

Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2021

Present:

Councillor Wilson - In the Chair

Councillors Azra Ali, Andrews, Chambers, Connolly, Evans, Grimshaw, Hilal, Rawson and Wills

Also present:

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children's Services

Louise Harding, MCR Active

Nicky Boothroyd, MCR Active

Ivan Wadeson, Manchester City of Literature

Apologies:

Councillors M Dar, Douglas, Hacking, S Judge, Sheikh and Whiston

CESC/21/28 Chair

The Committee Support Officer informed Members that the Chair had sent his apologies for the meeting and asked for nominations for a Member to chair the meeting. A Member nominated Councillor Wilson, which was seconded by another Member and agreed by the Committee.

Decision

To appoint Councillor Wilson as Chair for the meeting.

CESC/21/29 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2021 as a correct record.

CESC/21/30 Homelessness

The Committee received a presentation of the Director of Homelessness which provided an update on homelessness in Manchester. The Chair expressed concern that the presentation slides had only been received on the day of the meeting.

The main points and themes within the presentation included:

- The service environment;
- Ending the routine use of bed and breakfast accommodation for families;
- Redesign of the Private Rented Sector Scheme;
- Woodward Court and the Direct Access Hostel;
- Temporary accommodation review;
- Service redesign; and
- Outcomes.

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

- That the Committee was likely to look at the service redesign at a future meeting;
- Request for more data on past, present and forecasted homelessness;
- Families temporarily living with relatives or friends and the need to build more social housing;
- Whether there was sufficient housing in the private rented sector;
- People being provided with housing in other areas, when their support networks were in their current area;
- The collaboration with Lambeth Council;
- Request for a report on Woodward Court;
- Timescales for the projects outlined in the presentation; and
- That the Executive Member for Housing and Employment should be invited to a future meeting to discuss housing strategy.

The Director of Homelessness advised Members that the Private Rented Sector Scheme was being designed to prioritise housing within the Council's area. In response to a Member's question, he advised that properties would be sought with rents set at housing allowance levels. He agreed that more social housing was needed, including to address hidden need, such as people living with relatives. He assured Members that Lambeth Council was not one of the southern councils which was re-locating a lot of homeless families to other parts of the country.

The Chair thanked the Director of Homelessness for his presentation.

Decisions

1. To note the presentation.
2. That the requests from Members for further information and reports at future meetings would be discussed with Councillor Hacking on his return.

CESC/21/31 Manchester Playing Pitch Strategy Update

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which updated the Committee on the progress of the Manchester Playing Pitch Strategy and proposals for consideration over the next 12-month period.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Supply and demand update;
- Playing field and outdoor sport facility improvements;
- New site management arrangements; and
- Manchester Playing Pitch Strategy refresh.

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

- Request for data on the number of people using the pitches and equality data, if available;
- Whether those using the playing pitches would be consulted with, including local youth clubs;
- That pitches needed to be resilient to climate change, specifically different weather conditions, and that 3G pitches should be as sustainable as possible; and
- Private pitches that were not being used and might be lost to redevelopment.

Louise Harding advised that information could be provided on the users of playing pitches. She advised that her service would be liaising with Neighbourhood Managers to obtain information on youth clubs and other groups within local areas so that a range of local people were engaged with about plans for local playing pitches, in addition to traditional sports clubs. In response to a Member's question, she confirmed that an Equality Impact Assessment would be carried out on the refresh of the Strategy and that a section on this would be included in a future report to the Committee. She advised that MCR Active was having discussions with funding partners and the Council about climate change and sustainable technologies for pitches. She offered to provide Members with an update on work on sustainable 3G pitches at a future meeting. She reported that her service was consulted on any planning applications on playing pitch land and that, unless there was a mitigation plan, the service would be object to the application.

In response to a Member's question, Louise Harding advised that her service was currently in discussions with the Council's Education Service regarding the plans for the Newall Green High School site and whether the site could be maintained for community use and she offered to provide Members with an update on this at a future meeting; however, she advised that MCR Active was also looking at a re-location plan for clubs, groups and users of the former school's facilities. She also outlined work to assess and gather evidence on the shortfall of football pitches in Wythenshawe and, if necessary, to identify a site and funding for new 3G provision in the area. In response to a question from the Chair, she outlined proposals for club cricket sites to be used for more informal cricket. In response to a Member's question on an activation programme for cricket wickets, she confirmed that this would be going ahead and that she could share further information on this.

Decision

To note the report, subject to Members' comments.

CESC/21/32 Recycling in Leisure Centres

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided an overview of recycling rates for Council owned leisure centres and highlighted the progress made through the pandemic from February 2020 to May 2021. It highlighted the progress that had been made in generating a sustainable waste and recycling structure to achieve zero waste to landfill and increase recycling in all the leisure centres. This was one of the objectives set out in MCR Active's Leisure Facilities Sustainability Strategy 2020-2025 in response to the Council's priorities for waste.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Background information;
- Recycling rates; and
- Plan for 2021/22.

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

- The proportion of gym users using reusable water bottles rather than single-use plastic bottles;
- Measures to reduce COVID-19 transmission and their environmental impact, for example, paper towels to clean down equipment between users;
- The monitoring of recycling rates; and
- Staff training.

Nicky Boothroyd from MCR Active advised that gym users had been increasingly bringing their own equipment such as towels to the gym since leisure centres had re-opened and that this included bringing water bottles with them. She advised that research could be done on the use of reusable bottles as work took place with the vending machine company to remove plastic bottles from the machines. She reported that more cleaning of equipment had to take place during the pandemic although there were alternatives to using paper towels such as fogging machines. She advised Members that environmental issues formed part of the contract monitoring for GLL and SLM and that an audit of staff training was also about to be carried out. She advised that training on climate change had been rolled out to staff across GLL and SLM. In response to a Member's question, she reported that the Regional Gymnastics Centre was not producing any waste which was not recyclable and did not have a general waste collection.

Decision

To note the report.

CESC/21/33 Manchester UNESCO City of Literature - Progress Report

The Committee received a report of Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which detailed the progress with Manchester UNESCO City of Literature. It outlined how, following the designation awarded in 2017, an independent organisation was established in 2019. The vision for Manchester City of Literature was for Manchester to be an innovative, distinctive, equitable, globally connected city of reading and writing, where diverse voices were celebrated, creative talent and industries were nurtured and where literary activity changed lives. This report showed the progress the organisation had made towards the vision, how it had unified the city's literary sector to strengthen programmes and events that supported reading for pleasure, literacy and social capital. It also showed how the charity had leveraged additional funds for the city and created new festivals and activity to benefit residents.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Manchester City of Literature: a partnership network;
- Funding;
- Responding to the pandemic;
- Project activity supporting literacy and reading for pleasure;
- International Mother Language Day;
- Festival of Libraries;
- Community Champions;
- Write Manchester; and
- The future.

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

- How would this be publicised;
- Request for more information on the Community Champions referred to in the report;
- How were young writers and illustrators benefitting from Manchester's designation as a UNESCO City of Literature;
- Work with schools; and
- Whether any LGBT-related events had taken place or were planned.

Ivan Wadeson, Executive Director of Manchester City of Literature, advised that there had been a lot of press coverage when Manchester was awarded this status in October 2017 and that work had then taken place to set up the organisation in 2018 to 2019. He advised that a website had been created in November 2020, that the organisation had been working to develop a social media presence and that the events it was delivering also worked to promote awareness of the City of Literature. He outlined the Community Champions programme which was working to identify how the organisation could best support particular communities to come to literary activities on their own terms. He reported that the international network of UNESCO Cities of Literature provided opportunities for young writers and his organisation worked with the community of writers it was building up to make them aware of those opportunities. In response to a Member's question, he informed the Committee that his organisation was working closely with Read Manchester and that he was a Board Member.

Ivan Wadeson reported that engagement with schools had still taken place during the past year but that it had been online and that the pandemic had affected the numbers involved. He highlighted the Write Manchester programme outlined within the report which would be launched in October 2021 and the resources this would provide for schools. He informed Members that the City of Literature worked with a diverse range of writers and had platformed emerging LGBT writers. A Member suggested doing some work linked in with LGBT History month in February.

Decision

To note the report.

CESC/21/34 Read Manchester - Progress Report

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which detailed the progress with Read Manchester since it was launched in 2016, managed within the library service in partnership with Education, and the National Literacy Trust. It showed how by developing the love of 'reading for pleasure', Read Manchester contributed to tackling low literacy levels in the city. It showed how initiatives such as book gifting had continued to maintain residents' access to reading, during the pandemic. It stated that Read Manchester would be more important than ever over the next 12 months with the Year of the Child.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Work to ensure that the poorest children in Manchester started school with language and vocabulary skills on par with their peers;
- Work to ensure that all 11-year-olds in Manchester left primary school able to read well;
- Work to ensure that young people in Manchester developed an enjoyment of reading;
- Work to prepare young people in Manchester for the workplace;
- Work to promote book ownership in Manchester;
- Work to promote adult literacy in Manchester;
- Work to engage communities in literacy through libraries in Manchester; and
- The future.

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

- To welcome the progress made;
- Community library projects; and
- What feedback there had been from children and young people and how this would inform future work.

The Hub Manager (Read Manchester) recognised the purpose that small community-based libraries served for people who might not want to access an imposing library building and that this project had to expand beyond libraries and schools through networks like this. She advised that summer reading challenge flyers and approximately 2000 books had been distributed to the network of little free libraries and that she would be discussing a proposed small free library for Wythenshawe Park later that day.

The Director of Education informed the Committee that Councillors, senior officers and other were engaging with children and young people to hear their experiences of the pandemic and what they would like to see in 2022, which had been designated as the Year of the Child in Manchester. She advised that reading and libraries had been mentioned a lot by the children and young people, including positive feedback about the reading challenge, visiting libraries and the transition read for pupils moving from primary to secondary school. She advised that school leaders had fed back on the value of children's authors talking to and reading to pupils – either through visits or online during the pandemic – which had brought the books to life for the pupils and encouraged reluctant readers to pick up a book. She informed the

Committee that Read Manchester and events with authors would be a prominent part of the year dedicated to children and young people.

The Executive Member for Children's Services praised the way different Council services and schools had all worked in partnership on Read Manchester.

Decision

To note the report.

CESC/21/35 Overview Report

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

A Member requested that the Committee receive a report on Homelessness at a future meeting to provide an update on the areas of work outlined in the presentation delivered earlier in the meeting. The Chair advised that this would be raised with Councillor Hacking.

Decision

To note the report, subject to the above comments.

This page is intentionally blank

Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 7 September 2021

Present:

Councillor Hacking - In the Chair

Councillors Azra Ali, Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Connolly, M Dar, Evans, Grimshaw, Hilal, S Judge, Rawson, Sheikh, Whiston, Wills and Wilson

Also present:

Councillor Rahman, Deputy Leader

Councillor Midgley, Executive Member for Health and Care

Karen Shannon, Manchester Histories

Priya Chopra, Saheli

Apologies:

Councillors Battle, Chambers and Douglas

CESC/21/36 Minutes

Councillor Shaukat Ali requested that his apologies be recorded for the meeting on 20 July 2021, to which the Chair agreed. The Chair noted the requests from Members at that meeting for further information and reports relating to homelessness and advised that he would take this forward.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2021 as a correct record, subject to the above amendment.

CESC/21/37 Histories, Stories and Voices in Manchester's Public Realm

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided an update about the Histories, Stories and Voices programme.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Background to the review;
- The consultation;
- The review of cultural and heritage objects in the city; and
- Public Art Strategy development.

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

- To welcome the way that the Whitworth Art Gallery had put its origination and connection to its benefactor into context;
- That information should be displayed next to statues in the public realm to inform the public and provide context, in a similar way to what the Whitworth had done;

- That any future public objects, street names and plaques should represent the city that Manchester had become;
- That some aspects of the city's history were not widely known and that this should be addressed;
- Concern that the respondents to the consultation were not representative of all demographic groups;
- The approach to any identified objects of concern in a modern-day values context or objects that were the subject of significant controversy or at potential risk;
- That the mural of Marcus Rashford in Withington had been omitted from the list in the report;
- That a lot could be learnt from the project which led to the Emmeline Pankhurst statue, including how the sculptor, Hazel Reeves, had engaged with local communities; and
- The campaign for a statue of the boxer Len Johnson.

The Deputy Leader advised that the responses to the consultation indicated that most people wanted to understand more about the people and events that were memorialised through these statues and monuments and the historical context rather than wanting them removed and that work was taking place to develop a platform through which this could be achieved. He reported that the other main feedback from the consultation was that there was not enough diversity reflected in the public realm. He commented that Len Johnson's story was one which reflected the diversity of the city, that he supported the campaign and that the Council would be working with and supporting the campaign group, which was trying to identify a suitable site for his statue.

In response to a Member's request to see an example of the database providing information on these objects, the Head of Libraries, Galleries and Culture advised that this could be shared with Members once it was available. He reported that, in addition to the database, this work would also involve telling the story of Manchester through the city's libraries and Archives+. The Deputy Leader informed Members that work had previously been carried out by various organisations to record information on objects in the public realm but that it needed to be made more easily accessible.

In response to a Member's question about objects outside of the city centre, Karen Shannon from Manchester Histories reported that the responses to the consultation had demonstrated that people wanted objects and figures from their local area to be included in this work and that this had been taken on board in the project. Regarding contested statues, such as the statue of Robert Peel, she noted that most people did not want the statues to be removed but wanted to understand the story behind them and that this involved complex issues relating to inequality, racism and underrepresentation. She advised that difficult stories from the past needed to be told with better interpretation of them which made them relevant to modern times and representative of the city as it was now and that further consultation was needed in order to achieve this. She outlined some of the work to address the underrepresentation of some groups in the consultation responses, including a task group looking at how to engage with young people.

The Deputy Leader highlighted the impact of the pandemic on the consultation and assured Members that this was an ongoing process, with more work taking place to engage with different communities, including young people, ethnic minorities and areas of the city with lower levels of engagement. In response to a Member's question, he confirmed that the Council had looked at how other cities had responded to this issue.

Decision

That the Committee will receive further updates on this work.

CESC/21/38 Domestic Abuse

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which detailed a summary of recent work to address Domestic Violence and Abuse, including the Domestic Violence and Abuse Strategy and the Domestic Abuse Act 2021.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Background information;
- Domestic Abuse Act readiness and implementation work;
- Domestic Abuse and Covid – Response into Recovery;
- Other service developments; and
- Current and emerging issues and challenges.

Priya Chopra from Saheli outlined the work of her organisation, which had been set up to support south Asian woman and children experiencing domestic abuse and was now supporting women from a range of ethnic minority backgrounds. She explained the challenges in getting these women's views and experiences across to policy makers and how Saheli had worked with Council officers to look at issues these women were facing, including the barriers they faced in accessing services. She outlined how they had ensured that these women, including older women from these communities, were included in the consultation on the new strategy. She also outlined some of the challenges that the pandemic had presented, as women had had less opportunities during lockdown to be away from the perpetrator and other family members in order to access support. She explained how Saheli had worked with other organisations to address issues this group of women faced, for example, ensuring that women living in predominantly white areas could access their services and enabling women to access foodbanks. She advised that Saheli was working with the commissioners to ensure that the action plan for the strategy addressed the issues that these survivors of domestic abuse were dealing with.

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

- Promoting the new strategy, especially to marginalised communities;
- That the Council should model good practice, including working to achieve White Ribbon accreditation;
- That financial abuse should be explicitly referenced in the strategy;

- That the term “gender reassignment”, used in the “Ensuring Equality” section of the draft strategy, while taken from the Equality Act 2010, was considered outdated and “gender identity” was the preferred term;
- What work would be done with partner organisations to address domestic abuse within LGBTQ communities;
- Work to prevent domestic abuse, including considering the objectification of women in advertising around the city and what could be done to address this and the teaching of healthy relationships in schools and how to work with men who were abusers or at risk of becoming abusers;
- The link between gambling and domestic abuse;
- To thank officers for the way the consultation had been conducted;
- How would the voice of the survivor continue to be heard through the implementation of the strategy; and
- What plans were there to ensure that teams across the Council were aware of the strategy and understood their responsibilities.

The Community Safety Lead reported that raising awareness was a key strand of the work on domestic violence and abuse and that officers would work with partners, providers and communities to ensure the right approach to communicating this issue with the public. She advised that, following its launch, work would also take place to raise awareness of and embed this work across the Council and partner organisations. She informed Members that the Domestic Abuse Partnership Board was looking at what needed to be done to achieve White Ribbon accreditation and that this would be progressed. She confirmed that the terminology in the equality section of the strategy would be amended. In response to a Member’s request for more information on the Domestic Abuse Partnership Board, she advised that she would share the Terms of Reference of the Board, which included its membership. She recognised that the voice of domestic abuse survivors needed to be incorporated throughout the implementation of the strategy and advised that work was taking place to identify the most appropriate way to do this.

The Domestic Abuse Reduction Manager advised that the strategy covered economic abuse which recognised a wider range of issues than financial abuse, such as issues in accessing work or benefits. She confirmed that gambling had been raised as a key area under economic abuse, that links were being made with Gamble Aware and other relevant organisations to progress this work and that officers could report back on this at a later date. She also outlined work to address domestic abuse within LGBTQ communities, including working with the LGBT Foundation. In response to a Member’s question, she informed Members about the Sanctuary Scheme to enable victims of domestic abuse to stay in their own homes where it was safe to do so.

