

## **Audit Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 18 October 2022**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Lanchbury - In the Chair  
Councillors Curley, Russell, Simcock and Wheeler  
Independent Co-opted member: Dr S Downs

#### **Apologies:**

Independent Co-opted member: Dr D Barker  
Councillor Good

#### **Also Present:**

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Finance and Resources  
Councillor Stanton, Deputy Executive Member for Finance and Resources.  
Alistair Newall, Mazars (External Auditor)

### **AC/22/38 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 27 September 2022 as a correct record.

### **AC/22/39 Oral update: the unaudited 2021/22 Accounts**

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer gave an oral update on progress towards finalisation of the unaudited 2021/22 Annual Accounts.

The key points which the Committee was invited to note were:

- The unaudited accounts (2021/22) have been published and are open for public inspection until 4 November 2022.
- The Whole of Government Accounts (WGA - 2020/21) have been completed for submission to the Government, as part of the consolidated audited accounts of organisations across the UK public sector.
- External Auditors were on-site and work has commenced (2022/23 accounts) and was underpinned by regular meetings with the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and Deputy City Treasurer to oversee progress of the audit which was said to be on track in terms of the revised timetable.
- The implementation of a 'statutory override' (a temporary change to legislation) was anticipated in relation to the accounting methodology for highways assets in light of its impact on the finalisation of the 2020/21 accounts, nationally. A delay was therefore possible in relation to the completion of the current financial year's accounts (2022/23), with timescales yet to be determined.
- Sign-off of the external audit of the unaudited 2021/22 accounts was anticipated for early next year, this was however dependent on the outcome and resolution of the accounting methodology issue.

In a discussion about likely timescales for the statutory override, the Deputy City Treasurer outlined the steps involved based on current understanding of the timescales involved for the override's enactment itself, to the interpretation of guidance to undertake technical adjustments for incorporation into the accounts. Based on current knowledge, sign off as anticipated in the early new year. The Committee noted this.

## **Decision**

To note the update.

### **AC/22/40 Oral update: External Audit Progress (Mazars)**

Having duly noted the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer's update on the current position of the 2021/22 unaudited accounts, the Committee heard from Alistair Newall (Mazars) about the commencement of Mazar's audit work on the accounts (2022/23).

Mr Newall confirmed that audit work had commenced and that a good experienced team of six auditors was in place (working a mixture of on-site and remotely) with view to completion of the audit of accounts within two months. He indicated that the early focus on planning and the identification of testing samples in the early stages had had a positive impact and that lessons learnt from previous challenges around resource management had proved effective.

A further update on the progression of external audit would be brought to the next meeting.

## **Decision**

To note the progress outlined.

### **AC/22/41 Oral Update: Appointment of External Auditors**

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer updated the Committee on progress on the appointment of an external auditor.

The key points which the Committee was invited to note were:

- That the first stage of procurement is complete and as such, six audit firms had been offered contracts (one of whom was Mazars)
- The next stage of the procurement process was the allocation of those firms to individual local authorities, in line with PSIA arrangements. An announcement was expected within the next couple of months, subject to no complexities arising from the PSIA consultation process.
- The fees would increase at a rate of approximately 150% when compared to previous rates. Whilst the impact of the fee increase on the budget was as yet unknown, it was felt that this would support the delivery of future audit work of a greater quality and breadth than was previously possible.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer responded to a question about how the decision to allocate is made. She explained that the process followed was part of established PSIA procurement procedures where an assessment was undertaken to determine which provider was best placed to deliver the work across the country. For example in Greater Manchester the request was for a firm that could deliver audit work across all of the Greater Manchester Authorities in view of the extent of collaboration across the boroughs.

The Committee was invited to note that of the six firms who had progressed to the second stage of the procurement process, a number of whom's names were known to the Council, with two new entrants to the market were included on the list. No decision could be made until the consultation period of the PSIA allocation process had elapsed and the responses subsequently evaluated. Members were also invited to note that the PSIA had sought through its tendering processes to actively encourage new entrants to the market, through the structuring of contracts specifically to encourage bids from firms who did not yet have a long track history of local government audit work but were seeking to become established providers.

## **Decision**

To note the update.

## **AC/22/42 Internal Audit Assurance (Q2)**

The Committee considered a report of the Head of Audit and Risk Management which provided an update on progress on the agreed Audit Plan in the second quarter of the 2022/23 municipal year. The report also referenced additional work that had been assigned to the Audit Service and copies of the Audit Opinions issued during the period July 2022 to September 2022 as an appendix.

The report provided information about:

- The delivery of the Audit Programme
- Resourcing and the Audit Plan
- Children's Services and Education: Management Oversight and Supervisions, Foster Care Payments and the OfSTED Improvement Plan, Supporting People, Elective Home Education, Safer Recruitment in Schools, School financial Health Checks and Follow up Audits for individual schools with a limited assurance opinion.
- Adult Services: Management oversight and supervisions, payments, adaptations and Adults Quality Assurance Framework,
- Corporate Core and Information Governance: Core, ICT and Information governance
- Neighbourhoods; Growth and Strategic Development: Pest Control, Youth and Play Provision Transition, Avro Hollows, Building Control, Housing Operations – Consumer and Building Safety Regulations and Highways Pothole Grant activity
- Procurement, Contracts and Commissioning: Social Value, Our Town Hall -

Management of Work Package Delivery, Adult Social Care: Contract Governance, The Factory - Management of Work Package Delivery and Payments, New Contract Management System, Counter-Fraud and Investigations (proactive and reactive corporate cases), and Other Reactive Investigations including Business Grants, Council Tax Reduction Scheme and Housing Tenancy

The Head of Audit and Risk Management introduced the report outlining the above points of consideration and responded to questions and comments from the Committee.

In response to a comment about the time taken to implement the reviewed Audit and Risk Management Service's staffing structure, the Head of Audit and Risk Management responded that following advice from HROD, the decision had been taken to widen the process to a whole service review. The scale of change and complexities around staff migration had led to challenges in finalising the role descriptors for the Health and Safety team. However, these had very recently been agreed. Next steps were described as sign off from HROD and progression to the consultation period.

In response to a query about how costs to the Local Authority were recovered where it was under a statutory duty to intervene in remedial work for dangerous buildings, the Head of Audit and Risk Management advised that work in that area had not yet commenced. The Committee recognised that where those costs were attached to the sale of a particular piece of land, the time taken for those funds to be returned to the the Director of Planning, Building Control's budget could be in some cases, extremely lengthy and sought to explore what actions could be taken to manage those deficits. The Head of Audit and Risk Management agreed to explore whether this matter could form part of the scope of Internal Audit's work in that area.

In response to comments about the number of limited assurance opinions issued to schools around compliance with 'safer recruitment' policies, the Head of Audit and Risk Management explained that whilst the Local Authority offered training to schools, officers were seeking to explore how compliance assurance could be strengthened. Discussions moved to schools financial health checks. The Committee noted the progress described in the report and asked what measures were being undertaken to ensure that guidance on financial compliance had been appropriately strengthened, including other Authority approaches. The Head of Audit and Risk Management explained that samples used the report were to a limited degree, skewed, in that they comprised of a mixture of targeted and randomly selected schools with some selected purely on the basis that they had not been visited for an audit of any given capacity for some time. Capacity as a result of staff vacancies and the segregation of duties within smaller schools remained a prevalent issue to be resolved. The Head of Audit and Risk Management added that whilst these findings were not uncommon across the wider school estate, there was no room for complacency, and as such, officers would seek to explore to what extent other authority's approaches had achieved. However as both the budget and estate had reduced over the recent years, the ability of the Authority to provide support and challenge to schools had declined. In terms of action points, the Authority would be writing to all schools about the findings of the thematic audit and following issue of

the final audit report (an Executive Summary of which would be provided to the Committee), next steps would be agreed. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer added that majority of the Local Authority's school estate were primary schools where challenges around divisions of duty were most likely to occur. Additional guidance on how to practice safely was therefore being developed in light of pressured resources within the schools sector.

