for large number of vulnerable young people to be exploited to support this, the challenges facing young people growing up in Manchester and the attraction to those young people of seeming to be able to make easy money.

Superintendent Chris Downey from GMP advised that joint enterprise was only rarely used and that he would endeavour to find the figures requested by the Member on its use by GMP and provide them to him. He acknowledged a Member's comments that being arrested could be a very traumatic experience for a young person, although, he advised, that in some situations, it was necessary. He stated that the use of handcuffs was now limited, rather than routine, that there were Mental Health professionals in custody suites who assessed everyone who was brought in and that young people would also have an "appropriate adult" to support them, either a family member or friend or someone from the commissioned Appropriate Adult service.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services highlighted that the Committee would be receiving a report on School Inclusion at its next meeting. He reported that work was taking place with GMP and colleagues from across Greater Manchester to make improvements in relation to young people held in custody, including reducing the number of young people placed in custody suites and reducing the length of time they were held there.

In response to a Member's question about work with faith groups, the Community Safety Lead stated that it was recognised that voluntary and community groups, including faith groups, had a wealth of expertise and skills and that they contributed to this work, and she provided an example of this work. She acknowledged the Member's comments about the wider context of serious youth violence and reported that the Joint Needs Assessment of serious and organised crime sought to understand these issues, looking at statistics and connections, and that work was taking place to respond to these different elements, for example, through the GMP Challenger Team and through the Complex Safeguarding Hub. She also recognised the importance of learning from best practice elsewhere and stated that the Greater Manchester Violence Reduction Unit had the resources to seek out and share best practice.

The Chair emphasised the importance of engaging with Manchester NHS Foundation Trust on this issue. She commented on police working with schools, expressing concern that the current arrangements were not working and asking the Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People to follow this up. She also expressed concern that it was easy for children to buy knives over the internet.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

**CYP/23/32                      Annual Report of Complex Safeguarding Hub (CSH)**

The Committee considered the report and presentation of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which summarised the partnership arrangements in place in Manchester to respond to children at risk of exploitation, including practice model, governance and assurance activity. In addition, key performance and assurance data articulated the progress and impact of the CSH in Manchester.

Key points and themes in the report and presentation included:

- An overview of the CSH and its purpose;
- The referrals to the CSH;
- Governance arrangements;
- Complex Safeguarding Team offer;
- Impact;
- Missing from Home and Care; and
- Priorities for the future.

In response to Members' questions about children missing from home and care, the Assistant Director (North and Complex Safeguarding) reported that the data was monitored in a monthly and annual report and that there had been an increase after the pandemic, with children being out in their communities more, noting that there was also always a rise in figures during the summer as children stayed out when the evenings were lighter. She reported that there were no missing children in Manchester who had not returned, stating that missing children were tracked and that there was a process, including strategy meetings, to ensure that they knew where children were.

In response to a Member's question about social media, Detective Inspector Chris Chadderton from GMP stated that there were a lot of referrals in relation to this. He reported that his service had Digital Media Investigators and that social media was monitored, within the legislation, to recover evidence and identify perpetrators seeking to abuse children. The Chair expressed concern that artificial intelligence could be used to abuse children.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services reported that, when children had been missing for a period of time, there was an internal mechanism to escalate this and that, when there were frequent episodes of an individual child going missing, the reasons for this were looked into. He reported that online grooming and exploitation was a key priority area for the Safeguarding Partnership, looking at how to raise awareness of the dangers and put safeguards in place.

A Member stated that the previous Committee visit to the offices at Greenheys Police Station had been useful and suggested arranging a further visit.

**Decision**

To endorse the proposed priorities for 2023/34.

**CYP/23/33                      Overview Report**

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

The Chair informed Members that the date of the October meeting was likely to be moved.

**Decision**

To note the report and agree the work programme.



## Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 6 September 2023

#### Present:

Councillor Reid – in the Chair

Councillors N Ali, Amin, Fletcher, Gartside, Hewitson, Judge, Lovecy, Ludford, Muse and Nunney

#### Co-opted Voting Members:

Mr G Cleworth, Parent Governor Representative

#### Also present:

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People

Councillor Flanagan, Ward Councillor for Miles Platting and Newton Heath

Councillor Hitchen, Ward Councillor for Miles Platting and Newton Heath

#### Apologies:

Councillors Bell, McHale and Sharif Mahamed

Canon S Mapledoram, Representative of the Diocese of Manchester

Ms L Smith, Primary Sector Teacher Representative

Mr Y Yonis, Parent Governor Representative

#### CYP/23/34 Minutes

#### Decisions

1. To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2023.
2. To receive the minutes of the meetings of the Ofsted Subgroup held on 14 June 2023 and 26 July 2023.

#### CYP/23/35 Urgent Business – Reinforced Autoclaved Aerated Concrete (RAAC) in Schools

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People reported that there was one school in Manchester which was confirmed as being affected by the RAAC issue and that this was All Saints C of E Primary School, Newton Heath. He informed Members that the Council was supporting the school, Ward Councillors had also offered support and that the school had been allocated a caseworker from the Department for Education (DfE). He advised that this issue would not have a significant impact on teaching within the school as the RAAC was in the school hall and that other community facilities were being considered, in case these were needed.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People outlined the national context of this issue, in particular a reduction in spending on rebuilding schools over the previous 13 years. He expressed concern about the lack of information provided to the Council by the DfE on which schools were affected and

which schools had not completed surveys, advising that the Council could provide support to schools with this. He advised that he would keep Councillors updated as the situation developed, including communicating with Ward Councillors with an affected school in their ward.

The Director of Education outlined to the Committee who the responsible body was for different types of schools. She explained that the Council was the responsible body for community maintained and voluntary controlled schools and that the relevant Diocese was responsible for voluntary aided schools. For academies in a multi-academy trust (MAT), the MAT was the responsible body while single academies which were not in a MAT were their own responsible body. She advised that all responsible bodies had been required to complete a survey about suspected RAAC within their school buildings. She reported that the Council had completed surveys for the 71 schools which it was the responsible body for early in 2023. She advised that she was aware that the Dioceses had completed the surveys for schools they were responsible for but that the Council had not yet been informed whether surveys had been completed for all the academies in Manchester, despite being in a position to help any who needed assistance. She reported that the DfE was reviewing surveys which were received and, where there was suspected RAAC, a specialist surveyor was being sent to inspect the building. She advised that where there was a confirmed presence of RAAC within a school building, the DfE was advising the schools to close off that part of the school and was allocating a caseworker to the school. She reported that there was no indication that there was RAAC within any of the schools for which the Council was the responsible body.

The Chair advised that the scrapping of the Building Schools for the Future Programme in 2010 had led to this problem.

Councillor Flanagan, Ward Councillor for Miles Platting and Newton Heath, expressed concern that there had been a failure of leadership from the Government on this issue, advising that it was not realistic to expect headteachers to identify RAAC and that every school, including private schools, should have been surveyed by a building inspector. He praised the response of Council officers, the Executive Member and the headteacher to the RAAC issue at All Saints Primary School and advised that everyone needed to work together to support affected schools. He called on Committee Members to lobby the Chancellor of Exchequer to change taxation laws so that top private schools, such as Eton, did not attract charitable status and advised that the additional funding from this should be spent on addressing the RAAC issue and that affected schools should be charged lower business rates. He advised Members that the Government should be instructing councils to inspect every building, noting that RAAC was used in a range of public buildings, and that the Government needed to provide extra funding to support this work.

Councillor Hitchen, Ward Councillor for Miles Platting and Newton Heath, thanked the Executive Member and Council officers within the Education Service, as well as the headteacher and staff of All Saints Primary School for their work to ensure that the pupils were able to return to school with as little disruption as possible. She reported that her ward was one of the most deprived wards in the city and the pandemic had had a negative impact on the children so she welcomed the work to

support the children and ensure they could continue their education. She criticised the DfE for spending £34 million on refurbishing its offices, for school closures and reductions in spending on school maintenance. She supported Councillor Flanagan's comments about tax breaks for private schools and the need to inspect other public buildings.

The Chair commented that she was putting the Committee's Representative of the Diocese of Manchester, which was the Diocese responsible for All Saints Primary School, in touch with the Ward Councillors.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People reported that Corporate Property were now undertaking an exercise to look at all Council buildings to ascertain whether any were affected by RAAC. He emphasised that the Council was totally committed to addressing the issue of RAAC in schools, including providing assistance to any academies who required it.

In response to a Member's question about secondary schools, the Director of Education reported that a lot of Manchester secondary schools were part of one of the Dioceses and the Council knew that surveys had been completed in relation to these schools but did not know whether surveys had been completed in relation to secondary schools which were academies. She reported, while schools affected by RAAC would be provided with a DfE caseworker and a specialist structural survey, it was not yet clear what longer term help would be provided by central Government.

In response to a Member's question, the Director of Education reported that it was too early to tell whether attendance levels had been affected by parents worrying about sending their children back to school due to RAAC but that this would be monitored. In response to a question about communication, she explained how the Council, including the Communications Team and Press Office, worked with all types of schools on communicating information to parents, as well as on dealing with the media.

The Chair advised that most of the city's Sure Start buildings had had their roofs replaced as part of planned maintenance but she expressed concern that a range of public buildings could be affected by RAAC. She highlighted some of the questions trade unions had put to the Secretary of State for Education in relation to the Government's response to RAAC in schools and advised that the Committee would be revisiting this issue.

## **Decision**

That the Committee will receive an update on this at a future meeting.

## **CYP/23/36            School Places**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided an overview of Manchester's current school age population and the numbers forecast for future academic years. It also detailed work previously undertaken to create additional school places to ensure Manchester met its sufficiency duty. The report showed that demand for school places continued to

increase and outlined the work that was planned to achieve sufficiency of places across the city in response to this continued growth.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The school age population;
- Approach to securing sufficient school places; and
- Actions to secure sufficient school places in the primary phase, secondary phase and special schools.

The Head of Access and Sufficiency advised that, since the report had been published, two further schools had been secured for the city through the Free Schools Programme, one at post-16 and one at the secondary phase.

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

- Special school places and resourced provision within mainstream schools;
- Sixth form provision;
- Did planning for school places take into account children crossing local authority boundaries to attend school; and
- The increase in children with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND).

The Head of Access and Sufficiency reported that it was planned to have a mixed offer for additional specialist places including further expansion of special schools and specialist units within mainstream schools, which enabled children to remain at the local school that they were originally allocated while accessing additional support and an adapted curriculum. She confirmed that children attending schools outside their local authority area were taken into account in her service's planning and forecasting and that information was shared between Greater Manchester local authorities. She reported that previously a significant number of Manchester children had attended schools outside of the city's boundaries, particularly at the secondary phase, but that more recently Manchester children were choosing to stay within the city for secondary school, which meant there were fewer places at Manchester schools available for children living outside of the city. In response to a Member's question, she confirmed that, if a family moved house during the academic year, they could apply for a school place from their new address, although in some circumstances it might be better for the child to remain at their existing school. She advised that, if there were no vacancies at their preferred schools, the Admissions Team would work with the family to identify a suitable school which was closer to their new home.

In response to a Member's questions about children who did not receive a place at one of their preferred schools, the Head of Access and Sufficiency reported that they would be allocated a place at the closest school with a vacancy and, depending on the distance, would be offered free travel. She reported that in some cases the Council had worked with particular schools on trying to transport children in groups so that they were not travelling alone to schools in different areas of the city. She



outlined work to create more school places in areas where there was pressure on school places, particularly in south Manchester and Wythenshawe.

The Director of Education reported that post-16 education was now at capacity and more places would be needed in future years and she outlined some of the work taking place to increase capacity, including working with sixth form providers to expand their provision, encouraging providers to apply to open additional post-16 provision through the Free School Process and conversations with the DfE about the allocation of capital funding. She also informed Members about ongoing discussions with the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) and the DfE about post-16 technical pathways.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People suggested that the Committee receive a separate report on post-16 provision at a future meeting. He praised how Council departments had worked together to provide additional school places during a period of significant population growth, when there was a shortage of available land and the Council did not have direct control over schools.

The Director of Education reported that the number of children with SEND had risen nationally and that Manchester had been asked by the DfE to lead for the north-west region on work in relation to SEND and early intervention. She highlighted the impact of the pandemic on children's development and mental health. A Member commented on the impact of poverty on children's development.

The Chair reported that the decline in the birth rate could mean that there would be less demand for primary school places, while recognising that there was a degree of uncertainty about future numbers due to families moving into the city, and that campuses which accommodated children from 3 to 19 would make it easier to manage fluctuating year group sizes. She also highlighted the impact of the planned expansion of free childcare.

The Head of Access and Sufficiency advised that, while the birth rate had gone down, by Key Stage 2 numbers had recovered in some schools, due to in-year migration, so it was difficult to reduce capacity as it was likely to be needed later. She reported that her service was monitoring the situation and working with schools in relation to this but, at present, it was not planned to reduce capacity in primary schools. She also highlighted that the regeneration projects taking place across the city were likely to bring more families into the city in future. The Chair highlighted the importance of ensuring there were sufficient amenities when new housing was built.

In response to a question from the Chair, the Director of Education reported that the number of children being Electively Home Educated (EHE) had risen during the pandemic and had not returned to pre-pandemic levels but was no longer continuing to rise. She informed the Committee that work was taking place to ascertain whether there was sufficiency in the childcare sector in the city to accommodate the expansion of free childcare. In response to a comment from the Chair about one-form-entry Roman Catholic primary schools in north Manchester, she reported that her service was working with the Diocese of Salford. She reported that her service and the Diocese were also involved in the discussions about large-scale housing developments such as Victoria North.

## Decision

To receive an update report later in the year.

### **CYP/23/37                      School Attendance in 2022/2023**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided a summary of attendance data in Manchester for the academic year 2022/2023. It also reviewed some of the activity that had taken place over the course of the last academic year and outlined the strategic approach for 2023/2024 for Committee Members.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- National context;
- Attendance data overview in 2022/2023;
- Overview of attendance work in 2022/2023; and
- Strategic approach 2023/2024.

A Member expressed concern that Wythenshawe had worse school attendance than other areas of the city and asked what the Council and local Councillors could do to address this. The Statutory Lead for Attendance and Exclusions reported that his team had worked with a number of schools in Wythenshawe through the Targeted Support Meetings pilot and this had resulted in improved attendance levels in those schools. He advised that he was confident that when Targeted Support Meetings were rolled out to other schools in Wythenshawe, this would result in further improvements. The Director of Education advised that Ward Councillors could help through their role, for example, asking why a child was not in school or routinely asking about children's schooling when families approached them for help and she outlined some of the support families could access if they were struggling to get their child to school on time, through Early Help Hubs or the school. She reported that school attendance was looked at through the school quality assurance process and, where needed, schools could be invited to attend a Support and Challenge meeting to discuss this.

In response to Members' questions about Fixed Penalty Notices (FPN), the Statutory Lead for Attendance and Exclusions reported that these were requested by the individual school so there was variation in their use across the city, with some schools using it as early intervention and some using it as a last resort, although there were plans to provide more challenge to schools on their processes before issuing an FPN. He informed the Committee that 75% of FPNs were issued due to families taking holidays in term-time, with most of the rest being due to persistent absence.

The Chair highlighted that the groups with the lowest attendance levels were White Travellers of Irish Heritage and White Gypsy/Roma and asked what work was taking place to address this. The Statutory Lead for Attendance and Exclusions reported that the Council produced a model attendance policy for schools which included an appendix with guidance in relation to these groups and that Targeted Support

Meetings with schools could be used to formulate a strategy for improving the attendance of individual pupils.

The Chair advised that Ward Councillors in areas with the lowest attendance levels should be informed of this. She supported the development of a strategy to improve attendance levels for White Travellers of Irish Heritage and White Gypsy/Roma children.

### **Decisions**

1. To note the progress made on school attendance in 2022/2023.
2. To approve the strategic approach for 2023/2024 which both meets the DfE non statutory requirements and improves support to schools.
3. To approve the strategic approach for 2023/2024 which looks to build a partnership consensus around attendance so that a multi-disciplinary approach is embedded across Children's Services and wider agencies.
4. To support the building of a 'think attendance' approach into Members' ward level activity so that attendance at school is encouraged and promoted with all residents.
5. To support the development of a strategy to improve attendance levels for White Travellers of Irish Heritage and White Gypsy/Roma children.

### **CYP/23/38 Manchester Inclusion Strategy Update**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided an update on the implementation of Manchester's Inclusion Strategy 2022-2025 and an overview of the key priorities and next steps.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Manchester Inclusion Strategy activity since July 2022;
- What was known about inclusion across the city; and
- Priority Inclusion Strategy activity for 2023-24.

The Director of Education offered to share a link to the Inclusion Strategy toolkit with Members of the Committee.

A Member welcomed the positive report and that so many schools in Manchester were becoming Rights Respecting Schools.

The Chair asked what was being done in relation to schools which had higher levels of exclusions than others. The Director of Education reported that exclusion and suspension data was monitored and, if a school was an outlier, they would be invited to a Support and Challenge meeting to understand the reasons for the higher number of exclusions and identify a way to work with the school to improve that.

**Decision**

To note the report.

**CYP/23/39                      Overview Report**

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

The Chair encouraged more Members to join the Ofsted Subgroup. She informed Members about the forthcoming visit to Wetherby Young Offenders Institution and stated that the Committee would receive a report on Youth Justice at a future meeting. In response to a Member's comments about an incident of anti-social behaviour by young people in the city centre and what was being done to prevent this from happening again, the Chair stated that she would discuss with the Chair of the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee which Committee should consider this issue.

**Decision**

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

## Health Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2023

#### Present:

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

**Apologies:** Councillors Riasat and Wilson

#### 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  
Professor Cheryl Lenney OBE, Chief Nurse, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Dr Sarah Vause, Consultant in Fetal and Maternal Medicine and Medical Director of Saint Mary's Managed Clinical Service  
Esme Booth, Head of Midwifery, North Manchester, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Celine Doyle, Mental Health Lead, Burnage Academy for Boys

### HSC/23/31 Minutes

#### Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 21 June 2023.

### HSC/23/32 Implementing Ockenden: One Year On

The Committee considered the report of the Saint Mary's Managed Clinical Service, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust that described that Dame Donna Ockenden had been appointed to conduct an independent review of maternity services at Shrewsbury and Telford NHS Trust. A report highlighting the initial findings was published in December 2020, with the second and final report being published in March 2022.

A report detailing Saint Mary's Managed Clinical Service progress against delivering the immediate and essential actions to both reports was presented at the Health Scrutiny Committee on 22 June 2022. This report provides a further update on our progress against the remaining actions.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Discussion of the Manchester Foundation Trust response to emerging findings from the first Ockenden report;
- Discussion of the Manchester Foundation Trust response to findings from the final Ockenden report;

- Information on the support for the maternal health of women and families from Black African, Asian and other ethnic minority groups;
- Information on the response to the Care Quality Commission s29A warning letter, noting that a s29A warning notice stated the reasons why the CQC considered that a trust needed to make significant improvements; and
- Progress on success measures.

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

- Welcoming the use of appropriate language and terminology throughout the report;
- What research, if any had been undertaken to understand the psychological impact the findings of the Ockenden Report and the increased awareness of the issues identified had on women and families from Black African, Asian and other ethnic minority groups;
- Noting that written information booklets were provided in 11 languages, what provision was made for speakers of other languages;
- What provision was made to provide maternity services for refugee women and disabled women;
- Noting comments regarding staff recruitment and retention;
- What were the barriers to implementing the recommendation that 'The transitional care model offered at the Wythenshawe site should be replicated across the three sites without delay'; and
- Noting the reported work analysing a large data set of birth outcomes that found differences in the rates of fetal growth restriction in certain geographical areas with high ethnic diversity and enquiring what were the geographical areas.

The Head of Midwifery, North Manchester, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust made reference to the Maternity Voice Partnership that had been established across all three hospital sites. She advised this forum captured and articulated the voice of service users. She stated this feedback from women and their families, including those from different ethnicities was important to inform services and responses. She stated that she was not aware of any specific research into the psychological impact the findings of the Ockenden and increased awareness of the issues identified had on women and families from Black African, Asian and other ethnic minority groups. In response to a specific question the Committee was advised that further information on the 12 Black and Asian maternity equity standards that was referred to in the report would be circulated following the meeting for information.

The Consultant in Fetal and Maternal Medicine and Medical Director of Saint Mary's Managed Clinical Service made reference to the initiatives to engage and support women and families from Black African, Asian and other ethnic minority groups, noting that consideration was also given to wider health inequalities, such as socio and economic deprivation. She made reference to the advice work undertaken across a range of health-related topics such as Vitamin D and vaccinations. She commented that this engagement with women helped understand the needs, concerns and risks experienced by women. She also stated that raising awareness of health inequalities amongst staff was also important to support this activity and address health inequalities. She further made reference to the intention to increase

the number of staff across the workforce that reflected the women that were cared for.

The Consultant in Fetal and Maternal Medicine and Medical Director of Saint Mary's Managed Clinical Service commented that it was important to recruit and train the staff so they were equipped with the required skillset to safely complete the transition of the care model offered at the Wythenshawe site across the other sites.

The Chief Nurse, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust stated that translation services, either face to face or via telephone was utilised for speakers of other languages. She added that they would not use a family member as a translator. She said that if it became evident that there was a need to publish a booklet in another language this could be arranged. The Head of Midwifery, North Manchester, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust advised that there were specialist staff who worked with asylum seekers, adding that these staff had established community links and worked closely with the VCSE sector. She stated that a Specialist Midwifery Advocate would support a disabled person and devise specialist individual care plans, including those in the home setting.

The Consultant in Fetal and Maternal Medicine and Medical Director of Saint Mary's Managed Clinical Service advised that the geographical areas referred to in the research into the rates of fetal growth restriction were Longsight, Levenshulme and Fallowfield. She added that this research would inform targeted intervention work to improve health outcomes. The Chair stated any future update reports should include this, and any other relevant data sets, and where possible this should be provided at a ward level.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

### **HSC/23/33 Adverse Childhood Experiences & Trauma Informed Practice**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Director of Public Health that provided an update to a report considered at the meeting of the committee on 7 September 2022 on Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) and Trauma Informed Practice.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an update on the work done to strengthen the ACEs programme objectives, through extensive engagement and consultation with stakeholders to ensure that the programme was fit for purpose following the impact of COVID-19 and within the context of Making Manchester Fairer;
- Providing an update on the ACEs and Trauma programme of work across the city including a good practice example of culture change from Manchester Housing Services and a collaboration between Z-Arts and the Burnage Academy for Boys; and
- Next steps.

The Committee then heard from Celine Doyle, Mental Health Lead, Burnage Academy for Boys. She described the art project that had been delivered at the school that engaged with 13 boys who had experienced displacement from their country of birth. She spoke of the positive outcomes that the boys experienced via the project and the legacy this had provided for the school. The Committee welcomed this testimony and the positive contribution this had made to the young people. The Programme Lead described this was one of the four schools and four creative providers using a trauma informed lens.

The Committee further welcomed the case study that related to the work of Housing Services. The Head of Neighbourhood Services stated that Housing Services were a key partner in North Manchester and Trauma Informed Practice was embedded in their approach, adding that this was the only approach that worked. The Chair acknowledged this powerful statement.

The Committee then received a written statement from Councillor Doswell, Lead Member for Trauma Informed that had been submitted. In her statement Councillor Doswell spoke of her own experience of Adverse Childhood Experiences, praising the staff involved with this work and endorsing the report to the Committee. The Chair thanked Councillor Doswell for her continued commitment to this area of work.

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

- Was the work described shared and implemented by other housing providers and other key partners, such as the police;
- Welcoming the positive contribution this work had delivered for the city, recognising that this approach and understanding would continue to be rolled out across different sectors and partners; and
- The need to ensure this work was embedded across services for all generations, not just young people.

The Head of Neighbourhood Services advised that there was a desire from different housing providers to deliver and adopt this work, recognising that some were at different stages in this work. She said that there was a Housing Group who met regularly, and this area of work was discussed and provided a forum to share good practice. Celine Doyle, Mental Health Lead, Burnage Academy for Boys commented that there were a lot of schools adopting the Trauma Informed model of practice. She referred to the Trauma Informed Network of Schools that would help build traction across the secondary school sector in Manchester. She added that an evaluation of this work and the outcomes of this would be undertaken.

The Deputy Director of Public Health informed the Committee that an element of the Making Manchester Fairer Work Force Development Group considered how Trauma Informed Practice would be embedded across all services, including all age groups. She further commented that one of the themes of the Making Manchester Fairer Plan was to consider Community power and social connections and she recognised that the Police were a key partner in this work and conversations would include how they could adopt Trauma Informed Practice.



The Programme Lead stated that consideration was always been given as to how this work could be expanded, noting that since September 2022 over 1,000 individuals have attended a training session. This included elected members, staff from the Manchester Jewish Museum, the Afro-Caribbean Alliance, MCC Homelessness Directorate, Manchester Sensory Support Service, Department for Work and Pensions, a number of schools, Greater Manchester Police, Primary Care, housing providers and a range of voluntary sector organisations. With specific reference to work with the police he described the training delivered to officers working within the Violence Reduction Unit and to PCSOs. He acknowledged that more needed to be done, especially with the training of new recruits to the police service. The Chair made reference to her experience of the police who had undertaken this training and the positive difference this had made in how they interacted with young people and their families.

The Programme Lead commented that he welcomed the continued support of the Committee for this area of work and he acknowledged the observations from the Members in regard to other sectors that would benefit from this approach and training, including Care Homes.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care commented that he respected and endorsed the ambitions as described within the report. He added that the refreshed ACEs and Trauma Responsive Programme needed to include discussion and consideration of the significant impact the pandemic had on citizens of all ages, adding that the impact of the pandemic and associated trauma would be realised for many years to come.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **HSC/23/34 Draft Terms of Reference and Work Programme for the Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust: Improvement Plan Task and Finish Group**

The Committee considered the report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit that presented the draft terms of reference and work programme for the proposed Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust: Improvement Plan Task and Finish Group.

The Committee were invited to agree the membership of the Task and Finish Group, the terms of reference and work programme.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care stated that he would attend each meeting of the Group to provide any verbal updates that were relevant to the Group.

### **Decision**

The Committee;

1. Appoint Councillors Bayunu, Curley, Green and Wilson as members of the Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust: Improvement Plan Task and Finish Group.
2. Approve the terms of reference of the Task and Finish Group.
3. Approve the work programme of the Task and Finish Group, noting the comments above.

### **HSC/23/35 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 6 September 2023

#### Present:

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

**Apologies:** Councillor Riasat

#### 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  
Julie Taylor, Locality Director of Strategy/Provider Collaboration (MICP)  
Sophie Hargreaves, Director of Strategy, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Tom Hinchcliffe, Deputy Place-based Lead, NHS GM (Manchester)  
Professor Matt Makin, Medical Director at North Manchester General Hospital, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Darren Banks, Group Director of Strategy, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Mark Edwards, Chief Operating Officer, Manchester Local Care Organisation

#### HSC/23/36 Minutes

#### Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2023.

#### HSC/23/37 Pennine Acute Disaggregation Update

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Strategy, MFT and Locality Director of Strategy/Provider Collaboration that provided an update regarding the dissolution of the former Pennine Acute Hospitals Trust (PAHT) and re-provision of services by both Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust (MFT) and the Northern Care Alliance (NCA). The report advised that this was the third phase of change proposals arising from the dissolution of PAHT.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing a background to the acquisition of the Pennine Acute Hospitals Trust;
- An overview of the disaggregation approach and context of complex services;
- A summary of proposals to disaggregate the third phase of complex services namely Dexa (bone density) scanning, Ear, Nose & Throat (ENT), Urology and Trauma & Orthopaedics; and
- A summary of the assessment of the impact of these proposed changes on North Manchester residents in terms of quality, equality, patient choice, travel and access.

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

- Recognising the significant work that had been undertaken to progress this work;
- Recognising and welcoming the patient centred approach;
- Noting the importance of car parking for both patients and staff and in doing so welcoming the development of the multistorey car park facility at the North Manchester General Hospital site;
- Recognising that the work described in the report was part of the wider economic regeneration of north Manchester; and
- Would there be ongoing monitoring of the impacts on patient experience following implementation of the changes described.

The Locality Director of Strategy/Provider Collaboration (MICP) described that there had been significant work undertaken via the public engagement exercise on the issue of patient travel, including consideration of the cost associated with travel and a summary of these findings had been presented in the report. She described that information on travel options would now be routinely included in appointment letters that would be sent to patients. The Director of Strategy, MFT added that the public engagement events had identified that a lot of patients did not know what their options were in relation to public transport. Regarding the multistorey car park to be delivered at North Manchester General Hospital it was noted that this would alleviate issues associated with on-street parking experienced by local residents.

The Director of Strategy, MFT informed the Members that each phase of the disaggregation process that had been reported to the Committee would be monitored. The Chair commented that the Committee would be interested to learn of these findings once collated.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care said that he welcomed the report. He commented that he was very appreciative of the ongoing dialogue between the Trust and the Council from the early stages of planning of this programme of work.

## **Decisions**

The Committee;

1. Endorse the progress Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust and Northern Care Alliance have made to disaggregate services from the legacy Pennine Acute Hospitals Trust footprint; and
2. Endorse the assessment made by the working group that the changes identified in phase 3 do not constitute a 'substantial variation'.

## **HSC/23/38 Integrated Care Systems**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Place Based Lead, Manchester Integrated Care Partnership that provided an update following the UK Government's reforms to health and social care, which established Integrated Care Systems on 1 July 2022, including Greater Manchester Integrated Care System (NHS GM). The

report also provided an update on the governance arrangements that had developed over the last year for NHS GM and the Manchester locality.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Information on the NHS Greater Manchester (NHS GM) Integrated Care System (ICS); and
- An update on the Manchester Locality Plan.

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

- Noting that Manchester had been pioneering in terms of health devolution and the integration of health and social care;
- Recognising the risk to delivering all the ambitions for Manchester whilst delivering the inherited required efficiencies of £606.2m;
- All available levers and opportunities should be used to raise awareness of these required efficiencies, including the lobbying of local MPs and the Shadow Secretary of State for Health and Social Care;
- Noting and welcoming the completion of the Environmental Impact Assessment and the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion sections of the report template;
- Further information was requested on the GM NHS Green Plan in 2023/24;
- What was the approach to ensure people and communities were active partners as described as an aim of the Our Healthier Manchester Locality Plan; and
- Discussing the relationship between housing and health.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care stated that he had great concerns regarding the ability to deliver the ambitions for Manchester and to improve the health outcomes of Manchester residents whilst delivering the inherited required efficiencies of £606.2m. He stated that with the support of the Committee, and in conjunction with the Chair, he would write to the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care to lobby for adequate funding for Manchester ahead of the Autumn Budget Statement. The Committee fully endorsed this suggestion and noted that the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care should be invited to meet in person with the Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care when he would be visiting Manchester attending the party conference.

In response to Members' comments regarding planning for managing and understanding the impact of the required efficiencies of £606.2m, the Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care stated that this issue was considered and monitored at monthly meetings that involved all partners. He reiterated that he remained deeply concerned about this inherited financial situation, however he was committed to doing all he could to protect the most vulnerable residents in the city and use all available funding to achieve the best health outcomes for Mancunians.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care commented that appropriate and quality housing was recognised as a factor in residents' health outcomes. He made reference to the many initiatives that had been delivered in Manchester that had been reported to the Committee over previous meetings,

including Dementia Friendly Housing schemes and Extra Care Schemes. He further addressed the question asked in relation to active partners by advising that the Director of Equality and Engagement had involved the Patient Advisory Groups in the detailed delivery planning. In addition, all existing community networks and sounding boards were involved in this work, adding that this approach was reflected across Greater Manchester.

In response to the request for further information on the GM NHS Green Plan in 2023/24, the Deputy Place-based Lead, NHS GM (Manchester) advised that information would be provided following the meeting. He further clarified that the Director of Equality and Engagement was Sharmila Kar.

The Chair in concluding this item of business requested that any future update reports on Integrated Care Systems to the Committee include information on how the new arrangements impacted Manchester residents and provide case studies and examples of outcomes.

### **Decision**

The Committee recommend that the Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care, in conjunction with the Chair, write to the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care to lobby for adequate funding for Manchester ahead of the Autumn Budget Statement.

### **HSC/23/39 COVID-19 National Inquiry**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Public Health that provided information about the UK Covid 19 Inquiry, how the Council had contributed to the Inquiry so far and described the arrangements in place for responding to future requests.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background in terms of the national context;
- Describing the structure of the Inquiry; and
- Information of the local response to date, including information on the role and membership of the UK Covid-19 Inquiry: MCC Internal working Group Membership.

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

- That an accurate account of the Manchester experience should be written to act as an accurate testimony;
- Paying tribute to all Mancunians who responded heroically during the pandemic, paying particular tribute to the many volunteers across the vaccination sites; and
- Noting that each and every Mancunian had a personal story to tell about their experience of the pandemic.

In response to a specific question regarding the UK Covid-19 Inquiry: MCC Internal working Group membership, the Director of Public Health advised that this was an

officer led group, using existing officer networks who would coordinate each respective directorate's response and submission to the inquiry.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care echoed the views of the Members in paying tribute to the heroic Mancunian response to the pandemic. In addition, he paid tribute to the Director of Public Health and his team and to the Executive Director of Executive Director of Adult Social Services. He said that Manchester, in the absence of national policy, had taken the lead in regard to instigating testing patients for Covid before they were discharged from hospital into other care settings.