The Community Safety Lead reported that early intervention and prevention was one of the main strands of the strategy. She advised that the Council had invested in a number of early intervention services which had started this year, including work with children and young people. The Domestic Abuse Reduction Manager informed Members that significant investment had been made in behaviour change programmes, which would now be available to a wider range of perpetrators. She reported that a pilot project was taking place in south Manchester, as part of the Home Office’s Drive programme, to work with high risk, high harm, repeat

perpetrators of domestic abuse. She informed Members that there were now Domestic Abuse workers in Early Help Hubs and she reported that the Council was working closely with schools to ensure consistency in teaching about relationships and to ensure that they were aware of therapeutic interventions available for children affected by domestic abuse and children who were starting to display similar behaviours. In response to a question from the Chair, she reported that, at present, referrals to the perpetrator programmes mainly came from services for children and families but that these programmes were being promoted to other partners such as housing providers and Greater Manchester Police and that people could also self-refer.

The Executive Member for Health and Care supported a Member's comment that this work was everybody's responsibility and advised that this point would be emphasised in communications about the strategy. She suggested that the Committee receive an update report at a future meeting to monitor progress.

Decision

To note the report.

CESC/21/39 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.

The Chair advised that the scope of the HMICFRS Victim Services Inspection Update report scheduled for the October meeting would be discussed. He also noted the report on Highways Crimes which was listed as to be scheduled and advised that this would either be incorporated into another report or be scheduled as a standalone report for a future meeting.

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme.

This page is intentionally blank

Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2021

Present:

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors- Andrews, Clay, Davies, Hitchen, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Priest, Robinson, Simcock, Wheeler, Wright

Also present:

Councillor Craig, Deputy Leader (Finance)

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment

Apologies: Cllr Ali, Cllr Rowles

RGSC/21/28 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2021 as a correct record.

RGSC/21/29 Global Monitoring Report

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which provided an outline on the projected outturn position for 2021/22 based on the Council's expenditure and income activity as at the end of May 2021 and future projections.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- There's uncertainty around the budget but at present a £1.359m underspend is currently forecast for the year;
- Delivery of budget savings are on track and officers are working to ensure all savings are achieved;
- The impact of Covid-19 and related financial forecasts and associated virements and grants remains an evolving situation;
- Additional non-Covid-19 grant funding has also been received.

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

- Clarity was sought on what the Welcome Back Fund is to be used for in the coming weeks ahead in light of the easing of Covid-19 restrictions;
- Homelessness remained identified as a high risk area - what future grant funding was likely to become available from Central Government;
- The Report's new format was clear and succinct;
- Car parking revenue was down by £4.1m due to reduced season ticket sales, was this an amber or a red risk;

- Social Care had a £2.6m overspend due to agency staff filling the vacancies arising. Why was agency spend being incurred;
- How was there currently an underspend on mental health;
- A reduction in B&B use for dispersed accommodation was anticipated, clarity sought on what cost effective measures were being put in place;
- A further report or information on the wider spend on temporary accommodation is perhaps something more appropriate to establish the overall context.

The Deputy Chief Executive stated that hopefully the new report format distilled the key information for financial reporting, there were still longer-term challenges ahead.

The Deputy Leader commented that although there is still uncertainty around future funding but hoped that the report was self-explanatory in nature. The Deputy Chief Executive stated that further details would be provided by the Deputy Chief Executive to the Committee regarding spending on the Welcome Back Fund. In relation to homeless grant funding, she stated that it was too early to look at upcoming grant funding and further clarity would hopefully be received in the coming months.

The Deputy Leader stated how the Council was stepping up to provide homeless support, but ultimately the funding was insufficient and the government needed to adopt a longer-term approach to the funding of the sector to provide the necessary certainty. The Council was watching the property market and evictions ban to identify how it developed in the foreseeable future but it was doubtful if the funding issue was to be solved within the next settlement period.

In relation to the specific question on car parking revenue, the Deputy Chief Executive stated that finances were an amber risk at the moment until fully worked through in the financial year.

The Deputy Leader offered insight, having previously been the Executive Member for Adult Social Care, stating that there was an issue with reporting on the agency staff spend. Some of the spend was on standard sick cover and due to short-staffing ratios where staff had not been fully identified to cover positions. Work was in progress and sits more with the issues identified around staffing ratios and cover.

The Deputy Chief Executive set out that due to the budgetary process an underspend on mental health in early parts of the year may end up being reflected as the year goes on so may well balance out. In relation to the question on dispersed accommodation the Director of Homelessness was doing lots of work to look into these issues. It was difficult to unpick singular elements of the strategy and breaking up spend profile of individual aspects would not necessarily reflect the wider scenario.

Decisions

1. To note the report; and
2. Further details are to be provided by the Deputy Chief Executive to the Committee around spending on the Welcome Back Fund

RGSC/21/30 Delivery of the Public Sector Decarbonisation Programme

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which provided an update on the delivery of the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme in Manchester.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The scheme is delivering grant funded investment of £19.7m across eleven public buildings in Manchester;
- Grant funding covers 100% of the capital works with a particular focus on heat reduction technology;
- The Council received the full amount of its bid enabling the acceleration of decarbonisation and achievement of the Climate Change Action Plan Targets;
- Ongoing challenge of short construction completion timescales set by government and ensuring carbon efficiencies are met.

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

- Feeling that the report was telling some very powerful strategies for reducing the carbon footprint of the Council with clarity on the carbon-saving per pound spent. This is good news; an opportunity and a huge achievement to deliver but report and outcomes were important so should be better communicated;
- With the scheme starting in the coming months would there be opportunities for local jobs and apprenticeships;
- Ameresco were a delivery partner for this work but make no reference to the project on their website. Contractors should be promoting the positive work alongside the Council;
- Lots of hard work would be required to deliver the projects by January 2022. The scheme focused on heat pumps, were there wider technologies that could be adopted for other schemes;
- Clarity on the lifetime cost of any other technology that could be utilised;
- How could funding be maximised for Manchester and what opportunities were being looked at to work with other public-sector bodies to invest in low-carbon for their estates;
- The National Tennis Centre was identified within the report as a site but this remains a Covid-19 vaccination centre, what is the contingency if this is not available for work to be carried out; and
- Were there opportunities for higher-risk but emerging carbon reduction technologies to be adopted at significantly reduced cost for providing opportunities to be a 'pioneer' prior to entrance for a product to the wider market – with an understanding from Councillors that this may mean that sometimes projects have variable success.

The Deputy Chief Executive welcomed the feedback on the scheme and agreed that it's a good news story and exciting issue. The Executive Member for Environment also agreed that there were lots of work to be done to get the good news messages out via the Council's website. This was a fully funded grant scheme which was good news for the city and residents. The Council was constantly looking at new funding sources in order to build a pipeline of project funding for decarbonisation by working closely with third-party operators.

The Head of Corporate Estates and Facilities stated that the supply chain were delivering local jobs and apprenticeships and that further information would be drawn out. Future reporting would take place on the percentage of carbon reduction achieved by the scheme. Work was being done with third party operators of buildings such as the leisure estate, Space Project and Sharp Project to enable climate targets to be met at a Manchester level and ensure that all public sector bodies had similar access to funding opportunities. If access to carry out the works was not possible at the National Tennis Centre due to the current vaccination centre, the Council was working with the GMCA to identify similar projects and then could revisit the project as a priority when the site became available. Officer's welcomed the steer to try pioneering technologies where these could be obtained at reduced cost, and pointed to a project where this had successfully been achieved already.

Decisions

1. To note the report;
2. The Executive Member for Environment is to feedback on the good news set out within the report and invite members to have conversations on how to communicate ongoing projects to residents; and
3. The Head of Corporate Estates and Facilities will circulate information on the commitments made by contractors regarding local jobs and apprenticeships and will share details with the Committee on the work done with third party operators of buildings such as the leisure estate, Space Project and Sharp Project to enable climate targets to be met.

RGSC/21/31 Spend on Highways Maintenance and Road Safety

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Highways, which outlined the capital investment in highway maintenance from the 5-year investment programme.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The recent capital investment in highway maintenance and the fact that the programme is now in year 5 and remains on-time and budget;
- Highways investment programme has helped deliver Our Manchester strategy and fulfil the greater Manchester Transport Strategy 2040;

- Future investment decisions remain with any future investment targeting local footways and roads to encourage sustainable transport, a proposed programme will be brought forward in the next 6 months;
- There is no specific road safety budget but Highways have continued to secure external funding and have a number of ongoing schemes.

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

- Much of the committee's discussion was around the issue of road safety and the mechanism for funding schemes around the City. Both Deansgate and Piccadilly ward Councillors and Neighbourhood Officers had been unable to access the recent community funding scheme on the basis that other capital schemes had been delivered within the City Centre;
- Councillors broadly welcomed the opportunity to bid for road safety funding for their wards but questioned the mechanism through which funding was allocated with cheaper schemes being most likely to secure funding despite not necessarily offering the best value for money. A long-term plan with a more strategic vision was required towards road safety to ensure that schemes could be delivered within a programme of works;
- The committee asked whether funding existed for further safety cameras to be installed around the City Centre and Kingsway and the potential for further speeding, CCTV and ASB cameras;
- The Committee queried the separation of funding for resurfacing and road safety where schemes were to be carried out for the same roads but only a matter of months apart. It was noted to be positive to see that over 214 resurfacing projects had been delivered although there's no clarity on the outstanding projects.

The Director of Highways discussed the issue of road safety and the difficulty of identifying an accident trend for 2020 due to the pandemic. Funding shortages meant that enforcement by GMP was the exception rather than the rule especially with speed cameras, which have to meet DfT criteria, although there were plans to update and improve movable CCTV cameras to deal with ASB for example. The City Centre has had considerable investment with further 4 schemes coming forward. E.g. Northern Quarter traffic scheme, Deansgate which are reducing accidents. The City environment was rapidly changing making it difficult to deliver road safety schemes because it was hard to establish the characteristics of a road due to so many developments that impacted on the highway.

In terms of the 2021/22 road safety programme methodology and assessment criteria, there were 16 roads across the city that are 40 mph but Kingsway was a long one which made it the hardest to deal with. Speed cameras were not there to generate income and Kingsway was unlikely to meet the rules for a normal speed camera, although officers were looking at average speed cameras.

When assessing accident reduction schemes the top three ranked schemes required too much money that MCC did not have available. Budgetary constraints meant that the schemes were reranked on the basis of deliverability within the funding available. The ranking and worked example could be shared with the Committee but consideration was given to accidents, speed cameras, volume of traffic, with a focus on low cost and high impact so that a lower cost solution got a higher score in the process. Neighbourhood officers contacted ward members for their top two priorities in each ward. Members could request further information on successful or unsuccessful proposals to: Roadsafety2021@manchester.gov.uk.

Over the last five years the Council had followed-up active travel bid opportunities such as the City Centre triangle/Wythenshawe with further tranches envisaged. Historically, road safety funding previously came from the Integrated Transport Board which now funded the Metrolink/Bus network.

On the point of overlapping resurfacing and road safety works, the Director of Highways stated that it can't be predicted where and when funding would come available so must be carried out on an individual basis.

The Deputy Chief Executive stated that priorities in the capital programme were set by the capital strategy in the budget setting process. Highways works were agreed at £100m previously and now the Council were looking at the future priorities for Manchester.

The Executive Member for Environment agreed that it is somewhat misleading to call the road safety scheme a community scheme and it's about making scant resources going as far as possible across the city. City Centre wards did benefit from the work being done but both highways and neighbourhoods teams are encouraged to discuss further.

The Executive Member for Environment suggested requests for proposals came from neighbourhood officers but they may not have been consistent across the City and that she would take this up for future learning. There was at present no allocated road safety budget but Members were to be part of creating that vision with future plans to include works to footways and minor roads that had not been receiving the benefit of funding in recent years.

Decisions

1. To note the report;
2. Appendix 2 to be corrected and reissued to committee members (incorrect date headings details); and
3. The Director of Highways is to share a worked example of the local safety scheme methodology.

RGSC/21/32 Our Town Hall Project – Progress Update

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which provided an update on the progress of the project since Notice to Proceed (NTP) was instructed in July 2020.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The project has reached 74% cost surety with a Date for Completion set for 25 June 2024;
- The project is making good progress on social value and remains within budget for construction despite cost pressures across the construction sector;
- The ongoing financial and social value delivery is being monitored to ensure early action can be taken to prevent any impact on cost or programme.

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

- The committee discussed the revised budget and timescales and sought clarity on the confidence of achieving these in light of Covid-19 and the wider materials issues;
- The Committee praised the excellent school engagement, work experience and local spend with the example given of contractors helping to keep the City Centre's facilities stay open during lockdowns. The public engagement and perception was hugely important for this project to communicate the message as to what works are being undertaken. The website was perceived to be disappointing and showing outdated or irrelevant information but recent news articles in the MEN and hoardings were regarded as wonderful and a greater role should be given to telling the story;
- Confirmation was sought on Lendlease's adoption of the Unite Construction charter and use of the monitoring framework. The targets for local labour were also queried as to what benchmark was being used and whether these were standard for a project of this nature.

The Deputy Leader introduced the project stating that it was important to keep progress on the project moving forward with Manchester Town Hall delivering for people of Manchester.

The Director of Capital Programmes stated that issues around the unprecedented materials crisis and Brexit supply chain issues were being worked through with a refocus due to Covid in some areas but generally the project had been very successful in terms of achieving its milestones. Due to the number of works packages, spend could be spread over the course of the project but it remained a very visible building and scheme. The Unite framework was discussed regarding access into the site and was a positive process between Unite and Lendlease. Feedback would come back to Committee on the basis of future discussions.

In answer to the question on local labour targets the Deputy Leader stated that some remained more challenging than others. Local labour and spend for a project of this nature was difficult in some respects due to the complexity of the project and expertise required. The Council had been sensitive around communications over the last year but are now proactively working with media outlets to get engagement with the project.

Decisions

1. To note the report; and
2. Director of Capital Programmes to feedback to the committee on the tracking of job opportunities, labour within Manchester and the Unite Construction Framework.

[Councillor Priest declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest in this item]

RGSC/21/33 The Factory, St John's - Delivery Update

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, which provided an update on the delivery of The Factory project, including: Construction progress, securing projected social value outcomes identified to be delivered collaboratively through the design team, contractors and the operator, the Factory Academy, and the finance and fundraising position.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The report notes the construction programme and the current completion estimate of February 2023 whereby MIF will take occupation of the building subject to the handover and commissioning plan
- Progress on site remains good although the project did suffer some supply chain and cost issues
- 81% cost certainty is expected by the end of July 2021 with this rising to 90% by March 2022
- The Council is currently negotiating the terms of an agreement for lease with MIF and the operator's agreement
- Capital fundraising has been constrained by the pandemic but outreach work has remained positive
- Social value outcomes continue to make significant progress.

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

- The committee were glad to see that Covid-19 kickstart funding was coming to support the project and to see the reach-out by the project to a diverse audience;
- The committee sought further details on job opportunities and the impact of the project to improve Manchester's economic diversity especially given the deprivation in some wards;

- Clarity was sought on the opportunities for local people in the construction programme with only 7% local spend being in Manchester v 58% for the Town Hall;
- The committee queried the outreach opportunities of the Factory to arts organisations within Manchester wards outside the City Centre such as the Miner's Community Arts Centre. Outreach had been observed as communities were now becoming part of MIF family, the example were given of the children's choir at a recent event coming from North Manchester schools and the BECTU union newsletter article on the Old Granada Studios which gave an indication of the potential impact of the project and opportunities that Manchester had to offer for the sector;
- In respect of the commercial naming rights there was a requirement for a robust due diligence process on any potential branding partner in accordance with best practice and the ethical procurement policy;
- The Committee sought clarity as to the future impact of The Factory on revenue spend and noted that as the budget quoted in the report had altered it would be good to summarise the development of the budget over the project's course; and
- Further details were sought on the agreement around the Unite Construction Charter.

The Leader introduced the project and set out the context in that the last time Factory was raised at Committee it was in a far more difficult position than at present. Discussions were going well regarding both the Factory Academy and the long term use of the premises with the agreement for lease and operator agreement being progressed. Some Members and residents have had the opportunity to look inside and the recent Arcadia event and tours were well-received with the building regarded as magnificent.

In relation to outreach, MIF would contribute to the city's cultural offering as demonstrated by recent performances and the Factory Academy would offer a similar degree of impact; potentially impacting upon 1000s of jobs for the cultural industry. Partners at MCDA/Arbeta/Screen Manchester were also working to provide production support in the city. The Council was looking to expand Space Studios in the future and the investment in Factory confirms to DCMS/ACE that MCC were prepared to invest alongside partners into the Arts industry. Arts organisations in Manchester had done well due to the maintenance of support, coupled with a relaxation of grant conditions by the Council that were unachievable the Council recognised the role of small organisations and the support required.

Mongoose are a MIF contract but do have a track-record of delivery in relation to external sponsorship and marketing. There was to be joint accountability from the Council and MIF in terms of the naming with an Ethics Policy being developed to set out the scope of the branding.

On the issue of local construction spend, the Town Hall project didn't require major steelwork which came from elsewhere in Greater Manchester and as such there were

material differences between the two projects. The Director of Capital Programmes stated that the original KPIs on jobs were set out in the Laing O'Rourke procurement and the supply of works is based upon Manchester jobs/training. Conversations were continuing around the Unite Construction Charter and would be revitalised.

The Deputy Chief Executive stated that the project team had done well to source complex parts of building from Greater Manchester and continued to work with Angela Harrington for Manchester residents to benefit.

Decisions

1. To note the report; and
2. Potential future reports on revenue spend to be incurred by the Council on both the Factory and Civic Quarter Heat Network.

RGSC/21/34 Overview Report

The Committee considered the report by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which provided details of key decisions that fall within the Committee's remit and an update on actions resulting from the Committee's recommendations. The report also includes the Committee's work programme, which the Committee is asked to amend as appropriate and agree.

