

## **Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 5 November 2019**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Ahmed Ali, Andrews, Clay, Davies, Lanchbury, Moore, B Priest,  
A Simcock, Stanton, Wheeler and Wright

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Leese, Leader  
Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader  
Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources  
Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport

**Apologies:** Councillor Battle and Rowles

#### **RGSC/19/60 Minutes**

##### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on the 8 October 2019 as a correct record.

#### **RGSC/19/61 Minutes of the Human Resources Sub Group**

##### **Decision**

To note the minutes of the meeting held on the 15 October 2019 as a correct record.

#### **RGSC/19/62 Annual Property Report 2018/19**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided an update on property activity since November 2018. The report reviewed activity across in Development and the Investment, Operational and Heritage estates. The report also included an update on the Council's Asset Management Strategy and governance of land transfers and Community Asset Transfers (CAT).

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- The delivery and operation of the Council's Digital assets which included The Sharp Project, Space Studios Manchester and Arbeta (previously One Central Park);
- The on-going development of Manchester Airport and Enterprise Zone;
- The development of City Centre schemes involving Council assets which included First Street, Jacksons Row/Bootle Street, St Johns, Heron House, Mayfield Regeneration Area, Circle Square, Portugal Street East and Bridge Street and Kendals;

- Details of other commercial and employment development, including Central Retail Park, Didsbury Technology Park, Central Park and New Smithfield Market;
- Work with Strategic Housing, Planning and other partners to deliver the Council's objectives for Housing;
- Involvement in a range of initiatives to improve the quality and offer in district centres
- Property input in relation to leisure, sport and education provision;
- The management of a programme of strategic acquisitions
- Income from the Council's investment estate, particularly from its property interests in the Airport
- The management of the Council's non-operational (investment) estate and transactional work;
- An overview of the Operational Estate activity and Asset Management Programme;
- Progress with the Council's Carbon Reduction programme; and
- Updates in relation to Community Asset Transfers and Voluntary Sector Support and the Council's Heritage Estate.

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

- Had the process of Community Asset Transfers (CAT's) slowed down and if so what was the reason for this;
- It would be useful if all Members of the Council were provided with details of buildings across the city that were still available for CAT's;
- Why was it envisaged that there would possibly be a need to progress sales of Council assets quickly if demand from investors and occupiers particularly in the residential, office and leisure sectors within the city centre remained strong;
- Clarity was sought as to what was determined to be "affordable" in the context of housing development within the city;
- It would be helpful in future reports to have a breakdown of the different types of housing provision being provided across the city;
- In relation to the proposed housing renewal scheme in Beswick, what was meant by the re-provision of all existing social housing tenants;
- Given the Council's exposure to the retail sector, with specific reference to Kendals and the Arndale Centre, was there any concern in relation to the retail performance of the city;
- What was the timescale for actual movement on the proposals for the redevelopment of Wythenshawe Town Centre;
- Why had the Council paid £37million to acquire Central Retail Park site but was selling a site in close proximity (Pollard Street) to this for significantly less;
- There was concern that there appeared to be a significant change to the proposals for the future use Central Retail Park which were different to the initial proposals for mixed use residential housing provision;
- There was concern in relation to the change in use of some new developments from initially residential provision to commercial provision and the possible shortage of homes for owner occupation;
- There was concern in relation to the delay in progress with Upper and Lower Campfield Markets;

- Clarification was sought as to whether the requirement to absorb vacant business rates liability within the Head Lease with the Arndale Centre was contained in any other Head Leases that the Council had and was there a risk to the Council with the creation of other high value retail propositions across the city that the Council would potentially need to absorb more of these;
- It was suggested that the Council received a future report detailing its heritage assets and how these could be enhanced; and
- Was there anything that had not gone as well as anticipated.

The Head of Estates and Facilities confirmed that the process of CAT's had slowed compared to previous years and this had been as a result of less stock being available now and the stock that remained, was complex and required more work in terms of developing the businesses cases. The Deputy Leader commented that information was available on CPAD in relation to buildings that were available to a CAT but agreed to send this information directly to all Members of the Council.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) advised that in terms of the development cycle and the disposal of land and property, there was a clear view within the market that difficult times were approaching, which was being reflected in terms of land values in the city resulting from the uncertainty of Brexit and the country's global trading position. There was also evidence of land traders offloading land which was a concern. Taking a wider perspective, he reported that demand was still strong within the city for commercial space.

The Committee was advised that the Council had realigned its policy framework on housing and affordability so that this was now in line with the Council's new Affordable Housing Policy which was approved by the Executive in September 2019. In essence this meant that future disposal of land needed to promote properties for social rent, affordable rent and shared ownership. The Leader commented that the term affordable had been coined by Government and was used in a specific way and was a definition of affordability never accepted by the Council. Instead the Council determined affordability in the context of a family at or below the mean income for the city, where a maximum of 30% of income was spent on housing costs. He suggested that an alternative description of affordability should be adopted.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) advised that he would seek clarification from One Manchester in relation to the proposed re-provision of all existing social housing tenants in connection to the proposed housing renewal scheme in Beswick and provide a response to the Committee.

The Leader advised that the Council was due to meet with representatives of Kendals to discuss the future plans for the department store. In terms of retail in general, there were numerous national and international chains that were struggling, however, independent retail in the city was flourishing and there was also an increase in online businesses establishing a physical presence within the city, with reference to Amazon Market Place and the Hut Group being given. Taking all this into account, it was considered that Manchester was able to offer a thriving retail offer. The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) commented that the impact of what was happening at a national level in the retail market was having an impact on the Council's income from the Arndale and Wythenshawe Town Centre. In terms of

movement on the proposals for the redevelopment of Wythenshawe Town Centre, there was imminent discussion to take place with local members on the proposals.

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) reported that both Central Retail Park and Portugal Street East schemes had been subject to independent valuations by agents and were very different schemes. The Pollard Street scheme had a major challenge in terms of development due to an operational tram line running through the centre of the scheme which placed a considerable impact on the valuation of the land in terms of development which was reflected in its valuation. It was also a low density scheme, whereas Central Retail Park did not have the same type of development challenges and was a higher density scheme. It was also commented that the value of Central Retail Park had been based on its current use a retail park. In terms of the proposals of Central Retail Park, he advised that the Council was in the final stages of preparing a strategic framework for the use of Central Retail Park which would be submitted to a future meeting of Economy Scrutiny and that the Council had other land interest around Central retail Park which might be more suitable for future affordable housing provision

The Strategic Director (Growth and Development) advised that the broad numbers of proposed housing at a city level that were forecasted to be built as part of the Council's Local Plan and within the GMSF had not changed but acknowledged that the provision of owner occupied properties was an issue that needed to be looked at. The Leader gave an assurance that Deansgate Ward Councillors would be kept updated on the progress with Upper and Lower Campfield Markets and St Johns as they developed.

It was reported to the Committee that the requirement to absorb vacant business rates was bespoke to the Head Lease with the owners of the Arndale. It was acknowledged that if there was another major retail development in the city centre there would be a need for the Council to be cognisant of the potential impact this would have.

The Deputy Leader reported that a lot of heritage buildings in the city were not owned by the Council and therefore it was not possible for the Council to enhance these. The Chair advised that she would consult with the Chair of Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee about a future report on the governance structure of how heritage assets were looked after.

In terms of what had not gone so well, the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) advised that there will still be outstanding issues around the Investment Estate over and above the issues in relation to the Arndale and Wythenshawe Town Centre and gave reference to complex issues around 103 Princess Street and Heron House which impacted on the Investment Estate.

## **Decision**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report; and

- (2) Notes that the Chair will consult with the Chair of Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee about a future report on the governance structure of how heritage assets were looked after.