In concluding this item of business, the Chair stated that she was incredibly proud of Manchester and our residents for their response during the pandemic.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **HSC/23/40 Planning for Winter 2023/24 Across Health and Care**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Place Based Lead, the Executive Director Adult Social Services and the Director of Public Health that provided an overview of the key elements of the approach to winter planning 2023/24 alongside organisational updates relating to what would be delivered by partner organisations.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Noting that a full system winter plan would be developed through the two urgent care system boards – Manchester and Trafford Operational Delivery Group (ODG) and Urgent Care Board (UCB);
- A first iteration of the system plan would be shared at the September Urgent Care Board, with a further update in October, and then as required throughout winter;
- Information regarding the operational resilience across the NHS;
- Information regarding the Urgent and Emergency Care System Plan;
- Information regarding the Operational Pressures Escalation Levels (OPEL) Framework;
- An update on the planned Winter Communications Plan; and
- Organisational winter deliverables, by organisation.

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

- Noting the pressures the NHS was already experiencing prior to additional winter pressures;
- Noting the pressures and resulting waiting times at Accident and Emergency (A&E) departments;
- Noting the additional impact of Covid over the winter period;
- Advice and information needed to be cascaded to residents regarding the importance of accessing health services when they were ill; and

- Clarification was sought on the reported need for sufficient call handling capacity within the North West Ambulance Service (NWAS) and did this indicate that it was currently under resourced.

The Group Director of Strategy, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust stated that the report presented to Committee provided a summary of the planning work underway and advised that significant detailed work and analysis informed the planning. He commented that there were a range of initiatives to reduce pressures experienced at A&E departments, including the use of Virtual Wards that could be used to clinically care for and manage patients, and safely step up or step down care as appropriate. He stated that this could improve patient flow at A&E. He added that demand at A&E acted as a useful barometer for how the wider system was functioning. He stated that all available knowledge, intelligence and experience informed the planning for winter pressures.

The Chief Operating Officer, Manchester Local Care Organisation advised that currently, a third of the 320 virtual community beds target to be delivered by the end of March 2024 had been achieved, adding this was in line with current projections. He commented that there was clinical evidence to demonstrate that this approach to care was appropriate for certain cohorts and conditions. He added that this approach also included participation from GPs.

The Director of Public Health responded to the comment raised regarding the need for resident advice and information. He made reference to the Winter Communications Plan that was described in the report, adding that this would be bespoke to Manchester and would include Cost of Living advice and vaccination information. He stated that information would be published in an easy to read format and available in different languages.

The Director of Public Health advised the Committee that following publication of the report the date for care home residents and staff for flu and Covid vaccinations had been brought forward from October to commence the 11 September and the 18 September for all other eligible cohorts. He added that this decision had been taken in response to the new variant of concern that had been identified, variant BA.2.86, also known as Pirola. He advised that all existing trusted networks would be used to articulate and promote vaccination information and advice.

In response to the discussion regarding call handler capacity within NWAS, the Deputy Place-based Lead, NHS GM (Manchester) advised that the reference in the report referred to the need to ensure that capacity within this service was adequate to respond to the winter pressures.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care commented that there was an established and strong dialogue across all health and social care partners in the city to enable the planning for winter. He advised that the Winter Plan would be reviewed monthly by the Manchester Partnership Board and all Councillors would be kept updated by himself. He noted that the Committee would be considering a report at the February 2024 meeting that reflected on how effective the winter planning had been.



**Decision**

To note the report.

**HSC/23/41 Overview Report**

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

In response to a comment from a Member regarding the Care Quality Commission rating of 'Requires Improvement' for Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, the Chair stated that she would give consideration as to how the Committee could be informed of the Trust's response to these findings.

**Decision**

The Committee notes the report and agrees the work programme.



## Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 20 July 2023

**Present:**

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

**Also present:**

Councillor Rahman, Statutory Deputy Leader  
Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Finance and Resources

**Apologies:** Councillors Andrews and Evans

**RGSC/23/35            Interests**

Councillors Connolly and Wheeler declared a personal interest in items 8 and 12 - MCC Housing Services & Equans contract extension – and would remain in the meeting for the duration of discussions.

**RGSC/23/36            Minutes**

Members received and considered the minutes of the previous meeting. It was requested that the minutes be amended under minute number RGSC/23/31 to include a statement made by the Executive Member for Finance and Resources that the Council should see progress in the use of insourcing as a delivery model within 3 years.

**Decision:**

That the minutes of the previous meeting, held on 22 June 2023, be approved as a correct record subject to the amendment as detailed above.

**RGSC/23/37            Review of Development Agreements**

The committee considered a report of the Director of Strategic Housing and Development and the Head of Development and Investment Estate which outlined the Council's use of development agreements along with the governance arrangements in relation to the negotiation, management and monitoring of development and associated agreements over Council land and buildings.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Non-standardisation of approach within agreements in place;

- The Council's formal corporate Joint Venture arrangements;
- Overage and performance-related profit, with PwC commissioned to undertake a peer review of overage arrangements;
- How due diligence was undertaken, including the use of a checklist and form for developing Joint Ventures and agreements; and
- The best practice principles of overage.

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

- What was meant by 'reputational factors', and whether the Council would reject a tender on these grounds;
- How reputational factors would be taken into consideration in regard to Joint Ventures;
- Noting the peer review of overage arrangements being undertaken by PwC, and querying who the Council's peers were;
- Whether ethical considerations were taken into account when awarding contracts; and
- Whether Joint Ventures were subject to procurement regulations and non-commercial matters.

The Head of Development and Investment Estate explained that the Development team worked closely with colleagues across the Council through the Best Value Working Group and the due diligence process to review, enhance and bolster governance arrangements within Development. He also stated that a dashboard in relation to development agreements and overages would be included within the Annual Property Report, which was listed on the Committee's work programme for a future meeting.

In response to queries around what was meant by 'reputational factors', the Head of Development and Investment Estate stated that this referred to the ability and track record of a company and how they consulted and worked with local communities.

The Director of Development stated that Manchester was an investable city, with significant interest in opportunities to collaborate with the Council. He explained that there were a series of measures and de-risking opportunities to ensure the Council works with the right partners who could deliver on economic outputs, such as new homes, new skills and investment.

The Head of Development and Investment Estate reiterated the Council's focus on outputs within development agreements and explained that delivery milestones were contained within each contractual framework. Checks and balances were also undertaken to examine the nature of an organisation, their corporate structure and their income streams through a procurement exercise, development agreement or land transaction. A framework had been developed in collaboration with Corporate Governance to ensure assurance prior to entering into an agreement with a tender.

The Head of Development and Investment Estate explained that PwC were a multi-disciplinary organisation with significant experience in management, contracts and finance. He stated that PwC had experience in working with a number of local authorities and organisations and were skilled in the area of the review. The review included undertaking a forensic review of some of the development agreements which the Council already had in place and would report back to the Council.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that the Council placed great importance on due diligence when considering Joint Ventures. This included best consideration for land procurement or transactions and ensuring that this was transparent.

In response to a member's query regarding ethical considerations, the Executive Member for Finance and Resources highlighted that there was not a 'one-size-fits-all' approach to awarding contracts. He stated that each Joint Venture would be awarded on their own merit and that any future risk would be mitigated against.

The City Solicitor reiterated that each Joint Venture would be awarded on individual merit. There were a variety of factors which could be taken into account when considering a Joint Venture and this could include some political and ethical factors, although these could not be explicitly listed.

**Decision:**

That the report be noted.

**RGSC/23/38            Our Town Hall Project – Progress Update**

The committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which provided an update on the progress of the refurbishment and partial restoration of the Town Hall and Albert Square under the Our Town Hall (OTH) project.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background to the OTH project;
- Providing an update on the operating model and social value;
- Progress against key performance indicators (KPIs);
- Challenges experienced since the Notice to Proceed (NTP);
- The current financial position, noting that the project team had extensively sought opportunities to reduce cost pressures;
- The programme end date would not be confirmed until January 2024 when the position would be clearer; and
- The project was seeking additional funding of £29m to fund works until the end of December.

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

- What mechanisms were in place to ensure that higher costs were not a profit-making opportunity for contractors and suppliers;
- Whether any of the challenges and discoveries, such as out-of-true lifts, could have been foreseen earlier in the project;
- What the budget position would look like in January 2024;
- Whether officers would still recommend the same level of borrowing for the project, given the current position;
- The time at which officers became aware of delays, and how this was communicated to members and residents;
- Whether there were any financial implications affecting Lend Lease;
- If any cost mitigation measures were in place to reduce the need for additional funding;
- The impact of rising interest rates;
- How the building will be operated and when more information could be provided on this;
- Whether there was any certainty on the completion date for the project; and
- Whether a definitive completion date and final revenue budget would be available at the next update.

In opening the item, the Chair explained that he and some committee members had recently visited the Town Hall, which they found useful and were impressed by the enthusiasm of officers working on the project.

The Statutory Deputy Leader stated that the Council had a duty to preserve the Town Hall for future generations as a symbol of democracy and civic pride and that the House of Commons Restoration Team recently visited the site.

The Project Director stated that this was the largest heritage project in the country and acknowledged that this posed unique challenges.

In response to a query regarding what mechanisms were in place to ensure that higher costs were not a profit-making opportunity for contractors and suppliers, the Project Director stated that this was traditionally undertaken through competitive tension, which ensured a supply chain that was motivated and had capacity to undertake work. He noted, however, that there was a reduced appetite within the supply chain since the Covid-19 pandemic due to perception of risk and staff shortages. Members were advised that a significant number of tenders had withdrawn toward the end of the tender process, which reduced the competitive tension and meant that some contracts had to be awarded to the most expensive tender.

The Project Director explained that problems with lifts were unknown prior to works beginning and required major engineering exercises. He explained that a contingency plan had been developed and broken down by individual packages to

identify the appropriate levels of risk in design, procurement and buying, construction and discovery.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer highlighted that the last report to the committee predicted a budget increase of £17m to address emerging pressures. She stated that there had been a concentrated period of work and officers were near to fully understanding the challenges posed by the building. She reiterated the commitment to keeping members and the public informed on progress.

In response to a query regarding whether officers would still recommend the same level of borrowing for the project, given the current position, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that the Council created a significant reserve to address the capital financing costs of both Our Town Hall and Factory International. She also explained that prior to the project, two floors in the Town Hall were out of use and there were issues with stonework and heating, and that key considerations had been taken into account.

The Project Director explained that there was a significant contingency of £49m at Notice to Proceed stage and the risks of discovery were recognised. He stated, however, that the Council could not have foreseen the impacts of hyperinflation, market pressures, redesign and delay claims. He advised that the project team had been working hard since Notice to Proceed (NTP) to mitigate overrun costs and programme.

With regards to a query around the financial implications affecting Lend Lease, members were advised that the Council's contract with Lend Lease governed how they would be rewarded and how they must perform. It was stated that the Council was currently in receipt of delay claims amounting to £25m and some of these claims had been submitted by Lend Lease. These would be assessed and would be awarded if found to meet the contractual terms.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer also expressed the Council's commitment for the Town Hall to be open and accessible to residents and the wider public, highlighting the Visitor Centre that would form part of the building. She stated that work was underway to develop a large Civic Quarter and further information would be provided as part of the budget process for 2024/25. Members were also advised that officers were examining the costs of running the estate to ensure sustainability in the future.

The Project Director explained that the biggest risk currently facing the project was further delay. He stated that there was still £10m-worth of works packages to procure, which would remove inflationary risk to procurement by the end of 2023. There remained risks around discovery and having to reorder materials at higher prices.

In response to a question on interest rates, it was explained that high interest rates had implications for the Council's borrowing costs but it was stated that the Council did not borrow for individual projects but to meet the overall capital cash flow requirements. Significant work had been undertaken to examine the impact of this for future capital programmes but the financing reserve for the Our Town Hall project to meet financing charges was sufficient to cover interest rate increases and to not increase pressure on the revenue budget.

The Chair expressed his hope that there would be a definitive cost and completion date for the project at the next update to the committee in early 2024, to which the Project Director explained that the hiatus of risk would have passed by then which could provide a clearer position.

**Decision:**

That the committee

1. notes the progress made, and
2. endorses the recommendation to the Executive.

**RGSC/23/39            MCC Housing Services and Equans Contract Extension  
(PART A)**

The committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Director of Housing Services, which sought the committee's endorsement to extend the Council's contract with Equans to provide housing repairs and maintenance services to the Council's housing stock for a further 3 years.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- An overview of and background to the Council's contract with Equans;
- The fundamental deliverables of the contract;
- Performance of the contract, with most performance indicators being met across repairs and compliance;
- The delivery model assessment being undertaken for future delivery, assessing whether to continue to outsource in the longer-term or to bring the service in-house; and
- The role of the Housing Advisory Board.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development explained that the contract applied to the Council's housing stock in the city centre and North Manchester and that this was a vital service which affected thousands of residents. He stated that the proposal was to extend the current contract for three years from April 2024, with an additional break clause each year to allow the Council to assess alternative delivery models, such as insourcing, and to ensure best value and quality of service.



In response to a comment by a member that the Housing Advisory Board had not yet met to discuss the proposal, the Executive Member clarified that the Board had been established for over a year and met every 2 months. He noted that the Board would meet that evening to discuss the proposal and that there had been preliminary discussions already.

Members noted that a Part B report on the proposal was listed further on the agenda and would reserve their comments for discussion under that item.

**Decision:**

That the Part A report be noted.

**RGSC/23/40          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 and items for information previously requested by the Committee. The report also included the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to amend as appropriate and agree.

**Decision:**

That the report be noted and the work programme agreed.

**RGSC/23/41          Factory International Progress Update (PART A)**

The committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Strategic Director (Development) which provided an update on the delivery of Aviva Studios including progress with the construction programme; the evolution of Factory International; the success of the recent MIF23 festival; and the conclusion of the naming rights agreement with Aviva for Aviva Studios.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Providing an introduction to the project;
- The benefits already being felt by the works;
- The social value provided by The Factory Academy and Factory Futures;
- The social value created through the construction works;
- Progress and key performance indicators;
- The position of the project at July 2023;
- The fundraising strategy;
- That the naming rights had been awarded to Aviva and would be called Aviva Studios; and
- Contractual arrangements.

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

- Why the most recent report to the Committee in October 2022 was not listed within the background documents;
- Reiterating a previous request that any future requests for increased funding include a breakdown of all funding increases over the project's lifespan;
- Whether any costs were charged to architects as a result of design challenges;
- If delays due to water damage caused by inclement weather could have been avoided;
- Noting the importance of engaging with local businesses, particularly small enterprises, and querying how this would be undertaken; and
- Welcoming the community and social value work.

The Statutory Deputy Leader introduced the item and stated that the delivery of Aviva Studios had brought in more than £106m of new money into Manchester and would result in an additional £1.1bn in the economy over a period of time. It would also create over 1500 jobs and would serve as a catalyst for investment into the cultural sector. He highlighted that Lonely Planet had named Manchester one of the top 30 destinations to visit and Time Out named The Factory as one of the best things to visit in 2023. He stated that positive feedback had been received from residents and the cultural sector.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer apologised for the most recent report not being included in the list of background documents and explained that this had been done in error. She also committed to providing a full history of the funding increase within the final account at a future meeting, to which members requested this be provided sooner.

In response to a query regarding design challenges, the Director of Capital Programmes explained that two design architect firms had been commissioned to ensure the acoustic capacity and fire safety of the building. He stated that the cost of this had been borne by the Council and that this was necessary to ensure the integrity of the building.

The Director of Capital Programmes explained that inclement weather also described the cold snap experienced at the beginning of the year, which led to water damage as a result of condensation. He stated that discussions were ongoing regarding the management of works as part of the commercial considerations.

The Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure provided assurances that the development would have a positive impact on local businesses and the Council would engage with these as Aviva Studios became embedded within the city. She also highlighted that twelve food and beverage venues were planned for St John's to support the area.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer also wished to place on record the Council's excitement to work and partner with Aviva on this project.

**Decision:**

That the committee

1. notes the report, and
2. endorses the recommendations being made to the Executive.

**RGSC/23/42            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/23/43            Factory International Progress Update (PART B)**

The committee considered a confidential report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Strategic Director (Development), which update on the fundraising for the construction project and the conclusion of the naming rights agreement with Aviva for Aviva Studios, supplementary to item 5.

The committee discussed and queried a number of issues and points within the report.

**Decision:**

That the committee

1. notes the report, and
2. endorses the recommendations being made to the Executive.

**RGSC/23/44            MCC Housing Services and Equans Contract Extension (PART B)**

The committee considered a confidential report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Director of Housing Services, which detailed the key considerations accounted for in recommending extending the contract for housing repairs and maintenance for up to three years.

The committee discussed and queried a number of issues and points within the report.

**Decision:**

That the committee does not endorse the recommendation to extend the MCC Housing Services contract with Equans up to a maximum of three years.

## Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 24 August 2023

**Present:**

Councillor Simcock (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors Andrews, Connolly, Evans, Kilpatrick, Lanchbury and Wheeler

**Also present:**

Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Development

Councillor Karney

Councillor Leech

**Apologies:** Councillors Brickell and Davies

**RGSC/23/45            Interests**

Councillors Connolly and Wheeler declared a personal interest in items 4 - Call in of decision: MCC Housing Services – Equans Extension – and would remain in the meeting for the duration of discussions.

**RGSC/23/46            Call in of decision: MCC Housing Services – Equans Extension**

The committee considered a Key Decision that had been called in by five members of the Council to ascertain whether this complied with the Council's decision-making process. If the Committee believed that this had not been complied with, it could then refer the matter back to the decision-maker for reconsideration.

On behalf of those who had signed the request, Councillor John Leech was invited by the Chair to explain the reasons for calling in the decision made by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer to extend the current Equans Housing Services Contract for the provision of the housing operations repairs and maintenance service for up to 3 years from April 2024 to April 2027.

Councillor Leech explained that he proposed the call-in of this decision due to concerns around value for money, and whether the decision constituted the best option for tenants, the workforce and the Council; the use of subcontractors and agency staff by Equans; and concerns raised by Unite the Union regarding health and safety, changes to the sickness absence policy, a failure to address accusations of bullying and harassment towards their members and a lack of trust in management. He also highlighted how the Council was still addressing historic challenges from the transfer of the Northwards housing stock to the Council's management.

Councillor Leech stated that the report failed to provide any evidence to support the outcome of the feasibility study, which suggested that extending the current contract with Equans provided best value for money. He also queried whether alternative options had been fully considered.

In line with Council procedures, the Committee were invited to ask questions of Councillor Leech. In response to a query from the Chair regarding how Councillor Leech thought the decision-making process had been deficient, he reiterated that there was a lack of justification as to why alternative options for the contract had been dismissed. Councillor Leech also stated that he believed it would be difficult for the committee to endorse the decision without information on the alternative options considered, although he acknowledged the time sensitivity around the contract extension.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Director of Housing Services were in attendance to answer questions of the Committee.

As the decision-maker, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer explained that Key Decision Notice was published following consultation with the Housing Advisory Board, Major Contracts Oversight Board and the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee. She stated that the Council was still in the process of embedding the former Northwards housing stock into the Council's oversight and this limited capacity to undertake another major insourcing project.

She addressed some of Councillor Leech's concerns and explained that the Council had and would continue to consider alternative options for the housing repairs and maintenance contract. She stated that value for money could be demonstrated through feedback from tenants and advised that the Head of Internal Audit had been requested to undertake a quality assurance exercise on the key performance indicators (KPIs) for the contract.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer also stated that the Council took the concerns raised by Unite the Union seriously but reiterated that resolving HR issues was the responsibility of Equans.

Members sought clarification from the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer on the alternative options for the contract and the timescales around employing a break clause in the contract in the first year of its extension. The committee was advised, in response, that it would be ambitious to exercise a break clause within the first year and that the Council would need to be mindful of the volume of work that this would impact. She reiterated that work was underway to understand future opportunities for the contract.

In response to other queries, it was confirmed that work to scope the Internal Audit review of KPIs was underway and confirmation would be given at a later date as to when the outcome of this review would be reported to the Audit Committee. It was

also confirmed that the Major Contracts Oversight Board considered reputational issues when considering any contract.

The Director of Housing Services informed the Committee that there was an overall satisfaction rate of 82% amongst tenants in June 2023 and that there were now more directly employed staff members on the contract with hopes of increasing the number of apprentices employed. He also recognised the benefit of expert knowledge afforded by employing subcontractors and agency staff. The Committee was also advised that specific issues would be taken seriously and raised directly with Equans management team once made aware.

In response to a member's query around those tenants that did not respond to the satisfaction survey, the Director of Housing Services explained that work was being undertaken to build stronger connections with tenants and acknowledged that the survey was a representative sample with more work needed to guarantee a higher response rate.

The Director of Housing Services also provided assurances that he would continue to engage with Unite the Union on the issues raised by their members.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development explained that the delivery of repairs and maintenance within the housing stock was a key priority for the Council and that this was a frequent subject of discussion at the Housing Advisory Board, where tenant representatives were in attendance. He highlighted that it was a political decision to pursue insourcing where appropriate and reiterated previous comments made that the concerns raised by Unite the Union were taken seriously.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, the Director of Housing Services and the Executive Member for Housing and Development all expressed their confidence that the correct decision-making processes had been followed.

The Chair called Councillor Pat Karney as a witness in his capacity as the elected member of a ward in which much of the Council's housing stock was located. Councillor Karney reiterated the importance of having a good housing repairs service. He stated that it would be irresponsible to bring this service in-house whilst the Council was still working to embed the old Northwards service and that doing so would have a detrimental impact on residents.

In coming to their decision, members of the Committee noted that 12 months would not be sufficient time to bring the service in-house but welcomed ongoing work to identify ways in which this could be brought forward in future. Members recognised the enormity and complexity of bringing the service in-house and acknowledged the improvements made so far. They welcomed the suggestion of yearly reviews of the contract and insourcing capacity and acknowledged the need to get the contract right and learn lessons.

**Decision: (5:1:1)**

That the decision taken by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer on 24 July 2023 to extend the current Equans Housing Services Contract for up to 3 years from April 2024 to April 2027, for the provision of the housing operations repairs and maintenance service, should stand.



## **Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 7 September 2023**

**Present:**

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

**Also present:**

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Finance and Resources  
Representatives of ACORN  
Representative of Debt Justice

**Apologies:** Councillors Andrews, Evans, Kirkpatrick and Rowles

#### **RGSC/23/47            Urgent business**

In opening the meeting, the Chair informed the committee that there was one item of urgent business relating to the recent issuing of a Section 114 notice by Birmingham City Council.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that, whilst she could not comment on the individual circumstances, she hoped this announcement would not detract from the challenges and pressures faced by local authorities. The impact of funding reductions and inflation had significantly impacted many authorities and she explained that a Budget Monitoring report would be considered by the Executive later in the month which highlighted an in-year overspend which was largely driven by pressures in the social care sector, for which the Council was looking at mitigation measures.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer assured the committee that Manchester City Council was relatively financially resilient due to previous decisions and was not anticipating having to issue a Section 114 notice.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources commended the current City Treasurer and her predecessor. He stated that successive Conservative governments had underinvested in local government funding, which disproportionately impacted Manchester. He called on the government to review the local government funding formula and to end the use of 1-year funding settlements.

#### **RGSC/23/48            Minutes**

Members received and considered the minutes of the previous meeting. A query was raised under minute number RGSC/23/43 regarding whether a report on further financing requests for Aviva Studios would be considered by the committee. The

Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer advised that the Capital Monitoring report would be considered by Executive later in the month and further detail on this was included in the report. A further report would be submitted to Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee once the final account was available.

In response to a query regarding whether some of the points raised during the discussion of Part B items could be included in the minutes, the Deputy City Solicitor stated that he would advise the member on this outside of the meeting.

**Decision:**

That

1. the minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2023 be approved as a correct record, and
2. the minutes of the meeting held on 24 August 2023 be approved as a correct record.

**RGSC/23/49                      Changes to Council Tax Support Scheme from April 2024**

The committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which proposed changes to the Council Tax Support Scheme (CTSS) to ensure that the scheme remains fit for purpose in response to cost-of-living challenges and the transition of most working age residents in receipt of welfare benefits onto Universal Credit.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- The proposed CTSS would pay up to 85% of the Council Tax bill, leaving 15% to pay, compared to the current CTSS which paid up to 82.5% of the Council Tax bill leaving 17.5% to pay;
- It was also proposed to extend the CTS backdating period for working-age and pension-age claims from six-months to 12-months;
- The background to council tax and previous CTS schemes in Manchester;
- The options for consideration;
- Consultation would be undertaken with precepting authorities and residents; and
- Key policies and considerations.

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

- Expressing broad support for the proposals;
- How the Council helped those ineligible for CTS; and
- What evidence there was to suggest that most CTS cases did not need backdating for the full six months to award the additional eligible period of CTS.

The Head of Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services explained that the CTSS provided support to residents on low income by reducing the amount of council tax they were required to pay. The proposed changes would apply from April 2024 and a thorough consultation exercise would be undertaken with the outcomes and final proposals reported back to the committee in January 2024.

In response to queries, the Head of Corporate Assessments explained that there were a number of discretionary schemes in place for those residents who were not eligible for the CTSS, such as the Discretionary Council Tax Payments scheme which allowed a greater level of scope for individuals who may require assistance. He stated that the Discretionary Housing Payments scheme could also be used to address other financial pressures, although it was noted that recipients of this scheme must be in receipt of Housing Benefit or Universal Credit. There was also the Welfare Provision scheme and the Household Support Fund 4 and the Council remained open to finding the best response to individual circumstances where possible.

The Head of Corporate Assessments stated that an underlying entitlement to the CTS benefit would be required for the Council to consider backdating. The proposed change would give additional flexibility to provide the maximum amount of support to households who struggled to make a claim for CTS at the point they needed it.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources stated that the cost-of-living crisis remained a serious issue for many residents and the proposed changes to the CTSS would fulfil the Council's commitment to support those residents most in need.

### **Decision:**

That the committee

1. notes the report, and
2. notes that the outcome of the consultation will be reported back to the committee and for approval by the Executive and Full Council in January 2024.

### **RGSC/23/50            Update from the Revenues and Benefits Unit**

The committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which provided an update on the activity of the Revenues and Benefits Unit since March 2023, including final details of recently completed Covid schemes and ongoing cost of living schemes delivered by the service.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Benefits administration, including Council Tax Support and the management of the Welfare Provision Scheme and other discretionary schemes;
- The financial support provided by the Household Support Fund scheme;
- The financial support provided by the Council Tax Support Fund;
- The financial support provided by the Energy Bills Support Scheme Alternative Funding programme;
- The financial support provided by the Alternative Fuel Payment Alternative Funding scheme;
- Performance in the collection of council tax and how we balance collection, whilst working in an ethical way and supporting those residents on a low income; and
- Performance in the collection of business rates in the 2022/23 financial year and between 1 April and 31 July of the 2023/24 financial year.

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

- Welcoming the report;
- Querying whether any extra and more innovative communications could be used to highlight the support available and to reiterate that contacting the Council would not have a detrimental impact on a resident's case;
- Suggesting that Appendix 4 could be shared with members and advice agencies for distribution in their communities;
- The purpose of passing cases with a debt less than £150 to Enforcement Agents given that these cases are returned without an in-person visit;
- Whether there was a legal requirement to ask residents to pay their entire council tax bill in full if they missed one payment;
- How effective the Council was in receiving council tax debts in cases passed to Enforcement Agents;
- How a holistic approach was undertaken;
- Noting that Enforcement Agents were not used in 1 in 7 cases where a resident was vulnerable and/or qualified for CTSS and querying why this could not be rolled out fully;
- Noting the low take-up level of the Energy Bill Support Scheme Alternative Funding;
- The real cost to residents of using Enforcement Agents; and
- Whether the Council was currently involved in any government pilot schemes.

The Head of Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services explained that the report set out the significant work undertaken by the Revenues and Benefits Unit since the last update to the committee in March 2023 and detailed the continued delivery of core functions and services and the role played in providing critical financial support to residents and businesses through local and government grants and schemes. He stated that the Unit would continue to ensure that any available funding had the best impact for residents and communities.

In response to a question around effective communications, the Head of Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services stated that work was ongoing with colleagues in the Communications team to identify new ways to engage with residents. He advised that a working group had been established to undertake a review of council tax correspondence in response to representations by ACORN. It was also stated that there had been a significant reduction in call waiting times in recent months.

The Head of Corporate Revenues explained that cases with a debt less than £150 were passed to Enforcement Agents in an attempt to recover the debt without Enforcement Agents needing to visit a property, and this minimised the fee charged to residents. This was an automated process with no cost incurred by the Council. In circumstances where this would not be possible, the case would be returned for the Council to identify alternative methods to recover the debt.

It was further explained that when a payment is missed, the resident would receive a reminder and would only be required to pay their council tax bill for the year in full if this reminder was ignored. It was reiterated that, if a resident contacted the Council to advise that they were unable to pay the missed payment, officers could implement a payment plan to spread the cost over the year. A case would only be passed to Enforcement Agents if non-payment continued and a Liability Order was obtained from the Magistrates Court.

In response to a question regarding the efficacy of using Enforcement Agents to collect money owed, the Head of Corporate Revenues stated that around 14% of cases passed to Enforcement Agents resulted in the recovery of money and he recognised that Manchester was a deprived area compared to areas where Enforcement Agents were likely to collect a higher level of money owed. He stated that these were cases where the ratepayer had not engaged with the Council and where the Council did not have additional information to support their case, or the recovery of money owed and so there was no alternative means to retrieve the debt.

With regards to the holistic approach taken by the Revenues and Benefits Unit, the committee was advised that officers identify the most appropriate method for recovery based on the information they have. The Head of Corporate Revenues explained that the Council's role was to maximise the collection of council tax which required implementing sustainable arrangements. He stated that there were flexibilities to make it easier for residents to pay their council tax, such as providing breathing spaces and improving access to the Discretionary Council Tax Payment scheme.

The Head of Corporate Revenues advised that Enforcement Agents were not used to collect missed payments where the ratepayer is on the maximum level of CTS. These residents would be sent reminders to pay but were not issued with a summons and were not pursued further if payments continued to be missed.

In response to a query regarding the low take-up level of the Energy Bill Support Scheme, the Head of Corporate Assessments stated that Manchester achieved the greatest level of spend through the Energy Bills Support Scheme Alternative Funding programme than other GM authorities which responded to officers' enquiries. He stated that the Council had done all it could to communicate about and encourage take-up of the schemes. This was a government scheme for which Manchester was responsible for issuing payments to eligible applications received through the government portal. Other local authorities had advised that take-up of the Alternative Fuel Payment Alternative Funding scheme was higher in rural areas.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer emphasised the need for the government to design funding schemes collaboratively with local authorities.

The committee was further advised that Enforcement Agent fees were prescribed by the government and that there were 3 basic charges which included a £75 fee for passing a case to Enforcement Agents to collect through phone calls and letters, a £235 fee for home visits and a £110 fee for the removal of goods from a property, although this was a rare occurrence. The Head of Corporate Revenues endeavoured to provide an addendum to the report to detail these charges further.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer confirmed that the Council was involved in the Greater Manchester 100% of Business Rates pilot scheme, which allowed the Council to retain 99% of business rates growth over the baseline. This pilot scheme had been extended and discussions were underway with the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) to extend by a further 10 years as part of the Devolution Trailblazer.

The Chair invited representatives from ACORN and Debt Justice to provide representations to the committee. They called on the committee to recommend that the Council ends the use of Enforcement Agents to collect council tax arrears and highlighted issues around mental health, the need for a more approachable method of collection and the importance of better engagement with residents. A representative of ACORN stated that the organisation agreed with the need to collect council tax to fund key services but expressed a need to be mindful of the human cost of using Enforcement Agents.

In response to these representations, officers stated that they could not comment on individual cases included in ACORN's appendix but provided assurances that the Enforcement Agent sector had positively changed in the years since these cases. Members were also advised that Enforcement Agents would not be sent where a payment was two days late nor would a resident be taken to court without being informed. It was also stated that there were few complaints made regarding the conduct of Enforcement Agents and that thorough training was provided for those in the role.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources commended the work and performance of the Revenues and Benefits Unit. He recognised the empathetic approach of officers in helping residents. He thanked the guests for their attendance and contributions. He explained that the use of Enforcement Agents had decreased in past years but that the Council would lose £2.3million if it ended this practice.

**Decision:**

That the committee

1. notes the report, and
2. requests that officers, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Resources, undertake a feasibility study into ending the use of Enforcement Agents.

**RGSC/23/51            Automation and Artificial Intelligence**

The committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which established the Council's current position on and plans for automation and artificial intelligence (AI) and defined the different terminologies that often get grouped into this.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- An introduction written by artificial intelligence software, ChatGPT;
- The benefits of automation for the Council;
- Types of automation;
- Opportunities and risks from the ongoing development of AI; and
- Future ambitions for automation and AI and next steps.

