

Licensing and Appeals Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 24 January 2022

Present: Councillor Ludford – in the Chair

Councillors: Grimshaw, Evans, Flanagan, Hassan, Hewitson, Hughes and Reid

Apologies: Councillor Andrews, Connolly, Jeavons and Lynch

LAP/22/01 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 25 October 2021 were submitted for approval.

Decision

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Licensing & Appeals Committee meeting held on 25 October 2021.

LAP/22/02 GM Minimum Licensing Standards – Stage 2 Recommendations (Vehicles)

The Committee considered the content of the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing which concerned the proposed Greater Manchester Minimum Licensing Standards for Taxis and Private Hire. There were 10 Standards within the report, proposing that all the standards recommended to be implemented, are done so with immediate effect (or as soon thereafter where procurement or substantial changes to process are required).

The Licensing Unit Manager informed the Committee that the aim of the work is to harmonise standards across the districts, ensuring GM authorities work collaboratively on policies for these licensing functions that seek to support and not undermine each other, and are the preferred option for residents and visitors. This was due to an absence of a National Policy. The Licensing Unit Manager confirmed the breakdown from feedback, agreements presented to the 10 GM authorities and agreements reached with these authorities.

The Licensing Unit Manager presented the 10 standards to the Committee for consideration.

Standard 1 – Hackney Carriages to be Wheelchair Accessible Vehicles (WAVs).

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that this standard had been accepted by 3 local authorities that had not previously approved and requested that the Committee consider the proposal for use of side-loading access only or amend to allow the use of rear-loading access also.

During discussions, questions and considerations it was raised that rear-loading WAVs posed problems at Hackney Carriage ranks, requiring extra space at the rear of the vehicle as well as adding a safety risk to any wheelchair users/mobility

impaired customers. The Committee had concerns on whether disability groups had been consulted on this issue and felt that feedback should be considered.

The Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that TfGM had carried out consultations in this regard but expressed that there could be a more targeted approach.

In considering that more work could be done in consultation on this issue the Committee felt that the option to amend to allow side-loading vehicles should be revisited in the future.

Decision

The Committee agreed to retain the standard that all licensed Hackney Vehicles must to be side loading.

Standard 2 – Vehicle Age

The Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that it was proposed for consultation that all licensed vehicles are under 5 years old at first licensing and no more than 10 years old and that views were sought on consideration of a different age policy for electric and wheelchair accessible vehicles (PHV WAV – under 7 years on to fleet and 15 years off and Purpose built HVC – under 7 on to fleet and 15 years off).

During discussions, questions and considerations a concern was raised on whether vehicles over 7 years old could be sold and returned to another fleet. It was confirmed that this would not be allowed and that any vehicles over the age limit would be automatically barred from use.

Decision

The Committee agreed the Lead Officer's recommendation:

To implement the following as the minimum standard:

- PHV – under 5 years on to fleet and 10 years off
- PHV WAV – under 7 years on to fleet and 15 years off
- Purpose built HVC – under 7 on to fleet and 15 years off
- To remove the beyond the age limit policy

That the above policy be implemented for new to licence vehicles as soon as the policy takes effect.

That existing licences begin transitioning and are compliant with the new policy standard by 1 April 2024.

To remove the beyond the age limit policy.

Standard 3 - Vehicle Emissions

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that this proposal had changed considerably, adding that Manchester does not currently present an emissions problem due to the vehicle age limit. It was added that the Clean Air Policy would commence from May 2022 but new standards for taxis had been paused due to issues with the supply

chain. The Zero Emissions Policy, scheduled for 2028 had also been paused with no date set, but the Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that this date was still Manchester's aim.