### **RGSC/19/63 Annual Section 106 Monitoring Report**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided information on the 2018/19 municipal year's activity in relation to S106 Agreements and specifically on associated financial obligations. The report also set out the legislative framework for negotiating S106 agreements, and updates on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and viability assessments.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport provided a brief summary of the report. The main points and themes included:-

- During 2018/19 year, 16 S106 agreements were signed. Of these, seven related to the provision of affordable housing;
- A total of £966,865 had been received in S106 financial contributions and to date income collected in the current fiscal year was £907,878;
- There was currently £6.5 million held through received S106 contributions. Of this around £500,000 was awaiting to be reserved to projects;
- No refunds had been made during this period in relation to any financial obligation, however, there was one case where the financial obligation was now required and this was being pursued;
- Viability assessments were now submitted as part of the planning application and were publically available for inspection;
- The ability of Member engagement in the context of planning agreements;
- S106 governance arrangements, which included the establishment of a dedicated S106 Advisory Group to review spend, track process and help unblock any issues; and
- The Council continued to not implement CIL in Manchester at the current time. As part of the review of the Core Strategy (the development plan), consideration would be given to the introduction of CIL which would include assessing, if it is possible to establish an economically viable CIL rate and/or whether these could differ in different geographical areas.

The report also contained a breakdown of S106 agreements on a ward by ward basis.

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

- Would it be possible for all Councillors to have access to the new viewing portal for S106 agreements;
- What was the exact process for Member engagement in the context of S106 agreements secured through the planning process;
- It was felt that on some occasions, Ward Councillors were not being made aware of potential S106 monies within their wards and clarification was sought on the co-ordination between the Planning Department and Neighbourhood Teams;

- It was suggested that some Members felt that S106 agreements had been determined by the time pre-application discussions were taking place and that due to this, they had little influence;
- It was queried as to how local residents could contribute ideas to S106 spend;
- Could the amount of S106 contribution increase if a development became more profitable than anticipated;
- Was there any timescale around a future decision on the possible implementation of a CIL;
- There was concern about assumptions being made between the S106 agreement and the source of spend as well as the length of time it was taking between a S106 agreement being made and the its implementation;
- It was suggested that it was not clear to Members who was responsible for ensuring the spend of S106 once an agreement had been secured through the planning agreements
- It was suggested that the Council's Member Development Working Group considered arranging refresher training for all Councillors on the S106 agreement process;
- Was there anything more the Council could do to achieve more S106 contributions from developers; and
- Had there been any instances where the Council had proposed a small S106 contribution than that identified from the viability assessment.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing advised that it was the intention for the new viewing portal for S106 agreements to be accessible for all Councillors by the beginning of December 2019. In terms of Member engagement in the context of S106 agreements secured through Planning, it was reported that pre application engagement was key and although not mandatory, all developers were encouraged to undertake this. Once a planning application was submitted, every Member was provided with details of these applications relevant to their ward and were encouraged to contact Planning to discuss the S106 proposals in relation to these applications.

The Committee was advised that the dedicated S106 Advisory Group was led by the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing and had strategic leads from Neighbourhoods and Planning as part of its membership to ensure that appropriate governance arrangements were in place.

It was explained that when the Council entered pre-application discussions with developers it was inevitable that discussions around mitigation measures would take place and this would include whether this could be achieved by way of a planning condition or through a S106 agreement and at this stage, no final decision would be taken. Once an application was submitted, officers constantly reviewed, assessed and evaluated what may be required and up until the point of issuing a Planning committee report, Members and residents had the opportunity to make comments as to whether they felt a requirement for a S106 contribution was needed in relation to an application. This was caveated with the point that there would be some limitations as to what a S106 agreement could be used for.

In terms of the ability to increase the amount of S106 contribution from a profitable development, the Council now introduced a reconciliation process which enabled the

Council to retest the viability of every S106 agreement it entered into for a financial contribution and had embedded a claw back provision to enable the Council to seek further S106 contributions from a developer if there had been an uplift. In relation to CIL, the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing advised that at present there was no timescale for the introduction of CIL in Manchester but this would be considered as part of the development of Manchester's Local Plan. This would not be a straight forward decision and due to the complexity, it would take some time before a decision was taken as to whether to implement this in Manchester.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing acknowledged that there was a number of S106 agreements that were now quite old in terms of when these agreements had been made, however, over the last 12 months a risk review had been undertaken for these agreements and it was reported that none of the S106 agreements were in danger of the financial contributions being returned to the developer. It was agreed that in future reports dates would be included in the as to when consents were granted and dates S106 agreements were signed. The Chair asked that this information be added to the Ward Information data and circulated to all Members within the next month.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing acknowledge concerns raised and commented that the establishment of the S106 Advisory Group and new governance arrangements as detailed in the report sought to address these concerns. It was also reported that the Council's Internal audit had been asked to undertake a complete review of the new governance arrangements. The Chair suggested that the Committee received an update report following Internal Audit's review.

It was reported that at the present moment it was difficult to identify and further scope where the Council could seek further S106 financial contributions as all viability information was now published in the public domain and the Council already negotiated strongly with developers. Furthermore it was reported that the Council had been no instances where the Council had proposed a smaller S106 contribution than that identified from the viability assessment.

## Decisions

The Committee

- (1) Notes the report; and
- (2) Requests an update report following Internal Audit's review of the new S106 governance arrangements and that this report includes the following information:-
  - An indication of affordable housing being provided from S106 contributions
  - How Developers are encouraged to mitigate any harm from their developments
  - Best practice and comparison of S106 arrangements with other GM local authorities; and
  - The S106 triggers for planning applications within the Deansgate Ward (Land Bounded By Chester Road, Mancunian Way And Former

Bridgewater Canal Offices and Land Bounded by Jackson Row, Bootle Street, Southmill Street and 201 Deansgate.

- (3) Requests that when the update report is considered, representatives from Neighbourhoods and Capital Programmes attend to help address the Committee's concerns around the rate of spend of S106 agreements.

### **RGSC/19/64 The Factory, St John's**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided an update on the construction progress for The Factory project, its significance in terms of cultural impact within the city, the projected social and economic benefits, legacy impacts and opportunities for Manchester residents generated by the project.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- To date progress had been good, with 11 of the 32 work packages having been let, the most visible of which were the steelworks;
- A number of key successes were highlighted including the substantial completion of the towers steelwork, the installation of the concrete stairs and the lift shaft erection. The truck lift enclosure and orchestra pit had also been 'topped out' and structurally completed;
- The project team were working to achieve the earliest, most cost effective completion date, with the Factory due to play a significant role in MIF 2021, however the most significant challenge remained the complexity of the project;
- Additional issues had been discovered on site including drainage issues due to incomplete data which had put some pressure on the project;
- The project was currently going through the next quarterly review with Arts Council England. A cost and design review had also been commissioned to underpin the next phase of delivery with the Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing (MEP) being the next major work package to be let;
- Details of social value commitments to date, including the number of apprenticeship starts, pre-employment schemes or placements focusing on long term unemployed groups and employability skills support activities;
- A broader piece of work was also being undertaken into the construction market and inflationary pressures within Manchester as this was a concern across the capital programme; and
- Whilst at this stage the project was reported as delivering to budget, the situation was being kept under careful review.

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

- Concern was raised in relation to the engagement by the Management Contractor in permitting access to the site for Unite and Trade Unions, in light of the Council's signing of the Unite Construction Charter;
- Members sought further detail in relation to the additional drainage issue identified in the report;
- What financial contingency existed within the total cost of the project to take account of these additional issues and inflationary pressures surrounding the construction market;

- In terms of apprentices, could the Committee be provided with information on how many had actually started working on the project and how many of these were Manchester residents; and
- Could Officers give an assurance that there would be no need for any further capital investment into the project

The Director of Capital Programmes advised that he met regularly with Unite, officers within Procurement and the Management Contractor's Project Director, to discuss protocols around site access for Trade Unions. It was reported that it had been agreed that the protocols for Trade Union access to the site would replicate those protocols applied to the construction of Liverpool Hospital (which was another development overseen by the same Management Contractor), however, he had been advised that negotiations around this between Unite and the Management Contractor had broken down and as a result he had contacted Unite to understand their issues and had committed to meeting with the Management Contractor and Unite to try and identify and agree a resolution.

In relation to the additional drainage issue, it was explained that following intrusive surveys of the site it was identified that drainage of an adjacent site (owned by Allied London) was actually coming on to the Factory site which had not been identified in any groundwork drawings. Consequently adjustments were needed and the Council had formally written to Allied London to suggest that the cost of these adjustments were borne by them rather than the Council. It was also reported that following ground excavation, contamination had been found, which was not unusual for a brownfield site, but required additional unplanned work to remedy.

