

## **Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2021**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Hacking - In the Chair

Councillors Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Connolly, M Dar, Evans, Grimshaw, Hilal, Hussain, Whiston, Wills and Wilson

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Rahman, Deputy Leader  
Elaine Astley, Breakthrough UK

#### **Apologies:**

Councillor Rawson

### **CESC/21/51 Minutes**

The Chair informed the Committee that the Mayor of Greater Manchester, Andy Burnham, and the Deputy Mayor for Policing and Crime, Baroness Beverley Hughes, would be attending the Committee's next meeting on 11 January 2022 and he suggested that Members discuss beforehand the format of and focus for this agenda item.

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9 November 2021 as a correct record.

### **CESC/21/52 Deep Dive: Disability in Manchester**

The Committee received a report of the City Solicitor which provided an overview of the data and activity in Manchester in relation to disability, linked to inequalities in life chances and the impacts of COVID-19. This was one of a series of 'deep dive' reports that the Committee had requested into different aspects of equalities.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Statistical information relating to disabled people in Manchester;
- Work to improve the life chances of disabled people in Manchester; and
- Celebrating diversity.

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

- That the condition of pavements, and roads, was an equalities issue which disproportionately affected disabled people and some other groups such as older people and that decisions on the prioritisation of repairs and maintenance should take into account equality issues;
- That some consultations were not carried out in a way which was accessible to all Manchester residents;

- The impact of austerity measures on disabled people;
- How accessible was this meeting and its papers for disabled people, including people who were visually impaired and the Deaf community;
- What was being done to increase the number of disabled people in senior positions in the Council;
- That the Council should be using the social model of disability; and
- What was being done to ensure that Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs) reflected the impact of proposals on disabled people.

The Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager advised that her team would link up with Age Friendly Manchester and the Highways service to look at what could be done to improve the condition of pavements and she offered to provide Members with an update on this. She advised that she would also talk to the Communications Team about the accessibility of consultations and would update Members on this.

The Strategic Lead (City Centre Partnerships) advised that the Highways Service and officers in Growth and Development who were working on areas such as the public realm and travel were increasingly taking a more joined-up approach to their work. She outlined the work focusing on a modal shift, encouraging people to walk, cycle and use public transport more, and advised that improving pavements and pedestrianising spaces were key to this. She emphasised the importance of consultations being accessible and advised that she was working with officers to look at how this could be improved.

A Member requested that representatives from the Highways Service be invited to a future meeting to discuss equalities issues relating to pavements and roads, to which the Chair agreed.

The Chair suggested that the question about the accessibility of meetings be raised through Committee Services and the Overview and Scrutiny Co-ordinating Group. The Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager offered to discuss with Committee Services how accessibility could be strengthened.

In response to a Member's question, the Head of Commissioning for Adult Social Care outlined the range of supported housing accommodation that was available both in-house and externally and offered to provide any further information that the Member wanted. She advised that people could also be supported to live independently in their own homes, for example, through adaptations or a care package.

The Strategic Lead (Reform and Innovation) reported that workforce equalities issues were being scrutinised by the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee and that they had recently looked at the new Workforce Equality Strategy. The Chair stated that the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee had previously received an update on this workforce equality work and suggested that a further update be scheduled.

The Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager recognised the importance of the social model of disability and informed Members that her team would be looking at how they could increase people's understanding of this. She reported that

strengthening the monitoring and quality assurance of EIAs would be a key priority for her team and she offered to provide further updates on this work. Elaine Astley from Breakthrough UK reported that the Council had adopted the social model of disability over 20 years ago but that, while this approach was still be used in some individual areas, it appeared that the broader understanding of this across all areas of the Council had been lost. She emphasised the importance of the social model of disability being understood across the Council and this approach being embedded across everything the Council was doing, in order to ensure the disabled people were fully included. She cited the example of consultations where, she advised, the Council should be working with disabled people's organisations and disabled people from diverse communities to identify disabling barriers to participating in consultations and identify solutions.

In response to a Member's question about the data in the report, the Strategic Lead (Reform and Innovation) advised that officers had had to use the data which was available to them, which was from multiple sources and, therefore, not consistent; however, she added that work would be taking place next year on the communities of identity report which would enable the Council to obtain qualitative information and a more coherent narrative.

### **Decisions**

1. To recognise the importance of the social model of disability and this approach being embedded across all areas of the Council.
2. To invite representatives from the Highways Service to a future meeting to discuss equalities issues relating to pavements and roads.
3. That the accessibility of meetings be discussed with Committee Services and raised through the Overview and Scrutiny Co-ordinating Group.
4. That an update on the work to improve Workforce Equality be scheduled for a future meeting.

[Councillor Wills declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest as an employee of Manchester Metropolitan University.]

### **CESC/21/53                      Compliance and Enforcement Services - Performance in 2020/21**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided an update on demand for and performance of the Compliance and Enforcement Service during 2020/21 including an overview of the service's activities in support of the Council's response to the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. The report also provided a forward look at challenges and future workload pressures as a result of changes to legislation, policy and areas of growth that would have an impact on the work carried out by Compliance and Enforcement teams.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Overall demand;
- Proactive activity;
- Formal enforcement action;
- COVID-19 response;
- Current challenges and future workload;
- Neighbourhood compliance;
- Food Health and Safety and Airport Team;
- Trading Standards;
- Housing;
- Licensing Out of Hours Team; and
- Environmental Protection Team.

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

- Obstructions on the pavement, such as fruit and vegetable displays and shop signs, and what was being done to address this;
- Cars parking on the pavement;
- To request more information on the review of the approach to inspecting licensed premises;
- Enforcement action against non-Blue Badge holders parking in spaces for Blue Badge holders;
- That the Council should publicise the enforcement action it took to address issues affecting residents;
- Plans in response to the motion passed by Council the previous week relating to drink spiking;
- That there was a perception that enforcement activity was not undertaken consistently and equally across all wards;
- Praise from Members about Compliance Officers within their wards and for the service's work during the pandemic; and
- That there should be a more joined up approach between the Council and Biffa on contaminated bins.

The Head of Compliance Enforcement and Community Safety advised that many businesses owned space in front of their shops and were entitled to use it but, where shop were encroaching onto and obstructing the pavement, her service would take enforcement action. She reported that, where cars were parked in contravention of yellow lines or other traffic regulations, Parking Services would take enforcement action; however, if this was not the case, Greater Manchester Police (GMP) would need to decide whether an obstruction was being caused and, if so, take action. The Chair advised that Councillors needed to have clear information on which service was responsible for these kinds of issues, including the issue of parking in cycleways, so that they could report issues that were raised with them and empower residents to report these themselves. He also expressed concern that these issues were not being enforced to the extent that Members would like and asked the Head of Compliance Enforcement and Community Safety to raise this with Parking Services. The Head of Compliance Enforcement and Community Safety advised that she would also raise the issue of the enforcement of Blue Badge parking spaces with Parking Services. In response to a Member's question, she advised that there was

no legislation which prevented people from parking their cars on residential streets close to Manchester Airport while they went on holiday.

The Head of Compliance Enforcement and Community Safety informed the Committee that the Licensing Out of Hours Team had focused its resources on visiting premises which they had received the highest level of complaints about so some premises had not been visited for a number of years; however, she advised that a programme of inspections was now being put in place to ensure that every licensed premises would be inspected at some point. In response to a question about Martyn's Law, proposed legislation to improve event security following the Manchester Arena bombing, she advised that, although this was not law yet, new premises were encouraged to have these conditions included on their license. A Member recognised the hard work of officers in progressing Martyn's Law, which he hoped would become legislation within the next year or two, and reported that most clubs and premises in Manchester had undertaken some form of counter terrorism training.

In response to a Member's question, the Head of Compliance Enforcement and Community Safety advised that, when taking enforcement action, enforcement officers had to demonstrate that they had first taken reasonable steps to get the person to comply, even if Ward Councillors felt that they had already tried this before referring the issue to her service. She advised that in many cases educating the person or warning them that enforcement action could be taken against them was enough to persuade them to comply. In response to a Member's concern that residents were struggling to get issues addressed until they involved their Ward Councillor, she asked the Member to contact her about any specific examples so that she could look into this. She advised that the response to enforcement was the same across the city, although communities in some areas were more likely to report issues than in other areas. She informed Members that her service provided Ward Councillors with information on enforcement activity through Ward Co-ordination and that Committee Members could be provided with a breakdown of the activity taking place.

The Head of Compliance Enforcement and Community Safety reported that she had been speaking to the Communications Team about publicising enforcement activity which had been taken via social media. She advised that, where formal enforcement action was taken, the service asked for press releases to be issued, although whether this was reported in the press would depend on whether it was a busy news day. She advised that her service had been providing information and advice to bars on drink spiking and that there was a group being set up at a Greater Manchester level to look at this issue.

In response to a Member's questions about the Clean Air Zone, the Head of Compliance Enforcement and Community Safety advised that her service contributed to but did not lead on this work and that she did not anticipate that officers would struggle with this additional work but that she would come back to the Member with further information. She informed the Committee that she would look into the issue that a Member had raised about contaminated bins. In response to a Member's question, she outlined the work taking place in the Strangeways area as part of

Operation Magpie, advising that there was an ongoing sustained commitment from the Council and partner agencies to addressing these issues.

**Decision**

To request that Ward Councillors be provided with information on who is responsible for the enforcement of different kinds of parking issues, including parking on cycleways, and what regulations are being breached in these different situations.

**CESC/21/54 Overview Report**

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

**Decision**

To note the report and agree the work programme.

## **Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 11 January 2022**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Hacking - In the Chair  
Councillors Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Chambers, Connolly, M Dar, Evans, Hilal, Hussain, S Judge, Rawson, Wills and Wilson

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods  
Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for the Environment  
Councillor Igbon, Chair of the Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee and Ward Councillor for Hulme  
Councillor Ahmed Ali, Ward Councillor for Rusholme  
Andy Burnham, Mayor of Greater Manchester  
Baroness Beverley Hughes, Deputy Mayor of Greater Manchester  
Nicky Boothroyd, MCRactive  
Louise Harding, MCRactive

#### **Apologies:**

Councillors Azra Ali and Whiston

### **CESC/22/01 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 7 December 2021 as a correct record.

### **CESC/22/02 Crime and Policing**

The Committee welcomed Andy Burnham, Mayor of Greater Manchester, and Baroness Beverley Hughes, Deputy Mayor of Greater Manchester.

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

- That Ward Councillors across Greater Manchester had been raising concerns about the performance of Greater Manchester Police (GMP) over a number of years but that it had taken the report of HM Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) for action to be taken and how could Ward Councillors be involved and make their voices heard in future;
- Serious youth violence, including the need for a trauma-informed approach and for improved information-sharing;
- How much could realistically be achieved given the funding cuts;
- The closure of police stations and the loss of that as a link between the public and the police;
- What was being done to improve the 101 non-emergency telephone number;
- Concern about the level of communication with victims of crime after they had reported the crime; and

- Concern about an increase in car crime and burglaries and a lack of visible policing on the streets.

Andy Burnham informed Members that he had had concerns about GMP when he was an MP and that he had brought that experience into the role of Mayor of Greater Manchester. He outlined the journey from 2017, when he was elected as Mayor, to the HMIC inspection of 2020, which had judged that the service provided to victims of crime by GMP to be a serious cause of concern. As part of this, he highlighted the review of how GMP and partner agencies had responded to Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE), the Kerslake Report into the preparedness for and response to the Manchester Arena Attack and issues with GMP's computer system, which he advised, the Deputy Mayor had asked for a review of. He reported that these had created a picture of the issues within GMP, the final piece of which had been the HMIC report, which had made it clear that fundamental change was needed, resulting in the decision to change the leadership of GMP. In response to the Member's question about how Greater Manchester could avoid getting into this situation again in future and how Members could be involved, he recognised the importance of engagement with local Councillors and highlighted the introduction of named accountable police teams at a neighbourhood level and meetings with local Councillors and MPs, including police accountability processes taking place in public. He advised that improvements had been made in GMP and that he felt confident that further positive changes would be seen in 2022.

Baroness Hughes agreed that the involvement of local Councillors in contributing to, monitoring and scrutinising changes was essential and advised that this was best focused at the local level. She outlined the changes to the leadership structure since the new Chief Constable had started, including the appointment of new Chief Superintendents for each borough, and how these changes contributed to improved partnership working, communication and problem solving in neighbourhoods. She encouraged Members to engage at a local level and recommended that the Committee meet with their Chief Superintendent, if they had not already done so. She informed the Committee how the new Chief Constable was holding meetings with officers, down to sergeant level, communicating the new ethos, following which officers were committing to a pledge about their role in the locality.

Andy Burnham advised Members that the importance of a trauma-informed approach was recognised across public services in Greater Manchester and that, once this approach was adopted, it changed the ways of thinking and approaches to supporting people in relation to a range of issues, including CSE and homelessness. He offered to provide a note to the Member who had raised this on the adoption of the trauma-informed approach across Greater Manchester.

Andy Burnham informed Members that, although funding cuts from 2010 to 2017 had negatively impacted on GMP, there were already issues with the internal culture of the organisation and that the way the cuts had been implemented had also been part of the problem. He highlighted the decision in 2017 to introduce the precept on Council Tax to provide additional funding to GMP which had enabled them to recruit more police officers and advised that central funding was no longer being reduced and GMP was now receiving an uplift in funding. He advised that last year he had not felt it appropriate to give GMP the full precept that they were asking for, following

the concerns that had been raised about their performance, but that, with changes having been made and the new leadership, it was important now to provide this additional funding; however, he emphasised that his focus was not just on funding levels but the implementation of the Chief Constable's Plan and making improvements in key areas such as the response on the 101 non-emergency telephone number. He encouraged Members to hold their local police teams to account for delivering on GMP's commitments.

