

Audit Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2018

Present:

Councillor Watson - In the Chair
Councillors Connolly, Lanchbury, Russell and A. Simcock

Also Present:

Councillor Bridges Executive Member for Children's Services
Councillor Craig Executive Member for Adults Health and Wellbeing

Apologies: Councillor Ahmed Ali.
Mr S Downs (Co-opted member) and Dr D Barker (Co-opted member)

AC/18/50 Appointment of Chair

In the absence of Councillor Ali, the Committee was requested to make a nomination for a Chair for the meeting.

Councillor Watson was nominated by Councillor A Simcock and this was seconded by Councillor Lanchbury.

Decision

To appoint Councillor Watson as Chair of the meeting.

AC/18/51 Minutes

The minutes of the Audit Committee held on 3 September 2018 were submitted for approval.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 3 September 2018 as a correct record.

AC/18/52 Internal Audit Assurance Report

The Committee considered the report of the City Treasurer and the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management which provided a summary of the work of the Internal Audit Section for the period April to September 2018. The report included progress toward delivery of the annual audit plan, a summary of assurance opinions on completed audits, counter fraud and investigation and a summary position on the implementation of Internal Audit recommendations.

The Chair invited questions from the committee.

A member referred to internal audit work on commissioning and contract management work and what plans are in place to include this within the work of Internal Audit.

It was reported that the Internal Audit Service had undertaken considerable work in procurement, contracts and commissioning work, focussing on insurance, whistleblowing and social value within contracts as well as working closely with the procurement team.

A member asked if officers would prioritise the audit work that had been removed from the current year's work plan as detailed in paragraph 2.4 of the report relating to audits of:

- Software Licensing;
- Public Contracts Regulations Compliance; and
- Manchester Support for Independent Living

The meeting was informed that the audits moved from the current work plan would be considered as a priority in the work plan for 2019/20.

A member referred to the lower priority rating of the audit of Manchester Support for Independent Living and requested officers to provide further information on the decision to delay the audit.

In response to a question from a member regarding the fee charged by the external partner for work to recover overpayments or unclaimed credit notes, it was reported that the fee would be 15% of the total recovered.

The Chair referred to audit work to deal with Manchester Health Care Commissioning (MHCC) and Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO) and requested an update on progress.

The Committee was informed that audit plans had been shared with auditors from Manchester Foundation Trust and the Care Commissioning Group. Audits had been undertaken by the Council on specific areas and jointly with MHCC and MLCO. An update report would be submitted to the Audit Committee at a future meeting.

Officers were requested to provide a separate report providing progress on the working arrangements for audit work of Mental Health casework compliance in respect of the Greater Manchester Mental Health Trust to the meeting of the Audit Committee on 11 February 2018.

Reference was made to the success of recovery work regarding Council Tax Support, Housing Tenancy Fraud and Right to Buy application fraud and officers were requested to ensure that such information was publicised widely through the Council's Communications Team.

Decisions

1. To note the report submitted and the comments raised.
2. To request that a report is submitted to the next meeting of the Committee providing a review of lower priority rating of the audit of Manchester Support for Independent Living.
3. To request that a report is submitted to the meeting of the Committee in February 2019 to give an update on the working arrangements of audit work of Mental Health casework compliance in respect of the Greater Manchester Mental Health Trust.

AC/18/53 Outstanding Audit Recommendations

The Committee considered the quarterly report of the City Treasurer and the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management which provided information on the current implementation position and arrangements for monitoring and reporting internal and external audit recommendations. The report contained only Internal Audit recommendations.

The Chief Operating Officer (Neighbourhoods) and the Strategic Lead Officer (Events Parks and Leisure) attended the meeting to introduce the report and an update on actions taken on the development of an Events Strategy and Events Management.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

Officers were requested to provide more information on resources for events and the appointment of staff.

It was reported that the post of 'Head of Events' had not been filled after advertising the post on two occasions. Following a review of the position it was decided that the role would be combined to include other responsibilities and was advertised again. It was anticipated that suitable candidates would apply and an appointment could be made from the process. The Committee was informed that unanticipated events such as large scale parades and demonstrations within the city had contributed to pressure placed on current resources.

The Chair referred to the holding of events within Albert Square and asked officers if this would be included within the Strategy as part of the refurbishment of the Town Hall.

The Committee was assured that the refurbishment of the Town Hall and Albert Square would be included within the Strategy and this will take into account the use of the area as a future venue in view of changes taking place to other outdoor venues within the city. The Albert Square area would be enhanced with an increased pedestrian area and reduced traffic flow and the inclusion of barrier protection in line with the advice received on counter terrorism.

A member referred to the use of new venues identified in the strategy and sought

assurance that, where necessary, local residents and resident's groups would be fully informed and consulted on events proposed.

It was reported that the Events Strategy will include engagement with elected members and a check will be made with the Executive Members concerned on whether residents will be included in this. The Strategy will include provision for the notification of events at venues within residential areas, such as the Castlefield Bowl, and this will continue to take place well in advance of a planned event.

A member referred to the list of overdue recommendations and asked officers which of the recommendations is causing most concern.

The meeting was informed that the audit work relating to Liquid Logic Data Migration and Testing Phase 1, for the reason that the system dealt with issues relating to children's and adults social care. All outstanding audits would be monitored and an update would be provided on this within the next report to the Committee.

The Committee agreed that it was satisfied with the assurance provided within the report it had considered.

Decisions

1. To note the report submitted and the comments received.
2. To note that the next report on Outstanding Recommendations will include an update on the position of overdue recommendations.

AC/18/54 2018/19 Annual Governance Statement (AGS) – Summary of Progress to Date

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive which provided a summary of progress that has been made to date in implementing the governance recommendations from 2017/18 Annual Governance Statement (AGS). The report also outlined the next steps in the process of producing the Annual Statement for 2019/20. The AGS provides explanation of the governance challenges the Council is facing and these are reported on a six monthly basis to ensure the challenges continue to remain in focus on how they are addressed.

The Chair welcomed the report, in particular, the comprehensive coverage on the range of governance challenges it provides.

The Committee considered the actions listed in the report and the Chair invited the Committee to ask questions.

Members referred to the Our Manchester Behaviours process involving staff self-assessment and Listening in Action events. Members agreed that it was important to ensure that the Our Manchester approach in the delivery of Council services was consistent across the authority. Reference was also made to the reducing number of staff attending Listening in Action events and an assurance was sought from officers that all staff will be provided with the opportunity and time to attend an event

regardless of their role within the authority and location.

Officers noted the comments and suggested that a comprehensive response to the points raised would be included within the next Annual Governance Statement.

A member reported that the Resources and Governance Human Resources Sub-Group could consider the issues raised regarding Listening in Action and the Our Manchester Strategy as part of an annual report to be submitted on the BHeard survey.

The Chair referred to the Our Manchester Experience and requested that the work to refresh the experience take into account the feedback of the Older Peoples Board, in particular the wealth of local knowledge and experience that older people possess about the city. Also the observation that listening to residents is crucial to the success of experience.

A member referred to the number of Freedom of Information (FOI) requests made to the Council annually and asked officers to provide information on the time taken to respond to each request made and how much of the information requested was usually already available within the public domain and the cost to the Council.

It was reported that the Council receives up to 3000 (approx) FOI and other information requests annually and this generated a significant cost to the Council in processing and providing responses. Based on the popular information requests submitted, information is included on the Council website in order to address future requests. The Annual Complaints report will include details on the number of complaints and requests received however, this did not include use of resources such as staff time spent on the requests or cost.

A member referred to the implementation of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) requirements across the Council on asked officers if this was on schedule to be achieved.

Officers undertook to report back to the Committee on the current position regarding GDPR.

The Chair referred to Action 11 within the report and requested that the Human Resources Sub-Group consider the issues raised relating to the improvement of governance and communication of workforce policy and associated guidance, including embedding new ways of working.

Councillor Russell reported that the subject of improvement of governance and communication of workforce policy and associated guidance, including embedding new ways of working was not on the current work programme of the Sub-Group. Councillor Russell undertook to include the topic in the work programme for future consideration.

Decisions

1. To note the report submitted and the assurance provided.

2. To request that the Annual Governance Statement includes a response to concerns expressed regarding the consistency of the implementation of the Our Manchester behaviours across all areas of the Council's services and staff.
3. To request the Resources and Governance Human Resources Sub-Group to consider a report that provides feedback on the BHeard survey, an update on the training and implementation of the Our Manchester Strategy and to update on the arrangements for Council staff to attend Listening in Action events.
4. To note the comments made regarding the Our Manchester Experience and to pass the comments on to the officers involved in the refresh of the experience.
5. To request that, as part of the Annual Complaints report, officers include details on the number of Freedom of Information and other subject access requests made to the Council and provide details of the average length of staff time taken to process a request and costs involved.
6. To request the Resources and Governance Human Resources Sub-Group to consider issues raised within Action 11 of the report submitted relating to "improvement of governance and communication of workforce policy and associated guidance, including embedding new ways of working".

(The Chair adjourned the meeting at 11:00am and resumed the meeting at 11:06am)

AC/18/55 Governance Improvement Progress for Partnerships with Medium of High Risk Assessment Ratings

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and the City Treasurer which provided an update on progress made to strengthen governance arrangements in the fourteen partnerships where a 'Medium' or 'High' Partnership Governance Risk Assessment was recorded in the 2017 Register of Significant Partnerships. The report provided information on the progress made in the governance of the partnerships since the submission of the latest version of the register to the meeting of the Committee on 25 January 2018.