The Director of Capital Programmes advised that the original contingency for the project was circa £4.1m and it was acknowledged that this was currently under some pressure. Reassurance was given that the agreed budget was being monitored regularly and all efforts were being made to deliver the project on budget. In terms of inflationary pressures, it was explained that at present, the demand in the Manchester construction market outstripped supply and as a result complex projects such as the Factory were not as appealing to the supply chain as more simpler projects. As such some of the supply chain were less active in some of the key components of the factory.

The Chair suggested as well as information on apprenticeship starts being sent to Members of the Committee, a report should be submitted to the Ethical Procurement Sub Group on apprentices, including the gender breakdown and BAME background and the issues that had occurred between the Management Contractor and the Trade Unions.

Furthermore, the Director of Capital Programmes advised that it was not possible to give an absolute assurance there would be no need for any further capital investment due to the nature and complexity of the project. Only 11 of the 32 works packages had been let so far and the Council was still in design and negotiation with the supply chain on some of the remaining packages of work. He did advise that this was being monitored closely and steps had been taken to reduce some of the cost and inflationary pressures.

## Decision

The Committee notes the report.

### **RGSC/19/65 Progress of Expenditure - Northern and Eastern Gateway Programmes**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided a progress update in relation to investment being made by the Council in delivering the Northern and Eastern Gateway programmes, which in total were anticipated to deliver in excess of 21,000 new homes over a 15 – 20 year period and create or safeguard 2,200 jobs.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- Budgetary allocations of £25m (Northern Gateway) and £47m (Eastern Gateway) had been made available from the Capital Programme 2017 – 2022 to help unlock and maximise the potential of these areas;
- The scale of the Northern Gateway opportunity and associated challenges;
- Details of the investment to support both the Northern Gateway and Eastern Gateway initiatives, including co-investment with joint venture partners;
- Progress to date in terms of expenditure, including the acquisition of Central Retail Park and The Courtyard at Royal Mills; and
- Detail of remedial works undertaken around New Islington Marina.

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

- What would be the consequence to the Council should the bid for £51.6m from the Government's Housing Infrastructure Fund, to tackle constraints to development in the Lower Irk Valley neighbourhood, be unsuccessful;
- Clarification was sought as to whether the bid for £51.6m from the Housing Infrastructure Fund was by Manchester City Council or whether this was a bid on behalf the Combined Authority;
- Was there still a proposal for a new tram stop within the Northern gateway programme; and
- If the bid to the Government's Housing Infrastructure Fund was unsuccessful, would this impact on the ability to deliver the target of 20% affordable housing (equating to 3000 properties) within the Northern Gateway programme.

The Committee was advised that the Council was remaining optimistic in terms of the outcome of the bid submitted. The Council had been in detailed negotiations with Homes England for a significant period of time and had been through a detailed process of due diligence in relation to the bid. However, should the bid be unsuccessful in part or whole, the Council had identified a range of scenarios as to how the Council would intend to progress with both programmes. The Leader added that in the event of the bid being unsuccessful the likely impact would be that the development programme would be lengthened in terms of completion rather than scaled back or abandoned.

The Leader advised that the £51.6m bid was originally a joint between Manchester Council and Salford Council, supported by the Combined Authority, but having taken advice from Government, the Council had separated its bid from Salford's bid, as it was suggested that this would result in a higher chance of both bids being successful.

Officers explained that the Transport Strategy for 2040 still proposed a new tram stop within the Northern Gateway programme and the Council was in discussions with TfGM around a pre-feasibility study.

The Leader explained that within the Strategic Framework for the Irk Valley and Collyhurst area of the Northern Gateway, the Council expected that at least 3000 properties would meet the Council's definition of affordability. There would be a number of controls in relation to this, the most important being approval by the Executive of the Business Plan, which would be required to provide detail on how the Council intended to deliver this number of affordable homes.

## **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

## **RGSC/19/66 Capital Requirements and Anticipated Borrowing**

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which informed Members of the Council's capital financing position, forecast borrowing, and the impact on the Council's balance sheet and revenue budget. The report also reviewed the changes to Public Works Loan Board (PWLB) borrowing rates announced in October 2019.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- The context of the Council's approach to managing its debt, which had been to minimise cash balances by delaying taking external debt;
- Changes in internal borrowing to create revenue savings compared to the cost of externalising the debt and holding cash;
- Interest rate expectations over the next three years;
- An overview of the Council's borrowing strategy, which was based on aggregating the debt needs of the Council to achieve the optimum risk balance in debt management;
- The forecast borrowing requirements from 2019/20 to 2023/24;
- Revenue implications of new debt for the medium term; and
- The impact and potential future implications to the Council in relation to the PWLB rate policy change.

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

- Rather than increase the PWLB rate, could Government not have tightened the rules up in regards to public sector borrowing;
- As the PWLB rate had historically been low, had the Council and other local authorities simply become accustomed to borrowing at a low rate of interest;

- How was the Council lobbying Government to review the change in the PWLB rate;
- Which regeneration schemes, where a return on investment was expected, were likely to be affected by the change in the PWLB policy;
- What was the Council's borrowing cost in terms of the potential impact on the revenue budget;
- Had any potential equalities impact been taken in to consideration in connection to borrowing costs and the increased impact on the Council's revenue budget, which was largely spent on groups with a protected characteristic; and
- What were the benefits and potential drawbacks for potentially borrowing from the private sector in the future.

The Leader advised that the 1% increase of the PWLB borrowing rate was unlikely to stop local authorities investing in certain ventures, but more likely it would have an impact on more marginal schemes such as affordable housing taking place and as such he felt this was a counterproductive measure.

The Deputy City Treasurer advised that the Council had become used to borrowing money at a low rate of interest, however, she provided an assurance that when the Council set its capital programme, it was set against the slightly higher PWLB rate towards the end of 2018, to ensure that the existing capital programme was predominantly budgeted for at that time, meaning that the programme remained affordable. The consequence of the increase in the PWLB rate was the impact on the viability of any future schemes.

The Committee was also advised that in terms of lobby government, the City Treasure had contacted a number influential organisations, including a number of other Local Authorities and the LGA, to enable a concerted response to the proposed increase. As well as this the City Treasurer had spoken to HM Treasury and the Department for Communities and Local Government to seek an explanation and the reasons for the increase.

The Leader advised that in terms of regeneration schemes likely to be affected, this would likely relate to any future schemes where the Council was required to invest. He also advised that in terms of borrowing costs, there were two elements that needed to be taken into account, the minimum revenue provision and interest. The totality of this was that in any given year the Council repaid approximately 4.5% of its total borrowing. Due to the way the Council set the interest when it fixed its capital budget, it meant that the Council would likely need to increase its revenue provision in 2021/22.

The Deputy City Treasurer reported that as part of the business cases for capital investment, a number of factors would be considered, including strategic fit, economic case, social value outputs and carbon implications and the impact on equalities would be built into part. It was suggested that going forward this could be something that was looked at more explicitly in future business cases for investment proposals.

Furthermore, the Committee was advised that the Council had always borrowed from the PWLB due to the ease of which loan funding could be accessed and good

interests rates. At the present moment the Council was waiting to see how the other market participants responded to the PWLB increase in relation to how local authorities could access borrowing and associated restructure payments.

**Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

**RGSC/19/67 Overview Report**

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

**Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

## Health Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2019

#### Present:

Councillor Farrell – in the Chair  
Councillors Clay, Curley, Holt, Mary Monaghan, Newman, Riasat and Wills

#### Apologies: O'Neil

#### Also present:

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing  
Nick Gomm, Director of Corporate Affairs, Manchester Health and Care  
Commissioning (MHCC)  
Michelle Irvine, Director of Quality & Performance, MHCC  
Neil Walbran, Chief Officer, Healthwatch Manchester  
Vicky Szulist, Chair, Healthwatch Manchester  
Tony Ullman, Deputy Director, Primary Care Integration, MHCC  
Dr Manisha Kumar, Medical Director, MHCC  
Mark Edwards, Chief Operating Officer, Manchester Local Care Organisation  
Marie Rowland, Associate Director Performance, Manchester University NHS Trust  
Dr Sarah Follon  
Dr Craig Ferguson

#### HSC/19/39                      Minutes

#### Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 8 October 2019 as a correct record.