There was a discussion about the volume and complexities of various grant funding schemes and their reliance on assurance processes to be overseen by internal audit and finance capacity resources. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer described the challenge and additional burden this placed on the services as a direct result of the associated governance and the assurance processes which underpinned them. The committee was advised that different government departments and funding institutions have different requirements and processes.

The Head of Audit and Risk Management responded to questions about the report's reference to ICT's Vulnerability, and Asset Management programmes, noting the issue of a reasonable assurance opinion. The Deputy Executive Member for Finance and Resources referred to the refreshed ICT and Digital Strategy which would be considered at the upcoming meeting of the Executive for approval and would address the points raised in the audit. A rollout of staff training on the new Data Strategy, a strand of which would establish a solution for the retention of important documents, whilst adhering to regulatory framework. A bespoke training exercise for elected members was also planned. In response the management of vulnerabilities he described a reasonably defensible position with further information to follow in due course. With regard to the Authority's website and Customer Relations Management (CRM) system, these too were under review, with a view to improving accessibility for residents, the vision being that CRM would eventually accommodate virtually all resident-facing Council Services and improve resident's digital experience

## **Decision**

To note the update.

## **AC/22/43 Outstanding Audit Recommendations (Q2)**

The Committee considered a report of the Head of Audit and Risk Management which summarised the current implementation position and arrangements for monitoring and reporting internal and external audit recommendations in accordance with Public Sector Internal Audit Standards.

In addition to the report's introduction and background information, the following information was also included:

- Current Implementation Position Update
- Outstanding Recommendations – over 12 months
- Significant / Critical Overdue Recommendations – 6 to 12 months
- Significant / Critical Overdue Recommendations – 1 to 6 months
- Reporting timescales for recommendations which are as yet not due a response.

With reference to outstanding recommendation in relation to Mental Health Casework, the Head of Audit and Risk Management advised that training of staff would take place during 21 – 28 October 2022. A member questioned whether consideration given been on the likely impact of scheduling the training during the school's half term holidays and could be reflected in the evaluation of it's uptake. provided. The Executive Member for Finance and Resources added that whilst he was satisfied to see that the training was in place, the point made about its scheduling was valid. He suggested that the next scheduled report, should provide the committee with the appropriate level of assurance that eligible staff had undergone the appropriate training in order that the Committee could be satisfied that that the recommendation had been fully implemented. The Head of Audit and Risk Management agreed to pass those comments on to the Director.

In respect of foster care overpayments, the Committee was asked to note that an audit of the foster care service was currently in progress and, as such, the Committee's earlier recommendation on foster care payments would be addressed in full in the forthcoming report. The audit was described as a full scale analytical review of data population for such payments, with reasonably positive results yielded to date.

In respect of the overdue recommendation associated with Avro Hollows Tenant Management Organisation (TMO), the Head of Audit and Risk Management gave clarification that a 3 month priority for recommended interventions to address the identified gaps in assurance had been passed to the TMO and the Director of Strategic Housing.

The Committee noted the progress and timeline on the introduction of a centralised contract management system. In response to the partially-implemented overdue significant recommendation for Waivers and Contract Extensions, a member expressed the view officers should be invited to attend the Committee and so that members were able to get a better understanding of the barriers to implementation. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer commented that there were occasions where waivers and / or direct allocations were an appropriate procurement method. She gave assurance that effective measures were in place to monitor contract extensions and waivers and support informed decision making, adding that where it was agreed that a procurement exercise was indicated, this was duly followed up. She also said that that the flexibility to extend contract arrangements formed part of the Council's contract awarding practices and benefited the Council particularly for longer contract awards.

## **Decision**

To note the report

## **AC/22/44 Work Programme and Recommendations Monitor**

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which set out its future Work Programme for the forthcoming municipal year.

A member asked that the Corporate Risk Register and the Management of Inflationary Risk reports currently scheduled for the Committee's January 2023 meeting be brought forward to the next meeting of the Committee.

A member noted that the report on governance and management of complaints was scheduled for the committee's next meeting. He stated that he was aware that the Complaints function was being used in relation to the management of requests for information that related to the extension of the Christies car parking scheme and questioned whether the complains function was an appropriate vehicle to manage such requests. He asked whether the scheduled report could include an update on that particular matter.

The Committee suggested the following additions to its annual training event:

- ICT systems and governance considerations
- Treasury Management
- Capital / Revenue budgets

The Chair suggested that a paper be brought to the next meeting with an overview of proposed items to be considered in the December training event. In the interim, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer agreed to circulate a note to members of the committee which listed Frequently Asked Questions in relation to capital and revenue budgets.

## **Decision**

To agree the Committee's Work programme, subject to the amendments above.



## **Personnel Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 19 October 2022**

**Present:** Councillor Akbar (Chair) – in the Chair

**Councillors:** Bridges, Hacking, Igbon, Midgley, Leech, T Robinson, Stanton and White

**Apologies:** Councillor Craig, Rahman and Rawlins

**Also present:** Councillors Ahmed Ali, Butt

#### **PE/22/7 Minutes**

##### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2022 as a correct record.

#### **PE/22/8 Arrangements between the City Council and NHS**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Human Resources and Organisation Development, which detailed the arrangements for the Manchester Place Based Lead for GM Integrated Care System, and the Deputy Place Based Lead as well as an agreement to create a joint post of Director of Equalities, Inclusion and Engagement with the NHS.

The role of a single responsible Place Lead for Integrated Care had been recognised as a core feature of the locality approach intended as part of GM's development as an integrated care system. Their responsibility would include driving the local integration of health and social care and connecting that to wider public services to address the social determinants of health, with the purpose of improving health outcomes, improving the quality of care, reducing health inequalities and maximising the value of public resource

In Manchester, it had been decided that the Place Based Lead would be the Chief Executive of Manchester City Council (Joanne Roney), Joanne had been performing this role (as well as her substantive role of Chief Executive) since implementation on 1 July 2022.

A post of Deputy Place Based Lead had been created and an external appointment had been made, with the candidate aiming to start in January 2023. In the meantime, the Director of Population Health (David Regan) had been appointed as Interim Deputy Place Based Lead to cover until the substantive post holder is in place including a period of handover. As a consequence of this cover arrangements for the Director of Population Health had been put into place with the appointment of Dr Cordelle Ofori as Interim Deputy Director for Public Health.

In addition, there was currently, in the former MHCC structure, a post of Director of Workforce, OD and Inclusion and this post was now part of the functions set under

the Place Based Lead. It had been agreed to rescope this role to be a Joint Director (across health and local government) and retitled to Joint Director of Equality, Inclusion and Health Engagement. The Council would fund half of this post which would reflect the focus on health but also the wider council requirements. The post would be responsible for the current council equalities team and their work programme which would be synthesised with wider work on Marmot and engagement and would report into the Director of Population Health. The current postholder, an NHS employee, would remain so, on existing terms and conditions and pay, so would not appear on the payroll of the Council.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Note that the Chief Executive has also taken on the role of Place Based Lead, under a secondment agreement.
- (2) Note that the role of Deputy Place Based Lead has gone to external recruitment with an appointment having been made and note that in the meantime the Director of Population Health is acting up into this role, retaining his statutory DPH responsibilities.
- (3) Note that cover for the Director of Public Health will be provided by Cordelle Ofori in the capacity of Interim Deputy Director for Public Health.
- (4) Note the creation of a Joint Director of Equalities, Inclusion and Engagement with the NHS and the transfer of the City Council Equalities Team to that post.