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

- Noting the evolving nature of AI and automation;
- The impact of AI and automation on the workforce, and whether staff are consulted on proposed changes;
- Whether there were any real examples of AI being used to drive efficiencies and to streamline processes;
- Requesting that future reports include case studies;
- The need to implement new technologies appropriately so as not to alienate residents;
- How the use of AI and automation would change job roles;
- Whether an ethical approach would be taken to implementation of AI;
- Issues around intellectual property rights;
- Recommending that this be a standing item for discussion at Joint Consultative Committee (JCC) meetings; and

- Noting that Google Meet allowed AI personas to attend virtual meetings, and querying whether this would be rolled out within the Council.

In introducing the item, the Director of ICT recognised the growing profile of AI and automation within the news and explained that the Council had been using some established automation software for a substantial period of time.

In response to members' questions, the Director of ICT concurred that AI and automation was a fast-moving issue. Members were interested to note that some job applications received by the Council appeared to be written by AI and new technologies were being developed to identify what had been created through AI. Briefing sessions on new technologies would be arranged for members later in the year.

The Director of ICT acknowledged the importance of engaging with the workforce and unions. He noted that engagement had been undertaken previously where new systems or technologies were implemented and that a report had been requested by the JCC on the impacts of AI and automation.

With regards to real examples of AI in use, the committee was informed of two pilots regarding issuing blue badges and reconciliation of earnings which were being designed. A further report on these pilots could be provided to the committee at a later date.

The need to create guidance on how the Council will use AI and automation was highlighted to ensure the right processes and procedures were in place. The impact of AI and automation in changing job roles was acknowledged as more technologies were adopted and would provide greater flexibility for staff to work on other tasks.

In response to a query around intellectual property rights, the Director of ICT explained that legislation and regulations on this were awaited from the government, but the Council would put its own guidance in place.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer highlighted the potential of AI but stated that the Council was still in the early stages of implementing this. She explained that work was underway between ICT, Communications, Legal and Policy to create a stronger framework for the AI and automation agenda and there was a lot of work being undertaken across Greater Manchester, which the Council could draw expertise from.

The Director of ICT informed members that Microsoft Teams would be launching a similar AI persona technology to Google Meet and that the Council would assess where it could be suitable to use this.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources reiterated how this technology was fast-moving and stated that the next steps listed in the report were appropriate.



**Decision:**

That the committee

1. notes the report, and
2. recommends that, through the JCC, the workforce be consulted on any proposed changes or implementation of AI and automation technologies.

**RGSC/23/52          Resident and Business Digital Experience Programme  
(RBDxP) Progress Update**

The committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which provided an update on the Resident and Business Digital Experience Programme (RBDxP), the Programme's approach to user engagement and progress made in the procurement of new technology to replace the Council's existing Customer Relationship Management (CRM) System, eForms and integration technology.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background to RBDxP;
- Recent progress made;
- The approach to procurement of a new Digital Platform;
- The approach to implementation;
- Timescales;
- Priorities and next steps for the Programme; and
- Improvement activities in the Revenues and Benefits Unit.

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

- Seeking assurances that the Council's Public Services Network (PSN) was robust;
- How those residents who were digitally excluded or who did not contact the Council digitally would be consulted with;
- Noting that young people can also experience digital exclusion;
- The timescales for implementation of the new CRM system;
- Whether the new CRM system would allow photo uploads;
- How a non-resident could report an issue through the CRM system;
- The possible impact of decommissioning the previous CRM system without all current functionality being delivered; and
- Whether emails would remain a channel for communication.

The Head of Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services explained that RBDxP was a key workstream under the Council's Future Shape programme, which sought to replace the current CRM system, integration technology and website with an

integrated digital platform which worked collaboratively for the benefit of residents, members and businesses when interacting with the Council. He highlighted the extensive engagement which had taken place with residents, community groups, businesses and members to ensure these new systems meet their needs and expectations. He stated that a series of user personas had been developed and would be at the heart of the system design to overcome any barriers and challenges users currently faced when interacting with Council services.

In response to queries, the Head of Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services stated that retaining PSN-compliance was a priority for the programme and this was largely the driving factor behind the deadline to replace the current CRM system by February 2024. He explained that significant work around form build and design had been undertaken and that further progress could be made now that Verint had been appointed as the Council's CRM provider.

Regarding the engagement methods, the committee was advised that the programme would not replace technology like-for-like but would improve the experience of and the way that the Council communicated with residents and businesses to allow for a more joined-up experience. The Head of Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services explained that there had been direct engagement with Age Friendly Manchester and a number of public drop-in sessions had been held with the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion team and work had been undertaken with the digital inclusion team. The RBDxP Programme Manager stated that feedback sessions had been held in the Town Hall Extension, Central Library, Longsight and Gorton. Additional forums had been held in Chorlton, Moss Side, Clayton, Piccadilly and the Northern Quarter and a Residents User Group had been established with over 100 members.

The Head of Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services acknowledged an urgency to replace the Council's current CRM system by February 2024 and this would be completed on a like-for-like basis to ensure that the Council remains PSN-compliant. Once implemented like-for-like, there would be a number of phases rolled out over a period of approximately 18-24 months to refine the technology. He noted that any, if possible, 'quick wins' such as photo uploads would be implemented by February 2024 if feasible.

Assurances were also provided that services would be designed to be quick and easy to use to allow those with the ability to interact digitally with the Council to do so and to allow greater availability in traditional communication channels, such as telephony services, for those users who require these.

In response to a query regarding how a non-resident could report an issue through the CRM system, the RBDxP Programme Manager explained that a user persona had been created for visitors to encompass the experience and challenges they may face.

The Head of Revenues, Benefits and Customer Services explained that Verint and Mulesoft were leading market providers, and the procurement process was split into three cohorts which enabled integration between the two technologies. Both providers had been informed of the timescales for implementation. He also advised that as the CRM system was a workflow between Customer Services and the relevant department that the query would be directed to, so users would not see much difference from the replacement and should have a seamless experience. Contact centre agents and service areas would be fully trained before February 2024.

Assurances were also provided that processes would be put in place in the event that the system functionalities could not be replaced like-for-like prior to the launch date to ensure that residents and businesses would not be impacted.

It was confirmed that emails would continue to be available as a channel for members to report issues and request services.

**Decision:**

That the report be noted.

**RGSC/23/53                    2024/25 Budget Process**

The committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which on the current position of the Medium-Term Financial Plan and the planned approach to the 2024/25 budget process.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- The current Medium-Term Financial Plan, approved in February 2023;
- The context behind the budget;
- The proposed approach and refresh of the 2024/25 position; and
- Timescales and next steps.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that the government's Autumn Statement would be provided on 22 November 2023 with the Finance Settlement expected in late December.

Members expressed their disappointment that the Council had to prepare in such a manner as a result of the unpredictability of the government to provide adequate funding and to provide this information in a timely manner.

The Deputy City Treasurer commented that the Council was entering a challenging phase with regards to the budget and stated that officers were working to find suitable solutions and hoped to be in a sustainable position.

**Decision:**

That the proposed approach be noted.

**RGSC/23/54          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 and items for information previously requested by the Committee. The report also included the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to amend as appropriate and agree.

**Decision:**

That the report be noted and the work programme agreed.

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

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2023**

#### **Present:**

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

**Apologies:** Councillors Ilyas and Razaq

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment and Transport  
Councillor Foley, Deputy Executive Member for Environment and Transport  
Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Development

### **ECCNSC/23/38      Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 22 June 2023 as a correct record.

### **ECCNSC/23/39      Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan – Quarter 1 Update Report**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update and overview of progress made in delivering the Council's refreshed CCAP during Quarter 1 2023-24 (April – June 2023).

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Key messages from the Quarter 1 Progress Report, noting that since 2020 the Council had remained within its carbon budget each year and the Quarter 1 report showed continued progress was being made with the Council on track to meet its 2025 target;
- Information in relation to CO2 Emissions, reporting that the Council had used 88.5% of its 2022-23 carbon budget during the year (April 2022 – March 2023) and was therefore on track to remain within its carbon budget for this year; and
- Key achievements.

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

- Noting that the current Climate Change Action Plan ran until 2025, and asking had the worked commenced to plan for beyond April 2025;
- Clarification was sought as to the carbon budget;
- Further information was requested on the project delivered in partnership with Wenta and how this was promoted to small businesses;

- More information was sought on the Refill Scheme, commenting that water filling stations needed to be provided to support this scheme, especially in those areas of high footfall; and
- An update was sought on the actions in relation to Clean Air.

The Zero Carbon Manager stated that the carbon budget that had been set for the city was a science-based budget and had been calculated by the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research. She described that the Council's biggest source of carbon emissions were related to the estate and that a lot of work had been done to address this, adding this activity had been regularly reported to the Committee. She acknowledged that reducing carbon emissions going forward in future years would be a challenge and the team were constantly reviewing progress against this work. She further commented on the reliance on grant funding which was often piecemeal to deliver this important programme. She commented that all opportunities to access additional funding were explored and work was underway to understand and unblock the barriers to attracting private finance to deliver this work at the scale required.

The Zero Carbon Manager further made reference to the ongoing current national conversation in relation to alternatives to gas. In response to a comment regarding a risk register she advised that all associated projects had a corresponding risk register.

The Zero Carbon Manager advised the Committee that planning work had commenced for the Climate Change Action Plan beyond April 2025 and this would be reported to the Committee at the appropriate time prior to its submission to Executive for formal adoption.

The Zero Carbon Manager advised that she would liaise with the Work and Skills Team to provide information on the Wenta project and this would be circulated following the meeting. In regard to the Refill Scheme, she commented that an exercise was underway to obtain base line data to understand the current provision across the city and to explore all opportunities to increase these.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport described that all opportunities to improve air quality were being utilised, including school streets and the use of green screens. She described that work was ongoing at a Greater Manchester level in relation to clean air and monitoring data was being submitted to the government. The Chair stated that a report on this work would be scheduled for consideration by the Committee.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport stated that regular updates on the range of associated activities were provided to Members via the Zero Carbon Quarterly newsletter that was circulated to all Members. In conclusion she stated that the Council remained committed to the City Council becoming a zero carbon organisation by 2038.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **ECCNSC/23/40      Local Area Energy Plan – Progress Update**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Growth & Development) that described that the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) was the first city region in the country to compile and complete Local Area Energy Plans (LAEP) from street to network level. LAEPs had been produced at both the regional level and also for each of the 10 districts. The Greater Manchester and Manchester LAEP were adopted in September 2022. This report provided Members with an overview of the Manchester LAEP and how this would be used to meet our target to be a zero carbon city by 2038.

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

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Discussion of the opportunities and challenges;
- Priority areas and challenges;
- Discussion of the sphere of influence, noting the council's main role in taking the LAEP forward is that of facilitator and enabler rather than as a main delivery agent;
- Progress to date; and
- Next steps.

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

- Information was sought on the progress to decarbonise the electric national grid;
- The need to lobby government for regulation of the domestic heat network;
- Discussing the national debate regarding the viability of hydrogen as a viable alternative to gas;
- The need to provide information to residents and homeowners to make informed, positive decisions in relation to alternative domestic heating options; and
- Was the data referred to throughout the report open data and available to residents, commenting that these were very informative.

The Chair commented that the Committee would be receiving a substantive update report on the Electric Vehicle Charging Strategy at the next meeting and questions and comments on this subject would be reserved for that meeting. The Committee further noted that an update on the Local Plan would be submitted for consideration at the November meeting.

The Principal Policy Officer stated that lobbying of government continued in relation to regulation of the domestic heat network and that any available information in regard to the decarbonisation of the electricity grid would be provided following the meeting. In response to the discussion regarding hydrogen as a viable alternative fuel for domestic boilers she stated they were alive to the national debate on this issue, commenting that direction from government was required on this issue. The Interim Head of Infrastructure and Environment commented that in the absence of any direction from government a position would need to be adopted locally.

The Principal Policy Officer commented that the data that was referenced within the report was available for members of the public to access.

The Strategic Director Development discussed the role of the Council in relation lobbying and influence. She stated that the Council was proactive on a range of issues, drawing down funding wherever possible to help resource the Council's response to the LAEP, and made reference to the work in relation to housing retrofit and Electric Vehicle Charging. She stated that the LAEP would assist with highlighting priorities for the Council to focus a response.

The Chair requested that any future update report included consideration and data in relation to demand management and energy generation when discussing the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport stated that the Local Area Energy Plan provided an evidence-based tool on which to continue to lobby government. She stated that reflection and review of this area of activity was regularly undertaken and conversations with other cities were convened to share learning and experience.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **ECCNSC/23/41      Integrated Water Management**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Licensing and Building Control that provided a summary of the Council's approach to slowing water flow and water capture, with a particular focus on nature-based solutions and consideration of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Information on the outcomes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Task and Finish Report on Integrated Water Management that was presented to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) in May 2023;
- Describing the draft Integrated Water Management Plan; and
- Discussion of nature based solutions.

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

- There was little or no reference within the report to the canal network, recognising the complexities relating to the diverse ownership;
- What was the approach to Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS);
- What was the approach taken to new developments to ensure they were sustainable and how was this monitored and enforced;
- The need to communicate to residents the risks of flooding and mitigating actions that could be taken, in particular in regard to paving over green space; and
- The need for developers to consider water capture and storage.



The Director of Planning, Licensing and Building Control stated that she had welcomed the work of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Task and Finish Report on Integrated Water Management for raising the profile of this important issue. She stated that canals were included in the open space audit and were included in the green and blue infrastructure strategy and action plan. She acknowledged the challenge of waterways and the need to engage with all relevant partners, neighbouring authorities and those beyond Greater Manchester on the issue of waterway management and she made reference to the Greater Manchester Integrated Water Management Plan that was currently subject to consultation.

The Director of Planning, Licensing and Building Control stated that SuDS would be included in Local Plan and stated that it was anticipated that these would be mandatory from 2024. She commented that in anticipation of this, dialogue and work was currently underway locally with developers on this issue and colleagues in the Highways Department had produced guidance for developers.

The Director of Planning, Licensing and Building Control commented that flood zones were mapped across the city and this intelligence informed how all proposed developments were assessed. She commented that the Local Plan would strengthen the control in regard to sustainable development standards, however pending finalisation and adoption of the Local Plan proactive dialogue and conversations were undertaken with developers to push for sustainable buildings, including discussions on water capture and storage.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport acknowledged the importance of communications with residents on the issue of flooding and the promotion of actions that residents could take to mitigate risk. She stated that this would be included in the city-wide communication programmes.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

[Councillor Shilton Godwin declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest as she chaired the Overview and Scrutiny Committee Task and Finish Report on Integrated Water Management.]

## **ECCNSC/23/42      Update on the Manchester Biodiversity Strategy and the Open Space Study**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Licensing and Building Control that provided an update on delivery of the Biodiversity Strategy that was endorsed by Executive in October 2022.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Describing the objectives of the Biodiversity Strategy; and
- Information on the findings of the open space audit that would inform the development of the emerging Local Plan.

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

- The need to communicate to residents those areas of land designated to be areas for meadows and wildflowers, as the perception was often that the Council had failed to cut the grass;
- Enquiring where the 344 sites referred to in Recommendation 3 being rated as below quality and/or value thresholds were;
- Would the Local Plan increase biodiversity;
- The need to ensure green space was maintained, including those associated with the highways network;
- Noting that the focus of the study referred to was on sites with public access that were larger than 0.2 hectares and the need to acknowledge the importance of smaller green spaces, especially in the city centre;
- Recognising the importance of access to quality green space for residents;
- Noting the impact of the urban heat island effect.

The Director of Planning, Licensing and Building Control acknowledged the comment regarding the importance of communicating with residents the approach to meadows and wildflowers and stated that she would discuss this further with the relevant Executive Member. She said that an exercise was underway to provide a visual aid that mapped the 344 sites referred to in Recommendation 3. She stated that the Local Plan would make it mandatory for 10% increase in biodiversity associated with all new developments and this would be regulated through the establishment of long-term management plans to be formalised through legal agreements and conditions.

In response to a specific question regarding the location of the Tiny Forest and data relating to training referred to in the report that had been delivered by partners and the cohorts of people involved she advised that she would follow that up outside of the meeting.

The Director of Planning, Licensing and Building Control noted and agreed with the comment made regarding the importance of smaller green spaces. She advised that the ambition was to increase Sites of Biological Importance and there was a pipeline of work at pace to increase the number of nature reserves across the city.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport responded to a comment from a Member regarding the communication with Councillors regarding events by stating that this would have been done using the usual channels.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development reiterated the importance of accessibility to quality green space to local residents and stated that he welcomed the introduction of the Local Plan as means to increase biodiversity and mitigate issues such as the urban heat island effect.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport acknowledged the discussion regarding grass cutting, meadows and the use of verges to promote and encourage biodiversity and encouraged Members to pursue this with their respective Neighbourhood Teams. She concluded by thanking all of the officers involved in this important area of work and acknowledged the importance of this work for the city.

She stated that this work had been recognised nationally as a model of good practice.

**Decision**

To note the report.

[Councillor Weist declared a personal and non-pecuniary interest as she had previously been an employee of Groundwork.]

**ECCNSC/23/43      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.



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

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2023**

#### **Present:**

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

**Apologies:** Councillor Razaq

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment and Transport  
Councillor Igbon, Executive Member for Vibrant Neighbourhoods  
Councillor Ahmed Ali, Deputy Executive Member for Vibrant Neighbourhoods  
Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Development  
Councillor Hacking, Executive Member for Employment, Skills and Leisure  
Matt Roberts, Strategic Director, Property and Development, Southway Housing Trust

#### **ECCNSC/23/44 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2023 as a correct record.

#### **ECCNSC/23/45 Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan 2022/23 Annual Report**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that presented the third Annual Report of the Manchester City Council Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) 2020-25.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Noting that this report brought together updates to the Committee provided over the last 12 months (April 22 – March 23) into a single report and highlighted progress made during this time against the CCAP Work Plan 2022-23 as well as progress made on the Council's direct carbon emissions;
- Key messages;
- Key achievements; and
- Summary and next steps.

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

- Further information was sought regarding the reported sustainable practices within Highways;

- Recognising the significant challenges post 2025 to continue delivering on this important work and deliver the stated ambition for the organisation to become zero carbon by 2038 at the latest;
- Request that comparative data and analysis of the communications strategy was needed to understand the impact on behaviour change, recognising that this could be difficult to quantify and report;
- Analysis as to the impact of the poster and billboard campaigns was requested;
- Commenting that Active Travel schemes needed to be coordinated and linked up with neighbouring authority schemes to deliver connectivity across the city region;
- A request for information on the next round of tree planting; and
- Commenting on the need to decarbonise the national electricity grid.

The Principal Resources and Programmes Officer, Zero Carbon Team informed the Committee that Scope 3 emissions associated with Highways (Scope 3 encompasses emissions that are not produced by the company itself and were not the result of activities from assets owned or controlled by them, but by those that it's indirectly responsible for up and down its value chain) were not accounted in the carbon budget. The Chair commented that responsibility for Highways sat within the remit of the Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee and that she would speak with the Chair to discuss bringing a report on this area of activity to that Committee.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer acknowledged the discussion regarding communications campaigns and informed the Committee that a substantive report was scheduled for consideration at the December meeting. Similarly, a report on a Power Purchase Agreement was listed for the November meeting. The Chair referred to a comment made regarding young people and climate change and advised that this had been considered recently by the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee and asked that the Scrutiny Support Officer circulate the report that had been considered to all Committee members for information.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer noted the comments regarding Active Travel and commented that the next stage of planning around this activity would include consideration of joining up schemes as part of wider infrastructure planning considerations. She further commented that she shared Members' disappointment in relation to national policy towards decarbonisation of the national electricity grid.

The Zero Carbon Manager advised the Committee that discussions and planning were ongoing regarding establishing an action plan post 2025, acknowledging the comment from a Member regarding the importance of adaptation and resilience as part of these discussions.

The Zero Carbon Manager further responded to questions regarding resident engagement by advising that a report on Neighbourhood Teams Engagement with Residents was scheduled for consideration at the December meeting.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport stated that work across Greater Manchester was ongoing in relation to Active Travel and expressed her

frustration that funding to deliver such schemes was piecemeal and inadequate to deliver the ambitions of the city region, however lobbying of government would continue on this subject. She advised that a report on the Manchester Active Travel Strategy and Investment Plan was scheduled for the November meeting, and she further acknowledged the comment made regarding the need to promote diversity when encouraging cycling.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport informed the Committee that a report on the Tree and Woodland Action Plan was listed for consideration at the November meeting, adding that Members were informed via the regular Member communication channels when any planting of trees in their ward was scheduled.

The Chair concluded this item of business by acknowledging the work delivered by all the officers working in this area of activity and paid tribute to their continued dedication to this important work.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **ECCNSC/23/46 Street Cleansing Programme and Campaigns Update**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) that provided an update on street cleansing services and the Keep Manchester Tidy programme. Describing how the activity contributes to protecting the environment, climate change agenda and key priorities for future.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Information regarding cleansing standards;
- Information relating to the street cleansing contract;
- An update on the additional investment in waste collection and street cleansing services;
- Improvements to the street cleansing model;
- Street cleansing performance;
- Information on education, awareness and engaging local communities;
- Trials and innovations to tackle all forms of littering; and
- Priorities for 2023/24.

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

- Information was requested on the criteria and definitions of the cleansing standards;
- Information was sought as to the location of the additional (200) litter bins secured through the investment to deliver service improvements;
- The challenge presented by different landowners across the city to apply consistent cleansing standards;
- How did activities associated with building works and construction impact on Biffa and service delivery;

- How could Members engage with, and seek to influence Keep Manchester Tidy campaigns; and
- The importance of maintaining cleaning standards in cycle lanes to ensure they remained safe for users.

The Contract Manager, Waste acknowledged the comments and requests from Members around the issue of standards and their application and monitoring; information on the steam cleaning trials in district centres; approach to cycle lane cleansing and suggested that he prepared a detailed briefing note to be circulated following the meeting. He further extended an invitation to Members to accompany officers when undertaking inspections.

The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling & Street Cleansing Team advised that the trials relating to litter bins waste storage containers, measures to target harden infrastructure and the additional bins were initially in the city centre, and consideration would be given as to other appropriate locations. Investment had been agreed to replace litter bin infrastructure citywide. She further commented that they worked closely with different landowners to influence improvements and that they worked with Biffa to reduce the escape of detritus when bins were emptied.

The Project Officer advised that Keep Manchester Tidy campaigns were fast paced projects and acknowledged that timely communications with Members on these activities needed to be strengthened. She discussed the campaign delivered on the issue of discarded chewing gum, commenting that this had been delivered in partnership with City Co and the Universities. She added that consideration was being given as to how this campaign could be rolled out wider across the city.

The Executive Member for Vibrant Neighbourhoods addressed comments made regarding comparative data across different wards and expressed caution as it was important to acknowledge that different wards and localities presented different opportunities and challenges. She informed Members that the autumn street cleansing programme would be communicated to all Members via the usual communication channels. She further commented that Members should liaise with their respective Neighbourhood Teams about local Keep Manchester Tidy projects. Noting a comment from the Chair regarding the importance of maintaining standards and leaf removal from cycle lanes she stated that if there were specific locations of concern that Members contact the relevant officers so these could be addressed.

The Chair concluded this item of business by acknowledging the work delivered by all the officers working in this area of activity.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **ECCNSC/23/47      Housing Retrofit**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director, Growth and Development that provided an update on the Council's proposals to decarbonise the city's housing, incorporating an update on Green Skills.



Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background to the subject area;
- Discussion of the approach to Social Housing, including Council owned properties;
- Consideration of Private Sector Housing;
- Consideration of the approach to cross tenure housing and area based schemes;
- Engagement activity;
- Skills, including the Greater Manchester approach;
- Funding considerations;
- The importance of partnership working;
- Discussion of internal staff resources;
- Information on developing a Retrofit Plan document; and
- Conclusion.

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

- Calling for continued lobbying of the government for the decarbonisation of the national grid;
- Calling for continued lobbying of the government for adequate financial resources to deliver the scale of retrofitting required across the city region, particularly to address the barriers experienced in the private rented sector;
- The need to regulate heat networks to protect residents from unreasonable price hikes in their energy;
- Were there any pilot schemes that individual tenants, keen to adopt new technologies and alternatives to address climate change could access;
- What work was being done with property managing agents and leaseholders to support and allow tenants / occupiers to install new technologies such as solar panels etc;

The Committee heard from Matt Roberts, Strategic Director, Property and Development, Southway Housing Trust who delivered a presentation that discussed the Arrowfield Low Carbon Communities Project. He informed the Committee that Southway had pledged to become a zero-carbon organisation by 2038, following Greater Manchester's climate emergency declaration. Switching from gas to electricity was one way to reduce carbon emissions and tackle climate change. The Low Carbon Living Project was helping Southway's tenants on the Arrowfield estate switch to cleaner, greener, and cheaper energy to heat their homes.

Mr Roberts explained that many of the heating systems in the homes on the Arrowfield estate were old and needed replacing. The government will be banning gas boilers in new properties in 2025, so replacing like for like would not be appropriate. Therefore, Southway had decided to invest in heating and hot water systems that did not use gas. The old gas systems would be replaced with new 'air source heat pump' technology that only used electricity. In addition, other energy saving projects would be carried out at the same time, such as improved loft and cavity wall insulation. These improvements could reduce households' carbon footprint by as much as 50%.

There were nearly 400 properties on the Arrowfield estate, making it one of Southway's biggest neighbourhoods. Therefore, the Low Carbon Living Project would make a significant impact on Southway achieving its zero-carbon ambitions.

He advised the committee of the challenges experienced when delivering this project and the lessons learnt. He said that it was important to engage with the District Network Operator at the earliest opportunity and emphasised the importance of meaningful, ongoing resident engagement. He also stated that issues and delays had arisen when seeking relevant planning permissions that had not been anticipated. The Chair thanked Mr Roberts for attending the meeting and sharing the experience of Southway Housing Trust. She commented that the learning from delivering this project should be shared across all housing providers at an appropriate time. In response to a question from the Chair, the Executive Member for Housing and Development confirmed that he would facilitate meetings and dialogue between the planning department and Southway Housing Trust.

The Executive Member for Employment, Skills and Leisure provided an update on the developments across the education and training sector, referenced at sections 7 and 8 of the report. The Committee noted the importance of green skills and training and welcomed the update. The Chair advised the Committee that Skills Development sat within the remit of the Economy and Regeneration Scrutiny Committee.

The Zero Carbon Programme Manager addressed the issue of the private rented sector and commented that this was a very challenging sector to engage with. She stated that all opportunities and levers were used to engage with private landlords on this subject.

In response to the specific questions relating to individual tenants and pilot schemes and the issue of managing agents, officers advised that they would follow this up outside of the meeting and contact the Member directly.

The Head of Strategic Housing acknowledged the comment and concern regarding the Heat Network and advised that the Council managed and controlled this system.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport advised that the Climate Change Partnership continued to lobby the government for appropriate levels of funding to deliver the scale of work required across the city region, adding that historically funding had been piecemeal that had to be bid for.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **ECCNSC/23/48      Electric Vehicle Charging Strategy**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director, Growth and Development that provided an update on progress following the adoption of the Manchester Electric Vehicle Charging (EV) Strategy.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background to the topic,
- Discussion of the main challenges;
- Information in relation to Public Charging Network;
- The Public EV Procurement Process;
- The approach to support the move towards a cleaner taxi fleet;
- Consideration of the requirements for the installation of EV charge points as part of both new build developments and change of use developments;
- Consideration of the council's own vehicle fleet; and
- Consideration of on-street charging, noting that this presented particular challenges, especially in residential areas with informal parking arrangements such as terraced streets.

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

- Articulating the request from residents for additional on-street EV charging points, especially in high density areas such as the city centre, and reflecting the proportion of areas in the city there is no or little off-street parking
- Additional information was requested on the data and information that had been used to inform the report;
- Suggesting increased access for the public to charging points by working with employers who provide EVs on their sites and owned land;
- The need to consider all viable options and opportunities to deliver on-street EV charging to give residents confidence to change to an electric vehicle; and
- Need and demand for EV charging across the whole of the city needed to be considered.

The Principal Policy Officer informed the Committee that a draft list of locations (over 40 in total) had been developed and internal agreement was currently being sought for these locations to supply, install, manage and operate a scheme of up to 200 connectors (100 dual headed chargepoints) to be installed over a two year period. The locations were geographically spread across the city to ensure that chargepoints would be accessible to as many residents as possible. She said that the Members would have sight of these locations prior to a go-live date, however at this time it was not possible to share more widely as these were subject to change and not finalised. She advised that consideration was given to maximising all opportunities using Council owned land and appropriate consideration was given to developments in battery technology.

The Principal Policy Officer discussed the issue of the use of lamp posts to deliver EV charging on- street. She stated this was not considered as a viable option due to a number of factors, including the position of lampposts at the rear of pavements; capacity within the existing grid, adding that lampposts would only offer a very slow charge time; costs associated with additional necessary highways works to deliver that type of EV charging facility.

The Interim Head of Infrastructure and Environment commented that Manchester continued to discuss and learn from other authorities on this issue.

The Executive Member for Environment and Transport commented that Manchester was constrained due to the inadequate funding from government to progress this work. She said that despite this all opportunities were explored to support residents transition to electric vehicles. She proposed to review the strategy as it was clear that members felt that it needed to demonstrate more ambition. She further stated that this programme of work needed to be considered in the wider strategic context of citywide travel including via public transport and active travel.

### **Decision**

The Committee recommend that a review of the Electric Vehicle Charging Strategy be undertaken in due course to more rapidly increase the proportion of residents able to change to an electric vehicle with confidence.

### **ECCNSC/23/49      Overview Report**

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

The Committee requested an update report on Housing Retrofit and an update on the delivery of the Electric Vehicle Charging Strategy be included on the Committee's Work Programme for consideration at an appropriate time.

### **Decision**

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

## **Audit Committee**

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

#### **Present:**

Councillor Lanchbury - In the Chair  
Councillors Curley, Kilpatrick, Noor, and Stogia

Independent Co-opted member: Dr S Downs

**Apologies:** Councillor Simcock, Dr D Barker

#### **Also Present:**

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Finance and Resources  
Karen Murray, Mazars (External Auditor)  
Alastair Newall (External Auditor)

### **AC/23/15 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2023 as a correct record.

### **AC/23/16 External Audit of Accounts 2020/21**

The Committee received a report of the External Auditors (Mazars)

The report provided:

- An Executive Summary
- A summary of the audit's overall status
- An overview of the audit approach
- A discussion of findings of significance
- A list of Internal Control recommendations
- A summary of misstatements; and
- Information about Value for Money arrangements

Karen Murray introduced the report and explained that essentially the report was an update to the information Mazars had previously discussed in their report to the Audit Committee in July 2022 in which reference had been made to outstanding information on the consolidation of Group Accounts as well as infrastructure arrangements.

Ms Murray highlighted the information about amendments to infrastructure that had not been made. It was confirmed that, in line with the recent statutory override, the Council's accounting policies had been changed and whilst those impact had been calculated it had been subsequently determined that the impact of those changes were immaterial to the overall infrastructure value and the decision had been made not amend. The Committee endorsed this approach.

Changes were also highlighted in respect of consolidation adjustments to the Group accounts.

Ms Murray gave emphasis to the report containing no new recommendations regarding internal control and that the management responses that were previously provided were extant. She also outlined next steps in terms of the issue of the associated audit report, completion of which was described to be imminent.

The Committee conveyed its thanks to Ms Murray and her team at Mazars as well the Council's Finance team for the work undertaken to oversee completion in a particular challenging landscape.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **AC/23/17 Final Statement of Accounts 2020/21**

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that updated Members on the final 2020/21 accounts and associated amendments. The accounts had been updated from those reported to the 26 July 2022 Committee to take account of any changes that had arisen since that time and referred to national accounting changes to the reporting of infrastructure assets that had delayed the final audit of the accounts and had affected all Councils.

In addition to the background and introduction, the report included:

- A summary of the amended accounts including changes to the Main Accounting Statements since the July 2022 updated accounts
- An overview of unadjusted errors
- An outline of next steps

The Committee was asked to

- To note amendments to the annual accounts as detailed at Appendix 1.
- To agree the proposal not to amend the annual accounts in respect of a recalculation, on the basis that the value had been deemed immaterial.

The Deputy City Treasurer introduced the report with reference to earlier submissions to the Committee. He also outlined the timescale for progression of the finalisation of the 2021/22 Annual Accounts and the commencement of audit work on 2022/23 Annual Accounts.

The Committee conveyed its thanks to the Finance team and agreed the recommendations.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

**AC/23/18 Capital Outturn 2022/23**

The Committee received a report of The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which provided confirmation of the final outturn and financing of capital expenditure for 2022/23. The committee was invited to note the information provided in the context of the report concerning the Final Statement of Accounts for 2022/23.

**Decision**

To note the report.

**AC/23/19 Revenue Outturn 2022/23**

The Committee received the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which set out confirmation of the final outturn position of for the Council's revenue budget in 2022/23, which the Committee was asked to consider in the context of the Final Statement of Accounts for 2022/23.

**Decision**

To note the report.

**AC/23/20 Treasury Management Outturn 2022/23**

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which discussed the Council's Treasury Management activities during the financial year 2022/23.