#### HSC/19/40                      Primary Care Access in Manchester

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Director, Primary Care Integration, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC) that provided Members with an update on access to Primary Medical Care in Manchester; both in core and also extended hours.

The Deputy Director, Primary Care Integration, MHCC referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Access to General Practice during core hours;
- Information on the 9 Primary Care Standards;
- Extended hours population coverage and Primary Care Networks;
- Patient and public perspectives of Primary Care access;
- An update on the enhanced 7 day access service;
- National review of Access;
- Developing a model for integrated urgent and enhanced access;

- Digital access and Manchester's Strategy for Primary Care Information Management and Technology; and
- Inclusion Health – Safe Surgeries designed to ensure that Manchester's Primary Care system is properly inclusive to all groups and communities.

Members discussed the difficulties they had experienced in securing GP appointments, commenting that the requirement to call at a specified time, often to find that there were no appointments left and was asked to call back the next day was not acceptable. Members commented that there was no triage of patients applied and there was a first come / first served system and further questioned the findings of the patient survey that reported that 69% of patients found it fairly to very easy to get through to someone at their GP surgery on the phone, slightly above the national average of 68%.

Dr Kumar described that Primary Care was experiencing significant pressures due to an ageing population with complex health needs. She said that whilst it was recognised that some patients still required face to face consultations, the options of providing online consultations and telephone consultations, where appropriate were being considered. She described that consideration would be given to understand what patients required from this offer, adding that it needed to be appropriate for patients. She stated that this would also reduce the demand at GP surgeries for appointments and help alleviate the experiences described by Members when telephoning surgeries.

Dr Kumar responded to a question from a Member by explaining that GPs were required to review patients' medications, even if they had been prescribed by a Consultant as responsibility was with the GP. She stated that it was correct and appropriate to undertake periodic health checks, such as blood pressure monitoring to ensure patients remained safe and healthy.

A Member commented that the closure of Walk In Centres had a detrimental impact on residents ability to access GP appointments, with the result that patients presented at Emergency Departments that resulted in additional pressures on these services. The Member further commented that more needed to be done to publicise the availability of the extended hours and enhanced offer provided through the Primary Care Networks. He said that leaflets and posters needed to be prominently displayed in GP surgery waiting areas, in addition to reception staff informing their patients.

The Deputy Director, Primary Care Integration, MHCC stated that there were three Walk In Centres in Manchester and the intention was to incorporate this model to complement and support other offers.

In response to a question regarding the number of Did Not Attends at extended hour appointments Dr Kumar reported that they were currently at 10%, and this reflected the number of Did Not Attends at GP practices. She said that the system had been improved so that patients could now cancel appointments using a text message service. Members recommended that consideration should be given to sending appointment reminder messages also.

Members welcomed the Inclusion Health programme, a range of initiatives and programmes to ensure that Manchester's Primary Care system is properly inclusive to all groups and communities.

The Deputy Director, Primary Care Integration, MHCC informed the Committee that the introduction of Primary Care Standards provided a better offer to patients and addressed the issue of variation that had previously been evident in GP Primary Care. He stated that mystery shopping exercises would be undertaken to assess how these standards were implemented. In response to a specific question regarding the number of single or two doctor Practices in Manchester, he said these were extremely low and he would circulate this information following the meeting. He further informed the Committee that Surgeries could close for training and development purposes only when reasonable alternatives and satisfactory arrangements had been agreed for their patients.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **HSC/19/41                      Healthwatch: Primary Care Access in Manchester**

The Committee considered the report submitted by Healthwatch Manchester that assessed the impact of their report 'Week Spot?' a Review of Access to the 7 Day GP Service published in 2017.

The Chief Officer, Healthwatch Manchester referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Describing the objectives and rationale of the report;
- The methodology employed to undertake the review;
- Describing the key findings, including comparative data; and
- Conclusions.

The Chief Officer, Healthwatch Manchester commented that he recognised that improvements had been made in regard to access to Primary Care however more could be done to promote and publicise the extended appointment offer to patients. In response to comments from Members regarding the subjectivity of the findings provided within the report, in particular in regard to levels of politeness, the Chief Office, Healthwatch Manchester informed the Committee that there was a third person listening into the call who could offer an opinion also.

A Member commented that more needed to be done to publicise the availability of the extended hours and enhanced offer. He said that leaflets and posters needed to be prominently displayed in all GP surgery waiting areas, in addition to reception staff informing their patients and online information.

In response to a comment from a Member regarding potential barriers to patients accessing online appointments and other online support, the Chair, Healthwatch Manchester commented that their studies had indicated that this did not present as

much of a barrier as had been suggested.

In response to comments made regarding postcode barriers to registration in central Manchester experienced by homeless people and temporary residents, the Director of Corporate Affairs, MHCC informed the Chair that he would provide a briefing note to Members.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing acknowledged a comment from the Chair, Healthwatch Manchester regarding the confusion created regarding the different wording used to describe the extended offer. She stated that a preferred description would be 'evening and weekend access' to avoid any confusion or ambiguity.

## **Decisions**

1. The Committee welcome the report produced by Healthwatch Manchester and fully endorse their recommendations.
2. The Committee recommend that the Deputy Director, Primary Care Integration, MHCC ensures that leaflets and posters promoting evening and weekend appointments are prominently displayed in all GP surgery waiting areas, in addition to reception staff informing their patients and online information.

## **HSC/19/42 Winter Pressures**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Performance and Quality Improvement, MHCC and Trafford Clinical Commissioning Group and the Director of Adult Social Services which provided an overview of urgent care winter planning for 2019/20. It contained information on the joint system-wide planning taking place across the Manchester urgent care system, the surge and escalation approach taken in order to manage periods of pressure and the resulting impact on key performance targets.

The Director of Quality & Performance, MHCC referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- The approach to winter resilience planning;
- Describing a range of key interventions and processes that outline the Manchester approach to winter planning;
- An update on the Integrated Discharge Team; and
- Information on the Manchester Community Response.

Members welcomed the report and recognised that it was a system wide response to the challenge of winter pressures. A Member commented that he recognised that the system experienced pressures year round.

The Chair sought an assurance that similar winter planning preparations were underway at the North Manchester General Hospital site. The Director of Quality & Performance, MHCC reassured the Committee that detailed plans had been

developed by the Pennine Acute Hospital Trust. Members requested that further information on the Winter Planning activity for the North Manchester General Hospital site be provided to the Committee following the meeting.

In response to a question from a Member regarding the additional capacity at MRI the Director of Quality & Performance, MHCC advised that 12 beds had been secured for winter pressures and 8 beds for major trauma. In response to whether this would be enough to meet the demand, Members were advised that there was always an issue of capacity and safe staffing levels also had to be taken into consideration.

The Director of Adult Social Services responded to a question regarding resilience of the care home market by stating that commissioners were working closely with providers to ensure there was enough capacity to meet demand on a long term basis. She further commented that homeless people were being discharged from hospital into high quality accommodation in community settings.

The Chief Operating Officer, Manchester Local Care Organisation further commented that the integrated discharge service, that brought medical and social care staff together in a team that had been developed in north Manchester would be rolled out across the city. Members requested that they be kept regularly updated on the Delayed Transfer of Care figures across Manchester. The Director of Quality & Performance, MHCC confirmed that these figures were collated and could be provided to the Committee. She commented that the main reasons for Delayed Transfer of Care were; awaiting assessment by Social Worker, awaiting a place in a care home and patient/family preference as to where to be discharged to.

A Member commented that following the implementation of the Single Hospital Service there had been a decrease in engagement with local ward Councillors in the Wythenshawe area. The Associate Director Performance, Manchester University NHS Trust acknowledged these comments and stated that these would be fed back. She further commented that the delivery of the Single Hospital Service had allowed for the better deployment of staff across sites to best respond to demand. She commented that this had also been welcomed by staff as they were able to obtain a range of experiences and skills by working across the sites footprint. She further commented that the Wythenshawe site had seen increased presentations from Stockport residents as it was perceived by them to be a better environment to be treated.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing stated that the report demonstrated a coordinated system wide response to the challenge of winter pressures. She commented that community and social services were recognised as important contributors to this model and they remained committed to delivering the best services for the residents of Manchester. She stated that despite this Social Care funding remained inadequate. She stated that there had been no increase in Social Care funding in real terms since 2010 when taking into account inflation, the increase in population and an ageing population.