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 20 October 2022**

**Present:** Councillor Curley - In the Chair

**Councillors:** Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Baker-Smith, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Hewitson, Kamal, Leech, J Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat, Richards and Stogia

**Apologies:** Councillors Riasat and Stogia

#### **PH/22/55      Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 130387/FO/2021 and 133576/FO/2022.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/22/56      Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 22 September 2022 as a correct record.

#### **PH/22/57      133700/FO/2022 - Former Jacksons Brickworks Site, Ten Acres Lane, Manchester - Miles Platting and Newton Heath Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described that the application related to a former brickworks site that has been vacant for many years. Due to past use, there was a legacy of contamination across the site which has been challenging in terms of bringing forward its redevelopment.

In 2021, the current applicant was able to demonstrate how the site could be remediated and a strategy was subsequently approved following a robust assessment of how this would be delivered.

The application now under consideration was for development following the implementation of the strategy. It would create 716 homes, with 378 (134 apartments and 244 houses) in a first phase together with a community building, a community and pocket parks. 338 dwellings would follow in a second phase, which also included the provision of a secondary school. Parking, public realm and landscaping would be provided throughout.

The Committee held a site visit prior to the meeting to see the proposed access points to the site.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee and referred to amendments to the application resulting from the comments raised at the previous meeting. The amendments related to the access to the site from Hallam Road. All vehicular access to the site has been removed from Hallam Road. A dedicated drop off/pick point will be introduced. The proposed pedestrian/cycle route is integral to the masterplan for the proposal site and provides sustainable access for school pupils from the canal tow path and the district centre. The applicant accepts the additional conditions proposed. The development will provide 716 much needed homes to the area, as well as a secondary school and associated playing fields, that will be available for the community to use and green space. The proposal will provide significant investment to the area and provide employment and training opportunities for local people.

Councillor Flanagan addressed the Committee as a ward councillor before leaving the meeting. The Committee was thanked for attending the site visit and receiving photographs from Councillor Grimshaw and were reminded of the objection made. The proposed site included an area of contaminated ground and the proposal to develop the area for new housing and a new high school is welcomed. The objection from the ward councillors relates to an agreement with the developer that Hallam Road would not be opened to pedestrian and vehicular access. The ward councillors have stated that they have seen a plan since speaking to the developer, that will open another entrance to the proposed school which would increase traffic usage. The plan is not included in the application being considered and includes a pedestrian and cycle route. The Committee visited the proposed site and noted the entrance to the nursery school at Briscoe Lane PS is on Hallam Road. Hallam Road is a narrow and congested road. A new crossing was installed to improve safety for accessing the school, however, the proposal will reduce safety for nursery children and parents. The Committee was requested to approve the proposal as submitted and to include an additional condition, to keep Hallam Road unchanged to ensure no pedestrian access or vehicular traffic is allowed through or as an access to a future school site. The local ward councillors believe that if access was allowed on Hallam Road, it would become a main drop-off/pick point for the proposed school and that would make the road a dangerous area for the young children attending the nursery.

The planning officer noted the concern expressed relating to Hallam Road as a future high school drop off/pick point. The committee was informed that allowing access through Hallam Road would provide the benefit of opening the existing community to the proposed community and the new facilities included in the proposed development. Not allowing access will result in a longer journey for those pupils accessing Briscoe Lane PS from the proposed development area and will include using main roads. The access through Hallam Road is supported. The new high school will have a travel plan with a designated drop off and pick up point to improve safety of school children. The application includes a condition to monitor the impact on Hallam Road, with possible additional mitigation if required once the high school was opened.

Members of the committee commented on the application. Reference was made to the size/ quality of the drawings of the road layout within the committee report. The proposed width of the roads on the development is limited and this will result in vehicles parking on the pavement. There are no details of cycling being encouraged in the new development, such as storage or accessing cycle lanes around the area.

Officers were asked for information regarding the depth levels of contamination to the land in the development area, what will happen to it and what investigations have taken place. Also, is there is a significant issue regarding the removal of the contaminated ground, would any additional cost impact on the number of affordable homes within the development.

The Director of Planning reported that a programme of remediation had taken place over eighteen months ago on identification and removal of the contamination from the ground on the development site. Following the earlier application for the remediation work on the site to understand what contaminants are present, a number of conditions had been included and the developer is still required to discharge the remainder of the conditions. A condition is included within the application report being considered to ensure that all of the requirements are carried out. The developer had already stated that brownfield funding has been received to deal with the removal of the contaminated ground.

The Committee was advised that all plans relating the application and all other plans for planning applications are available to view on the Council website and can be provided to members. The width of the proposed roads met the council standards and there is 100% provision for secure cycle parking and off road car parking for the site. Due to the residential nature of the estate and it being located away from the main roads, it was not necessary to include cycle lanes, but there will be access to the Rochdale Canal tow path, to join up with the cycle network. The development has included cycling infrastructure rather than retrofitting them later on. Also, the application includes the intention is to install a pedestrian cycle route on Hallam Road.

Councillor Andrews moved the Officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve, subject to a legal agreement in respect of a reconciliation clause and proposed the inclusion of an additional condition for the closure of Hallam Road as an access to the development site by pedestrians, cycles and vehicles to ensure the safety of school children.

Councillor Saukat Ali seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to Minded to Approve the application (subject to a legal agreement in respect of a reconciliation clause), for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the report submitted. The Committee also approved the inclusion of an additional condition that requires Hallam Road is closed to pedestrian, cycle and vehicular access to the proposed development site.

(Councillor Richards declared a personal interest in the application and left the meeting room, taking no part in the consideration and decision making.)

(Councillor Flanagan spoke on the application as Ward Councillor for Miles Platting and Newton Heath and then left the meeting, taking no part in the consideration and decision making).

**PH/22/58 130387/FO/2021 - The Former Gamecock Public House, Boundary Lane, Manchester M15 6GE - Hulme Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for a part 7, part 11 storey purpose built student accommodation (PBSA) building providing 197 bed spaces. The Committee was 'minded to refuse' a proposal for a part 9 part 13 storey (PBSA) building providing 261 bed spaces on 31 May 2022 as the scale was over dominant and the lack of parking in close proximity to the entrance for those with disabilities.

There were 72 objections to the original submission from neighbours, an objection from 'Block the Block', Aquarius Tenants and Residents Association, Hulme Community Forum, On Top of the World Hulme, Hopton Hopefuls, a letter from 2 employees of Manchester University, the GP practice on Booth Street West, the Guinness Partnership and One Manchester and 3 representations from members of the public supporting the proposal. Councillors Annette Wright and Lucy Powell MP objected to the scheme considered in May. There were 25 objections from neighbours and an objection from 'Block the Block' to the revised proposal.

Councillors Wright and Igbon objected for the reasons the Committee were Minded to Refuse the earlier application and a resident objected on the grounds of overdevelopment, the council should plan for local people in Hulme and the site should accommodate 3 or 4 storey extra care homes. The council should utilise its CPO powers.

The application had been amended to reduce the height to that agreed on appeal. Ten parking spaces, were proposed for disabled people in close proximity to the site. As such a refusal could not be substantiated.

Sally Casey (Chair - Aquarius Tenants and Residents Association) addressed the Committee to object to the application. The issue of the growing number of students attending the Universities and the problems, in finding accommodation is not the fault of the people of Hulme and student accommodation should be better balanced across Manchester rather than being concentrated in Hulme and Moss Side. Hulme has already accommodated the new university developments, and this could not continue. The amended application is inappropriate, is over development and is bigger than the residential blocks adjacent to it. The proposal would have a negative impact on the community, particularly young people. The limited size of the rooms in the building may have a negative impact on students. The Committee was requested to refuse the application.