In response to a question from the Ward Councillor for Hulme, Andy Burnham highlighted the work of the Violence Reduction Unit, in particular work on a community-led approach to serious youth crime and violence, including a number of pilots across Greater Manchester, one of which was in Moss Side, and the learning that was coming out of those pilots. He advised that he would welcome the Ward Councillor's input into those pilots. In response to the question about police stations, he stated that, while it was not possible to revert to the previous situation of having police stations in every area, as part of the move to having a named accountable team in each neighbourhood, it would be possible to have a base or some way for the public to physically access that team, for example, through a regular surgery at a local library. He advised that enabling people to have access to their neighbourhood police team was important in connecting the teams to their communities and building relationships, recognising that not everyone would want to use online communication.

In response to the question on serious youth violence, Baroness Hughes recognised that information-sharing was key, not only where a homicide had taken place but to identify a young person in difficulty at an early stage and to intervene to protect them. She outlined the multi-agency approach of the Violence Reduction Unit and the community involvement in the pilots taking place. She highlighted the Bill currently going through the House of Lords which would place a duty on local authorities, the police and a number of other agencies, to collaborate to prevent serious violence, including information-sharing.

In response to a question about domestic abuse, Andy Burnham reported that the Gender-Based Violence Strategy had been published last year. He advised that culture change was needed both in the way victims were supported and in relation to the casual harassment of and unacceptable behaviour towards women and girls, noting the link between this and more serious abuse, and he informed Members that the new Gender-Based Violence Board was working on these issues. In response to a question about GMP's IT system, iOPs, he advised that large parts of this did now work well but one part of the system, PoliceWorks, had not been working properly, that a review of PoliceWorks was underway and that a decision on how to resolve this was due to be made in the early part of this year.

Andy Burnham reported that GMP now had the right leadership and the right policy in place and that, with local politicians holding them to account, significant improvements could be expected. He informed the Committee that he would be happy to come back to them in future.

Baroness Hughes informed Members that a new Chief Superintendent had been appointed to lead the contact centre which dealt with 101 and 999 calls and crime

recording and the process of grading and responding to incidents. She advised that this new Chief Superintendent had an excellent track record and detailed plan for improving the service and, having identified that this area was under-resourced, a recruitment exercise was taking place. She advised that the recording of crime had significantly improved but recognised the Member's point about contact with victims after they had reported a crime and outlined some of the approaches being trialled to address this, including an appointment system for officers to visit victims in serious but non-urgent cases, training for officers on what was expected of them and contact cards for officers to hand out. In response to a Member's question about what was being done to address issues in the Cheetham area, she advised that she had raised this with the Chief Constable. She reported that organised criminal gangs were at the root of the problem but that it created a lot of other kinds of crime and disorder which affected local people. She advised that work was periodically taking place in the area to disrupt this activity and reported that the National Crime Agency was also working on this issue but that international gangs were behind this which made it difficult to disrupt. She reported that identifying and pursuing leaders of serious and organised crime was one of GMP's areas of strength. In response to a Member's question, she outlined the approach and purpose of Operation AVRO, a force-wide initiative that delivered a surge of extra resources and specialist officers to a different district within Greater Manchester each month.

In response to a Member's question about work to address gender-based violence, Baroness Hughes informed Members about the first Board meeting which had recently taken place and the planning that was underway on how the strategy would be implemented and progress monitored. She informed Members that this was a multi-agency Board, including people with lived experience of gender-based violence. In response to a Member's question about the police's frontline response to domestic abuse and other gender-based violence, she acknowledged that, based on a review which had taken place, there were some concerning attitudes and behaviours from some police officers and, following this review, a training programme, Domestic Abuse Matters, was being rolled out to all responding officers.

Baroness Hughes advised the Committee that tackling car crime and burglaries linked in directly with the commitment to rebuild neighbourhood policing which had been referred to earlier. She advised that there was now a commitment for police to attend every burglary and robbery in person and that, since this pledge had been made, police had attended 92% of burglaries in person, which was a significant change from the previous situation. She reported that most car thefts were organised by criminal gangs so this needed to be addressed at a number of different levels. In response to a Member's question, she advised that more civilian staff would be recruited to enable police officers who were doing those roles to get back to policing.

In response to a Member's question, Baroness Hughes advised that police School Engagement Officers were not about criminalising young people but about building relationships. She reported that there had been a lot of engagement with schools, pupils and parents about this and that they were only in schools if the school wanted that. She agreed with the Member's point about the need to recruit more officers from under-represented groups and drew Members' attention to GMP's Race Equality Report, advising that the Chief Constable was very involved in and

committed to this work. In response to a Member's question about road safety, she advised that the new Deputy Chief Constable had a track record of developing road safety work and was developing a strategy on this for GMP.

## **Decision**

To thank the Mayor and Deputy Mayor of Greater Manchester for attending.

### **CESC/22/03 Proposed Public Spaces Protection Order - restricting alcohol consumption in public places**

The Committee received a report of the Head of Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety and the Community Safety Lead, Compliance, Enforcement and Community Safety which provided information about the outcome of the statutory consultation regarding the potential introduction of a Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) to restrict the consumption of alcohol in public places and proposed the introduction of a new PSPO.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Background information;
- Early engagement;
- The statutory PSPO consultation and the responses;
- Equality Impact Assessment and the European Convention on Human Rights;
- Risk of displacement;
- The proposed PSPO;
- Enforcement; and
- Next steps.

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

- Would there be resources available to enforce the PSPO;
- That communication with the public needed to make it clear that this was not a ban on drinking alcohol in public places;
- Was this PSPO necessary and proportionate, given the laws that were already in place on being drunk and disorderly and on anti-social behaviour;
- How effective had previous PSPOs been;
- Concern about the wording in the survey and the timing of it during the pandemic when pubs were not open and people's experience of street drinking was not typical of what it would have been in normal circumstances; and
- Some Members stating their support for additional powers to address anti-social behaviour and make communities a better place to live, including a suggestion that in some areas officers should work with local bars.

The Community Safety Lead informed Members that PSPOs like this had been in place in some parts of the city previously but that these had expired and, that rather than just consulting on extending the existing PSPOs, a decision had been made to consult with residents across the city on whether this would be useful in other areas

too. She advised that engagement and enforcement action in relation to the PSPOs would be targeted, based upon reports of anti-social behaviour, rather than widespread action against anyone who was street drinking and that, where these PSPOs had been in force previously, the police had been able to enforce this within their existing resources. She recognised that communication was key, including making the public aware that this was something that would be enforced to address anti-social behaviour, rather than being used routinely. She advised that the existing PSPO in the city centre had been enforced proportionately to tackle problems in particular areas and that a similar approach would be taken if the proposed PSPO was introduced. The Head of Compliance Enforcement and Community Safety reported that this work would include engaging with people who were street drinking and referring them to support services, where appropriate. The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods advised that this proposal took into account historical concerns about street drinking, citing examples from his ward, not just concerns raised during the pandemic.

The Community Safety Lead advised that this was an additional power that could be used to address anti-social behaviour with a focus on engaging with people to get them to comply rather than on issuing penalties. She reported that both Council and police officers would use discretion on what tools to use in a particular case, that a breach of the PSPO would only occur if someone refused to surrender their alcohol when asked to do so and that the response could be a warning, a referral to an appropriate agency or a fixed penalty notice and prosecution if appropriate. She advised that officers believed that the statutory threshold for introducing this PSPO had been met. She advised that there was not much national data available on the effectiveness of PSPOs but that Manchester had seen some impact from PSPOs and they were seen as a useful tool. She agreed to take forward a Member's comments about the importance of clarity in the signage relating to the PSPO. In response to a Member's question, she advised that introducing this across the whole city rather than in specific areas reduced the risk of PSPOs just moving the problem elsewhere.

Noting that the report recommended that the Committee endorse the proposed decision to make a City Wide PSPO to restrict alcohol consumption in a public place, a Member asked that it be made clear that the Committee endorsed this specifically as a tool to address anti-social behaviour, rather than drinking in public places more broadly.

## **Decision**

To endorse the proposed decision to make a City Wide PSPO to restrict alcohol consumption in a public place, specifically as a tool to address anti-social behaviour, and that this should be made clear in signage and communication with the public.

## **CESC/22/04      Climate Change - Events**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which provided an overview of the current City Council approach to help to address the environmental impact of events in the city, acknowledge the ongoing impacts of COVID-19 and what future measures the Council could implement to influence sectoral change and further minimise the carbon footprint of these events.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Background contextual information;
- Climate Change Action Plan 2020-25;
- Sustainable event guides;
- Single use plastics;
- Temporary power: reducing the need for generators;
- Engagement of suppliers; and
- Next steps.

The Chair of the Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee praised the work taking place but advised that more should be done in relation to smaller, community events and that the link between the Events Team and Parks Team should be improved. She reported that more should be done to address the rubbish left after these community events and cross-contamination of different types of waste. She asked whether any workshops could be provided to local community groups to help them to understand what should be done.

The Head of Event Development advised that he would look into work with Parks and what additional measures could be put in place in relation to smaller, community events. He reported that workshops were being arranged for events funded through the Community Events Fund and that he would look into whether this could be expanded to cover groups whose events did not fall into this category. In response to a Member's question, he advised that his team were involved in the festive markets and a number of specialist markets and that he would look at what more could be done in relation to these.

The Executive Member for the Environment informed the Committee that discussions were taking place with the Head of Neighbourhoods about how learning from community events could be embedded into smaller events in neighbourhoods, focusing on reducing waste.

In response to a Member's question about the use of plastic bottles at the Manchester Marathon, the Head of Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth acknowledged that this was an issue and advised that his service was working with the organisers to develop a plan to address this. He reported that the initial focus of work to address the environmental impact of events had been on the larger events but that the Events and Parks Teams were working to ensure that the learning from these events would be shared and embedded more widely to also reduce the impact of smaller events. In response to a Member's question, he confirmed that Friends Groups would be involved in this work. In response to a question about the use of generators for events, he highlighted the information in the report about work to reduce the need for generators.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **CESC/22/05                      Climate Change – Leisure Estate**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) which described the work that had been undertaken over the last three years to retrofit and improve the sustainability of the Council's leisure estate. This contributed to the decarbonisation of Manchester City Council's operational estate and more generally to the climate change emergency. The report outlined the Carbon Reduction Programme (CRP) that was underway to deliver energy efficiency and carbon reduction measures across the estate.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Current emissions;
- Carbon Reduction Programme;
- Leisure operator measures;
- Impact of carbon reduction measures; and
- Next steps.

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

- To welcome the progress being made and that these achievements should be promoted;
- Improving the sustainability of 3G pitches through using cork infill instead of rubber crumb; and
- The impact of people travelling to leisure facilities.

A Member reported that at the Committee's July 2021 meeting, the Committee had asked officers to look into how leisure centre users could be discouraged from using single-use plastic bottles as well as the use of paper towels to wipe down equipment between users and he asked what progress had been made. The Head of Parks, Leisure, Events and Youth informed Members that these issues had been raised with the leisure operators, who had been asked to focus on addressing these issues. He advised that progress was being monitored on a quarterly basis on the use of consumable items in leisure centres and he suggested that the Committee receive a report on recycling in 12 months' time. In response to the question about playing pitches, he advised that Manchester was leading the way in experimenting with the use of cork infill instead of rubber crumb on the pitches that were planned for Hough End but that at this stage the longevity of and the maintenance required for this type of pitch was not known. He agreed that it was important to look at sustainable solutions for pitches and advised that, if cork infill proved to be a reasonable solution, the Council would look at using it elsewhere within the city. He informed Members that the Council's Leisure Strategy set out an aim that all residents should live within 20 minutes' public transport or walk time of a leisure facility and that decisions on the location of new leisure facilities had been made on this basis, supporting the shift towards more people using public transport instead of cars. He advised that the Leisure Strategy was being refreshed, taking into account the Council's declaration of the Climate Emergency. The Chair of the Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee advised that the leisure operators should promote the use of public transport or active travel to access their facilities and that work should also take place with Transport for Greater Manchester on this.

The Executive Member for the Environment supported Members' comments about promoting the achievements made in improving the sustainability of the leisure estate. She also agreed that, as public buildings regularly visited by many Manchester residents, leisure centres should be used to encourage, inform and support residents in behaviour change.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **CESC/22/06 Overview Report**

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

A Member requested an update report on the City Centre PSPO which had been introduced in 2020, to which the Chair agreed.

### **Decision**

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



## **Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 7 December 2021**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Ahmed Ali, Andrews, Clay, Davies, Hitchen, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, B Priest, Robinson, Simcock, Wheeler and Wright

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Craig, Leader  
Councillor White, Executive Member for Employment and Housing

**Apologies:** Councillor Hacking and Rowles

#### **RGSC/21/55 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9 November 2021 as a correct record.

#### **RGSC/21/56 Setting Of The Council Tax Base And Business Rates Shares For Budget Setting Purposes**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that advised on the methodology of calculating the City Council's Council Tax base for tax setting purposes and Business Rates income for budget setting purposes for the 2022/23 financial year, together with the timing of related payments and the decision on business rates pool membership. The Chair of the Committee would be requested to exempt various key decisions from call in.

The Deputy City Treasurer reported that a key change this year was in respect of the mandatory spreading of the collection fund deficit over three years, brought in by the Government due to the impact of Covid.