Decisions

1. To note the report;
2. Potential for a report to be brought later in the year on the wider spending by the Council on homelessness and temporary accommodation in light of the service improvement works;
3. The Executive Member for Environment is to feedback on the good news set out within the report and invite members to have conversations on how to effectively communicate ongoing work to residents;
4. The Head of Corporate Estates and Facilities will circulate information on the commitments made by contractors regarding local jobs and apprenticeships and will share details with the Committee on the work done with third party operators of buildings such as the leisure estate, Space Project and Sharp Project to enable climate targets to be met;
5. Director of Capital Programmes to feedback to the committee on the tracking of job opportunities, labour within Manchester and the Unite Construction Framework;
6. Highways Road Safety projects table to be corrected and reissued to committee members (correcting incorrect project details); and
7. The Director of Highways is to share a worked example of the road safety scheme methodology.

Health Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2021

Present:

Councillor Green – in the Chair

Councillors Appleby, Curley, Hussain, Newman, Reeves and Richards

Apologies: Councillors Nasrin Ali, Cooley, Riasat and Monaghan

Also present:

Councillor Midgley, Executive Member for Health and Care

Dr Alice Seabourne, Medical Director, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust

Adam Young, Associate Director of Operations, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust

Peter Broom, Citizen of Manchester

HSC/21/27 Minutes

Decision

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

HSC/21/28 COVID-19 Update

The Committee considered the joint presentation of the Director of Public Health and the Executive Clinical Director Manchester Health and Care Commissioning that provided an update on COVID-19 activity that included the latest available information on data and intelligence.

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

- Welcoming the Public Health Annual Report;
- The Committee expressed their continued confidence and support for the Public Health Team, NHS partners and all those involved in the vaccination programme;
- What would the impact on the vaccination programme be if the Enhanced Support Status was withdrawn;
- Was there sufficient capacity within the system come September to deliver the vaccination programme and the roll out of the booster jab;
- Concern was expressed regarding the relaxation of the rules and the reopening of night clubs, describing these as 'super spreader events', noting the recent experience witnessed in the Netherlands;
- Expressing concern regarding the levels of anti-vaccination and conspiracy theories that were circulating on social media, noting that young people in particular were recipients of these messages and this needed to be robustly challenged;
- Were residents with vaccination appointments already booked for their second jab being actively contacted to bring this forward from 12 weeks to 8 weeks;

- Was the number of confirmed positive cases as a result of the increased rates of testing;
- Analysis was required to understand the relationship between the number of hospital admissions and those patients that were vaccinated and unvaccinated, noting this was a key message to encourage the take up of the vaccination;
- Were the reasons for the shorter stays in hospitals experienced by COVID patients as a result of improved clinical care and learning from previous waves;
- Was testing data available by ethnicity;
- How did Manchester compare with other comparable cities regarding vaccination rates; and
- Continuing the call for central government to adequately fund and support the city to respond to the pandemic.

The Director of Public Health advised that the city had benefited over a number of weeks from the Enhanced Response Area status. He commented that with the likely removal of this status other providers such as Community Pharmacy and allocated support and resources agreed across Greater Manchester would be utilised to continue this work, adding that pop up clinics and targeted interventions would continue to be delivered.

The Director of Public Health commented that national guidance was to be issued regarding the roll out of the booster programme from September onwards, however he reassured the Committee that planning and discussions were already underway across the system to prepare for this. He further stated that a proactive programme was underway to contact people with prebooked vaccination appointments to offer them an earlier date.

The Director of Public Health commented that there were risks associated with nightclubs due to the fact that they were unventilated, enclosed spaces where patrons were not required to wear a face mask. He stated that this was why the key message regarding coming forward to have the vaccine was so important. He further commented that discussions were already underway with the Compliance Team to plan for Pride and Park Life.

The Director of Public Health commented that Manchester was comparable with a number of London boroughs in terms of demography, with particular reference to the younger population and the experiences, lessons learnt and best practice was being shared.

The Director of Public Health said that the data on testing and ethnicity was not currently available however this was collected geographically. He further commented that the relationship between the numbers of hospital admissions and patients who were vaccinated was being collected and he suggested that colleagues from Manchester Foundation Trust NHS Hospital could contribute to future updates on this specific issue. The Chair welcomed this suggestion and requested that this be included in future updates to the Committee.

He stated that clinicians and staff treating COVID patients in hospitals had taken the learning from previous waves and the Executive Director of Adult Social Services commented that the reduction in the time patients stayed in hospital had been assisted by the new hospital discharge regulations whereby patients were

discharged as soon as medically fit and their care and support needs assessed outside of an acute ward, either in a discharge to assess bed or their own home.

Decisions

The Committee;

1. Notes the reports and presentation;
2. Express their continued confidence and support for the Public Health Team, NHS partners and all those involved in the vaccination programme; and
3. Recommend that Manchester Foundation Trust NHS Hospital contribute to future updates to the Committee in regard to the relationship between hospital COVID patient admissions and vaccination.

HSC/21/29 Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust - Manchester Covid Recovery

The Committee considered the report of Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust (GMMH) that provided a summary and overview of the activity across the GMMH Manchester services and the Covid response.

The main points and themes within the report included updates in relation to: -

- Urgent Care/Crisis response;
- Early Intervention;
- Community Mental Health Teams;
- Delayed Transfer of Care; and
- Out of Area Placements.

The Committee then heard from Peter Broom, citizen of Manchester who provided an account of his lived experience of mental health and the support he had received from the Trust. Having described his journey and the many positive outcomes he had experienced he paid tribute to the staff at the Trust and added that he had witnessed similar experiences with other recipients of this service.

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

- Thanking Mr Broom for attending the meeting and sharing his experience with the Committee;
- Stating that more needed to be done to promote the positive outcomes and success of the service;
- Was the funding provided by central government to deliver mental health services sufficient to meet the demand, noting the full impact of COVID was yet to be realised, especially amongst young people;
- Had the Transformation Fund delivered the required objectives and outcomes.
- How were the Crisis Cafes advertised and were they culturally appropriate to meet the needs of all residents in the city;

- Further analysis and understanding of the outcomes of the Crisis Cafe was requested;
- What analysis had been undertaken on the impact of changes to the delivery of the Community Mental Health Teams services during the pandemic;
- How did the figures provided on the numbers of Delayed Transfer of Care compare to previous years;
- Consideration needed to be given to increasing the number of patient bed spaces in acute settings to reduce the numbers of Out of Area placements;
- All Councillors should be proactive in promoting and supporting resident groups to access the Wellbeing Fund; and
- Mental Health Services needed to work collaboratively with other agencies and partners to ensure people received the most appropriate care and support, particularly at times of crisis.

The Medical Director GMMH, described that staff were working with all in patients and service users to engage with and actively encourage them to have the vaccine. She stated this included working collaboratively with the local Primary Care Network to deliver these in appropriate community settings. She informed the Members that the Trust had employed an Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Lead who worked closely with the University to address health inequalities.

The Associate Director of Operations GMMH said that it was recognised that investment by central government in mental health services over many years had not been adequate, however the Trust remained committed through the Transformation Fund to working with the Local Care Organisation to invest in and deliver Community Services, adding that this approach would also improve the Delayed Transfer of Care cases. He further commented that work would also be delivered in conjunction with the Primary Care Service to improve the offer delivered to residents experiencing mental health problems. He acknowledged the scenario described by a Member and said that they were working closely with key agencies and partners, including the police to ensure the response to an episode of crisis was proportional and appropriate.

In response to the questions raised regarding the Crisis Café, the Associate Director of Operations GMMH stated that these were the only ones in Greater Manchester and were new to the city, noting that the one delivered at Turning Point had only launched three weeks ago. He advised that this was new model of service delivery and was designed and delivered in conjunction with the VCSE and supported by clinical teams and links to the 24/7 helpline. He commented that these cafes had been advertised through a social media campaign and with posters. He commented that the use of, and outcomes of these cafes would to be monitored and assessed.

In response to the provision of services across the different hospital sites the Associate Director of Operations GMMH informed the Committee of the challenges experienced at the Manchester Royal Infirmary site due to the physical restrictions of the Emergency Department, however discussions continued with the site to resolve the issue.

In regard to the service provided by Community Teams during the pandemic the Associate Director of Operations GMMH advised that 75%-80% of all new referrals were seen face to face (subject to all current guidance), adding that they had

continued to offer virtual face to face appointments in addition to telephone calls. He commented that the feedback from service users regarding these arrangements implemented in response to the pandemic had been very positive. He added that during the pandemic the number of mental health patients presenting at Emergency Department had not risen which was an outlier nationally.

In conclusion the Associate Director of Operations GMMH paid tribute to the staff working at the Trust, in particular during the additional challenges presented during the pandemic.

The Executive Member for Health stated that mental health services both locally and nationally had suffered from significant underfunding that had resulted in real term funding cuts to these important services and called upon the government to adequately fund these vital services. She further paid tribute to all of the staff working at the Trust, especially during such challenging times and welcomed the Trust's commitment to working with Neighbourhood Delivery Teams. She concluded by recognising the important contribution the VCSE and the Wellbeing Fund had in supporting residents who experienced mental health issues.

The Chair on behalf of the Committee thanked all who had attended, in particular Mr Broom whose testimony was greatly appreciated, noting the importance of hearing and understanding the citizen's voice at scrutiny meetings. She stated that the Committee would invite a further report on this issue for consideration at a future meeting with the remit and scope to be agreed and this would be relayed to the Trust.

Decisions

The Committee;

1. Notes the report and requests that an update report is scheduled at an appropriate time; and
2. Request that information relating to the Crisis Cafes is circulated to the Members of the Committee.

HSC/21/30 Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs) & Trauma Informed Practice

The Committee considered the report and accompanying presentations of the Director of Public Health that provided an overview of how the MCC Population Health team was leading the work to fulfil the ambition of Manchester being an ACE-aware, trauma informed and trauma responsive city by 2025. A city with a co-ordinated approach to reducing exposure to ACEs, where all practitioners work with residents to prevent or mitigate the consequences of trauma; helping children, families, and communities to build resilience; and improve outcomes for residents by working in a trauma responsive way.

The main points and themes within the report included: -

- Providing an introduction and background, noting the pilot scheme delivered in Hapurhey between September 2018 and August 2019 and subsequent evaluation;
- Describing how this approach was embedded into mainstream provision within the Population Health team; included in the city-wide Covid recovery plan;
- Describing how this approach was embedded in a range of serves across the health sector; and
- Describing how success was to be measured.

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

- The Chair paid tribute to the approach and gave testimony as to the impact the training had on professionals and how this had positively influenced their approach to their work;
- Noting the positive work delivered with Social Landlords more needed to be done to engage with landlords in the Private Rented Sector (PRS) around this issue;
- ACE Training should be made available to all Councillors and MPs;
- How had COVID impacted on the delivery of this programme;
- What were the barriers to accelerating this programme and what could the Committee do to support this activity; and
- Acknowledging that Manchester was pioneering this approach and would inform and support the development of a Greater Manchester programme.

The Project Manager, ACEs and Trauma Informed Practice stated that Covid had presented a significant challenge to delivering this programme and establishing the community hubs, however opportunities had been taken to deliver virtual engagement, networking and training events with a range of participants, noting that these had been very successful. She stated that appropriate consideration would be given to people's concerns and social apprehensions post lockdown in the delivery of community hubs so as to give confidence and support to residents using these.

The Project Manager, ACEs and Trauma Informed Practice stated that working in partnership with the local Integrated Neighbourhood Teams and the VCSE would ensure all communities were catered for, adding that if Members were aware of any community groups that would benefit from this service they should contact her.

In response to the comment made regarding the PRS Landlords she stated she would take this away from the meeting for consideration,

The Director of Public Health added that undoubtedly Covid had impacted on the implementation plans, noting that the Public Health Annual report provided a case study of where the Programme Lead had been deployed to deliver Covid response duties, however he reassured Members this work was key to the recovery programme and he commented that training would be extended to Councillors and MPs.

Decisions

The Committee;

1. Endorse the approach, continue to support trauma informed and trauma responsive practice, and undertake to promote it wherever possible; and
2. Invite the project team back in June or July 2022 to update on progress.
3. Recommend that the ACE Training should be made available to all Councillors and MPs.

HSC/21/31 Overview Report

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

Decision

The Committee notes the report and agree the work programme.

This page is intentionally blank

Health Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2021

Present:

Councillor Green – in the Chair

Councillors Nasrin Ali, Cooley, Curley, Hussain, Leech, Monaghan and Riasat

Apologies: Councillors Appleby, Newman, Reeves and Richards

Also present:

Councillor Midgley, Executive Member for Health and Care

Dr Manisha Kumar, Executive Clinical Director Manchester Health and Care
Commissioning (MHCC)

Kate Provan, Quality Lead, MHCC

James Allison, Director of Turnaround, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust

Ben Squires, Head of Primary Care, National Health Service England

Jim Rochford, Manchester Local Dental Committee

Don McGrath, Manchester Local Dental Committee

Dr Paul Wright, Deputy Medical Director, MHCC

Caroline Bradley, Head of Primary Care, MHCC

Dr Vish Mehra, Primary Care Network and Clinical Director and Chair of Manchester
GP Forum

Ed Dyson, Executive Director of Strategy, MHCC

Neil Walbran, Chief Officer, Healthwatch Manchester

Morgan Tarr, Information and Communication Officer, Healthwatch Manchester

HSC/21/32 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2021 as a correct record.

HSC/21/33 COVID-19-19 Update

The Committee considered the joint presentation of the Director of Public Health and the Executive Clinical Director Manchester Health and Care Commissioning that provided an update on COVID-19 activity that included the latest available information on data and intelligence.

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

- Recognising the important work of the local Neighbourhood Teams and did they require any additional resources to support the COVID-19 response activity;
- Noting the comparative vaccination data for Manchester compared to the national figure, was learning and good practice shared between cities;
- Welcoming the reported vaccination activity in relation to Learning Disabled citizens;
- Was the requirement to obtain Vaccination Passports a factor in explaining the reasons for people coming forward to be vaccinated;

- What was being done to support Care Home workers, noting the recent announcements regarding their requirement to be vaccinated.

The Director of Public Health advised that local trends in relation to infection rates continued to be monitored closely, and where necessary an appropriate targeted intervention could be deployed by the Neighbourhood Teams working collaboratively with the Local Care Organisation.

The Executive Clinical Director MHCC described that data regarding the different cohorts of people coming forward to receive their vaccination continued to be monitored and reviewed in accordance with all national guidance. She stated that the models of delivery, such as the deployment of pop-up clinics in community settings and the proactive work with homeless residents was recognised as good practice and had been adopted by other regions. She stated that when people did come forward to be vaccinated they were surveyed so as to understand their reasons. She confirmed that the requirement for vaccination passports had been identified as a significant reason. She added that people were always welcome and encouraged to receive their vaccination, even if they were hesitant in the first instance.

The Executive Director of Adult Social Services informed the Committee that the recent announcement regarding the requirement that all staff working in Care Homes must be vaccinated from a stated date applied to all staff, including those deployed to or visiting a Care Home. She stated that discussions were ongoing with providers, Trade Unions and Human Resources Departments to mitigate the impact and support staff and keep residents safe. She further advised that discussions were ongoing across Greater Manchester and the other core cities so as to navigate this requirement and share best practice. The Chair noted that this was an issue that the Committee would return to at a future meeting.

The Chair concluded this item of business by thanking all those staff involved with the vaccination programme for their continued hard work.

Decisions

To note the report and presentation.

HSC/21/34 Health and Social Care Recovery

The Committee considered the report of the Chair, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning that provided an update on the current recovery of health and social care services as part of the system's response to the COVID-19 pandemic, with a specific focus on Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust (MFT). Noting that COVID-19 (Covid) had had a much broader impact on the health and wellbeing on the people of Manchester. The report further described the development of a strategic recovery framework that captured the breadth of the health and social care system's response within the recovery phase.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Describing the position in relation to COVID-19, impact and continued planning;

- The Impact of COVID-19 on Long Waits and the associated response planning;
- Progress on Recovery Workstreams;
- Information in relation to a range of activities including Urgent Care and flows, diagnostics and cancer treatment;
- Update on outpatient activity and associated response;
- An update on the work of the Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO); and
- Describing the strategic recovery framework and the four themes with associated outcomes metrics.

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

- An explanation had been sought as to why the figures reported were significantly higher than the national average for the number of patients waiting more than 52 weeks for elective treatment;
- Noting that whilst the impact of COVID-19 could not be underestimated, however there was a need to acknowledge that delays in elective surgery existed prior to the pandemic;
- Based on the COVID-19 modelling at the Hospital, how confident was the Trust in the modelling that had been undertaken ahead of the winter period;
- How confident was the Trust that the Patient Initiated Follow-up (PIFU) plans that would enable patients with suitable conditions to manage their own condition better without the need to attend routine follow-up would not result in people becoming more ill;
- Comparative performance data would have been useful in the report across the range of described activity; and
- None of the Board Members at MFT were from the BAME community.

The Director of Turnaround, MFT advised that the position in relation to the 52 week figure for patients awaiting elective treatment had been challenging before the pandemic. He advised that COVID-19 had exacerbated this situation with bed space being allocated to manage COVID-19 patients and staff being redeployed to different duties. He stated that COVID-19 had also impacted on the work force in the same way it had across the general population.

The Director of Turnaround, MFT stated that whilst progress was being made COVID-19 had undoubtedly impacted on the ability to increase elective surgery. He concluded by informing the Committee that MFT continued to treat the most clinically urgent patients, and the longest waiters were prioritised for treatment through elective surgical committee processes. In response to specific questions regarding comparative data across a range of activities he stated this would be provided following the meeting.

The Quality Lead, MHCC responded to the concern expressed regarding Patient Initiated Follow-up by stating that each case was assessed on an individual basis and patient safety was assessed to ensure this was an appropriate care pathway.

The Quality Lead, MHCC described that the modelling of patient flow was undertaken using a wide range of data sets and these were regularly reviewed and assessed to inform the modelling and winter planning.