Decision

The Committee agreed to implement the policy:

To require licensed vehicles to be compliant with the current emissions standard as follows:

- For all new to licence vehicles – from the date the policy is determined locally
For existing fleets – to begin transitioning as soon as the policy is in place and to complete transitioning by 1 April 2024 (vehicle must also be compliant with the age policy)
- To note the strong ambition to move existing fleets to Zero Emissions Capable as soon as possible

Standard 4 – Vehicle Colour

The Licensing Unit Manager presented information relating to vehicle colour policy, including exemptions (silver cars allowed for Private Hire Vehicles) and risks (potential for more instances of Ply For Hire due to uniformity of fleets). It was noted that Manchester was at the forefront of this policy and that this was undermined by other local authorities due to the de-regulation act. It was confirmed that customers with sight impairment disabilities and/or guide dogs find white taxis more difficult to notice. The Licensing Unit Manager expressed that retaining the all-white colour policy for Private Hire Vehicles (PHV) could see drivers move away from Manchester, adding that customers now have confirmation of the vehicle type, number plate and driver name via booking apps, adding that bogus drivers can potentially exploit the current policy. Final comments centred around no other local authorities in GM or nationally were upholding the policy for Private Hire vehicles.

During discussions, questions and considerations, comments were raised around passenger safety if the PHV policy was not retained, that Uber did not operate with this policy, the potential discrimination to visual impaired customers if the policy was retained, whether this proposal had been considered by the Executive Members and that vehicles licensing in other local authorities, allowed to operate in Manchester, did not have this standard implemented.

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that the MLS requested that all GM local authorities have stickers and plates, adding that there had been a noted trend in drivers ceasing to operate in Manchester due to this policy.

Decision

The Committee agreed to remove the requirement for Private Hire Vehicles to be of a specified colour and retain the policy standard that all Hackney Carriage Vehicles should be black in colour with the following exceptions:

- Purpose-built Taxis may be of the manufacturer's colour
- Advertising is allowed on London Style Taxis

Standard 5 - Vehicle Livery

The Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that Hackney Carriages should retain the requirement for Fixed plates to the front and rear and include stickers on the bonnet and that Private Hire Vehicles should carry stickers bearing the operators name, 'advanced bookings only', 'not insured unless pre-booked' and the licensing authority logo, display those stickers on both rear side doors and the back window and not use any magnetic stickers.

Decision

The Committee agreed to implement the standard as proposed.

Standard 6 - Vehicle Testing

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that this standard proposed that all vehicles more than 3 years old will be tested at least twice a year and that all vehicles will be tested against the DVSA MOT standard as a minimum. (This will be at cost to the vehicle licence proprietor/driver), adding that Manchester currently exceeds the proposal.

The recommendations for testing were outlined as:

0-3 years, 1 test per year

4-8 years, 2 tests per year

9-15 years, 3 tests per year

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that this could be retained or varied, adding that consideration should be given as to whether this standard was conducted in-house at MCC or handed to external providers and to consider any risks associated.

During discussions, questions and considerations it was expressed that in-house was preferable and clarification was sought on how tests were currently conducted.

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that improvements had been made in providing tests dates and reminders to licence holders and that there was no intention to look for an external provider for this service.

Decision

The Committee agreed to amend the age parameters as follows:

a. 0-3 years old = 1 test

b. 4-8 years old = 2 tests

c. 9-15 years old = 3 tests

Standard 7 – CCTV

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that CCTV was currently allowed but not mandated and that the full policy is in the process of being drafted.

Decision

The Committee agreed to approve the drafting of a CCTV policy for further consideration and consultation.

Standard 8 – Executive Hire

The Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that Manchester City Council was already compliant with this standard and stated that the recommendation was to retain this policy.

Decision

The Committee agreed to retain the standard as proposed.