## **Decisions**

1. To note the report.
2. Members requested that the Director of Performance and Quality Improvement, MHCC provide a regular update on the Delayed Transfer of Care figures across Manchester.
3. Members requested that information on the Winter Planning activity for North Manchester General Hospital be circulated to Members.

### **HSC/19/43                      Overview Report**

A 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**

To note the report and approve the work programme.

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

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 6 November 2019**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Stone – in the Chair

Councillors Alijah, Cooley, Hewitson, T Judge, Kilpatrick, Lovecy, Reeves and Reid

#### Co-opted Voting Members:

Mr A Arogundade, Parent Governor Representative

Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative

Ms Z Stepan, Parent Governor Representative

#### Co-opted Non Voting Members:

Mr L Duffy, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools

Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure

Councillor Igbon, Ward Councillor for Hulme

Jeff Seneviratne, Supporter of Ghyll Head Outdoor Education Centre

Justin Watson, Young Manchester

Toni Good, Barlow Moor Community Association

#### **Apologies:**

Councillors Madeleine Monaghan and Wilson

Mrs J Miles, Representative of the Diocese of Salford

Mr R Lammas, Primary Sector Teacher Representative

### **CYP/19/44 Minutes**

The Chair informed the Committee that this was the last meeting for Ms Stepan, Mr Arogundade and Mr Lammas, due to their terms of office as Co-opted Members finishing, and thanked them for their contributions.

#### **Decision**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 9 October 2019.

### **CYP/19/45 Update on the Planned Manchester Healthy Weight Strategy to Tackle Obesity and Update on Progress in Delivering the Manchester Reducing Infant Mortality Strategy**

The Committee received a report of the Director of the Public Health/Population Health Consultant in Public Health which provided an overview of the health data for Manchester children in relation to childhood obesity and infant mortality. Information was provided on the causes and impact of obesity and the work taking place to develop a Manchester Healthy Weight Strategy 2020-2025, which would take a whole system, partnership approach to tackling obesity in the city. The report included an update on new service models being commissioned to reduce obesity in children and their families. It also summarised the progress that had been made in

delivering the Manchester Reducing Infant Mortality Strategy following its publication in March 2019.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Childhood obesity;
- Measuring obesity in children;
- Cause and impact of obesity;
- Developing a new Healthy Weight Strategy to tackle obesity;
- Commissioned Services - Healthy Weight;
- Obesity and safeguarding;
- Reducing infant mortality;
- Patterns and trends in infant deaths;
- Summary of Manchester Reducing Infant Mortality Strategy; and
- Progress on delivering the Reducing Infant Mortality Strategy.

The Consultant in Public Health reported that there was an error in table 2 (Infant Mortality Data for 2018 - Manchester and England) under point 9.2 and clarified that the neonatal period was 0-28 days, not 7-28 days, as stated in the table.

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

- What could be done to address the increase in obesity between reception and Year 6, noting that this was above the national average;
- The impact of poverty and deprivation;
- Reasons behind the increase in infant mortality;
- Drinking during pregnancy and whether the Committee could consider Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder at a future meeting;
- The impact of takeaways, particularly those close to schools, and whether there should be more regulation of this;
- The impact of smoking on infant mortality; and
- Why stillbirths were not included in the infant mortality figures.

The Consultant in Public Health advised the Committee that tackling child obesity required working not just in schools but also with families and in the community. The Commissioning Manager (Starting Well) reported that the Population Health Team had reviewed their approach to tackling child obesity, advising that Public Health England had advocated a whole system approach. The Consultant in Public Health explained that this involved a range of partners such as the Early Help Hubs, Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO) and Licensing working together to tackle obesity and advised that a workshop was being planned to bring different partners together to develop a shared approach. The Manchester Healthy Weight Strategy Lead author informed Members that the Healthy Weight Strategy was due to be published in Spring 2020 and informed Members of the some of the other partners to be involved in this including businesses, transport and the Food Board.

The Commissioning Manager (Starting Well) reported that the Healthy Schools Team had a dedicated weight management project. He advised that his service had

recently commissioned this team to do some additional work focusing on reception age children and that work was also starting to take place with the 0 – 5 year age range.

The Consultant in Public Health noted the relationship between deprivation and both childhood obesity and infant mortality rates and advised that this could explain the increase in infant mortality in the city. She highlighted that poverty was linked to poor housing conditions and other factors which impacted on infant mortality rates and informed Members that this was incorporated into the strategy. The Executive Member for Children and Schools advised Members that poverty also led families towards poor food choices such as cheap takeaway meals. He informed Members about the midwife-led smoking cessation programme at St Mary's Hospital and suggested that the Committee might want to look at this in future.

In response to a Member's question, the Consultant in Public Health reported that she would contact the Member outside of the meeting to provide him with more detail on the data and analysis behind the information in the report. The Chair supported this and commented that, if there was any additional information for circulation to the wider Committee, to do this via the Scrutiny Support Officer.

The Programme Lead reported that the infant mortality rate was a national measure so officers could not change it to include stillbirths; however, she advised that the work being done in Manchester to reduce infant mortality, for example work to reduce smoking in pregnancy and to raise public awareness about changes in foetal movement, should also reduce stillbirths. She advised Members that her team was monitoring stillbirth rates, despite this not being included in the infant mortality rate figure.

## **Decisions**

1. To support the proposed Manchester Healthy Weight Strategy to reduce obesity.
2. To receive a report on Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder at a future meeting.

[Councillor Alijah declared a personal interest as a member of the steering group of the charity Safety4Sisters.]

## **CYP/19/46 Ghyll Head Outdoor Education Centre**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education and the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which set out the work that had been undertaken to examine the option of progressing a new operating arrangement for Ghyll Head as part of the Council's wider leisure contract.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Background information;
- The current situation;
- The capital proposal;

- Controlling risk; and
- Next steps.

Jeff Seneviratne outlined his involvement with Ghyll Head, including as a member of the Friends of Ghyll Head. He emphasised the value of outdoor education and welcomed the work outlined in the report. He noted the references in the report to the 50% occupancy rate at Ghyll Head and informed Members that it was unrealistic to expect a 100% occupancy rate because, for example, a school could book the house for one class which would not require all the beds. He advised that the Council should consider how usage of the centre could best be measured. He commented that he hoped the centre could be used to provide outdoor education not only to children but also to families to improve their health and well-being.

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

- That Ghyll Head was a well-loved and valuable provision;
- Members shared positive experiences of Ghyll Head from themselves, their family members and other Manchester residents, including Our Children (Looked After Children);
- That the centre could also be used by families whose children were on the edge of care;
- That, with capital investment, Ghyll Head could be marketed commercially, at a higher rate, at weekends;
- Concern that some parents could not afford to send their children to Ghyll Head, while noting that some schools used their own funds to subsidise places;
- The importance of not changing the ethos of the centre; and
- That some schools did not use it.

The Director of Education reported that the intention for the future was that Ghyll Head would not be just a one-off positive experience but something that introduced children to an activity which they could then continue to take part in once they were back in Manchester, for example, at Debdale Outdoor Centre. She confirmed that a number of schools did subsidise places at Ghyll Head for their pupils, advising that schools could use their Pupil Premium, money given to schools to improve the attainment of disadvantaged pupils, on this. The Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events) advised that the contracting arrangements would allow the Council to control the prices and protect prices for Manchester schools. The Director of Education commented that some schools did take their pupils to other centres which also offered similar activities but that this investment would enable Ghyll Head to compete with them.

The Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events) reported that Ghyll Head did not currently have a dedicated website and that this was something that would need to be invested in in order for the centre to be able to attract commercial bookings. He advised Members that the ethos and values of Ghyll Head were due to its workforce and that the Council intended to protect the current workforce through this transition period while also giving the centre an element of commercial focus.

The Ward Councillor for Hulme expressed her support for the proposals in the report. She emphasised the importance of recruiting experienced staff, commenting that the centre currently had high quality, experienced staff. She reported that play and youth services and colleges also used Ghyll Head and that they should be encouraged to use it more. She also noted the proposal to establish a Stakeholder Board to oversee and govern the management of the centre and suggested that representatives from the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee and the Friends of Ghyll Head could be involved in this.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure commented that the Council wanted to increase the use of Ghyll Head by Manchester residents and that this included encouraging play and youth providers to use the centre. He reported that consideration would be given as to how to engage Members in the work of the Stakeholder Board.