Noting the impact of COVID-19 on the BAME population nationally and how this had directly impacted on the staff working across MFT this had brought into sharp relief the issue of health inequalities and work was underway within the Trust to escalate the work to address health inequalities. The Chair commented that the October meeting would be dedicated to the issue of health inequalities and the work underway to address. She stated that the Committee would welcome a specific update on the work at MFT.

The Chair concluded this item of business by thanking all those staff involved for their continued hard work and recognising the significant pressures and challenges they had experienced as a result of the pandemic.

Decisions

The Committee note the report.

HSC/21/35 Provision and access to NHS Dentistry

The Committee considered the report of Greater Manchester Health and Social Care Partnership that provided an update to the Health Scrutiny Committee on the provision of, and access to, NHS Primary, Secondary, and Community Dental services and delivery of Oral Health Improvement activity across the city of Manchester since March 2020.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- An overview of dentistry across the city;
- The impact of COVID-19 and the approach to planning and recovery;
- Urgent Dental Care and the measures to improve access;
- General Dentistry and the measures to improve access;
- Information on relation to Secondary Care Dental Services;
- Initiatives to address inequalities;
- The Buddy Practice Scheme; and
- Responding to patient feedback, noting the engagement with Healthwatch.

The Information and Communication Officer, Healthwatch Manchester stated that they had experienced a 55% increase in enquiries from the public regarding access to NHS Dentists since April to September 2021 than they had received in the whole twelve months prior to April 2021. He said that Healthwatch regularly made contact with Practices to ask if they were taking on NHS patients and they had found that they were not, however there was capacity to accept private patients.

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

- Giving personal accounts of the frustrations experienced when trying to access a local NHS Dentist practice;
- Noting that a lot of information that was provided on Practice websites was often out of date or incorrect;
- More decisions needed to be taken locally in regard to the delivery and provision of NHS Dental services;

- Concern on the numbers of people not able to access NHS Dental services;
- Noting the importance of oral health prevention and the importance of engaging with young people on this issue; and
- The service provided to Manchester was unsatisfactory.

The Head of Primary Care, National Health Service England described that during COVID the dental infrastructure had been maintained across Manchester, however accepted that the ability to access treatment had declined. He explained that this was as a result of the National Guidance in relation to infection control that had impacted on the capacity of practices to see patients. The Manchester Local Dental Committee representative added that this national guidance also dictated those groups of patients who should be prioritised during COVID.

The Head of Primary Care, National Health Service England informed the Committee that he would circulate information regarding the numbers and location of Practices following the meeting, adding that it was important to note that unlike GP practices, patients were not restricted by geographical boundaries when accessing Dental Practices.

The Head of Primary Care, National Health Service England stated that they did work closely with the local Public Health Team to develop and deliver prevention work and made reference to the Buddy Practices initiative as described within the report.

The Head of Primary Care, National Health Service England described that from April 2020, Urgent Dental Centres (UDCs) had been established across the city of Manchester offering face-to-face dental treatment after remote triage. UDCs were linked with the Unscheduled Urgent Care call handling service to receive referrals for patients in pain. The UDCs provide extractions and extirpations (first stage of Root Canal Treatment) to save the tooth and address pain.

The Head of Primary Care, National Health Service England described that 15 of the Urgent Dental Centres (UDCs) (27%) were situated within the City of Manchester, providing an additional 115 appointments per week for urgent care. He advised that all UDCs continued to be available for those patients who had not seen a Dentist on a regular basis, or patients referred from dental practices, who were unable to deliver services due to staff absence. Patients were able to attend the most convenient centre and were not restricted by local authority or CCG boundaries within Greater Manchester.

The Head of Primary Care, National Health Service England stated that an additional £2m was to be invested across Greater Manchester to address priorities access and support Practices address their backlogs. This additional access should also reduce the need for people to visit the Dental Hospital.

The Manchester Local Dental Committee representative stated that all Dentists were independent contractors, and they would provide both a NHS and private patient offer, adding this would explain that why patients requesting a NHS appointment would be offered a private appointment if they were at capacity. He advised that it was important to acknowledge that the national position for access to NHS dental services had never accommodated 100% of the population. The national

arrangements and funding, as established by government were such that only up to approximately 60% of the population were able to be accommodated by capacity within NHS Dental services.

The Chair stated that it was evident that the current system and arrangements for the delivery of NHS Dentistry was not appropriate and did not meet the demands of the population. She commented that it would never be designed in this way now.

The Manchester Local Dental Committee representative described the acute pressures experienced by Practices and the restrictions placed on Practices as a result of COVID-19 to manage patients attending. He advised of the strict guidelines they were required to follow to ensure both staff and patient safety, adding that failure to adhere to this would result in serious consequences for the Practice concerned. He further commented that this was in addition to the staffing pressures experienced in Practices as a result of staff absences due to COVID-19.

The Manchester Local Dental Committee representative clarified the treatment pricing tier system, adding that the charge for the course of treatment was not dictated by the number of appointments required.

The Manchester Local Dental Committee representative stated that he had an appreciation for the extreme pressures Dentists and all Primary Care frontline workers had and continued to experience. He stated that morale amongst the profession was at an all-time low and informed the Committee that a recent survey revealed that 47% of Dentists were due to leave or retire from the profession in the next 12 months.

The Executive Member for Health and Care stated that the importance of Dentists could not be underestimated, noting that Dentists often identified other health issues, such as mouth cancers and the issue of NHS provision was a national issue that needed to be addressed immediately by central government.

Decisions

The Committee note the report.

HSC/21/36 Access to General Practice in Manchester

The Committee considered the report of Head of Primary Care, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC) that provided information on the current position in relation to access to General Practice (GP) in Manchester.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The impact the COVID-19 pandemic had had on access to primary care and the modifications that had been put in place to continue to provide access to General Practice in Manchester;
- New ways of working, including the digital transformation programme;

- Plans that were underway to support the recovery of General Practice including improving access and reducing barriers patients face when accessing General Practice; and
- An update on the GP Patient Survey for 2021.

The Medical Director, MHCC provided the Committee with the current figures on the numbers of appointments delivered with the conclusion that the key message was that Primary Care was open for business.

The Information and Communication Officer, Healthwatch Manchester advised the Committee that they had surveyed the information that was available to residents on Practice's website and commented that they had found that this information was not easily accessible and there was a disparity in the length of time patients were expected to have to wait for an appointment.

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

- Noting the importance of online patient information being available in a range of languages and formats;
- Consideration needed to be given to the use of the term 'The Elderly' as it was not an appropriate term;
- The need to recognise that not all people could use technology and face to face appointments provided an opportunity to assess a patient's body language and understand, particularly if a patient was presenting with mental health issues; and
- Noting the reported 85 GP practices across Manchester was there a maximum capacity / register for these and was there any additional provision for under provided areas;

The Medical Director, MHCC stated that she had maintained strong relationships with her patients despite the pandemic, however commented that as a result of the need to wear full PPE (personal protective equipment) and stripped down consultation rooms meant that the patient experience of a face to face appointment was very different currently. In response to the comment regarding a patient's ability to navigate IT systems she stated that it would be wrong to make assumptions, however accepted that a one-size fits all approach was not appropriate. She further added that the telephone triage system was useful to sign post patients to the correct health professional for care, adding that this was not always a GP.

The Head of Primary Care, MHCC stated that in response to a growing population in the city, more GPs and Primary Care Health Workers needed to be recruited and the estates strategy, working collaboratively with the Primary Care Network were working to meet the needs of a growing population. In response to the comments made by Healthwatch she stated that a workstream had been developed to look at the ways in which access to Primary Care could be improved, noting that this included reviewing the information that was provided online and on Practice answer machines. She stated that they remained committed to working with Healthwatch to address the issue of variation in access. The Clinical Director and Chair of Manchester GP Forum reiterated this commitment to improving access, adding that COVID-19 had placed additional pressures on GPs.

The Executive Member for Health and Care thanked all of GPs across the city for all their continued dedication in supporting the residents of Manchester during the pandemic. She stated that this gratitude needed to be extended to all staff working in GP practices, in particular, receptionists who had experienced increased abuse from callers. She stated that more needed to be done to dispel the many negative and demoralising media comments regarding GPs and the service they provide.

Decisions

The Committee note the report.

HSC/21/37 Overview Report

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

Decision

The Committee notes the report and agree the work programme.

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2021

Present:

Councillor Reid – in the Chair

Councillors Abdullatif, Alijah, Foley, Hewitson, Lovecy, McHale, Nunney and Sadler

Co-opted Non Voting Members:

Mr L Duffy, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

Also present:

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children's Services

Councillor Hitchen, Ward Councillor for Miles Platting and Newton Heath

Alex Kennedy, Member of the Youth Parliament and Manchester Youth Council and Chair of Gorton Youth Forum

Apologies:

Councillor Bano

CYP/21/30 Minutes

Decision

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

CYP/21/31 Responding to Children in Need of Help, Support and Protection

The Committee received a presentation of the Deputy Director of Children's Services which outlined how Children's Services and partners were responding to children in need of help, support and protection.

The main points and themes within the presentation included:

- The inspection framework and approach;
- Social work practice;
- The front door;
- Early Help;
- Action to protect children;
- Child protection and assessments;
- Children Missing from Education; and
- Edge of Care services.

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

- Referrals relating to domestic abuse;
- The 11% of assessments which had not yet been completed; and
- The number of Children Missing from Education.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services advised that domestic abuse was a significant issue and that it often presented alongside other complicating factors. He drew Members' attention to the Council's new Domestic Violence Strategy and he outlined some of the work taking place to address the issue including protection plans and other work to support victims and more challenge for perpetrators, including work with the Probation Service. He advised that the figure on the completion of assessments related to those completed within 45 days, that Manchester compared well against Greater Manchester and nationally on this and that processes were in place to ensure the completion of assessments which had gone beyond that timescale. In response to Member's question about the Greater Manchester Contextual Safeguarding Pilot, he stated that this work was at a very early stage and suggested that officers could provide further information on this in a future report to the Committee. In response to another question, he confirmed that any parent could use the parenting helpline.

The Director of Education explained that Children Missing from Education (CME) included different categories of children. She advised that this included children who had recently arrived in the city and were in the process of being allocated a school place. She reported that another category within CME was children who had been taken off the school roll. She advised that, where a child had been removed from the school roll because they had stopped attending but the school had not been able to identify where that child had gone, the Council's CME Team had processes in place for trying to locate them. She stated that she could provide figures for CME cases whose whereabouts was unknown but that the numbers fluctuated from week to week. She advised that approximately 85% of these cases were quickly resolved, for example where it was established that the family had relocated to a different area but not told the school. She informed Members that CME figures were currently higher because a significant number of children were in countries on the government's red travel list which created challenges in returning to the UK. She reported that schools had been advised to keep these children on roll if they knew where they were and the family was keeping in contact but that, where there was no contact, children were being removed from the school roll and referred to the CME team. In response to a Member's question about Alternative Provision, she advised that the Council was reducing the number of Alternative Provision places as there was a high level of capacity in the city and mainstream schools were increasingly putting in place facilities to keep these children in their own school and reduce the use of Alternative Provision. She reported that quality assurance of independent Alternative Provision was carried out by the Secondary Pupil Referral Unit, as well as using independent quality assurance professionals; however, she reported that current arrangements were being reviewed and that further information on this would be included in a report at a future meeting.

The Strategic Director for Children and Education Services reported that continual improvement had been made since 2014, when Ofsted had judged the service as inadequate. He advised that the service had moved beyond compliance to being focussed on relationships, the quality of intervention and the difference being made to children's lives. He highlighted the increased demand on the service, with more children requiring help and support due to the pandemic, but advised that the service was now in a better position to make the decisions which would help it to respond to this level of demand.

The Chair welcomed the significant progress that had been made since 2014, including the valuable role of Early Help and Alonzi House, and she highlighted the important contribution of the late Councillor Sheila Newman to this work.

Decision

To note the presentation.

CYP/21/32 Manchester's Year of the Child

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director for Children and Education Services which provided information on the dedication of 2022 to celebrating the successes of Manchester's children and young people and supporting their recovery from the impact of COVID-19.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Engagement with children and young people;
- Education and learning;
- Early Years;
- Children's Services;
- Looking to the future; and
- Social and emotional development opportunities.

The Chair shared her experience of taking part in the engagement with children and young people for the Year of the Child and recommended that other Members visit local schools to engage with children and young people.

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

- To welcome this work, including engaging with children and young people and responding to the issues and priorities they raised;
- The many ways that the pandemic had impacted on children and young people, including recognising the effect this had had on their education, despite the hard work of teachers and other schools staff;
- When the outcomes of the consultation would be available; and
- Recognising the additional pressure that the teacher assessment of GCSE and A-level grades had placed on teachers and how they and school leaders could be supported with challenges from parents and pupils arising from the results.

The Director of Education informed the Committee that there were robust arrangements in place for the teacher assessments along with clear appeal procedures and that schools would encourage parents to channel any issue they had about the grade awarded through the appeal process.

The Strategic Director for Children and Education Services advised that the aim was to complete the engagement work during the autumn term and present the outcomes

to a meeting of the Council. He emphasised the importance of reaching all young people, not only those who were part of groups like Manchester Youth Council, and putting children and young people at the heart of decision-making. In response to a question about how young people would continue to be involved in decision-making, he advised that young people were being asked how they wanted to engage with this. He suggested that the Committee might want to receive regular reports on this work.

Decisions

1. To note the report and the recommendations made to the Executive at its meeting on 30 June 2021.
2. To receive an update report at a future meeting.

CYP/21/33 Ways of Working

The Committee received a presentation of the Deputy Director of Children's Services which outlined new ways of working within Children's Services.

The main points and themes within the presentation included:

- The principles supporting this work;
- Flexible working;
- Line manager and employee responsibilities;
- The Organisational Development Plan for the service;
- Monitoring impact;
- ICT; and
- Estates.

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

- To welcome that the service was taking the opportunity to identify the positive changes in ways of working which had arisen out of the pandemic and build on them;
- Whether office space would be reduced;
- The importance of a team ethos and social work staff being able to access informal support through colleagues, noting that this had been observed on a recent visit to a Locality Office; and
- Whether staff with ADHD had been involved in the consultation process.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services advised that there were no immediate plans to reduce office space and that this work was about creating a more employee-friendly environment, using the space better rather than reducing it. He reported that the staff consultation had taken place through multiple methods to meet staff's needs and preferences and that the vast majority of staff had felt able to participate.

The Executive Member for Children's Services recognised some of the negative impacts of the pandemic on social work staff, in particular feeling more isolated and

not having the same level and type of interaction with colleagues which would support them in normal circumstances. He assured Members that being able to work in an office environment, with a supportive team ethos, was a key priority.

Decision

To note the presentation.

CYP/21/34 COVID-19 Update

The Committee received a verbal update from the Director of Education which outlined new developments and significant changes to the current situation, particularly in relation to schools. She thanked school and college leaders and their staff for their work through this challenging year, as well as thanking children and young people and their parents and carers for the way they had responded.

The main points and themes within the verbal update included:

- Recognising that Manchester schools had very largely remained open throughout this time, in spite of high infection rates and the number of staff and pupils self-isolating and that this was not the case everywhere;
- Attendance figures, stating that the most recent available figures showed attendance rates at just over 93%, while highlighting that the figures did not include pupils who were self-isolating;
- The numbers of positive cases and children being sent home to self-isolate because they were in the same bubble, noting that while the figures were reducing, they were still high;
- The changes to the national guidance for schools from 19 July 2021, as England moved to Stage 4 of the Roadmap out of Lockdown;
- That the Council, along with other Greater Manchester local authorities, was advising its schools to continue with their existing arrangements for the last few days of term, following which they would have time to plan for the new arrangements in September; and
- That the Council would continue to provide support to schools on COVID-19-related arrangements and issues into the new academic year.

In response to a question from the Chair, the Director of Education informed the Committee that she and the Executive Member for Children's Services had written to schools to thank them for their work during the pandemic.

Decision

To note the verbal update.

CYP/21/35 Youth and Play Fund - Summer Provision

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) and the Head of Youth Strategy and Engagement which provided an overview of Manchester's Youth and Play offer, which included provision commissioned by the Council and the Youth and Play Fund which was distributed via Young Manchester. It

also highlighted the offer which would be available across the city throughout the summer school holidays, which encompassed the offers from the wider partners and stakeholders, including the targeted Holiday Activities and Food programme (HAF).

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

- Youth and Play Funding (Manchester City Council);
- Youth and Play Fund (Young Manchester);
- Summer provision; and
- Next steps.

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

- To ask how the engagement data referred to in the report was collected;
- How the Youth and Play Fund was allocated and the geographic spread of organisations applying for and receiving funding;
- Young people not wanting to cross ward boundaries to access youth provision;
- What could be done to improve the engagement of young people with youth provision, particularly in wards where this was low;
- To request a breakdown of data for the four hubs, including the ward of residence of the young people accessing the provision; and
- That issues relating to youth provision should be brought to Ward Co-ordination meetings.

Alex Kennedy, Member of the Youth Parliament and Manchester Youth Council and Chair of Gorton Youth Forum, asked what was being done to ensure equality of accessibility to funding for grassroots youth projects compared to more established projects and to ensure an equal distribution of funding across different wards.

The Head of Youth Strategy and Engagement explained how Young Manchester funding was distributed across wards based on a needs analysis which ranked wards on factors such as deprivation, education levels and eligibility for Free School Meals. She acknowledged that more needed to be done in relation to access to funding for grassroots providers and black-led organisations and advised that there was currently a consultation taking place with the sector on the future of commissioning for the Youth and Play Fund and that a report would be coming to the Committee and the Executive on this. She also informed Members that the Council had established Area Youth Leads who each had an allocation of funding for working with grassroots organisations, helping to get them into a position where they could apply for larger amounts of funding.