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

- In what circumstances would the Council not want to be part of the pooling arrangements for business rates; and
- How many business properties were within the four Enterprise Zones and where these pooled with Greater Manchester

The Deputy City Treasurer explained that Government set a spending assessment for each Council on the level of Business Rates to be collected each year. The pooling of business rates allowed for any over collection of Business Rates from any Greater Manchester council to be retained and spread across other council's within the Greater Manchester area that were struggling to meet the level that had been set for them. There would be no advantage to Manchester in withdrawing from these

arrangements. The Deputy City Treasurer agreed to provide information after the meeting on the number of business properties in each of the four Enterprise Zones and confirmed that any growth in Business rates in these Zones were retained within Manchester rather than spread across Greater Manchester

## Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Note that the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Deputy Leader of the Council (Finance) and Leader of the Council, has delegated powers to:
  - Set the council tax base for tax setting purposes in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2013;
  - Calculate the business rates income for budget setting purposes in accordance with the Non-Domestic Rating (Rates Retention) Regulations;
  - Agree the estimated council tax surplus or deficit for 2021/22;
  - Agree the estimated business rates surplus or deficit for 2021/22;
  - Determine whether the Council should be part of a business rate pooling arrangements with other Greater Manchester local authorities in 2022/23;
  - Set the dates of precept payments to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority.
- (2) Note that the Chair of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee will be requested to exempt various key decisions from the call in procedure.

## RGSC/21/57 Council Housing Stock - Governance Arrangements

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) and City Solicitor, that provided a further briefing to the Committee on the proposed governance arrangements in respect of Council housing stock. The proposal is intended to have proper oversight of housing management and maintenance services. Empower tenants and meet the requirements of the White Paper "A charter for social housing tenants".

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The scope of the Board's remit in relation to housing stock in different areas of the City;
- The scope of the Board's remit, including in relation to fire safety matters;
- The proposed composition of the Board;
- Engagement with Elected Members; and
- The timeline for recruitment to the Board.

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

- There was still an issue in relation to the three PFI estates being reference in the draft Terms of Reference and these needed to be removed;

- There was strong concern in relation the proposals around the composition of the Board, which included:-
  - Clarity was needed as to how Elected Members that represented wards with Northwards properties within them will be selected to sit on the Board;
  - Whether the proposal for five of elected members in addition the Executive Member for Housing was enough, as there are fewer members than there are relevant wards;
  - It was not appropriate to compare the composition with Registered Providers and other Housing Providers as what was being proposed was an Advisory Group, not a Governance Board;
  - A proposed two year term of office for the five co-opted residents from the Council's housing stock was felt to be too short and there was no proposed length of the term of office for Elected Members on the board;
  - There was a lack of reference to diversity and gender balance in the membership of the Board in the Terms of Reference;
  - Had the Federation of ALMO's guidance been consulted in drawing up these terms of reference?
  - There was a maximum but no minimum number of independent members of the Board, and no reference to timelines or plans for recruitment to these positions;
  - How would the connectivity of the core housing provision with neighbourhoods and other community delivery impacts, with particular reference to environmental investment and community safety, be undertaken;
  - Clarity of the position of Council Officers in respect of their role with the Board and whether they would be advising it or members of it;
  - What would happen if the Housing Board, as an Advisory Committee, disagreed with a decision made by the Council;
  - Was there any obstacle to the Executive Member for Housing and Employment chairing the Board;
  - Was reference to tenants in the charter inclusive of both tenants and leaseholders;
  - Was all miscellaneous council housing stock going to come under the remit of the proposed Board; and
  - The proposals made no or little reference to the following areas:
    - Review of the HRA Business Plan by the Board;
    - Management of contracts and value for money;
    - Whistleblowing arrangements;
    - Conflicts of interest;
    - Partnership and joint venture arrangements.

The Director of Housing Operations confirmed that the three PFI estates were not included within the proposals. He apologised for this oversight and agreed to have reference to these removed from the draft terms of reference for the Board.

In terms of the composition of the Board, he advised that governance arrangements of Registered Providers and similar sized organisations across the country had been looked at, acknowledging however that Local Government operated in a different context, but it was felt that there needed to be the right balance around the resident

voice and elected members with further contribution from independent specialist members.

Noting the concerns raised by the Committee in relation to the composition, the Executive Member for Housing and Employment agreed that this would be reconsidered with the points raised being taken into consideration.

The Director of Housing Operations advised that community safety was a core component part of the governance arrangements being put in place. Work around this was being undertaken in partnership with the Council's Neighbourhoods team and Northwards and although at present there was no intention for tenants to be part of this work, this could be looked at.

The City Solicitor advised that if an Elected Member sat on the Board which did not agree with a decision made by the Council, then the Elected Member would likely have a conflict of interest and commented that they should speak to herself in advance so appropriate advice could be given.

The Leader commented that housing management sat within the Neighbourhoods Executive portfolio but if this post was vacant then the Board would be chaired by the Executive Member for Housing and Employment. The Leader acknowledged the concerns that had been raised around the proposed composition of the Board and agreed that this would be addressed, including appropriate diversity and gender balance.

The Director of Housing Operations confirmed miscellaneous council housing stock would not come under the remit of the proposed Board.

The City Solicitor advised that as Northwards was now part of the Council, it would be required to follow the same rules and requirements of the Council, as set out with the constitution. The scope and role of the Board would continue to be developed to ensure it scrutinised the appropriate areas that had been highlighted by the Committee and a number of sub groups would be established under the Board to strengthen the engagement framework with tenants and residents.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report.
- (2) Requests Officers and the appropriate Executive Member(s) re-consider the proposed makeup of the Board in light of the comments and concerns raised and in doing so recommends that:-
  - the PFI stock is explicitly removed from the Terms of Reference;
  - the maximum term of office for both Elected Members and the co-opted residents from the Council's housing stock should be set at a maximum of six years, that there should be parity between Members and residents, and that consideration be given to staggering the lengths of membership of the Board so that there is progressive rolling change in personnel over time;

- the terms of reference cover how conflicts of interest for Elected Members are to be addressed;
- the terms of reference explicitly refer to gender balance and ensuring diversity and protected characteristics are proportionately reflected across the membership of the Board;
- the terms of reference identify which Scrutiny Committee(s) will be responsible for scrutinising the work of the Board.
- the terms of reference refer to the conurbation of Northwards Housing Stock rather than North Manchester, in order to truly reflect the location of all Northwards residents;
- the terms of reference are explicit insofar as the Board will act as an advisory body and not a governance and decision-making body; and
- consideration be given to a minimum number of co-opted non-resident members to be appointed, and a strategy is drawn up for timely recruitment of suitably qualified independent members.

### **RGSC/21/58 Manchester's Park Development Programme 2021 - 2025**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods), that provided an overview of the financial (revenue and capital) position for parks, with reference to the impact of the pandemic and an update on the programme of investment to deliver revenue savings beyond 2021.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Noting the vision, key themes and actions of the Manchester Park's strategy;
- Information on the Parks Development Programme;
- Describing capital projects and investment, both live and in the pipeline;
- Revenue achieved through parks

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

- In relation to live projects, clarification was sought as to which Park was to benefit from new cycling facilities, subject to funding confirmation from British Cycling;
- Had any thought been given to whether there was a tipping point between the use of a park as a form of income generation and being a public accessible open space;
- It was felt that small ward parks should be kept as public open spaces and not used for income generation so not to exclude those resident who could not afford to attend events;
- How was additional funds, with an anticipated £427k income growth by 2024/25 expected to be achieved;
- How did the Council balance the letting of large contracts against ensuring small local suppliers were not excluded;
- The contribution and value that volunteers brought to local parks needed to be acknowledged;

- An audit should be undertaken on the number of parks that had access to public conveniences;
- A holistic view on the running costs of all parks was needed to understand how the spend was allocated and distributed geographically, including what was considered capital and revenue costs;
- What work was being done in respect of improvements to playing fields;
- The investment that was being made in parks needed to be promoted more to address false reporting of parks being under threat; and
- How had the park plans been impacted by the Covid pandemic; and
- Were any parks in Manchester under threat of being sold off for development.

The Head of Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events confirmed that it was Wythenshawe Park that was to benefit from new cycling facilities, subject to funding confirmation from British Cycling. He added that in terms of income generation, the model developed was not to charge for basic or core services, which included access. It was more about where the Council could encourage people to stay in parks longer and choose to spend money rather than go elsewhere, such as good quality café facilities, other concession stands, bringing in attractions periodically which added value over and above the core offer. He advised that the Council had consolidated its contracting arrangements, which for example had resulted in a £90,000 per year from the sale of ice cream alone. He assured the Committee that in adopting this position, it had not been done to attract larger contractors but to derive certain benefits from economies of scale, however in practice, the Council had issued a number of lots for the sale of ice cream and all the companies that had secured these were local companies.

He also advised the Committee that the current strategy would not suggest the charging of core services to attend parks. He acknowledged that point made around the affordability of events in parks and commented that there was a balance to be struck between adding value to communities and generating income for reinvestment.

The Head of Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events reported that he did not feel the Council was anywhere near the tipping point in relation to the use of parks as income generation and being public accessible open spaces and there was still many things that could be done to improve parks and generate income through secondary spend, which linked into the income targets outlined in the report.

The Head of Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events acknowledged the role and contribution of volunteers to parks and would include reference to this in a future report. He added that it was recognised that parks contributed to improvements in public health and wellbeing but through austerity they had struggled to secure investment for the assets within the parks and there was a need for a stronger asset management plan for parks as part of the strategy.

It was explained that there was a separate strategy that addressed the investment and improvements to be made to playing fields and there was interdependency between the two strategies. In relation to Park plans, these were important as they set a framework for investment, however given that £960,000 had been allocated to delivered improvements across every ward, the absence of a park plan would not

prevent improvements from taking place. The impact of the pandemic had been the inability to have face to face meetings with “Friends” groups and people’s reluctance to do things that were not seen to be essential.

The Head of Parks, Leisure, Youth and Events assured the Committee that no park in Manchester was under threat of being sold off for development.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report.
- (2) Request a future report that provides a more holistic view on the running costs of all parks and allotments to understand how the spend is allocated, and distributed geographically, including what is considered capital and revenue costs.

## **RGSC/21/59 Community Safety Partnership Spend**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods), that provided an overview of the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) spend.

This will include details of the members, strategic priorities, and funding sources. The report will also provide details of how the partnership allocates funding and the approved spending plans for 2021/22, and some of the activity and outcomes of previously funded projects.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Details of the members of the CSP, strategic priorities, and funding sources;
- How the partnership allocated funding and the approved spending plans for 2021/22; and
- Activity and outcomes of previously funded projects.

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

- What was the totality of the money available for community safety, who decided how it was allocated, what criteria was used in determining allocation and what monitoring of spend was taking place, with specific reference to youth funding;
- What lobbying was being done to change the current budgetary process from an annual allocation and was there anything the Committee do to support this;
- Was the provision of CCTV included within the budget for Community Safety;
- Further clarity of how the funding was allocated was needed;
- Funding of £15,000 to tackle hate crime appeared to be low

The Community Safety Lead advised that the Community Safety Partnership received an annual payment from the Greater Manchester Combined Authority and for 2021/22 this equated to £1.13m made up of four, one-year funding grants, which could not be used to provide mainstream services within any of the agencies, including police overtime. The CSP strategy had a number of key priorities and each

priority was overseen by theme leads who were responsible for developing the Partnership's response with regards to their priority. At the start of each financial year, the CSP Board would agree a funding plan that identified spending on each priority.

The Community Safety Lead acknowledged that a more detailed breakdown of what the allocated spend covered would have been helpful and to assure Members, gave an example in relation to the spend in protecting people from serious harm would include spend around tackling moderns slavery, family support for individuals subject to exploitation, domestic violence and abuse spend, spend on community engagement on Prevent and raising community awareness. The CSP Board was reliant on a number of processes to ensure the commissioning of work was appropriate and relied on partners in different services including the voluntary and community sector in utilising their commissioning processes as the team did not have the resources to undertake these processes themselves.

The Community Safety Lead advised that the Council had raised the challenge for annual funding with the GMCA and how that impact don the ability to plan in advance. She also advised that the provision of CCT was not included in the funding for Community Safety. In addition the Community Safety Lead reported that the Council topped up the funding to tackle hate crime, adding a further £30,000 to the overall budget.

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

### **RGSC/21/60 Annual S106 Monitoring Report**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director, Growth and Development, that provided an update on the Council's Section 106 (s106) activity for the municipal years 2019/20, 2020/21 and 2021/22 (to date). The report further provided an update on the management and administration of planning obligations and set out the progress on unspent funds.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Information following Internal Audit's review of the new S106 governance arrangements;
- An indication of affordable housing being provided from S106 contributions;
- How Developers were encouraged to mitigate any harm from their developments;
- Best practice and comparison of S106 arrangements with other GM local authorities; and
- The S106 triggers for planning applications within the Deansgate Ward.

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

- Could an example be given of an occasion where the appropriate trigger has been met to facilitate the reconciliation process;

- Further clarity was needed on how officers saw the role and input from Elected Members for the allocation of S106 spend within their ward;
- It would be helpful to have examples of other local planning authorities of their approach to allocation of S106 spend;
- Could S106 spend allocated to one ward be spent in another ward;
- What was the S106 money allocated to affordable housing being spent on; and
- It was important to note that not all S106 agreements were financial and some did relate to improvements made to areas within respective wards.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing advised that there had not yet been an occasion where the appropriate trigger had been met to facilitate the reconciliation process so was not able to provide an example. In terms of the input of Elected Members, there were certain points in the process, especially around pre-application stage where applicants were encouraged to engage with Elected Members to discuss requirements for mitigations before the application was formally submitted; once submitted applications were on a weekly list and there was also an opportunity to comment when an application is presented to the Planning and Highways Committee. She added that in addition, when S106 money was received, officers should engage with relevant ward members and agreed to develop this process in order to be consistent across the city. It was reported that there was a meeting planned in early 2022 with other core cities around how S106 monies were being secured and negotiated.