The applicant's agent explained how the application has been amended to address the points raised by Committee, including a reduction in the height by three storeys, ie 20% to that similar to a scheme agreed on appeal in 2008. The number of bedrooms had reduced from 261 to 197. Ten on street parking spaces will be converted to spaces for disabled people. Students need a safe and secure, centrally located home and a place to study and Hulme is close to places of study. Purpose built student stock is one of the Council's only tools in managing the increase in the use of properties in residential areas. There is not enough student accommodation, and the growth of the universities will impact further with overseas students

significantly increasing (2022-2026). Students are commuting because of a lack of appropriate locations in Manchester. A community space will be available to the local community. The development will provide £20m of investment and jobs and will provide benefits to the area.

Councillor Wright (Hulme ward) stated that the proposal has not changed much. The building does not benefit the area or community. The reasons for refusal still apply. The scale and massing remained a concern and will be taller than both Cooper House and Hopton Court. The parking converts existing parking spaces into those for disabled people. People who drive and work in the city centre and study locally all park on the streets in the area and this does not provide a solution to the reason to refuse. The building restricts/reduces natural light into adjacent homes and may impact on the health of residents through reduced vitamin D levels. The number of people being attracted to the area is too high. The developers have not properly demonstrated that there is need for this type of student accommodation in Hulme. Students are sharing residential houses in Hulme because it is cheaper and better than that proposed. International students are buying accommodation because they will not live in this type of student accommodation which then reduces the availability of homes. The Committee is requested to be minded to refuse the application for the reasons stated. If the Committee is unsure, then a site visit would help members to see the small size of the site and the impact the development will have on nearby homes.

Councillor Igbon (Hulme ward) explained that the Aquarius area of Hulme is surrounded by university buildings and that gives an idea of the number of people attending the ward on a daily basis and the impact this has on the lives of the people who live there. Students were located outside of Manchester as MMU, was not their first choice, and had been allocated via the clearing process. MMU have not considered the accommodation needs of the students or prepared appropriately for the numbers coming to the city. The proposal provides no amenity space and will not add to or improve the area. Students will need access local services and amenities and no reference has been made to the provision of green space. The site is located on a busy road junction and the application does not include any additional crossing facilities or provide a positive environmental change to support the community. The inclusion of a community space includes a number of conditions for the community for its use. The application assumes that students will not need parking spaces which is unrealistic. The inclusion of disabled parking is not sufficient, and it should be on site. The application does not provide any benefit for local residents or the area and shows a lack of consideration for those who may live in the proposed building with limited living space and amenity.

The planning officer stated that the applicant could only respond to the reasons for Minded to Refuse given by the Committee, relating to height and massing and a lack of parking for disabled people. The height is within parameters that have been acceptable on appeal. The parking issue was addressed with ten spaces proposed near the site.

The Chair referred to the terminology in the application that referred to student bed spaces and the similarity this has with the dispersal programme undertaken by the Home Office to provide accommodation for asylum seekers. He believed that the

language provided a negative image of Manchester and students who expect a good standard of accommodation. He referenced the recent pandemic and the challenges students faced when they were unable to leave their accommodation and the impact this had on mental health and wellbeing. The officer stated that the accommodation is similar to other student accommodation schemes across City and the country. It is 6/8 bed cluster accommodation with separate study areas and on-suite facilities and shared-communal areas. Manchester has a shortage of student accommodation, and the proposal will help to address this need and free up the rented and social housing that is often used by students.

Members spoke on the application and the committee was reminded that the Mind to Refuse decision was for the reason of the scale of the proposal and the dominant visual impact this would have on the area and the lack of parking in close proximity to the entrance for those with disabilities.

Councillor Flanagan stated that the height of the amended design is still too high. Provision of disabled parking in the proximity of the entrance, is a Council policy and has not been properly addressed. Students have the same requirements as all members of our society, including disabled parking spaces and developers should be held to account. The application does not improve safety for pedestrian at a busy junction. For those reasons, Councillor Flanagan stated that he was Mind to Refuse the application.

The officer stated that four spaces are proposed on Booth Street West. The proposal is of a similar height to that approved through the appeal process. The distance to Hopton Court is 44 metres and 21 metres to Cooper House. The issue of safety at the junction was not previously raised by members.

Councillor Lyons commented that the development was unlikely to reduce the numbers of students living in multiple occupancy/ shared accommodation and city centre accommodation due to the cost of the new accommodation and the requirements of students who could afford more expensive, centrally located accommodation. The height and massing appeared to be excessive and for those reasons he was Mind to Refuse the application.

The officer stated that students live in different types of accommodation and this proposal would help to address an overall shortage. The Council is advised by the universities and accommodation providers that the city lacks this kind of cluster accommodation. The application provides a form of development that has been allowed on appeal and the committee should consider this carefully.

Councillor Leech referred to the disabled parking being off site and suggested that the spaces could be used by non-residents. On that basis the application should be Mind to Refuse.

Councillor Richards noted the points and concerns raised but considered that the planning policy for student accommodation in residential areas did not strike the right balance and needed to be reconsidered.

The planning officer stated that policy H12 in the Core Strategy is key to determining if the application is appropriate.

Councillor Lovecy referred to policy H12 and questioned whether the location is compatible with existing development. The location is close to the Oxford Road corridor but is close to a residential neighbourhood with other similar high-rise buildings and Councillor Lovecy considered it to be over development and for those reasons she would be Minded to Refuse.

The officer stated that the concerns raised are addressed in the committee report.

Councillor Davies referred to student movements and their use of taxis and free buses which indicates that movement is not limited to walking. Students occupying other types of accommodation has impacted on the availability of family homes and had increased accommodation cost and land values. Officers were asked how policy H12 impacts on housing provision.

The planning officer stated that the committee is not considering land value in considering the application.

The Director of Planning informed the committee that consideration of the application should only be based on planning policies. Issues raised on the adequacy of the policies can be noted and can be discussed when policies are reviewed.

Councillor Andrews asked the City Solicitor's to advise on the number of the times the Committee can be Minded to Refuse an application. The Committee was advised that there is no restriction, but the committee must provide planning related grounds and reasons for its decision.

Councillor Andrews acknowledged the previous allowed decision referred to but stated that this proposal had to be considered on its own merit. He proposed the Committee to refuse the application, for the reason that local residents will be caused dis-amenity.

Councillor Lyons seconded the proposal.

The Director of Planning confirmed that because the Committee is considering an amended application, it could only be Minded to Refuse.

Councillor Flanagan proposed a Minded to Refuse for reasons relating to:

- The scale of the proposal and the dominant visual impact this would have on the area.
- The lack of parking in close proximity to the entrance for those with disabilities
- The use of on-street spaces for disabled parking spaces.
- Policy PH12 (3) – High density developments should be sited in locations where this is compatible with existing developments and initiatives, and where retail facilities are within walking distance. Proposals should not lead to an increase in on-street parking in the surrounding area
- Policy PH12 (6) – Consideration should be given to the design and layout of the student accommodation and siting of individual uses within the overall development in relation to adjacent neighbouring uses. The aim is to ensure that there is no unacceptable effect on residential amenity in the surrounding

area through increased noise, disturbance or impact on the streetscene either from the proposed development itself or when combined with existing accommodation.

Councillor Andrews withdrew the proposal to refuse the application.