The Chair advised that the funding allocation should be more evenly spread across different areas of the city. She highlighted that, when funding had recently been made available for capital projects in parks, it had been distributed evenly with £30k being allocated to each ward and she stated that this was a fairer approach.

The Head of Youth Strategy and Engagement advised that the engagement data referred to in the report was data returned to Young Manchester by the organisations

that received funding from the Youth and Play Fund and she outlined how this was used, for example, identifying demographic groups who were less likely to be accessing youth provision and responding to this. She highlighted that figures were lower than in previous years due to the COVID-19 restrictions that had been in place. In response to the question on crossing ward boundaries, she reported that data was gathered from the hubs on where the young people accessing them came from and it showed that young people were travelling in to the bigger hubs, advising that it was important to ensure the transport links were good and that young people felt safe on that transport; however, she acknowledged that ongoing work was needed about making young people felt safe crossing boundaries and that it was also important to get the right providers in each area so that young people had access to the kind of provision that they wanted to attend. She reported that the national guidelines were that young people should live within a 20-minute safe travel journey of youth provision and that in Manchester all young people lived within that time limit.

The Executive Member for Children's Services reported that more youth activities had been provided this summer than had taken place for a number of years and that Ward Councillors had been provided with details of both universal provision and provision in their ward funded through the Holiday Activities and Food programme.

The Ward Councillor for Miles Platting and Newton Heath expressed concern about the level of provision for young people in her ward and questioned whether youth provision was within a 20-minute safe travel journey for all young people. She highlighted how travel issues were restricting the access of young people in her ward to youth activities in the city. She questioned the accuracy of the data on which provision across different wards was based. She advised that there was no high school within her ward and that many children in her ward attended a high school outside of Manchester City Council's boundaries and, therefore, data on the number of these children who were eligible for Free School Meals had not been included in the analysis. She also asked how Manchester children attending a non-Manchester school could find out about youth provision within the city.

The Chair stated that, while the Government did not provide sufficient funding for youth provision, the Council needed to ensure that the limited funds that were available were targeted in the right places. She highlighted the need to consider the boundaries that some young people would not cross and transport issues and also advised that more detached youth work was needed.

The Head of Youth Strategy and Engagement reported that the needs analysis had been carried out in conjunction with the Council and the relevant Executive Member at the time but that this had been five years ago and she agreed that it needed to be revised. She confirmed that the Free School Meals data was based on the ward in which the school was located, not where the young person lived. The Chair advised that Ward Councillors should be consulted at an early stage in the revised needs analysis.

The Head of Youth Strategy and Engagement clarified that the guideline of being within a 20-minute safe travel time related to a youth provision, not one of the main youth hubs. She advised that information on youth activities had been disseminated through a range of channels, including working collaboratively with Greater

Manchester colleagues, and that many youth providers had also been using social media to promote their provision. She highlighted that information was also available on the Loads To Do website. She informed the Committee that the CEO of the HideOut Youth Zone had offered to share their minibuses to help young people access activities but that this was the responsibility of the providers and not something that was directly in the control of the Council.

Decisions

1. To note that the Committee will receive a further report on the Youth and Play Fund and Young Manchester in the autumn.
2. To request a breakdown of data for the four hubs, including the ward of residence of the young people accessing the provision.

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

CYP/21/36 Overview Report

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

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme.

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 8 September 2021

Present:

Councillor Reid – in the Chair
Councillors Alijah, Bano, Cooley, Foley, Hewitson, McHale, Nunney and Sadler

Co-opted Voting Members:

Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative

Co-opted Non Voting Members:

Mr L Duffy, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

Also present:

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children's Services
Councillor Midgley, Executive Member for Health and Care
Kimberley Evans, Healthy Schools Team, Manchester Foundation Trust (MFT)
Claire McNicholls, Named Nurse (Safeguarding), MFT
Superintendent Rebecca Boyce, Greater Manchester Police (GMP)

Apologies:

Councillor Collins
Ms Z Derraz, Parent Governor Representative

CYP/21/37 Minutes

Councillor Cooley and Dr Omara asked to be added to the list of attendees in the minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2021, to which the Chair agreed.

Decision

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2021, subject to the above amendment.

CYP/21/38 COVID-19 Update

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

The main points within the verbal update included:

- That secondary schools and colleges were staggering the start of term to enable pupils to take Lateral Flow Tests on site;
- The key changes in schools for the autumn term, which were that schools were no longer required to keep pupils in groups referred to as "bubbles" to reduce mixing, that close contacts of positive cases would be identified by NHS Test and Trace rather than the school and that face coverings were no

- longer mandatory in secondary schools;
- That all schools, colleges and daycare settings had completed a risk assessment and put in place infection control measures and outbreak management plans;
- That the Council would continue to provide support to schools and monitor the number of positive cases;
- The changes in self-isolation rules for close contacts, emphasising the importance of children displaying even mild symptoms not being sent to school;
- Asymptomatic testing arrangements for pupils in Year 7 and above; and
- The current position on the vaccination of children and young people.

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

- To thank officers for their work during the pandemic;
- Children who were still abroad due to travel restrictions;
- Being prepared to respond to a further spike in cases, taking learning from previous experience;
- The importance of parents and governors supporting the new arrangements;
- Take-up of the vaccine among 16- and 17-year-olds; and
- Examination arrangements for the new academic year.

The Director of Education advised that, as schools were only just re-opening for the autumn term, information on the number of children who were still in countries on the 'red' list or were in quarantine on return from those countries was not yet available and she would provide more information on this at the October meeting. She advised that, due to their previous experience of providing remote learning and working in school under tighter restrictions, schools were much better prepared now than they had been at the start of the pandemic, knew what worked and could quickly set up any arrangements needed if the situation changed. She informed Members that she and the Director of Population Health and Wellbeing had sent a letter to parents and carers via schools which provided them with an update, thanked them for their support so far and asked for their continued support during this new phase. She advised that communications were also being sent to School Governors.

In response to a Member's question about reactions to the Pfizer vaccine, the Executive Member for Health and Care advised that GPs could provide advice on this but that she would liaise with the Public Health Team and respond to the Member. She assured Members that supporting schools and colleges was a key aim of the 12-point action plan for dealing with COVID-19 during the next few months. She advised that work would continue to increase the take-up of vaccines by 16- and 17-year-olds and that this would include communications with young people through a range of platforms and regular pop-up vaccination centres at sixth form colleges.

In response to a question from the Chair about whether some schools were continuing to group pupils in bubbles, the Director of Education advised that some schools had found that some of the measures that they had had to put in place due to COVID-19 had had a positive impact, for example, staggered lunch breaks making

the lunch period calmer, and that some schools might choose to retain these; however, she advised that, even if schools retained some of these arrangements, it was no longer the case that close contacts of a positive case had to self-isolate so there would not be whole groups of children being required to self-isolate as had happened previously. She reported that at the moment the intention was that examinations would go ahead in 2022 and that examination boards might release details to schools of which topics would come up in the examinations so that they knew which areas to focus on.

The Chair requested that the Committee receive a written report next time, including statistical information, and suggested that the Committee receive a written report approximately every three months with verbal updates at the other meetings.

In response to a Member's question about school attendance, the Director of Education advised that she did not yet have last year's national attendance data. The Chair asked that this be provided to the next meeting. A Member emphasised the importance of ensuring that Ofsted inspectors carrying out inspections of Manchester schools were made aware of the disproportionate impact that the pandemic had had on the city.

Decision

To request that the Committee receive a written report at its next meeting, with statistical information, including national school attendance data from 2020/21 and data on children who were still in countries on the 'red' list or in quarantine on return from those countries at the start of the school year.

CYP/21/39 Update on wellbeing and mental health and support for schools and settings and education for children unable to attend school due to ill health

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education which provided an update on wellbeing and mental health and support for schools and settings and education for children unable to attend school due to ill health.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Mental Health Support Team (M Thrive in Education);
- Elective Home Education (EHE); and
- Section 19 Duty on Local Authorities to provide suitable education for children who, by reason of illness, exclusion from school or otherwise, might not receive education.

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

- Waiting times for Children and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS);
- Children and young people who had been referred to CAMHS but were not assessed as having met the threshold and the importance of them being

- signposted to other support;
- That a representative from CAMHS should have attended for this item;
- Concern about rising numbers of children being home educated following lockdown;
- The recent report from the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman following their investigation into a complaint against the Council; and
- The important role of school nurses, Early Help and Sure Start.

The Senior Schools Quality Assurance Officer advised that she did not have the CAMHS waiting time figures put could arrange from them to be provided to the Member. She advised that M-Thrive in Education's purpose was to provide the right support at the right time, supporting children and young people in school and outlined the role of the CAMHS practitioners in schools in this work.

In response to a question about suicide prevention, the Senior Schools Quality Assurance Officer outlined work taking place at a Greater Manchester level on self-harm and suicide prevention and offered to provide an update on this work in a future report. The Executive Member for Health and Care advised that the Suicide Prevention Partnership had obtained some funding to provide training on suicide prevention in young people. A Member advised that many young people who had committed suicide had never accessed mental health services and asked that information on universal suicide prevention training in schools be included in a future report. The Senior Schools Quality Assurance Officer highlighted the work of the Healthy Schools Team, which preceded the M Thrive in Education local offer, and which supported schools in identifying and supporting children and young people at risk of suicide. Members discussed some of the factors which could impact on young people's mental health, including social media and peer pressure.

In response to the question about young people who were not assessed as meeting the threshold for CAMHS, the Executive Member for Children's Services advised that the Thrive model aimed to address some of these issues, ensuring that children and young people received appropriate support, whether through CAMHS or through other services, for example, school-based support or support through a voluntary sector organisation. He suggested that the next report on this could focus more on the relationship between the specialist CAMHS service and the wider well-being support for young people. The Senior Schools Quality Assurance Officer highlighted the video made available through the Manchester Safeguarding Partnership which set out the different levels of support available, from universal to targeted to bespoke, although she advised that the Thrive Hubs were not referenced very strongly in this as the offer was still developing at the time the video was produced.

In response to a Member's question about the figures in the report relating to young people using Kooth's online mental health services, Kimberley Evans from the Healthy Schools Team advised that young people could engage with Kooth in different ways, for example, reading the website or accessing online counselling, but that she would contact Kooth to obtain clarity on the figures included in the report.

The Director of Education outlined the details of the case investigated by the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman following a complaint about the Council

regarding its duty to provide alternative education for a child whose GP had deemed them medically unfit to attend school. She advised that, in response to one of the recommendations, the Council had reviewed what triggered its duty under Section 19 of the Education Act 1996 to make arrangements to provide "suitable education at school, or otherwise than at school, for those children of compulsory school age who, by reason of illness, exclusion from school or otherwise, may not for any period receive suitable education unless such arrangements are made for them". In response to comments from the Chair about children refusing to go to school, she informed Members about the anxiety and avoidance pathway, advising that in these cases it was usually preferable that this did not trigger Section 19 and that the child maintained links with their school with the aim of them returning to school and she reported that early intervention was important in these situations.

The Senior Schools Quality Assurance Officer advised that the Council's policy on Elective Home Education had recently been reviewed and, although statutory powers were quite limited, the Council asked schools to engage with families who wanted to remove their child from the roll and home educate them and that the policy included engagement with and taking into account the views of the child.

In response to a question from the Chair about support for LGBT young people, Kimberley Evans offered to circulate details of her team's offer to support schools in teaching the relationship, sex and health curriculum, including ensuring that it was inclusive.

Decision

That the Committee will consider this again at a future meeting and that a representative of CAMHS should be present for this.

CYP/21/40 Helping and supporting Our Children to lead a safe, healthy, happy life and have a successful future

The Committee received a presentation of the Deputy Director of Children's Services which outlined work on helping and supporting Our Children to lead a safe, healthy, happy life and have a successful future.

The main points and themes within the presentation included:

- Decision making in practice, focusing on early permanence, family time and the legal gateway process;
- The role and function of the Independent Reviewing service;
- Engagement and participation of children and young people;
- Quality of care planning, including pathway planning;
- Providing stability and permanence for children;
- Risk management with specific focus on the role of the complex safeguarding hub;
- Health data and impacts on children;
- Permanence and placement stability; and
- The virtual school contributing to preventing young people from being Not in

Employment, Education or Training (NEET).

The Executive Member for Children's Services reported that Ofsted had seen improvements at every visit and suggested that the Ofsted Subgroup could focus on some of the areas identified as needing more work.

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

- The frequency of Our Children seeing their own Social Worker and the impact of the number of agency workers; and
- Access to dentists for Our Children;
- Access to support for families caring for children on Special Guardianship Orders (SGOs); and
- Children placed outside the city boundaries.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services advised that issues with access to dentists had been escalated through the Corporate Parenting Panel and NHS England. The Executive Member for Children's Services advised that the last two meetings of the Corporate Parenting Panel had received data on this and that the more recent set of figures had shown signs of rapid improvement and that this and other health-related issues affecting Our Children would be a priority at the next Corporate Parenting Panel meeting.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services recognised that inconsistency of contact with Social Workers would have a detrimental effect on Our Children but advised that the risk of this was low because the Council's turnover rate for Social Workers was around 11% and the vacancy rate 7% and that the figure for Social Workers seeing the child on their own was 85%. He advised that the risk was mitigated through the permanence planning meetings and looked after children reviews. He reported that the service's reliance on agency workers was less than it had been in 2017 and that he could provide figures on this.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services advised that a support plan was put in place when an SGO was discharged but that he would undertake a deep dive investigation of re-engagement with families when the arrangements were not working out. He informed Members about the Advice, Guidance and Support service that could signpost families experiencing difficulties to support, advising that this was very well used. In response to a request for the Committee to look at this issue further, the Chair advised that this could be something that the Ofsted Subgroup looked at it. In response to a Member's request for information on progress in areas that had previously been judged as 'requires improvement', the Chair advised that the Ofsted Subgroup would be looking at this in detail.

The Deputy Director of Children's Services advised that most children who had been placed outside of the city's boundaries were still placed close to Manchester and, due to the geography of the city, a placement outside of the Council area could sometimes be closer to the area the child was from than a placement in a different part of the city. In response to a further question about reciprocal arrangements

where children were placed across local authority boundaries, he advised that he chaired the Greater Manchester Local Authorities Care Leavers Forum which was looking at and escalating this issue. The Executive Member for Children's Services advised that he sat on the Greater Manchester Children's Board and that there was a lot of commitment to making the offer to Our Children and Care Leavers more equal across Greater Manchester and that the disparity sometimes arose because one local authority was leading the way in what it was offering.

The Chair recognised the progress that the Council had made since it was judged as 'inadequate' in 2014. She encouraged more Members to become independent visitors to children's homes under Regulation 44 of the Children's Home (England) Regulations 2015.

Decision

To note the presentation.

CYP/21/41 Manchester Complex Safeguarding Hub

The Committee received a presentation of the Head of Locality and Claire McNicholls, Named Nurse (Safeguarding), which provided Members with an annual report on the Complex Safeguarding Hub for 2020/2021.

The main points and themes within the presentation included:

- Overview of the Complex Safeguarding Hub;
- Partnership arrangements;
- Governance, accountability and assurance arrangements;
- Response to COVID-19;
- Achieving Change Together model (ACT);
- Performance and outcomes;
- Impact; and
- Priorities 2021/2022.

The Chair welcomed the improvement in agencies working together and that a representative from GMP was in attendance.

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

- How well informed were neighbourhood police teams on the criminal exploitation of children and young people and was there sufficient capacity to address this when it was happening in neighbourhoods;
- The early signs of exploitation and how agencies could work together to identify and address issues at an early stage; and
- How Ward Councillors could support this work.

Superintendent Rebecca Boyce from GMP reported that neighbourhood police teams were informed about the Complex Safeguarding Hub and criminal exploitation

through briefings and district tasking and co-ordination groups. She advised that it was important to increase the ability of neighbourhood teams to respond to exploitation as the Complex Safeguarding Hub did not have the capacity to be open to every young person where there was a suggestion of exploitation, reporting that there had been some good examples of neighbourhood police teams responding to adult exploitation, such as cuckooing. She advised that there had also been some good joint work between district police teams and the Complex Safeguarding Hub, where the district police team had identified exploitation as part of a police operation. She outlined some of the ways in which early indications of exploitation were identified through intelligence teams, police district safeguarding teams and engagement officers in schools. The Chair noted that the Committee would be receiving a report on the role of police in schools at a future meeting.

The Head of Locality informed Members that training was provided to schools on child criminal and sexual exploitation. She also advised that Missing From Home Panels provided opportunities to identify signs that a child or young person was being exploited. Claire McNicholls, Named Nurse (Safeguarding), advised that MFT had a robust training programme which included child sexual exploitation (CSE) and that the Trust's Complex Safeguarding Subgroup communicated across the Trust on indicators and themes relating to exploitation. She highlighted that the Trust had recently developed a Complex Safeguarding Policy and the resources it provided. She advised that a short briefing on CSE and Child Criminal Exploitation had also been sent out to staff and that risk indicator checklists had been introduced for CSE and knife crime.

In response to a Member's question, Superintendent Boyce advised that the term child criminal exploitation included county lines but encompassed a broader range of issues.

In response to a Member's question about the data in the presentation on the young people involved in ACT, the Head of Locality advised that this was quite a small cohort so not representative of all young people that the service was working with. Noting that many of the young people involved in ACT were from Hulme, Moss Side, and Rusholme, the Chair advised that she would discuss this with one of the Hulme Ward Councillors.

The Executive Member for Children's Services advised that Ward Councillors and the public had a role in recognising criminal exploitation and that in recent years a number of Councillors had approached him with information on issues within their ward which had been referred to the service and led to concrete outcomes.