Standard 9 – Vehicle Design

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that all vehicles were to conform to the categorisations in the report. If any vehicles were modified and/or retro-fitted vehicles they would then be checked for approval. It was noted that Manchester was compliant with most recommendations already with the additional option to allow written off vehicles with an engineer's report and for a swivel seat to be added to Hackney Carriages. Mention was given to window tint specifications and that there had been strong lobbying in support of this from the trade. There was an intention to move to CCTV which would mitigate the move to tinted windows (currently allowing for 20% light transmission). Other local authorities had approved the "written off" policy for implementation as of April 2022, adding that this was reliant on the outcomes of the Clean Air Policy and would, therefore, not require implementation prior to this policy being passed. The swivel seat policy would require further information on side/rear loading and the Licensing Unit Manager stated that there were some in the fleet already.

During discussions, questions and considerations it was expressed that a 20% light transmission tint was a safety issue for passengers and should not be allowed without a CCTV policy being implemented. It was suggested that this proposal should be deferred for further information.

The Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that checks had been made with GMP and no evidence on the compromise of passenger safety had been noted, also adding that the cost to replace tints would be at the operators cost, which was seen as an issue within the trade.

An observer from the trade agreed that there should be further examination conducted into the effect tints have on passengers and their feelings on personal safety.

Decision

The Committee agreed to defer the following proposal for further information:

To change the minimum light transmission specific for point c) remaining glass and specify:

- Remaining glass or rear side windows (exc. Rear window) – allow manufacturer's tint to a minimum 20% light transmission

The Committee agreed to otherwise retain the standard as proposed with the following minor amendments:

To change:

- No advertising other than Council *issued* signage on PHVs to: No advertising other than Council *approved* signage on PHVs

To amend the start date for non-renewal of licences with vehicles that have been previously written off and for this policy to take effect at a date to be agreed with the Chair of Licensing and Appeals Committee following the findings of the GM Clean Air Committee funding review.

To defer the decision on swivel seats at this time, but in the interim allow other purpose-built Hackney models that are not manufactured with a swivel seat onto the fleet for an agreed period of time.

Standard 10 – Vehicle Licence Conditions

The Licensing Unit Manager stated that there were two sets of proposed conditions in the report for this standard which had not yet been implemented. It was explained that improvements were proposed pre-pandemic and then adopted by 7 of the GM authorities. DBS checks were confirmed as now added which differed from the recommendations laid out in 2020.

Decision

The Committee agreed to implement the standard as proposed with the addition of the DBS requirement for vehicle proprietors who are not licensed drivers.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 20 January 2022

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

Councillors: S Ali, Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Kamal, Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat, Richards and Stogia

Also present:

Councillors Hilal, Hitchens and Johns

PH/22/01 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 131314/FO/2021 and 132069/FO/2021.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/22/02 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 December 2021 as a correct record.

PH/22/03 131895/JO/2021 - Coleshill Street Manchester M40 8HH – Miles Platting and Newton Heath Ward

Permission was sought to remove condition no.44 attached to planning permission reference 125596/FO/2019 (approved subject to conditions and a section 106 agreement on 10 November 2020), which related to affordable housing.

The approved scheme for 410 new homes, was accompanied by an Affordable Housing Statement, which outlined that the viability of the scheme had been considered in line with best practice and as such a Viability Assessment was submitted for consideration. There are complex ground conditions on the site, which impact on viability, and it was demonstrated that the development could not support affordable housing. Through the involvement of a Registered Provider, however, 114 affordable dwellings are to be provided on the site through grant funding from Homes England.

Since the granting of the planning permission, Homes England has confirmed that the houses would not qualify for funding if they are subject to a planning condition. In this instance the affordable homes would be delivered and secured via the Development Agreement with the City Council and provisions in the leases (fulfilled by virtue of the City Council's landownership interest), rather than by way of condition no.44.

The application site covers an area of approximately 6.4 hectares and includes the former Manox site (chemical dye factory). It is bounded by the Rochdale Canal (and associated tow path), grassed brownfield land and commercial /industrial uses to the north. To the south is Iron Street; this area to the south is largely residential and includes a play area. There are further residential properties to the west and across Varley Street is Victoria Mill (Grade II * listed building) which has been converted to residential use. To the east across Alan Turing Way there are commercial /industrial uses.