The Executive Member for Environment acknowledged the frustration on the lack of consistency in the engagement with Elected members on the allocation of S106 spend and agreed to pick this up with officers outside of the meeting and an update would be provided to all Members.

It was clarified that S106 money allocated to one ward could not always be spent in another ward as there was a need for a geographical link to the application in question (with the exception of a affordable housing contribution) and had to be spent within the terms of the original legal agreement.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment advised that the Council's Housing Affordability Fund did take money from S106 agreements and there was a governance process to ensure this was best spent across the city to deliver as much social rent and affordable housing as possible. This would include working in partnership with Registered Providers.

## **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

## **RGSC/21/61 Overview Report**

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

## **Decision**

To note the overview report and agree the Committee's Work Programme.

## Health Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2021

#### Present:

Councillor Green – in the Chair  
Councillors Curley, Hussain, Leech, Monaghan, Newman and Richards

**Apologies:** Councillors N. Ali, Appleby, Cooley, Reeves and Riasat

#### Also present:

Councillor Midgley, Deputy Leader  
Dr Manisha Kumar, Executive Clinical Director, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC)  
Chris Gaffey, Head of Corporate Governance, MHCC  
Professor Navneet Kapur, Head of Research at the Centre for Suicide Prevention, University of Manchester  
Charles Kwaku-Odoi, Caribbean & African Health Network  
Lynne Stafford, Chief Executive, Gaddum  
Dorothy Evans, Chief Executive, African Caribbean Care Group  
Gaynor Morgan, Carer and Chair of the Manchester Carers Forum  
Saeed Jan, Carer and citizen of Manchester

### HSC/21/50 Minutes

#### Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 10 November 2021 as a correct record.

### HSC/21/51 COVID-19 Update

The Committee considered the joint presentation of the Director of Public Health and the Executive Clinical Director, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning, that had been circulated to all Members in advance of the meeting. The presentations provided an update on COVID-19 activity that included the latest available information on data and intelligence.

The Director of Public Health provided the latest information and response to the variant of concern, Omicron. He noted that at that time of reporting there had been no deaths in Manchester attributed to Omicron, however the emerging situation continued to be monitored very closely both at a local and national level to understand the transmissible rates of this variant and levels of community transmissions. He described that local teams were in place to support those people required to self-isolate and he further commented that sites, such as schools, would be supported to manage any outbreaks.

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

- Noting the variant of concern, Omicron;

- An update was sought on the impact of the mandated COVID-19 vaccinations for Health and Social Care staff;
- Recognising the urgent need for all residents to come forward for their booster jabs and in particular those who had still not had their first vaccination;
- Describing inconsistencies in the approach taken by some Care Homes in regard to the numbers of visitors permitted;
- The need to understand the correlation between the number of hospital admissions and patients who had been vaccinated; and
- Welcoming the extension to the cohorts being encouraged to obtain their booster jabs.

The Director of Public Health stated that Care Homes were required to comply with the current guidance regarding visitors. He said that if the Member had specific concerns regarding a site that he could discuss this outside of the meeting.

In regard to the issue of mandated COVID-19 vaccinations for Health and Social Care staff, the Deputy Director of Adult Social Services stated that currently this only applied to staff in Care Homes, noting that the deadline for all Health staff, including ancillary staff such as porters or receptionists who might have social contact with patients but were not directly involved in their care, as well as staff in the wider care market e.g. homecare, supported accommodation was 1 April 2022. She described that the uptake amongst care homes in Manchester had been positive, however some staff had been lost due to not wishing to take the vaccine. She advised that regular contact was maintained with providers to ensure safe and appropriate levels of care continued to be provided.

The Director of Public Health noted the comment regarding the relationship between hospital admissions and patients who were not vaccinated or partially vaccinated. He stated that he would discuss with health partners to ascertain if this data was collected and if so, this would be reported to the Committee in a future update. In regard to the importance for those residents who had not been vaccinated to come forward he made reference to the role of trusted community messaging and the breadth of work of COVID-19 Health Equity Manchester who had attended and presented at the October meeting (see minutes of 13 October 2021 reference HSC/21/40 Building Back Fairer in Manchester).

### **Decision**

The Committee recommend that information on the relationship between COVID-19 hospital admissions and patient vaccination status be provided in future updates.

### **HSC/21/52 Suicide Prevention Local Plan**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Public Health and Professor Navneet Kapur, Head of Research at the Centre for Suicide Prevention, University of Manchester that provided the Committee with an update on the paper on suicide prevention submitted in December 2019 and specifically reported progress on the delivery of the local Suicide Prevention Plan (2017 - 2019) and on the development of a refreshed plan for 2020 – 2024.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The national and local strategic context of suicide prevention;
- Key trends, facts, figures and risk factors relating to suicides in Manchester;
- The COVID-19 pandemic and suicide risk;
- A summary of key areas of activity contributing to suicide prevention; and
- Progress on delivery of actions within the local plan.

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

- Welcoming the report and noting that it provided a useful context for the subject area;
- An explanation was sought as to why suicide rates in Manchester had fallen;
- Welcoming the stated commitment to the Armed Forces Covenant to support veterans and their families and enquired if any additional support was available for this cohort;
- Was Greater Manchester Police (GMP) a member of the Manchester Suicide Prevention Partnership;
- Suicide awareness training should be extended to as many front-line staff as possible, noting that Further Education providers should also be included in this;
- How was success to be measured against the pillars articulated within the Action Plan;
- Recommending that Manchester should participate in the reported pilot for the collection of key 'real time' data, co-ordinated by the Greater Manchester Suicide Prevention lead;
- What alternatives were there for residents experiencing crisis or at risk of crisis for whom traditional services were not appropriate or preferred; and
- Noting that Manchester was a Marmot City and this understanding and approach to tackle health inequalities would support the ambitions of the city to address incidents of suicide.

Professor Kapur, Head of Research at the Centre for Suicide Prevention, University of Manchester stated that suicide was a very complex issue, commenting that it was an intensely personal expression of acute distress. He informed the Members that the accepted term to describe such tragic events was 'died by suicide' rather than 'committed suicide'. He described that nationally the rates of suicide had reduced, stating that the accepted national drivers were economic factors, public health factors and the delivery of clinical service, adding that good progress had been achieved in Manchester to improve these. He described that the impact of the pandemic, both in the immediate and long term would be closely monitored.

Professor Kapur commented that the specific needs of veterans was understood and was a live issue with work ongoing. In regard to how success was to be measured he advised that the levels of self-harm were an indicator of suicide rates and trends across the population.

Professor Kapur stated that Manchester had progressed significantly in its understanding and response to the issue of suicide and paid tribute to the work of the Manchester Suicide Prevention Partnership.

The Programme Lead, Manchester Population Health Team advised that the delivery of suicide awareness training to front line staff, including call centre staff and homelessness workers was an ongoing project, noting that during the pandemic this had continued to be delivered online. The Locality Manager advised that staff were trained and encouraged to engage in conversations on suicide, recognise trigger signs and escalate when appropriate. She described that there was a good relationship across the Manchester Suicide Prevention Partnership and good practice and experiences were regularly shared across staff and teams.

Charles Kwaku-Odoi, Caribbean & African Health Network, described the programme of delivering training across the Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) partners. He stated that despite the pandemic this had continued to be delivered virtually and the challenge to partners was to understand and address the reasons and barriers as to why people did not access services.

The Programme Lead, Manchester Population Health Team confirmed that GMP were a member of the Manchester Suicide Prevention Partnership, adding that they had their own suicide prevention training. In response to the point raised regarding the GM pilot and real time data, she advised that in Manchester a good relationship already existed with the local Coroner and those in the neighbouring boroughs, however consideration would be given as to how the Manchester data could contribute to the pilot. She further commented that data from the North West Ambulance Service was now available.

In response to the discussion regarding alternative services and support for residents, Professor Kapur commented that all services needed to be fit for purpose and appropriate for those people accessing them, adding that this was national issue. The Director of Public Health commented that alternative routes of support and pathways were available, such as Be Well services and Social Prescribing, noting that the Committee would be receiving a report on this subject at a future meeting. He further commented that the recommendations of the Marmot Review were understood and incorporated into this important area of work.

The Deputy Leader advised the Committee that she was Chair of the Manchester Suicide Prevention Partnership and provided testimony to the positive and committed approach by all of those involved. She described that significant progress had been achieved over the years in the city on the issue of suicide and stated that this learning and good practice was shared across Greater Manchester. The Deputy Leader concluded by thanking all involved in this important activity of work.

## **Decision**

The Committee recommend that consideration is given to Manchester contributing to the Greater Manchester pilot for the collection of key 'real time' data co-ordinated by the Greater Manchester Suicide Prevention lead.

## **HSC/21/53 Our Manchester Carers Strategy Update**

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director of Adult Social Services that provided an update on progress to further develop the Our Manchester Carers Strategy since the last update to Health Scrutiny in September 2019.

Progress in some areas has been hindered through the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, however, there were still many significant developments to update Members on which had transformed how carers were better supported to continue/maintain their caring role.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing a background and introduction to the report, describing that the nationally-adopted definition was provided by the Carers Trust – ‘a carer is anyone who cares, unpaid, for a friend or family member who, due to illness, disability, a mental health need or addiction cannot cope without their support’.
- Evidence how additional funding, secured in 2019, had been used to implement a new carer pathway delivered through a strong partnership between Manchester Carers VCSE organisations, Adult Social Care Commissioners and Adult Social Care Carers Team, embracing carers across all age groups over 18 years and disability groups;
- Noting that effective support for unpaid, informal or family-based caring arrangements remained critical to the sustainability of our health and social care system and the success of our Better Outcomes, Better Lives programme as well as initiatives such as ‘discharge to assess’ designed to further shift the focus from acute interventions to care and support delivered closer to home;
- Describing that progress in some areas had been hindered through the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic;
- Information on the report ‘Breaks or Breakdown’, published by Carers UK in 2021 that described the impact of the pandemic on carers;
- Detailing the Adult Social Care Statutory duties under the Care Act 2014;
- The Vision for Carers in Our Manchester Carers Strategy and how this could be achieved by a new delivery model;
- An update on the Carers Manchester Network Coordination; Carers Manchester Contact Point and Locality Partnerships;
- Describing how the NHS Long Term Plan would support carers;
- Information on the Manchester City Council Carers Emergency Fund, noting the positive impact this had;
- Key highlights from the academic survey that had been undertaken of Carers in 2021;
- Other key developments that benefited Carers, including work on the Covid-19 vaccine uptake for Carers and partnerships with cultural, leisure and sport outlets;
- Describing that options for developing a Carer Break, building on the Liverpool City Council developments, were being progressed;
- Identified challenges and risks; and
- Conclusions.

Members heard from Saeed, a Carer who described his lived experience and difficulties when trying to navigate the benefits system to access Carer's Allowance. Members acknowledged the frustration and distress experienced by Saeed and encouraged him to contact his local MP who would be able to assist with issues relating to the Department of Work and Pensions.

The Committee also heard from Gaynor Morgan, Carer and Chair of the Manchester Carers Forum who articulated her lived experience as a full-time carer. She described the immense positive support she had received from the Carers Manchester Contact Point and how she had encouraged other carers she came into contact with to access this free service.

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

- Thanking the invited guests for attending the meeting and sharing their lived experience with the Committee;
- Noting that the issue of young carers fell within the remit of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee;
- Welcoming the delivery of the Carers Manchester Contact Point (CMCP) and noting the positive experience of this articulated by the invited guests;
- Noting the significant contribution the Carers Emergency Fund had made in supporting Carers and recognising the importance of this and the need to promote all avenues of financial support available to carers;
- The future funding of Gaddum and other VSCE organisations;
- The need to identify and engage with 'hidden carers' noting that often individuals do not identify themselves as carers;
- Further information was sought on the reported underspend of the Carers' Personal Budget; and
- Noting the importance of informal information sharing and signposting amongst carers.

The Strategic Lead (Commissioning) advised the Committee that the additional investment in the Our Manchester Carer Support was realised through the Greater Manchester Transformation Fund (GMTF) and the Our Manchester Investment Fund (OMIF – MCC) over a two-year period which would come to an end in March 2022 and this would impact both Gaddum and the other eighteen Voluntary Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) partners. She described that discussions were currently ongoing with the Deputy Director of Adult Social Services to consider all future funding options, noting the importance of maintaining the progress that had been made to date, in particular the CMCP. In response to the question relating to the Personal Budget underspend she advised that any reported underspend would be included back into the global budget, however they remained fully committed to a balanced budget and staff were actively working to identify additional carers who would be eligible for this fund.

The Strategic Lead (Commissioning) noted the comments from the Member in regard to the important contribution the Carers Emergency Fund had made to the lives of carers and she further paid tribute to the staff in the Carers Manchester Contact Point and those in the Revenues and Benefits Unit who had administered this fund.

Lynne Stafford, Chief Executive, Gaddum described the challenges that the pandemic had presented when trying to deliver the CMCP, noting that this had to be delivered by staff working remotely. She stated that despite this challenge the service had been launched successfully and provided a free, single point of contact for carers.