The report included information on:

- The background and context of the report
- The Council's Portfolio Position as at 31st March 2023
- A Review of Economic Conditions 2022-23
- An outline of Treasury Borrowing in 2022-23
- The Investment Strategy for 2022-23
- An overview of Temporary Borrowing and Investment for 2022-23
- The Implications of Rising Interest Rates; and,
- Concluding comments

The Deputy City Treasurer introduced the report and responded to questions about Salix funding, temporary borrowing, the implications of the cost of carry and the Council's reviewing and reporting strategy.

The impact of breaches was also discussed. The Deputy City Treasurer stressed the importance of transparency in this area and explained that these were largely attributable to unscheduled deposits or payments. He also outlined the principles on which the account was managed.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer spoke about the importance of the report's narrative and how this aligned with reports to the Resources and

Governance Scrutiny Committee on the Council's commercial activity. She referred to the recent focus on Local Authority failures in respect of treasury management and / or joint venture activities. She referred to the Office for Local Government's recent consultation on a list of Key Performance Indicators and the role of the Audit Committee and invited comments on future areas of training, skills and information in this area. The Chair indicated that this could be a matter for consideration in the Committee's annual training event in December.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **AC/23/21 Draft Statement of Accounts 2022/23**

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which presented the signed 2022/23 Draft Annual Accounts. The report presented information on the structure of the accounts, highlighted key issues and provided a summary of key accounting statements. The Committee was invited to note that the presently unaudited accounts would be made available for public inspection from 1 August 2023.

In addition and to the report's introduction, the following information was also included:

- The structure of the Annual Accounts
- A discussion of key considerations for the Accounts
- An Accounts Summary with specific reference to Comprehensive Income and Expenditure Statement (CIES), the Balance Sheet, the Collection Fund and Group Accounts
- The timeline of the Annual Accounts process

The Committee listened to a presentation by the Deputy City Treasurer and the Head of Corporate Finance about the progression of the 2022/23 Accounts which discussed:

- The Accounts Timetable
- The context of National Challenges
- DHLUC proposals to clear the audit backlog
- A Summary of Local Challenges
- Improvements
- Key points of consideration in the narrative report
- General Fund Revenue Outturn 2022/23
- Key Variations from Budget 2022/23
- The Housing Revenue Account Outturn 2022/23
- Key aspects of the Capital Outturn 2022/23
- The Comprehensive Income and Expenditure Statement
- Movement in the Reserves
- The Council's Balance Sheet
- Usable Reserves



The Deputy City Treasurer responded to questions about the capital outturn, associated budget adjustments, management of borrowing, the reserves strategy and the impact of pay awards.

The Executive Member for Finance and the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer expressed their thanks to the Finance team in producing the statement in a particularly challenging landscape.

## **Decision**

To note the unaudited Annual Accounts for 2022/23 as signed by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer.

### **AC/23/22 Internal Audit Update – Quarter 1**

The Committee received a report of The Head of Audit and Risk Management which provided an update of the progress on the agreed audit plan and detailed assurance opinions issued in the first Quarter of 2023/24.

In addition to the background and context, the report included:

- An outline of progress and delivery of the Audit Programme
- Audit assurance findings, risks and issues with specific reference to Payment Systems and Processes, Schools Financial Value Standards (SFVS) and Related Parties, Housing Services, Commercial and Contracts, and Climate Change.

The Head of Audit and Risk Management introduced the report with reference to its new format and enhanced focus on key issues arising from audit work and the incorporation of other sources of assurance. He referred to the Council's robust Overview and Scrutiny function which through established reporting arrangements provide assurance on a variety of Council functions.

In response to the new format, a member suggested added clarity could be given in respect of audit reviews and follow up activity.

In response to the report's discussion about a backlog of payments within the Council social care system (Liquid Logic) to providers, it was explained a number of payments had been actioned outside of the system to mitigate cashflow impacts on providers, where indicated. Reference was made to the associated challenge and complexity around payments outside of the establish process was also discussed. The deputy City Treasurer added that a working group had been constituted to review payment processes so that issues are identified and resolved at the earliest possible opportunity.

In respect of controls that are in place for any such transactions valued over £20,000 in the schools sector, the Head of Audit and Risk Management gave emphasis to the role of Governor oversight and challenge, to address concerns over transparency, in particular where payments to family members were found. He outlined a number of

planned actions to support schools in strengthening their governance arrangements.

With regard to the reports discussion about fire risk, the Head of Audit and Risk Management gave assurance that whilst those issues were of concern, he was satisfied that the challenge around identified compliance matters were well understood by managers and that there was a plan in place to address those concerns. He added that the key consideration for him was centred on the tracking and implementation of identified actions to address the issues around fire risk as well as the procedures that are in place to resolve and prevent a recurrence of outstanding works. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer gave assurance that the matter was considered with the highest possible regard and referred to the scope of work being undertaken by colleagues in Housing Operations to resolve a number of legacy issues since returning in-house. She referred to earlier engagement with the Regulator adding that a clear plan had been established with robust oversight from the Housing Improvement Board in terms of implementation. The Committee agreed to a further update on this matter being included in the next scheduled update (Quarter 2) planned for October 2023 with a focus on likely timescales for completion.

Discussions moved to the issue of damp and mould. The Head of Audit and Risk explained that a plan was in place to ensure that the Council remained cognisant of developing regulatory and legislative requirements as well as other requirements for Housing Services, including matters concerning procurement and contracts and that further work around contracts assurance. Further information on this would be brought to a future meeting of this committee.

The Chair asked a question about the aids and adaptations delivery model with regard to assessment, design and implementation. The Head of Audit and Risk Management confirmed that management were seeking to address the delays in service delivery performance and that a number of recommendations had been made arising from the audit.

### **Decision**

1. To note the report.
2. To note the intention to provide a further update on Housing Services findings in the next scheduled update.

### **AC/23/23 Outstanding Audit Recommendations – Quarter 1**

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer This report summarises the implementation position at the end of June 2023

In addition and introduction and background, the report provided a summary of overdue recommendations:

- over 12 months old,
- 6 – 12 months old; and
- 1 – 6 months old

The Head of Audit and Risk Management introduced the report with a particular focus on recommendations around monitoring and reporting of payment processes in Children's services which had been integrated into a new audit in view of ongoing challenges and complexity with foster payments. He gave assurance that a clear line of sight would be implemented to demonstrate progress on historic recommendations.

Reference was also made to outstanding recommendations for Avro Hollows Tenant Management Organisation (TMO) and next steps. The Committee noted that a meeting had been scheduled with the Chair of the Board, the Head of Housing Services and the Head of Audit and Risk to discuss ongoing issues in respect of repairs, governance arrangements and its relationship with the Council. It was clarified that concerns over fire risk and damp or mould were not particular areas of concern for the TMO.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **AC/23/24 Work Programme**

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which set out its future Work Programme for the remainder of 2023/24 municipal year.

### **Decision**

To note the report and approve the work programme.



## **Audit Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 19 September 2023**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Lanchbury - In the Chair  
Councillors, Kilpatrick, Noor, Simcock and Stogia

Independent Co-opted members: Dr S Downs and Dr D Barker

**Apologies:** Councillor Curley

#### **Also Present:**

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Finance and Resources  
Alastair Newall (External Auditor)  
Suresh Patel, Mazars (External Auditor)

#### **AC/23/25 Statement on the recent issue of a Section 114 Notice by Birmingham City Council**

In light of the recent issue of a Section 114 Notice by Birmingham City Council, at the Chair's request, the Deputy City Treasurer made a statement to Committee members to provide assurance on the authority's financial position.

An outline of the factors that had contributed to Birmingham City Council's Section 114 notice was provided to the Committee. Members were informed that Manchester had settled all of its equal pay claims with no outstanding liabilities remaining as a result of its robust job evaluation processes. Members were also invited to note that some 27 Councils had to date either warned or had issued a Section 114 Notice due to significant funding pressures with more warning of similarly precarious circumstances should in-year budgets and/or savings not be delivered.

The Committee was invited to note that whilst the Authority's position was challenging with various overspends being reported, mitigations are being developed and the Council has a robust reserves strategy leaving the Authority in a sustainable yet challenging position. However, any reductions in funding (eg the forthcoming Business Rates reset due in 2025/26) would pose a significant risk to the Council's longer term financial sustainability. He gave assurance that the Council would continue its prudent approach to treasury management and would uphold its established track record of taking early and positive financial decisions.

#### **AC/23/26 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 25 July 2023 as a correct record.

#### **AC/23/27 Mazars (External Auditor) Annual Audit report 2020/2021**

The Committee received the Annual Auditors' report (AAR) from Mazars (External

Auditors) which summarised the work undertaken by Mazars in respect of audit work for the year ended 31 March 2021.

In addition to the background and introduction, the report included:

- The opinion on financial statements, including the scope of the audit and the results of the opinion.
- A discussion of Value for Money (VFM) arrangements, including the approach to VFM and a summary in respect of financial sustainability, governance and economy, efficiency and effectiveness; and
- An outline of wider reporting responsibilities, including fees

Alastair Newall (External Auditor) confirmed that this was the final report on the 202/21 audit which had been completed in August 2023 shortly following the Committee's previous meeting in July 2023. He gave emphasis to the information remaining unchanged to that which had been previously reported in July 2023 and had been submitted as a formality in line with National Audit Office requirements.

In response to a query from a committee member, he outlined the complexities in the approach required to ensure that valuations remained materially correct in the context of a five-year rolling programme and the Council's broad and complex asset base.

The Committee conveyed its thanks to the Finance Team and Mazars for the completion under challenging circumstances.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **AC/23/28 Mazars (External Auditors) Audit Completion Letter 2020/21**

The Committee received the Annual Audit Completion letter in respect of the 2020/21 Local Authority Accounts. Appended to the Letter was Mazars proposed audit report and opinion and a summary of additional fees to be requested from Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA). The letter confirmed that there were no matters to report to the Committee in relation to the audit.

The Committee acknowledged that the purpose of the letter's submission was to align with International Standards on Auditing - UK and Ireland (ISA (UK and Ireland)) requirements and that all matters relating to the 2020/21 Audit of Accounts was complete.

### **Decision**

To note the audit completion in respect of 2020/21 Annual Accounts.

**AC/23/29 Mazars (External Auditors) Audit Completion report 2021/22**

The Committee received a report of the External Auditors (Mazars) which presented the Annual Audit Completion report for the year ending 31 March 2022.

The report included the following information:

- The Executive Summary,
- The Audit Status
- The Audit Approach
- Significant Findings
- Internal Control Mechanism recommendations
- Misstatements

The following were also appended to the report:

- The Draft Management Representation Letter
- The Draft Audit Report
- Independence
- Other Communications

Suresh Patel (External Auditor, Mazars) introduced the report with reference to its Executive Summary, highlighting familiar areas of risk and focus to the 2020/21 Audit of Accounts. Mr Patel indicated that Mazars were preparing to submit an unqualified opinion subject to a number of matters requiring completion and with an anticipated date of the end of September 2023. With regard to Value for Money arrangements, he endorsed the Deputy City Treasurer's earlier statement concerning the Council's financial sustainability as a result of unearmarked reserves. It was anticipated that the report on Value for Money audit work would be completed by the end of November 2023 at which the Annual Audit report for 2021/22 would be submitted. He added that no correspondence or objections from any sources including the public had been received in respect of the report.

Alastair Newall (External Auditor, Mazars) talked the Committee through the report's findings, providing a narrative for the similar areas of risk as identified in the previous financial year's audit. There was then a discussion about the factors that had contributed to those repeated risks which were said to be due in part to the impact of the five year rolling programme as well as ongoing considerations in respect of their individual nature and complexity, meaning that they may take longer to be appropriately addressed. He urged the Committee to note that this should not be seen as criticism of the Council's processes and that Mazars were satisfied with the progress that had been made thus far. The Committee acknowledged this.

**Decision**

To note the report.

**AC/23/30 Final Statement of Accounts 2021/22**

The Committee received the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer

which presented the Council's final accounts for 2021/22 and an explanation for the key audit adjustments to the draft. The accounts had been updated from the draft accounts previously reported (27 September 2022) and took account of changes that had arisen since that time. This included the national accounting changes to the reporting of infrastructure assets that had delayed the final audit of the accounts, and affected all Councils.

In addition to an introduction and background, the report discussed:

- Changes to the Single Entity Main Accounting Statements
- Group Accounts; and,
- Other changes

The following was appended to the report:

- A summary of changes to the Comprehensive Income and Expenditure Statement (CIES) and Balance Sheet
- The updated Annual Statement of Accounts 2021/22

The Committee was asked to:

- 1) Note the amendments made to the annual accounts since they were reported to the Audit Committee in September 2022
- 2) Approve the revised annual accounts including the accounting policies contained within them
- 3) Agree not to amend the annual accounts in relation to asset valuations as detailed in paragraphs 2.8, 2.11 and 2.12 and that the amounts are not considered material

The Deputy City Treasurer introduced the report's main points of consideration and responded to questions.

In response to a question from a Committee Member, the Deputy City Treasurer confirmed that the valuation regarding the National Football Museum (NFM) had been undertaken by professional valuers instructed by Mazars and that periodically differences of opinion can occur, and which highlighted the complexities of asset valuation. Mr Newall (External Auditor, Mazars) confirmed that the NFM sat amongst numerous city centre assets in which there had been a disparity over the land value rate applied when compared to other city centre sites. The Finance Lead added that in view of those complexities, a commitment was in place to have certain city centre assets valued on an annual basis. The Chair acknowledged the broad ranging asset base across the city resulting in the Council's decision to use a range of valuers to allow for the appropriate level of expertise.

Discussions moved to the report's discussion about the pensions liability as a result of the reintegration of former Northwards staff to the Council. The Deputy City Treasurer confirmed that the liabilities had been calculated correctly but had been posted in the incorrect subsection of the financial statement but had not been a discrepancy in terms of the amount of pensions liability.



## Decision

- 1) Note the amendments made to the annual accounts since they were reported to the Audit Committee in September 2022
- 2) Approve the revised annual accounts including the accounting policies contained within them
- 3) Agree not to amend the annual accounts in relation to asset valuations as detailed in paragraphs 2.8, 2.11 and 2.12 and that the amounts are not considered material

### **AC/23/31 Mazars (External Auditors) Oral Update on Progress of 2022/23 Accounts**

The Committee listened to an oral update on the progress of the 2022/23 accounts as delivered by Suresh Patel (External Auditor, Mazars).

Mr Patel set out the timetable for 2022/23 audit work. Planning and some interim audit work was scheduled to commence in November/December 2023 with detailed audit work scheduled for January 2024. The anticipated completion date for the audit was said to be the end of March 2024. No significant changes were highlighted for the audit plan itself, however with reference to earlier discussions in the meeting regarding repeated risks it was anticipated that those risks would reduce as a result of reviewed processes.

Discussions moved to the issue of Reinforced Autoclaved Aerated Concrete (RAAC) (aka RAAC concrete) and the scope for this to become an issue for the 2022/23 audit. The Deputy City Treasurer said that this was largely attributed to the schools sector with currently just one Voluntary Aided school partially affected though still operational. However a Task and Finish Group had been constituted to look at assets across the estate meaning that Council would soon be able to provide further information on the matter once those assessments had concluded with a view to whether any findings could significantly impair the Council's asset base.

## Decision

To note the report.

### **AC/23/32 Work Programme**

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which set out its future Work Programme for the remainder of 2023/24 municipal year.

## Decision

To note the report and approve the work programme.



## Planning and Highways Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 27 July 2023

**Present:** Councillor Lyons - In the Chair

Councillors Shaukat Ali, Chohan, Curley, Davies, Gartside, Hughes, Johnson, Kamal, Lovecy and Riasat

**Apologies:** Councillors Andrews, Hassan, Hewitson and Ludford

**Also present:** Councillors Bayunu, Igbon and Wright

#### **PH/23/54      Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 135544/FO/2022 & 135545/LO/2022, 136721/FO/2023 and 130387/FO/2021.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/23/55      Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2023 as a correct record.

#### **PH/23/56      136934/FO/2023 - Greenheys Building, Pencroft Way, Manchester, M15 6JJ - Hulme Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for the erection of 7-storey building comprising office and laboratory floorspace (Use Class E); cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping, access and servicing.

An anchor tenant would occupy the ground, mezzanine and first floor, with the remaining floors available for occupiers in the life science and healthcare sectors. The anchor tenant is an internationally significant health research organisation that would bring substantial direct and indirect socio-economic benefits to Manchester Science Park (MSP) and the Corridor eco-system, and leverage MSP's advantages in terms of locational clustering with major knowledge and research institutions.

The proposal would contribute positively to the city's economy creating jobs and training opportunities in key growth sectors for residents and support growth through graduate retention.

4 letters of objection had been received. The grounds of objections concern design, the nature of the use, traffic impacts, impacts on the residential character of the area and sunlight and daylight.

The Planning Officer did not add anything to the printed report.

An objector stated that the neighbourhood consultation did not make it clear what the building would be used for. The height would cause overshadowing and there were concerns over noise and possible unknown pathogens and the effect on air quality. He questioned the purpose and work that would be undertaken in the laboratories and commented on the change in class use. New drugs normally use some form of animal testing and the objector felt that Hulme should be an animal testing and vivisection free zone and asked the Committee to lead on ethical and political decisions when considering this application.

The applicant's agent that Bruntwood, have 40 years experience in delivering office, research and lab spaces. This proposal would be a milestone for the science park and enhance the capabilities of the university's NHS foundation trust. The anchor tenant and other high specification laboratories would attract occupiers in the science and technology sectors. The proposal would add employment opportunities and socio-economic benefits. No animal testing would be carried out on this site.

Ward Councillor Bayunu acknowledged the investment but also had to consider her residents. She felt the developer should work with the community. There had been some consultation but not all issues had been addressed. There would be more development and she asked for all involved to be brought together and added as a Council and Hulme as a Ward, should be animal testing and vivisection free zones.

Ward Councillor Wright noted that 9 trees would be replaced by 27 expressed having had difficulties with other developers on this issue. Previous construction activity at MSP had caused problems with contractors taking up parking spaces so a condition on a construction plan would be welcomed. Daylight and sunlight would affect a small number of residents but was still an important issue to raise. Some dwellings were below balconies and received less sun and daylight. Jobs should be targeted at the Hulme area and the area should be vivisection free. She supported the new pedestrian crossing.

The Director of Planning stated that the Committee could take land use into account but moral/ethical wishes could not be taken into account.

The Planning Officer stated that 27 trees are shown on the submitted plans. He offered apologies regarding the impacts of previous construction activity. The impacts on daylight and sunlight would be minimal because of existing overhanging balconies. The developer would work with the works and skills team and engage with the community.

Councillor Davies understood that the Committee could not take animal testing into account but felt that the developer would be well advised to consider this especially in this Ward. Bruntwood had caused problems to neighbouring residents and residents should be able to access and park cars during construction. Councillor Davies hoped for the construction plan would reflect this.

Councillor Johnson felt that a commitment to community engagement would be useful and could be added as a condition if the Committee moved a Minded to Approve decision and asked what this might look like. The Planning Officer stated that there could be an additional condition in the construction plan to engage with the community.

Councillor Curley expressed that this was a good report, well presented and felt that any ongoing discussions with Bruntwood would be successful. Councillor Curley then moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to move the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application subject to an additional condition whereby the developer amends the construction plan to include community engagement and subject to conditions set out in the report.

#### **PH/23/57 135544/FO/2022 & 135545/LO/2022 - 466 - 472 Moss Lane East Manchester M14 4PJ - Moss Side Ward**

The application was placed before Committee on 6 July 2023, where it was resolved to defer consideration of the proposal to allow for a site visit to enable Members to gain a better understanding of the impact the proposed development would have on the local neighbourhood, owing to concerns expressed regarding the height of the development.

The Committee considered the reports of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described that full planning permission was sought for the demolition of 470-472 Moss Lane East and conversion of 466 – 468 Moss Lane East, in order to facilitate the erection of a 7-9 storey building to form purpose-built student accommodation (sui generis) and provide in total 261 student bedrooms with a mix of studios and en-suite rooms set within clusters bedrooms.

Listed Building Consent was also sought for internal and external alterations and extension, in the form of a link building to the Grade II listed 466 to 468 Moss Lane East to facilitate its conversion to purpose-built student accommodation.

17 individual representations had been received, 12 of which objected and 5 of which supported the proposed development. Objections had also been received from Platt Claremont Residents Association, Moss Side Tenants Union, Great Southern to Western Community Action Network, The Victorian Society and from Councillor Emily Rowles on behalf of the Moss Side Councillors.

The Planning Officer addressed a note of clarification from Councillor Sharif Mahamed who had stated that the scheme would address and improve the needs of students in the city. As stated in the Late Reps report, the applicant had resolved to offer 20% of the bedspaces at a 20% discount on their base market value and to

make these rooms available on this basis. Furthermore, there would be no parking permits available to tenants.

Councillor Bayunu addressed the Committee as a Moss Side resident, stating that this was a sign of a creeping impact of student accommodation off the Oxford Road corridor. In terms of accuracy amongst those already living at this location, a door to door check had been made by residents and found lots of families on site. There should be clearer information about the impact this development would have on the area. It was expressed that the Council cannot open up to this kind of development. Councillor Bayunu objected to this application and felt there were inaccuracies that required addressing.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee and stated that this was a significant student accommodation offer which was greatly needed in Manchester, the shortfall of which was having an impact in retaining potential family homes as they were currently being used as HMOs. This site was 200 metres from Oxford Road and a 10 minute walk to the University. The University had written with a representation of support for the application. Purpose built student accommodation (PBSAs) were of high need. The application was sensitive to the context of the area and of suitable scale and massing. Preservation of the building style had been included. There were no impacts from loss of light and a 24 hour contact point was available. Manchester was an attractive destination and students were an addition to the city. The scheme now offered 20% reduced rate dwellings, as set out in the late report.

The Planning Officer stated that due diligence had been applied with units to be lost having been checked (a summary was in the printed report on page 103). There would be packages to rehome anyone affected by this demolition and re-development of this site.

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

Councillor Curley stated that the site visit had been very useful and felt that this scheme would improve the building. The footpath was noted to be in a poor state and it was put to the Planning Officer whether a condition could be added to improve this as part of adjacent public realm.

Councillor Johnson understood the need for student accommodation in Manchester and stated that Moss Side was densely populated and more homes for residents and families would be good. Disabled parking on the proposal was insufficient and this would be an ideal site due to the park and nearby public transport links. Councillor Johnson noted the use of terminology relating to the Oxford Road Corridor and raised that this site is not on Oxford Road, adding that taller buildings can be seen on Oxford Road and expressed that this should be a development of lesser height. Councillor Johnson was concerned that this would set a precedent and encourage further tall buildings in this residential area. Councillor Johnson stated that she may wish to propose a motion to address the height aspect later in the meeting.

Councillor Davies had concerns for any families living at the current site. Page 103 of the printed report referred to the standard of the building at present. Councillor Davies enquired about the details of these families who are due to be rehoused and needed reassurances before making any decision.

The Planning Officer stated that the footpath issues raised by Councillor Curley could be included as part of Highways. Regarding disabled parking, 3 spaces were available on the street and a further condition could be added. The University had plans for students already due to move into this development when complete. Regarding the height, this scheme was closely related to the Oxford Road Corridor and based on its own merits and that this application had been deemed as appropriate for this area. Families in this dwelling would be re-homed.

Councillor Davies considered that there was insufficient awareness of these families and their voices had not been heard as part of this aspect of the application.

Councillor Lovecy expressed that the site visit was very useful. She stated that she was not Minded to Approve for this application due to the scale being more in line with buildings on Oxford Road. The impact of 7 and 9 storey buildings in this area would impact negatively on the amenity of local residents. Also, the heritage aspect of this building should be considered. Whilst the building would be improved, it would then be dwarfed by the additional buildings.

Councillor Hughes stated that he was considering supporting the application after the site visit but now had concerns about the rehousing of families as this is always a difficult proposition with the potential for children having to change schools.

The Director of Planning stated that the rehousing issue is something that the Planning Team take very seriously and, having asked for information on current tenants, found that they were all under short term tenancies. If the Committee were Minded to Approve for the application, the Planning Team would work with the Chair of the Planning & Highways Committee to create a condition for development not to start until there was an awareness of ongoing arrangements. This would be taken away for discussion with the developer and legal services.

Councillor Johnson welcomed this proposal from the Director of Planning but added her concern that the overall scale and massing issue remains.

Councillor Riasat added that the site visit was useful, that there was a similar sized building close by and confirmed his support for the application, moving the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve.

Councillor Shaukat Ali seconded the proposal with the added condition stipulated earlier by the Director of Planning concerning a rehousing strategy.

Councillor Lovecy stated her preference for a maximum 6 storey height and raised concerns over the impact on the neighbourhood.

Councillor Johnson wished to propose a motion regarding the scale and massing.

The Chair explained due process, in that, if the proposal put forward by Councillor Riasat fell then another motion could then be considered for the Committee to make a decision on.

Councillor Davies felt that the onus should be on the developer to make rehousing arrangements.

The Director of Planning confirmed that this responsibility would lie with the developer.

Councillor Curley noted that a similar scheme in Chorlton had been agreed under the same process and asked the Director of Planning if the same process would be adhered to.

The Director of Planning confirmed this with Councillor Curley.

The Chair confirmed with the Committee that the Minded to Approve decision was for both applications concerning this development.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to move the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve for both applications subject to an additional condition whereby the developer entered into discussions with the city council regarding the rehousing of current tenants and devise their own rehousing strategy and subject to conditions set out in the report.

#### **PH/23/58      136721/FO/2023 - Site Of Former Day Nursery, Longhurst Road, Manchester, M9 8NS - Higher Blackley**

The Committee considered the reports of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing concerning the erection of 14 x 3 storey semi-detached houses and 2 blocks of 2 storey apartments containing 8 flats in total (Class C3) with associated car parking, landscaping, regrading of ground levels and boundary treatment.

The principle of the proposal and the scheme's contribution to regeneration, as set out in the report, accords not only with national and local planning policies, but would also deliver key outcomes for the city delivering new homes for affordable rent (through a Registered Provider). Any potential impacts on local residents are fully set out and addressed. These include wider impacts from construction to operational impacts such as traffic, trees and visually from the development itself.

The site is located in Higher Blackley Ward, is broadly rectangular in shape, and covers 0.46 ha. It is vacant, with an area of hardstanding with areas of grass, self-seeded vegetation and trees. It is bounded to the east by St. Andrews Community Hall (single storey building), with two storey housing to the north of Longhurst Road, St. Andrews Church and rectory to the south, and Blackley Cemetery to the west.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the printed report and late reps report.



The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application and stated that this scheme would offer 22 new houses at 100% affordable rent rate as part of Project 500.

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

Councillor Lovecy stated that this development was very welcome and added that she supported the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

Councillor Curley expressed that this was good news for those on housing waiting lists and looked forward to many more schemes of this nature.

Councillor Johnson raised a query regarding the comments on page 155 on opportunities to create improved areas of green infrastructure.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this was attached to the application as part of the landscape scheme.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to Approve the application, subject to conditions set out in the report.

### **PH/23/59      130387/FO/2021 - The Former Gamecock Public House, Boundary Lane, Manchester, M15 6GE - Hulme Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for the erection of a part 7, part 11 storey purpose built student accommodation building comprising 197 bed spaces (56no. studios, 14 no. threedios, 10 no. cluster units (Sui Generis use class)).

The Committee was minded to refuse an application for a part 9 part 13 storey (PBSA) building providing 261 bed spaces on 31st May 2022 on the basis of the scale of the application and the shortages of parking spaces for disabled people.

There were objections to original scheme including neighbours, 'Block the Block' a resident-led campaign supported by Hopton Hopefuls, Aquarius Tenants and Residents Association, Hulme Community Forum and On Top of the World Hulme, Hopton Hopefuls, 2 employees of Manchester University, a GP practice on Booth Street West, the Guinness Partnership and One Manchester. 3 representations were also received from members of the public supporting the proposal. Councillor Annette Wright and Lucy Powell MP objected.

Revised drawings were submitted to address the above reasons for refusal; 25 objections from neighbours and an objection from 'Block the Block' were subsequently received.

Members were minded to refuse a revised scheme on 20 October 2022 on the basis of scale and dominant visual impact and the lack of parking in close proximity to the entrance for those with disabilities and the use of on-street spaces for disabled parking spaces.

The Late Reps report stated that 20% of the bedspaces would be available at a 20% discount of market rent. The recommendation was altered to Minded to Approve subject to a legal agreement regarding the containing affordable rent obligations.

An additional representation from Councillor Wright referred to the previous Minded to Refuse decision. The Chair confirmed that 2 objectors were to address the Committee, sharing the 4 minutes allotted speaking time between them.

The first was a tenant of Hopton Court and had lived in Hulme all his life. Hulme had undergone many changes, not all good. He got involved with the Tenant's Committee at Hopton Court and arranged for tables and benches to be placed outside. Then they managed to arrange for Hopton Court to be specifically for the 50+ age group and retired people. With the addition of Birley Fields campus and now this proposal for PBSA across the road he felt that this was too much for the neighbourhood. This was a piling in of students that would erode the community. Noise and litter were already a problem and Hopton Court was designed with bedrooms at the front of the building, making sleeping spaces only 20/30 yards away from the development. Other people in the building had been persuaded to join THOSE spending time in the outside area and this development would be a detriment to this outdoor space. The local GP were also concerned over the impact of this scheme and felt that the impact would be huge. In closing his objection statement, the objector stated that he did not know why this application had come before the Committee again.

The second stated that this proposal would negatively affect the amenity of residents and tenants. The north face of the apartments in her building were second bedrooms and, in many cases, children's bedrooms. This proposal was close to neighbouring dwellings and the overshadowing would have an impact on the energy bills. There were concerns over the disabled parking bays, a nearby cul-de-sac and loss of access. The objector stated that she was a blue badge holder and implored the Committee to refuse the application.

The agent stated that this is a sustainable location and recognised that the developer had to respect existing tenants. They took this seriously and offered a free community hub space. This developer was an experienced operator and would create a move-in and move-out strategy. 3 additional disabled parking spaces had been created on-site and students would not be permitted to own cars. Deliveries would be made within specified hours and an engagement plan had been created regarding litter picking in the vicinity and a contact point for regular liaison with the community. If approved, the proposal would regenerate the site. Access would be available throughout construction to all roads.

Ward Councillor Wright noted previous decisions in October 2022 and May 2023 and reasons for refusal plus other historical refusals from 2008 and 2012. She felt that the daylight and sunlight issues were more impactful due to dwellings being single aspect at Hopton Court. The only open space for tenants is an outside area and

some tenants already suffer with vitamin D deficiency. There was no need for student accommodation in this residential area. The application was opposed by the local GP and many more. Tenants had been assured there would be no impact on this site but were right to oppose this application. The accommodation on offer is not good enough to house students. Some areas of the development have no natural light, would be overshadowed and have no outside space. Developers see the site as a blight but residents see it as their area.

Ward Councillor Igbon stated that this site has looked the same for decades with no investment in the area. The developers were looking to make money and there were concerns over traffic and deliveries. The application stated that students would not be allowed to have cars but this was out of the developer's control and students with cars would have to use local on street parking which was also a concern. The local GP is the second busiest surgery in Manchester and the impact of an additional 200 people living in this area would create huge impacts to the community. Trees would have to be removed, one of which had a TPO. As a resident of the area, Councillor Igbon felt there was a blasé attitude from the developers and while a place for students to live was needed, this was the wrong site.

Ward Councillor Bayunu was shocked to see the officer's recommendation was no longer for refusal. Whilst she agreed that Manchester needed PBSAs, the impact to the community and amenities could not be ignored. 20% of the residents at Hopton Court have vitamin D deficiency, depression and anxiety. Allowing this development to go ahead would add to these problems. This was an area made up of older and deprived people and Councillor Bayunu wished to see the community improved.

The Planning Office stated that the previous Mind to Refuse decision was based on the scale and lack of parking. The Committee asked officers to identify reasons for refusal. A previous appeal had allowed a building of a similar scale and a reason could not be provided. 3 additional parking spaces for disabled people had been created on Camelford Close. Students are choosing where they want to live and are taking up family homes.

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

Councillor Lovecy stated that she had been present for other, previous applications on this site. Officers had stated that there were no grounds for a Mind to Refuse decision but Councillor Lovecy added that the area was not appropriate for a PBSA scheme. It was not a sustainable location for a mixed use of this kind. PBSA should be on sites where there would be no impact on residential neighbourhoods. Hopton Court has become a 50+ age group block and Manchester should allow for places that older people can remain in. In terms of the appeal against the previous decision, this was before the city council had confirmed their PBSA policy and the inspector will not have considered this policy in their decision. The impact of daylight and sunlight on adjacent buildings adds further weight against approving this development. Better sites were available and the sustained impact on this residential neighbourhood in addition to the scale and massing were grounds for the Committee to move a Mind to Refuse proposal.