In response to a question from the Chair about the impact of lockdown on referrals, the Head of Locality advised that there had been a reduction in referrals at the start of the pandemic as some services were not seeing young people but that this had gradually increased, with more referrals coming from different sources such as British Transport Police and that the service had continued to review young people who were regularly going missing from home. In response to a further question from the Chair about 16 and 17-year-olds who were looked after going missing from home,

she informed the Committee that work was taking place with the Children's Society on this and that she could provide further information at a later date.

Decision

To note the presentation.

CYP/21/42 Overview Report

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

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme.

This page is intentionally blank

Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2021

Present:

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair

Councillors Chohan, Flanagan, Foley, Hassan, Holt, Hughes, Jeavons, Lynch, Lyons, Razaq, Sadler, Shilton Godwin and Wright

Apologies: Councillors Jeavons

Also present:

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment

Megan Black, Head of Logistics & Environment, Transport for Greater Manchester

ECCSC/21/09 Minute Silence For The Victims Of Recent Environmental Disasters

The Committee and all those present observed a minute's silence in remembrance of all those who had lost lives as a result of the extreme weather events witnessed recently across the globe.

ECCSC/21/10 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2021 as a correct record.

ECCSC/21/11 Climate Change Action Plan Quarterly Progress Report: Q1 April - June 2021

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update on the progress that had been made in delivering the Plan over the last 3 months (April – June 2021), noting that Council declared a Climate Emergency in July 2019 and developed a Climate Change Action Plan 2020-25, which was approved by Executive in March 2020.

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

- Recognising the significant progress made to date to reduce carbon emissions;
- Requesting that reports to the Committee that were publicly available on the website should include bar charts to track emissions against the carbon budget;
- All RAG ratings needed to include figures, targets and comparative data where available.
- Consideration needed to be given as to how the impact of actions were assessed and reported;
- Noting that research undertaken by the Local Government Association had described that Councils had significant wider influence to reduce emissions, in

- addition to those that they were directly responsible for;
- Information that was published on the website needed to be clear and accessible
- Information was sought on available and future funding sources to progress this work, in particular the retrofitting of homes;
- An update was sought on the recruitment to posts within the Manchester Climate Change Agency (MCCA);
- Noting the levels of occupancy within the Private Rented Sector (PRS) it was important that private landlords improved their housing stock to reduce carbon emissions;
- All new housing developments should include solar panels;
- The need to capture the impact of COVID within the plan, noting the new ways of working and people's travel arrangements, adding the need to recognise the impact on emissions as a result of working from home;
- Were the emissions savings achieved through the buildings estate a result of COVID and the new ways of working and was this sustainable long term;
- Noting that the University had developed a Place Based Carbon Calculator;
- Noting that the report was honest and transparent and had included a discussion on the Risks and Issues identified;
- Noting the challenges and barriers experienced by different groups across this city it was important to ensure that engagement with residents on the issue of climate change needed to be appropriate;
- Clarification was sought as to the reasons for the reported air travel;
- An update was sought on the calls for the Greater Manchester Pension Fund (GMPF) to divest from investing in fossil fuels;
- Carbon Literacy training needed to be delivered in schools, including those schools cross borders that children attended, adding that the voice of young people and schools should be included in the development of climate change ward action plans; and
- The need to ensure that the correct species of trees be planted in locations such as near schools and on road routes so as to maximise their carbon capture.

The Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships updated the Members in regard to the recruitment to posts within the MCCA by advising that the Director will be starting 1 October 2021 and the recruitment to the post of Deputy Director was about to commence. In addition, the Policy and Strategy Lead would be starting 20 September 2021, the Programme and Finance Officer was currently in post as was the Residents and Communities Lead. He advised that all of these posts were funded by Manchester City Council. In addition, the post of Youth Champion had been appointed funded by crowd funding and the Adaptation and Resilience Officer was also in post via a secondment from Manchester Metropolitan University. He further informed the Committee that there were five other roles identified on the MCCA structure but filling these would be dependent on funding from other members of the Manchester Climate Change Partnership.

In response to the issue of funding, the Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships commented that the pipeline of projects described within the plan helped to inform and articulate all funding opportunities. He stated that work had been undertaken to understand the projected figures to deliver retrofitting works and this evidence would

be submitted as part of the ask of the government's spending review. He commented that carbon reduction also informed the Economic Recovery Plan for the city. The Zero Carbon Manager acknowledged the comments regarding the reporting of data, adding that the emissions against carbon budget was produced in the annual report as there were challenges regarding the frequency and verification of data reporting and the risk of double counting when reporting. The Committee were informed that the issue regarding the RAG ratings would be discussed further at the Zero Carbon Coordination Group.

The Zero Carbon Manager further commented that a project was currently underway to review the information that was available to the public on the Council's website so that in addition to the more formal reporting, a narrative would also be provided to describe the progress achieved to date.

The Zero Carbon Manager advised that the learning from the pandemic would be adopted and she made reference to the staff travel policy that was currently being drafted.

Noting the comments regarding the need to engage with private landlords on the issue of carbon emissions, the Zero Carbon Manager described that this was recognised as a significant area and that a programme was underway at a Greater Manchester level to consider the issue of retrofitting across all types of tenure. She stated that in addition to tackling the issue of carbon emissions this work would also contribute to other important issues such as fuel poverty, health and skills and employment.

The Executive Member for Environment informed the Committee that she would be discussing the issue of PRS with the Executive Member for Housing and Employment with the ambition to progressing this important area of work. In regard to the issue of tree planting and the choice of species she advised that this was scheduled to be reported to a future meeting of the Committee, however she would speak with the Member outside of the meeting regarding the specific scheme in her ward.

The Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships stated that Northwards Housing would be considering all retrofitting options, including alternative heat sources and solar panels as part of their wider capital investment programme and scheduled improvement works. He further added that resident behavior change and adaption to new technology was important to ensure that maximum benefits from new technology could be realised.

The Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships commented that he was aware of the Place Based Carbon Calculator that had been developed by the University and consideration would be given as to how this tool could be utilised to help deliver and inform the programme of activities described across the Action Plan.

The Head of Neighbourhoods described that the Climate Change Neighbourhood Officers would assist Neighbourhood Teams to develop individual Climate Change Ward Action Plans, noting that work to quantify and report the outcomes of these plans was to be developed with the local University. She acknowledged the comment from the Member regarding the need to use appropriate language and engagement with different communities adding that this was understood.

In response to the question relating to air travel, the Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships clarified that these flights had been purchased to facilitate the repatriation of Looked After Children, adding that as these had been purchased by the Local Authority and in the spirit of openness and transparency it was important to report this.

The Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships further acknowledged the comments regarding young people and schools noting the importance of this, in particular in the context of the Year of the Child.

In regard to the issue of the GMPF the Executive Member for Environment stated that she shared the Committee's frustration and like her predecessor she would continue to lobby them to disinvest from fossil fuels. Members recommended that the Chair of this Committee should also write to the GMPF to urge them to disinvest immediately and support the city's ambition to transition to a zero carbon city.

The Chair concluded this item of business by congratulating all involved on the progress to date. She informed the Committee that she would be speaking with the Executive Member for Environment and the Head of Planning to scope the content of the report scheduled for the September meeting on the issue of planning to ensure that the themes and topics raised at this meeting were adequately addressed. She further stated that following the discussion she would be meeting with the other Scrutiny Chairs to ensure the issue of climate change was addressed through the remits of their respective Committees.

Decisions

The Committee recommend;

1. That every school on a main arterial route with high traffic have a tree planting plan included as part of the tree strategy to promote clean air;
2. That every council employee and Councillor make a pledge to support climate change; and
3. That all ward climate change plans across the city include a priority action to reduce carbon emissions and promote clean air, including but not restricted to no idling campaigns outside schools, developing walk to school schemes, road closures and the promotion of playing out schemes.
4. That the Chair write to the GMPF to urge them to disinvest from fossil fuels immediately and support the city's ambition to transition to a zero carbon city.

ECCSC/21/12 Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and City Solicitor that set out the proposed Greater Manchester Final Clean Air Plan and policy following a review of all the information gathered through the GM CAP consultation and wider data, evidence and modelling work which was to be agreed by the ten Greater Manchester local authorities.

The Committee were invited to comment on the report prior to its consideration by the Executive at their meeting of 28 July 2021.

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

- Noting that the Clean Air Plan would primarily address the issue of Nitrogen Dioxide would this plan contribute to the lowering of Carbon Dioxide emissions;
- Expressing disappointment that the Strategic Road Network did not include the M60 motorway;
- A member called for a suspension of road building, similar to that which had recently been announced in Wales;
- Good practice and scrappage schemes, with reference to a scheme delivered in Coventry should be used to incentivise drivers to change to more environmentally friendly vehicles;
- The Council needed to be clear in its ambition to see a reduced dependency on cars to undertake journeys, in particular unnecessary short journeys, commenting that the Council remained committed to this;
- Questioning the space allocated to staff car parking at schools that had been recently built across the city, commenting that this was contrary to the ambitions of the city as it did not set a good example to both pupils attending the school and their parents, and it further contributed to the issue of water run off;
- The Council should use all levers of influence to encourage all employers across the city to develop sustainable staff travel plans;
- Consideration needed to be given to addressing the emissions caused by diesel freight trains; and
- An update was sought as to the introduction of electric buses across the city, noting that this has been piloted in the city.

In response to the questions from the Members, the Head of Environment, Planning and Infrastructure advised that the Clean Air Plan was part of a wider suite of strategies and planned projects designed to contribute to reducing the city's carbon emissions, making reference to the Greater Manchester Transport Strategy, the City Centre Transport Strategy, reference to the significant investment to deliver public transport and active travel projects and the work across Greater Manchester to deliver electric vehicle charging points.

With regard to the comments raised regarding the schools, the Head of Environment, Planning and Infrastructure commented that he would look into the specific cases raised following the meeting. He added that the delivery of Mobility Hubs across Greater Manchester would encourage and support public and active travel, noting that work was underway to strategically place these sites. He commented that this would support the ambition to reduce the number of journeys undertaken by car.

In response to the discussion on diesel freight trains, the Head of Environment, Planning and Infrastructure stated that the Government had recently released its transport decarbonisation plan; however, he would need to research the specifics in relation to diesel trains and feed back to the Member.

The Head of Logistics and Environment, Transport for Greater Manchester referred to the issue of electric buses by stating that the pilot scheme referred to had been funded by central government and that subsequently a bid had been submitted to fund the delivery of electric vehicles for the whole of the bus fleet, adding that funding was available and already being delivered through the Clean Air Plan to retrofit the existing fleet if required.

Decisions

The Committee endorse the recommendations that the Executive;

1. Note the progress of the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan;
2. Note the progress in the distribution of Bus Retrofit funding;
3. Note Ministers' agreement to include the sections of the A628/A57 in Tameside which form part of the Strategic Road Network within the Greater Manchester's Clean Air Zone (CAZ) and their request for Tameside MBC, TfGM and Highways England to establish the most appropriate solution for the charging mechanism to be applied on this section of the Strategic Road Network (SRN);
4. Approve the GM Clean Air Plan Policy, at Appendix 1 noting that the policy outlines the boundary, discounts, exemptions, daily charges of the Clean Air Zone as well as the financial support packages offered towards upgrading to a compliant vehicle, including the eligibility criteria to be applied.
5. Note the Equalities Impact Assessment, as set out at Appendix 2;
6. Note the AECOM Consultation Report, as set out at Appendix 3;
7. Agree the proposed Response to the Consultation at Appendix 4 which has been prepared by TfGM on behalf of the ten GM local authorities;
8. Note the Impacts of COVID-19 Report, as set out at Appendix 5;
9. Agree the Modelling report of the final CAP package, as set out at Appendix 6, and in particular that the modelling outputs of the final plan scheme show the achievement of compliance with the legal limits for Nitrogen Dioxide in the shortest possible time and by 2024 at the latest as required by the Ministerial Direction;
10. Note the economic implications of the CAP Report, as set out at Appendix 7;
11. Note the update on the GM Minimum Licensing Standards, set out in section 3.1, and in particular that licensing conditions will not be used to support delivery of the GM Clean Air Plan;

12. Approve a 6-week public consultation on the inclusion of motorhomes classified as MSP1 in the GM Clean Air Zone and on the inclusion of the A575 and A580 at Worsley commencing on 1 September 2021 and delegate authority to the Executive Member for Environment to approve the consultation materials;
13. Note that the GM Clean Air Charging Authorities Committee has the authority to make the Charging Scheme Order which establishes the GM Charging Scheme in line with the agreed GM Clean Air Plan Policy;
14. Note that the GM Charging Authorities Committee has the authority to vary the Charging Scheme Order if this is established as the most appropriate charging mechanism to be applied on sections of the A628/A57 part of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) in Tameside;
15. Note that the Air Quality Administration Committee has the authority to agree the final form of the Operational Agreement for the Central Clean Air Service, and to authorise the making of the Agreement, on behalf of the ten GM local authorities;
16. Note that the Air Quality Administration Committee has the authority to:
 - a. establish and distribute the funds set out in the agreed GM Clean Air Plan policy;
 - b. approve the assessment mechanism agreed with JAQU to ensure that Clean Air Funds can be adapted if necessary;
 - c. keep the use of the funds under review and to determine any changes in the amounts allocated to each and their use; and
 - d. monitor and evaluate the joint local charging scheme.
17. Approve the reallocation of funding from the Try Before You Buy scheme to provide additional electric vehicle charging points dedicated for use by taxis;
18. Delegate to the GM Charging Authorities Committee the authority to determine the outcome of the consultation on both the inclusion of motorhomes classified as MSP1 within the scope of Clean Air Zone charges and on the inclusion in the GM Clean Air Zone of the A575 and A580 at Worsley following the conclusion of that consultation;
19. Approve the Clean Air Zone ANPR and signage locations, as set out at Appendix 10; and
20. Agree a delegation to Deputy Chief Executive to approve the submission of the Interim Full Business Case if required and Executive Member for Environment the Full Business Case (FBC) to the Government's Joint Air Quality Unit to support the GM Clean Air Plan and any supplementary information to that Unit.

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

A member requested that a report on the issue of flood management be submitted to the Committee for consideration and that representatives from the Environment Agency would be invited to attend that meeting. The Chair advised that she would look to schedule this on the Committee's Work Programme at the earliest opportunity.

Decision

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

Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2021

Present:

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair

Councillors Foley, Hassan, Holt, Jeavons, Razaq, Sadler, Shilton Godwin and Wright

Apologies: Councillors Chohan, Flanagan, Hughes, Lynch and Lyons

Also present:

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment

Tom Flanagan, Interim Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency

Simon Curtis, Chair, Manchester Arts and Sustainability Team

ECCSC/21/14 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2021 as a correct record.

ECCSC/21/15 Climate Change Action Plan Annual Report 2020-21 and Work Programme 2021-22

The Committee considered a joint report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update on the progress that had been made in delivering the Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) during the first full financial year (CCAP Annual Report 2020-21) and the work programme for the second financial year of the Action Plan (CCAP Work Programme 2021-22).

Key points and themes in the report included:

- A five-year CCAP covering 2020-25 was approved at Executive in March 2020;
- Updates had been considered by Strategic Management Team and the former Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee throughout the CCAP's first year, with a detailed progress report considered in February 2021;
- This Annual Report brought together the CCAP updates provided over the last 12 months, a full year of CO2 emissions data and highlighted the progress which had been made during this time;
- Overall, the Council's direct emissions had reduced by 21% (-6,783 tonnes CO2) compared to 2019-20 and against an annual target to reduce emissions by 13%. For 2021-22, the Council's carbon budget was 27,056 tonnes CO2, 13% lower than for 2020-21;
- The Work Programme for 2021-22, outlined the key CCAP actions, or critical milestones within complex CCAP actions spanning multiple years, which were to be delivered during this period and these were listed under the five themes (Buildings & Energy, Transport & Travel, Reducing consumption based emissions, Climate adaptation, and Catalysing change); and

- The work programme took account of a small number of actions that were delayed last year due to the pandemic and incorporated milestones for new projects, such as the Public Sector Decarbonisation Scheme, the Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund and the 'In Our Nature' communities programme. None of these projects had featured in the original CCAP 2020-25.

The Committee was invited to comment on the report prior to it being considered by Executive.

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

- The need to reiterate the urgency and immediacy of the climate emergency;
- Questioning that if we accepted that climate change was such an important and immediate issue why were some targets listed as still 'to be confirmed' in relation to projected CO2 emissions reductions;
- An update was sought on the Local Authority Green Homes Grant;
- Questioning the capacity and ability of the Manchester Climate Change Agency (MCCA) to lead and deliver on such an important issue for the city;
- Commenting that the Council contained the capacity and leadership to deliver the ambitions of the MCCA;
- More information was sought on the task-and-finish sub-group that had been convened to ensure the new organisational and governance structures of the MCCA were fit for purpose;
- Noting that the Council's own emissions had reduced more than the minimum target and that it was important to continue on this trajectory and all levers should be used to influence partners and organisations across the city to address their own carbon emissions;
- More needed to be done to improve and deliver green public transport; active travel and measures to address the emissions from domestic properties across all tenures;
- Consideration needed to be given to creating a local bank/bond scheme to support green investments;
- An explanation was sought as to the reported spike in emissions in 2015 attributed to Biffa;
- An update on the sustainable travel policy for Officers and Members was requested;
- An update on the activities to address emissions associated with aviation was requested;
- More information was requested on the Manchester Food Board;
- Would Manchester be represented at COP26, the international meeting to discuss global action on climate change;
- Could the Civic Quarter Heat Network supply domestic properties;
- How were the emissions generated from Northwards properties accounted for now that these had been brought back in house;

The Strategic Lead - Policy and Partnerships informed Members that the spike in emissions attributed to Biffa in 2015 was as a result of the change in the contract at that time which moved street sweeper vehicles from the Council's fleet to Biffa and was mirrored by a decrease in emissions in MCC's operational fleet at the same time.