A member referred to the partnership involve with Brunswick PFI (entry 55) and asked if there had been any improvement following the issue of warning notices to S4B to highlight specific contract concerns.

It was reported that the Brunswick PFI had been rated as a 'Medium' risk partnership and it was not anticipated that this be changed to a 'Low' risk rating at this stage. The rating would be reassessed as part of the review of the Risk Partnership Register.

The Chair referred to the concerns raised regarding Manchester Service for Independent Living and the need for the service to fully integrate with other health

care related services. In view of the concerns on the partnership and the request to reconsider the priority given for audit work, officers were asked what action would be taken. It was noted that although governance arrangements concerning systems and processes within the organisation had improved the Service Level Agreement relating to the Council and three Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCG) was awaiting ratification.

It was reported that officers would look into the audit of Manchester Service for Independent Living in light of the comments made and would revisit the existing audit assumptions. A watching brief would be maintained on the partnership with a further update in the report to be submitted to the meeting of the Committee on 11 February 2019. A check would also be made on the position of the Service Level Agreement sign off.

A member referred to delays in the provision of wheelchairs and requested officers to include information on this situation as part of the review.

Decisions

1. To note the progress made to improve the governance arrangements in the partnerships detailed within the report submitted.
2. To note the comments received in respect of Manchester Service for Independent Living and request officers to undertake a review of the audit assumptions made on Manchester Service for Independent Living and provide an update on the partnership for the meeting of the Committee on 11 February 2018.

AC/18/56 Treasury Management Interim Report 2018-19

Members considered the report of the City Treasurer that provided Members with information on the Treasury Management activities of the Council during the first six months of 2018-19. The City Treasurer introduced the report by stating that the Housing Investment Fund would transfer to GMCA before the next financial year end; based on the forecast cash flow, that the level of temporary deposits will continue to fall and that therefore the Council will need to borrow further funding during 2018/19; and On 10 November 2017 DCLG (now MHCLG) published a consultation on changes to the guidance on local authority investments and Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP).

In response to question from a Member regarding the European Investment Bank (EIB) the City Treasurer stated that borrowing from the EIB was made against infrastructure projects and a decision on these was pending.

The City Treasurer said that the requirement for local authorities to disclose their dependence on commercial income to deliver statutory services and the amount of borrowing that has been committed to generate that income was a positive development that will allow for a more transparent reporting mechanism.

In response to a question from the Chair regarding the ten changes to the statutory guidance published by the MHCLG the City Treasurer said that she broadly welcomed these, however expressed caution that they should not place too many restrictions on Local Authorities ability to borrow or invest if one or two Local Authorities acted irresponsibly. When asked the external auditor said that the changes did not present any concerns to them.

The Chair commented that the glossary that had been provided with the report was very beneficial for the lay reader.

Decision

To note the report submitted.

AC/18/57 External Audit Progress Report and Update

Members considered the report of Mazars, the Councils appointed external auditor that provided the Committee with an update in progress in delivering their responsibilities for the 2018/19 audit as the external auditor. The report detailed the areas of activity and the timescales for delivering and reporting on these. The report further highlighted national publications and guidance that are relevant to the work of the Committee.

The External Auditor commented that work was ongoing as described and the Audit Plan will be reported to a future meeting of the Committee.

A Member asked if the Transformation Guidance for Audit Committees applied to partners noting that many of the principals described should be considered by partners such as the Local Care Organisation. The External Auditor replied that the guidance had been produced primarily for Audit Committees to help them consider how they could robustly challenge and monitor transformation projects, noting that in many cases transformation programmes rely on new technologies and online services, and are highly ambitious and have a high risk of failure.

The Chair commented that the 'Our Manchester' approach was dependant on people and influencing behaviour change to transform the organisation and delivery of services.

Decision

To note the report submitted.

AC/18/58 Progress Report on Manchester City Council's Commissioning and Contract Management

The Committee considered the report of the City Treasurer that summarised progress against the actions set out in the contract management improvement work plan approved by the council's Senior Management Team on 27 February and the recommendations of the Audit Committee in January 2018.

The Head of Integrated Commissioning introduced the report, stating that a great deal had been achieved in the last seven months in relation to governance, monitoring and accountability, with notable progress on completion and analysis of contract registers, the development of standard products and processes, and growing awareness and tools for monitoring social value in contract delivery.

The Head of Integrated Commissioning stated that work was also ongoing with health partner in the Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC) and the Local Care Organisation, however the scale and complexity of the challenge should not be underestimated, given the number, value and variety of external contracts, the Council's ambition for delivering for Manchester residents, and the pressing need to maximise value for money. The report noted that this was a long-term improvement programme, and there remained much work to be done.

A member commented that she welcomed the establishment of a standard contract register as a mechanism for the efficient monitoring of contracts. She commented that this would enable conversations to be had with local, smaller suppliers to encourage them to bid for contracts noting that it was important that barriers to doing this needed to be removed. The Head of Integrated Commissioning stated that this was being undertaken as the new model supported this approach.

In response to Members questions the Head of Integrated Commissioning informed the Committee that she would circulate the figures of how many contracts existed per Directorate and information on those contracts that were rated as either Gold, Silver or Bronze as assessed for their criticality. The Chair welcomed this, noting that this may inform future work of the Committee and if necessary the Committee may wish to consider referring matters to the appropriate Scrutiny Committee.

A Member requested further information on the Directorates that would develop forward commissioning pipelines on the basis of risk and criticality, and reflect in service and budget plans, with first drafts to be completed by December 2018, to be combined in City Council and MHCC forward planning. The Head of Integrated Commissioning said that this would be shared with Members, mindful that some information was commercially sensitive and advice on this would be provided.

The City Treasurer responded to comment from a Member regarding staff training to manage contracts noting that the Council currently commissioned and procured over £0.5bn of services from third parties, the scale of which illustrates the importance of this function by saying that this has been identified as a priority workforce development and funding had been identified to deliver staff training.

In response to a question from the Chair the Head of Integrated Commissioning confirmed that the reported £0.5bn was for the procurement of a variety of services, such as homecare, highways and children's' services for example and not capital expenditure and was an annual figure. The Chair commented that this was a significant amount of money and highlighted why this activity was so important.

A Member asked how much money was being saved currently and what future saving would be realised by delivering this approach to commissioning and contract management. The Head of Integrated Commissioning said that work was ongoing

with each Directorate so that they are prepared for the re procurement of services and the awarding of new contracts and commented that any savings achieved would be retained by the relevant service Directorate budget. She said that work was ongoing to prioritise high risk areas and opportunities for achieving savings from existing contracts were being explored. She said savings would be achieved long term through a more robust, timely and efficient monitoring and management of contracts. She made particular reference to the Neighbourhoods Directorate who had embraced and developed a very good model to review their contracts that would be shared with other Directorates to support them with this activity and influence behaviour change.

In response to a question asked by the Chair the Head of Integrated Commissioning reported that those contracts that had been identified for priority review were as a result of them being because they were time sensitive or had been identified by the Senior Management Team to achieve specific strategic objectives. She said priorities would be reviewed each year taking into consideration budget priorities and strategic plans.

The Chair noted the reported progress and requested that future update reports on this important area of work contained examples.

Decision

To note the report submitted.

AC/18/59 Annual Audit Letter for Year Ending 31 March 2018

Members considered the Annual Audit Letter from the Council's previous external auditor (Grant Thornton) for the year ended 31 March 2018.

The Chair thanked Grant Thornton for the hard work of the staff involved with the external audit of the Council's finances and the help and advice the company had provided to the committee during this working relationship.

Decision

To note the Annual Audit Letter.

AC/18/60 Work Programme and Audit Committee Recommendations Monitor

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

Decision

To note that the Work Programme and Recommendations Monitor will be updated for the next meeting of the Audit Committee.

Health and Wellbeing Board

Minutes of the meeting held on 31 October 2018

Present

Councillor Richard Leese, Leader of the Council (MCC) (Chair)
Councillor Bev Craig, Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing (MCC)
Councillor Garry Bridges, Executive Member for Children's Services (MCC)
Councillor Sue Murphy, Executive Member for Public Service Reform
Jim Potter, Chair, Pennine Acute Hospital Trust
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University Hospitals Foundation Trust (MFT)
Dr Ruth Bromley, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Dr Denis Colligan, GP Member (North) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Dr Murugesan Raja, GP Member Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Neil Walbram, Healthwatch
David Regan, Director of Public Health
Paul Marshall, Strategic Director of Children's Services
Dr Tracey Vell, Primary Care representative – Local Medical Committee

Also present

Peter Blythin, Director SHS Programme – Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust
Cym D'Souza, Chief Executive - Arawak Walton Housing Association
Robin Lawler, Chief Executive, Northwards Housing
Sean Duffy, Manchester Housing Providers' Partnership
Graham Mellors, Central Manchester GP Federation
Julia Shephens-Row, Independent Chair of the Manchester Safeguarding Boards
Craig Harris – Executive Director Safeguarding

Apologies

Rupert Nichols, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust
Vicky Szulist, Chair, Healthwatch
Mike Wild, Voluntary and Community Sector representative

HWB/18/28 Minutes

Decision

To agree the minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 29 August 2018.