Councillor Davies questioned whether the 20% reduced rate would be applied if the developer were to sell the building. She stated that she had lived in her building for 17 years with a north facing window, therefore having little natural light. To lose any more light, as would be the case for residents concerned here, would create an impact on health, energy bills and general wellbeing. This was a good location for older people who know their neighbours and enjoy life. The developer's suggestions on banning cars and late deliveries could not practically be implemented. In terms of the litter picking, while welcomed, shows that there is an expectation of increased litter problems and it was unlikely there would be litter picking early on a Sunday. Councillor Davies stated that she could not see this litter picking scheme working well. Residents already housed in this area enjoy living there and, whilst there was a need for students to free up housing stock for families, their lifestyles were often at odds with communities when mixed together

The Planning Officer stated that the 2008 decision was not based on PBSA but on scale and massing, which was more or less the same. As the Section 106 agreement was binding on the developer and any subsequent owner. It was residents who had identified existing litter problems that needed to be addressed. It was true that nobody could be stopped people from owning a car but students would not be allowed to have a residents parking permit. The issue of GP access is a problem across the city and the city council have many discussions about addressing this.

Councillor Curley stated that this was a difficult application of competing interests. Officers are working to the national framework, which should make decisions easier but for the concerns of residents and Ward Councillors. The council bought into the regeneration of Hulme for family lives and there was a commitment from people moving into the area. These competing pressures put the Committee in a position of having to have a full understanding of officer's and resident's viewpoints. Councillor Curley noted that some students come to Manchester, stay and contribute greatly to the city and the economy. The application here today was 2 storeys higher than the application from 2008. Councillor Curley concluded by stating that he was on the side of the residents as it was the right thing to do due to the potential for overlooking, shadowing, noise and parking issues. This way, it would be better for the communities in Hulme.

Councillor S Ali stated that he knew the site as a vacant eyesore for maybe 15 years. Previously, the application had been determined by the Committee with a Refused decision due to parking issues and the height of the proposed development. Officers had been asked to take the application away and address these issues, which they had done and Councillor S Ali stated he would now support the application.

The Planning Officer addressed an earlier comment from Councillor Curley and confirmed that the current application was not for 2 extra storeys in height but was the same height as the 2008 application.

The Director of Planning stated that this was a very challenging application having its fourth appearance before the Committee. The application was not dismissive of issues surrounding the proposal and a very detailed report had been presented.

Having looked at a possible Minded to Refuse decision, it was deemed as not sustainable as the scale and parking had been addressed.

Councillor Johnson referred to the site designation in the report stating that this is the right site, yet it appeared that it was not and asked how this can be confirmed. The Planning Officer stated this was covered in the report under Planning Policy terms.

Councillor Lovecy proposed a Minded to Refuse decision due to a PBSA of this size being contrary to sustainable neighbourhoods. The city council's own PBSA policy does not mean that the Committee have to agree to approve this application. She added that this was not a suitable site.

Councillor Curley seconded the proposal.

The Director of Planning confirmed to all present that the Committee's decision was not a final determination but a deferral. The decision would be taken away to be determined whether the Committee's reason was suitable.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Refuse due to a PBSA of this size being contrary to sustainable neighbourhoods in keeping with the city council's PBSA Policy.

#### **PH/23/60      135028/FO/2022 & 135029/LO/2022 - Land Bound By King Street West, St Marys Parsonage, Garden Lane And Smithy Lane, Manchester, M3 2JP - Deansgate Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for the erection of 14 storey office building and the refurbishment of the existing buildings at 3 Smithy Lane and Carriage Works on Garden Lane / St Mary's Parsonage. The Committee considered an application for LISTED BUILDING CONSENT for the demolition of 31-33 King Street West and the refurbishment of the existing buildings at 3 Smithy Lane and Carriage Works on Garden Lane / St Mary's Parsonage with ground floor extension. Consideration of this proposal was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 6 July 2023 to enable a site visit to take place.

The proposal is for 4,849 sqm of office floorspace and the retention and improvement of the Grade II Listed 3 Smithy Lane and the Carriage Works, following the demolition of part of the listed complex and other buildings on site. Objections have been received from Historic England and Save Britain's Heritage about the loss of 31-33 King Street West and the impact of the new build on the retained listed buildings and the surrounding Conservation Area. Application referenced 135029/LO/2022 will need to be referred to the Secretary of State for a decision if Members are minded to approve this proposal.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report.

The agent appreciated the concern over the demolition and noted that not much Victorian heritage survived World War II. The applicant had spent 4 years to find the best solution for the mix of heritage and development. Sustainability is key and this site would support Manchester's zero carbon emission strategy. There was an ongoing demand for workspaces in the city and new offices would support more jobs. This application would bring an underused site back into use and open up Garden Lane and Smithy Lane. The agent hoped that the Committee could support the application.

The Planning Officer stated that the building to be demolished had very little remaining heritage and was listed as part of a complex. The proposal is large but this supported the restoration of the remaining listed buildings.

The Chair of the Planning & Highways Committee noted that the retention of heritage aspects was welcomed and invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions.

Councillor Riasat stated that the site visit was very useful to understand the context of the building and the proposal and was happy to see this modernisation and confirmed he supported this application.

Councillor Curley agreed that the site visit was useful. Once on site he understood the poor condition of the building and could see the value of saving the two buildings at the rear. This application offered a good resolution.

Councillor Davies referred to the pictures supplied showing current and proposed images and asked for them to be taken from the same viewpoint in future. She inferred that this was not a strong heritage site and added that the site visit was very revealing in that it assisted the Committee members in understand the site. The 2 buildings to the rear were worth preserving and Councillor Davies felt that it would be nice for the public to be able to see, if just on Open Heritage days. The courtyard was also a great gain from the project.

Councillor S Ali moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to conditions within the report.

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve for the application, subject to conditions set out in the report.

**PH/23/61     136874/FO/2023 - Echo Street, Manchester, M1 3QJ - Piccadilly Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for erection of 3 interlinked towers of 27, 21 and 16 storeys together with intermediary link buildings (15 and 11 storeys) to form Purpose Built Student Accommodation (Sui Generis)

No objections had been received. MMU support the proposal.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this proposal included affordable student accommodation with 16% available at 80% of the market rate, secured via a Section 106 agreement that would bind the development and any successors.

The applicant stated that they were a leading provider and excited by the project on Echo Street. The scheme includes affordable accommodation. This was a high quality alternative to students living in HMOs and would free up housing stock.

The Planning Officer stated that this proposal essentially repurposed a previous approval for co-living and PBSA. It was now 100% student accommodation.

The Chair stated that this application would secure some affordable rental spaces for students which would be a positive outcome.

Councillor Curley concurred with the Chair's comments and noted that the development was made of the same sized units across the whole and this was welcomed.

Councillor Johnson stated that there was no concentration of large developments in this area. Piccadilly was growing but there was still a need for long term residents and the area was not established yet. Councillor Johnson asked if the cycle storage was under cover i.e., proper storage.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there was cycle storage inside and outside the building.

Councillor Kamal moved the officer's recommendation of Mind to Approve.

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be Mind to Approve for the application, subject to conditions set out in the report.

### **PH/23/62      136763/FO/2023 - Etihad Stadium (North Stand), Etihad Campus, Manchester, M11 3FF - Ancoats & Beswick Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for alterations to the Etihad Stadium North Stand and adjoining land to provide an overall increase in Stadium capacity, hospitality, and concourse facilities available for use both during and outside of event days, an ancillary TV Studio (Sui Generis), a Roof-Walk Attraction (Use Class F1(c)) together with the erection of a 9 storey, 391 bed hotel (Use Class C1) with a further 10 suites provided within the North Stand of the Etihad Stadium for hotel or hospitality space (Use Class C1 / Sui Generis); restaurant at Level 1 (Use Class C1 / Class E), erection of an 8-storey building comprising: a new Club Shop and Ticket Office (Use Class E) at Ground and

Level 1, City Museum at Level 2, Leisure Attraction at Level 3 (Class F1(c)); and workspace (Class E) at Levels 4, 5, 6 and 7 and a new covered City Square fan zone and flexible event space with ground floor commercial, leisure, food and drink use (Use Class E and/ or drinking establishment (Sui Generis)) within each of the interrelated buildings adjoining the proposed square with associated landscaping and public realm works, servicing and access arrangements, and other associated works.

The proposal would extend the North Stand and include hospitality and concourse facilities which would also be available every day. Ancillary elements include a TV studio, roof walk attraction, 391 bed hotel, club shop and museum plus workspace for start ups and small businesses linked to the other users at the Campus. There would be a covered square forming an enhanced fan zone which would be supported by new food and beverage outlets. New public realm was proposed.

Lucy Powell MP (Manchester Central) supported the proposal. There had been 3 individual letters of support and 5 objections.

The Planning Officer did not add anything to the printed report.

The agent stated that the development involved over £300million of investment. It was a sustainable and world class proposal for a sports and leisure district which supports the economy and residents in East Manchester. The site would employ a 890 people over the construction period. £100million of supply chain expenditure and 3,000 jobs would also be created. The site would inject £70million into Manchester's economy and offer training and recruitment opportunities for local people. It would be a destination for football fans and other communities. The increased capacity at the Etihad as part of this development had been a relevant consideration. The scheme was future proofed and had been collaborated on with all stakeholders. This project also supports ambitions for net zero carbon by 2030.

The Planning Officer noted that all the agent's comments were within the report.

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

Councillor Hughes stated that he was a lifelong Manchester City supporter and felt that this was a great scheme for East Manchester. He noted that the club were staying in East Manchester for the long haul and the additional jobs provided by this development were much needed.

Councillor Riasat stated that this was a commercial investment that has transformed the area and added that this was the next step on that journey. Councillor Riasat spoke of his support for this application.

Councillor Curley added his support and stated that he was a fan of Manchester City's approach, naming Pete Bradshaw as a hard worker and congratulating the club on their work with apprenticeships which produced high quality opportunities.

Councillor Kamal moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve for the application.



Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve for the application, subject to conditions set out in the report.

### **PH/23/63 Confirmation The Manchester City Council (Land at Sherwood Street & Wynnstay Grove) Tree Preservation Order 2023 - Old Moat Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing concerning the background and issues involved in the making of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on 18 April 2023 and to recommend the confirmation of this Tree Preservation Order.

The Director of Planning recommends that the Planning and Highways Committee instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the Tree Preservation Order on land at Wynnstay Grove/Sherwood Street, under Section 199 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and that the Order should cover the woodland as plotted T1 on the plan attached to this report.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the printed report.

An objector addressed the Committee, stating that he was here as Head of Estate Management for the charity, Railway Paths who own this land and 350km of other property attached to disused railway lines, lots of which are public access, such as Manchester's Fallowfield Loop Line which adjoins this site. This was in conjunction with sister charity group, Sustrans.

The charity do not receive external funding so rely on construction projects on and around their sites. The charity needed to generate £750,000/£1million per year to keep running. The objector expressed his concern at how this TPO had been brought forward. No trees were at risk and there was a proposal made to the city council for potential social housing on this site. He believed the TPO application was flawed stating "one high quality tree" but added that this was not high quality woodland, and not accessible to the public. The site was used for fly-tipping, ASB and attracted rats and, regarding its visual amenity, its value was questionable. The charity had not had any discussions with the city council on this piece of land and the TPO may halt some much needed development. The TPO was premature and this site could be enhanced via the planning process. There was access to the Fallowfield Loop Line through Sherwood Street. Sustrans would like to enhance this area and the city council were supportive but unable to fund. Confirmation of this TPO would make any enhancements more expensive to deliver which would be contrary to aims of the charities efforts for the loop line and for the benefit of the public. In his closing statement, the objector requested that the Committee do not confirm this TPO and stated his desire to engage with the council on a proposal for social housing.

The Planning Officer stated that this process had been difficult. An arborist had been consulted and found 1 good quality tree on site. The application may have been pre-emptive to have control over what happens with the site in future. The Planning Team would work with the charity to give the trees any credence that may be deserved.

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

Councillor Curley stated that this was an unusual TPO that could stop development on a brownfield site. It was the first time Councillor Curley could recall that a TPO did not feel necessary and he expressed the need to have discussions.

Councillor Riasat enquired as to why there had been a TPO over a piece of land, how many trees were on the site and why the site was chosen.

The Planning Officer stated that this TPO came from a number of agents/consultants who felt the site was being marketed. This was a former railway site with some trees of scale and the general setting had been taken into account. The arborist's view was that there was a group value to the site. The council would have control over any development in future and were willing to speak with charities, having not had that approach previously for this site.

Councillor Lovecy stated that she was generally supportive of saving trees and groups of trees. She asked, if supportive of the TPO, how could someone propose to use the land for a worthy project, such as affordable housing.

The Director of Planning stated that there were numerous approaches and that a TPO does not preclude developers if the benefit of the scheme is seen as more worthy than the scheme could be approved.

Councillor Lovecy was satisfied that she could support the recommendation after hearing the Director's comments.

Councillor Curley stated that the Committee may need to know if the land is included in development land pockets as, if there was a housing partner interested, they would have to back away from any project if the site was not within a developmental plot. Councillor Curley felt that the Committee would need to see partnership out of courtesy and accountability and asked how urgent a decision was and whether this could come back to the next Planning & Highways meeting. Councillor Curley then moved to defer the application.

The Director of Planning stated that there was a set period to confirm a TPO and made checks with Planning Team members. Following making checks, the Director stated that the TPO would have to be determined at the next Committee meeting on 31 August 2023.

Councillor S Ali seconded Councillor Curley's deferral proposal.

## **Decision**

To defer the TPO until the next Committee meeting on 31 August 2023.



## Planning and Highways Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 31 August 2023

**Present:** Councillor Lyons - In the Chair  
Councillors Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Chohan, Curley, Davies, Gartside, Hassan, Hughes, Johnson, Kamal and Lovecy

**Apologies:** Councillors Hewitson, Ludford, Riasat

**Also present:** Councillors Igbon and Wright

#### **PH/23/64      Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 136812/OO/2023, 136814/FO/2023, 136963/FO/2023 and 136791/FO/2023.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/23/65      Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 27 July 2023 as a correct record.

#### **PH/23/66      136812/OO/2023 - Land At Red Bank Victoria North Manchester**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that presented the outline of an application for a development comprising: Erection of a residential led mixed use development across severable plots comprising residential (Use Class C3a); non-residential floorspace comprising commercial, business, service and community uses (Use Classes E, F and Sui Generis); residents amenity space including within clubhouse buildings; health centre (Use Class E); a primary school (Use Class F); the final surface finish of the highway and footpath consented under HIF permission ref: 133143/VO/2022; creation of new public realm and associated landscaping, car parking provision, cycle storage, and other associated works (with all matters reserved). It also outlined an application for development with all matters considered: Demolition of existing buildings and structures.

The Outline application was for a residential led development, with a clubhouse, a health centre, a primary school, infrastructure, public realm and landscaping. One letter of support had been received.

The Planning Officer noted that it was unusual for an outline application to be brought before Committee but that the Planning team had accepted due to the size of the plans. The outline application was to establish the principle of the development.

The applicant addressed the Committee, stating that the outline application proposed a new district for the city that had been in planning and public consultation since 2021. The project would create a new population of 6,000 people. The aim of the project is to create a sustainable community, with affordable housing a key part of the project. It was noted that the project aimed to meet the requirement of 20% affordable housing across the plans, with 5% already secured. The homes built on site would be a mix of open market, built to rent and affordable. There were non-residential plans too, including the building of a new Primary School. There were extensive plans regarding the public realm. It was noted the project would create over 4,500 temporary construction jobs.

Members, in general, welcomed the proposals as put forward in the outline application. Concerns were raised regarding the lack of social housing in the application and the process of considering an outline application, whether discussion would be possible later when further planning applications are put forward due to the lack of commitment to certain proposals within the application in its current form.

The Planning Officer noted that there was an expectation of 20% affordable housing but without the detail, they could not be certain. They did inform the Committee that 20% affordable housing was being delivered elsewhere in the project. As this was an outline application, there were conditions set within it. The Planning Officer stated that the public realm was being looked at creatively, but more detailed proposals can be discussed at future phases of planning.

Members then queried why the application was being considered as an outline application and concerns over space for children to play.

The Planning Officer stated that an outline application was a legitimate part of the process and was not unusual in other places. The Planning Officer was confident of what was being supported but accepted that detail could not yet be confirmed. The scale of the investment was the reason for an outline application being accepted, noting they had not seen this level of thought at this stage before. The Planning Officer noted that there would be a lot of open space for children to play.

Members then queried if there was a possibility for priority to be given to certain residents for the affordable housing as part of this project and if there would be any constraints to the Committee in the future to agreeing the outline application.

The Planning Officer noted that a local lettings policy could form part of the project. They stated that the Committee were agreeing to the parameters in the report and that further detail would still need to be considered.

Councillor Andrews moved the Officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve.

Councillor Shaukat Ali seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve the Application for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the report and subject to the signing a legal agreement in respect of affordable housing and to secure the retention of the project architect.

**PH/23/67      136814/FO/2023 - Land Bounded By Dantzic Street, Dalton Street And The Railway Line Known As Plots NT02, NT03 And NT04 Manchester**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing concerning the erection of a phased residential led mixed use development comprising three residential towers (Use Class C3 and C2) (NT02 34 storeys, NT03 part 8, part 20 and part 31 storeys and NT04 part 8, part 27 storeys) with associated flexible non-residential floorspace comprising commercial, business, service and community uses (Use Classes E, F and Sui Generis); erection of a 6 storey residential amenity space within a clubhouse building (part of NT02), with associated car and cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping, improvement works to Dantzic Street, drainage infrastructure and associated engineering works following demolition of existing buildings and structures.

The application proposed 1551 homes of which 78 would be affordable (5%). It included a clubhouse, commercial uses, highway improvements, public realm and landscaping.

Three letters had been received providing comments on construction impacts and the impact of the height on nearby residential accommodation.

The Planning Officer noted that the Council had a land interest in the site and that needed to be disregarded by members of the Committee.

The applicant addressed the Committee, noting that this application was the first phase of a new sustainable community. The application proposed 1,551 new homes, with high-quality public realm. There was a commitment to affordable housing, with 5% secured and 20% the ultimate aim. Within the application, there would be 4,000sq. metres of non-residential uses. The application would create a 26% biodiversity net-gain, with energy efficiency measures in place in the design of buildings. The application would create over 1,800 temporary construction jobs.

A member raised a query regarding the proposals for Dulwich Street and if there would be actual play space for children or would the space be for parking for residents. A member also queried if the affordable housing as part of the application was 5% or if there would be 20%.

The Planning Officer noted that Dulwich Street would be restricted access and that was why there was reference in the report to it being gated. The application only proposed space for up to 100 cars, around 10% of the site which was not a large number. In terms of affordable housing, 5% was offered as part of the proposal but the objective was 20%, as had been secured in other proposals, leaving the Planning Officer with no reason to doubt it would not be secured for this application. A local lettings policy could also form part of the application.

A member noted the green and blue policy within the application that noted the target would be reached in 2025. They queried if that trajectory would continue post-2025. They also queried if the 10 disabled access points proposed satisfied the Planning Officer. They also questioned if, in relation to the new trees proposed, there would be any control over the wider area. A member then noted the 1,250 jobs created by the application and questioned if that would include apprenticeships for young Manchester residents.

The Planning Officer noted that this was the usual level of disabled access points. In terms of trees, there was lots of space to plant the trees and they were confident that the number proposed would be met. The Planning Officer was also confident that apprenticeships for local residents would form part of the jobs created by the application.

Councillor Shaukat Ali moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve.

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve the Application for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the report and subject to the signing a legal agreement to secure 5% on site affordable, a late-stage review of the viability and to secure the retention of the project architect.

**PH/23/68      136963/FO/2023 - Loreto College 146 Chichester Road And The Former Probation Centre Bounded By Chichester Road South/Moss Lane East/Maher Gardens And Tamworth Street Manchester M15 5PB**

The Committee considered the reports of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing concerning the erection of a three-storey Class F1 (a) (Provision of education) building comprising a 20 no. classrooms, an assembly space, study centre, staff rooms and associated accommodation following the demolition of the existing single-storey building and partial demolition of the St Vincent's building together with a phased landscaping scheme; boundary treatments; cycle parking; and, car parking.

The application proposals seek approval for the provision of a teaching block for the Loreto Sixth Form College on a site which lies to the immediate south of the existing College campus. The site is owned by the City Council and was previously leased to the Ministry of Justice who provided Probation Services from the single storey building on the site from the late 1980s early 1990s until 2021.

Due to its long-standing reputation of academic excellence, the college was consistently oversubscribed with nearly 3 applications received for each available place. It was operating at capacity with no further flexibility to accommodate the ever-growing demand for places. This situation will be exacerbated owing to demographic growth in the Manchester region. ONS data indicated growth of circa 20-30% in 16



18-year-olds over the next 5-10 years. In order to meet this forecasted demand, the college had put in place a capital plan that focused on a new teaching block located on the application site. A grant application was submitted to the Department of Education in November 2022, which was approved, and confirmation obtained in May 2022 for the provision of new teaching accommodation proposed by these application proposals.

Nearby properties were notified of the proposals with letters sent to 191 addresses, in addition a site notice was posted, and an advertisement placed in the Manchester Evening News notifying of the application proposals. In response, comments were received from 1 Manchester resident together with comments from ward members raising concerns around: the perceived inefficient use of land, impacts on air quality, transport implications of the proposals, and the notification process undertaken.

The Planning Officer noted that funding for the application had been received on a time-limited basis and that there was an urgent need to provide post-16 education places. The situation relating to transport and car parking was being looked at in more detail outside the application.

Councillor Igbon addressed the Committee as a local resident. It was noted that residents had not received information regarding the application and concerns had been raised that had not been addressed. The college has a negative impact for residents in terms of vehicles, pollution, noise, anti-social behaviour, and litter. The plan to extend was a lack of responsibility to the community, with an additional 500 people proposed to be attending the college. Within the application, there was a lack of an Active Travel Plan lack which would cause severe impact to residents. The Travel Plan enclosed as part of the application was not fit for purpose and a comprehensive plan should be worked on between the college and other stakeholders, including residents, according to Councillor Igbon in their capacity as a local resident.

The applicant then addressed the Committee, stating that there was a shortage of post-16 places, and the proposal would increase capacity at the college. The college had received a grant for the expansion. They were aware of the ongoing traffic issues and were happy to work with stakeholders and residents to alleviate those problems, as had already been happening. The college was involved in a wide range of environmental issues. The application proposed 96 cycle spaces. All students at the college would receive Carbon Literacy training. The applicant stated that they had consulted on the proposals locally and that they wanted to continue to support the local area.

Councillor Wright addressed the Committee as a ward councillor, querying why there appeared to be a separate process for the active travel plan. Councillor Wright noted that the issue related to traffic. A recent air quality assessment was completed that showed an improvement since stopping 2-way traffic, and more traffic would have a detrimental effect on this. Councillor Wright stated that the college had referenced it not being safe to cycle, yet the application contained a lot of information about cycling.

The Chair questioned if an active travel plan can be included as a condition. The Chair also asked if the Director of Planning could write to the college to stress the importance of engagement with residents.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing stated that they would write to the college regarding engagement. It was noted that there is a proposed condition attached to the application regarding a travel plan [Condition 16]. The Director suggested that this condition could be reworded to link this travel plan with the wider travel plan for the whole of the college and to develop a plan for communication and engagement; and that if the Committee were minded to approve the application, the wording of this condition could be delegated to the Chair and Director of Planning.

The Planning Officer noted that 191 addresses were provided notification of the application, with more also sent by the college. It was stated that this went beyond the statutory requirements. The Planning Officer accepted that a formal travel plan would be included, alongside improvements to the public realm. They noted that the proposed extension would be an energy efficient building.

A member raised concerns that there would be an impact on residents from the increased traffic. They stated that resident should be involved in the creation of the travel plan and improvement is needed in the ongoing engagement strategy.

A member also stated that the travel plan needed to include a reduction of air pollution, but noted their support with the amendments to conditions as referenced by the Director of Planning.

Councillor Shaukat Ali moved the officer's recommendation of Approve.

Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to Approve the application subject to conditions with authority delegated to the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing in conjunction with Chair to redraft Condition 16 as discussed.

### **PH/23/69      136791/FO/2023 - Former Chorlton Leisure Centre Manchester Road Chorlton Manchester M21 9PQ**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing concerning the erection of 2 no. 5 storey residential buildings comprising 50 no. dwellings (Class C3) with ancillary communal facilities; and, associated access, car parking, bin store, amenity space and landscaping, following the demolition of the existing building. The proposal was for a part 7 part 11 storey purpose built student accommodation (PBSA) building providing 197 student bed spaces.

The application related to the erection of a 5-storey residential development comprising 50 affordable apartments for the over 55s, following demolition of an existing vacant leisure centre. Following notification of the application 9

representations had been received, including 3 objections, 2 in support and 4 neutral responses with comments.

The Planning Officer had nothing to add to the report.

The applicant addressed the Committee, noting that the application would make a contribution to the local area. They had consulted widely, which had informed the application as submitted. The proposal was for 50 affordable homes for elderly residents. The proposals were energy efficient and in a sustainable location. They noted there had been no objections from the statutory consultees. They noted that the existing building could not be converted, and that this application would bring significant benefits to the site.

A member queried if there was parking space for carers. Another member queried if the 19 spaces proposed was sufficient.

The Planning Officer noted that the 19 spaces were sufficient for the application, allowing both visitors and occupiers to park.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation to approve.

Councillor Curley seconded the proposal, noting that no issues had been raised regarding the application by Historic England.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to approve the application as set out in the officer's report.

#### **PH/23/70 137579/FO/2023 - 12 And 12A Errwood Road Manchester M19 2PA**

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing confirmed that this item had been withdrawn and therefore no decision was required.

#### **PH/23/71 Confirmation of The Manchester City Council (Land at Sherwood Street & Wynnstay Grove) Tree Preservation Order 2023**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing informing the committee about the background and issues involved in the making of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on 18 April 2023 and to recommend the confirmation of this Tree Preservation Order.

The Director of Planning recommended that the Planning and Highways Committee instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the Tree Preservation Order on land at Wynnstay Grove/Sherwood Street, under Section 199 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and that the Order should cover the woodland as plotted W1 on the plan attached to the report.

The Planning Officer noted that this report had been deferred from the previous meeting and a meeting had since taken place between Planning officer's and the landowners.

An objector addressed the Committee, noting their belief that the TPO appeared a blunt instrument. They stated there was considerable tree issues on the street. They felt that the TPO was unnecessary. They stated that some trees were coming to the end of their natural life on the life. The objector stated that the trees on the site were not in any danger.

The Planning Officer was happy to enter engagement with the landowner and that was not prevented by the TPO. Any end-of-life trees could be independently assessed where necessary whilst the TPO was in place. The TPO simply served as extra protection.

A member noted that the TPO was a positive and that it was nothing against the landowners.

Councillor Curley moved the officer's recommendation to instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the TPO, noting that Planning Officer's had alleviated members concerns.

Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the Tree Preservation Order on land at Wynnstay Grove/Sherwood Street, under Section 199 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and that the Order should cover the woodland as plotted W1 on the plan attached to this report.

## **Personnel Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 13 September 2023**

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

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

**Apologies:** Councillor Moran and Rahman

#### **PE/23/7 Minutes**

##### **Decision**

The Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on 31 May 2023

#### **PE/23/8 Recruitment and Selection Policy**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Human Resources, Organisational Development and Transformation, which sought approval of a proposed revision to the Council's Recruitment and Selection Policy.

The revised Recruitment and Selection Policy had been developed to incorporate critical strategic aims arising from the Race Review (2019) and the Workforce Equality Strategy (2022). The policy was last approved by Personnel Committee in June 2018.

The main changes reflected the strategic aims of the Workforce Equality Strategy. The central ambition of the Workforce Equality Strategy (WES) was that the Council's workforce should reflect the rich diversity of talent in the community it served by 2025.

The aim of diversifying the workforce to better reflect the city's community required internal and external candidates to be recruited on a more equal footing. This was to facilitate a wider and more diverse pool of candidates from which to select the best candidates. Therefore, one key change set out in the revised policy was that, normally and by default, roles would be advertised externally and internally at the same time.

Trade Unions had been consulted on the proposed revisions and had not raised any issues.

##### **Decision**

The Committee approve the revised Recruitment and Selection Policy.

## **PE/23/9 Recruitment to the role of Director of Population Health and Wellbeing**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Human Resources, Organisational Development and Transformation, which outlined the approach for recruitment to the upcoming vacant post of Director of Population Health and Wellbeing, in line with the guidance from the Department of Health and Social Care.

The Director of Population Health and Wellbeing carried out the statutory functions of the Director of Public Health under Section 73A(1) of the National Health Service Act 2006. The current substantive grading level was SS4 (£105,566 to £116,346). As a result of the imminent departure of the postholder, benchmarking had been undertaken against core cities and regional comparators, to ensure the Council positioned the role appropriately for a successful recruitment episode. On the basis of the benchmarking, it was proposed to retain the salary of the post in line with its current substantive grading level of SS4, with an optional static market rate supplement of up to £5000. This would be applied at the discretion of the Director of Human Resources, Organisational Development and Transformation (in discussion with the Chief Executive) based on the calibre of the candidate selected by the panel.

There was a standard national appointment process which must be followed for all appointments to roles with the statutory functions of the Director of Public Health. This would operate alongside the stipulations within the Council's Constitution in relation to the appointment of Statutory Chief Officer posts. The recruitment process would also be supported by an Executive Search Company, on which a recommendation had been made and authorised by the Chief Executive.

In compliance with the National Health Service (Appointment of Consultants) Regulations 1996 on recruiting to roles with the statutory responsibility of the Director of Public Health, an Advisory Appointment Committee would also be set up as the final panel to make recommendations on the appointment to the Leader of the Local Authority. All members of the Advisory Appointment Committee would be required to participate in all elements of the recruitment process, including shortlisting and the core make up of the Advisory Appointment Committee was set out in legislation.

In addition, the Personnel Committee was required to establish a sub-committee to act as the appointment panel for the appointment to any Statutory Chief Officer. To comply with the stipulations set out in the Council's Constitution, it was proposed that the Personnel Sub-Committee formed part of the required Advisory Appointment Committee

Whilst it was mandatory for the Advisory Appointment Committee to be the final panel, it was proposed that there was an additional panel with stakeholders as part of the process. The Faculty of Public Health Assessor would check the technical and professional expertise of the candidates at this stage.

### **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Places on record its most sincere thanks and appreciation to the Director of Population Health and Wellbeing, David Regan, for his contribution to the city of Manchester across the past 23 years and his strong and inspiring leadership that has enabled Manchester to navigate through some difficult times, including the COVID-19 pandemic, and to embark on new programmes to reduce inequalities and improve the lives of Manchester residents.
- (2) Agree to establish a Personnel Sub-Committee for the purposes of this appointment and invite nominations from Personnel Committee members to determine its membership.
- (3) To request Council agree the recruitment for the role to be at its current substantive grading level of SS4 (£105,566 to £116,346), with the optional inclusion of a market rate supplement up to a fixed maximum of £5,000 to be applied at the discretion of the Director of HROD and Transformation (in discussion with the Chief Executive).
- (4) Endorse the outlined approach to the recruitment of the Director of Population Health and Wellbeing for Manchester City Council.





## Health and Wellbeing Board

### Minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2023

#### Present:

Councillor T Robinson, Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care (Chair)  
 Councillor Chambers, Deputy Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care  
 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, Deputy Place Based Lead  
 Dr Murugesan Raja, Manchester GP Board

#### Apologies:

Dr Doug Jeffrey, Manchester GP Board  
 Bill McCarthy, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust  
 Katy Calvin-Thomas, Manchester Local Care Organisation  
 Dr Geeta Wadhwa, Manchester GP Board

#### Also in attendance:

Tim Griffiths, Manchester Local Care Organisation  
 Sarah Doran, Assistant Director of Public Health  
 Leesa Benson, Lead Nurse Health Protection  
 Dr Anna Trelfa, Consultant Health Protection, UK Health Security Agency  
 Ryan Noonan, Lead TB Nurse Specialist, MFT  
 Kenny Li, Chief Pharmacist, Greater Manchester ICS  
 Cordelle Ofori, Deputy Director of Public Health, MCC  
 Katie McCall, Strategic Lead, Making Manchester Fairer  
 Guy Cresswell, Executive Director, Great Places Housing Group  
 David Ashmore, Director of Housing Services, MCC  
 Neil Walbran – Chief Officer, Healthwatch

### HWB/23/13 Urgent Business – Manchester Partnership Business

The Chair agreed to an item of urgent business to provide the Board with an update on the work of the Manchester Partnership Board following its most recent meeting.

The Deputy Place Base Lead addressed the meeting and referred to the meeting of the Partnership Board, held on 15 September 2023 which considered proposals for the winter plan for Manchester and the Manchester Board priorities for ensuring the health and wellbeing of residents and the accessing of services.

Hospital at Home programme

Reference was made to the development of the Hospital at Home programme in place to avoid the need for hospital admission, using virtual wards or other technology-enabled care within a patient's home. The pilot scheme has in six months seen a reduction of over two thousand hospital bed days. A further information sharing event is planned for 28 September 2023, for the next stage of the rollout of the programme. It is planned that the 'Hospital at Home' team will be in place to support the Central Manchester area by the end of 2023, and it is expected that this will be extended to the north and south areas of the city by the first quarter of 2024.