He further commented that the impact of the new electric refuse collection vehicles within the fleet were yet to be realised but would be captured and reported.

The Strategic Lead - Policy and Partnerships noted the comment from the Committee regarding the need to continue with the trajectory of reducing the Council's emissions. He said this was understood and in response to the question regarding the targets that were listed as 'to be confirmed', he stated that this only applied to those projects where CO2 savings could not currently be quantified. He further confirmed that the sustainable travel policy for Officers and Members was still being progressed and updates would be provided at the appropriate time. In response to the question regarding aviation emissions he advised that the Committee would be receiving a substantive report on this item at the December meeting.

The Strategic Lead - Policy and Partnerships acknowledged the challenge and scale of retrofitting domestic properties, however modelling work had been undertaken across Greater Manchester (GM) and that evidence would inform the submission to central government as part of the Spending Review Submission. He further acknowledged the suggestion regarding the bond scheme and stated this would be taken away for consideration.

The Strategic Lead - Policy and Partnerships stated that the Climate Change Action Plan was designed to be clear and transparent, and he assured Members that the Zero Carbon Co-ordination Group met monthly to review the plan. He added that this would include discussions on the best way of reporting emissions from Northwards and their properties. He stated that it was important to have a pipeline of projects scheduled to continue to deliver the reduction in emissions. With reference to the question related to the Civic Quarter Heat Network he confirmed that this was not available to domestic properties, however the Zero Carbon Manager advised that work was underway at a GM level to consider the options to address domestic energy supply, adding that currently the production and supply of hydrogen is not sufficient to support large scale adoption of hydrogen boilers for domestic properties. In response to the discussion on the provision of energy she suggested that a report on the Local Energy Area Plan developed by the Energy Systems Catapult could be provided to the Committee for consideration at a future meeting.

The Strategic Lead - Policy and Partnerships stated that Manchester was working in collaboration with the other Core Cities to ensure there was a presence at COP26. He advised that a piece of work was underway to better articulate and communicate the Council's actions on climate change and that this would be included in the Council's website ahead of COP26.

The Executive Member for Environment referred to the Green Homes Grant and noted that lessons would be learnt to improve the take up rate of any future grant schemes. She said that a strategy would be developed with the Communications Team to ensure the correct message were directed at residents to maximise the take up.

The Executive Member for Environment stated that ongoing impact of austerity and budget cuts and the subsequent impact on Council staff numbers meant that the Council did not have the capacity to deliver the work and ambitions of the MCCA.

She stated that the benefits of a partnership model was demonstrated by the bringing together of a wealth of knowledge and resources across the city.

The Chair informed the Committee that a report on Food Sustainability would be scheduled for the Committee's January 2022 meeting and this would include information on the Manchester Food Board.

Decisions

The Committee:-

1. Endorse the recommendation that the Executive note the contents of the report, the progress that has been made in delivering the Action Plan during the first year (CCAP Annual Report 2020-21) and the work programme for the second year of the Action Plan (CCAP Work Programme 2021-22).
2. Agree that the Chair convenes a meeting with the Executive Member for Environment to discuss the concerns raised by Members regarding the Manchester Climate Change Agency.
3. Recommend that a report on the options to be considered relating to the provision of energy for domestic properties is included on the Committee's Work Programme.

ECCSC/21/16 Manchester Climate Change Agency Progress Report 2021/22

The Committee considered a joint report and presentation of the Interim Director and the Interim Policy and Strategy Advisor, Manchester Climate Change Agency that provided a progress update to the Committee on the Climate Change Agency's achievements to date during the year and reviewed work in progress.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing reasons for delaying publication of the Manchester Climate Change Partnership's Annual Report until September;
- Describing the context of the Manchester Climate Change Framework 2020-25 and its four headline objectives and the six priority areas for action;
- A narrative that described Partnership and Agency Progress 2021/22;
- Citywide Progress 2020/21, including aviation;
- Describing the rationale for developing Version 2.0 of the Framework for 2020-25, noting that Manchester was one of the first cities to adopt science-based carbon budgeting; and
- An update on National Policy and Local & National Government Joint-working.

The Committee also received a presentation from Simon Curtis, Chair, Manchester Arts and Sustainability Team that discussed the relationship between the arts and culture and climate change and how culture could engage with citizens on this issue to influence change.

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

- Action needed to be taken to reduce the demand on aviation, adding that technology alone was not the solution to reducing emissions from the aviation industry;
- The need for the Council to take the moral lead on the issue so as to inspire and influence change;
- Noting the importance and impact of Carbon Literacy Training, and that this should be delivered to all residents;
- Everyone needed to take responsibility for their own emissions, in particular in regard to the issue of consumption, especially in relation to clothing;
- A list of all organisations in Manchester of those that had signed up to the MCCA and a list of all those that had not, and where available the reasons for not signing up to be provided;
- Consideration needed to be given as to how targets and outcomes were reported, adding that this should be similar to the format of the Manchester Climate Change Action Plan;
- A report was required that evaluated whether the City Council was achieving value for money for its investment into the MCCA;
- Recognising the need to increase capacity within MCCA to influence and deliver this programme;
- The impact of poverty and emissions, noting that economically disadvantaged residents often did not own a vehicle or take flights; and
- Did the MCCA lobby the Government for funding to deliver schemes such as solar panels for schools and hospitals.

The Interim Director MCCA stated that it was important to recognise that the MCCA was not responsible for the targets but rather a body to coordinate all action plans of partners across the city. He reiterated the point that it was the responsibility of every organisation and individual to consider and take action to address their carbon emissions.

The Interim Director MCCA advised that MCCA did work with other cities to consider challenges at scale, such as the issue of aviation emissions as this provided an opportunity to share knowledge and best practice. He further acknowledged the comment regarding consumption and stated that it was an opportunity for organisations to challenge themselves through their own procurement process and supply chains. With reference to the list of organisations requested he stated that this could be provided following the meeting.

The Interim Director MCCA further advised that they did work with other Core Cities to lobby the Government for additional resources to fund initiatives and projects to reduce carbon emissions.

The Chair commented that she noted the Members comments regarding the format of the reports submitted by MCCA to the Committee, including the delivery of presentations at meetings. She said she would liaise with the Executive Member to discuss this further.

The Executive Member for Environment stated she acknowledged the comments regarding Carbon Literacy Training and said that there were good examples of how this could be delivered locally, and she would share good practice with Members for them to consider how this could be applied to their respective wards.

Decision

To note the report.

ECCSC/21/17 Planning and Its Contribution To Address Climate Change

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described how the planning policy and process was used to influence and address climate change, including an update on the Local Plan, describing the policy in relation to developer requirements to provide electric vehicle charging points and cycle storage facilities, and the approach to Environmental Impact Assessments.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing a background and overview of the planning policy framework, including the Core Strategy.
- An update on the Local Plan and the opportunities of the Local Plan refresh;
- The policy in relation to developer requirements to provide electric vehicle charging points and cycle storage facilities;
- The approach to Environmental Impact Assessments; and
- Conclusion and next steps.

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

- Planning policy and decisions were a significant lever at the disposal of the Council and should be used to maximise environmental improvements and address carbon emissions;
- Nothing in the city should be built that adversely affects the environment;
- All developments should support active travel by providing bike storage space and support the Council's ambition to reduce reliance on cars;
- Construction Management Plans should also be used to maximise environmental benefits, including the impact on noise pollution;
- Could Energy Reduction Targets be imposed following the completion of a development;
- There was no reference within the report to protecting existing bio diversity;
- Permitted development on domestic buildings needed to be monitored to ensure they were not adding to emissions; and
- Consideration needed to be given to addressing urban heat islands that occurred when cities replaced natural land cover with dense concentrations of pavement, buildings, and other surfaces that absorbed and retained heat.

The Head of Environment, Planning and Infrastructure informed the Committee that the Local Plan was one of a suite of strategies and he made reference to the Green

and Blue Strategy and the policies at both a Manchester level and GM level to address issues relating to transport and active travel.

The Planning Section Manager advised that the Environmental Impact Assessment considers a range of issues including the energy efficiency of the development, bio diversity, tree planting, drainage and highways. He commented that all applications were assessed and considered using existing national guidance and local policy and developers were always challenged to increase their contribution to reducing the developments' environmental impact, particularly in relation as to how they sourced their materials.

In response to the comments made regarding the monitoring of Construction Management Plans, the Planning Section Manager advised that if issues did occur there were a range of teams within the Council who would respond to these, and where necessary take enforcement action. He said that if a Construction Management Plan was not available at the application stage due to a contractor not being identified this would be stipulated as a condition of any consent granted.

The Planning Section Manager noted the comment made regarding permitted developments and stated that planning permission was not required for these, which in effect reduced the control the planning department had on such projects.

In response to the comment made regarding Heat Islands, the Planning and Infrastructure Manager advised that a piece of bespoke work had been commissioned to consider the open space across the city which would support work on the Local Plan refresh.

The Chair stated that every opportunity should be taken to increase green spaces and planting in the city so as to support and encourage bio diversity. She further suggested that a point of contact should be created so that developers could obtain advice on the type of tree and the best locations they should be planting them so as to maximise their impact.

Decision

To note the report.

ECCSC/21/18 Overview Report

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

Decision

The Committee note the report and agree the work programme.

This page is intentionally blank

Economy Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2021

Present:

Councillor Priest (Chair) – in the Chair
Councillors Farrell, Johns, Moore, Noor and Shilton-Godwin

Also present:

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment
Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing
Councillors Flanagan and Karney

Apologies: Councillor Baker-Smith, Bayunu, Doswell, Raikes and Stanton

ESC/21/34 Minutes

Two requests for information remain outstanding:

- Information on the GM Independent Inequalities Commission
- Information on housing support provided to asylum seekers has been highlighted not yet been actioned

Note that the Chair of Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee is happy for the Economy Scrutiny Committee to consider the audit on temporary accommodation ahead of the strategy being considered further

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 24 June 2021 as a correct record.

ESC/21/35 Places for Everyone Publication Plan 2021: A Joint Development Plan Document for Nine GM Authorities

The Committee considered a report of the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure, which sets out the proposed consultation on the publication stage of the Places for Everyone Publication Plan pursuant to Regulation 19, Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Places for Everyone set the plan for growth and ambition across Greater Manchester and was designed to align with Manchester's own local plan;
- The spatial strategy set out the position on growth, competitiveness and opportunities alongside the housing methodology;
- It considered the previous consultation exercise carried out as part of the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and set out the next steps following consultation

whereby the draft joint development plan document and representations would be submitted to the Secretary of State, a post-consultation report would then be prepared and then the plan submitted to the Secretary of State for Examination.

The report was also scheduled to be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 28 July 2021.

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

- The report and documentation referenced carbon neutral which was different to zero carbon. There needed to be greater clarity on what was expected in terms of carbon objectives within the report;
- Heat in cities and surrounding environments and whether consideration had been given to the role played by heat islands around buildings and developments?
- The employment land identified to the North of Manchester but outside the City identified in the consultation was important to North Manchester and its residents;
- It was felt that the report was very technical report and residents may not appreciate the impact and role they had to play in shaping the future;
- Members would like to see attempts to ensure widest possible engagement to get the plan out to residents;
- It was a large piece of work which had been married to the GM 2040 Transport Strategy, and it was questioned whether Stockport's removal had altered the transport impact?
- Many green spaces in Manchester were reclaimed brownfield land which in places were often more biodiverse than some of the greenbelt land itself. And it was pleasing to see that the report offered a good insight and nuance into the types of green space in Manchester; and
- Reference was made to the zero waste strategy and GM plans to move towards a circular economy in seeing waste as a resource.

The Planning and Infrastructure Manager stated that the plan didn't state zero carbon but did state carbon neutral by 2038 so did pick up the theme in the plan to an extent. It was reported that changes were not possible to this consultation but can be incorporated in future iterations.

In respect of the heat islands point, it was stated that the Environment Bill required net biodiversity gain which was built into the plan and in November the Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee would be considering a presentation on climate and environmental policy around heat island effects setting out the difference between green streets and those without.

On getting local buy-in the Planning and Infrastructure Manager stated that due to the strategic nature of the development plan document it had been difficult to get buy-in at a local level. Going forward, engagement was likely best achieved through the local plan. The development plan should be taken as a whole for Greater Manchester and not just the nine participating districts so each proposal did need to be considered as a whole.

Around the issue of the government reforms on local plans, at present there was no clarity on the draft legislation/expectations around local plans. The ongoing conversations would be considered in light of the proposals once they came forward.

It was reported that Stockport's Transport 2040 Strategy had been refreshed following its their from the GMSF. Manchester schemes were firmly in scope and it was reported that Manchester needed to focus efforts onto upcoming infrastructure tranches. The Head of Environment, Planning and Infrastructure informed the Committee of the government's recent commitment to £4.2bn for an integrated transport fund for eight city regions. Manchester was expecting to get a good share to put towards its 2040 strategy. It was also reported that both the TfGM/GMCA growth strategies and Places for Everyone were coming forward together.

In relation to the point around greenfield/brownfield sites, the Planning and Infrastructure Manager stated that Places for Everyone offered a strong urban regeneration framework. The plan could deliver site-specific outcomes with granular detail. Victoria North offered an example of integrating green/blue infrastructure in the city and it was important to look at all the aspects of green/blue infrastructure for the city.

The Executive member for Housing and Employment stated that the Plan would deliver 165,000 homes across Greater Manchester with 56,000 in Manchester, of which 20,000 would be affordable and 30,000 social rent. He added that the brownfield/greenfield discussion was a really important debate especially around what was defined as being brownfield land. He welcomed the plan coming together despite the Conservatives/Liberal Democrats blocking of affordable housing via GMSF in their borough

The Executive Member for Environment stated that conversations had started and a policy on the circular economy would come through Environment Scrutiny Committee, with the Chair of Economy Scrutiny updated on progress. She also added that community grants had recently been issued to encourage upcycling with HWRCs mending items to look to reuse items again.

Decisions

The Committee

1. Endorse the recommendations of the report to Executive on 28 July, those being:-
 - Approve the Places for Everyone Publication Plan 2021, including strategic site allocations and green belt boundary amendments, and reference to the potential use of compulsory purchase powers to assist with site assembly, and the supporting background documents, for publication pursuant to Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England)

Regulations 2012 for an 8 week period for representations to begin not earlier than 9 August 2021; and

- Delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing, in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration, to approve the relevant Statement of Common Ground(s) required pursuant to the National Planning Policy Framework 2019.
- 2. Recommend that conversations take place between Officers and Executive Members around resident engagement particularly in wards bordering other GM boroughs such as in Blackley.
- 3. Requests that a future update comes to the Committee regarding the policy on the circular economy

ESC/21/36 Victoria North (formerly Northern Gateway) progress update

The Committee considered a report of the Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth providing an update on the progress being made in delivering the Victoria North initiative (formerly Northern Gateway) which is seeking to transform 155 hectares of land at the northern edge of the City Centre through Collyhurst, New Cross and the Lower Irk Valley.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- In March 2019, Executive approved a final version of the Strategic Regeneration Framework which set out the vision for 15,000 homes over 15-20 years and offers the guidance document for both the joint venture with FEC and landowners.
- In February 2020, Executive approved the Strategic Business plan of the JV and the initial development area business plan
- In total, it is anticipated that 988 new homes will be delivered through the JV by no later than 2025. Progress is being made on Collyhurst Village Phase 1
- Executive agreed to provide a facility agreement to FEC to finance the development on commercial terms
- The report discusses the coordination between Victoria North and development at North Manchester Health Campus

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

- Councillor White introduced the report stating that it represents a key part of regeneration for the city as the biggest UK housing scheme on site with a significant investment in green space, reclamation of the valley and lots of decontamination works;
- Councillor Karney spoke to the committee in his capacity as a local councillor, stating that Collyhurst has waited over 11 years since the coalition cancelled the

previous development proposals. The scheme will deliver 240 new homes, 100 of which will be Council-owned. Collyhurst is the gateway to North Manchester and it's central to the renaissance and renewal of North Manchester and it's good to see that North Manchester voices are being heard to lead the country in building more council houses;

- Councillor Flanagan spoke to the committee in his capacity as a local councillor, stating that FEC's vision for the area was the most superior and he is delighted to see the delivery of new Council houses and 15,000 new homes. Officers are listening to ensure existing residents aren't displaced and he requests that the Committee supports local members in setting up a committee to oversee the development project. There are concerns around facilities such as the lack of school, health provision and removal of existing shops. Also, the scheme needs to ensure grey water capture to help the Irk Valley alongside the electrification of car charging points;
- What facilities will be provided for the local community such as health, education and transport in addition to job opportunities?
- How will housing profits be reinvested and the socially rented properties managed?
- The development of Victoria North, Northern Gateway and NMGH developments all benefit North Manchester. While it's good to see the inclusion of the voluntary sector and focus around 'Our Manchester' values, there needs to be wider involvement of councillors locally so elected members are better informed;
- Ambition around passivhaus is positive and hopefully consideration is being given to homes that will cool down easier rather than retaining heat. There's a need to consider heat islands in the development scheme in addition to the potential flood risk mitigation issues which pose a particular problem in the upper valley up to Oldham and Bury;
- The target of 16% affordable housing appears particularly low given the structure of this scheme, if this scheme can't deliver 20% affordable housing, how can anything?

The Head of Residential Growth ran through a presentation on the project with particular updates around the upcoming delivery of 30 homes in Collyhurst Village where determination is expected in August/September. The scheme will see FEC build-out the developments and then the Council will take ownership of the social rent properties. 29 demolitions are due to take place and a 1.3 Ha park is to be constructed. The difficulty is around unlocking the lower Irk valley due to constraints caused by historic contamination and rail infrastructure. £51.6m funding has been secured and contracting team have been appointed;

The Head of Work and Skills stated that from the outset of the scheme key partners are around the table. NMGH is waiting for DHSC approval as is Parkhouse Manchester/GMMHT. The updated social value policy from March is the basis for the scheme's social value approach.