The Planning officer had no further information or additional comments to make.

Councillor Hitchen addressed the Committee and requested that consideration of the application be deferred to allow the Committee to see a copy of the development agreement to ensure that affordable dwellings will be included in the application.

A member of the committee commented that the executive summary made reference to the removal of condition 44 and there was concern that by removing the condition there should be an undertaking within the development agreement to ensure the inclusion of affordable housing.

Councillor Andrews proposed that the application be deferred until the next meeting of the Committee to allow members to see the development agreement and be satisfied that a robust agreement is in place to ensure the 144 affordable dwellings will be included within the development.

The planning officer reported that he had spoken to both the applicant and colleagues in Corporate Property and they have advised that the development agreement does include the requirement for the provision of 114 affordable dwellings.

The Director of Planning advised that Committee that the development agreement contained commercially sensitive information and therefore checks would be made to ensure only non-sensitive extracts were presented to members of the Committee to confirm the inclusion of 114 affordable dwellings.

Councillor Flanagan seconded the proposal to defer consideration of the application until the next meeting of the Committee.

Decision

The Committee agreed to defer consideration of the application until the next meeting to allow members to be satisfied that the inclusion of 114 affordable dwellings is clearly stated within the development agreement for the proposed development.

(Councillor Richards declared a personal interest in the application having had an involvement previously as an Executive member and left the room during the consideration of the application.

Piccadilly Ward

This application sought the erection of a part 11, part 13 storey building to form residential apartments (Use Class C3a) together with the erection of two blocks of 3 storey duplexes (Use Class C3a) to form 237 residential homes in total with associated commercial floor (Use Class E) (132 sqm), basement car parking, landscaping and public realm, and associated engineering and infrastructure works following demolition of existing buildings and structures.

The Planning officer had no further information or additional comments to make.

No objectors to the application attended the meeting or addressed the Committee on the application.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Lyons addressed the committee as ward councillor. Reference was made to the lack of affordable homes and he commented that this would a good location for development. It was noted that the planning report contained some errors regarding the inclusion of affordable housing. Councillor Lyons made reference discussions held with the developer and the people who may be attracted to living there and it was concerning that there is a lack of soft play areas within the public realm element of the development for families with young children. The suggestion was made that a condition be added to the application for the inclusion of soft play areas to be included as part of the development. (Councillor Lyons then left the meeting room and took no part in the consideration or vote on the application.)

The planning officer confirmed that the development does not include affordable housing. A clawback mechanism would review this. A condition could be included for assessment and evaluation of a soft play area.

Councillor Flanagan proposed that an additional condition for the inclusion of soft plays areas and that final designs be agreed by the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee. The councillor made the point that no reference is made in the application to the development of family homes but no reference is made to provision for families with children.

Councillor Richards in seconded the proposal commented that the application falls in the Northern Gateway SRF area, where developer partners already offer 20% affordable homes. In addition, the inclusion of local infrastructure needed to be included to help support the building of a community in the area and meet the needs of all residents instead of a one-sided approach. It is important that a contribution is made to help meet the cost of providing the infrastructure, if affordable housing is not achievable.

The planning officer reported that discussions are ongoing with key partners on the Victoria North area for the ongoing transformation of the area over the next 10-15 years. The area will see significant change that will include important infrastructure facilities such as schools and GP surgeries.

The Committee agreed the application with the inclusion of an additional condition for a soft play area with the design to be subject to approval by the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee and members of the committee.

Decision

The Committee agreed the application as detailed in the report submitted and with the inclusion of an additional condition for the assessment and evaluation of providing a soft play area, with the design of it to be subject to approval by the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee and local members.

(Councillor Lyons declared a personal interest in the application but addressed the Committee as a ward councillor before leaving the meeting and taking no part in the consideration or vote.)