Dorothy Evans, Chief Executive, African Caribbean Care Group provided an account of the activities and work delivered at a local level to provide culturally appropriate support and advice to the local community. She described that this was delivered by engaging with and understanding the specific needs and barriers experienced by the community before they reached a crisis point. Lynne Stafford, Chief Executive, Gaddum also described the work delivered in localities to identify and support those hidden carers, adding that there was specific pathway designed to support young carers.

### **Decision**

The Committee recommend that the Deputy Leader consider the options to maintain the Carers Emergency Fund.

### **HSC/21/54 Overview Report**

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

In response to a question from a Member regarding the reported Care Quality Commission rating awarded to a Dental Practice, Officers reported that a response would be provided following the meeting.

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report and agrees the work programme.



## **Health Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 12 January 2022**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Richards – in the Chair  
Councillors Appleby, Curley, Hussain, Leech, Monaghan, Newman and Riasat

**Apologies:** Councillors Cooley, Green and Reeves

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Midgley, Deputy Leader  
Stephen Gardner, Programme Director, Single Hospital Service, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Andrew Maloney, Director of Human Resources and Deputy Chief Executive, Greater Manchester Mental Health Trust  
Michelle Humphreys, Director of Strategic Projects, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Jackie McVan, Greater Manchester Head of Services for Change, Grow, Live  
Caitriona Gallagher, Be Smoke Free, Team Manager for Change, Grow, Live

#### **HSC/22/01 Appointment of Chair**

Councillor Richards was nominated to Chair the meeting. This was seconded and approved by the Committee.

#### **Decision**

To appoint Councillor Richards as Chair for the meeting.

#### **HSC/22/02 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2021 as a correct record.

#### **HSC/22/03 COVID-19 Update**

The Committee considered the joint presentation of the Director of Public Health and the Executive Clinical Director, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning, that had been circulated to all Members in advance of the meeting. The presentations provided an update on COVID-19 activity that included the latest available information on data and intelligence.

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

- The Committee again reiterated their recognition and appreciation for all involved with the vaccination programme;

- What was the correlation between COVID-19 related hospital admissions and the patients' vaccination status;
- The need to challenge and counter the misinformation relating to the vaccination and pregnancy that was being circulated on social media, particularly amongst young people;
- Commenting that due to the high infection rates and transmissibility of OMICRON it was important for all to observe mask wearing, adding that this was a societal, in addition to a personal responsibility to protect everyone;
- Patients and their families' lived experience of COVID-19 should be used to articulate the importance of receiving the vaccination and the serious consequences of not doing so;
- It was the responsibility for everyone to come forward and receive their vaccination and noting the vaccination rates in Manchester it was important to keep articulating this and encouraging people to come forward; and
- Noting the recent changes announced in relation to the requirement not to obtain a PCR test following a positive LFT result, was there a possibility that this would skewer the reported infection rates as people either did not always formally record their results or were reluctant to report a positive test.

The Director of Public Health provided the Committee with the figures of those patients currently admitted to hospital with COVID-19 related illness and their vaccination status, noting that in critical care this was five times higher. He stated that this clearly demonstrated the need and importance of receiving the vaccination and booster. He stated that there was no call for mandatory vaccination in the UK and the approach was for citizens to take the vaccination on a voluntary basis, with the caveat in relation to specific professions and settings. He further commented that people who may have been hesitant may decide to take up the offer of the vaccination when they were required to provide vaccination passports to undertake travel or participate and access events.

In response to a request for more granular data on the cohorts admitted to hospital as a result of COVID-19, the Director of Public Health advised there was a challenge to providing this data in real time to report to the Committee.

The Director of Public Health informed the Committee that there was a pilot being delivered at the Etihad stadium where those people who had received their vaccination overseas could attend to have their vaccination validated, their COVID-19 passport records updated, and a booster administered where appropriate.

The Director of Public Health stated that they remained committed to work with communities and networks, including schools to address concerns people had and challenge prevailing myths to maximise the take up of the vaccination. In response to a comment regarding the infection rates across different wards and the demographic profiles he stated that this was closely monitored and analysed to understand specific trends and where appropriate deploy targeted interventions.

The Director of Public Health accepted the comment made regarding the reporting of LFT results and advised that the Communications Team were delivering a campaign to encourage people to regularly test and report the results. He added that he understood that PCR testing would resume at some point and had only been

suspended temporarily as a result of the demand experienced by the service. He said that he would keep the Committee informed of these developments.

The Director of Public Health commented that he acknowledged the comment regarding using lived experience and case studies in campaigns to promote the vaccination programme and made reference to the Communications and engagement focus slide within the pack that had been provided to Members. The Chair commented that it would be useful to have a more detailed update on the Communications strategy, both at a local and national level in a future update.

The Deputy Leader paid tribute to all staff and partners working to address COVID-19 for their continued dedication and hard work. She particularly paid tribute to the teams working in Adult Social Care who were working to safely discharge patients from hospital settings into alternative, appropriate and safe care pathways. She commented that this was testimony to the positive partnership approach to working to deliver improved health outcomes for Manchester residents.

### **Decision**

The Committee recommend that a future update includes a detailed discussion on the vaccination and COVID-19 communications strategy, with specific discussion in relation to the measures taken to counter misconceptions and myths surrounding the vaccination, noting that the Committee request that appropriate officers are in attendance.

### **HSC/22/04 Alcohol, Drugs, and Tobacco Addiction Treatment Services in Manchester**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Public Health that provided the Committee with an overview of the Drug and Alcohol Treatment and Support and Tobacco Addiction Treatment Services commissioned by the Manchester Population Health/Public Health Team.

To accompany the report a video was played that articulated the voice of the service user.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The Manchester Drug and Alcohol Treatment and Support Service and Tobacco Addiction Treatment Service is provided by Change, Grow, Live (CGL);
- Providing a strategic context both at a local and national level;
- Key statistics;
- A description of the service offer for each service;
- An outline of the performance and an overview of the successes and challenges;
- The impact of COVID-19; and
- Next steps.

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

- Recognising the valuable and important role that the services provided;

- Had there been a reduction in the numbers of clients seen due to the impact of COVID-19 and the move to online consultations;
- The need to recognise and address the correlation between socio-economic deprivation and smoking and drug consumption;
- Was there any evidence to suggest that the increased cost of tobacco had any impact on the numbers of smokers;
- Was there any evidence to indicate if the historic reduction and closure of services had any impact on the numbers of people seen or being supported by the drug and alcohol service;
- Noting the prevalence in specific areas of needles being disposed of irresponsibly and what was being done to address this; and
- Was there any evidence currently available to identify the number of COVID-19 related deaths amongst drug users.

In presenting the report, the Strategic Commissioning Manager advised the Committee that there was a correction at sections 4.2.1 and 5.5.1 of the paper. She reported that the service is specified to supply Varenicline, commonly known by its trade name Champix, which was an important stop smoking medication, often used alongside Nicotine Replacement Therapy, but because of a national issue, this currently cannot be sourced or provided at the moment. She reported that there was no end date for this situation currently and it was likely that it would impact on quit rates.

In response to the question on the issue of historic reduction and closure of services and the impact on the numbers of people seen or being supported by the drug and alcohol service, the Strategic Commissioning Manager advised that any data available would be circulated for information following the meeting.

The Greater Manchester Head of Services for Change, Grow, Live discussed the impact that COVID-19 had placed on the delivery of services, in particular the planned launch of the Be Smoke Free programme that coincided with the beginning of the pandemic. She said staff had responded quickly and effectively to deliver these sessions online and commented that the numbers of people seen had not reduced as a result, adding that some people who might otherwise not have attended an in-person appointment had accessed services online. She commented that where appropriate medication had been delivered to people's doors.

The Be Smoke Free, Team Manager for Change, Grow, Live supported the comments previously given as to the challenge presented by COVID-19. She said that the intention was to continue to deliver a hybrid model of service delivery and to raise the profile of the service amongst communities going forward.

The Greater Manchester Head of Services for Change, Grow, Live discussed the successful response to bring homeless people indoors at the start of the pandemic. She described the wrap around support that had been provided to both homeless people, including providing vaping devices for smokers, and support for the staff working in those sites. She stated this had been very successful and had provided an opportunity to engage with and assist homeless people around often complex issues to achieve long term positive outcomes.

In response to the question asked relating to the number of COVID-19 related deaths amongst drug users, the Director of Public Health stated this data was not currently available. He further responded to an earlier comment regarding the figures provided within the report relating to alcohol dependency by advising that these were compiled using Public Health England National Data.

The Greater Manchester Head of Services for Change, Grow, Live responded to the issue of the disposal of needles and needle exchanges by commenting that there was no need for people to use dirty needles and there were provisions across a range of locations to dispose of needles safely. She described that there were outreach workers, that included ex-users with lived experience, who would attend specific sites at the appropriate times to engage with users and offer advice and signpost to help and support. She further described the locations around the city as to where advice and information could be obtained, in addition to their social media presence. Noting the positive comments from the Members she extended an invitation to any Member wishing to visit the teams and accompany them when they were out and engaging with users to further understand the work of the service and witness the impact this had.

The Programme Lead stated that the prevalence of smoking in Manchester was high, noting that it was recognised that the incidents of smoking was related to deprivation. She stated that a Tobacco Control Programme had been developed at a Greater Manchester level, based on the World Health Organisation framework. She said this had an emphasis on prevention and de-normalisation of tobacco in addition to treatment services. In reply to the question relating to the pricing of tobacco as an incentive to quit smoking she stated that whilst the cost of tobacco was high it was important to acknowledge that there was a significant presence of organised crime that flooded communities across the city with illicit tobacco. She described that e-cigarettes and similar devices were not licensed medication and as such were regulated by Trading Standards legislation. In response to a question relating to the smoking of shisha she said that the Licensing Out Of Hours Team had been proactive in monitoring and visiting those establishments where this activity was undertaken across the city to ensure they were compliant with the relevant legislation.

## **Decision**

The Committee note the report and thanked all of the invited representatives for attending the meeting and contributing to the Members' discussion.

## **HSC/22/05 Health Infrastructure Developments**

The Committee considered the joint report of the Executive Director of Strategy, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning Group, Executive Director of Workforce and Corporate Business, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust, Deputy Chief Executive, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust, Director of Strategic Projects, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust and Director of Inclusive Economy, Manchester City Council that provided an update on health infrastructure developments in North Manchester, including New Park House, the

North Manchester General Hospital (NMGH) site redevelopment and the associated North Manchester Strategy; and at Wythenshawe Hospital.

The report was accompanied by a presentation that further articulated the key points within the report.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- An update on the developments in North Manchester, noting the North Manchester Strategy, the shared ambition of the key partner organisations in Manchester to deliver much-needed investment in North Manchester, and to use this as a stimulus to drive economic regeneration and improved health and wellbeing for the local population;
- An update on the New Park House Development; and
- An update on the developments at Wythenshawe Hospital, noting that the Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF) for MFT's Wythenshawe site was endorsed by the Executive on 17 March 2020.

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

- Noting that the plans for North Manchester presented an exciting and positive development for the site that was in much need of modernisation and recognising the significant wider benefits to the local area in terms of employment and skills;
- Noting that it was important to ensure that public transport links to hospital sites were improved;
- Seeking an assurance that services would not be relocated from North Manchester General Hospital, stressing the importance of retaining the status of the provision as a General Hospital;
- Welcoming the proposals to develop Park House and enquiring what support would be offered to patients transferring from the old provision into the new one;
- Expressing concern that the proposals for Wythenshawe Hospital to release the potential of the site to attract significant complementary economic activity such as research and innovation was dependant on a change to national policy;
- Recommending that a substantive report specifically on the plans for Wythenshawe Hospital be submitted for consideration at an appropriate time; and
- Had COVID-19 impacted on the budget to deliver the ambitions described for North Manchester and would the delivery of the scheme described result in any debt for the Trust.

The Director of Human Resources and Deputy Chief Executive, Greater Manchester Mental Health Trust described that patients accessing Park House typically stayed for 30 days on average, so there were no long-term patients. However, patients who would transfer into the new unit would be supported by staff to help familiarise and orientate them into the new and improved environment. He further informed the Members that service users had been consulted with and closely involved with the design of the new facility.

The Director of Strategic Projects, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust stated that the plan would be to develop a multi storey car park at the Wythenshawe

site and noted the comment regarding the need for improved public transport links. She said that the move to regulate the bus network in Manchester was an opportunity to address this and would further support the environmental ambitions of the city. She reassured the Members that this was a live and ongoing discussion.

In response to a comment made regarding the digital offer, the Director of Strategic Projects, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust stated that digital was embedded in all aspects of the site, stating that there were many examples of how this had improved the patient experience and improved the efficiency of service delivery. She stated that they were mindful of digital exclusion and were working to address this where appropriate.

The Programme Director, Single Hospital Service, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust noted the comments regarding the opportunity to utilise the plans as a catalyst to deliver employment and skills to the local community in north Manchester by adding that it would also deliver commercial opportunities in the localities and physical improvements and connectivity in those areas. He described that this scheme would be delivered in partnership with the Council and partners to maximise the full potential of the project and maximise the benefits and opportunities to local residents. He described that the programme would be delivered via national funding so there would be no debt incurred by the Trust. He further added that the financial implications resulting from inflation and the sourcing of materials and resources would be addressed through the ongoing discussions with central government.

The Programme Director, Single Hospital Service, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust reassured the Committee that in terms of service delivery there would be no visible change in North Manchester, and the intention was to retain the existing specialist services at the site, noting that there were still issues to be resolved as part of the transition to the Single Hospital Service discussions and agreements. He stated that any proposals to change or alter the provision of a service would be subject to formal consultation and discussion with the Health Scrutiny Committee.