HWB/18/29 Our Healthier Manchester Single Hospital Service Update

The Board received a report from the Director of Single Hospital Service (SHS) Programme which provided an update on the progress of the SHS. The report referred to delivery of the integration plans and Year Two post-merger plans following the creation of Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust (MFT) and the current position regarding the proposal for MFT to acquire North Manchester

General Hospital (NMGH). The Board also viewed the MFT “Together Care Matters – Our Values” video to demonstrate the ongoing work to engage staff and develop positive culture, values and leadership across the organisation.

The Chair invited questions.

Members commented that the positive benefits provided by a single trust were noticeable and included the positivity and moral of staff to continue to develop and improve care and an increase in efficiency through dealing with a single citywide organisation rather than of a number of trusts.

A member referred to the involvement of Healthwatch and questioned why the number of Quality Impact Assessments (QIA) had increased from a single QIA, as previously reported, to four hundred QIAs.

It was reported that a review of the Single Hospital Service had revealed a large number of QIAs across the Trust. The Trust is committed to equality and diversity and the Integration Steering Group had received a report on the issue which would be shared with Healthwatch.

In welcoming the report, the Chair referred to the partnership of the MFT, Manchester Primary Care Partnership (MPCP) and Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO) and the work to move towards a preventative care approach away from hospital and closer to patient’s homes and asked would this be addressed in the next report.

The Board was informed that the report submitted had focussed primarily on the first year of the MFT, however during this period the MFT has provided a lot of support to the work of the MLCO. It was reported that a partnership of MFT, MLCO, the Council and MPCP is working to move the provision of care out of hospital and into patient’s homes. An example of this joint work included the recent discharge of 57 patients over a period of seven weeks who’s stay within hospital had gone over 100 days.

In noting the good progress made with MFT and the improvements in care provision in Wythenshawe and Central Manchester the Chair commented that the progress of the transformation journey had been delayed and it was necessary to accelerate the work in the development of a different approach to care. The point was also made that patient care at NMGH had suffered as a result of the uncertainty around the acquisition and transformation process of NMGH and it was now vital to finalise and agree a strategic case in order to move forward.

The meeting was informed that MFT is working closely with SRFT to accelerate two strategic cases. Further discussions with National Health Service Improvement (NHSI) had been necessary to resolve questions raised on national funding and NHSI options appraisal. This process would help to avoid a delay in completing the strategic case. It was reported that meetings would take place on 9 November with the Transaction Board and 21 November with the NHSI and it was anticipated progress could be made. It was acknowledged that the time taken in this process may be having an impact on the moral of staff at NMGH and staff engagement meetings had taken place to provide assurance to staff. As part of its involvement in

the transformation process, SRFT was working to ensure patient safety is maintained at NMGH and arrangements were in place to promote NMGH to oversees nursing staff and recruit additional nursing staff in the short term.

Decisions

1. To note the report submitted and the comments received.
2. To note the current position of the Single Hospital Programme.

HWB/18/30 Children and Adults Safeguarding Boards Annual Reports

The Board received a report from the Chair of the Manchester Safeguarding Boards, the Strategic Director of Children's Services and the Executive Director of Adult Social Care. The report provided the Annual reports of the Manchester Safe Guarding Adults Board and the Manchester Safeguarding Children's Board for the period April 2017 to March 2018. A copy of the "Trust Your Instinct" booklet was circulated to members.

The report set out the business priorities for 2017/18 that would be shared across the two boards. These included:

- Engagement and Involvement – listening and learning; hearing the voice of children and adults and Making Safeguarding Personal.
- Complex Safeguarding – Domestic Violence and Abuse; Female Genital Mutilation; Sexual Exploitation; Radicalisation; Missing from Care, Home and Education; Organised Crime; Trafficking & Modern Slavery; So-called Honour Based Violence.
- Transitions – Moving from child to adulthood in a safe and positive way.
- Neglect – Ensuring the basic needs of every child are met.
- Neglect - Safeguarding and supporting adults at risk of wilful neglect, acts of omission and self-neglect.

The Board welcomed the report and commented on the help the reports provide to GPs and other frontline roles and the work with communities in helping to identify and report on areas of concern.

Decisions

1. To note the Children and Adults Safeguarding Annual Reports 2017/2018.
2. To request that Health and Wellbeing Board members to consider how the Children and Adults Safeguarding Annual Reports are disseminated and hold to account their organisation with regard to delivering the priorities of both Safeguarding Boards.

HWB/18/31 Health and Housing

The Board received a report from the Director of Population Health and Wellbeing which provided an overview of some of the initiatives and programmes currently

underway in Manchester related to housing and health for the purpose of contributing to better outcomes for residents. The Board also received a presentation.

The report provided the basis for a thematic discussion on the challenges and opportunities for a stronger collaborative approach between the organisations represented on the Health and Wellbeing Board registered providers and other key stakeholders.

The Chair invited comments and questions from Board members.

A member welcomed the report and referred to the work being done on age friendly initiatives within the city. Reference was also made to the good work being done within the social housing sector however, it was commented that more focus was needed on work with private rental sector landlords. The Board was informed that a growing number of residents in private rented accommodation were contacting local councillors regarding the condition of their homes and the related health conditions suffered as a consequence of this. The private sector provided accommodation for many of the most vulnerable people in the city and this would usually be low quality accommodation. It was requested that private rental sector accommodation be included within the work programme of the Board.

A member commented on the positive work of health providers to provide mini hubs to support health care for homeless people in view of the significant impact homelessness has on the health of the individual. It was noted that the average life expectancy of a person sleeping rough over time reduces significantly due to resulting ill health (female 43 years and male 47 years). The Board was informed that another area of concern is the number of homeless people living within temporary dispersed accommodation across Manchester, which currently stands at 1900. The poor living conditions of short term private sector accommodation being used in these situations was having a negative impact on the health of those people concerned. The Board was requested to include the impact of homelessness on health within the work programme.

It was reported that the work of Wythenshawe Integrated Neighbourhood Service (WINS) had been successful in the way issues such as health and adult and children's safeguarding had been identified and addressed. Also, training materials had been developed for health workers and twelve homeless health champions were available to provide help and support at the Urban Village Medical Practice. It was noted that the service could be further improved through upskilling by primary care staff within their existing skillsets.

In noting the importance of focussing on the health of homeless people, a member highlighted the need to consider work taking place on an inclusion based primary health care model that included support for before and after periods of homelessness. Reference was made to clusters of poor quality temporary private rented accommodation that is used to home a significant number of vulnerable people and the need to recognise the impact of health on those living in poor accommodation.

The Chair welcomed the comments and added that Manchester had seen the private rented housing sector triple in size to become the largest provider of accommodation in the city. The Manchester Life initiative had provided high quality accommodation with flexible three-year secure tenancy agreements for social housing. Unfortunately, this was not the case across all of the private sector with the quality of some of the accommodation used being poor quality. Landlords were using older properties to convert into cheap multiple occupancy lets. It was noted that the private rented sector had become a major contributor in the rise of homeless people and families who were unable to pay increased rents and were subsequently evicted. The Board noted that the impact of poor housing on health was as significant as other major causes such as smoking, poor diet and lack of exercise.

The attention of the Board was drawn to the number of diverse Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) communities in the city who were living in low quality accommodation and were unlikely to be registered with a GP or seek medical care. Further research and work was needed to reach out to those communities in order to provide help and support in accessing medical care and better accommodation.

The Chair also referred to the issue of asthma and respiratory disease and as well as the links to poor housing he also stressed the importance of the impact of poor air quality on health. The Chair requested that raising awareness about Clean Air was a key role for health organisations to stimulate discussion and action across a wider audience.

Decisions

1. To note the report submitted.
2. To request the inclusion of the following topics within the Annual Work Programme:
 - Impact on health caused by poor quality accommodation within the private rental sector and support for vulnerable groups;
 - Impact on health as a consequence of homelessness;
 - Research into the health and housing needs of BAME communities living within Manchester.
3. To request that the topic of Clean Air be added to the agenda for the next meeting of the Board.

HWB/18/32 Public Health Approach to Violent Crime

The Board received a report from the Director of Population Health and Wellbeing which highlighted the success of adopting a public health approach to tackling violent crime. The Board was informed that work in this area, undertaken in Glasgow over the last decade, had achieved positive outcomes based on a significant reduction in the number of homicides involving a knife.

The report stated that partners in Manchester are keen to explore a similar approach for the city and for the work be taken forward through a Working Group under the

guidance of the Health and Wellbeing Board and Manchester Community Safety Partnership, using existing resources. To ensure the work involves the appropriate people with the expertise the input of the following groups and organisations would be required:

- MHCC Population Health and Wellbeing Team
- NHS Hospital Trust Emergency Department Consultants and Senior Nurses
- Greater Manchester Mental Health Trust Leads
- GP Neighbourhood Leads
- Community Safety Partnership Team
- Greater Manchester Police
- Youth Justice Lead
- Probation Service
- MCC Education and Social Work Leads
- CSE Organisations

Decisions

1. To support the development of proposals to adopt a public health approach to violent crime.
2. To request officers to ensure that key personnel from the organisations represented on the Board input to the proposals.