### **Decisions**

1. To support the proposals in the report wholeheartedly and to recommend to the Executive that the Council invest £1.1 million in capital to achieve this.
2. To recommend that officers look into how Ghyll Head could be used by families whose children are on the edge of care.
3. To request that consideration be given as to how Members and the Friends of Ghyll Head can be engaged in the work of the Stakeholder Board.

### **CYP/19/47 Youth Strategy and Engagement**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided a summary of the Our Manchester Youth Offer Strategy which replaced the Valuing Young People Strategy 2016 - 2019. It was the city's multi-sector strategic framework jointly owned by Manchester City Council, its partners and stakeholders, all of whom were responsible for making sure that young people had access to a high quality-driven youth offer that addressed both universal and targeted needs and which directly contributed to and enabled young people to grow into responsible, independent and successful adults. The Committee was invited to comment on the report prior to its submission to the Executive on 13 November 2019.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Our Manchester Youth Offer Strategy 2019 – 2025;
- Workshops and engagement events;
- Outcomes and success;
- Strategy document production;
- Delivery of the strategy; and
- Next steps.

The Committee watched a video produced by Members of Manchester Youth Council (MYC). The video included Youth Council Members talking about the MYC, its new election model and how MYC had helped to shape the Youth Strategy.

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

- To thank the young people for their contribution;
- To welcome the report;
- That Stockton Council had adopted a similar approach which had been very effective, that they had developed an action plan from this work and that it would be useful to look at some of things they had done;
- The importance of play provision;
- To request demographic information on the young people accessing youth services, particularly the youth hubs, including by ward; and
- The importance of universal youth services and of reaching out to young people who were not currently accessing youth services or communicating their views through MYC.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure informed Members how MYC was being developed as a membership organisation which all young people could join and get involved in to different levels. He advised that it was important for all young people to have a mechanism to raise any issues that concerned them and that the Council was creating a website through which any young person could raise an issue.

The Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth) agreed that play provision was important, informing Members that there were over 100 play areas in Manchester parks. He reported that over the previous 12 months approximately £1.3 million had been invested in commissioning play activities across the city and it was hoped that this could be increased, with Young Manchester playing a key role in bringing in additional funding.

The Head of Youth Strategy reported that Manchester had a higher level of youth engagement than other areas of the country, citing that 50.3% of Manchester young people had taken part in the Make Your Mark ballot, compared to 18.6% nationally, but that the Council wanted to improve this further. She advised Members that her service was working to reach young people who did not currently access youth services or visit other facilities such as libraries by using detached youth workers to talk to young people where they were. She agreed that Stockton Council had a good reputation for their Youth Strategy work and informed Members that her service was working to put together an action plan for the Youth Strategy, which would be wide-ranging and involve work with other services.

## **Decisions**

1. To request demographic information on the young people accessing youth services, particularly the youth hubs, including by ward.
2. To endorse the recommendations to the Executive that:

The Executive is recommended to:

1. To agree, subject to budget, the continuation of investment into Young Manchester for the next 3 years, on the basis that Young Manchester uses this as leverage to grow external investment to support the sector.
2. To consider and approve the adoption of the proposed vision, strategic themes and 'We Wills' to deliver the Strategy over the next 3 years.
3. Delegate authority to the Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth) in consultation with the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure to complete the production of the strategy document for communication with young people, partners and the Youth Sector.
4. Delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive & City Treasurer in consultation with the City Solicitor and Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure to finalise the contract value following conclusion of the VAT assessment to ensure that the contract fee is delivered within the available budget.
5. Delegate authority to the City Solicitor to enter into, complete and execute any documents or agreements necessary to give effect to the recommendations in this report.

[Councillor Stone declared a personal interest as a trustee of HOME.]

[Councillor Alijah declared a personal interest as chair of the Hideaway Youth Project.]

### **CYP/19/48 Youth and Play Services - Young Manchester**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Neighbourhoods which provided an overview of the progress of Young Manchester, an independent youth and play charity, and its contract with the Council to commission the city's Youth and Play Fund Programme. It presented an update on progress made since the establishment of the fund in April 2018, focusing on outcomes for children and young people and the growth and development of the city's youth and play sector.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Background to the Youth and Play Fund;
- Impact and outcomes;
- Feedback from children and young people;
- Further investment in children and young people;
- Building a national platform for Manchester; and
- Youth and Play Fund 2020.

The Ward Councillor for Hulme welcomed what had been achieved despite the budget cuts. She emphasised the importance of tackling knife crime and requested further information on the next commissioning round.

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

were:

- The importance of universal youth services;
- That a lack of facilities such as toilets and changing facilities in parks presented a barrier for parents and grandparents wanting to take children to the park, that better information could make people aware of facilities in park cafes but that, where available, these were still only open for limited hours;
- How funding could be identified for work such as repairing swings in parks; and
- How smaller organisations which did not have expertise in writing bids could be supported to obtain funding.

The Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth) informed Members about a new website which was being developed which would provide information on all youth and play services across the city and which would be integrated with the MCR Active website. He advised Members that this would enable the Council and Young Manchester to have a better understanding on where there were gaps in provision. The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure outlined how this information would be gathered at a local level.

The Strategic Lead (Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth) reported that individual park plans were being developed for each park to identify the highest priority work that needed to be done in that park, following which sources of funding could be identified. He advised Members that the Council was releasing £12.5 million to invest in its parks and that his service was looking at ways to reduce demand on the parks budget and to generate income.

Justin Watson from Young Manchester reported that part of his organisation's role was as an infrastructure organisation, supporting organisations, particularly smaller community organisations, so that they were in a better position to access funding, not just from Young Manchester but from other sources. He informed the Committee that Young Manchester had just launched the new Youth and Play Fund 2020 and he offered to share information on this with Members, as well as more details of the rationale for previous decisions which had been made about funding.

Toni Good, a Youth Worker from Barlow Moor Community Association, outlined what her organisation delivered and how it and the young people she worked with had benefited from working with Young Manchester. She informed Members that the Youth and Play Workers in her organisation did not have expertise in areas such as art and drama but that through the network meetings organised by Young Manchester they had been able to make links with people with that expertise and provide new opportunities for their young people. She also informed Members about a social action project their young people had taken part in through which they had been able to achieve some of the improvements they had wanted to see in their local area. She reported that this had made them feel that they were being listened to and keener to make their voices heard in future.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure reported that this year's Make Your Mark ballot had identified youth violence as the top priority for young people. He advised the Committee that this needed a multi-agency approach and assured

Members that the Council would play its part in this.

The Chair noted that the report recommended that the Committee receive a further report in November 2021 but requested that this be received in November 2020 instead.

### **Decisions**

1. To recommend that a further report be brought back to Members in November 2020, which focuses on qualitative and quantitative data, evidence of impact, outcomes and young people's feedback relating to the Youth and Play Fund 2020/2022.
2. To note the offer from Justin Watson from Young Manchester to share information on the new Youth and Play Fund 2020 with Members, as well as more details of the rationale for previous decisions which had been made about funding.
3. To request that clear information on the availability of toilet facilities, for example, in park cafes, be included on signage in parks.

[Councillor Alijah declared a personal interest as chair of the Hideaway Youth Project.]

### **CYP/19/49 Overview Report**

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

A Member asked for information on concealed pregnancy to be included in a future report. Another Member noted that the Committee had requested a report on Foetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder under an earlier agenda item.

### **Decision**

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

## **Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 7 November 2019**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Hacking - In the Chair

Councillors Andrews, Chambers, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Grimshaw, Hitchen, Kirkpatrick and Rawson

Councillor Leese, Leader of the Council

Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader

Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure

Councillor Kilpatrick, Deputy Leader of the Opposition

Councillor Davies, Ward Councillor for Deansgate

Councillor Johns, Ward Councillor for Deansgate

Councillor Lyons, Ward Councillor for Piccadilly

Councillor Whiston, Ward Councillor for Sharston

Kathy Cosgrove, Greater Manchester Law Centre

Dr Morag Rose, University of Liverpool

John McGrath, Manchester International Festival (MIF)

Ciaron Wilkinson, MIF

#### **Apologies:**

Councillors M Dar and Rawlins

#### **CESC/19/43            Minutes**

#### **Decisions**

1. To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 10 October 2019 as a correct record.
2. To receive the minutes of the meeting of the Review of Advice Services in Manchester Task and Finish Group held on 30 September 2019.