The Deputy Leader stated that the plans described represented a unique opportunity to improve the outcomes for many Manchester residents. She stated that this programme would further support the stated commitment for Manchester to be a Marmot City Region and tackle health and socio-economic inequalities experienced in the city. She stated that local residents and local Members would be consulted with as these projects developed.

## **Decision**

The Committee recommend;

1. That a substantive report that describes the plans for Wythenshawe Hospital, including funding agreements be added to the Committee's Work Programme for consideration at an appropriate time.

2. That the Chair of Health Scrutiny discuss with other Committee Chairs the division of scrutiny of the Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for North Manchester Hospital to ensure they were monitored by the appropriate committee. Noting that the data to be monitored and any benchmarking / baseline that are set were scrutinised before being finalised by the appropriate committees.

### **HSC/22/06 Overview Report**

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

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report and agrees the work programme.

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

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2021**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair  
Councillors Flanagan, Foley, Hassan, Holt, Hughes, Jeavons, Lynch, Lyons, Razaq, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin and Wright

**Apologies:** Councillor Chohan

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment  
Councillor Nunney, Ward Member for Woodhouse Park  
Neil Robinson, Group Corporate Social Responsibility & Future Airspace Director  
Manchester Airports Group  
Katie Rice, Public Affairs Officer, Manchester Airports Group  
Andy Clarke, Head of Public Affairs, Manchester Airports Group  
Richard Elliott, Interim Policy and Strategy Advisor, Manchester Climate Change Agency

### **ECCSC/21/32          Minutes**

A Member noted that the information previously requested in relation to those businesses and organisations that were not formally engaged with the Climate Change Agency had been circulated with the offer of a further meeting with the Agency to discuss the content further if required. A Member requested that this meeting be convened with the date and time circulated to all Members of the Committee.

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2021 as a correct record, noting the above request.

### **ECCSC/21/33          Aviation and Carbon Emissions**

The Committee considered the report of the Manchester Climate Change Agency and Manchester Airports Group (MAG) that provided an overview of the relationship between aviation and the city's carbon emissions. It set out how, as previously agreed, aviation related emissions needed to form part of a nationally agreed carbon budget for aviation, which should be compatible with the Paris Agreement, rather than being accounted for directly in the city's own discreet carbon budget. The report contained information on the work that Manchester Airport had been doing to reduce the ground-based carbon impact of their activities and the work that Manchester Airport Group were involved with to ensure that the aviation sector played its part in working to reduce its carbon impact.

The report was accompanied by a presentation that summarised the key points within the report.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background, including a description of the economic benefits of the airport;
- Recognising that the airport and aviation did make a contribution to carbon emissions;
- Recognising the importance that both ground emissions and emissions from aviation were considered in the overall strategy to limit overall carbon emissions;
- The Manchester Climate Change Framework included a specific sub-objective for aviation which would be updated in the Framework refresh;
- An overview of the Manchester Airports Group, including information on their Corporate Social Responsibility;
- Information in relation to carbon reporting;
- Information in relation to carbon neutral airports and those activities to address indirect emissions; and
- An update on the work of the Sustainable Aviation Coalition to address aircraft emissions and the Sustainable Aviation Decarbonisation Road-Map.

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

- Supporting a call for a frequent flyer tax to be levied;
- Calling upon MAG to exercise its influence both nationally and internationally to address the emissions caused by the aviation industry;
- Any land used for the development and delivery of Sustainable Aviation Fuel should not be at the expense of land that could be used for food production;
- Alternative methods of travel should be promoted by MAG, especially in relation to internal flights;
- More investment was required in sustainable transport to access the airport site rather than rely on car parks, adding that a stop to car park expansion at the site would provide a significant message of intention to address emissions;
- Consideration should be given to adopting an alternative carbon calculation method as recommended by the Tyndall Centre;
- Who established the carbon budget for the airport and how was this arrived at;
- What was MAG doing to attract and adopt green skills and jobs at the airport;
- The need to review the Manchester City Council Staff Travel Policy and the policy that was applied to Executive Members to ensure that it was consistent and not contrary to the Climate Emergency;
- The call to minimise or stop aircraft engines revving when on the airfields with consideration to be given to electric ground vehicles manoeuvring aircraft into their holding position ahead of take off;
- Noting that aircraft engines emitted carbon and harmful particulates that could have an adverse effect on a person's health;
- Consideration needed to be given to free parking for electric vehicles and the installation of electric vehicle charging point to be installed at the airport;
- The Government should be lobbied to support and finance electric vehicles that don't access the highways but were used to service major infrastructure sites, such as airports and ports;
- Requesting that the views of the Committee were relayed to the Aviation Sub Group established by the Climate Change Partnership; and

- Members would welcome the opportunity to understand the options being discussed by the Aviation Sub Group.

The Committee heard from Councillor Nunney, Ward Member for Woodhouse Park who had requested to address the Committee. Councillor Nunney stated that he had concerns in regard to the air quality surrounding the airport and the impact this had on the health outcomes of those residents in the local vicinity. He stated that there was far too much focus and discussion on growth and expansion at the expense of the immediate climate breakdown. He further made reference to the report produced by Climate Emergency Manchester (CEM) on the subject of the airport and aviation emissions and stated that he endorsed their conclusions and recommendations. He concluded by saying that he supported the introduction of a frequent flyer tax, arguing that further analysis was required to fully understand the benefits that could be realised by adopting such an approach.

The Chair informed the Committee that she had agreed to read out the questions submitted by Climate Emergency Manchester (CEM), in advance of the meeting and requested that a written response be provided by the report authors to CEM and a copy circulated to Members of the Committee for information. She thanked CEM for submitting their questions.

Neil Robinson, Group Corporate Social Responsibility & Future Airspace Director, Manchester Airports Group, in reply to the comments and views expressed by the Committee, said that he recognised and acknowledged the strength of feeling expressed by the Members. He said that the relationship between the airport and the city's carbon reduction ambitions was understood. He described that the importance of addressing climate change had been acknowledged by the airport for many years and the site had responded to this issue by introducing many carbon efficiencies across the airport estate, including the operational efficiencies of the airfield. He said that MAG airports were already carbon neutral, and MAG was committed to a transition to net zero carbon by 2038.

Mr Robinson advised that MAG sought to exert influence to achieve improvements in emissions from the aviation industry both at a national and international level. He stated that the need to address carbon emissions in accordance with the Paris Agreement on Climate Change was understood. He advised that MAG were represented on the Jet Zero Council, a partnership between industry and government to bring together Ministers and Chief Executive Officer level stakeholders, with the aim of delivering zero emission transatlantic flight within a generation, driving the delivery of new technologies and innovative ways to cut aviation emissions.

In reply to the discussion on levying a frequent flyer tax, Mr Robinson stated that MAG did not support this approach, arguing that stimulating innovation and challenging the industry itself would deliver the required technological improvements to reduce carbon emissions from aviation. He further stated that aviation was already substantially taxed higher when compared to other industries.

Mr Robinson advised that the development and investment in sustainable aviation fuels (SAF) would stimulate and innovate green technologies, support a circular economy and deliver green jobs and skills in the North West, recognising the

comment on the appropriate use of land. He further commented that the delivery of SAF would also reduce the particulates emitted from aircraft engines. He also advised that all ground support vehicles across the site would be ultra-low emission vehicles by 2030.

Mr Robinson advised that a common global standard was required in relation to SAF, adding that there was a global United Nations conference planned for 2022 that included this issue amongst others relating to the aviation industry.

In response to the discussion regarding calling for a reduction or end to internal domestic flights, Mr Robinson advised that the majority of those flights included crossing a body of water making any alternative methods of travel, if available, both costly and time consuming for the customer. With regard to access to the airport he referenced the Metrolink extension to the airport site and in response to the car park issue he commented that providing car parking was preferable to 'kiss and fly' arrangements which would result in double the number of journeys to and from the site. He added that MAG would welcome Government funding to deliver electric charging points, however this was currently not forthcoming and he recognised that work was ongoing across Greater Manchester on the issue of electric car charging infrastructure.

In reply to the comments regarding air quality, Mr Robinson stated that this was regularly recorded, and the results reported to Environmental Health Officers within the Council.

The Executive Member for Environment stated that the staff travel policy was being reviewed and she noted the comment regarding the need to ensure the policy that applied to Executive Members and flying was consistent. She described that the Government continued to be lobbied for funding to deliver improved connectivity and active travel across the city. She further advised that as part of the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan funding was available for taxi drivers to retrofit or upgrade their vehicles. She commented that Members would be invited to sessions that had been arranged to explain the carbon budget setting process as requested by the Committee at a previous meeting. In conclusion she stated that the Leader was committed to working with both herself and MAG to progress the issue of reducing carbon emissions associated with the aviation industry.

The Chair concluded this item of business by thanking all of the guests present for attending the meeting and allowing the Committee the opportunity to scrutinise this important subject matter.

## **Decisions**

The Committee recommend;

1. That the Executive Member for the Environment convene a meeting with Members of the Committee to discuss further the issues raised at the meeting.
2. That the Chair discusses with the Chairs of the Economy Scrutiny and Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee the request for the consideration of

the issue of the airport within their respective remits and focus.

3. That a report on both Staff Active Travel Plans and Member Active Travel Plans be submitted for consideration at an appropriate time.

4. That the Executive Member for Environment lobby Government to appropriately fund and incentivise electric vehicle parking and charging at all airports.

5. That the Executive Member for Environment lobby Government to fund and incentivise the conversion to electric vehicles for those industries and business whose vehicles do not access the public highways.

[Councillor Flanagan declared prejudicial interest in the subject of the Airports Group so took no part in the discussion relating to the airport and restricted his contribution to the issue of emissions and carbon reduction.]

### **ECCSC/21/34      Grounds Maintenance Update: The Use of Pesticides**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) that provided an update on the approach to the use of pesticides when delivering Grounds Maintenance.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- The usage of herbicides as part of a citywide grounds' maintenance weed control programme;
- An update on the works to reduce the City's dependency on herbicides and in particular Glyphosate as the primary weed control method;
- The use of Glyphosate as a standard weed treatment having ceased altogether in parks and gardens, and the use of alternative herbicides significantly reduced to spot and targeted treatments;
- No general Glyphosate based treatments had been used by the Grounds Teams to manage weeds in either Manchester Parks and Gardens, Street Scene, or Northwards communal areas and incidental green space since 2019;
- Describing that in other parts of the public estate the approach had been to reduce use of glyphosate;
- Noting that alternate methods of control were being explored, including organic herbicides, vinegar solutions, mechanical clearance, hot water and hot foam;
- An update on the approach to weed control in cemeteries;
- An update on the approach to weed control across highways and the public estate;
- Describing the work in consultation with landowners and those responsible for maintenance of land to understand the current approach to weed control; and
- Conclusions and next steps.

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

- Reiterating the call previously expressed by the Committee for an immediate end to the use of Glyphosate as a means of weed control across all settings;

- The need to use the imminent contract re- negotiation as an opportunity to insist the Biffa also stop using Glyphosate;
- The use of Glyphosate was contrary to the ambitions of the Climate Emergency, commenting upon the need to support biodiversity;
- The need to educate residents and manage their expectations in relation to weed control and emphasise the environmental benefits of these;
- What was the approach and guidance as to the use of Glyphosate in allotments;
- Was Glyphosate injected or sprayed to tackle Japanese Knotweed;
- The probation service should deploy those offenders undertaking Community Payback sentences to manually remove weeds where required;
- Recognising the work delivered by the Cemeteries Teams, adding that the Committee should endorse a recommendation to increase the numbers of staff in the teams as part of the budget considerations;
- That a briefing note be prepared for information to the Committee that described the actions taken by other Local Authorities to eradicate the use of Glyphosate and the alternate measures introduced;
- Information was requested on the approach and alternatives to weed control adopted by Registered Housing Providers across the city; and
- Noting that residents could collectively opt out of having Glyphosate used on a specific residential street and more should be done to publicise this to residents.

The Strategic Lead, Waste Recycling and Street Cleaning, acknowledged the comments from the Members and responded by saying that the UK Health and Safety Executive had extended the use of Glyphosate until December 2025. She stated that Glyphosate is acknowledged as an efficient means of weed control, however the Council had reduced its use as described within the report. She acknowledged the point regarding the need to educate residents in regard to weeds by stating this could be included in individual ward plans. She described that Glyphosate was administered via injection rather than spraying when dealing with cases of Japanese Knotweed, and in regard to Allotments this was not within her remit however a response to the question would be requested following the meeting.

The Strategic Lead, Waste Recycling and Street Cleaning, advised that discussions were ongoing with Biffa and a range of stakeholders regarding the use of Glyphosate and the adoption of alternative methods of weed control. In response to points raised regarding a cost benefit analysis, the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) stated that this analysis would inform part of the budget setting considerations that the Committee would be invited to consider and comment upon.

In regard to cemeteries, the Bereavement Services Manager described that specific designated areas within Southern Cemetery areas had been left to grow, however in those areas where new plots were located a degree of sensitivity was required and accepting that there was a need to balance the environmental needs and those of bereaved families.

## **Decisions**

The Committee recommend;

1. That a briefing note be prepared by Officers that describes the approach taken by

other Local Authorities to stop using Glyphosate and the alternate methods of weed control adopted.

2. That a briefing note be prepared by Officers that describes the approach taken by local Registered Housing Providers to reduce their use of Glyphosate and the alternate methods considered to control weeds.