HWB/18/33 Better Care Fund 2018/2019

The Board received a report from the City Treasurer (Manchester City Council) and the Chief Finance Officer (Manchester Health and Care Commissioning) which provided the Board with an overview of the plan submitted for Better Care Fund 2018/2019 and an update on changes from the guidance released in July 2018.

The Better Care Fund was established by the Government to provide funds to local areas to support the integration of health and social care. Section 75 of the National Health Service 2006 Act gives powers to local authorities and health bodies to establish and maintain pooled funds. Payment from the funds may be made towards expenditure incurred in the exercise of prescribed local authority functions and prescribed National Health Service (NHS) functions.

Decisions

1. To note the changes to the Delayed Transfers of Care monitoring.
2. To confirm the expenditure plan for 2018/19, as agreed previously at the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 30 August 2017.

Licensing Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2018

Present

Councillor Ludford (in the Chair)
Councillors Chohan, Grimshaw, Hassan, Hughes, Jeavons, T. Judge, Lynch, McHale, Reid and Stone.

Apologies

Councillors Barrett, Evans and Madeleine Monaghan

LC/18/8 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting on 16 July 2018 were submitted for consideration.

Decision

To approve as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2018.

LC/18/9 Review of Gambling Policy 2019-2021

A report of the Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing was submitted, which presented the outcome of a public consultation on the revised Statement of the Policy under the Licensing Act 2003. The report also presented the proposed final Statement of Gambling Policy.

The Committee was informed that the consultation process had resulted in two responses being received from the Association of British Bookmakers and Gamcare. The proposed amendments and changes that had been received were considered and responded to.

Other amendments were incorporated in the proposed final version and included:

- Inclusion of Foreword by the Leader of the Council;
- Corrections to some Appendix references in the document;
- Movement of text from 3.13 relating to enforcement responsibilities of Gambling Commission into 3.10 "Compliance, enforcement and the inspection of premises";
- Replacement of outdated reference to 'Responsible Gambling Trust' with 'GambleAware' and the 'Responsible Gambling Strategy Board', in Appendix H (Other useful contacts).

Decisions

1. To endorse the proposed final Gambling Policy Statement 2019-2022 as set out in Appendix 2 of the report submitted.
2. To approve the proposed amendments as detailed in the report submitted.
3. To refer the Policy to the Council with the recommendation for approval at its meeting on 28 November 2018 and is adopted with effect from January 2019.

Licensing and Appeals Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2018

Present

Councillor Ludford (in the Chair)

Councillors Chohan, Grimshaw, Hassan, Hughes, Jeavons, T. Judge, Lynch, McHale, Reid and Stone.

Apologies

Councillors Barrett, Evans and Madeleine Monaghan

LAP/18/27 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting on 10 September 2018 were submitted for consideration as a correct record.

Decision

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 10 September 2018.

LAP/18/28 Application to Register Land Known as Godfrey Ermen Playing Field, Abbey Hey as a Town or Village Green (Application TG18)

The Committee were presented with the report of the Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing which provided the outcome of a non-statutory public enquiry into the Application to register land known as Godfrey Ermen Playing Field, Abbey Hey as a Town or Village Green (Application TG18).

The Committee was advised that a letter had been received from the solicitors acting on behalf of the owners of the land concerned. The letter requested that consideration of the matter be adjourned for three months before the Committee took a final decision to enable the land owner to consult with the Council and local residents about possible alternatives which would be consistent with the Trustees' charitable objective and would provide a sustainable asset for the benefit of the local area.

The Committee received submissions from Councillor Reid and Councillor Hughes and a member of the public present in response to the request.

The Chair requested members of the public and Councillor Reid and Councillor Hughes to leave the meeting while the Committee considered the request.

The Committee unanimously decided that consideration of the application would not be adjourned for a period of three months.

The members of the public and Councillor Reid and Councillor Hughes were invited back into the meeting room.

The Chair proceeded with the meeting and invited the Principal Licensing Officer to introduce the report.

The Committee was informed that in May 2016, the Council as Registration Authority, received an application under Section 15(1) of the Commons Act 2006 to register as a Town or Village Green land known as Godfrey Ermen Playing Field, Abbey Hey. Following the advertisement of the application, two objections were received, one from the Greater Manchester Trust for Recreation and one from a local resident. A non-statutory inquiry took place in Manchester between 22 and 25 May 2018 where both the applicants and the Trust (as objector) were represented by counsel. The report prepared by the inspector was attached to the report submitted (Appendix 2).

Decision

1. To approve the application to register land known as Godfrey Ermen Playing Field, Abbey Hey, Manchester (as detailed in the plan in Appendix 1 of the report submitted) for the reasons as set out in the report.
2. To note that the Council is to take all necessary steps to confirm the registration of the land.

(Councillor Hughes and Councillor Reid each declared a prejudicial interest in respect of the above item and took no part in voting on the item.)

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2018

Present: Councillor Ellison (Chair).

Councillors: Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Clay, Curley, Y. Dar, Kamal, Kirkpatrick, Lovecy, Lyons, White and Watson.

Apologies: Councillors: Madeleine Monaghan and Strong.

Also present: Councillors Akbar, Davies, Hacking, Igbon and Wright.

PH/18/87 Minutes

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2018 as a correct record.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2018 as a correct record.

PH/18/88 120896/FO/2018 - 391 Palatine Road, Manchester, M22 4JS

Planning application 120665/FO/2018 was deferred to allow the applicant to submit a daylight/sunlight analysis to consider further the impact of the proposal on nearby residents.

Decision

To defer consideration of the application for the reasons given in the late representation.

PH/18/89 116753/FO/2017 - 318 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 8AY

Planning application 116753/FO/2017 for the erection of a part three-storey, part single-storey building to form ground floor retail unit with four residential flats above, following demolition of the existing building was received.

318 Barlow Moor Road is located at the southern edge of Chorlton District Centre and is the end property of a staggered group of three, linked-detached, two-storey properties with commercial uses at ground floor and residential above. The group of properties has a large forecourt to the front and this is used for car parking in connection with the two end properties, and middle unit has raised decking area.

The proposal involves the demolition of the existing property and the erection of a three-storey building which steps down to single-storey at the rear. The ground floor would form A1 retail space and there would be four apartments above.

The proposal has undergone a number of revisions to its design, scale and density following negotiations with the applicant.

Neither the applicant nor any objectors were present, and the Committee carefully considered the report and the information that it contained.

Officers advised that should the Committee be minded to approve the application, further conditions should be attached regarding the details of the landscaping to the site. In addition a further condition should be added to ensure that the use of the ground floor retail units be restricted to Class A1 – shops and retail outlets.

The Committee asked for further clarification as to why the ground floor use should be restricted to Class A1, and officers confirmed that the condition would be to protect this usage and would prevent the units being used for Class A5 – hot food and takeaway without a change of use application.

The Committee also asked for clarification as to the number of bedrooms in each of the proposed flats, and officers confirmed that the accommodation units would be 2-bedroom. The Committee also considered Condition 10 in the report that specified that the units would remain C3 use and would not be able to be used as Class C4 - Houses in multiple occupation.

On balance, the Committee considered that the proposed development would make a positive contribution in terms of improving the visual amenity of the area and was considered to conform to national and local policies.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the additional condition regarding landscaping.

PH/18/90 120665/FO/2018 - Land Known As Birley Plot E, Stretford Road, Manchester

Planning application 120896/FO/2018 for the construction of a part 6, part 11 and part 16 storey building comprising 491 student bed spaces (sui generis), amenity space, cycle parking, landscaping, and associated highways work was received.

The site lies in a prominent location on Stretford Road next to the Hulme Arch to the east of Princess Road in Hulme. The site is viewed in the context of the Mancunian Way and Manchester City Centre when approaching Manchester using the Princess Road arterial route from the south.

The proposal comprises the redevelopment of the site to create a part 6, part 11 and part 16 storey building to be used as purpose built student accommodation. A total of 491 student rooms would be provided within the development, arranged in clusters of 7 and 8 single occupancy rooms (en-suite), organised around kitchen and lounge area.

The development would provide communal areas in the form of a social area with TV lounge, games room, gym, an informal study room and group study areas. The ground floor would include a reception area, management offices, storage, post room and a show flat.

Officers advised that in addition to the amended condition 3 in the late representation, there should be an additional condition regarding acoustic insulation to control noise breakout from the accommodation. Officers also recommended that condition 13, in relation to a scheme of highway works is revised to include any requirement for alterations to traffic regulation orders. In addition officers confirmed that additional information has been received from the applicant which explains how the University promotes respectful behavior in the community and in the Halls. The applicant confirmed that the University would deploy staff on a 24 hours basis as well as students employed as residential assistants to help create a sense of community for both students and local residents and to ensure that any issues are dealt with promptly and effectively as they may arise. Officers also confirmed that there would be an ongoing programme of community engagement and that students would be encouraged to engage positively with local residents.

A representative of local residents spoke in objection to the proposals, and said that Hulme had undergone several rounds of regeneration in her lifetime. The last round of regeneration was the one that local residents had endorsed, and that the aims of this regeneration would not be met by the current proposals. She pointed out that there have been over 50 objections, and that there is a lot of discontent within the Hulme community as the University are reaping the benefits of the community that was built by residents.