### Integrated Care Board

An update was also provided on the Integrated Care Board (ICB) and the financial position. It was reported that a turn around director has been appointed to look examine the finances across the integrated care system to work towards improving the current financial position. The current deficit stands at £606 million across the integrated system for 2023/24 financial year. Work continues to ensure financial sustainability for Manchester and a financial stability programme is in place and to integrate services for best value.

### Carnall Farrar Leadership and Governance Review

It was reported that following the review, work has proceeded and there is now a revised model for the Integrated Care Board that will be considered by the Board of the ICB, today. The proposed model will set up more clearly the division of responsibility held at a Greater Manchester level. Work is continuing to embed and operationalise the new system, in particular the commissioning of services at a Greater Manchester level.

The Chair reported that he with the Chair of the Health Scrutiny Committee (Councillor Green) had written to the Secretary of State (Health) to highlight concerns regarding the transition of Integrated Care, in view of the financial deficit (£606 million) so late into the financial year. The Secretary of State has been requested lobby the Treasury to highlight the situation, ahead of the Government's Autumn Statement. The Chair made the point was made that, as the winter period approaches there are clear indications of increasing numbers of seasonal illness and health service partners have implemented changes to accommodate additional pressure on existing services.

### Decision

#### **HWB/23/14 Minutes**

The chair made a correction to the title of members present at the previous meeting.

### Decision

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

#### **HWB/23/15 Health Protection - Operational Local Health Economy Outbreak Plan Manchester and Update on Tuberculosis**

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health that provided background information about the refresh of the Operational Local Health Economy Management Plan for Manchester and includes the draft plan for approval. It also provided a detailed focus on current epidemiology and issues relating to tuberculosis (TB).

The Board was informed that the Health Protection Board had focussed on covid during the covid pandemic, however other diseases such as TB remain a serious public health concern and present a challenge to public health funding. Reference was also made the Outbreak Management Plan (appendix 1, of the report), concerning the operational arrangements in place specific to Manchester. The operational arrangements in place address several diseases specific to the complexity and diversity of city. It was reported that the covid pandemic had highlighted the lack of public health protection capacity and work had been ongoing to address this. The report also addressed the incidence of TB in Manchester which had risen in the latest reporting period. It was reported that there are current funding and capacity challenges regarding levels of latent TB and screening.

The Assistant Director of Public Health reported on the good working relationship with health service partners to help identify and treat TB cases through MFT. It was reported that current funding levels have limited preventative screening work to identify latent TB and this has been highlighted from outbreaks of TB across the city in different settings such as care homes and schools. Health partners were requested to consider the provision of services to ensure health equity for all the city's population.

The Chair thanked officers for their ongoing important work in tackling TB within the city and noted that current funding allows screening for 26% for latent TB, and highlighted the necessity for anyone newly arriving in Manchester to be provided with health screening checks to identify illnesses at the earliest stage.

Members welcomed the report and noted the difficulties of detecting and treating latent TB across communities. The importance of developing a joined-up communications strategy to raise public awareness and provide information to a range of communities on recognising TB symptoms must continue as well as encouraging attendance for screening appointments. The approach taken to engage with communities, in particular migrants, is important to ensure health screening and the take up of vaccination at the earliest opportunity before individuals were resettled to other areas.

The Board was informed that a business plan is in place to address funding issues for services across the city and the help of the Health and Wellbeing Board is welcomed in progressing that work.

Reference was made to those individuals with no recourse to funds, in particular homeless people leaving hospital and requiring accommodation to help sustain their recovery. A recovery pathway has been produced to help homeless people recovering from TB, where accommodation will be provided and located close to hospital to ensure treatment is continued. The system has been recognised nationally as unique to Manchester and will be shared with other public health

providers. Funding for the service has not yet been determined and is currently provided via the Public Health team until NHS funds are available.

The Director of Public Health reported that the NHS GM Migrant Health Group had met on 18 September 2023, and would be the appropriate forum to escalate the matters raised concerning TB. The Group can provide a lobbying role on the subject which is a national issue, and this may provide access to funding to increase TB screening.

## **Decisions**

The Health and Wellbeing Board;

1. Approve the Operational Local Health Economy Outbreak Management Plan for Manchester, as detailed in appendix 1, of the report submitted.
2. Are informed of the current issues around TB and recommend that the Director of Public Health a) escalates migrant health related issues to the newly established NHS GM Migrant Health Group; b) advocates through professional networks for more latent TB testing to be available for all residents with higher risk of TB, not just new entrants and not just adults.

## **HWB/23/16 Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategies**

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health that described that in November 2022, the Department of Health and Social Care confirmed that local Health and Wellbeing Boards would continue to be responsible for assessing the health and wellbeing needs of their local population through the publication of a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) and a Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy (JLHWS). The report focused specifically on the statutory guidance and the November 2022 update and what it meant for Manchester.

Reference was made to section 3 of the report regarding the Manchester Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy and the proposal to not write another new strategy but use Our Healthier Manchester Strategy which was refreshed in 2021 alongside Making Manchester Fairer to constitute the Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy. The Our Healthier Manchester Strategy will reflect both the Greater Manchester Strategy and the five year forward view.

The Chair referred to the number of changes to health arrangements, outlined between paragraphs 3.4. and 3.6 and asked how these may be scrutinised or assessed between the Manchester Partnership Board and the Health and Wellbeing Board.

The Board welcomed the proposal to bring the strategies together and refresh them to produce a strategy that aligns with the Greater Manchester framework and that is specific and works for the city, noting also the need to include greater focus on the needs of children and young people and the measurement of outcomes delivered.

## **Decisions**

The Health and Wellbeing Board;

1. Note the report and its statutory duties and powers in relation to the Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy.
2. Agree to delegate the co-ordination of the approach to comply the statutory duty to the Director of Public Health and the Deputy Place Based Lead.

### **HWB/23/17 Armed Forces Community Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA)**

The Board considered the report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services that provided a summary of the evidence and data regarding the health of the armed forces community. It described some of the health issues that may affect members of the armed forces community and what the data from the 2021 Census told us about UK armed forces veterans living in Manchester.

The report also described what Manchester City Council and other organisations working in the city are doing to support members of the armed forces community and their families as well as some of the opportunities for action that existed.

The Chair welcomed the report and referred to the provision of support at a national level to ex-service personnel returning to civilian life, suffering from mental health issues and/or physical injuries or other illnesses. The production of a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment will help to bridge the gap of the national strategy and better focus services for veterans and serving members of the armed forces and their families living within Manchester, to help them to settle and access help with medical issues and employment opportunities.

Members of the Board welcomed the report and acknowledged the work of those to help ex-service personnel and their families to settle within communities and help with employment. Also, the work to help those who are employed and who are members of the TA and serve and return to work. It is important for those employers who have employees serving in the armed forces to allow them time to return and readjust to civilian life. Reference was made to the importance of raising of awareness of local GPs on the process to access the mental health support pathway. There are currently twenty-two GP surgeries involved under the OP Courage and Transition intervention and liaison service operated by MFT. Recognising skills that can be transferred to the civilian workplace is a major factor in helping ex-service personnel, and employers are asked to look further than the individual's academic achievement to include other important skills that have been developed in the armed services, when considering an offer of employment.

The Director of Public Health reported that the new style to the production of Joint Strategic Needs Assessments will be a briefer concise document that will include a structure to include the nature of challenges involved in an area of service and provide opportunities for action. This model will be developed to allow contributors to take ownership of the document. The proposal to include consultation with GPs to raise awareness of OP Courage and Transition intervention and liaison service will

be included in the JSNA to move the matter forward in promoting the service to veterans and armed forces personnel.

### **Decisions**

The Health and Wellbeing Board;

1. Note the content of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.
2. Support the opportunities for further action described in the JSNA.
3. To endorse the inclusion within the JSNA of GP surgery liaison and consultation to raise awareness of the OP Courage and Transition intervention and liaison service.

### **HWB/23/18 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 June to August on the Making Manchester Fairer Action Plan and a case study on Manchester Housing Provider Partnership's approach to Making Manchester Fairer and tackling health inequalities.

The Board welcomed the report and acknowledged the role of housing providers in communities by providing more than just good quality homes and working to empower local people and helping maintain the health and wellbeing of residents through maintaining communication and involvement of service provider partners.

The Chair welcomed the report and looked to use the subject matter for inclusion in future meetings of the Making Manchester Fairer Board. The chair requested the amendment to the first bullet of paragraph 4.1 of the report to replace the word 'launch' with 'development'.

### **Decision**

The Health and Wellbeing Board note progress made in implementing the Making Manchester Fairer Action Plan. As well as noting the work that is taking place across partner organisations to integrate the Making Manchester approach and principles system wide.

### **HWB/23/19 Children and Young People's Health Summit**

The Board considered the report of the Deputy Director of Public Health that described that the Children and Young People's Health Summit brought system leaders together to develop, drive and own the future direction and delivery of Manchester Locality's priorities for the health of our children and young people. The report summarised the event and next steps.

### **Decision**

The Health and Wellbeing Board note the key outputs from the event and proposed next steps.

This page is intentionally left blank



**Manchester City Council  
Report for Resolution**

**Report to:** Council – 4 October 2023

**Subject:** Review of Members' Allowances

**Report of:** City Solicitor

---

**Summary**

To enable the Council to consider the report and recommendations of the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) in relation to the remuneration of the members of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

**Recommendations:**

That Council:

1. Accept the recommendations of the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel and agree payment of special responsibility allowances to the Manchester City Council Members appointed as Members, substitute Members, Chair and, where appointed, the vice-chair of the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee as set out in the report, backdated to 1st April 2023;
  2. Agree the indexation of the special responsibility allowances as recommended by the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel;
  3. Instruct the City Solicitor to amend the Council's Members' Allowance Scheme set out in Part 7 of the Council's Constitution to give effect to the decision of Council.
- 

**Wards Affected - All**

---

**Financial Consequences – Revenue**

There are no financial implications for the Council arising as a result of the proposed changes to the Member Allowance Scheme. Allowances paid by the Council to its Members that are appointed to sit on the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee will be reimbursed to the Council by the GMCA.

**Financial Consequences – Capital - None.**

**Contact Officers:**

Name: Fiona Ledden  
Position: City Solicitor  
E-mail: [fiona.ledden@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:fiona.ledden@manchester.gov.uk)

Name: Peter Hassett  
Position: Senior Solicitor  
E-mail: [peter.hassett@manchester.gov.uk](mailto:peter.hassett@manchester.gov.uk)

**Background documents (available for public inspection):**

The following document discloses important facts on which the report is based and has been relied upon in preparing the report. Copies of the background documents are available up to 4 years after the date of the meeting. The document is available on the Council's website [www.manchester.gov.uk](http://www.manchester.gov.uk)

- Report of the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel
- Statutory Guidance issued by the Secretary of State

## 1. Background

1.1 At its meeting held on 16 December 2022 the GMCA considered a report of its Independent Remuneration Panel in relation to special responsibility allowances (SRA's) for Members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee and recommended as follows:

- a) That the recommendations of the report of the GM IRP be noted and accepted;
- b) That it be noted that the levelling up bill is still proceeding through parliament and therefore the GMCA does not yet have legislative power to pay allowances directly to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee members;
- c) That it be recommended that the GM Districts consider paying such allowances to their appointees to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee in the interim;
- d) That a request be made to the GMCA Treasurer to ensure that appropriate arrangements be put in place with GM Districts to enable the payment of the allowances, subject to reimbursement from the GMCA;
- e) That it be recommended that any Special Responsibility Allowances for Members and Chair of the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee be set as recommended in the report and be backdated to 24th June 2022 when the new scrutiny arrangements were put in place.

## 2. The Manchester City Council Independent Remuneration Panel

2.1 The Manchester City Council Independent Remuneration Panel consists of the following persons:

- Dr Declan Hall (Chair) - a former lecturer at the Institute of Local Government, the University of Birmingham, currently an independent consultant who specialises in Members Allowances and support;
- Vicky Knight – Regional Manager, UNISON North West
- Clive Memmott OBE - Chief Executive of Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce.

2.2 The Council's IRP met on 27 June 2023 and interviewed a number of Members and Council staff. The IRP completed its review on 3 July 2023 and issued its report which is attached as Appendix 1.

2.3 Before the Council amends the Members' Allowances Scheme it must have regard to the report of the IRP and also the Statutory Guidance issued by the Secretary of State, a copy of which is attached at appendix 2.

2.4 The Council is not obliged to follow the proposals of the IRP.

### **3. Summary of the Panel's Recommendations**

3.1 The IRP recommends that the Council sets out in its allowances scheme that it pays the following SRAs to the Members it appoints to the GMCA Overview & Scrutiny Committee (until the GMCA acquires to powers to pay the posts itself) as follows:

- The full Members: annual SRA of £3,228
- The Substitute Members: an annual standing SRA of £536 + a variable SRA of £134.52 for each meeting attended of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and related Task & Finish Groups
- If a MCC Member is a Chair: an annual SRA of £9,684 only
- If a MCC Member is a Vice Chair (and GMCA appoints one): an annual SRA of £4,035 only

3.2 The IRP further recommends, in accordance with Council policy, that the SRAs paid to MCC Members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee are subject to the 1-SRA only rule. In that where a Member appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee, who is already in receipt of another SRA, then they are only able to be paid 1-SRA only.

3.3 The IRP also recommends that the SRAs paid to MCC Members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee are updated each year in accordance with the annual percentage pay increase given to Manchester City Council employees at SCP 43 (and rounded to the nearest £) as agreed for each year by the National Joint Council for Local Government Staff. This index should continue to the end of March 2025, if the SRAs are still applicable at MCC.

3.4 The IRP recommended that the recommended SRAs for MCC Members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee including their indexation are implemented from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2023 or from any date before then as agreed by the Council.

### **4. Recommendations:**

4.1 The recommendations appear at the front of this report.

**A Review  
Of  
Members' Allowances  
For  
Manchester City Council**

---

**A Report**

**By the**

**Independent Remuneration Panel**

**Dr Declan Hall (Chair)  
Vicky Knight  
Clive Memmott OBE**

**July 2023**

## **Executive Summary: Recommendations**

**The IRP recommends that:**

### **MCC Members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee**

- The full Members: annual SRA of £3,228
- The Substitute Members: an annual standing SRA of £536 + a variable SRA of £134.52 for each meeting attended of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and related Task & Finish Groups
- If a MCC Member is a Chair: an annual SRA of £9,684 only
- If a MCC Member is a Vice Chair (and GMCA appoints one): an annual SRA of £4,035 only

### **Applying 1-SRA rule to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny SRAs**

The SRAs paid to MCC Members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee is subject to the 1-SRA only rule.

### **Indexation of Allowances**

The SRAs paid to MCC Members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee are also updated each year in accordance with the annual percentage pay increase given to Manchester City Council employees at SCP 43 (and rounded to the nearest £) as agreed for each year by the National Joint Council for Local Government Staff. This index should continue to the end of March 2025, if the SRAs are still applicable at MCC.

### **Special Responsibility Allowances**

Any recommendations on other SRAs are to be deferred at the request of MCC for further consideration.

### **Implementation of Recommendations**

The recommended SRAs for MCC Members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee including their indexation are implemented from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2023 or from any date before then as agreed by the Council.

## **A Review of Members' Allowances**

**For**

**Manchester City Council**

**By the**

**Independent Remuneration Panel**

**July 2023**

### **Introduction: The Regulatory Context**

1. This report is a synopsis of the deliberations and recommendations made by the Independent Remuneration Panel (the IRP) for Manchester City Council to advise the Council on its Members' Allowances scheme. The IRP was convened under *The Local Authorities' (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 (SI 1021)* ("the 2003 Regulations"). These regulations, which arise out of the relevant provisions contained in the Local Government Act 2000, require all local authorities to establish and maintain an advisory Independent [Members] Remuneration Panel to review and provide advice on Members' allowances on a periodic basis. All Councils are required to convene their IRP and seek its advice before they make any changes or amendments to their members' allowances scheme. They must 'pay regard' to their IRPs recommendations before setting a new or amended Members' Allowances Scheme (2003 Regulations paragraph 19)
2. On this particular occasion, as the Council was primarily seeking to adopt some new SRAs, namely for Members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the IRP was reconvened under the 2003 Regulations (paragraph 19).

### **The IRP**

3. Manchester City Council reconvened its Independent Remuneration Panel, constituted of the following members:
  - Dr Declan Hall (Chair): a former lecturer at the Institute of Local Government, the University of Birmingham, currently an independent consultant who specialises in Members Allowances and support

- Clive Memmott (OBE):<sup>1</sup> Chief Executive of Greater Manchester Chamber of Commerce
  - Vicky Knight: Regional Manager UNISON North West
4. The IRP was supported by:
- Fiona Ledden: City Solicitor
  - Peter Hassett: Senior Lawyer, who took the organisational Lead in facilitating the work of the IRP

### Terms of Reference

5. In accordance with the 2003 Regulations (21.1) and 2006 Statutory Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances (61) the IRP was asked to produce a report to make recommendations on the following:
- I. The payment of SRAs to those Manchester City Council (MCC) Members appointed as members of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA), including as members, substitute members or the Chair to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the amount of such allowances
  - II. The responsibilities or duties which should lead to the payment of a Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) and as to the amount of such an allowance
  - III. As to whether annual adjustments of allowance levels may be made by reference to an index, and, if so, which index should apply, subject to a maximum of four years, before its application is reviewed
  - IV. The implementation date for the new Scheme of Members' Allowances and as to whether, in the event that the scheme is amended, any such amendments should be backdated to the beginning of the financial year

In undertaking the review, the IRP is expected to:

- A. To take into account allowances paid in comparable councils, namely the other Greater Manchester Metropolitan Councils
- B. To take into account the recommendations of the GMCA IRP report dated November 2022, on SRAs payable to members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- C. To take into account the views of Members
- D. Any other consideration that the Council obliges the IRP to take into account

---

<sup>1</sup> Clive Memmott took part in the view virtually



## Process and Methodology

6. The IRP met in person at Manchester Town Hall Extension on 27<sup>th</sup> June 2023. These meetings were in private session to enable the IRP to meet with Members and receive factual briefings from relevant Officers and conduct deliberations in confidence.
7. In accordance with the terms of reference, in arriving at its recommendations, the IRP also reviewed a wide range of written data and evidence, which included but was not limited to Council and committee meetings schedules and terms of reference, relevant reports and information on the Council's governance arrangements, the 2006 Statutory Guidance on Members' Allowances, etc.
8. For full details of the written evidence received and reviewed by the IRP see:
  - Appendix 1: Details of Members interviewed and Officers who provided a factual briefing to the IRP
  - Appendix 2: for a list of the full range of evidence considered by the IRP
  - Appendix 3: Benchmarking data, namely the Basic and Special Responsibility Allowances (2022/23) paid across all 10 Greater Manchester Metropolitan Councils

## Introductory Observation – Not time to make revisions to the wider scheme

9. While the IRP did identify some anomalies in the current scheme, aside from the SRAs for members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee, the IRP considered, based on the representation received it is reasonable in the circumstances to defer any recommendations regarding other SRAs.
10. The IRP does feel that some of the main allowances payable are not sustainable in the longer term. To encourage a wide range of candidates to run for and remain on Council the allowances will need addressing in the future.

## The IRPs Recommendations – Recommended SRAs for MCC Members appointed to the GMCA Overview & Scrutiny Committee

24. The trigger for this review was a report received by the Council from the GMCA (dated 16 December 2022) that also contained a report (November 2022) from the GMCA IRP setting out its recommendations regarding the payment of SRAs of GM council Members appointed to the GMCA Overview & Scrutiny

Committee. All GM councils are required to appoint Members to the GMCA Overview & Scrutiny Committees and it is a statutory committee.

25. The GMCA IRP reviewed these SRAs in anticipation of the enacting of the Levelling Up Bill which will give the GMCA the authority to remunerate GM council Members appointed to its Overview & Scrutiny Committee. However, the Levelling Up Bill is still proceeding through Parliament and therefore the GMCA does not yet have the legislative power to pay an SRA directly to the GMCA Overview & Scrutiny Committee Members. As an interim arrangement, the GMCA has asked all GM councils to adopt the recommendations of the GMCA IRP regarding GM council Members appointed to its Overview & Scrutiny Committee. Moreover, there will be no financial impact for Manchester City Council, as the payment of these SRAs will be reimbursed by the GMCA.
26. The MCC IRP received no evidence to deviate from the recommendations of the GMCA IRP regarding the payment of SRAs for MCC Members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee. These SRAs were supported in the representation received and it is noted that where considered all other GM Council have adopted the same recommendations.
27. As such, the IRP recommends that the Council sets out in its allowances scheme that it pays the following SRAs to the Members it appoints to the GMCA Overview & Scrutiny Committee (until the GMCA acquires to powers to pay the posts itself) as follows:
- **The full Members:** **annual SRA of £3,228**
  - **The Substitute Members:** **an annual standing SRA of £536 + a variable SRA of £134.52 for each meeting attended of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and related Task & Finish Groups**
  - **If a MCC Member is a Chair:** **an annual SRA of £9,684 only**
  - **If a MCC Member is a Vice Chair (and GMCA appoints one):** **an annual SRA of £4,035 only**

11. The IRP further recommends, in accordance with Council policy, that the SRAs paid to MCC Members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee are subject to the 1-SRA only rule. In that where a Member appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee who is already in receipt of another SRA then they are only able to be paid 1-SRA only.

### **Indexation of Allowances**

12. The 2003 Regulations permit allowances to be indexed on an annual basis but for no longer than a period of 4 years before a Council is required to reconvene and seek a view from their IRP before it can be renewed for another four years. Most Councils now index their allowances, it helps to prevent them losing value over time. Currently, MCC indexes the Basic Allowance, SRAs, Co-optees' Allowances and payments to Members of the

Independent Education Appeals Panels to the annual percentage increase (at SCP 43) given to Manchester City Council employees (and rounded to the nearest £) as agreed for each year by the National Joint Council (NJC) for Local Government, known as the NJC index. Authority for this indexation runs until the end of March 2025, implemented from the 1<sup>st</sup> of April 2021, a period of four years, the maximum period allowed before the Council is required to seek further advice on the issue from the IRP.

13. In the representation received there was overall support to continue this indexing for the SRAs paid to MCC Members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It is also noted that all other GM Councils apply the NJC index to their relevant allowances.
14. Thus the IRP recommends that the SRAs paid to MCC Members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee are also uprated each year in accordance with the annual percentage pay increase given to Manchester City Council employees at SCP 43 (and rounded to the nearest £) as agreed for each year by the National Joint Council for Local Government Staff. This index should continue to the end of March 2025, if the SRAs are still applicable at MCC.

### **Special Responsibility Allowances**

15. While as previously indicated, the IRP did consider that there was a case to revisit some of the current SRAs payable any recommendations on other SRAs have been deferred at the request of MCC for further consideration.

### **Implementation of Recommendations**

16. It is recommended that the recommended SRAs for MCC Members appointed to the GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee including their indexation are implemented from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2023 or from any date before then as agreed by the Council.

## **Appendix One: Members interviewed by IRP and Officers who provided a factual briefing to the IRP**

### **Members interviewed by the IRP**

Cllr B. Craig	Leader of the Council and Labour Group, Executive Lead for Governance & Devolution, External Relationships and Strategic Policy Coordination and GMCA Portfolio Holder for Economy, Business & Inclusive Growth
Cllr A. Johnson	Leader of Green Opposition Group
Cllr P. Karney	Labour Group Secretary
Cllr J. Leech	Leader of Liberal Democrat Opposition Group
Cllr J. Midgley	Deputy Leader and Executive Lead for Reducing Poverty & tackling inequalities, Homeless, Voluntary & Community Sector, Domestic Violence & Abuse. Advice Services, Refugees & Asylum Seekers and Member Development
Cllr L. Rahman	Deputy Leader (statutory) and Executive Lead for Crime & Safety, Our Manchester Strategy Performance, Civil contingencies & Emergency Planning, Corporate & Property & Estates, Cultural Strategy, Future Council Programme Oversight, Capital Project and Lord Mayor's Office

### **Officer who provided a factual briefing to the IRP**

Joanne Roney	Chief Executive
Fiona Ledden	City Solicitor & Monitoring Officer

## Appendix Two: Papers and other Written Material Received by the IRP

1. IRP Terms of Reference
2. Review of Members Allowances for MCC, Report of the IRP, February 2022
3. Report to Council on Report of the IRP, February 2022, 18<sup>th</sup> May 2022
4. Extract minutes of Council meeting 18<sup>th</sup> May 2022
5. Manchester City Council Members' Allowances Scheme 2022/23 including full schedule of SRAs payable, travel and subsistence rates and approved duties, including the support provided to Members
6. Schedule of payments, support and other allowances provided to Members appointed to the MCC Independent Education Appeals Panels
7. Manchester City Council annual statutory publication of Members' allowances and expenses received by each Member, 2021/22
8. Manchester City Council Constitution, Articles 6-7, The Council, Council, Chair, Scrutiny Committees, The Executive, Regulatory & other Committees and Standards Committee
9. Manchester City Council Constitution, Part 3, Section C, Terms of Reference for Committees
10. Manchester City Council and committees, meetings timetable 2022/23
11. Membership, including Chair and Deputy Chair of Manchester City Council Committees and Executive
12. Executive Member roles, 2022/23
13. Portfolio of MCC Council Leader on the GMCA
14. National Employers for Local Government Services, Local Government Pay Offer, 27<sup>rd</sup> February 2023
15. The Greater Manchester Combined Authority Order 2011, Schedule 1, SI2011/908
16. Benchmarking (BM1-3) - summary of allowances paid across the GM Councils 2022/23 or the latest data available
17. Hard copies of allowances schemes from all GM Councils
18. New Council Constitutions: (Statutory) Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances, May 2006 (extract)
19. The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003, SI 2003/1021

20. GMCA IRP Report, Review of SRAs for Members appointed to GMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee, November 2022

### Appendix Three: Benchmarking Data Summary

<b>BM1 Manchester City Council BM Group - Other GM Mets: BA + Exec + Scrutiny SRAs (22/23)</b>									
Comparator Council	Basic Allowance	Leader or Elected Mayor	Leader or Mayor Total	Deputy Leader	Executive Cabinet Members	Assistant or Deputy Execs	Chairs or Lead Scrutiny	V/Chairs Scrutiny	Chairs Scrutiny Subs/WGs
<b>Bolton</b>	£11,848	£31,989	£43,837	£19,104	£7,265		£5,189		
<b>Bury*</b>	£11,227	£39,681	£50,908	£20,209	£15,157	£2,273	£8,420		
<b>Oldham*</b>	£10,514	£37,848	£48,362	£22,079	£18,272	£7,885	£9,462		
<b>Rochdale*</b>	£11,172	£39,395	£50,567	£16,758	£15,082	£3,016	£8,379		
<b>Salford**</b>	£12,012	£59,817	£71,829	£24,930	£15,932	£11,626	£9,432	£3,141	
<b>Stockport</b>	£10,717	£32,151	£42,868	£17,683	£16,075		£6,430		£1,286
<b>Tameside</b>	£14,712	£39,588	£54,300	£25,812	£22,081	£9,176	£10,526	£3,509	£2,601
<b>Trafford*</b>	£10,076	£41,473	£51,549	£20,303	£15,618	£7,809	£8,590	£2,577	
<b>Wigan*</b>	£13,920	£52,737	£66,657	£27,147	£18,818	£6,210	£8,364		
<b>Manchester</b>	£18,841	£47,016	£65,857	£19,775	£19,775	£7,913	£11,877		
<b>Mean</b>	<b>£12,504</b>	<b>£42,170</b>	<b>£54,673</b>	<b>£21,380</b>	<b>£16,408</b>	<b>£6,989</b>	<b>£8,667</b>	<b>£3,076</b>	
<b>Median</b>	<b>£11,538</b>	<b>£39,635</b>	<b>£51,229</b>	<b>£20,256</b>	<b>£16,004</b>	<b>£7,847</b>	<b>£8,505</b>	<b>£3,141</b>	
<b>Highest</b>	<b>£18,841</b>	<b>£59,817</b>	<b>£71,829</b>	<b>£27,147</b>	<b>£22,081</b>	<b>£11,626</b>	<b>£11,877</b>	<b>£3,509</b>	
<b>Lowest</b>	<b>£10,076</b>	<b>£31,989</b>	<b>£42,868</b>	<b>£16,758</b>	<b>£7,265</b>	<b>£2,273</b>	<b>£5,189</b>	<b>£2,577</b>	
<b>Mean Ratios</b>		Mean Leaders SRA = 3.73 X Mean BA		<b>51%</b>	<b>39%</b>	<b>43%</b>	<b>21%</b>	<b>35%</b>	
<b>MCC Ratios</b>		2.5 X MCC BA		<b>42%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>NA</b>	
* Leaders SRAs include where 2nd GMCA Leaders additional SRA is also payable					** Salford has 2 Deputy Mayors				

BM2 Manchester City Council BM Group Other GM Mets : Regulatory SRAs (22/23)										
Comparator Council	Chair of Planning	V/Chair Planning	Chair of Licensing	V/Chair Licensing	Chairs Licensing Panels/Subs	Mbrs Licensing	Chair Audit &/or Governance	V/Chair Audit	Chair Standards	Chair Employment
<b>Bolton</b>	£8,321	£2,863	£7,875	£2,565						
<b>Bury</b>	£8,420		£8,420			£106 p/mtng > 4 hours/£53 < 4 hours	£8,420			
<b>Oldham</b>	£9,462		£9,462				£2,325		£734	
<b>Rochdale</b>	£11,172		Inc in Planning				£8,379			£8,379
<b>Salford</b>	£9,432	£3,141	£9,432	£3,141			£9,432	£3,141		
<b>Stockport</b>	£8,038		£4,823		£3,858		£3,858			
<b>Tameside</b>	£10,526	£3,509	£6,809	£2,536	£6,809		£10,526	£3,509	£6,809	
<b>Trafford</b>	£10,933	£3,280	£10,933	£3,280			£8,590	£4,236	£2,343	£7,809
<b>Wigan</b>	£12,543	£3,265	£15,491	£3,873			£8,364			
<b>Manchester</b>	£11,877	£3,961	£11,877	£3,961		£596				
<b>Mean</b>	<b>£10,072</b>	<b>£3,337</b>	<b>£9,458</b>	<b>£3,226</b>			<b>£7,487</b>	<b>£3,629</b>	<b>£3,295</b>	
<b>Median</b>	<b>£9,994</b>	<b>£3,273</b>	<b>£9,432</b>	<b>£3,211</b>			<b>£8,400</b>	<b>£3,509</b>	<b>£2,343</b>	
<b>Highest</b>	<b>£12,543</b>	<b>£3,961</b>	<b>£15,491</b>	<b>£3,961</b>			<b>£10,526</b>	<b>£4,236</b>	<b>£6,809</b>	
<b>Lowest</b>	<b>£8,038</b>	<b>£2,863</b>	<b>£4,823</b>	<b>£2,536</b>			<b>£2,325</b>	<b>£3,141</b>	<b>£734</b>	
Mean Ratios Leaders' or Chairs' SRA	24%	33%	22%	34%			18%	48%	8%	
MCC Ratios	25%	33%	25%	33%						



**BM3 Manchester City Council BM Group - Other GM Mets: Opposition, Group & Other SRAs (22/23)**

Comparator Council	Main Opposition Leader	Main Opposition Deputy Leader	Other Opposition Group Leaders	Other Opposition Group Deputy Leaders	Area Chairs	Other/Political/Group SRAs
<b>Bolton</b>	£10,683	£4,273	£2,671	£1,870		Chair Bolton Cares £8,199, Bolton at Home £5,500, HM Pension Fund Member £1,460
<b>Bury</b>	£11,115	£4,446	£5,558	£1,946		Mbrs appointed to GMCA Waste Committee £1,500, Mbrs appointed to GMTC £3,000, Licensing Mbrs only paid if attend > 6 licensing hearings
<b>Oldham</b>	£15,771	£6,309	£4,568		£6,624	Shadow Execs £3,154, Deputy District Leads £1,302, "Additional SRA" £1,577, GMTC Mbrs £4,288, GM O&S Mbr £3,228, GM O&S Substitutes £536 + £135 p/mtnng
<b>Rochdale</b>	£11,731		£1,676		£8,379	Member Adoption + Fostering Panels £1,676, Mbrs GMTC + GMCA Waste Committee £4,182
<b>Salford</b>	£9,432		£9,432			Opposition Group Leaders SRA only payable with 3 Mbrs, Council Chair £11,04, Mbrs GMTC £5,629
<b>Stockport</b>	£9,645		£1,101 + £330 p/Mbr		£4,823	
<b>Tameside</b>	£12,381		£2,536		£10,526	Chair Council Business £12,381, Dep Chairs Licensing Subs £2,536, Dep Area Chairs £3,509, Dep Chair Standards £2,536, Member Standards £1,665 + if attend .5 Standards, Mbr GM Waste Disposal £2,100 + GMTC £3,825, Chair + Dep Chair + Mbr GM Pension Fund £17,525/£8,762/£1,486
<b>Trafford</b>	£10,933	£3,280	£3,142			Shadow Execs £2,187, Dep Chair Employment £2,343
<b>Wigan</b>	£5,641	£50 p/Member if > 15 Members	£5,641			
<b>Manchester</b>	£11,877	£4,752	£4,752			Opposition Lead Mbr Finance £1,188, City Centre Spokesperson + Member on Fostering Panel £7,913, Member on Adoption Panel £6,372. Members of Licensing only paid if attend >12 meetings
<b>Mean</b>	<b>£10,921</b>	<b>£4,612</b>	<b>£4,442</b>		<b>£7,588</b>	
<b>Median</b>	<b>£11,024</b>	<b>£4,446</b>	<b>£4,568</b>		<b>£7,502</b>	
<b>Highest</b>	<b>£15,771</b>	<b>£6,309</b>	<b>£9,432</b>		<b>£10,526</b>	
<b>Lowest</b>	<b>£5,641</b>	<b>£3,280</b>	<b>£1,676</b>		<b>£4,823</b>	
<b>Mean Ratios to Leaders' SRA</b>	26%	42%	11%		18%	
<b>MCC Ratios</b>	<b>25%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>10%</b>			



# New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

## Contents

<b>Front cover .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>4</b>
Main statutory provisions.....	4
Consolidation of Regulations.....	5
What allowances can be paid? .....	5
Withholding Allowances.....	8
Backdating of Allowances .....	9
Annual Adjustments of Allowance levels.....	9
<b>The independent remuneration panel .....</b>	<b>10</b>
The work of the panel .....	12
Making a scheme of allowances .....	13
Publicity .....	14
Transitional Provisions .....	16
Allowances for Chair and Vice Chair of Principal Councils .....	16
Allowances for Members of Parish Councils.....	16
<b>Tax and National Insurance treatment of Local Government Councillors' and Civic Dignitaries' allowances and expenses .....</b>	<b>19</b>
Taxation of Members' Allowances and Expenses.....	19
Members' Allowances which provide Remuneration .....	20
Other points concerning a member's tax affairs.....	24
<b>Members' Allowances and National Insurance contributions (NICs).....</b>	<b>27</b>
Introduction.....	27
If you have more than one job .....	27
General expenses .....	27
Motoring expenses.....	28
Benefits .....	28
Allowances and expenses paid to civic dignitaries .....	28
Clothing.....	28
Donations .....	29
Entertainment.....	29

New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

**Front cover**

**New Council Constitutions: Local leadership, local choice**

**Guidance on Consolidated Regulations for Local Authority Allowances**

July 2003

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister: London

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London SW1E 5DU

Telephone: 020 7944 3000

Web site: [www.odpm.gov.uk](http://www.odpm.gov.uk)

© Crown copyright 2003

*Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.*

*This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.*

*For any other use of this material, please write to HMSO, The Copyright Unit, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ Fax: 01603 723000 or e-mail: [copyright@hmso.gov.uk](mailto:copyright@hmso.gov.uk).*

*Applications for reproduction should be made in writing to The Copyright Unit, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ.*

Further copies of this publication are available from:

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister Publications  
PO Box 236  
Wetherby  
West Yorkshire  
LS23 7NB

Tel: 0870 1226 236

Fax: 0870 1226 237

Textphone: 0870 1207 405

E-mail: [odpm@twoten.press.net](mailto:odpm@twoten.press.net)

Printed in Great Britain on material containing 75% post-consumer waste and 25% ECF pulp.