PH/22/05 131314/FO/2021 - Speakers House 39 Deansgate Manchester M3 2BA - Deansgate Ward

This application sought the erection of a 17 storey building comprising office use (Use Class E(g)(i)) and flexible ground floor commercial units (Use Classes E(a), (b), (c) and sui generis 'drinking establishment'), new electricity substation, basement cycle parking and rooftop plant enclosure, together with access, servicing and associated works following demolition of the existing building.

The planning officer reported that late representations had been submitted from Councillor Johns (Deansgate ward Councillor) that referred to discussions held with the developer. The submission included a breakdown of the impact of the proposed development on the neighbouring residential property (No1 Deansgate), listed buildings and conservation area. The impact of the development on the townscape due to overdevelopment and concerns on the list of assumed benefits to the city to be provided by the development.

The planning officer stated that the responses to the concerns raised had been provided in the planning report.

The planning officer advised the Committee that the developer had provided a viability study of the scheme and alternative schemes for the site which had been independently assessed. The viability study had indicated that the scheme would not be viable in another or reduced form.

The Chair invited an objector to speak on the application. The Committee was advised that the planning application had been resubmitted with no changes. The development was not appropriate for the location due to its height and mass. The objectors were happy to engage with the developer to address concerns, although no agreement had been reached. The impact on the surrounding location, residential area, heritage area and assets are significant and the development would result in the loss of the low/mid roof lines of buildings in St Ann's Square Conservation Area and would dominate the Royal Exchange clock tower. The building would result in

the loss of views of heritage asset buildings. The Council appears to be moving away from its policy on tall buildings in a conservation area. Residents of No1 Deansgate will be impacted negatively with loss of privacy, amenity loss of light and will leave local residents in a less attractive position.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Johns (ward councillor Deansgate ward) addressed the application. The Committee was advised that the discussion held with the developer was positive but did not address the concerns of residents of No1 Deansgate regarding maintaining privacy. The application submitted appeared to be identical to the previous one apart from the inclusion of fritted glass and the Committee was asked to refuse the application, for the reasons that have been presented today and at previous meetings. A clear and compelling case has been presented through the Committee's consideration of the application, for the reasons that it impacts negatively the residents adjacent to the development and the important heritage assets and important buildings and features within the area.

The Planning Officer reported that the impacts would not be significant in a city centre context. The separation between the buildings is similar to distances agreed previously by the committee on other tall buildings and are not unusual. An assessment showed that wind condition would be improv. Historic England has indicated a 'less than substantial harm' to the buildings in St Ann's Square and the level of public benefit appeared to outweigh the level of harm to the area. The building is currently vacant and refurbishment is not viable.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to comment and ask questions.

A member asked if the application is a new application or an amendment of the previous application. The planning officer reported that the application was a new application involving a new consultation process and includes changes based on the Committee's previous comments.

A member referred to the loss of privacy for residents of No1 Deansgate and considered that to be significant due to the design and importance of the building which has an open aspect to the proposal. The impact on the local heritage assets would be detrimental to those buildings adjacent and stated they were minded to refuse the application. The Council did not have a tall building policy and suggested that more detail is needed within the strategic framework for the city centre to help and inform developers on this kind of development.

The planning officer reported that No1 Deansgate is similar to existing buildings in the city centre that are constructed from steel and glass and is therefore not significantly different. The decisions made by the Committee must be considered in the context of current policy, guidance and legislation.

A member of the Committee referred to the potential income from the proposed development and the existing business rates received from the empty building to compare the benefits of a new building. The statement that the council would receive an level of business rates from the building is incorrect and the public benefit

does not outweigh the damage to the heritage assets and conservation area and the application should be refused.

The Planning officer reported that the assessed benefits provided to the public were significant and included the jobs provided, the impact on the economy and the replacement of a derelict building to improve the area.