Councillor Lyons seconded the proposal made by Councillor Flanagan.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Refuse the application for the following reasons:

- The scale of the proposal and the dominant visual impact this would have on the area.
- The lack of parking in close proximity to the entrance for those with disabilities
- The use of on-street spaces for disabled parking spaces.
- Core Strategy - Policy PH12 (3) – High density developments should be sited in locations where this is compatible with existing developments and initiatives, and where retail facilities are within walking distance. Proposals should not lead to an increase in on-street parking in the surrounding area
- Core Strategy - Policy PH12 (6) – Consideration should be given to the design and layout of the student accommodation and siting of individual uses within the overall development in relation to adjacent neighbouring uses. The aim is to ensure that there is no unacceptable effect on residential amenity in the surrounding area through increased noise, disturbance or impact on the streetscene either from the proposed development itself or when combined with existing accommodation.

### **PH/22/59      134732/FO/2022 - Manley Park Play Centre, York Avenue, Manchester, M16 0AS - Whalley Range Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described planning permission was granted in March 2021 for extensions to an existing single storey community centre building located within Manley Park, this followed a previous approval in 2020 for extensions to the existing play centre. The extensions approved were to provide indoor covered activity spaces at the Community Centre to the north and south of the existing building. The approved extension to the south was to form a 9.2-metre-high activity hall, whilst the extension to the north was of a lower height (approximately 5 metres in height). Works have commenced on site to deliver these approved extensions.

The current proposals sought to provide a further enlargement to the rear of the existing building, a new front entrance, together with roof amendments to provide a more unifying design across the proposed development. The revised proposals indicate an increase in height of the activity hall to 9.3 metres.

110 addresses were notified of the proposals, 4 responses were received, 3 raising concerns with the proposals and particularly implications in terms of pedestrian and highway safety in the vicinity of the park.

Whilst a majority of the proposed works have previously been considered acceptable consideration of the additional extensions and amendments to the existing building is required in particular implications in terms of impacts on the visual amenity and character of the area together with consideration on residential amenity.

The matters raised above are set out and considered in full within the main body of this report. As the applicant is identified as an elected ward Councillor and objections have been received this application is being reported to Committee.

Councillor Flanagan moved the Officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor Lyons seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to Approve the application for the reasons stated and subject to the conditions set out in the report submitted.

(Councillor Dar declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the application and left the meeting room, taking no part in the consideration and decision making.)

### **PH/22/60      134245/FO/2022 - West Didsbury & Chorlton Football Club, Brookburn Road, Manchester M21 8FF - Chorlton Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described the application proposals related to the retention of a temporary 50 seater stand for supporters at West Didsbury And Chorlton Football Club. The stand was originally approved for a temporary 3 ½ year period in 2013 by the Council's Planning Committee with a subsequent further temporary consent granted in 2016 which expired in April 2020. The football club submitted a further extension of time application in July 2019 with a new location of the stand, this application was not determined, with the applicant withdrawing it from consideration earlier this year after the submission of the current application.

The stand was required to enable the football club to meet the standards set out by the Football Association, the temporary stand was intended to be replaced by a more permanent structure and this is still the intention of the football club when funding and the requisite permissions are in place. In the intervening period the football club still require the temporary stand and have submitted a further application for its retention at the site.

As part of the notification of this application 68 addresses were written to and site notices were posted and advertisement placed in the Manchester Evening News given the sites location within the Chorltonville Conservation Area. 18 responses

were received, 17 of these set out objections to the proposals including, amongst other matters; impacts of noise from supporters; a further temporary permission would be contrary to planning legislation; parking issues associated with the football club on residential streets; and, residents are not being listened to and the football club continues to expand.

The Applicant's agent addressed the Committee and referred to key points in particular to objections received regarding the temporary stand. It was reported that the previous applications could not be taken forward for the replacement with a permanent structure due to the availability of funding raising to carry out the work this was made more difficult as a result of the covid pandemic. The temporary stand will enable the club to continue to fulfil the seating arrangements in accordance with the FA standards. The additional five year period will allow the club time to work towards achieving the funding required to cover the costs of a permanent structure. There will be no impact on the green belt and the club works hard to be a good neighbour to the community.

The planning officers advised the Committee that there are a set of circumstances that would warrant an additional temporary period being granted.

Councillor Flanagan noted the objections raised and that the application did not seek to increase what is already in place and moved the Officer's recommendation of Approve for the temporary approval for a temporary 50 seater stand expiring 20th October 2027.

Councillor Leech seconded the proposal and asked officer if any solution had been found to address the issue of banging on the side of the stand.

The planning officer reported that matter has been discussed with the application and not solution had not been found for the type of stand used, however Environmental Health Officers had concluded that due to the position of the stand and the distance from local resident's properties the noise would not considered excessive and was acceptable under the current arrangement.

## **Decision**

The Committee resolved to Approve a temporary 50 seater stand, to expire on 20 October 2027, for the reasons stated and subject to the conditions set out in the report submitted.

**PH/22/61      133576/FO/2022 - Oakwood Resource Centre, 177 Longley Lane,  
Manchester, M22 4HY - Northenden Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described the applicant was proposing to erect 20 no. two storey residential dwellings on the site of the now vacant oakwood Resource Centre. The proposed accommodation would be affordable, split equally between shared ownership and social rent. Correspondence has been received from eleven local residents, as well as the adjoining children's nursery. The main concerns raised include impact on residential amenity, pedestrian/highway safety, existing ecology and insufficient parking.

The planning officer advised the Committee of an additional recommendation would be included, in the event that the Committee approved the application, regarding secure cycle parking proposed for each plot. The condition would ensure that this is provided and retained for the future.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Andrews moved the Officer's recommendation of Approve for the application with the inclusion of the additional condition.

Councillor Leech seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee resolved to Approve the application, with the additional condition concerning secure cycle parking, for the reasons stated and subject to the conditions set out in the report submitted.



## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 17 November 2022**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Baker-Smith, Y Dar, Davies, Hewitson, Kamal, Leech, J Lovecy, Riasat and Stogia

**Apologies:** Councillor Flanagan, Lyons and Richards

#### **PH/20/62. Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding application 133513/FO/2022.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/20/63. Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2022 as a correct record.

#### **PH/20/64. 133513/FO/2022 - 43 Liverpool Road, Manchester, M3 4NQ - Deansgate Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for an application to create an external seating area including a timber canopy with a retractable roof cover. The structure would be fixed to the ground floor slabs and would be 3 metres in height. The size of the outdoor area would measure 11.8 metres by 11.4 metres.

The area would be able to accommodate 11 tables for up to 58 people. Planters would be placed along the boundary with the nearest residential properties along with timber barriers and railings.

The planning officer reported that a management plan and drawing for the proposed seating area had been submitted by the applicant. The plan had been assessed by Environmental Health and they have confirmed that, if the application was allowed, the plan is considered to be acceptable.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee and explained that the seating area is proposed as a permanent feature in connection with the White Lion PH on

Liverpool Road. The applicant is keen to develop the design and appearance of the outdoor area. The PH currently has a temporary outdoor seating arrangement, and this has been in place since 1998. The proposal submitted will be smaller than the current seating arrangement and will be an improvement to the poor-quality furniture used previously. The consideration of the initial proposal for a steel pergola was changed to a timber material and the size of the area was reduced following consultation with planning officers. The consultation and acceptance of the amended design by planning officers is not mentioned in the planning report. No objections have been raised by Environmental Health, GMP or the Archaeological Advisory Service. The management plan submitted sets out the time of use for the area and arrangements for dispersal and use of CCTV. During the consultation process no reference was made that the PH would be considered as a non-designated heritage asset and this first came to light when the committee report was released. The report does not give reasons why the PH is considered as a non-designated heritage asset. Specialist guidance has been sought that questions the council's judgement on the heritage significance of the PH and seating area. The applicant has offered to accept a five-year temporary approval of the proposal and has given an undertaking to work with the Castlefield Forum in the future to help deliver the Castlefield Masterplan. The report does not mention this offer. The applicant refutes the reasons for the recommended refusal of the application, to the suggested significant harm to the heritage assets in the area. The area is smaller than the existing space, the pergola is an open structure, and the planters are set a lower level and do not restrict views. The applicant believes the proposed structure and the benefits it will bring to the site and wider setting would outweigh the negative impacts outlined in the report. The alternative to the proposal would be the use of cheap plastic furniture that is stacked when not in use.