Residents do not hold any resentment to the University, or to students, but the residents do object to the height and scale of the proposed development, given that they were told that the regeneration framework would prevent development of buildings over 6 storeys. She told the Committee that the height of the building would lead to problems with loss of light and lack of privacy. The local resident also explained that she lives next to the current student accommodation, and that residents can see into student bedrooms and students can see into resident's bedrooms, which was not acceptable.

The resident also said that the consultation exercise had been inadequate, and that they were unhappy that the University seemed to be under the impression that they were running the Hulme Masterplan and not the residents who had formulated it. She said that the Aquarius Community Association had not been consulted, and neither had residents of Hopton Court.

Local residents were also unhappy that they were subjected to homophobic abuse and attacks by students, which were not dealt with adequately by the University.

She also said that the analysis of parking problems in the area was not credible as it took no account of the fact that many students do have cars, despite the applicant not providing any parking spaces at the proposed development. She said that the University needed to start communicating with the community in a meaningful way, as at the moment residents had no faith in the plans being proposed.

The applicant's agent also spoke to the Committee in support of the proposed development. He said that this was a scheme that was a significant part of the University estate development programme. The principle of student accommodation at this location had been well established. Outline planning permission had been granted in 2012, and that permission was broadly similar to the current proposals in terms of bedspaces and height. He admitted that there had been an increase in bedspaces across the campus, but that this was necessary due to the success of the University overall. He told the Committee that the student headcount had been growing steadily, and that current projections indicated that this growth would continue.

He said that the University had identified a need to provide their own controlled student accommodation as an alternative to agreements with 3rd parties where the University is not able to exert the same level of management controls. The University also considers that the provision of affordable, purpose built accommodation would encourage to return of HMO's to family accommodation, which would benefit local communities.

He added that there have been 3 separate engagement events in a sustained effort to engage with local residents, invitations had been distributed across a wide area with local elected members being fully briefed on the process. There has also been an investment of over £5m in public realm around the campus, and the University takes its responsibilities to the permanent residents very seriously.

Councillor Wright spoke to the Committee and endorsed the concerns raised by residents. She said that there were significant concerns about the proposed development, and the way in which the consultation process had taken place. She said that there was some attempt to engage with residents, but that they must be given the opportunity to take part in discussions about the nature of development. Councillor Wright told the Committee that the history of regeneration in Hulme was that of change and development being imposed on residents, which led to failure as this did not take into account what residents actually wanted and needed.

Councillor Wright also said that the original outline permission was for 4 x 4 storey buildings, which was significantly different to the current proposals. She said that the proposed tower would overshadow the Hulme Archway, which was a significant local landmark. To move away from this configuration with regard to height was unacceptable.

Councillor Igbon also spoke to the Committee to endorse and support the concerns raised by residents. She said that the development of the Brooks Building had gone well, and that the University had engaged well with residents during this process. However, the team that had led the community engagement at that time were no longer with the University, and that when they left the level of community engagement declined significantly. Councillor Igbon also said that the University must understand that Hulme residents were not part of MMU, but that MMU was part of Hulme.

She added that the Hulme Councillors were not opposed to the development of this plot, but they were opposed to the overall height of the development. In addition, she said that the report was inaccurate with regard to the perceived lack of crime and disorder and pointed out that the area policing team had a dedicated officer allocated to support students. She also said that the impact of the increased student number had not been considered properly with regard to local amenities such as GP's, dentists and other community infrastructure.

Officers confirmed that the principle of development of this number of bedspaces had been established for some time, and that the height of the development had been informed by the scale of buildings near to this site. Officers added that a detailed sunlight and daylight analysis had been completed and submitted as part of the application process. In addition, with regard to the notification process he confirmed that the City Council had notified all surrounding addresses, including those occupied by local businesses, beyond statutory requirements. Officers also confirmed that they had contacted a representative of residents on the Aquarius Estate to seek their views.

The Committee expressed concern that the proposed scheme provided no disabled parking, as this would be a barrier to any potential disabled student wishing to live or study in the City. They also expressed concern at the very low level of cycle parking that was proposed. The Committee also queried why developments of this nature were exempt from the requirements of S106 assessment.

Officers confirmed that condition 13 in the report would ensure that there was a dedicated disabled on street parking space provided. Condition 12 also required an increased provision for cycle parking space. Officers also explained that with regard to affordability, purpose built student accommodation is not covered by the Policy, and that there is no requirement for student accommodation to give a contribution.

The Committee asked for further clarification of the impact on the adjacent school with regard to loss of daylight/sunlight. The Committee also noted that there was an existing residents' parking scheme and that students would be prevented from applying for parking permits from this scheme, and asked for clarification as to how drop off and pick up at the start and end of term would be managed given the lack of parking provision.

Officers confirmed that condition 16 did provide for the implementation of an access strategy relating to students moving in and out of the accommodation, and that there was a service bay with removable bollards which would allow access during these periods. With regard to the school, officers confirmed that a specific assessment was carried out to measure the impact on the playground, and that while there would be a small reduction in daylight/sunlight, the reduction was so small it was not considered significant. Officers also confirmed that students would not be permitted to apply for resident parking permits, and that the cost of any changes to traffic regulation orders as a result of the development would be met by the University and not residents.

The Committee asked if it would be possible to restrict the height of the tower to that agreed in the outline planning permission, and officers explained that this application had to be assessed on its own merits. The outline planning permission had

addressed the issue of the number of bedspaces to be provided, and that this application was broadly in line with this provision.

The Committee questioned whether the proposals would enhance the local community, as required under Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles, given the level of overlooking to neighbouring buildings and the school, and officers confirmed that the distances between the buildings had been assessed and were considered acceptable.

The Committee also asked for clarification with regard to waste management arrangements, given that waste storage would be in building B, which would have no connection to building C. Officers confirmed that they would look again at this condition to ensure that there was proper and adequate access to waste disposal facilities for all people resident in the complex.

The Committee also expressed concern that local consultation had not been as comprehensive as it could have been, and asked if the application could be deferred for further consultation. The Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing confirmed that consultation had been undertaken that exceeded the statutory requirements, and that deferral could not be recommended on this basis. The Committee asked whether there was a way of the University working with residents to restore some of the lost confidence, and The Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing confirmed that this would be raised at the regular liaison meetings that officers held with MMU, and that they would also be working with local elected members to establish the best way forward.

On balance, the Committee concluded that the development would see the reuse of previously developed land improving that appearance and character of this particular part of Hulme with a high quality well managed facility.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representations.

PH/18/91 118045/FO/2017 - Land Bounded By Worsley Street, Arundel Street, Ellesmere Street And Egerton Street, Manchester, M15 4JZ

Planning application 118045/FO/2017 for the erection of a 10 storey residential building (Use Class C3a) together ground floor commercial units (Use Classes A1, A2, B1, D1 and D2) (379 sqm) and the erection of 35 storey residential building (Use Class C3a), following demolition of existing buildings, together with the change of use of the former Department of Transport Building to form a mixed use residential and commercial building (Use Classes C3a, A1, A2, B1, D1 and D2), forming 386 residential apartments in total with associated amenity space, car and cycle parking, access, landscaping and other associated works was received.

The Planning and Highways Committee resolved that they were minded to refuse the application at its meeting on 20 September 2018 and Members requested that a report be brought back which addresses concerns and which presented potential

reasons for refusal that could be substantiated on the grounds that the proposal would have unacceptable impact on the setting of the Castlefield Conservation Area and the Grade II* Listed St George's Church.

Officers confirmed that detailed late representations had been received from the Britannia Basin Community Forum objecting to the proposals, and summarised these for the Committee's consideration. Officers also confirmed that the applicant had agreed to lower the height of the tower by 2 storeys in response to resident's concerns and the Committee comments at its meeting on 20 September 2018.

Officers also told the Committee that the applicant had met with the Britannia Basin Community Forum and had committed to provide community space for their monthly meetings and, with prior notice, community events throughout the year.

A local resident and member of the Britannia Basin Community Forum spoke in objection to the proposals, and said that other than the offer of a reduction in height of 2 storeys, there had been no effort on the part of the developer to address any of the residents' concerns. She reiterated the comments made by the Committee on 20 September 2018 and asked what was the point of a conservation area if it was going to be ignored. She also told the Committee that while the Mancunian Way had been called a "scar", which fragmented the area, a development of the nature proposed would damage the conservation area further rather than enhance it. The resident also gave examples of other proposed development that had been rejected as inappropriate for the area which were actually smaller in scale, height and massing than this development.

The resident also reiterated concerns regarding vehicle movements and parking problems in the area, and pointed out that the area was subject to a 12 month programme of road works which had severely exacerbated the problems that residents faced on a daily basis. She told the Committee that the traffic problems made the area unsafe for current residents, and that the increase in population that would result from a development of this size would only make matters worse.

Residents welcome development of the area, but said that this proposal was not appropriate and should be scaled down to deliver a more thoughtful enhancement of the area that better addresses the setting of the church and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Councillor Igbon spoke in objection to the proposals, and said that she fully supported the concerns of residents. She said that she fully understood the Policy regarding City Centre development, but reiterated that although this part of Hulme did come under the Policy area, it was still a residential area. Councillor Igbon added that the highways infrastructure was inadequate for the current residential population and to add to the population with a development of this size would make matters much worse. She said that there were both accidents and near misses every day due to the volume of traffic and vehicle movements. The area will have 6000 residents with just 2 routes into the area and 1 route out of the area.