A member referred to the impact on residential and the investment made by residents in choosing the city centre to make their lives and staying for a number of years. Reference was made to the cost paid for the existing building and how this could influence the economic viability of the proposal. Reference was made to the design of No1 Deansgate and the choice of not including the need for window coverings. The proposal would result in the loss of privacy and would be intrusive due to the close proximity. Some of the city centre residential blocks have an enclosed balcony which are used as a living area, such as No1 Deansgate. No1 Deansgate is unusual in its style and design and the damage caused should be considered in the balance of the building proposed.

The planning officer stated that No1 Deansgate has an enclosed glass balcony. The planning report provides a viability assessment and the cost of the land value is tested against other comparable sites. This had been validated. The city centre requires more grade A office space.

A member questioned the validity of the height in this location and whether it complied with current council policy and whether the building should be located within a heritage or conservation area.

The planning officer stated that the proposal had been tested in the context of current policy. The tall buildings policy suggests that tall buildings may be more appropriate outside of a conservation area however, the merits of an application must be considered on the appropriateness of a location.

A member suggested that more information is required to provide greater clarity on the siting of tall buildings within the city centre and in particular, conservation areas. This would help developers when assessing the viability of a location and related land costs.

The Director of Planning stated that core strategy was developed using the English Heritage/CABE guidance on tall buildings. The review of the core strategy would need to consider if there is an alternative or more appropriate approach. The current planning application must therefore be considered under the existing guidance.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation to approve the application.
Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee approved the application including the conditions, as detailed in the report submitted.

**PH/22/06 132069/FO/2021 - Former Police Station Car Parking Area
Davenfield Grove Manchester M20 6UA - Didsbury West Ward**

This application sought the temporary change of use of car parking area to form a builders compound (installation of welfare unit, WCs, car parking spaces and storage area) for a period of 12 months to be used in connection with the redevelopment of the former Didsbury Police Station.

This application related to a rectangular plot of land located at the southern end of Davenfield Grove. To the south of the site lies a terrace of dwellings, namely nos. 12 to 26 Whitechapel Street, while to the north there are further residential properties, namely no. 2 Davenfield Grove and nos. 10 to 16 Davenfield Road. To the east there is a car park and servicing area associated with several commercial properties on Wilmslow Road. To the west there are a number of terraced dwellings on Crossway.

Objections had been received from six local residents and Councillor Hilal. Objections have been raised in respect of the impact on residential amenity, resulting from noise and general disturbance; the impact in visual amenity; insufficient parking; and the impact on pedestrian and highway safety due to the comings and goings of contractors' vehicles and delivery wagons.

The planning officer referred to the late representation received from Councillor Hilal (ward councillor) that included photographs of rubble at the site. It was confirmed that the rubble will be removed today. The Committee was advised that if the recommendation is agreed it would be appropriate to amend condition 5 of the application, to state that no activity take within compound the place outside of the hours stated.

The architect attended the meeting but did not address the committee.

Councillor Hilal (ward councillor Didsbury West) addressed the Committee. The committee was informed that following her visit to the site issues had been raised by residents living next to the compound regarding disturbance due to generator noise and work taking place early in the morning, late evening and weekends. The use of the car park as a compound has been recommended by officers, however the residents believe the site management rules are not being followed by the contractors. The pavement has been damaged and residents are being inconvenienced by vehicle movement, engine noise, storage of building materials and breaking down of items on the road. The cottages adjacent to the compound are small and sited directly on the pavement. The Committee was asked to ensure that any future rule beaches of the site management rules are enforced by the compliance team.

The planning officer reported that if the application is agreed, officers will consult with the site management to ensure that the construction management conditions are followed to control the use of the generator, hours of use and the other issues raised. The planning compliance team will work with the site management to address the concerns if necessary.

A member stated that contractors could unload their vehicles within the compound and then park their vehicles away from the compound and reduce the congestion on the road. The Councillor proposed that an additional condition be added to the application requiring that all materials are unloaded within the compound area.

The planning officer confirmed that an additional condition could be added for a site management plan to require loading and unloading of materials takes place within the compound.