#### **CESC/19/44            Our Manchester Disability Plan**

The Committee received a report of the Executive Director of Adult Services which provided an update on progress with the Our Manchester Disability Plan (OMDP), including the recent refresh of the Plan and the new Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) for the Social Model of Disability. It also included updates from each of the current OMDP workstreams as well as a progress report on the Council's Disability Confident Scheme.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:

- An update on the Health and Social Care Workstream;
- Children and Young People update;
- Work and Skills update;

- Transport update; and
- The Disability Confident Scheme.

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

- Educational attainment of young people with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND);
- Delays in pupils with SEND receiving an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) and what support was available to parents of disabled children;
- The importance of considering mental health as part of the work on long-term health conditions and the social model of disability; and
- The problems some disabled people faced in accessing their own local area, for example, due to people parking cars across dropped kerbs and pavements and that work should take place with the Highways Team to address this.

The Chair commented that the Lead Member for Disability had been unable to attend the meeting but read out some comments she had wanted to make. These highlighted the breadth of the work taking place outside of the Board structure and through all the workstreams. Her comments also highlighted the work taking place to improve the accessibility of the Peterloo Memorial and to improve the Council's internal systems as well as initiatives taking place across the city such as Purple Tuesday the following week where the Christmas markets would open earlier and district centres like Wythenshawe would be supporting a quiet hour where loud instore music would be turned off and there would be more visible support for disabled shoppers.

The SEND Lead outlined the work taking place to improve educational outcomes for pupils with SEND, advising that her service reported regularly to the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee on this. She informed Members that there had been a significant increase in application for EHCPs so the Statutory Assessment Team which dealt with these applications was being re-designed to meet the demand. She suggested that progress on this be included in a future report. She informed Members that parents could access an impartial information, advice and support service and could also receive support from volunteer Parent Champions. A Member commented that he would welcome updates on the timescales for the EHCP along with examples of any cases where the process had not worked well for the young person so that the Committee could identify areas for improvement.

The Public Health Specialist advised that other Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) topic papers were being worked on which focused on mental health and that these were documents which were being updated and would be cross-referenced.

The Strategic Lead (Commissioning) reported that the problem of obstructions on pavements was something that had been raised by many disabled people as an issue for them. She advised that a public awareness campaign was needed to highlight to the general public how this impacted on disabled people but that this would require some resources. She confirmed that her team would engage with the Highways Team on this issue.

## Decision

To note the report.

### **CESC/19/45            Proposed City Centre Public Spaces Protection Order**

The Committee received a report of the Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety which provided an update on the outcome of the consultation for the city centre proposed Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO).

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:

- Background information;
- Supporting people with vulnerabilities;
- Evidence of issues of concern in Manchester city centre;
- The consultation and consultation responses;
- Consideration of the articles for a PSPO;
- The proposed PSPO;
- Enforcement;
- Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) and Human Rights; and
- Next steps.

Kathy Cosgrove from Greater Manchester Law Centre expressed concern about the lawfulness and fairness of the consultation. She advised that it did not include enough information, for example, on existing powers, to enable respondents to make an informed decision. She also stated that it was not balanced and that the way it was carried out as an online consultation meant that it did not target and was not accessible to some of the people who would be most impacted by the proposal, particularly homeless people. She also advised that the consultation responses were not presented fairly, not showing the full range of responses to the open text questions. She reported that the evidence presented did not demonstrate justification for the proposed PSPO, stating that it did not demonstrate that it would achieve its aims and that the benefits would outweigh the risk of harm. She expressed concern that the PSPO would indirectly discriminate against homeless people who could not avoid breaching it and were often members of other minority groups. She outlined the significant challenges facing homeless people and stated that the report did not address the additional risk of harm to this group which, she advised, the proposed PSPO would present. She stated that many professionals in this area of work and related fields were opposed to the proposed PSPO. She also reported that some other local authorities had introduced similar measures which had not been successful. A Member supported her comments.

Dr Morag Rose from the University of Liverpool outlined her concerns about the consultation, stating that it included leading and ambiguous questions, that it had received very few responses from homeless people, that some shop workers in the area had been coerced by their managers to complete it and that the analysis was flawed. She advised that there was academic evidence against the use of PSPOs to address the behaviours outlined. She also expressed concern that the proposed

PSPO could criminalise protest and that it sent a negative message about attitudes towards homeless people.

The Ward Councillors for the city centre wards of Deansgate and Piccadilly were invited to comment on the proposals. They provided a number of examples of the negative effect of the current situation on local residents, including repeated instances of people urinating and defecating outside their homes, alcohol consumption and associated litter and fighting, drug dealing and drug paraphernalia, receiving abuse and blocked entrances to residential buildings, which made residents feel intimidated going into and out of their home. A Ward Councillor for Deansgate noted that it was important not to penalise vulnerable people for unavoidable behaviour, that this had been given consideration in the proposals, and that this was the reason they had requested and obtained 24-hour access to the public toilets on Lloyd Street. He advised that it was important to provide support to people experiencing this issue from both sides and to find a solution that worked for everyone. Another Ward Councillor for Deansgate reported that begging in the city centre had increased and this was often not by people who were rough sleeping. She reported that local residents were sympathetic to the situation of vulnerable people but that the issue needed to be addressed. She reported that the police and Council officers did not just take enforcement action against vulnerable people but assessed their vulnerabilities and offered support to them. She outlined the dangers of people sleeping in tents and in doorways, which were often fire escapes.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition reported that, while he accepted the points in the report about commercial waste and anti-social behaviour related to drinking and drug-taking, he was concerned about how the proposed PSPO would impact on vulnerable people living on the streets. He advised that the proposed PSPO would be a blunt tool to deal with complex issues and, in his opinion, it was the wrong approach. He commented that more 24-hour toilets were needed across the city. He highlighted that article 8 of the proposed PSPO required the individual to provide their address to the Authorised Person, which a homeless person could not do. He questioned how the Committee could consider the proposals without knowing the enforcement protocol. He emphasised the need to consider the disproportionate impact on those living on the streets and the necessity and proportionality of the proposals.

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

- Recognition of the issues being experienced by city centre residents;
- The need to provide support to vulnerable people with complex needs;
- The importance of providing facilities such as 24-hour toilets and sharps bins for disposing of needles so that vulnerable people could avoid breaching the articles in the proposed PSPO;
- To ask what difference the PSPO would make and why this was preferable to using existing powers to tackle these issues;
- To question the appropriateness of fining vulnerable people with no means to pay a fine and the impact this would have on the relationship that Council officers were trying to build with these individuals to encourage them to engage with support services;
- Whether there was evidence that this would be effective;

- Whether a PSPO would just displace people outside the city centre rather than address the problem;
- That a significant number of the respondents to the consultation said the issues identified did not impact on their quality of life;
- How much money had been spent so far on the process for this PSPO, how much would it cost to implement and whether this money could be better spent on the valuable work the Council was already doing in this area; and
- That the Vagrancy Act 1824 should be reviewed.

The Deputy Leader commented that the main focus of Council officers engaging with these vulnerable groups was to encourage them to access support. He reported that the Council was engaging with pharmacies and other organisations over the provision of sharps bins. He advised that a review of the Vagrancy Act 1824 was underway.

The Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety reported that the PSPO was not intended to replace existing powers but to be an additional power and that the most appropriate power would be used in each case. She gave examples of how a PSPO would enable the Council to address issues in relation to waste which it was not able to do at present. She advised that it was hoped that the PSPO would have a deterrent effect and encourage vulnerable people to engage with services and that it would also reassure residents that these issues were being addressed.

The Community Safety Lead reported that, of the councils which had introduced similar PSPOs, some had revised them at the end of the initial period, some had extended them and some had terminated them; however, there were no published evaluations nationally about this use of PSPOs. She commented that, for Manchester City Council, the proposed PSPO was an opportunity to seek compliance and engage with individuals.