Councillor Igbon added that although the report asserted that the site was in a highly sustainable location for public transport, the reality was that the public transport

available was not adequate for current residents. A development of this size would impact on residential amenity, crime and disorder and the health and wellbeing of existing and future residents.

Councillor Wright also spoke in support of Councillor Igbon and the residents. She said that some people might say that this part of Hulme was in the City Centre, but that it was a residential area and part of Hulme Ward. She said that a lot of the points raised at the previous meeting had not been addressed, including the issue of waste management and storage, parking and the highways infrastructure, and that the current proposals were not as good as the original offer had been. Councillor Wright added that this was not a “gateway to the City” but a residential area and that development should take regard to existing residents and not just people driving through.

The applicant’s agent spoke to the Committee in support of the proposals and said that they had carried out a very detailed analysis of the area which had informed the design process. They had tested the design and its impact using industry standard evaluation tools. He agreed that there was always a degree of subjectivity in developments of this nature, and that he understood that height was one of the major issues to address. He reiterated that the design could be adjusted to remove 2 complete floors, but did not think that height was an overall sustainable reason for refusal. They had looked at the overall nature of the conservation area and concluded that according to NPPF tenets, the design must be taken as a whole. He said that a development of such high quality and design should be considered to be a neutral or positive contribution to an area that was largely modern in nature, albeit slightly run down.

He agreed that there would be a degree of harm to the setting of St George’s Church, but that this was at the lower end of substantial and more than offset by the benefits of the scheme. He added that conservation areas should never be static, but should be welcoming of change and innovation to become vibrant, thriving and desirable places to enhance the economic, social and cultural life of the city. He added that small families could be easily accommodated in the 2-bed units, and that there was a degree of activity at street level that had always been included in the planned development.

Officers commented that they had not been asked to negotiate a different scheme, but had been asked to assess and comment of the height of the development and the impact on the conservation area and the setting of the listed buildings.

The Committee expressed significant concern that the affordable housing contribution was not enough. They commented that Hulme in particular is an area where there was a need for affordable, family homes and that not enough of these are being built. The Committee also agreed that the height of the tower, even when reduced by 2 floors did dominate the setting of the listed St George’s Church. In addition the Committee were concerned that the car parking provision was inadequate and should be addressed.

The Committee also acknowledged that conservation areas should not be static areas of preservation, but that development should be done in a sensitive way, and

while there were aspects of this proposal that were sympathetic to the conservation area, there were other parts of the proposal that were not. The Committee could not see how the Tower aspect of the proposals would not cause significant harm to both the conservation area and the setting of the listed building. The Committee also commented that the Castlefield conservation area had been extended in the 1980's to include St George's, so this area had not been included by mistake. The Committee considered that the current proposals did not complement the conservation area but dominated it to an unacceptable degree. The Committee concluded that the proposals would cause significant harm to both the conservation area and the setting of the nearby listed buildings.

Decision

To refuse the application for the following reason.

The erection of a 35 storey tower and 10 storey building would, by virtue of its siting, scale and appearance, result in a form of development that would be overly dominant and would harm the form, character and setting of the Castlefield Conservation Area and the setting of the adjacent Grade II* listed former St George's Church.

PH/18/92 117470/FO/2017 - 39 Mason Street, Manchester, M4 5FX

Planning application 117470/FO/2017 for the erection of 6 storey building comprising a restaurant (Class A3) and retail unit (Class A1) at ground floor level and fourteen apartments above, together with basement parking was received.

The application site relates to a rectangular shaped area of land situated at the corner of Mason Street and Marshall Street and is presently used as a surface level, pay and display car park.

The application follows the granting of planning permission in 2010 for a 7 storey building to form 15 student apartments involving the creation of 80 bedrooms and a ground floor retail unit (Ref: 087073/FO/2008/N1). Shortly after permission was granted, the public house previously situated on the site was demolished in anticipation of development, but due to economic conditions, the permission was never implemented. The permission has since lapsed and the site used as a car park since.

The Committee asked for clarification as to whether the policy of only triggering a S106 assessment for developments of 15 units or more was an NPPF policy or a Manchester Policy. Officers confirmed that this was a Manchester agreed policy that officers were bound to work to.

Neither the applicant nor any objector was present, and the Committee carefully considered the information in the report as well as the representations. The Committee asked for clarification regarding the recycling facilities, and officers confirmed that there is space within each individual unit for recycling bins, with larger waste and recycling facilities being located on the ground floor.

The Committee asked whether there was any mechanism to prevent the ground floor retail space standing vacant for any prolonged period as other developments of this nature looked unattractive at the street scene level when vacant for extended periods. Officers confirmed that they do discuss lettings policies with applicants as part of the application process, but as this would be a commercial decision this was not something that could be controlled by means of conditions. Officers can however add conditions to ensure that the retail units have sufficient finish to preclude any unit being boarded up or providing unacceptably unattractive views at street level.

On balance, the Committee considered that the proposal represents an appropriate and satisfactory form of development that fulfils the criteria laid down in policy and City Council guidance which seeks to provide high quality, residential accommodation of an appropriate density which will contribute to a vibrant and sustainable neighbourhood with a high level of connectivity to adjoining neighbourhoods, including the city centre as well as nearby public transport. The proposal will involve the regeneration of a brownfield site, whilst contributing to national housing growth objectives and the continued evolution of the aspirations contained within the New Cross Neighbourhood Development Framework.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and an additional condition regarding the finish to the retail units.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 15 November 2018

Present: Councillor Ellison (Chair).

Councillors: Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Clay, Curley, Y. Dar, Lovecy, Lyons, White and Watson.

Apologies: Councillors Strong, Kamal and Kirkpatrick.

Also present: Councillor Kilpatrick.

PH/18/93 Minutes

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2018 as a correct record.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2018 as a correct record.

PH/18/94 119731/FO/2018 - Cheshire Cheese PH & Vacant Land (Formerly Nos 32-38) Oldham Road Manchester M4 5FE

Planning application 119731/FO/2018 for the erection of 7 storey building to form 38 apartments and ground floor retail unit (Class A1) together with associated car and cycle parking following demolition of existing building was received.

The application site relates to land situated at the corner of Oldham Road and Cornell Street which is presently occupied by a vacant, two storey public house (Cheshire Cheese) and a neighbouring area of hard-standing, which includes a steel storage container.

The applicant's agent spoke to the Committee in support of the proposals, and said that the site has been in the development process for some time, and planning permission had previously been granted but lapsed due to the recession. The building is in a very poor state, to the point that access is prohibited. The scheme has been amended after discussion with officers and several conditions have been agreed in advance. He added that the applicant was committed to delivering a high quality scheme that would enhance the immediate area.

The Committee asked for clarification as to the construction management plan and how current residents would be protected from dust etc., and officers confirmed that there was a specific condition that specified prior to the commencement of development, a construction management plan outlining working practices during development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, which for the avoidance of doubt should include;

- Dust suppression measures;
- Compound locations where relevant;

- Location, removal and recycling of waste;
- Detail of an emergency contact telephone number;
- Parking of construction vehicles; and
- Sheeting over of construction vehicles.

Officers also confirmed that the development will only be carried out in accordance with the approved construction management plan.

The Committee expressed concern at the very narrow margin of profitability, and asked if a condition could be added so that if the profit margin increased, a S106 contribution could be sought in the future for improvements to the street scene, as there was very little green space in the vicinity of the site. Officers clarified that the profit margins were so low, it would not be appropriate for such a condition to be imposed. The Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing informed the Committee that she was aware the area in general and particularly the Oldham Road/Great Ancoats Street junction was being looked at with a view to enhancing the environment including the potential for street planting.

The Committee also expressed concern at the low level of disabled parking provision, and the lack of storage facilities for mobility scooters. Officers confirmed that they would discuss these issues with the applicant and his agent, so that the maximum possible accessibility provision could be made.

With regard to the heritage value of the building, officers confirmed that it was in a poor state and that the proposed development would enhance the conservation area rather than have a negative impact.

The Committee concluded that the development will provide a high quality frontage to a main arterial route into the city centre and responds positively to the character, scale, massing and varying height of adjoining buildings, strengthening the urban grid which defines the area.

The Committee accepted that there will be minimal or any significant harmful impact upon either residential amenity or the operation of the highway and as a consequence, the proposed development can be satisfactorily accommodated at the site and will integrate effectively into the host streetscape. As such, the proposed development accords with all relevant local policy and national guidance.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representations.

**PH/18/95 120635/FO/2018 - Hotspur Press 2 Gloucester Street Manchester
M1 5QR**

This item was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

**PH/18/96 121184/FO/2018 - 107 Manchester Road Chorlton Manchester M21
9GA**

Planning application 121184/FO/2018 for the use of the property as a licensed cafe/bar Class A3/A4 including expansion of internal public area, relocation of kitchen and provision of ventilation, extraction and waste management equipment/facilities was received.