### **ECCSC/21/35      Overview Report**

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

### **Decision**

The Committee note the report and agree the work programme.



## Environment and Climate Change Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2022

#### **Present:**

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair  
Councillors Chohan, Flanagan, Foley, Hassan, Holt, Hughes, Lyons, Razaq, Shilton Godwin and Wright

**Apologies:** Councillor Jeavons, Lynch and Sheikh

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment  
Jemma Hynes, Chief Executive Officer, FoodSync

#### **ECCSC/22/01          Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2021 as a correct record.

#### **ECCSC/22/02          Manchester Food Board Report**

The Committee considered the report of the Consultant in Public Health, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning that described the strategic aims and objectives of the Manchester Food Board (MFB) in influencing and addressing climate change.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background, noting that the work of MFB reflected the breadth of issues at play in the wider food system, including food poverty, climate change, retail and hospitality, green spaces and food growing, economic development, waste and recycling, health and wellbeing, and community engagement;
- A summary of key activities over the previous six months; and
- A summary of key activities for the next six months.

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

- Reiterating the Committee's call for immediate action to be taken to address climate change in the context of the climate emergency;
- Recognising the importance of this work and how this impacted across a number of important key themes, including food poverty, social justice and climate change and the need to develop and deliver this programme at scale;
- Noting that the Committee welcomed the report and recommended that a regular update on the activities described be provided to the Committee for consideration;
- Calling upon the government to encourage and call upon large institutions, such as hospitals, to address food sustainability through their procurement process;

- Economy of scale should be used to influence change when procuring food for schools and Care Homes, and engage proactively with the commercial sector;
- Did the MFB have a relationship with the Manchester Climate Change Agency/Partnership;
- How was the MFB commissioned and funded;
- The Action Plan needed to be reviewed to include and prioritise specific actions to address carbon emissions;
- Examples of good local practice in relation to food sustainability, such as the development of the COOP arena in East Manchester, needed to be promoted; and
- The need to adequately fund the work of FoodSync and calling upon the Executive Member for Environment to outline proposals of how this could be achieved in the budget report that was scheduled to be considered at the February meeting.

The Consultant in Public Health, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning, stated that FoodSync had been commissioned up to March 2023 and following this a retender exercise would be undertaken.

The Chief Executive Officer, FoodSync responded by advising that the scale of the challenge was acknowledged and understood, however whilst committed they were limited due to the resources that were available to them. She stated that despite these limitations they aimed to work across all sectors and advised that the Manchester Climate Change Agency were represented on the Board, in addition to commercial representation.

The Chair noted that the Manchester Climate Change Agency were scheduled to present at the February meeting and would present an opportunity for Members to discuss how they supported this activity.

The Chief Executive Officer, FoodSync commented that she would be happy to contribute reports to future meetings, however expressed that Members needed to be mindful so as to not make this task too onerous for the limited number of staff as this would detract from delivering projects and activities. The Chair acknowledged this comment and suggested that she would discuss this further with the Executive Member for Environment to agree a way forward for future reporting and agree reporting metrics. The Chief Executive Officer, FoodSync commented that she would also be willing to arrange a workshop for Members if required.

The Executive Member for Environment advised the Members that a subgroup had been established to review the actions within the Action Plan and noted the comments raised regarding ensuring that carbon reduction was prioritised. The Chief Executive Officer, FoodSync commented that the actions had been co-produced and agreed following a consultation exercise, however acknowledged that since then priorities had changed.

## **Decision**

The Committee recommend;

1. That the Executive Member for Environment outlines the options to increase capacity to support and deliver the work of the Manchester Food Board and FoodSync at scale within the budget report that is scheduled to be considered at the February meeting.
2. That information be shared with Members of the Committee in relation to the commissioning process at the appropriate time and Members kept informed as this progressed.
3. That a progress report is provided at an appropriate time with the content, scope and metrics that are to be included agreed by the Chair in consultation with the Executive Member for Environment.
4. That the Chair consult with the other Scrutiny Chairs to ensure that the topics and themes raised at the meetings, such as health and socio-economic barriers were considered within the remit of their respective Committees.

### **ECCSC/22/03      Climate Change Action Plan - Quarterly Update report**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that described that the Council had declared a Climate Emergency in July 2019 and developed a Climate Change Action Plan (CCAP) 2020-25, which was approved by Executive in March 2020. This report provided an update on the progress in Quarter 3 2021-22 (October – December 2021).

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

- Welcoming the reported progress to date;
- Requesting that questions and issues raised through the scrutiny process were tracked and reported;
- The need to use the procurement process to address the use of plastics as the continued use and production of plastics contributed to the continued use of fossil fuels;
- What were the number of journeys undertaken by air travel in Quarter One, noting that none were undertaken in Quarter Two;
- Was the delivery of Social Value being monitored;
- More work needed to be done to ensure all staff and Members undertook the Carbon Literacy Training;
- Noting that a previous request had been made for a report that described how the Staff Travel Policy supported and contributed to the ambitions of the Action Plan and information also to include the policy applied to Members;
- Had there been any response from the Greater Manchester Pension Fund in response to the continued call to divest from fossil fuels;
- Further information on the Green Skills Action Plan and the outcomes from the Climate Assembly were requested to be circulated for information;
- A quarterly update report on recycling was requested;
- Noting the issue of safety and street lighting, would an increase in luminosity result in a corresponding increase in carbon emissions; and
- Noting that a report that summarised the topics relating to climate change that had been considered by each of the other scrutiny committees would be

submitted for consideration at an appropriate time, noting the Chair's comment that this would be in the next municipal year.

In response to the comments and questions raised Officers responded by advising that the comments regarding plastics and the procurement process would be relayed to the relevant team; the issue of tracking and reporting progress against scrutiny comments would be reviewed to consider how this could be best reported in future updates to the Committee; and in response to a specific question asked regarding the emissions from the works to address the Council buildings emissions and how this was captured and recorded within the overall carbon budget, this would be investigated and reported back, noting that a report entitled 'Manchester City Council Estates Decarbonisation' was considered by the Committee at the November 2021 meeting.

In response to the question raised regarding air travel in Quarter One (April to June 2021) it was advised that the number was six domestic flights, and these were as a result of fulfilling statutory social service obligations. The Committee were further informed that a training session had been arranged for all Members who had not undertaken their Carbon Literacy to be delivered following the meeting of Council, 2 February 2022. With regard to staff training, this was not currently mandatory however discussions were ongoing with HR colleagues to progress this issue. An assurance was also provided that the monitoring of the delivery of Social Value would be undertaken.

In response to the question regarding emissions and street lighting, officers reported that if the brightness of the lights were increased this would increase the carbon emissions generated. The issue raised regarding safety was noted and officers advised that if there were specific issues of concern regarding a specific location individual cases could be investigated to review the current local arrangement and look at what steps could be taken to mitigate the concern.

The Executive Member for Environment acknowledged the comment and request for a report on how the Staff Travel Policy supported and contributed to the ambitions of the Action Plan and added that a separate briefing note to Members would be provided regarding the travel policy for Members. She further confirmed that the information requested on the Green Skills Action Plan and the outcomes from the Climate Assembly would be circulated to the Committee for information. With regard to the response from the Greater Manchester Pension Fund and the continued call to divest from fossil fuels, she stated that a statement had been published on their webpage and the link to this would be circulated following the meeting to enable Members to locate this information and consider the response.

The Executive Member for Environment noted the request from the Committee for a regular quarterly report on recycling and said she would discuss this with Strategic Lead, Waste Recycling and Street Cleaning to agree how this could be best presented to the Committee.

## **Decision**

The Committee recommend;

1. That a report that summarises the topics relating to climate change that have been considered by each of the other scrutiny Committees is submitted for consideration at an appropriate time.
2. That a quarterly report on recycling rates is submitted to the Committee for consideration.

**ECCSC/22/04      Large Scale Renewable Energy Generation Outline Business Case**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that sought the opinion to support the proposal to secure delegation from Executive for the Council to enter commercial negotiations to progress the purchase of a suitable solution with options being a solar asset and / or a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA).

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

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Noting that the Committee had considered a report on this subject at their meeting of 14 October 2021;
- Describing the Key findings of the Feasibility Study;
- Updated Market Availability Assessment & Pricing, noting the Council was in the process of entering into Non-Disclosure Agreements with developers for two sites in order to progress discussions;
- Council's future energy needs considering a range of factors affecting future energy demand and the Council's CO2 reduction needs;
- Financing and the implications for both revenue and capital budgets;
- Current Energy Purchasing Policy; and
- Accounting for Emissions.

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

- Supporting the proposals and rationale described within the report and feasibility report;
- In addition to the proposals presented all opportunities should be explored to maximise smaller scale production of solar energy, such as local reservoirs;
- All avenues should be explored to influence to government to introduce grants for residents so that they can install solar panels onto their homes;
- What would happen to the site following the anticipated life span of 35-40 years;
- Clarification was sought in relation to schools and Bolton, noting that The Council's Energy Management Unit also purchased energy for Bolton Council;
- Employment and skills opportunities for Manchester residents should be maximised through this project; and
- All learning from this project should be understood and applied to future schemes.

In response to the comments raised, Officers replied that they acknowledged and appreciated the views expressed. Clarification was provided that due to the complex commercial arrangements, both schools and Bolton Council were not included in the proposals, however energy purchased would continue to be supplied via a green tariff. Officers reported that a commercial and viability decision would be taken as to the future of the site in 35-40 years based on the circumstances at that time.

## **Decision**

The Committee endorse the recommendations that the Executive:

1. Note the options in Section 4 available to the Council.
2. Note that should the direct purchase of a solar asset be pursued this will be funded via borrowing and require Council approval.
3. Agree to grant delegation for the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, in consultation with the Leader, Executive Member for Finance and the Executive Member for Environment to negotiate for the purchase of a solar asset / PPA and any associated corporate documentation to establish a Special Purpose Vehicle if required, to meet the Council's 2020-25 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reduction target and contribute positively to our longer term zero carbon 2038 target through:
  - development / purchase of a suitable large-scale solar PV facility
  - a suitable direct PPA of renewable energy

## **ECCSC/22/05      Overview Report**

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

Members requested that the Executive Member for Environment prepare a briefing note to be circulated to all Members that provided an update on recent developments in relation to the implementation of the Clean Air Zone for Greater Manchester.

A Member commented upon the remit of the Committee and requested that this be reviewed. The Chair stated she would raise this to be discussed at the Overview and Scrutiny Co-ordinating Group meeting.

## **Decisions**

1. The Committee note the report and agree the work programme.
2. Recommend that the Executive Member for Environment prepare a briefing note to be circulated to all Members that provided an update on recent developments in relation to the implementation of the Clean Air Zone for Greater Manchester.

## **Economy Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2021**

#### **Present:**

Councillor H Priest – in the Chair  
Councillors Doswell, Farrell, Johns, Moore, Noor, Raikes, Stanton and Shilton Godwin

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Craig, Leader  
Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Employment

#### **Apologies:**

Councillors Bayunu and Johns

#### **ESC/21/58                      Minutes**

#### **Decision**

The minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2021 were approved as a correct record.

#### **ESC/21/59                      Comprehensive Spending Review, Funding and Budget Update**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update on the main announcements from the Spending Review of the 27 October 2021 with a focus on the thematic areas relevant to Economy Scrutiny and the impact of the budget on Manchester. The report also provided an update on key funding programmes announced by government and the action Manchester is taking to access this funding.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- An overview of the Local Government Finance Announcements;
- Announcements impacting household incomes;
- Funding announcements which benefited Manchester;
- Implications for Employment and Skills;
- Implications for welfare benefits and unemployment;
- Implications for Housing, Transport, Culture, Climate and Net Zero and Innovation and Connectivity; and
- Other relevant announcements.

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

- Whilst welcoming the increase in spend in tackling homelessness and rough sleeping, what was being done to reduce the numbers of people afflicted;

- The increase in work and skills funding would not match the level of cuts that had occurred in the last ten years;
- What would be the impact of the slow progress of the new Apprenticeship Programme on residents who need to upskill;
- Was there any indication why the Levelling Up bid for Withington Village was unsuccessful;
- More information was needed on the Growth Company's Good Jobs project in North Manchester; and
- What was the Council doing to lobby government for a fair finance settlement;

The Committee was advised that the Council was waiting for a meeting with the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities to discuss why the bid for Withington Village was unsuccessful.

The Director of Inclusive Economy acknowledged that the increase in funding for work and skills did not match the level of funding that had previously been cut and as the budget for Adult Skills was a stationary budget this would be impacted by inflationary pressures on salaries and pensions. In terms of apprenticeships, the take up in Manchester had never been high and had dipped particularly for younger people and with other routes into employment and the volatility in the labor market, the attraction of apprenticeships and apprenticeship wages was not particularly attractive. The Council was still working on promoting apprenticeships as good routes into employment and job opportunities. She also provided a brief update on the Growth Company's Good Jobs project and suggested that the Committee may want to consider a more detailed report on this in the future.

The Strategy and Economic Policy Manager advised that in terms of homelessness, there had been a national increase in the spend to tackle this and it would need to be seen as to how this filtered down to local levels before more detail could be given. The Leader commented that the increase in government funding would not address the situation in Manchester and the Council would still need to supplement this through its general revenue budget. The Executive Member for Housing and Employment commented that the money allocated to the development of brownfield sites, which the Council could bid for, was welcomed and would contribute to affordable housing on brownfield site. He also welcomed the investment being made in North Manchester.