A member asked officers if other measures could be included to help relieve the difficulties of using the small access road on Davenfield Grove to the site in view of the disturbance and inconvenience being caused to local residents.

The planning officers reported that the proposed addition condition for the use of the compound for loading and unloading materials would provide the best solution to the concerns expressed and would allow enforcement action to be taken in the event of breaches to the conditions.

Councillor Flanagan moved approval of the recommendation with the inclusion of an additional condition to require the loading and unloading of materials take place within the compound.

Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee approved the application including the conditions, as detailed in the report submitted, with the inclusion of an additional condition to require that contractors load and unload materials only within the compound.

Health and Wellbeing Board

Minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2022

Present:

Councillor Midgley, Deputy Leader - In the chair
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools Services
David Regan, Director of Public Health
Rupert Nichols, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust
Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services
Dr Geeta Wadhwa, GP Member (South) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Dr Murugesan Raja, Manchester GP Forum
Dr Doug Jeffrey, (South) Primary Care Manchester Partnership
Katy Calvin-Thomas, Manchester Local Care Organisation
Dr Denis Colligan, GP Member (North) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust
Vicky Szulist, Healthwatch
Mike Wild, Voluntary and Community Sector representative

Apologies:

Councillor Craig, Leader of the Council
Dr Tracey Vell, Primary Care representative - Local Medical Committee

Also in attendance:

Sarah Broad, Deputy Director Adult Social Services
Paul Marshal, Strategic Director of Children's Services
Barry Gillespie, Consultant in Public Health, Chair of the Manchester CDOP
Stephanie Davern, Child Death Overview Panel Co-ordinator

HWB/22/01 Appointment of Chair

Councillor Midgley was nominated to Chair the meeting. This was seconded and approved by the Board.

Decision

Councillor Midgley was appointed Chair for the meeting.

HWB/22/02 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2021 as a correct record.

HWB/22/03 COVID-19 – Update

The Board considered the report and presentation of the Director of Public Health that provided an update on the latest COVID-19 data and progress on the implementation of the Manchester Vaccination Programme.

In response to comments from Board members the Director of Public Health advised that despite the lifting of the national plan B measures, local schools and Universities were being supported to maintain the wearing of face masks in communal areas as a measure to reduce infection rates. He described that both himself and the Director of Education had written to all Head Teachers in Manchester to offer support and guidance on this issue. The Executive Member for Children and Schools Services informed the Board that the feedback from schools was very positive and had welcomed this continued support.

In response to a comment raised regarding the national advice given regarding the symptoms to be aware of for the variants, noting that this was generic advice with no differentiation between the variants, the Director of Public Health stated this had been raised nationally as a concern. He said that this had been acknowledged locally and local bespoke advice and information had been issued but noted the comment from the Board.

The Director of Public Health responded to a question relating the issue of the removal of free Lateral Flow Tests (LFT) by stating that this was an equalities issue and stated that Manchester continued to make the case for free LFTs, adding that there was a need for an effective, equitable national testing policy.

The Chair on behalf of the Board paid tribute to all staff involved in the vaccination programme and the directed approach to address equity in the programme to protect as many residents as possible. The Chair also 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.

The Board reiterated the importance of the COVID-19 vaccination and encouraged all who had not come forward to receive the jab to do so.

Decision

To note the report and presentation.

HWB/22/04 Better Outcomes Better Lives

The Board considered the report of the Executive Director of Adult Social Services that provided an update on the delivery of Better Outcomes, Better Lives, the adult social care transformation programme. Noting that this was a long-term programme of practice-led change, which aimed to enable the people of Manchester to achieve better outcomes with the result of less dependence on formal care.

The report provided an introduction and background, describing that Better Outcomes Better Lives was the Manchester Local Care Organisation's programme to transform the way that we deliver adult social care so that it meets the needs of our most vulnerable residents and makes best use of the resources that we have. The programme is key to delivering the savings set out in the 2021/2022 budget agreed by the Council in March 2021.