The application site is a ground floor unit, with basement below, situated within a two/three storey terrace located on the western side of Manchester Road. Planning permission ref: 114208/TMCOU/2016 was granted on 14th October 2016 for a temporary change of use from A1 (shop) to A3 (cafe/restaurant), for a two year period commencing 20th October 2016. The use was implemented by the applicant and has been trading continuously as Henry C since. Whilst the temporary consent has now lapsed it should be noted that the current application was validated on 12th September 2018, prior to the lapse. The applicant is proposing to continue the existing Class A3, but also wishes to operate as a Class A4 bar in the later evening, which this permission would allow the flexibility within the two uses.

Officers confirmed that further to the late representation, the applicant has indicated that they are happy to accommodate level access to the premises, which will be subject to an additional condition.

The applicant's agent spoke in support of the proposals, and explained that the applicant has been trading for over 2 years at the site with no complaints or issues, which has been confirmed by Environmental Health. The proposals also have the support of Councillor Hacking who has confirmed that Ward Councillors have not received any reports of issues.

The agent also confirmed that they would happily agree to conditions designed to mitigate any problems or issues that might arise in the future.

The Committee asked for clarification as to the mitigation for the additional extract fan that would be installed as part of the proposals, and officers confirmed that this would be managed by way of conditions requiring information about the specification of the fans and acoustic insulation. Any changes needed would be carried out within 6 months of the grant of consent.

The Committee concluded that the proposed development will make a positive impact in terms of being an employment generator that would maintain an existing business within the Chorlton District Centre. The proposals are not considered to give rise to unacceptable impacts in terms of residential amenity or visual amenity of the area and therefore accord with the principles of Core Strategy policies SP1, C6, C10, and DM1 and saved UDP policies DC10 and DC26.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation, in particular the amendments to conditions 4, 6 and 8.

PH/18/97 121390/FO/2018 - 19 Elm Road Manchester M20 6XD

Planning application 121390/FO/2018 for the erection of a three storey dwellinghouse with basement and associated landscaping and car parking was received. The application site is part of the garden area within the curtilage of no.19 Elm Road, a detached Arts and Crafts style house situated on the north side of Elm Road near to the junction with Parkfield Road South in the Didsbury West ward. The site and surrounding area fall within the Blackburn Park Conservation Area (designated 1976).

The garden fronts Elm Road and the proposed house would be accessed through the creation of a new driveway opening to Elm Road through an existing high level hedge. The development plot extends to c. 680m² and the proposal is for 1 no. detached 5 bedroom 3-storey dwelling of a contemporary design with gardens and parking. The property would sit behind an attractive Copper Beech tree to be retained. The existing property at No. 19 Elm Road would still retain a sizeable garden to the front, side and rear.

The application is accompanied by a Planning Statement which demonstrates how the design has evolved with reference to the surrounding historic context, having regards to the Historic England publication 'Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance.'

A member of the Blackburn Park Conservation Society spoke in objection to the proposals, saying the proposals would cause significant harm to the conservation area. He said that there had been a failure to consider the impact on the openness and green space in the area, and the development is contrary to these aims and to policies DC18 and EN3.

He added that the design of the building was completely inappropriate to the setting of the neighbouring buildings, and would drastically reduce the amenity space at the current house at 19 Elm Road. He said that it would destroy the current arrangement of the houses at this point in the road, and would be a dangerous precedent to further damage to the conservation area. He added that the design was ugly, with too much glazing to the sides and the front, and an unsympathetic and harmful form of development for which there was no justification. He said that they did not agree with the principle of development as stated in the report and expressed surprise that the report recommended approval. He said that the Committee could not make a decision regarding the level of harm that would result unless they actively stood outside 19 Elm Road, and proposed an adjournment to facilitate a site visit.

The applicant spoke to the Committee and explained that the proposals were to provide a suitable dwelling for the needs of their family, now and in the future. They currently occupy the existing dwelling at 19 Elm Road, and have lived there for the last 14 years. She explained that they had spent a lot of time on the plans, and had developed the current proposals in consultation with planning officers, and were conscious of the constraints of the conservation area. She pointed out that there was a wide diversity in the styles of houses in the area, and as they chose not to adopt a pastiche design it has led to a contemporary approach. They understand that this

approach would attract differing views, but were confident that the design was elegant and would fit in with the conservation area.

They had also consulted specialists, and were confident that the copper beech tree and many other trees within the site would not be affected by the building or the associated works. She said that the space relationship between the house and garden was in keeping with many other properties on Elm Road. The house would be built with very high quality materials, and would incorporate a high level of sustainability. The applicant said that she firmly believed that once completed the house would be a positive addition to Elm Road rather than negatively impacting the conservation area.

Councillor Kilpatrick spoke in support of the Blackburn Park Conservation Society representative and the resident objectors. He said that he felt there was a strong case for deferral, as the detailed comments from the Conservation Society had been circulated at a late stage, and questioned whether the Committee had been given sufficient time to consider them. He added that the Ward Plan was clear about celebrating and preserving the trees in the area, and that there was a commitment to replacing any trees lost during development like for like. He said that this development would involve the felling of 7 trees with only 6 being replaced, which contravened the Ward Plan. Councillor Kilpatrick also asked that the matter be deferred for a site visit.

Officers confirmed that the detailed comments from the Conservation Society had not been available when the agenda and report had been published, but had been received subsequently. The comments had been circulated and made available as soon as it was possible to do so. Officers also confirmed that the site was not able to accommodate more than 6 replacement trees, but that the applicant had offered to provide additional tree planting on the highway if necessary.

The Head of Planning, Building Control and Licensing also confirmed that the application had been thoroughly assessed and had gone through a full consultation period; a deferral on the basis of the late comments from Blackburn Park Conservation Society was not recommended.

The Committee expressed concern that when considering an application for development in a conservation area, they must consider the impact and possible degradation of that conservation area, and whether a local precedent of development would be set.

Officers confirmed that the current property had an exceptionally large garden, even given the propensity of large gardens in the area, and that the proposals would result in 2 properties with gardens of a similar size to others on the road. Officers also commented that conservation areas were not static and that development could take place that was sympathetic and appropriate.

With regard to setting a precedent, officers said that any approval of the current proposal should not be taken as an acceptance in principle of development on other garden plots which must be assessed on their site-specific individual merits. Officers also explained that the design of the proposals, while contemporary did echo the

design of the other properties in the area, and example being the use of white brick rather than render to the upper elevations of the proposed development.

The Committee considered the request from the Conservation Society and Councillor Kilpatrick for a site visit, but concluded that the information contained in the report was sufficient for them to make a determination without the need for a deferral.

After considering all of the representations, the Committee concluded that the proposal is for a single family dwelling of 5-bedrooms which is considered to be appropriate and acceptable at this location. The design of the dwelling has paid sensitive regard to the context and setting of the Blackburn Park Conservation Area.

Decision

To be minded to approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation, and an additional condition regarding planting of trees off-site, the wording of which to be delegated to the Head of Planning, Building Control and Licencing in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee.

PH/18/98 120665/FO/2018 - 391 Palatine Road Manchester M22 4JS

Planning application 120665/FO/2018 for the erection of a part three to five storey building comprising of a ground floor commercial units for Class A1/A2 and 6 x 1 bedroom apartment, 6 x 2 bedroom apartments (12 in total), together with associated landscaping and car parking.

This application was deferred at the October meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee in order to allow the applicant to submit a daylight and sunlight analysis.

The applicant has submitted an Energy Conservation and Management Statement to illustrate how the development will comply with Council's policy on sustainability, as detailed in the Late Representation.

The applicant spoke to the Committee and said that prior to their involvement in the site, he was aware that there had been issues that had caused concerns locally, but since they became involved these had now been resolved.

The Committee welcomed the fact that the applicant had agreed to contribute to street tree planting. The Committee also welcomed the development as bringing back into use a derelict site. They did express a degree of concern about the car parking provision, but overall concluded that this proposal represents an opportunity to create a new focal point in a prominent location along Palatine Road and attract further investment into the district centre. The proposal would allow for the development of a high quality building which would add to the vitality of the district centre and increase the range of accommodation and services within a highly sustainable location.

Decision

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons in the report and the late representation, in particular the amended conditions 2 and 20 and an additional condition 21.

Personnel Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 14 November 2018

Present

Councillor Ollerhead - In the Chair

Councillors Akbar, Bridges, Craig, Leech, S Murphy, Rahman, Richards, Sheikh and Stogia

Apologies

Councillors Leese and N Murphy

PE/18/27 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 17 October 2018.

PE/18/28 Recruitment to the post of Executive Director Strategic Commissioning (including Director of Adult Social Services functions)

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Executive regarding the recruitment to the post of Executive Director Strategic Commissioning (with DASS responsibilities). The report sets out proposals to recruit to the vacancy as well as to ensure appropriate leadership arrangements are in place in the interim.

The report stated that the post will be recruited to on the terms of the previous appointment, as the Strategic Commissioner within Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC). The postholder will operate within MHCC on a day to day basis, whilst also holding the Council's designated statutory functions as the Director of Adult Social Services (DASS) discharging the duties in relation to this post as set out in the Local Authority Social Services Act.

The Committee agreed the recommendations.