The Leader advised that the Council had had a consistent approach on what local government should be funded for and how it should be funded. The move to more competitive small pots of funding did not help any local authority and Manchester would continue to make the case for an appropriate base line budget. Whilst Manchester budget position for 2022/23 looked to be positive when compared to elsewhere, this had been achievable due to decisive action taken in previous years and the financial situation for future years was precarious as one off additional funding stopped.

## Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report.
- (2) Request that a briefing note be sent to the Committee and all North Manchester Ward Councillors on the Growth Company's Good Jobs project.

### **ESC/21/60                      Innovation Greater Manchester**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure that provided an update on Innovation Greater Manchester – a business led platform that set out how a long-term strategy, underpinned by public and private investment, would unlock a globally leading innovation ecosystem that would spur on the discovery, invention, and adoption of new technologies and business models needed to raise productivity and competitiveness, and provide solutions for the city's big societal challenges including net zero and reducing health inequalities.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing a background and describing progress to date; and
- Providing a number of examples.

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

- Had any assessment been undertaken on whether the current LEP review posed any risks to Innovation GM;
- Partnership working with the wider north west region should not be forgotten and what was the nature of the relationship between Manchester and the wider region;
- Physical access to employment for residents, especially those in North Manchester, was important;
- It was important that any employment opportunities around the Oxford Corridor did not detract from the existing opportunities located at the Centre of Scientific Research and Development at Hexagon Tower in North Manchester;
- The regeneration of North Manchester needed to be wider than just the redevelopment of the North Manchester Hospital campus; and
- An update on Green Hydrogen technology was requested.

The Leader emphasized that the inclusion of the redevelopment of North Manchester Hospital Campus within the programmes of work demonstrated that it complemented the other pieces of work aimed at driving up the standards of health care and that it also demonstrated that Innovation Greater Manchester was a city wide approach and not centered around one specific area of the city. The Director of Inclusive Economy advised that North Manchester had been included as part of Health Innovation in Manchester's Data in Places programme, which would be submitted as part of the GM Innovation bid. The focus for the North Manchester elements of the bid would be

childhood obesity and frailty, with a view to using both quantitative and qualitative data on changing systems to tackle these two growing and prevalent population health issues. The new approaches would make a difference to health outcomes in North Manchester and provide opportunities for commercialisation /creation of new businesses and jobs to deliver solutions internationally.. She described that this would also commercialise health opportunities that was bespoke and distinct from the Oxford Road corridor.

In regard to the LEP review, it was commented that Manchester had an established and proven track record of working closely with local business leaders and that those relationships would continue. It was explained that the Advanced Machinery and Productivity Institute and the Sustainable Materials Translational Research Centre that were being progressed for the Rochdale-Bury Gateway North site, would leverage Manchester's global reputation in materials science, to create at-scale assets and services to embed new net zero materials in to manufacturing processes in businesses across the wider conurbation.

Officers further commented that the innovation in relation to green hydrogen and energy that had been developed at Manchester Metropolitan University was pioneering research. This project had now made the case for a larger facility in Manchester and the wider city region to build upon its success, noting the importance of this technology in the drive to net zero.

It was stated that the anticipated investment of circa £200m across Greater Manchester would facilitate the translation of innovation into jobs and skills. Discussions were ongoing with not only local neighbouring authorities, within the North West but also, other cities and city regions to explore and discuss shared opportunities. The Committee was also advised that conversations were being had with other European cities to share lessons learnt. It was further commented that the plans associated with North Manchester were not intended to displace skills from other areas but rather attract new and international opportunities and investment in the area.

The Chair commented that it was important that all resulting skills and employment opportunities were promoted and accessible to all residents across the city. Officers responded by advising that this was an important point and was fully understood.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **ESC/21/61            Selective Licensing - Results of Public Consultation**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) that provided the Committee with information on the recent consultation exercise completed in areas within Gorton and Abbey Hey, Harpurhey, Clayton and Openshaw to establish whether the declaration of a Selective Licensing (SL) scheme was required in those areas.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Providing an introduction and background;
- Noting that The Housing Act 2004 gave the Council the power to introduce the licensing of private rented homes within a designated area, with the aim of improving the management and condition of these properties to ensure they had a positive impact on the neighbourhood;
- Describing the consultation process and method undertaken;
- An evaluation and key findings from consultation exercise;
- A summary of the responses from both residents, landlords and agents and landlord organisations;
- The findings from an exercise to inspect the external condition of those properties in the identified locations; and
- Conclusions, noting that the results of both the initial and the formal consultation exercise showed the majority of residents supported the introduction of SL in all four areas.

Councillor Hughes (Gorton and Abbey Ward) addressed the Committee, welcoming the proposed selective licensing areas within his ward and the improvements this would bring to private rented properties.

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

- Whilst currently capped at a 20% limit of private rented housing stock, what progress had been made with government to press for a city wide selective licensing policy;
- Could a landlord with properties in a selective licensing area be required to improve standards to any properties that had outside of the selective licensing area;
- Had there been any evidence of the increase in costs to landlords being passed on to tenants;
- Could anything be done to incentivise landlords to provide properties that had a better ECP rating than E; and
- Was the other 80% of private rented properties benefit from the raising of standards in properties within selective licensing areas.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment stated that the Council wanted to target its resources to tackle the worst landlords in the worse areas and there needed to be a strong evidence base to apply for a city wide licensing scheme, citing a number of Councils that had applied for this but had been unsuccessful. He stated that this would be kept under review.

The Committee was advised that the Council could take action against individual properties that were in a poor state and these didn't need to fall under the selective licensing areas. In addition, the Committee was advised that there had been no

evidence of an increase in tenant rents following increased costs to landlords to improve their properties.

Officers advised that there was little the Council could do to incentivise landlords to improve the ECP rating of their properties as there was little in the way of grant funding.

The Executive Member for Housing and Employment commented that he would hope the improvement to the 20% of properties that fell under a selective licensing area would have an impact to the overall improvement to the remaining 80% of private rented sector properties.

## **Decision**

The Committee notes the report

### **ESC/21/62                      Update on COVID-19 Activity**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Growth and Development), which provided a further update of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of the Committee.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Although unemployment levels were falling, there was still a number of job vacancies and growth was beginning to slow;
- Challenges associated with rising inflation and energy costs on household incomes;
- An IPSOS MORIS Political Monitor report identified that 54% of people surveyed thought the economy would get worse next year; and
- The recent introduction of additional COVID measures had impacted on the city's hospitality and retail sectors.

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

- The additional COVID restrictions would have significant impact in the city centre and financial support from Government was needed; and
- Was office space demand in the city consistent across a typical week.

The Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure agreed the impact of the covid restrictions would have a financial impact on retailers and financial support would likely be needed for a number of retailers and hospitality businesses.

In terms of demand for office space, it was reported that information from agents demonstrated that there was still a strong trend for office uptake, particularly from smaller occupiers. How this translated into occupation for next year and beyond was

not yet know, but this would be kept under close review. At present there was no major concerns. It was also reported that pre-covid occupancy levels were at around 70% and now occupancy levels were at 40-50%, so it was evident there had been a steady increase of staff returning to offices for work.

The Chair agreed to raise with the Leader the need to make representations to Government on the need for financial support to retailers and hospitality businesses impacted by the additional covid measures.

**Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

**ESC/21/63                      Overview Report**

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

The Chair clarified the Work Programme items for the January to March 2022 meetings and suggested that items on access to childcare as a potential barrier to employment and scrutiny of the work to address issues raised in the Marmot report and beacon indicators pertinent to this committee's work (employment and housing) be added to the Work Programme as items to be scheduled in the new Municipal Year.

**Decision**

The Committee note the report and agree the work programme and the suggestions for future items as detailed above.



## **Economy Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 13 January 2022**

#### **Present:**

Councillor H Priest – in the Chair

Councillors Bayunu, Farrell, Johns, Moore, Noor, Raikes, Stanton and Shilton Godwin

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Craig, Leader

Councillor White, Executive Member for Housing and Employment

Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment

#### **ESC/22/01 Minutes**

##### **Decision**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2021 were approved as a correct record.

#### **ESC/22/02 Updates on Sub Strategies of the City Centre Transport Strategy**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of City Centre Growth and Infrastructure and Director of Highways that provided an update on the progress of sub strategies and other activities within the City Centre Transport Strategy including an update on active travel plans and wider connectivity issues across the city.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Updates on active travel schemes being developed and delivered;
- An overview of work planned for 2022 to develop strategy and investment plans to continue improving walking (which refers to wheelchair and all other pedestrian users) and cycling in Manchester; and
- Updates on other measures to improve connectivity including improving public transport and other mobility for the city.

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

- The need to ensure active travel schemes, such as cycle paths were developed in an integrated and holistic way and the need to reduce the number of severance points to ensure they were fully connected;
- The need to ensure public transport was affordable for residents of the city;
- How were the schools selected to participate in the School Streets scheme;
- The need to consider safety concerns was walking at night time;
- Consideration needed to be given to removing physical barriers, such as redundant phone boxes and A boards to ensure people can use the pathways safely and without obstruction;

- More needed to be done to increase cycle parking facilities and safe and appropriate cycle storage, noting the distinct difference between the two;
- Anti-social driving and inconsiderate pavement parking needed to be addressed;
- Noting that there was often a conflict between the bus system and active travel plans, especially in the Piccadilly Gardens area of the city centre;
- Supporting the work of the Highways Access Group;
- The need to improve communications with Members so that they are fully aware of developments and planned activity so that they could relay information to their residents and local interested groups;
- The need to deliver a cycle scheme that connects the north of the city to the city centre;
- Noting that mobility for residents is often an issue and calling for improvements to the footways; and
- The need to ensure any published information relating to schools was correct.

The Head of Environment Planning and Infrastructure stated that the issue of severance points was acknowledged and provided the context and approach adopted as to the delivery of early schemes. He informed the Members that an audit of the existing schemes was to be undertaken to identify the gaps with the intention was to use future funding to bridge these gaps. He further commented that an audit of the Bee Network would also be undertaken by Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM), adding that he would relay the comments from this meeting to colleagues at TfGM. The Strategic Director of Growth and Development suggested that a map could be provided to Members that highlighted the existing active travel schemes and the planned projects to connect these. The Committee welcomed this proposal.

In regard to the issue raised on the issue of the affordability of public transport, the Head of Environment Planning and Infrastructure stated that this was a consideration and identified as a priority within the Bus Service Improvement Plan that had been submitted to government and was currently being considered. He further acknowledged the comments raised regarding safety for the night time, especially in the city centre and added that this would inform consideration of schemes.

The Head of Environment Planning and Infrastructure stated that currently there was no dedicated funding available to deliver cycle storage schemes in private accommodation settings, such as apartment blocks, however consideration was being given as to how cycle parking could be provided in car parks that the Council controlled. He added that TfGM were also seeking to deliver improved cycle parking schemes at place such as train stations and these plans were currently being developed.

The Head of Environment Planning and Infrastructure acknowledged the comment raised regarding the conflict between the bus system and active travel plans, especially in the Piccadilly Gardens by commenting that as the number of journeys into the city centre by car reduced this would free up capacity on the road network for buses and thus relieve this pressure. He further provided an update on delivery of the project to

transform Deansgate into a high-quality, people-centred public space, prioritising walking, cycling and public transport.

The Director of Highways described how schools had been selected to participate in the School Streets scheme, noting that these had been very successful and Members would be informed of future funding opportunities and schools would be invited to apply.

The Director of Highways acknowledged the comment regarding anti social driving and the threat this posed to residents. He stated that the Highways Department did meet regularly with Greater Manchester Police to discuss issues and added that if Members had specific issues or concerns to contact him directly so these could be raised. He addresses the comment regarding the condition of the footways and stated that the intention would be to prioritise improvement works to footways. The Executive Member for Environment added that the Licensing Team did engage with businesses on the issue of street furniture and A boards and where necessary would target hot spots to address any specific concerns.

The Director of Highways noted the comment regarding the need to deliver a cycle lane to connect North Manchester to the city centre and added that delivery of such a scheme would be the next priority and Members would be informed as these plans were developed.

The Director of Highways acknowledged the comments raised regarding the need to improve communications with Members and stated that he and the Executive Members for Environment were discussing how this could be achieved. The Committee welcomed this commitment to improved communications with local Members. The issue raised regarding the accurate reporting of schools was also acknowledged and an assurance was given that that would be addressed with the Education Department.

The Strategic Lead City Centre Partnerships described the work of the Highways Network Group, adding that the group met monthly to consider proposed schemes and was an opportunity and forum for people with lived experience to discuss proposals with designers and Project Managers. The Executive Member for Environment stated that consideration would be given as to how the important work of this group was promoted.

## **Decision**

The Committee:-

- (1) Recommends that an item is added to the Committee's Work Programme (to be considered at an appropriate time) that provides an update on the Walking and Cycling Strategy. This report would include updates in relation to cycle storage, cycle parking and the consideration given to ensure safety for people walking at night.

- (2) Recommends that an item is added to the Committee's Work Programme (to be considered at an appropriate time) that describes the findings and conclusion of TfGMs audit exercise of the Bee Network.
- (3) That the Strategic Director (Growth and Development) circulate a map to all Members of the Committee that highlights the existing active travel schemes and the planned projects that connect these.

### **ESC/22/03 Update on COVID-19 Activity**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director, Growth and Development, which provided a further update of the current situation in the city in relation to COVID-19 and an update on the work progressing in Manchester in relation to areas within the remit of the Committee.

#### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

### **ESC/22/04 Overview Report**

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

#### **Decision**

The Committee note the report and agree the work programme, noting the recommendations arising from consideration of the previous agenda items.