The report described that the programme was structured around six key workstreams, noting that four of the workstreams had started in January 2021. The report further described what would feel different for residents who received our adult social care services in the future; what would feel different for families and carers; and what would feel different for staff.

The Board were provided with an overview of the programme that were accompanied by case studies to illustrate what these changes meant in practice.

The Board welcomed and endorsed the approach described, in particular the assurance provided that activities and progress would be reported and regularly reviewed by the MLCO Accountability Board. The Board further noted and welcomed the assurance given that this approach also informed the work and planning of the MLCO. The Chair stated that she had taken the opportunity to meet with the teams and had received very positive feedback from the staff. The Executive Director of Adult Social Services welcomed the positive feedback from the Board and assured those present that this would be relayed to the staff and practitioners working across the teams.

Decision

To note the report.

HWB/22/05 Integrated Care System arrangements and Manchester Locality Plan Refresh

The Board considered the report of the Deputy Leader (with responsibility for Health and Care), Manchester City Council and the Vice Chair, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning that provided an update on the establishment of a Greater Manchester Integrated Care System/Integrated Care Board and Manchester Locality Board. The report further provided an update on the refreshed Manchester Locality Plan, noting that the refreshed Locality Plan for Manchester, which recommits to the strategic intent to improve the health and care outcomes for the people of Manchester and recognised the significant change in context following the COVID-19 pandemic.

The report described that subject to legislation passing through parliament, Integrated Care Systems (ICS) would be established in England from 1 July 2022. This change was originally planned for 1 April 2022 but had been delayed allowing sufficient time for the legislative process to conclude. The report described the four aims of the ICS and the national core building blocks of an ICS.

In Greater Manchester this would mean a shift from the Greater Manchester Health & Social Care Partnership (GMHSCP) arrangements to a new Greater Manchester ICS and ICB. Work is underway to prepare for this shift, determining the future role and governance of the GM ICS and ICB and the 10 localities in the new structure. Noting that Manchester's Local Authorities and NHS leaders had both contributed to the

development of the GM ICS and ICB arrangements and had worked to develop locality arrangements for the City of Manchester.

The Board noted that Sir Richard Leese had been appointed Chair designate of the Greater Manchester ICB along with two non-executive directors. The Chief Executive Officer recruitment was currently in progress, with a planned interview date in February, and recruitment to the Chief Finance Officer, Medical Director and Chief Nurse roles had also commenced.

The Board endorsed the work reported to date, noting the challenges presented by the pandemic and welcomed the priority given to post pandemic recovery across all settings and continued commitment to address health inequalities.

Decision

The Board note the report and support the refreshed Locality Plan.

HWB/22/06 Child Death Overview Panel (CDOP) Annual Report

The Board considered the report of the Consultant in Public Health, Chair of the Manchester Child Death Overview Panel that described that the Manchester Child Death Overview Panel (CDOP) was a subgroup of the Manchester Safeguarding Partnership (MSP) and reviewed the deaths of children aged 0-17 years of age (excluding stillbirths and legal terminations of pregnancy) that were normally resident in the area of Manchester City.

The report described that in line with the Child Death Review: Statutory and Operational Guidance (England) published October 2018, the CDOP had a statutory requirement to produce a local annual report which provided a summary of the key learning and emerging trends arising with the aim of preventing future child deaths.

The report provided a description of the Child Death Review Process, in term of both national and local arrangements, noting that national line of accountability had transferred from the Department for Education (DfE) to the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC).

The Director of Public Health paid tribute to the staff working within the Manchester Child Death Overview Panel, adding that the arrangements in Manchester were regarded nationally as an exemplar model. In response to a comment from a Board member who discussed the need to support families and align strategies, he stated that the approach and findings of the Manchester Child Death Overview Panel were regularly reviewed and refreshed to ensure they aligned with wider policies, such as Early Years and Early Help.

Decision

The Board note the report.