Decisions

1. To note that the post of Executive Director Strategic Commissioning (with DASS responsibilities) has become vacant.
2. To agree the establishment an Appointments Sub-committee to comprise of Councillors Craig, Leech, Midgley, S Murphy and Ollerhead to progress all aspects of the recruitment and to act as the appointment panel for the appointment of a new Executive Director of Strategic Commissioning.
3. To agree the quorum of three members for any meetings of the sub-committee.

4. To agree the co-option of the Chief Officer for Manchester Health and Care Commissioning as advisor to the appointment panel.
5. To agree to delegate authority to the Appointments Sub-committee to agree an updated Role Profile as a basis for recruitment in-line with the previously agreed remuneration package for the post.
6. To note that, pending a permanent appointment, the Director of Adult Social Care will be asked to act up to cover the DASS functions and delegate authority to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Executive Member for Adults Health and Wellbeing, to determine the detail of these arrangements.
7. To recommend to Council that during the period of act-up the Director Social Care be paid the bottom SCP of the evaluated grade (SS5) for the Executive Director post, an annual salary of £121,692.
8. To agree to redesignate the job title of the Head of Quality Assurance for Safeguarding within the Children's Services Directorate to Strategic Lead for Safeguarding and Practice Improvement.

Standards Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 1 November 2018

Present: N Jackson – in the Chair

Councillors: Andrews, Connolly, Cooley, Evans, Kilpatrick, Lanchbury, O'Donovan (Ringway Parish Council)

Apologies: Mr G Linnell

ST/18/15. Minutes

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 14 June 2018. In approving the minutes the committee noted that work that was underway on encouraging the take-up of member training opportunities.

ST/18/16. Draft Code of Corporate Governance

A report submitted by the Deputy Chief Executive proposed a revised draft Code of Corporate Governance for the Council. The report explained that the Code had been revised to ensure that it continued to accord with the relevant published guidance. Compliance with the new version of the Code was to be monitored by means on the Council's Annual Governance Statement.

The key changes that had been made to the Code were outlined in the report. The revised version now incorporated the Our Manchester Strategy of the Council. It also included references to the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and Data Protection Act 2018; to CIPFA and IFAC's "Delivering Good Governance in Local Government: Framework (2016)". Other revisions had been made relating to the Council's Capital Strategy and the policies of the Greater Manchester Combined Authority.

Subject to the views of the Committee at this meeting, the process the draft would next follow was explained. The draft would go on to be considered by the Audit Committee and then be submitted to the Council in January for adoption.

The Committee welcomed the revised version of the Code of Corporate Governance. In relation to GDPR, a member questioned whether the Code should say more on the individual responsibilities of Councillors as data controllers in their own right, and the risks associated with that status. The member also asked if consideration could be given to the wording used to describe the Council's engagement with stakeholders, citizens and service users to give more emphasis to the ways in which the Council worked with service users and other stakeholders.

The officer presenting the report confirmed that the consideration of further revisions to the wording of the draft document would continue as it was made ready for submission to the Audit Committee and then to the Council.

Decision

To welcome and endorse the proposed revised draft Code of Corporate Governance.

ST/18/17. Members' Update on Ethical Governance

The City Solicitor asked the Committee to consider a draft of the next edition of the "Update on Ethical Governance" which is periodically issued to all Councillors. The draft edition was intended to update councillors on matters and recent events relating to:

- Standards in Public Life address
- Freedom of Information Tribunal decision – complaints and councillors' personal data
- Councillor cleared of Freedom of Information Act offence
- Councillor pleads guilty to posting offensive messages on social media
- Gifts and Hospitality
- Members Interests

Subject to requesting the amendment to the Freedom of Information Tribunal decision item to specify the name of the Council or to anonymise all for consistency with other items, the Committee agreed that the document should be promulgated within the Council.

Decision

To request that the draft be revised and then issued to all Councillors.

ST/18/18. Planning Protocol

In November 2017 the Committee had considered a report on the Council's Planning Protocol. The Protocol was one of the Codes included in Part 6 of the Council's Constitution. The purpose of the Protocol was to ensure that in the planning process there are no grounds for suggesting that a decision has been biased, partial or not well founded in any way. In November 2017 the Committee had made three recommendations: on mandatory training for members involved in deciding on planning applications; on including on the agenda for committee meetings an explanatory note about the protocol for site visits; and that a briefing note on the Protocol be produced for all Councillors (Minute ST/17/12).

A report was now submitted by the City Solicitor to describe the operation of and efficacy of the Planning Protocol as revised by the Council in May 2018 (Minute CC/18/50), and how the Committee's recommendations from November 2017 had been implemented.

The Mandatory training called for had taken place in May 2018, following the changes in the Planning and Highways Committee's membership after the local

elections in May. A mid-year follow-up to that training was being planned. A note on the importance of the Protocol and its application to site visits was now part of every Planning and Highways Committee agenda. Training was also being arranged for all members of the Council on planning obligations and the operation of and purpose of Section 106 Agreements.

The Committee agreed that in general the Protocol continued to be effective and welcomed the steps taken to implement the decisions made in November 2017.

Decision

To note the report.

ST/18/19. Standards Committee Annual Report

The City Solicitor submitted a report to update the Committee on matters within the remit of the Committee since March 2018. It was proposed that this be the Annual Report of the Committee for 2018. The Committee had agreed to the timing of the production of the Annual Report being revised so that it could become part of the evidence the Council used to compile the Annual Governance Statement. This version was for less than 12 months as it was the first produced under the new annual timetable.

A member queried whether the inclusion of the word "Purdah" in the outcome of complaint CCM2018.03 might lead some readers to infer that the Purdah regulations were in some way relevant to the consideration of this complaint, rather than just being a reference to a particular time of the year.

Decisions

1. To Note the work done since March 2018.
2. That this Annual Report now be submitted to the Council.

ST/18/20. Whistleblowing Policy

The overview of the Council's Whistleblowing Policy is part of the remit of the Committee. The Head of Audit and Risk Management submitted a review of the operation of the policy and on changes and updates to the policy and related procedures. The report explained the training that some Council staff had received to further improve the handling of matters raised by whistleblowers.

Members of the Committee queried the application of the policy to the recipients of services provided by the Council's contractors, in particular vulnerable people who were being supported by care agencies commissioned by the Council, and how the policy aligned with the Council's safeguarding arrangements for such people. Members also sought assurance on how, in those sorts of situations, the service user would be informed of the outcome of the concern they had raised.

An explanation was given on how whistleblowing was incorporated into the Council's commissioning of external providers and how a variety of sources of intelligence were used to identify and respond to issues and areas of concern.

Having discussed the issues raised the Committee agreed that when the Policy is next revised it should include more clarify and detail on the whistleblowing procedures that are available to services users who have concerns about a contractor providing services on behalf of the Council.

Decisions

1. To endorse the report.
2. To recommend to the Audit Committee, when it is next considering a revision of the Whistleblowing Policy, that information be included on arrangements for whistleblowing by services user about contractors.

ST/18/21. Consideration of the introduction of DBS checks for all Members

A report by the City Solicitor asked the Committee to consider whether Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) checks should be undertaken for some or all elected and co-opted members serving on the Council and its committees. The report explained the different levels of check that are available and the information each would disclose: a basic check, a standard check and an enhanced check. It also examined the different roles that councillors and co-opted members undertake in the Council and explained the significance of "regulated activities" and "saved regulated activities" as defined by the Protection of Freedoms Act (2012), and which activities undertaken by councillors would be considered to be regulated activities.

The present arrangements were described: councillors who sit on Fostering or Adoption Panels, and those who undertake Regulation 44 inspections of children's homes are required to have an enhanced check.

The report examined a range of options for the committee to consider: from ending the requirement for any checks on any councillors; maintaining the present arrangements; introducing more enhanced checks for those members involved in "saved" regulated activities; up to introducing basic checks for all councillors and co-opted members.

The committee supported the continuation of the present arrangements and introduction of the further options as set out in the report, with councillors involved in saved regulated activities needing an enhanced check, and all other councillors and co-opted members being asked to agree to a basic check that they share with the Council. The committee noted that no member could be compelled by the Council to have a basic check, but suggested that information on the number of councillors who had done so should be published each year. Councillors who already had a valid current check as a result of a role outside the Council would not need to have a second check done for the Council. The Committee also agreed that that it will be important for there to be well-written guidance on the arrangements relating to DBS checks for councillors which political parties could use for candidates that want to

stand for election to the Council. The Committee also agreed that this should form part of the induction training for newly elected Councillors.

Decision

To recommend to Council that it:

- (a) continues to carry out enhanced DBS checks with a check of the barred lists of members who sit on the Fostering and Adoption Panels or who undertake regulation 44 inspections of children's homes;
- (b) undertakes enhanced DBS checks, with a check of the barred lists, for all other elected and co-opted members who undertake "saved" regulated activities, namely
 - all members of the Executive,
 - all members of the Health and Wellbeing Board,
 - all members of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee,
 - all members of the Health Scrutiny Committee; and
- (c) requests all other members and co-opted members to agree to basic disclosure checks.

ST/18/22. Work Programme

The committee considered its work programme for its next three meetings, noting the items of business that were scheduled for each of the meetings. The committee agreed the proposals and requested that Social Media Guidance for Councillors be considered in March 2019 at the latest so that any revised guidance was issued before the 2019 local elections.

Decision

To note the report and agree the change to when Social Media Guidance will be considered by the Committee.