The planning officer noted that the use of the area for eating, and drinking has been in place since 1998. The current management arrangements in place require the furniture to be removed from the area in the evening and this is the same arrangement with other premises in other areas of the city centre. The types of external furniture available can be attractive and is used in other premises. It is considered that the size and permanent nature of the proposal will impact on all the heritage assets in the conservation area and listed buildings. The White Lion PH, although it has been altered externally, is a vintage building and is considered as a non-designated heritage asset. The test of the impact of the proposal has been evaluated and the committee report provides the reasons why the benefits of the proposal to the conservation area, do not outweigh the harm to heritage assets, listed buildings and other non-designated assets.

Councillor Leech asked officers is it their view that the application for this permanent structure is not acceptable or did this view apply to any proposal for a permanent structure.

The planning officer stated that in considering any application it was unlikely a permanent structure would be supported in that location to preserve the feeling of openness around the Roman Gardens area. The paved area outside the White Lion PH contributes to the site as part of improvements made during the 1980-1990s period. The site has important views of the Roman road line into the Roman fort. A

permanent structure would obstruct the views and that would not be in the interests of the Conservation Area.

Councillor Baker-Smith asked officers to explain the purpose of holding negotiations with the applicant to amend the proposal, if the intention was not to agree to the application.

The planning officer stated that the evaluation process of the scheme involves the receiving of views of consultees. Officers had considered the application and had indicated that they did not support the original proposal. The applicant had submitted an amended proposal and following evaluation officers do not consider the proposal to be acceptable.

Councillor Davies supported the officer recommendation and noted that any planning application for the area will receive scrutiny. Reference was made to the alignment of the proposal to the existing PH roofline. The management proposals submitted need to be considered and it was suggested that a premises licence variation may be required, and additional conditions added. The point was made that Liverpool Road attracts many visitors and contains a combination of heritage assets and modernity with a mixture of residential and business premises. It is important that this continued and that area is managed and controlled to maintain its attractiveness.

Councillor Andrews moved a recommendation of Refusal for the application for the reasons set out within the report and referred to the officer's view that there was no clear and convincing justification for the proposal.

Councillor Riasat seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee refused the application for the reason detailed in the report submitted (see below):

Reason for refusal:

1)The creation of an external structure associated with the reconfiguration of the outside seating area at land adjacent to the White Lion Public House by virtue of the siting, scale, appearance, and materiality would form an excessively large, dominant and incongruous within setting off the public house, the Castlefield conservation area and adjacent listed buildings. This would have an unduly harmful impact on the character and visual amenity of the local area and result in less than substantial harm to the historic environment. There would not be the required public benefits to outweigh this harm. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provisions of policies SP1, EN1, EN3, CC9, CC10 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012), saved policies DC18 and DC19 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester (1995) and NPPF.

(Councillor Kamal did not take part in the consideration or vote on the application.)

**PH/20/65. 134052/FO/2022 - Land Bounded by Varley Street, Sandal Street, Bradford Road and Stracey Street, Manchester - Miles Platting and Newton Heath Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for an application to erect 28 two and three storey residential dwellings comprising of 2-, 3-, and 4-bedroom houses. Parking, and landscaping would be provided.

The proposal site was previously occupied by Sandal Court and terraced housing and was cleared under Compulsory Purchase Order powers several years ago. The site is bounded by Varley Street, Sandal Street, Bradford Road and Stracey Street. Two letters of support have been received, along with 27 letters of objection and one letter submitted individually by 48 members of Miles Platting Community and Age Friendly Network. (MPCAN). The main concerns raised include impact on residential amenity, loss of green space, loss of trees and layout of development.

The planning application was a full detailed application for the works to be undertaken as part of the Private Finance Initiative (PFI) contract, this development site is on land bounded by Varley Street, Bradford Road, Sandal Street and Stracey Street and is identified as Cell 7.5b. The development of Area 7.5b offers the opportunity at the eastern area of the estate to provide for a choice of family homes for outright market sale, with space for private gardens and off-road parking. It forms part of a larger development area to the east of Varley Street, which was developed out approximately ten years ago, but this cell was delayed because of its proximity to a gas holder, which has been subsequently decommissioned, thereby allowing this part of the neighbourhood to be finally completed. The accommodation proposed would be in the form of 28 two and three storey 2, 3 and 4 bed houses together with landscaping, parking and boundary treatment.

The planning officer had no additional information to add.

There was no one to speak in favour of or against the application.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer recommendation to Approve the application, subject to the reasons stated and conditions detailed in the report submitted.

Councillor Dar seconded the proposal.

**Decision**

The Committee resolved to Approve the application for the reasons stated and subject to the conditions set out in the report submitted.

# **Health and Wellbeing Board**

## **Minutes of the meeting held on 2 November 2022**

### **Present:**

Councillor T Robinson, Executive Member for Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care (MCC)  
David Regan, Director of Public Health (MCC)  
Paul Marshall, Strategic Director of Children's Services  
Vicky Szulist, Chair, Healthwatch  
Dr Murugesan Raja Manchester GP Forum  
Katy Calvin-Thomas - Manchester Local Care Organisation  
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Rupert Nichols, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust

### **Apologies:**

Councillor Bev Craig, Leader of the Council  
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools Services (MCC)  
Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services  
Dr Geeta Wadhwa, Manchester GP Forum

### **Also in attendance:**

Councillor Collins, Deputy Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care  
Sophie Black, Health Protection Programme Lead  
Peter Cooper, Commissioning Manager  
Julie Jerram, Programme Lead, Public Health Team  
Naaira Zaman, Project Manager, Public Health Team  
Owen Boxx, Senior Planning and Policy Manager NHS, GM Integrated Care

## **HWB/22/20                      Appointment of Chair**

The Committee Support Officer informed members that the Chair had sent apologies for the meeting and asked for nominations for a Chair for the meeting. Councillor T Robinson was nominated by a Board member, this was seconded and agreed by the Board.

### **Decision**

To appoint Councillor T Robinson as Chair for the meeting.

## **HWB/22/21                      Minutes**

### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2022 as a correct record.

## **HWB/22/22                      Reset of the role of the Health and Wellbeing Board**

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health that set out how the Board would operate under the revised Integrated Care System arrangements from January 2023, noting that it had previously been agreed to revisit the role and function of the Board once the new Greater Manchester (GM) NHS Integrated Care System was established.

The Chair stated that all partners listed in Appendix 2 of the report to be written to inform them of the arrangements from 2023, noting that the proposal would be to convene three times per year and to have nominated deputies from each statutory representative.

The Chair also recommended that an update report be submitted for consideration at the January 2023 meeting.

### **Decision**

1. The Board agree the revised arrangements set out at section three of report and the appendices and specifically:
  - a. Approve the use of the Our Manchester Strategy Outcomes as the Board reporting Framework.
  - b. Approve the revised terms of reference and membership.
  - c. Move to three meetings each municipal year.
  - d. Review the terms of reference and membership annually.
2. To submit an update report to the January 2022 meeting of the board.

### **HWB/22/23                      Manchester Public Health Annual Report**

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health that described that as part of the statutory role of the Director of Public Health there was a requirement to produce an annual report on the health and wellbeing of the local population, highlighting key issues.