HIF money gives investment into the river park;

The Head of Residential Growth stated that the provision of new social and community infrastructure is vital to ensure that the neighbourhood is connected going forward. Lots of health facilities are needed including dentists and but there's a need to agree the long-term funding from the NHS to ensure health provision catches-up. The scheme is looking to provide accommodation for existing retailers to remain in the local area. Net Zero carbon developments and low carbon housing are to be delivered alongside a focus on reducing carbon use/thermal insulation coupled with electric vehicle charging points. Over 40 Ha of new green space will be created with appropriate trees rather than tokenistic trees around the area. There is a challenge due to the flooding risk and the project team are using an Environment Agency framework to identify expertise and ensure the wider catchment area is considered as a whole.

The Interim Director of Housing and Residential Growth stated that the social housing will be managed by the Council alongside the newly transferred Northwards properties;

The Head of Residential Growth discussed the breadth of scheme including its size and scale alongside the wider framework for North Manchester area. The project team are working with Homes England, TfGM and education colleagues but there is a challenge around the funding, by comparison Ebbsfleet has a £350m infrastructure budget. In relation to the volume of affordable housing, there is an ongoing commercial negotiation with a registered provider so no clarity can be offered yet however the multi-phased nature of the project means it will ride through a number of development cycles: present issues are Brexit, pandemic and materials crisis;

Councillor White encouraged the need for Executive members to work together to establish the best approach to regeneration in the area and stated that the scheme as a whole will deliver 20% affordable housing but this depends on the nature of each individual development.

Decisions

1. To note the report
2. Future reports don't need to consider the background but should set out how risks and issues are being overcome as the scheme develops.
3. Future reports should include reference to the river valleys coordination and management plan, this report did not mention the work that is currently taking place;
4. Committee to feedback to Executive members around the most productive means of raising issues between Executive members on the scheme.

ESC/21/37 Section 106 – Impact of the implementation of the policy in delivering the City's priorities

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing which outlined the City's s.106 policy and examined the impact of s.106 contributions and the future direction of travel in light of the proposed national planning reforms.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Significant benefits can be achieved separate to s.106 with the planning process as a whole supporting substantial investment in Manchester
- The creation of the HAF presents the Council with a real opportunity to invest directly into the provision of affordable homes in Manchester
- The number of s.106 agreements signed has remained consistent with previous years despite the pandemic
- The government's planning white paper proposes reforms to s.106 and the CIL system and as such the future role remains uncertain

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

- Councillor Rawlins and White introduced the report stating how s.106 is just one of the tools available to the Council but provides a means to bring in funding for the Housing Affordability Fund to deliver inclusive growth for all across the city;
- The committee considered whether developers generally follow-through on their s.106 agreements, how many historic agreements remain outstanding and what clawback mechanisms exist;
- Why do so few major developments provide s.106 funding with the schemes in the report being small-scale, and is CIL worthwhile in Manchester?
- Due to the allocation of resources between committees it can be difficult to scrutinise. What's the process if there's no money left in the development company and how can it be reviewed?
- there is a sense of dissatisfaction around s.106 policy in Manchester and a feeling of a slight fragmentation of the wider picture. Wider insight can only be achieved by asking for full details.

The Director of Planning, Licensing and Building control introduced the report stating that s.106 is just one small part of the wider planning process which delivers the city's priorities as a whole. If all schemes come forward across the city, 45,000 jobs would come forward so it's important to put the context forward around the planning process.

S.106 are legally stringent obligations but their future remains uncertain in policy terms. The Community Infrastructure Levy is not collected in Manchester and wouldn't work for the city as it's based on values. In terms of major applications coming forward, it's not known until they come in what the impact and s.106 requirement will be. S.106 can only be applied to mitigate harm and housing schemes in particular are tested via viability assessments.

Historically, lots of s.106 agreements sat on workbooks but new governance arrangements in the Planning Department have meant that the Council are much more active in getting the money and spending it. At some point £10m+ was held but now down to £4m and being spent. New schedule of more extensive information will go to the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee and be circulated to members. Where the legal agreement is made, the agreement runs with the land. On Manchester

schemes developers are required to provide reconciliation before completion to ensure that any uplift is captured. It can be difficult to capture exactly what is delivered from each scheme (jobs aren't captured for example).

Councillor White and Councillor Rawlins set out that national planning guidance limits the scope of policy e.g affordable housing not being required below 15 units and the fact that developers can make profits before s.106 contribution comes about. As such, Manchester is bound to some extent by wider government planning policy.

Decisions

1. To note the report
2. Committee to have oversight of the s.106 report that goes to Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

ESC/21/38 Economy Covid-19 Sit Rep Report

The Committee considered a report of the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure and Director of Inclusive Economy which provided Members with an update on the current situation in the city in relation to Covid-19 and on the work progressing in Manchester within the Committee's remit.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The report offered a general overview in addition to considering updates on the following areas: developments, footfall, culture, infrastructure, work and skills, funding and government legislation

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

- Going forward, will Coronavirus legislation provide for party conferences to take place in Manchester
- Discussion around the Science Museum Group's air and space hall's closure. Promising suggestions around what might happen next.
- What support is being offered to the particular sectors where furlough is ongoing?
- The committee discussed the University of Manchester's move to online teaching in the future
- In light of retail closures, increase in car use and the impact of that on the city's carbon use, what's being done to encourage people onto public transportation and what support is provided to local district centres?

The Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure stated that the city is still facing challenges post-covid but there are a number of measures being put in place to accelerate the city's recovery;

The Upper and Lower Campfield Markets had gone into Manchester's Levelling up fund bid with a view to future workspace, commercial use and retail but generally with the aim that the buildings make a positive contribution to the city;

The Director of Inclusive Economy set out that the current partnership of the job centre, business advice and growth company continue to offer support. If an employer is making more than 20 staff redundant/at risk this will be notified so a direct approach can be made to ensure workers' protection. However, some of these issues are not very predictable e.g Hospitality sector is missing skilled workers whereas a year ago the opposite was predicted.

The University of Manchester have pulled back from the position of online learning but Higher Education institutions remain in a mixed position. MMU want in-person teaching to resume;

Both the House of Fraser and Debenhams buildings are looking at office use to repurpose the stores. Very positive but will alter the dynamic of the high street;

Face coverings agreed to be used in GM on Metrolink. Work is being done to promote public transport. The Head of Planning, Environment and Infrastructure stated that TfGM are working with major employers to enable behaviour change and travel policy work is going on with a transition back to the workplace anticipated. Highways usage has increased but public transport has a way to go yet but public transport policy settings are being accelerated.

Councillor White stated that Manchester footfall is above the national average pre-pandemic. Recovering fast and there's something further to look into in district centres and how adaptation can take place going forward.

Decisions

To note the report.

ESC/21/39 Overview Report

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which provided the Committee with details of key decisions that fall within the Committee's remit and an update on actions resulting from the Committee's recommendations. The report also includes the Committee's work programme, which the Committee is asked to amend as appropriate and agree.

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

- A response on accommodation support for people seeking asylum has been highlighted as actioned but this is still yet to be received.

- Previous recommendations aspect. Brownfield land register has been allocated to Richard Elliott, this should be amended to Michael Marriott - Head of Planning, environment and Infrastructure.

Decision

To note the report.

Economy Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 9 September 2021

Present:

Councillors Baker-Smith, Bayunu, Farrell, Noor, Raikes, Stanton, Strong and Shilton
Godwin

Also present:

Councillor Leese, Leader
Councillor Craig, Deputy Leader
Councillor Sharif Mahamed, Assistant Executive Member (Antipoverty)
Councillor Midgley, Executive Member for Health and Care
Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Employment

Apologies: Councillors H. Priest, Johns and Doswell

ESC/21/40 Appointment of Chair

Noting the apologies received from the Chair, Councillor Farrell was nominated to Chair the meeting. This was seconded and approved.

Decision

To appoint Councillor Farrell as Chair for the meeting.

ESC/21/41 Minutes

Decision

The minutes of the meeting held on 22 July 2021 were approved as a correct record.

ESC/21/42 Manchester's support for families living in poverty

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Director of Inclusive Economy that provided an overview of the Council's response to poverty, including an update on the Family Poverty Strategy Reprioritisation.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background, noting that poverty in Manchester was deeply engrained and formed one of the most significant challenges due to its wide ranging and profound impacts on the people affected;
- The scale of the challenge had been further exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic;

- Noting that the Council and partners had a long-standing commitment to tackling poverty and supporting all its diverse residents to lead happy, healthy and fulfilling lives;
- Information on the rationale and approach taken to the Family Poverty Strategy 2017-22 Reprioritisation;
- Delivery of the Family Poverty Strategy, with examples of current activity and best practice;
- The approach to communications with residents;
- The Council's corporate role in tackling poverty;
- The impact of the Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) sector;
- Tackling poverty through day-to-day service design and delivery, with descriptions and examples provided across a range of Directorates and services; and
- The Council's response to COVID-19, noting the key achievements of the work to date.

The Committee also received a presentation from representative of Munchers Poverty Truth Commission, which informed Members of the findings of the investigation in to the Question "What if people who struggled against poverty were involved in making decisions about tackling poverty?". One of the key learnings from the Poverty Truth Commission was the value in developing relationships with people who share different life experiences and deeply listening to the impact of those experiences

The Committee was invited to comment on the report prior to it being considered by Executive.

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

- That the voices of people with lived experience of poverty was important and there was a need to keep including commissioners to feed-back information;
- Whether the Family Poverty Strategy could link into and be considered alongside other Council strategies;
- That there was a stigma attached to poverty and it was questioned as to how people could be encouraged to ask for help without losing their self-esteem;
- Did the Executive feel that some recommendations are more challenging than others;
- That the Marmot Review (into Health Inequalities) referred to in the report confirmed weaknesses around gender and race inequalities and that this could affect how the Council looked at the implementation of recommendations;
- Would there be some wider Scrutiny focus implemented to share reports and recommendations between Committees;
- That, whilst access to work and working was important, it was not a reality for all and to consider the Poverty Premium for people with disabilities and/or illnesses that keep them out of work; and
- That consultation was key to decision making.

The Deputy Leader confirmed that the Executive for Health and Care and the Assistant Executive Member (Antipoverty) were leading on the Family Poverty agenda and would bring together everything the Council was doing around the issue of poverty and looking at measures of support and prevention. The Deputy Leader stated that the report showed some of the harder issues and added that certain aspects of the Poverty Report (i.e. Revenues & Benefits) would be fed back to other Scrutiny Committees and it would be helpful for these to be shared with the Economy Scrutiny Committee in a year's time.

The Executive Member for Health and Care stated that the report was to provide information on the refresh approach to Family Poverty and confirmed her agreement with the need to include people with lived experience. The Executive Member for Health and Care stated that COVID-19 had exposed and widened many of the inequalities in people's lives and that the Council were committed to sharing the successes of the city with its inhabitants so all have the same opportunity to thrive but added that some of the policies were national and beyond the scope of the Council's response on the issue. The Executive Member for Health and Care stated that next month's Economy Scrutiny Committee would focus on aspects considered within the Marmot Review and added that the Family Poverty Strategy took consideration of some people's inability to work and felt that there was a need to look at tackling the poverty premium.

The Assistant Executive Member (Antipoverty) confirmed that he was taking the lead on Antipoverty and working closely with the Family Poverty Strategy group and referred to the report for information on how the Council was working with vulnerable residents across the city. The Assistant Executive Member (Antipoverty) referred to the work being done on family poverty but gave mention of the pandemic's affect across single adults and adult households and that when the wider review was complete in 2022 this demographic would form part of the ongoing review.

The Director of Inclusive Economy stated that there were three core themes to the Family Poverty Strategy, namely – access to quality sustainable work as a route out of poverty, focusing on the basics such as food and fuel and the third being boosting resilience and building on strengths. The Director of Inclusive Economy stated that part of the Family Poverty Strategy focused on families with children, noting that there had been an increase in the reliance on free school meals during the pandemic and echoed the Assistant Executive Member for Antipoverty's comments around single adults and adult households needs being included to broaden the strategy's aims.

A guest speaker from the Poverty Truth Commission stated that a shared sense of community between people with similar experiences could be a great help to individuals with regard to self-esteem and capturing these experiences should also feed into strategies to tackle poverty.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment stated that Manchester Adult Education Service (MAES) formed part of the response to the lack of work by training 3,000 adults per year.

Decisions

The Committee endorse the recommendations that the Executive:

1. Note the progress that has been made in delivering the Family Poverty Strategy 2017-22;
2. Note the Council's commitment to tackling poverty and its overall offer to residents;
3. Note the recommendations of the Poverty Truth Commission Report; and
4. Endorse the suggested approach to the refresh of the Family Poverty Strategy to address poverty more broadly and support all residents experiencing poverty; those with and without children.

ESC/21/43 Manchester's Digital Strategy

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Inclusive Economy that sought the Committees views on the approval for the adoption of the Manchester Digital Strategy.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing a background and purpose of the Manchester Digital Strategy;
- Describing the stated ambition to make Manchester one of the world's leading smart cities and digital economies in the next five years;
- Describing the development of the strategy;
- The impact of Covid-19 on the growth of the digital sector;
- An overview of the consultation process that had taken place from September 2020 to March 2021 with business, public and VCSE sectors and community organisations and networks;
- The delivery of the strategy and governance arrangements; and
- Describing how the strategy would directly contribute to achieving Manchester's zero-carbon target.

The Committee was invited to comment on the report prior to it being considered by Executive at its meeting on 15 September 2021.

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

- What processes were in place to deal with electrical waste when digital devices were superseded;
- Who would own the infrastructure that was being proposed;
- It was good to see an international context within the strategy;
- How would the creative industry sector of the city feature in contributing to the strategy; and
- The Council should not lose sight of the number of residents in the city that were digitally excluded.

The Director of Inclusive Economy commented that in terms of ownership of the infrastructure, the Council had joined the Digital Co-op, who had developed an interface between the digital providers and end users to enable new developments to be provider neutral which would enable opportunities for new providers to enter the market. In terms of waste from the digital sector, it was noted that at present the strategy did not address this, but it was agreed that this issue would be looked at and consideration would be given as to how this could be built into the strategy.

The Committee was also informed that the time the strategy was being developed the cultural organisations in the city were implementing their recovery plans post covid and there was quite a bit of overlap, which had been taken on board in the development in the strategy and it was acknowledged that creative and digital sectors of the city sat well together and was one of the city's strengths.

Decision

The Committee endorse the recommendation that the Executive adopt the Manchester Digital Strategy as part of the City's policy framework.

ESC/21/44 Digital Exclusion Index

The Committee considered the report and presentation of the Director of Inclusive Growth that described what the index was, how it worked, some of the initial trends the index provided in relation to residents and areas of the City with greatest likelihood of being digitally excluded and finally to provide a number of recommendations on how the index could be used to create better targeted interventions and more long-lasting change.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Describing the background and rationale for developing the Manchester Digital Exclusion Index;
- Describing what digital exclusion was and who affected;
- Describing what the Manchester's Digital Exclusion Index was and its purpose; and
- Conclusion and next steps.

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

- Some of the data in the presentation was from Census 2011 and it would be interesting to compare with the Census update expected in 2022;
- That it would be useful to see how Manchester compared to other cities;
- That intervention would be key and would be an on-going learning process;
- Would developing the impact measurement tool affect how other organisations used the index; and
- That an update on the implications of digital exclusion during the pandemic would be useful.

The Work and Skills Specialist stated that comparing the 2011 data with the update next year may expose more challenges and added that GMCA were involved nationally, speaking with other cities and sharing information, adding that Manchester was unique in gathering more information and leading the way in certain areas. The Work and Skills Specialist stated that a support guide would be of help to support communities and inform them on applying for funding and added that the report would help raise awareness of specific needs at schools and for single households.

The Chair concluded by stating that there was a likely overlap with the Digital Exclusion Index map of the North of the city with the Council owned housing stock that the Council needs to address.

Decisions

To note the report.

ESC/21/45 Economy COVID-19 Sit Rep Report

The Committee considered the report of the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure that provided Members with a further update summary of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of this Committee.

The report offered a general overview in addition to considering updates on the following areas: footfall, higher education institutions, aviation, culture, development, affordable housing, transport and infrastructure, skills, labour market and business support and funding

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

- As there was a skills shortage, was there any funding available to support skills development?
- The increase in wages in lower waged sectors was welcomed;
- Was there a knock-on effect on prices locally?
- Was there any work being done to skill match/upgrade people who were coming to the end of their furlough and likely to have their roles disestablished?
- Was information up to date regarding transport use?
- Was there a shift to smaller office space and had the retail sector returned completely?

The Director of Inclusive Economy stated that work was being done with JobCentre+ and hospitality industries to link people with job opportunities as well as linking with Government programmes and MAES. The Director of Inclusive Economy confirmed North Manchester was a priority target for funding and gave mention of the Kickstart

scheme for under 25 year olds whereby a range of employers offered six months paid experience and a career pathway.

The Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure confirmed that price increases were evident in the construction industry and addressed the question on transport, stating that rail use was low and bus use was high, especially at peak times. Addressing the question around returning to the workplace, the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure stated that larger businesses were more able to continue away from the office and that retail was still a challenge.

The Leader stated that the wage increase in the hospitality sector was welcomed but noted that this sector largely moved into the care sector during the pandemic but were now returning, leaving a staff shortage in care sector which needed urgent attention. The Leader stated that Brexit and the associated decrease in the student population had affected the amount of people covering roles in the care sector.

Decision

The Committee note the report.

ESC/21/46 Overview Report

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

Decision

The Committee note the report.