July 2003

Product code xxXXxxxxx

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

## Introduction

This Guidance is issued to English county councils, English district councils, London borough councils, the Council of the Isles of Scilly, fire authorities constituted by a combination scheme under the Fire Services Act 1947, joint authorities established by Part IV of the Local Government Act 1985, the London Fire and Emergency Planning Authority, the Broads Authority, the conservation boards of areas of outstanding natural beauty and the National Park authorities. The guidance also refers in part to the Association of London Government. Paragraphs 91 to 105 apply to parish councils in England.

The Guidance deals with:

- the payment of allowances to members of these authorities under the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and the Local Government Act 2000
- the payment of allowances to non-members serving on committees of authorities
- the establishment and maintenance of independent remuneration panels.

This guidance contains a combination of description of the main statutory provisions, statutory guidance (under section 18(5A) of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989, "the 1989 Act") to which local authorities must have regard and non-statutory guidance.

The statutory guidance to which local authorities must have regard is presented in maroon text with a "tick" in the left hand margin to distinguish it from the descriptive text and non-statutory guidance. This guidance supersedes our guidance *New Council Constitutions - Guidance on Members' Allowances for Local Authorities in England* issued by DETR in April 2001.

## Main statutory provisions

1. Section 18 of the 1989 Act, as amended by section 99 of the Local Government Act 2000 ("the 2000 Act"), makes provision in relation to basic, special responsibility and childcare and dependants' carers' allowances for members of local authorities. The Secretary of State can make regulations under this section requiring local authorities to make a scheme of allowances for their members and to establish and maintain a panel to make recommendations to the council about the scheme.
2. Section 100 of the 2000 Act allows the Secretary of State to make provision in relation to travel and subsistence allowance for members of local authorities and an allowance for non councillors who are members of a council's committee or sub-committee. This includes the amendment or repeal of provisions of sections 173 to 178 of the Local Government Act 1972.
3. The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances)(England) Regulations 2003 ("the Regulations") have been made under these provisions. These have recently been amended to change the dates by which local authorities must comply with the regulations. This Guidance deals with the regulations as so amended. The Regulations provide that it is for each local authority to decide its scheme and the amounts to be paid under that scheme.

Councils are required to establish and maintain an independent remuneration panel which will broadly have the functions of providing the local authority with advice on its scheme, the amounts to be paid and the pensionability of allowances where relevant. Local authorities must have regard to this advice.

4. The approach, therefore, is one where questions as to the amounts payable to members are matters for local determination. In this way, councils can take full account of their particular circumstances, including the precise form of their new constitution, and be directly accountable to their electorate. This accountability is sharpened through each council being advised on its own allowances scheme by a local panel whose members are required to be independent.

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

5. Local authorities must include in their scheme of allowances a basic allowance, payable to all members, and may include provision for the payment of special responsibility allowances and a dependants' carers' allowance. By virtue of section 100 of the 2000 Act, the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 allow the inclusion of a travel and subsistence and a co-optees' allowance within an allowances scheme. These allowances are also discretionary. Under the Regulations, made under s99 of the Local Government Act 2000, authorities may make provision in their schemes for the eligibility of members for pensions under the Local Government Pension Scheme.

### Consolidation of Regulations

6. The 2003 Regulations broadly:

- replicate the previous provisions for allowance schemes contained in the following Regulations, which are now revoked:
  - the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) Regulations 1991 as amended and
  - the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2001.

The 2003 Regulations in addition make the following changes:

- bring travel and subsistence allowances within the overall scheme, and for these to be subject to recommendations of the local panel rather than subject to limits imposed by the Secretary of State
- introduce a co-optees' allowance
- allow the ALG to pay a special responsibility allowance to its members, subject to the recommendations of an independent remuneration panel
- allow the conservation boards of areas of outstanding natural beauty and combined fire authorities, to make their own schemes of allowances
- allow waste disposal authorities, and joint boards upon which other authorities are represented, to pay travel and subsistence allowances
- allow authorities to cease payment to members who have been suspended or partially suspended from their duties, and to make provision for the repayment of allowances
- allow authorities to backdate allowances to the beginning of the financial year in which they are paid, and to make annual adjustments by means of an index, subject to the recommendations of the independent panel
- make provision for independent remuneration panels to make binding decisions on which councillors may be eligible for pensions
- allow parish councils to pay a parish basic allowance and travel and subsistence allowances to members
- enable parish remuneration panels to make recommendations on allowances paid by parish councils
- removing the option for parish councillors of claiming financial loss allowance
- require secondary authorities to have regard to the recommendations of the panels of those authorities which make nominations to the secondary authority.

### What allowances can be paid?

7. In summary, the allowances which are or may be payable to members of local authorities are as follows:

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

- basic allowance
- special responsibility allowance
- dependants' carers' allowance
- travelling and subsistence allowance.

8. The new co-optees' allowance may be payable to co-opted and appointed members of principal councils and non-elected members of other bodies appointed or nominated by a principal council.

***Basic allowance***

9. Each local authority must make provision in its scheme of allowances for a basic, flat rate allowance payable to all members of the authority. The allowance must be the same for each member. The allowance may be paid in a lump sum, or in instalments through the year.

10. Basic allowance is intended to recognise the time commitment of all councillors, including such inevitable calls on their time as meetings with officers and constituents and attendance at political group meetings. It is also intended to cover incidental costs such as the use of their homes.

***Special responsibility allowance***

11. Each local authority may also make provision in its scheme for the payment of special responsibility allowances for those councillors who have significant responsibilities. Special responsibility allowance may be payable for duties which fall within the following categories:

- acting as leader or deputy leader of a political group
- membership of the executive, where an authority is operating executive arrangements
- presiding at meetings of a committee, sub-committee, or joint committee
- representing the authority at meetings of another body
- membership of a committee or sub-committee which meets with exceptional frequency or for exceptionally long periods
- acting as a spokesperson for a political group on a committee or sub-committee
- membership of an adoption appeals panel or panel dealing with licensing or controlling any activity
- any other activities in relation to the discharge of the authority's functions as to require equal or greater effort of the member than any of the activities listed above.

12. A scheme must also specify the amounts of allowance to be paid for each such responsibility.

13. Where one political group is in control, and where an authority has decided to pay special responsibility allowances, the authority must make provision for the payment of a special responsibility allowance to at least one member of a minority group.

14. The Association of London Government will also be able to pay special responsibility allowances to those councillors who perform senior roles on it and who are also councillors of London borough councils.

***Dependants' carers' allowance***

15. A scheme of allowances may also include the payment of a dependants' carers' allowance to those councillors who incur expenditure for the care of children or other dependants whilst undertaking particular duties. These duties are specified in the Regulations and are as follows:

- a meeting of the executive



## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

- a meeting of a committee of the executive
- a meeting of the authority
- a meeting of a committee or sub-committee of the authority
- a meeting of some other body to which the authority make appointments or nominations, or
- a meeting of a committee or sub-committee of a body to which the authority make appointments or nominations
- a meeting which has **both** been authorised by the authority, a committee, or subcommittee of the authority or a joint committee of the authority and one or more other authorities, or a sub-committee of a joint committee **and** to which representatives of more than one political group have been invited (if the authority is divided into several political groups) or to which two or more councillors have been invited (if the authority is not divided into political groups)
- a meeting of a local authority association of which the authority is a member
- duties undertaken on behalf of the authority in pursuance of any standing order requiring a member or members to be present while tender documents are opened
- duties undertaken on behalf of the authority in connection with the discharge of any function of the authority conferred by or under any enactment and empowering or requiring the authority to inspect or authorise the inspection of premises
- duties undertaken on behalf of the authority in connection with arrangements made by the authority for the attendance of pupils at a school approved for the purposes of section 342 of the Education Act 1996
- any other duty approved by the authority in connection with discharging the duties of the authority or its committees or sub-committees.

***Travelling and subsistence allowance***

16. Each local authority may also make provision in its scheme for the payment of a travelling and subsistence allowance to its members, including co-opted members.

17. This may include provision for the payment of an allowance for those members who travel by bicycle or other non-motorised transport.

18. The Regulations also allows for waste disposal authorities and joint boards on which authorities are represented to pay a travelling and subsistence allowance to its members.

19. The Regulations provide that travelling and subsistence allowances may be paid for:

- a meeting of the executive
- a meeting of a committee of the executive
- a meeting of the authority
- a meeting of a committee or sub-committee of the authority
- a meeting of some other body to which the authority make appointments or nominations
- a meeting of a committee or sub-committee of a body to which the authority make appointments or nominations

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

- a meeting which has both been authorised by the authority, a committee, or subcommittee of the authority or a joint committee of the authority and one or more other authorities, or a sub-committee of a joint committee and to which representatives of more than one political group have been invited (if the authority is divided into several political groups) or to which two or more councillors have been invited (if the authority is not divided into political groups)
- a meeting of a local authority association of which the authority is a member
- duties undertaken on behalf of the authority in pursuance of any standing order requiring a member or members to be present while tender documents are opened
- duties undertaken on behalf of the authority in connection with the discharge of any function of the authority conferred by or under any enactment and empowering or requiring the authority to inspect or authorise the inspection of premises
- duties undertaken on behalf of the authority in connection with arrangements made by the authority for the attendance of pupils at a school approved for the purposes of section 342 of the Education Act 1996
- any other duty approved by the authority in connection with discharging the duties of the authority or its committees or sub-committees.

***Co-optees' allowance***

20. Each local authority may also make provision in its scheme for the payment of a co-optees' allowance, for attendance at conferences and meetings, to any co-opted and appointed members of a council's committees or sub-committees.

21. The co-optees' allowance will in general be an annual allowance, and it may vary from one co-opted member to another. Authorities have the ability to pay a proportion of the annual allowance in proportion to part of the year for which a member of a relevant committee or sub-committee serves on that committee or sub-committee.

22. Where either a co-opted or an appointed member is appointed chair of the committee on which they are co-opted or appointed, the co-optees' allowance they receive must be of an amount no less than the equivalent special responsibility allowances being made available to chairs of equivalent committees of the council.

**Withholding Allowances**

23. Certain allowances may be withheld as a result of full or partial suspension of a member of an authority. Where authorities would like to provide for this option, they should include provision for withdrawal of allowances in their schemes. An authority may provide in its scheme for the repayment of any allowances which have been paid in respect of a period during which a member has been suspended.

24. Where a councillor is fully or partially suspended from their duties, their basic allowance may be fully or partly withheld.

25. Travel and subsistence allowances maybe withheld where a councillor has been suspended from duties or responsibilities which attracted these allowances.

26. Where a councillor is fully or partially suspended from any duties or responsibilities which attract special responsibility allowance, those allowances may be withheld by the authority.

27. Co-optees' allowance may also be withheld where a co-optee is partially or fully suspended from their duties.

28. Dependants' carers' allowance may not be withheld from councillors.

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

**Backdating of Allowances**

29. When a scheme of allowances is amended, an authority may choose to apply the amendment retrospectively to the beginning of the financial year in which the amendment is made.
30. Where a councillor takes on duties entitling them to a different level of allowances (e.g. where a councillor is appointed to the executive, and thus entitled to special responsibility allowance), the new level of allowances may be applied retrospectively to the time at which the circumstances changed.
31. Independent remuneration panels may make recommendations, where relevant, as to whether the payments on which they have made a recommendation may be backdated. Authorities will be required to have regard to these recommendations.

**Annual Adjustments of Allowance levels**

32. A scheme of allowances may make provision for an annual adjustment of allowances to be ascertained by reference to an index as may be specified by the authority and contained in the scheme. The scheme must be publicised each year, whether or not it has been amended.
33. Where the only change made to a scheme is that caused by the annual impact of an index contained within that scheme, the scheme shall not be deemed to have been amended, and thus an authority will not have to seek a recommendation from its independent remuneration panel.
34. Where a panel makes a recommendation that allowance levels should be determined according to an index, it should also make a recommendation as to how long the index should run before reconsideration. In any case, an index may not run for more than four years before a further recommendation on it is sought from an independent remuneration panel.

***Forgoing allowances***

35. A scheme must provide that a person may forgo all or part of any allowances to which they are entitled. To do this they must give notice in writing to the proper officer of the authority.

## **The independent remuneration panel**

36. District, County and London Borough councils must establish and maintain an independent remuneration panel. The purpose of this panel is to make recommendations to the authority, or authorities in the case of a joint panel, about the allowances to be paid to members. In the case of a panel established by the Association of London Government (ALG), such a panel will make recommendations about the allowances to be paid to members in any London borough councils.

37. Independent remuneration panels will make recommendations about the level of basic allowance for all members, the level of special responsibility allowances and to whom they should be paid, and on whether dependants' carers' allowance, travel and subsistence allowances and co-optees' allowance should be paid, and the levels of these allowances.

38. Any further reference, up to paragraph 65, to "the panel" will include a joint panel or a panel established by the ALG. Any further reference to "the appointing authority" will include appointing authorities in circumstances where a panel has been appointed by two or more local authorities, or, for a panel established by the ALG, to any London borough councils to whom that panel is making recommendations.

### ***Setting up of an independent remuneration panel***

39. The 2003 Regulations provide that where an independent remuneration panel was set up, under the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) Regulations 2001, it shall continue to operate providing recommendations to the relevant authority. If the composition of the panel does not comply with the 2003 Regulations the authority must ensure that it does so by 30 November 2003. Where an authority does not currently have a panel, it must set one up by the same date.

40. Two or more local authorities are able under the Regulations to establish and maintain a joint independent remuneration panel to advise them on their schemes.

41. Such a panel must make separate recommendations to the appointing authorities. Local authorities should consider whether establishing such a joint panel would be an appropriate and cost effective arrangement in their local circumstances. In particular, where councils are considering a joint panel they will need to ensure that it would command public confidence in the areas of the local authorities concerned.

42. The 2003 Regulations also provide that the ALG may establish and maintain an independent remuneration panel to make recommendations to any London borough councils on their allowances schemes. Where the ALG has established such a panel to make recommendations to London borough councils, and where a particular London borough council chooses to have regard to these recommendations, it is not required to establish its own panel (or joint panel).

### ***Other authorities***

43. The 2003 Regulations provide that certain authorities must have regard to the recommendations of an independent remuneration panel of the authority by which its members are nominated. These authorities are a combined fire authority, joint authority established by the Local Government Act 1985, the Broads Authority, a National Park Authority or the conservation board of an area of outstanding natural beauty. While the panel of the nominating authority or authorities will not make a specific recommendation in relation to the secondary authority, having regard to the recommendation it makes about the nominating authority's allowances will provide some guidance for the secondary authority when making its own scheme.

### ***Appointment of the panel***

44. The Regulations require that independent remuneration panels have at least three members.

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

45. A local authority will need to consider the appropriate size for its panel to discharge its functions effectively given the particular local circumstances. Councils should avoid unduly large panels which would be unable to be an effective and publicly accountable source of clear recommendations.
46. The members of the independent remuneration panel cannot be members of any local authority in respect of which that panel makes recommendations. Anyone who would be disqualified from being an elected member of a local authority (see section 80 of the Local Government Act 1972 and sections 79 and 83(ii) of the Local Government Act 2000) is also disqualified from being a member of an independent panel.
47. The members of the independent remuneration panel cannot also be members of a committee or a sub-committee of an authority in respect of which the panel makes recommendations. This includes co-opted members.
48. The 2003 Regulations do not specify how a local authority may go about finding members of its remuneration panel. A local authority will need to consider carefully and plan its appointments process having regard to this guidance and the need to ensure that this process commands public confidence throughout all the communities in the local authority's area.
49. The council should adopt an appointments process which it considers is best able to result in the membership of its independent remuneration panel being truly independent, well qualified to discharge the functions of the panel and representative of the diversity of the communities in the local authority's area.
50. Local authorities may wish to advertise for candidates in local papers or may wish to ask particular stakeholders, e.g. the voluntary sector or the local business community, if they wish to put forward candidates. Councils may consider it best to use a combination of advertising and inviting the putting forward of candidates. In all cases the local authority will need to ensure that its appointment process is open to public scrutiny.
51. A local authority should give very serious consideration not only to ensuring the independence of its independent remuneration panel but also the public perception of this independence. To maintain the credibility of its panel a local authority will need to consider the extent to which some, if not all, of its panel members are recognisable members of the local community. Political appointments, and appointments which are made through friendship or any other personal association of any members of the council should always be avoided.
52. Local authorities should consider very carefully the extent of any candidate's connections to a political party and whether these are such as to risk the effective discharge of the panel's functions were the candidate to be appointed.
53. In appointing its panel, a local authority should consider candidates' knowledge of local government and the way it works although lack of familiarity with the functions of councils should not be a bar to appointment.
54. The local authority will need to consider whether to appoint one member of the independent remuneration panel as chair, or whether to allow the panel itself to decide which of its member will act as chair.
55. The local authority will need to consider the term of office of members of the panel. The panel will be required to make recommendations to the Council whenever the Council decides to, within the limits of the law, either revoke or amend its current scheme. The panel may become more effective as its knowledge and understanding of members' allowances is increased.
56. Accordingly local authorities may wish to consider appointing members of the panel for a term of office of several years, perhaps 3-5 years. Local authorities may also wish to consider phasing appointments to ensure that there is always one member of the panel who has some experience. Transitionally, on setting up the independent remuneration panel this would need different periods of office. This could be achieved by differing lengths of appointment.

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

A local authority will also need to consider the relationship between appointment dates and the electoral cycle and the benefits of continuity in the panel's membership.

57. Local authorities will wish to ensure that the terms and conditions of appointment of members of the independent remuneration panel include provision for circumstances where the local authority may wish to remove a discredited member from the panel. For example, a member of the panel may become discredited due to being found guilty of a criminal offence. The local authority will wish to ensure that this provision to change panel members is not itself abused for political or vexatious ends.

58. The time commitment of members of the panel will vary but it is likely that members will need to meet on a number of occasions when determining their recommendations for a new annual scheme. Local authorities will need to consider the likely time commitment they expect and should make this clear to candidates before appointments are made.

59. The 2003 Regulations provide that the local authority is able to pay allowances to panel members. These allowances are a matter for the local authority to determine. The local authority should tell prospective panel members about these allowances before they are appointed.

60. The local authority should provide the panel with appropriate administrative support.

### **The work of the panel**

61. The regulations provide for independent remuneration panels to have the following functions:

- to make recommendations to the authority as to the amount of basic allowance that should be payable to its elected members
- to make recommendations to the authority about the responsibilities or duties which should lead to the payment of a special responsibility allowance and as to the amount of such an allowance
- to make recommendations to the authority about the duties for which a travelling and subsistence allowance can be paid and as to the amount of this allowance
- to make recommendations as to the amount of co-optees' allowance
- to make recommendations as to whether the authority's allowances scheme should include an allowance in respect of the expenses of arranging for the care of children and dependants and if it does make such a recommendation, the amount of this allowance and the means by which it is determined
- to make recommendations on whether any allowance should be backdated to the beginning of a financial year in the event of the scheme being amended
- to make recommendations as to whether annual adjustments of allowance levels may be made by reference to an index, and, if so, for how long such a measure should run
- to make recommendations as to which members of an authority are to be entitled to pensions in accordance with a scheme made under section 7 of the Superannuation Act 1972
- as to treating basic allowance and special responsibility allowance as amounts in respect of which such pensions are payable.

62. The local authority will need to ensure that the panel is clear about its remit and the timetable in which it is working. The local authority will need to provide the panel with information about the roles of councillors in the authority and the way in which the authority operates and discharges its functions. The panel will need information about the business of the council.

63. The panel will need to have regard to this information. In addition, the panel may itself consider recent research on the role of councillors, or perhaps seek information about the work of other independent remuneration panels.

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

64. The council should provide the panel with the necessary resources to do this where it so chooses and should also provide the panel with copies of this guidance.

65. The independent remuneration panel will need to take into account this Guidance, in particular the factors highlighted in paragraphs 67-81 below, when making its recommendations to the council.

### **Making a scheme of allowances**

66. In making the scheme of allowances a council should have regard to factors and issues in paragraphs 67-81 below.

#### ***Basic allowance***

67. Paragraph 10 details the sorts of things basic allowance is intended to cover. Having established what local councillors do, and the hours which are devoted to these tasks the local authorities will need to take a view on the rate at which, and the number of hours for which, councillors ought to be remunerated.

68. It is important that some element of the work of members continues to be voluntary - that some hours are not remunerated. This must be balanced against the need to ensure that financial loss is not suffered by elected members, and further to ensure that, despite the input required, people are encouraged to come forward as elected members and that their service to the community is retained.

69. The local authority may wish to agree a rate for remuneration. They may chose to be guided by the LGA daily rate which is based on the national (male) median white-collar wage.

Alternatively they may wish to look at local and regional wage rates as these may seem more appropriate as measures for the allowances paid to members of its community. Local authorities may also wish to consider the allowances and remuneration which is paid to other members of the voluntary sector e.g. members of local health trusts.

#### ***Special responsibility allowance***

70. Special responsibility allowance (SRA) may be paid to those members of the council who have significant additional responsibilities, over and above the generally accepted duties of a councillor. These special responsibilities must be related to the discharge of the authority's functions.

71. The Regulations do not limit the number of special responsibility allowances which may be paid, nor do the regulations prohibit the payment of more than one special responsibility allowance to any one member.

72. However, these are important considerations for local authorities. If the majority of members of a council receive a special responsibility allowance the local electorate may rightly question whether this was justified. Local authorities will wish to consider very carefully the additional roles of members and the significance of these roles, both in terms of responsibility and real time commitment before deciding which will warrant the payment of a special responsibility allowance.

73. It does not necessarily follow that a particular responsibility which is vested to a particular member is a significant additional responsibility for which a special responsibility allowance should be paid. Local authorities will need to consider such particular responsibilities very carefully. Whilst such responsibilities may be unique to a particular member it may be that all or most members have some such responsibility to varying degrees. Such duties may not lead to a significant extra workload for any one particular member above another. These sorts of responsibilities should be recognised as a time commitment to council work which is acknowledged within the basic allowance and not responsibilities for which a special responsibility allowance should be recommended.

74. In addition, any particular local authority will need to look carefully at the nature of its constitution when determining its scheme. New arrangements will mean that there are inevitable changes in the positions of responsibility on the Council, both in terms of number and workload.

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

Some councillors will be spending significantly more of their time on council duties than has ever previously been the case. On the other hand, changes in the traditional committee structure will mean that there are far fewer committees and, as a consequence, fewer councillors engaged as chairs and vice-chairs of numerous committees.

75. In a case where a local authority has agreed that the holder of the chair of its overview and scrutiny committees should be rotated that local authority will need to assure itself of the additional responsibilities of the temporary chairs before determining what allowances to recommend.

76. Having determined which duties should be acknowledged as significant additional responsibilities, the local authority will need to consider the levels of special responsibility allowance which are attached to each post. A good starting point in determining special responsibility allowances may be to agree the allowance which should be attached to the most time consuming post on the Council (this maybe the elected mayor or the leader) and pro rata downwards for the other roles which it has agreed ought to receive an extra allowance. One way of calculating special responsibility allowances may be to take the agreed level of basic allowance and recommend a multiple of this allowance as an appropriate special responsibility allowance for either the elected mayor or the leader.

***Dependants' carers' allowance***

77. The panel may recommend that such an allowance is made available to elected members of the authority. It may also recommend a level for this allowance.

78. Local authorities will wish to consider whether this allowance should be set at an hourly rate which may vary depending on the sort of care which has been required. They may wish to consider whether the allowance should be subject to a maximum cap or alternatively, whether the allowances paid will be equal to the costs incurred.

***Travel and subsistence allowance***

79. The panel may recommend that allowances are made available to members in respect of travelling and subsistence. It may recommend which duties shall attract travel and subsistence allowances, and the levels of any such allowance.

80. Panels should consider a level of allowance which might be reasonably expected to cover a member's travel and subsistence costs. The panel may recommend, for example a system of direct invoicing or an annual or monthly allowance designed to cover all travel or subsistence within a particular period. In making their recommendation, the panel should take into account the need for a system which can operate efficiently and cost-effectively.

***Co-optees' allowance***

81. The panel may recommend payments for those who serve on the committees or subcommittees of an authority but who are not members of an authority. It may also make a recommendation as to the level of such an allowance. In doing so it may wish to consider the degree of time and effort put in by co-optees. Some element of the contribution made by co-optees should be voluntary. However, consideration should be given for the need to encourage non-councillors to give their services to local government, and to ensuring that co-optees are not financially disadvantaged by their civic activity.

**Publicity**

82. The 2003 Regulations place certain duties on local authorities in connection with publicising the recommendations made by their independent remuneration panel, their scheme of allowances and the actual allowances paid to members in any given year.

83. The regulations require that as soon as reasonably practicable after receiving a report from their panel which sets out the panels recommendations, local authorities must ensure that copies of the report are available for inspection at their principal office at all reasonable hours. Local authorities



## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

must also, as soon as reasonably practicable after they receive the report publish a notice in at least one newspaper circulating in their area which:

- states that the authority have received recommendations from an independent panel about their scheme of allowances
- states that copies of the report detailing the panels recommendations are available for inspection at their principal office at all reasonable hours
- states the address of their principal office
- describes the main features of the panel's recommendations including the amounts of allowances the panel has recommended should be payable to elected members.

84. The 2003 Regulations also require that members of the public may take copies of the panel's report on payment of such reasonable fee as the local authority may determine.

85. In respect of a local authority's scheme of allowances the regulations require that as soon as reasonably practicable after determining a scheme of allowances, local authorities must ensure that copies of the scheme are available for inspection at their principal office at all reasonable hours. Local authorities must also, as soon as reasonably practicable after determining the scheme publish a notice in at least one newspaper circulating in their area which:

- states that the authority has adopted a scheme of allowances and the period for which that scheme has effect
- states that copies of the scheme are available for inspection their principal office at all reasonable hours
- states the address of their principal office
- describes the main features of the scheme including the amounts of allowances payable to elected members under the scheme
- states that in determining the scheme the authority had regard to the recommendations of an independent remuneration panel
- describes the main features of the panel's recommendations including the amounts of allowances the panel has recommended should be payable to their elected members.
- describes any responsibilities or duties in the scheme which would merit the payment of special responsibility allowance and travelling and subsistence allowance.

Local authorities must ensure that such a notice is published every 12 months even if the scheme has not been amended since the last notice.

86. The 2003 Regulations also require that members of the public may take copies of the scheme on payment of such reasonable fee as the local authority may determine.

87. The final publicity requirement in the regulations is that as soon as reasonably practicable after the end of a year to which a scheme relates, local authorities must make arrangements for the publication in their area of the total sum paid by it to each member in respect of basic, special responsibility, travelling and subsistence, co-optees' and dependants' carers' allowances.

88. All these publicity requirements are statutory minimum requirements. Local authorities should publicise more widely the report from their panel, their scheme of allowances and the sums paid to each member. This should include, where possible, publishing this information on their web site and in the council's own newspaper (where they have one). Local authorities may also wish to consider including in their notice some detail about the responsibilities of elected members and the duties and time commitment which the basic allowance is intended to remunerate.

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

**Transitional Provisions**

89. An authority must amend its scheme of allowances or, where it does not currently have a scheme, establish one, by 31 December 2003. It may do so before this date. If it chooses it may backdate any amendments to the coming into force of the 2003 regulations.

**Allowances for Chair and Vice Chair of Principal Councils**

90. In addition to the provisions in the Regulations there are provisions for the payment of allowances in the Local Government Act 1972. A principal council may pay the chair and vice chair an allowance which it thinks reasonable for the purpose of meeting the expenses of those offices (s3(5), and s5(4), of the Local Government Act 1972). This is often known as 'civic dignitaries allowance'.

**Allowances for Members of Parish Councils***Parish basic allowance*

91. Parish councils may choose to pay their members an allowance, known as 'parish basic allowance', to recognise the time and effort they put into their parish duties. There is no obligation on parish councils to pay such allowances. Each parish council may make an allowance available to its chair only, or to each of its members. Where all members receive an allowance, the amount payable to the chair may be different to that paid to other members, but otherwise the amount paid to each member must be the same. Parish basic allowance is a discretionary allowance. It may be paid in a lump sum, or at intervals throughout the year.

92. If a parish council wishes to pay a basic allowance, it should have regard to a recommendation from its parish remuneration panel. This is a panel set up to make recommendations to parishes in its area. The membership of a parish remuneration panel will be the same as the independent remuneration panel of the district or county council within whose area the parish is situated. The panel will make a recommendation as to whom basic allowance should be paid, and the level of the allowance.

*Travel and subsistence allowances*

93. A parish council may also pay its members allowances in respect of travel and subsistence. These are discretionary allowances. They may be paid in respect of travel and subsistence both inside and outside the boundary of the parish. Allowances for travel may include allowances for travel by non-motorised transport, such as a bicycle.

94. Travel and subsistence allowances may only be paid for travel and subsistence in respect of:

- a meeting of the authority
- a meeting of a committee or sub-committee of the authority
- a meeting of some other body to which the authority make appointments or nominations
- a meeting of a committee or sub-committee of a body to which the authority make appointments or nominations
- duties undertaken on behalf of the authority in pursuance of any standing order requiring a member or members to be present while tender documents are opened.
- a meeting of a local authority association of which the authority is a member
- duties undertaken on behalf of the authority in connection with the discharge of any function of the authority conferred by or under any enactment and empowering or requiring the authority to inspect or authorise the inspection of premises

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

- any other duty approved by the authority in connection with discharging the duties of the authority or its committees or sub-committees.

95. If it wishes to pay travel and subsistence allowances, a parish council must consult its parish remuneration panel. The panel will make a recommendation as to the level of allowances, and the duties in respect of which they should be paid.

***Withdrawal of allowances***

96. A parish council may make provisions so that where a member is suspended or partially suspended from their duties, all or part of any allowances can be withheld. They may also provide that any allowances already paid in respect of a period for which a member has been suspended must be repaid.

***Forgoing allowances***

97. A parish councillor may choose not to receive all or part of any allowance to which they would otherwise be entitled. To do so they must give written notice to the proper officer of the parish council.

***Financial loss allowance***

98. The 2003 Regulations remove the option of authorities to allow parish councillors a financial loss allowance under section 173 of the Local Government Act 1972. Parish councillors can instead be paid the parish basic allowance and travel and subsistence allowances to remunerate them for their duties on the council.