The Community Safety Lead reported that the analysis of the consultation responses had taken into account the responses to all the questions, including the open text responses, to determine how big a problem a particular behaviour was and what should be included in the PSPO. She outlined the current multi-agency approach, involving different Council teams, GMP and the voluntary sector, to encourage and enable vulnerable individuals to access support and that, where appropriate, they chose from a range of existing powers to address behaviours. She reported that the same approach would be used if the proposed PSPO was introduced. She advised the Committee that she could identify the costs of the consultation and the costs of implementation if the PSPO went ahead and share this information with Members.

## **Decisions**

1. To thank everyone for sharing their views.
2. To ask the decision maker and Deputy Leader to take into account all the views raised when making their decision.
3. That if the decision maker wishes to respond to the Committee on any of the points raised, they are welcome to do so.

4. To note that the Community Safety Lead will share information on the costs of the consultation and the costs of implementation, if the PSPO goes ahead, with the Committee Members.

[Councillor Doswell declared a disclosable pecuniary interest as Secretary of the Tenants' Union and withdrew from the room for this item.]

#### **CESC/19/46 Manchester International Festival 2019**

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided information on the outcomes of the evaluation of the Manchester International Festival (MIF) 2019 and re-confirmed the funding arrangements for the 2021 Festival as approved by the Executive on 18 October 2017. The Committee was invited to comment on the report prior to its submission to the Executive on 13 November 2019.

John McGrath, Artistic Director and Chief Executive of MIF, referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:

- An assessment of the delivery of objectives for 2019;
- Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), sustainability and financial performance;
- The zero carbon agenda;
- Staffing; and
- Future planning.

The Leader highlighted the opening in 2021 of The Factory, which would be the new hub for the Festival, and reported that it was proposed to maintain the level of funding from the Council, supported by a significant investment from the Arts Council England towards the running of The Factory and to build MIF's capacity to run the Factory. He informed Members that the biennial MIF had previously been awarded funding from the Council every two years for the next Festival but that he would be recommending to the Executive that longer-term funding arrangements be put in place for MIF and The Factory.

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

- That this was a fantastic event and Members wanted to ensure that it was accessible to all residents;
- To request a ward breakdown of volunteers from Manchester;
- To request further information on what was being done to encourage people in areas with lower levels of engagement to access, participate in and volunteer at MIF, noting that some people could not afford even the discounted £10 tickets;
- What was being done to promote employment opportunities to local people;
- Whether 30% of attendees being from Manchester was sufficient and could more detailed information on where attendees were from be provided; and
- How the figure on the economic impact of MIF had been arrived at.

Ciaron Wilkinson, MIF's Cultural Connector, outlined the work he had undertaken over the previous 18 months to work with communities which were less likely to access arts and cultural activities, engaging with local partners such as Ward Councillors and the Council's Neighbourhood Teams and holding events and activities within the local area in order to increase residents' awareness of and willingness to participate in MIF.

John McGrath reported that a lot of outreach work had been carried out to recruit a diverse range of volunteers for this year's Festival and that this had been successful in recruiting volunteers from diverse backgrounds and, to a degree, in recruiting volunteers from a range of locations. He informed Members that the work that Ciaron Wilkinson had been doing had aimed to encourage residents in those wards to engage with MIF in a range of different ways, as audience members, as participants, as volunteers and as employees. He acknowledged that some people could not afford the discounted £10 tickets but reported that some free tickets were made available through local organisations and there were also a number of free events which were part of the MIF programme. He reported that his organisation was also working to address other barriers to people's attendance, for example, working with Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) regarding transport to events.

John McGrath outlined the range of methods his organisation had used to encourage local people to apply for jobs with MIF. He also informed Members about the traineeships which MIF had offered this year which had led to all seven apprentices going on to employment. He advised Members that the proportion of MIF employees from BME (Black and Minority Ethnic) communities had increased considerably and his organisation was aiming to increase recruitment from a range of wards across the city. He reported that his organisation was in a period of expansion and informed Members about the training programme which was being developed, stating that it would increase people's awareness, particularly young people's awareness, of the range of jobs available within the creative industries.

The Leader advised the Committee that there needed to be a balance of attendees from Manchester and people from further afield as the event was used to promote Manchester on the international stage. He highlighted that audience attendance was increasing overall, which included an increase in Manchester residents, and that Manchester residents were increasingly participating in the Festival in different ways, not just as audience members.

## **Decisions**

1. To request a ward breakdown of volunteers from Manchester.
2. To request more detailed information on where MIF attendees were from.
3. To request information on the methodology used to calculate the economic impact of the Festival.
4. To endorse the recommendations to the Executive that:

The Executive is recommended to: -

1. Note the substantial achievements of the 2019 Festival in overachieving its objectives, particularly in continuing to grow its international reputation, increasing co-commissioning partnerships, record attendance levels and increased involvement by Manchester emerging artists;
2. Recognise and support the importance of maintaining public sector funding commitments in order to attract significant match funding from other public and private sector partners;
3. Delegate responsibility to the Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods and City Treasurer in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources and Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure to finalise the financial arrangements.

### **CESC/19/47            2019 City Centre Festive Delivery Programme**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided an update on the 2019 City Centre Festive Delivery Programme.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:

- Christmas Markets;
- Family Focused Festive Attractions;
- Christmas Lighting Scheme; and
- Christmas Light Switch On and New Year's Eve Celebrations.

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

- Why MIF boosted the economy by a greater amount than the Christmas Markets, when the former ran over a shorter period; and
- That future reports which estimate the economic impact of an event should be clearer on the detail of this.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure reported that the MIF attracted international visitors, artists, organisations and media and resulted in increased hotel occupancy rates and spending in the local economy, whereas the Christmas Markets mainly attracted people from across the region so the economic impact was not comparable.

### **Decisions**

1. To note the report.
2. To request that further detail of how estimates of economic impact have been arrived at be included in a future report.

## **CESC/19/48            Widening Access and Participation in Leisure, Libraries, Galleries and Culture - Update and Cultural Impact Survey Data**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided an update about Widening Access to and Participation in Leisure, Libraries and Culture. The purpose of the Widening Access work was to understand resident engagement and to explore routes to increase participation among groups or communities that might be less engaged. The report highlighted progress made and outlined the priorities proposed for future work.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:

- The background to the Widening Access and Participation work;
- Data improvement;
- Wider access for under-represented groups;
- Leisure;
- Libraries, galleries and culture;
- Communication; and
- Resident engagement.

Councillor Whiston, Ward Councillor for Sharston, informed the Committee that he was the substitute for Councillor Stone on the Board of HOME. He highlighted the invisible barriers people faced if they were not used to participating in arts and culture, for example, if they did not go to the theatre when they were growing up and felt uncomfortable and did not know the etiquette of these environments. He advised that more work should be done with schools to encourage them to take pupils to the theatre and other cultural activities to break down these invisible barriers.

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

- To welcome the work being done in this area;
- To support Councillor Whiston's comments; and
- What progress was being made in engaging women and girls in sport.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure supported Councillor Whiston's comments and advised that work was already taking place to address this. He informed Members about the development of the Manchester Cultural Education Partnership and outlined how this aimed to embed arts, culture and creativity across the curriculum.

The Head of Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events reported that a lot of work was taking place to engage women and girls in sport and physical activity. He informed the Committee that there was a national gap between male and female participation in physical activity; however, the gap in Manchester was much smaller than the national average because of the work which was being carried out. He highlighted the provision of women-only sessions in all the Council's leisure facilities in Manchester, securing funding two years ago to run the This Girl Can campaign through which targeted activities had been put on across the city and, recently, an additional £100,000 funding from Sport England which would enable the further development of

this work. He reported that more women than men used the Council's leisure facilities, particularly pre-paid gym memberships, but that in the private and third sector male participants greatly outnumbered female participants so the Council did need to do more to support female participation.

### **Decisions**

1. To note the report.
2. To endorse Widening Access and Participation as a key priority to continue to be embedded in Leisure, Libraries, Galleries and Culture strategies and reporting going forward.

### **CESC/19/49 Overview Report**

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

### **Decision**

To note the report and agree the work programme.