The Board noted that the report could either be a broad overview of a wide range of public health programmes or may have a focus on a particular theme. This year the focus continued to be on the City's response to Covid-19, capturing our response during the second year of the pandemic. This report was a successor to the 2021 Annual Report, *The Manchester Difference*. The two are designed to be viewed together as a complete reflection on the most acute stages of the pandemic and the beginning of our efforts to recover, from January 2020 to August 2022.

In introducing his report, the Director of Public Health paid tribute to all those professionals and volunteers across the city who had responded collectively to the pandemic, with particular reference given to the nurses at the Central Coordination Hub.

The Assistant Director of Public Health provided an outline of the work on the Annual Report and the importance of the document as a record for the city and the input of the people involved.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care welcomed the report and stated that the report was excellent both in terms of content, style and substance. He stated that this was an important document in terms of a historical record of the Manchester response to the pandemic. He also welcomed the person-centred approach to the document and how this captured personal testimonies that highlighted the Manchester spirit. He further recognised the importance of this document and the learning to inform any response to a potential future pandemic. He stated that the report was testament to the stated ambition for the city to address health inequalities. He referred to the quote in the report that 'The Manchester message had to be a bold, brave and trusted voice' and stated that the report demonstrated that it had been.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

### **HWB/22/24                      Manchester Healthy Weight Declaration**

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health that described that the Healthy Weight Declaration had been developed by *Food Active!* a healthy weight programme delivered by the Health Equities Group, commissioned by Local Authority Public Health and NHS Teams. It is a strategic, system-wide commitment made across all council departments to reduce unhealthy weight in local communities, protect the health and wellbeing of staff and residents and make an economic impact on health and social care and the local economy.

The declaration presented the opportunity for local authorities to lead local action and promote healthy weight and overall good health and well-being in communities. It had been adopted by a number of local authorities across the country, including several in the North-West. Manchester had developed a local declaration that would support and promote city-wide activity under the four strands of the Healthy Weight Strategy. It would instigate a communications plan that would see the declaration promoted across stakeholder venues in the city (e.g., GP surgeries, sports centres, school canteens, green spaces), giving leverage for the engagement of a broad range of partners under our whole-system approach while recognising the economic challenges that families face with the cost of living.

The Board welcomed the report and supported the Healthy Weight Declaration. Members noted that this would require difficult conversations to be had with residents, especially in the context of the cost-of-living crisis. Members recognised the importance of prevention work, and work with young people and children undertaken in neighbourhoods to address obesity. Members noted the significant consequences that obesity had on a person's health outcomes, and this was the reason why these difficult conversations were so important.

The Board were advised that the findings of the National Child Measurement Programme would highlight the impact of the pandemic on obesity rates in children. The Board were informed of a range of programmes around the topic of healthy eating and food preparation that had been delivered in Wythenshawe, noting this was one example of projects delivered locally however the ambition was to scale these

up. The Board were also advised of the work of the Manchester Food Board, Chaired by Councillor Rawlins, Executive Member for Environment and Transport, adding that this work had been reported to the Health Scrutiny Committee.

## **Decision**

The Board approve the Healthy Weight Declaration.

### **HWB/22/25                      Gambling Related Harms**

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health provided an update on the national, regional, and local context of Gambling Related Harms. This included a summary of the key findings from the Public Health England (PHE) Gambling-related harms evidence review and the recently published Greater Manchester (GM) Strategic Needs Assessment on Gambling Related Harms.

The report provided an overview of some of the activities that had been taking place to support the strategic development of the gambling related harms programme both locally and sub-regionally.

The report was seeking approval for the development of a local gambling related harms plan which would be aligned to the priorities set out in the GM 'Preventing and Reducing Gambling Related Harms Programme'. It would aim to respond to the findings from GM Strategic Needs Assessment and prioritise the delivery of key activities over the next 12 months.

The Board in welcoming the report acknowledged the appropriate tone of the communications campaign. The Board further welcomed the acknowledgement that for every individual person directly affected by their own gambling, an average of six others were indirectly affected, noting that gambling affected the most vulnerable and those experiencing deprivation. The Board noted that gambling, particularly that associated with sports had become increasingly normalised in society. The Board discussed that the prevalence of gambling was increasing in the cost of living crisis, commenting that often people regarded gambling as a route out of poverty.

The Chair stated that he welcomed the report and commented that it was very accessible. He requested that this report and the accompanying presentation be circulated to all partners and key stakeholders. The Director of Public Health advised that this would be arranged following the meeting.

## **Decision**

The Board:

1. Acknowledge the Greater Manchester Strategic Needs Assessment on Gambling Harms.
2. Support the development of a local Gambling Related Harms plan in line with the GM Preventing and Reducing Gambling Harms Programme priorities.

3. Identify leads within their respective organisations and/or services to contribute to the development and/or delivery of the local Gambling Related Harms Plan.

### **HWB/22/26                      Cost of Living Crisis**

The Board considered the report of the Interim Deputy Place Based Lead (Manchester) that described that a Cost of Living (Health and Social Care) Task Group, chaired by the Interim Deputy Place Based Lead, had been established to coordinate the health and social care response to the cost of living crisis in Manchester.

The report described that as its first task, the Group had undertaken a piece of work to collate information from key health and social care organisations with a view to arriving at a collective understanding of the range of activities being undertaken in response to the crisis. In doing so, the Group had identified six common themes where collective action was being taken, with further activity planned. Additional focus has been placed on the priority wards where enhanced activity was most likely to be needed to mitigate against the impacts of the crisis.

Katy Calvin-Thomas, Manchester Local Care Organisation advised the Board that issues related to the cost of living crisis were being identified and escalated through the Integrated Neighbourhood Teams. She advised that for those residents who were identified as requiring additional assistance funding was available to provide equipment to enable people to remain living safely in their home.

The Board acknowledged that the cost of living crisis was impacting on all residents, recognising that this included staff and appropriate consideration needed to be given as to how best support staff. The Board noted that the cost of living crisis would impact people's mental health and commented further that schools needed to be supported to ensure that no child went without a meal.

The Chair commented that the established partnership approach in Manchester would be essential to supporting residents in the city, adding that this issue would be prolonged. He further requested that information of the cost of living crisis helpline and the work undertaken by Angela Harrington, Director of Inclusive Economy in response to the crisis be circulated to all partners and key stakeholders. The Director of Public Health advised that this would be arranged following the meeting.

### **Decision**

The Board note the report and committed to ensure their respective organisations continue to support this work.

### **HWB/22/27                      Children's Board Annual Report 2021-2022**

The Board considered the report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services that described that The Children's Board provided overall leadership for the shaping and delivering the vision for children, young people and their families, which is 'Our Manchester – building a safe, happy, healthy and successful future for children and young people'. The Annual Report 2021 – 2022 provided an overview of

the work undertaken by the Board and highlighted the strategic context in which the Board operated, and the progress made against key metrics in the outcomes framework.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services stated that Our Year had enabled significant engagement with young people at a locality level. He said that the brilliance, resilience and determination of young people in the city had shone through, adding that this gave him great confidence in the future. He said that the branding of Our Year had increased awareness and accessibility for young people, adding that this could be achieved with little cost. He said that making spaces and buildings available to support this activity had been very positive and he further made reference to the support offered by local businesses.

In response to a question on what can be done through the Board relating to children's related health, following on from Our Year, the Strategic Director referred to early years and the limited engagement, interaction and social development of children born during the period of the pandemic. Practitioners are seeing a larger gap in some children's school readiness and learning than seen before the pandemic. The response of the Board and the Public Health team will be to work towards closing the gap.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services called for Ambassadors from all partners to continue this work by ensuring that the voices of young people were heard, listened to and responded to. Further this voice should inform all planning and decision making. He further made reference to the recent motion passed by Council to 'Supporting Our Children and protecting Care Leavers' that called for the inclusion of "young people in care" and "care experienced young people" as an additional characteristic in the Council's Equality Impact Assessments, stating that this was very significant.