***Publicity***

99. Parish councils are required to publicise their allowances in a notice or notices conspicuous in their area. These notices must remain in place for at least 14 days. In addition, they must make a record of the allowances they have paid available for inspection at reasonable notice. They must provide copies of this record on request, and may charge a reasonable fee for this. Parishes must also publish details of the parish remuneration panel reports. Again, these are minimum requirements, and parish councils may wish to go further in making local people aware of their allowances scheme and payment levels. For example they may wish to circulate details of their allowances in the parish newsletter, if they have one, place them on a web site, or publish them in one or more local newspapers.

***Parish remuneration panels***

100. When they pay allowances parish councils should have regard to the recommendations of a parish remuneration panel. This panel is set up by a district or county council within whose area a parish council is situated and is referred to as the 'responsible' authority. Where a parish council is one of a group of parish councils established under s11 of the Local Government Act 1972, and which are not wholly situated within one district or county council, its responsible authority will be the authority within which the majority of the electors for the group of parishes live.

101. A parish remuneration panel may be established by a responsible authority. Alternatively, two or more responsible authorities may jointly form a parish remuneration panel. In considering whether to jointly establish a parish remuneration panel, responsible authorities should consider whether it would be appropriate and cost effective, taking into account local circumstances. Responsible authorities should also consider whether the joint parish remuneration panel would command public confidence within the parishes for which it made recommendations.

102. The membership of a parish remuneration panel will be the same as the independent remuneration panel of the responsible authority or authorities. However, where any member of the responsible authority's panel is also a member of a parish in respect of which the parish remuneration panel may make a recommendation they should not be a member of the parish remuneration panel.

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

Any parish councils for which a parish remuneration panel makes recommendations will contribute an equal share towards the running costs of the panel.

103. A parish remuneration panel can make recommendations as to allowances of the parishes situated within the area of the responsible authority or authorities. It may make a single recommendation applying to all the parishes within that area, or can make individual recommendations for each parish. It will make recommendations as to whether parish basic allowance should be available to all members of the parish council, or only to the chair. It will also make recommendations as to the duties for which travel and subsistence allowance may be claimed.

104. The panel will also make a recommendation as to the amounts of parish basic and travel and subsistence allowances. These recommendations will be expressed in terms of a cash figure. The level of parish basic allowance will also be expressed as a percentage of the amount recommended by the independent remuneration panel of the responsible authority for the allowances of that responsible authority. The percentage may be any figure up to and including 100%.

***Transitional provisions***

105. Parish councils, if they choose, will be able to pay parish basic allowance once they have had regard to a recommendation of their parish remuneration panel. Until 31 December 2003, they will retain the option of being able to pay attendance and financial loss allowances under the Local Government Act 1972. However, they may not pay both parish basic allowance and attendance or financial loss allowance in respect of the same duties or period of time. From 31 December 2003, sections 173-5 of the Local Government Act 1972 will be disapplied in respect of parish councils. As such, if they wish to pay allowances after that time they will only be able to do so under these Regulations.

## **Tax and National Insurance treatment of Local Government Councillors' and Civic Dignitaries' allowances and expenses**

### **Taxation of Members' Allowances and Expenses**

#### *Introduction*

106. This part provides general guidance on the tax treatment of members' allowances. It covers:

- the relevant tax rules
- which allowances are taxable
- the treatment of expenses incurred by a member carrying out approved duties which are reimbursed by the authority
- what tax relief is available for expenses that the authority does not reimburse.

There is also a short section covering civic dignitaries.

For information covering National Insurance liability on members' allowances and expenses see paragraph 146 onwards.

This guidance is not binding and does not affect any member's right of appeal. Nor is it a full statement of the law as it applies to members' allowances and expenses. Members should refer to the relevant legislation where appropriate. Alternatively they can contact their tax office, who will be able to help.

#### *The tax charge*

107. For tax purposes council members and civic dignitaries are treated in the same way as any other individual who holds an office or is an employee. Earnings received from an office or employment are chargeable to income tax as employment income. PAYE arrangements apply to these earnings as they do to any other employment. 'Earnings' has a wide meaning - it includes salaries, fees, wages and any other profits received from an office or employment. It also includes allowances paid to cover expenses incurred in carrying out the duties of an office or employment, unless these allowances do no more than reimburse expenses actually incurred and which are deductible for tax purposes.

#### *Relief for expenses*

108. Under the employment income expenses rules (Section 336 - 339 Income Tax (Earnings and Pensions) Act 2003, (ITEPA 2003)), local government councillors and civic dignitaries can get a tax deduction for:

- travelling expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of the duties of their office
- other travelling expenses which relate to their necessary attendance at a temporary workplace
- any other expenses which are incurred wholly, exclusively and necessarily in the performance of their official duties but note that expenses for travel in a person's own vehicle are dealt with under separate rules and that actual mileage expenses are not deductible. See paragraph 126(viii) below.

109. These rules include a series of conditions that vary for each type of expenditure. The conditions are:

- in all cases the expenditure must actually be incurred. So, for example, if a councillor or civic dignitary is away overnight on council business but finds it more convenient to stay with friends rather than incur hotel bills, there may be no expenditure to set against any allowance received so no deduction would be due

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

- travelling expenses necessarily incurred in performing the duties of the office are limited to expenses during necessary travel on members' business, for example travelling between the local authority offices and a place the member needs to visit on local government business
- a temporary workplace is a place the member only attends occasionally to carry out duties, or attends for a limited duration (defined as not more than 40% of working time over a period not exceeding 24 months) or a temporary purpose. The travel expenses to be deducted under this heading are the expenses of travelling between the members' home and the temporary workplace
- for expenses other than expenses of travel to a temporary workplace the expenditure must be incurred in the performance of the individual's duties. This means that, to be deductible, the expense must be incurred in actually carrying out the duties of the office. It is not sufficient that an expense is simply relevant to, or incurred in connection with, the duties of the office. In particular, no expense will be allowable which merely puts the office holder in a position to perform the duties of that office
- also for expenses other than those of travel to a temporary workplace the expenditure must be such that any holder of the office would be necessarily obliged to incur it. The fact that an office holder is encouraged, expected or required to incur a particular expense is not conclusive evidence that it is 'necessarily' incurred. Also, the expense must stem from the requirements of the job itself, not from the personal circumstances of the office holder. Strictly, the 'necessity test' will be satisfied if (and only if) each and every person holding the office would have to incur the expenditure
- expenditure on anything other than travel must also be incurred wholly and exclusively in the performance of the office holder's duties. For example, it may be necessary for a councillor to use a home telephone in the performance of his or her duties - but where the same facility is available to be used also for personal calls, the rental costs are not incurred exclusively in the performance of duties so no deduction is due (see paragraph 126(iii) below).

In addition, a deduction may only be given to the extent that the expense incurred does not exceed the earnings of the relevant office. If, for a particular year of assessment, there are insufficient earnings from the office to cover the expense claimed, no deduction can be given against any other income, including income from other offices or employments.

Similarly, where a councillor has renounced allowances to which he or she would otherwise be entitled, no expenses may be claimed as a deduction.

### **Members' Allowances which provide Remuneration**

#### ***Councillors on main and 'secondary' authorities***

110. Allowances taxable as employment income include the following:

- Basic allowance
- Special responsibility allowance
- Dependants' Carers' Allowance
- Co-Optees' Allowance

#### ***Parish, town and community councillors***

111. The Parish Basic Allowance is taxable as employment income.

#### ***Non-councillors***

112. The tax rules for Co-Optees' Allowance and Parish Basic Allowance to non-councillors are the same as for parish, town and community councillors set out in paragraphs 110 & 111 above.

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

***Renunciation***

113. Renunciation of allowances which provide remuneration will mean that there will be no liability to income tax, but it will also mean that no expenses can be claimed as a deduction (see paragraph 125) and may affect entitlement to social security benefits.

***Travel and subsistence allowances***

114. As elected representatives, councillors are accepted as normally having two places of work - at the council offices and in their electoral area. Often councillors need to use their own homes to see constituents. Where a councillor does use his or her own home to undertake representative duties on behalf of the council, an allowance paid for travel between home and the council offices or some other place on council business is included in the calculation under the rules described at paragraph 126(viii) below.

115. If it is not necessary for a councillor routinely to see constituents at home, any allowance paid for travel between home and the council offices will be taxable in the normal way. The fact that a councillor chooses to do some work at home - for example reading council papers or completing correspondence - does not make that home a distinct place of work for the purpose of claiming tax relief on travel expenses. However, an allowance paid for travel between home and any place that is a temporary workplace will also be included in the calculation at paragraph 126(viii) below.

116. For non-councillors, any allowance paid for travel between home and the council offices will be taxable unless he or she can show that home is itself a place of work in the real sense for that office - that is to say any holder of that office is necessarily obliged to perform substantive duties there.

117. For the treatment of mileage allowances paid for travel on council business generally, see paragraph 126(viii) below.

118. Day subsistence allowances are taxable unless they are paid in respect of the extra expense of subsistence incurred as a consequence of travel on council business away from the council offices.

119. Overnight subsistence allowances are not taxable provided there is no element of profit. A profit could arise, for example, if someone travelling on council business stays overnight with friends or relatives rather than in a hotel.

***Dispensations***

120. A 'dispensation' is a notice given by an Inspector of Taxes to an employer if the Inspector is satisfied that expense allowances paid or benefits provided by the employer would be fully matched by an expenses deduction, with the result that no tax liability arises. A dispensation relieves the employer of the need to report details of the particular expenses payments or benefits provided to the Revenue or to the employee or office-holder. And the employee or office-holder need not show them in his or her tax return if they get one.

121. The dispensation does not exempt from tax items upon which the taxpayer would otherwise be taxed. The aim is to eliminate unnecessary administrative burdens where no tax will be due, not to reduce the tax paid. Dispensations are reviewed from time to time and can be revoked. More advice on dispensations and an application form can be obtained from any Tax Office.

122. Dispensations are not appropriate for 'round sum' expenses allowances. But where an allowance is clearly intended to do no more than reimburse expenses actually incurred in carrying out the employee's or office-holder's duties, and the expense was incurred only because of the office or employment, the Inspector may be prepared to authorise payment of the allowance without deducting PAYE. Before doing this, the Inspector will need to be satisfied, however, that the allowance is at a reasonable scale and is clearly intended to do no more than reimburse expenses actually incurred.

123. Mileage expenses payments cannot be included in a dispensation.

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

124. Whenever there is no dispensation in operation authorities should consider whether or not PAYE should be applied to the allowances they pay. The Inspector will give guidance on this point.

***Relief for expenses***

125. Where an authority does not reimburse all expenditure incurred, members may claim the excess as a deduction from the earnings that they receive from the authority, provided the expenses satisfy the rules in paragraphs 108 and 109 above. No deduction can be claimed:

- where entitlement to all allowances has been renounced (see paragraph 113)
- where a member could use services provided by the authority, for example, postage or stationery but incurs expenses because he or she chooses not to do so
- for expenses incurred for political purposes, for example electioneering
- for expenses incurred on the cost of newspapers, books and periodicals of general interest. (Where however a magazine or journal is obtained by a member because he or she subscribes to a professional body or learned society which is approved under Section 344 ITEPA 2003 and the activities of this body are relevant to his or her work as a member a deduction may be given for the subscription)
- for donations to charity (unless these are made under a payroll giving scheme or by way of gift aid).

126. Typical deductible expenses which may be claimed include:

**(i) Travelling expenses**

**(a) By public transport** - Where the expenditure incurred is not covered by an allowance for which the authority has a dispensation.

**(b) By car** - Members who use their own cars in the performance of their duties are normally paid an allowance to cover their costs. There are special rules covering these at paragraph vii below.

**(ii) Postage and stationery**

The actual costs wholly, exclusively and necessarily incurred in the performance of the duties as a councillor for which no allowance can be obtained from the authority.

**(iii) Telephone**

The cost of calls made wholly, exclusively and necessarily in the performance of duties as a member. No deduction can be given for any part of the rental of the telephone unless no private use is made of it. Any claim should be reduced by any non-taxable reimbursement made by the authority. Where that reimbursement covers the cost of the official calls no claim should be made.

**(iv) Secretarial assistance**

The costs of secretarial assistance incurred wholly, exclusively and necessarily in the performance of council duties, where such assistance is not provided by the authority.

Any amounts claimed must be reasonable in relation to the member's allowances and to the assistance given. The Inspector may want to see supporting evidence for the claim.

**(v) Hire of rooms**

Where money is spent on the hire of rooms for 'surgeries' or public meetings, e.g. objections to planning applications. A claim cannot be allowed in respect of the hire of rooms for party political purposes.



## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

**(vi) Household expenses**

Where additional household expenses are incurred (light, fuel etc.) relating to those parts of members' homes that are set aside solely for use for duties as members, the Revenue will accept a standard deduction of £135 per year (an amount agreed between the Association of Councillors and Inland Revenue Head Office) to cover this. Members claiming more than this amount will have to show the additional amount is fully justified by reference to the expenses deduction rules explained in paragraphs 108 and 109.

From 6 April 2003 members working at home under homeworking arrangements with the local authority can be paid a tax-free allowance to reimburse the additional household expenses incurred while working at home. Up to £2 per week can be paid without any evidence of the actual amount of additional expense. Larger amounts can be paid if evidence can be provided to show that the amounts paid are a reasonable estimate of additional costs.

Members who do not receive an allowance are not entitled to deduct an equivalent amount except for those who are entitled to the standard deduction of £135. In these cases members should restrict the deduction by any amount received from the local authority, so that a member receiving £2 per week is entitled to deduct a further £31 from earnings.

**(vii) Mileage expenses for members using their own vehicles for business travel**

The following rules apply from 6 April 2002 and cater for all kinds of mileage expenses. The previous rules, including the Fixed Profit Car Scheme, no longer apply.

Actual expenses (including loan interest and capital allowances) can no longer be claimed.

'Business travel' is travel of the type described in paragraph 108 (fuller details can be found in Inland Revenue booklet 490, Employee Travel).

Members who use their own vehicles for business travel are normally paid an allowance to cover their costs. Normally, these payments are based on an amount per mile for the mileage travelled on council business but they can also be in the form of a lump sum or periodic payment. However they are paid, all Mileage

Allowance Payments (amounts paid to an employee or office holder for expenses related to the use by that person for business travel of their own vehicle) are treated in the same way.

Members can receive up to a tax-free "approved amount" when using their own vehicles for business travel. These payments are known as Approved Mileage Allowance Payments, or AMAPs.

The AMAPs amount is calculated by multiplying the number of business miles in each kind of vehicle by a statutory rate in pence per mile. The rates are:

These rates apply until changed by law as part of the Budget process. Any changes will also be announced on the Inland Revenue web site ([www.inlandrevenue.gov.uk](http://www.inlandrevenue.gov.uk)).

Employers do not need to send the Inland Revenue details of tax-free AMAPs, though they need to keep sufficient records to show that the payments qualified for exemption. Any amount in excess of the AMAPs amount is taxable and should be reported on form P9D or P11D; if members receive less than that amount, they are entitled to Mileage Allowance Relief.

Further details about AMAPs and the taxation of motor mileage allowances generally can be found in the Revenue leaflet IR124 'Using your own vehicle for work' and CWG2, 'Employer's Further Guide to PAYE and NICs'.

For NICs, a new statutory scheme for dealing with NICs liability on motoring expenses was also introduced on 6 April 2002. See paragraph 152 for more information.

**(viii) Other expenses**

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

Members with other expenses not covered by the above should Itemise them on their Tax Return. The Revenue may require evidence and details of the expenditure.

Kind of vehicle	Rate per mile
Car or van	40p for the first 10,000 miles
	25p after that
Motor cycle	24p (all miles)
Cycle	20p (all miles)

### Other points concerning a member's tax affairs

#### *Provision of benefits in kind*

127. If a member receives payments (including all allowances whether or not tax is paid on them) and benefits together totalling £8,500 a year or more (before any deduction for expenses) details must be reported to the Inspector on Form P11D. A copy of the details should be given to the member. (Any member who is in this position and who receives facilities from the council other than in cash should contact the local Inspector for advice.)

128. No tax charge arises on the provision of office accommodation, secretarial assistance, stationery or other facilities of a similar nature at an authority's premises. If the authority provides supplies or services for use at the member's home, no tax charge arises if the sole reason for providing them is to enable a member to perform their duties and any use for private purposes is not significant. If these conditions are not met, full details need to be provided to the Inland Revenue on forms P11D, with a copy provided to members, because a tax liability may arise.

129. Where an authority provides computer equipment for the member to perform his duties at home, the first £500 of the benefit charge is exempt from tax.

130. If an authority paid for a member to have a telephone installed at home any cash reimbursement for installation or any subsequent rental payments should be subjected to PAYE. If it is impossible to apply PAYE, for example because the authority pays British Telecom directly, the authority must give details to the Revenue after the end of each tax year. The member will then have to pay tax on the amount paid by the authority. Where an authority pays for broadband Internet connection to a member's home solely for work purposes, under a package where there is no separate billing or record of access calls, and

- no breakdown is possible between authority and private calls, and
- where private use is not significant the connection costs are exempt from tax.

#### *Operation of PAYE*

131. Tax is collected under the PAYE system. The amount of tax deducted by the authority depends on the code number issued by each member's own tax office. It is open to any councillor to ask to have the PAYE code number adjusted to take into account expenses which are deductible for tax purposes. If the Inspector is satisfied with the estimate provided, the code number for the year will be revised and the matter finalised after the end of the tax year when the accurate information will be available. How this works depends on whether or not the member receives a tax return (see paragraphs 127 and 128).

These arrangements apply, for example to:

- the basic allowance

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

- special responsibility allowance
- dependants' Carers' Allowance
- Co-Optees' Allowance
- any allowances payable to councillors in their capacity as civic dignitaries.

***Procedure at the end of the tax year***

132. Members who receive tax returns should include figures for all their income on their Self-Assessment tax return. They will also include all claims they wish to make.

133. They should send their completed tax return back to their tax office by 30 September after the end of the tax year if:

- they want the Inland Revenue to calculate their tax bill for them and/or
- they wish tax (below £2000) to be collected through next year's PAYE code where practicable.

134. The deadline for sending back their tax return is 31 January after the end of the tax year.

135. The Inland Revenue will make any repayment due. If there is tax to pay, the member should pay it by 31 January after the end of the tax year.

136. Members who do not receive tax returns will have their tax checked by the Inland Revenue in the traditional way. They should send any claims to their tax office after the end of the tax year as now.

***Further information***

137. If members have any questions about the taxation treatment of their allowances they should contact their Tax Office. Council Treasurers' Departments are usually in a position to answer routine questions and to seek advice on a member's behalf.

***Civic dignitaries***

138. Like councillors, civic dignitaries are office-holders and the same tax principles apply to their allowances and expenses. In particular, to qualify for relief expenditure must meet the conditions of Sections 336 to 339 ITEPA 2003 - explained in paragraphs 108 and 109 above. The following paragraphs set out how the rules apply to particular circumstances affecting civic dignitaries.

***Clothing***

139. Expenditure on ordinary clothing worn at work is not incurred wholly and exclusively in the performance of the duties. Consequently no deduction can be given for expenditure by civic dignitaries on ordinary clothing.

140. Exceptionally, a deduction can be given for expenditure on clothing which is recognisably a uniform or part of a uniform and the office holder is required, as part of the duties of that office to wear it. A useful test is whether someone wearing the clothing would be recognisable in the street as wearing the uniform of that particular office - just as a uniform identifies, say, nurses or policemen. Expenditure on, for example, maintenance of a mayor's regalia would normally, therefore, qualify for a deduction.

***Donations***

141. If a civic dignitary is given an allowance and the freedom to spend that allowance largely as he or she sees fit, it is extremely unlikely that any such expenditure would be deductible.

There would be an element of personal choice - and so expenditure would not be 'necessarily' incurred. This would apply to charitable donations as much as to any other use to which the money was put.

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

142. The tax position may, however, be different if there is a special fund set on one side, out of which agreed charitable donations are made. In these circumstances, when the funds are dealt with by the civic dignitary in a fiduciary capacity, there may be no tax consequences.

Each case will, however, depend on the precise arrangements in force.

***Entertainment***

143. If a civic dignitary is given an entertainment allowance which he or she has freedom to spend in any way he or she sees fit, the allowance is assessable to tax as part of the earnings of the office - except to the extent that the expenditure met out of the allowance qualifies for a deduction. Only entertaining expenses which are incurred wholly, exclusively and necessarily in the performance of the office holder's civic duties will qualify. No deduction is due for the cost of entertaining which is incurred primarily for personal or political reasons even if some civic business happens to be discussed.

144. As with donations, the tax position may be different if there is a special fund set on one side out of which entertainment is paid for in accordance with the council's wishes as to the amounts spent and persons to be entertained.

***Conclusion***

145. Local authorities sometimes ask how their systems can be structured so that no tax liability arises for their civic dignitaries in respect of expenses payments made to them. The paragraphs above should indicate that a system which in practice pays within the AMAPs amount for travelling expenses and provides for reimbursement only of those expenses deductible under the rules described in paragraphs 108 and 109 is unlikely to give rise to tax consequences. In addition, it is likely that a dispensation (see paragraphs 120-124 above) could be agreed with respect to such a system - eliminating reporting requirements.'

## Members' Allowances and National Insurance contributions (NICs)

### Introduction

146. As they are for tax purposes, members (councillors and non-councillors) are treated as employees. They are liable to pay National Insurance contributions as employed earners when they receive remuneration allowances at or above the threshold for contributions.

147. Where allowances are paid at different intervals, the earnings period for the assessment of National Insurance contributions is the shortest interval at which any allowance is paid. For example, if the agreement between the local authority and the member is:

- that a Basic allowance will be paid monthly
- that a special responsibility allowance will be paid quarterly
- that dependants' carers' allowance will be paid annually the earnings period is monthly. Class 1 National Insurance contributions would be due if the total earnings in any tax month reached the monthly threshold for contributions.

148. Members above statutory pension age (65 for men and 60 for women) are not liable for contributions on their allowances. But the authority (or whoever pays the allowances) is liable to pay the employer's contribution. For further details, the leaflet CA01 "National Insurance for employees" will be helpful.

### If you have more than one job

149. Members with other employment can apply to defer payment of contributions if they expect to pay the annual maximum in that employment. This does not affect the employer's liability to pay contributions at the appropriate time. For further details see leaflet CA01.

### General expenses

150. In some circumstances expenses which are paid or reimbursed by an employer can be disregarded when calculating National Insurance contributions. If an employer makes a payment in respect of specific and identifiable expenses which are actually incurred by a member in carrying out his duties they can be disregarded. Members may have to produce receipts or other evidence of their expenses to confirm the amount which can be disregarded. But if the expense payment is covered for tax by a dispensation notice then it will automatically be accepted that the amount can also be disregarded when calculating National Insurance contributions. Unlike the tax position, no relief is available in respect of National Insurance contributions if the employee has borne the cost themselves without reimbursement by the employer.

151. The sort of expenses which may be able to be disregarded include the following:

- Travelling expenses
  - by public transport. The reimbursement of travel costs incurred in connection with business journeys can be disregarded for National Insurance contributions purposes
  - by car. See the guidance at paragraphs 152 - 154 below.
- Postage and stationery. The actual costs incurred in carrying out the duties can be disregarded if reimbursed by the employer.
- Telephone costs. Reimbursement of the cost of calls made in carrying out the duties can be disregarded but any reimbursement of rental costs will attract a liability for National Insurance contributions unless the telephone is available exclusively for business use.

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

Any payment toward the cost of private calls cannot be disregarded.

- Secretarial assistance. The cost of secretarial assistance incurred in respect of carrying out the duties of the employment which is reimbursed by the employer where such assistance is not provided directly, can be disregarded for National Insurance contribution purposes.
- Hire of rooms. The reimbursement of the cost of hiring rooms to hold 'surgeries' or public meetings in connection with their duties can be disregarded.
- Household expenses. Where a councillor is reimbursed for additional household expenses (heating, lighting, etc.) incurred in relation to parts of the home set aside for use solely in carrying out the duties of the employment, the amounts can be disregarded when calculating National Insurance contributions. In line with the tax treatment of such additional costs, from 6 April 2003 £2 per week can be disregarded without evidence being produced. Higher amounts can only be disregarded if there is evidence that the higher figure has actually been incurred.

### **Motoring expenses**

152. Since 6 April 2002, there has been a new statutory scheme for dealing with NICs liability on motoring expenses incurred by employees who use their own vehicles for business travel. There is a maximum amount that may be paid to employees, in respect of all business motoring expenses they incur for the use of their privately owned car, without incurring a NICs liability.

153. The NICs scheme is aligned as far as possible with the Approved Mileage Allowance Payments (AMAPs) scheme for tax, but there are some differences between the two schemes.

For example the mileage rate used for cars and vans to calculate the maximum amount employers can pay free from NICs liability is the higher of the two rates at paragraph 126(viii) above, irrespective of the number of business miles travelled by the employee.

154. Further guidance about the NICs motoring expenses scheme can be found in the Revenue leaflet IR124 'Using your own vehicle for work' and CWG2, 'Employer's Further Guide to PAYE and NICs'.

### **Benefits**

155. Where a member receives payments (including all allowances whether or not tax is paid on them) and benefits together totalling £8,500 a year or more the authority may have to pay Class 1A NICs on any benefit they provide. Further guidance can be found in the Inland Revenue booklet CWG5.

156. Members requiring further advice on which expenses or payments in kind may be disregarded should contact their local tax office.

### **Allowances and expenses paid to civic dignitaries**

157. Civic dignitaries are elected office holders, and, like councillors, they are therefore employees for National Insurance contributions purposes. There will be a liability to pay Class 1 National Insurance contributions if they receive earnings above the level of the earnings threshold. The following paragraphs explain how certain types of expense payments made to civic dignitaries are treated for National Insurance contributions purposes.

### **Clothing**

158. If a civic dignitary receives an expense payment for ordinary clothing the amount involved is not a business expense, as it is not incurred in carrying out the employment. It cannot be disregarded when calculating National Insurance contributions.

159. If the payment relates to a uniform or part of a uniform which is required for the purposes of the employment, the amount involved can be disregarded because it will be an expense incurred in

## New Council Constitutions: Guidance on Regulation for Local Authority Allowances

carrying out the employment. This would apply, for example, in respect of a payment for a mayoral gown or similar regalia - and the cost of its upkeep (repairs and laundering).

**Donations**

160. If a civic dignitary receives an expenses payment/allowance for a series of itemised, charitable donations or gifts, the amount can be disregarded when calculating National Insurance contributions if the donations or gifts are made on the employer's behalf and details are kept of the donations and gifts.

**Entertainment**

161. If a civic dignitary receives an expenses payment/allowance for private entertainment, the amount involved cannot be disregarded when calculating National Insurance contributions.

**If the payment is for a business function where the costs are supported by itemised bills, the amount can be disregarded as a business expense because it will be incurred in carrying out the duties of the employment. This will apply, for example, where the mayor has receipts for the amount spent on a business lunch hosted for visiting officials.**

This guidance is intended to assist local authorities in their application of the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2001. It provides advice about the allowances which can be paid to elected members, the appointment of independent remuneration panels and the requirements for the publication of details about members' allowances. It contains a combination of description of the main statutory provisions, statutory guidance to which local authorities must have regard and non-statutory guidance.

This page is intentionally left blank



**Manchester City Council  
Report for Resolution**

**Report to:** Constitutional and Nomination Committee – 4 October 2023  
Council - 4 October 2023.

**Subject:** Appointment of an additional Independent Person for consideration of complaints against Members,

**Report of:** The City Solicitor

**Summary**

To enable the Constitutional and Nomination Committee to consider the appointment of an additional Independent Person to assist the Council’s Monitoring Officer in dealing with allegations that members of the Council have acted in breach of the Council’s Code of Conduct.

**Recommendation**

Constitution and Nomination Committee:

The Committee is asked to support the recommendation that the Council appoint William Goh as an Independent Person for period of four years starting 4 October 2023.

Council:

The Council is asked to agree to appoint William Goh as an Independent Person for period of four years starting 4 October 2023.

**Wards Affected:** All

<b>Environmental Impact Assessment</b> - the impact of the issues addressed in this report on achieving the zero-carbon target for the city
None

<b>Equality, Diversity and Inclusion</b> - the impact of the issues addressed in this report in meeting our Public Sector Equality Duty and broader equality commitments
none

<b>Manchester Strategy outcomes</b>	<b>Summary of how this report aligns to the OMS/Contribution to the Strategy</b>
A thriving and sustainable city: supporting a diverse and distinctive economy that creates jobs and opportunities	Not directly applicable
A highly skilled city: world class and home grown talent sustaining the city's economic success	Not directly applicable
A progressive and equitable city: making a positive contribution by unlocking the potential of our communities	Not directly applicable
A liveable and low carbon city: a destination of choice to live, visit, work	Not directly applicable
A connected city: world class infrastructure and connectivity to drive growth	Not directly applicable

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

- Equal Opportunities Policy
- Risk Management
- Legal Considerations

#### **Financial Consequences – Revenue**

The Council provides an allowance to its independent persons of £1,910 per annum and £119 for each day attended at a Hearing Panel as a Panel Member.

#### **Financial Consequences – Capital**

None

#### **Contact Officers:**

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

Name: Poornima Karkera  
 Position: Assistant Director Legal and Democratic Services:  
 Governance  
 Telephone: 0161 234 3719  
 E-mail: poornima.karkera@manchester.gov.uk

**Background documents (available for public inspection):**

None.

## 1.0 Introduction

1.1 Section 28 (7) of the Localism Act 2011 requires all English local authorities to appoint Independent Persons (IPs) to help them to discharge their duty to promote and maintain high standards of conduct by their Councillors and co-opted members and any Parish Councillors.

1.2 The main roles of the Independent Person are to:

- assist the Council in promoting high standards of conduct by elected and co-opted members
- be consulted by the Council's Monitoring Officer and/or the Standards Committee before a decision is made following the investigation of a complaint. The Independent Person may also be consulted before a decision is taken as to whether to investigate a complaint or whether the complaint should be resolved by an alternative means
- be available for consultation by an elected or co-opted member who is the subject of a standards complaint

1.3 The Council has delegated to the Standards Committee the power to deal with matters of conduct and ethical standards, and the promoting and maintaining of high standards of conduct by Councillors, Co-opted Members and church and parent governor representatives.

1.4 The Council currently has 2 Independent Persons whose terms of office were extended by the Council to 18 November 2026 as recommended by the Standards Committee at its meeting in June 2022 and reported to the Constitution and Nominations Committee in July 2022. The Standards Committee in addition to supporting the extension of the term of office of the current 2 Independent Persons endorsed the recruitment of an additional Independent Person to support on dealing with Complaints relating to Members.

1.5 An IP must be a person who has applied for the post following advertisement of a vacancy for the post and appointed by a positive vote from a majority of all the Members of the Council at a meeting of the full Council.

1.6 The Council delegated to the Monitoring Officer the making of arrangements for the recruitment and selection of Independent Persons, whose appointment must be approved by a majority of the Members of the Council in accordance with Section 28(8)(c)(ii) of the Localism Act.

1.7 Recruitment has now taken place for this additional Independent Person, and the Monitoring Officer has updated the members of the Standards Committee that following the taking place of interviews she will be recommending to Council the appointment of William Goh to this role. Mr Goh is currently an Independent Person for another Council, a role he has held since 2018. In interview he impressed with his suitability, experience and understanding of the role

## **2.0 Recommendation**

The recommendation appears at the top of this report.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Manchester City Council  
Report for Information**

**Report to:** Council – 4 October 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.

<b>Date</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Reason for urgency</b>	<b>Decision Taken by</b>	<b>Approved by</b>
6 July 2023	Award a contract following a Crown Commercial Service procurement exercise for an implementation supplier of the Mulesoft Integration Layer application.	A delay would have resulted in the implementation of the integration layer taking place later. As a consequence, testing of the links between CRM and the LoB systems will occur later. This would delay the start of the work to replace the current CRM system. This would result in the Council continuing to use an unsupported system which holds resident and business data	Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer	Councillor A Simcock – Chair of Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee
6 July 2023	Award a contract following a Crown Commercial Service procurement exercise for the provision of a Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system	A delay would have place a hold on the award of a contract to a new CRM supplier. This would delay the start of the work to replace the current system. This would result in the Council continuing to use an unsupported system which holds resident and business data	Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer	Councillor A Simcock – Chair of Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee
11 September 2023	Call-off a contract for the supply of electricity and related services to MCC's corporate estate (including street lighting) and for associated organisations (e.g. Manchester schools etc).	Given the proximity to the end of the current incumbent contracts (30 September 2023), any delay would be severe from a financial point of view.  If alternative provision could not be made (, then the council would be subject to short-term, "deemed" or "out of contract" rates, which were	Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer	Councillor A Simcock – Chair of Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

		<p>prohibitively expensive.</p> <p>The prevailing reason as to why the timeline was so suppressed, is that earlier this year markets were still highly inflated, meaning supplier interest in bidding for framework participation was extremely low if at all. The Council therefore had to wait for market conditions to improve before tendering the framework which this direct award will call off from.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--

This page is intentionally left blank