The Chair stated that Our Year had been a political and strategic priority for the Council, and he paid tribute to the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services and the Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People for their dedication and commitment to the young people of the city. The Board was informed that through discussions with other authorities, Our Year has been recognised in other cities and its purpose has resonated widely with colleagues.

## **Decision**

The Board:

1. Note the report and recognise the progress that has been made during the reporting period and priorities identified.
2. Recognise the strategic importance of the Children's Board and continue to provide the necessary governance.

The Board considered the report of the Senior Planning and Policy Manager, NHS GM Integrated Care that described that NHS England had requested that a BCF return was completed for Manchester which demonstrated the plan to successfully deliver integrated health and social care.

The plan focused on the requirement to reduce long length of stay in acute settings and to provide support for people to remain in the community by having effective discharge pathways and social care provision.

NHS England requested that the plan was approved by the Health and Wellbeing Board retrospectively as the plan needed to be submitted to NHS England by 26 September 2022.

The Board welcomed the report and the approach described. The Chair stated that this approach would support the continued integration of health and social care to best support the residents of Manchester and improve health outcomes.

### **Decision**

The Board:

1. Approve the Better Care Fund return.
2. Approve the narrative return in support of the Better Care Fund plan.
3. Approve the capacity and demand template.



## **Standards Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2022**

#### **Present:**

Independent Co-opted Member: Nicolé Jackson – In the Chair

Councillors Andrews, Connolly, Evans, Lanchbury, Nunney and Simcock  
Ringway Parish Council: Councillor O'Donovan

**Apologies:** Independent Co-opted Member: G Linnell

#### **ST/22/19     Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held 16 June 2022 were submitted for approval.

It was proposed that the wording relating to paragraph number 3 for item ST/22/10 'Review of the Operation and Efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol' be amended to the following:

*To request the recirculation of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol to all elected Members, following its adoption by Council.*

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 June 2022 as a correct record subject to the above amendment.

#### **ST/22/20     Draft Code of Corporate Governance**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that proposed both a revised draft of the Council's Code of Corporate Governance (the Code) which was in accordance with published guidance, and a revised process. Compliance with the Code was monitored on an annual basis through the Council's Annual Governance Statement.

The report provided an introduction and context, noting that a review of the Code had been carried out to improve the document and process. This had included a review of good practice across peer local authorities such as Core Cities (including Leeds, Bristol, and Birmingham), other Greater Manchester authorities and examples highlighted by Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy, including Lambeth and Westminster.

The report described that the Code would be submitted to Audit Committee on 29 November 2022. Once any comments from Standards and Audit Committees had been incorporated, subject to the views of those committees, it was proposed that a recommendation be made to full Council that, for agility, the Code be a standalone document rather than sit within the Council's Constitution and the responsibility for approval of the Code of Corporate Governance rest with Audit Committee by way of delegation by full Council to the Audit Committee. Once finalised, the updated Code

would be communicated to key stakeholders including Heads of Service, to support effective understanding and delivery of the Council's commitments to good governance across the organisation. Amendments to the Code of Corporate Governance would continue to be reported to Standards Committee and Audit Committee.

In response to comments from the Committee, Members were informed that this was an overarching document that set out the principles of Corporate Governance, and that the Annual Governance Statement to be considered at the June 2023 meeting would report specific areas of activity in greater detail. In response to a query from a Member, the Committee were also advised that a specific report on Member Training was scheduled to be considered at the March 2023 meeting of Standards Committee.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **ST/22/21     Members' Update on Ethical Governance**

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that sought the Standards Committee's comments on, and approval of, the draft Members' Update on Ethical Governance for November 2022.

In response to comments from the Committee, Members were informed that reminders were sent to all Members regarding the need to ensure that their Register of Interest declarations were up to date, noting this activity was also reported to the Committee as part of the ongoing assurance process.

### **Decision**

To approve the content of the draft Members' Update set out in the Appendix for circulation to all Members.

### **ST/22/22     Local Government (Disqualification) Act 2022**

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that informed the Standards Committee of the new grounds for disqualification from being elected to, or being a Member of, a local authority that have been introduced by the Local Government (Disqualification) Act 2022.

The report described that The Local Government (Disqualification) Act 2022 ("the 2022 Act"), which came into force on 28 June 2022, introduced new grounds on which a person was disqualified from being elected to, or holding, certain positions in local government in England, including the position of councillor.

The 2022 Act gives effect to the Government's commitment to legislate in this area. It expanded the new disqualification criteria beyond the offences consulted upon in 2017 to ensure that they were specific and comprehensive in disqualifying individuals subject to the relevant notification requirements or relevant orders imposed in respect

of sexual offences, and includes the territorial equivalents of such notification requirements and orders in the devolved nations (and the Isle of Man and Channel Islands) in the event that someone subject to such territorial equivalents subsequently stands for elected office in England.

The City Solicitor stated that she would confirm with the Head of Elections that the requirement for candidates to declare when standing that they were not disqualified under the newly inserted Section 81A of the Local Government Act 1972 was included on the nomination forms in advance of the May 2023 local elections.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **ST/22/23      Local Government Association Model Code of Conduct for Members**

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that presented the Local Government Association (LGA) Model Code of Conduct for Members for comment.

The report described that the Greater Manchester (GM) Chief Legal Officers had met to discuss the LGA Model Councillor Code of Conduct in light of the central government's response to the Committee on Standards in Public Life report. They had not however made any recommendation as a group for the 10 GM local authorities. The view of the GM Chief Legal Officers is that individual Councils needed to consider their own position in relation to the LGA Model Code. As at the date of writing of the report 4 GM Councils had adopted the LGA Model Code; 6 had not.

The City Solicitor stated that a further report would be submitted to the June 2023 meeting with the updated Manchester City Council Code of Conduct for Members where the Committee would be asked to endorse the Code prior to its submission to Council for adoption.

### **Decision**

That the City Solicitor submit an updated Manchester City Council Code of Conduct for Members to the June 2023 meeting.

### **ST/22/24      To propose amendments to the arrangements for dealing with complaints against Members**

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that set out the Monitoring Officer's proposals for amendments to the Arrangements. The Committee noted that the Council's Arrangements were last reviewed by the Standards Committee in June 2019.

A Member recommended that paragraph 2.9 of the Arrangements be amended to introduce a timeframe of 10 working days for the complainant to respond in relation to their preferred option for dealing with the situation where the Monitoring Officer

had refused a request for anonymity otherwise the complaint would be dismissed, noting that this would ensure consistency with prescribed time scales. This recommendation was agreed by the Committee.

A Member further recommended that reference in the Arrangements to 'He' or 'She' should be replaced with 'they'. This recommendation was agreed by the Committee.

### **Decision**

The Standards Committee recommend that Council approve the Arrangements as amended subject to the above recommendations.

### **ST/21/25      Work Programme**

The Committee considered the report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit that invited the Members of the Standards Committee to consider its work programme for future meetings and make any revisions.

Members noted that during discussion of a previous agenda item it had been noted that the Annual Governance Statement would be considered at the June 2023 meeting.

The City Solicitor advised a Member who raised an issue regarding residents being advised that they should use the Council's complaints system as a mechanism to raise queries that she would discuss this outside of the meeting with relevant officers to ensure this would be picked up by the correct Committee for consideration as it was outside the remit of the Standards Committee.

### **Decision**

To note the report and agree the Work Programme.