

Personnel Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 31 May 2023

Present: Councillor Akbar (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors: Bridges, Hacking, Igbon, Midgley, Leech, Moran, Rahman, Rawlins, T Robinson and White

Apologies: Councillor Craig

PE/23/4 Minutes

Decision

The Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on 22 March 2023

PE/23/5 Market Rate Supplements

The Committee considered a report of the Director of HR, OD and Transformation, which provided a summary of Market Rate Supplements (MRS) currently in place in the Council.

A MRS was a time limited additional payment to the basic salary of a role that had been subject to job evaluation and were determined by the relevant Strategic Director in conjunction with the Director of HR OD and Transformation and needed to be justified with reference to clear supporting evidence.

As of 1 March 2023, there were a total 217 of MRS attached to 38 different roles in the Council. No analysis by gender, ethnicity or any other protected characteristic had been undertaken because the MRS related to posts rather than individual postholders.

The report set out the rationale for the use of MRS across each Council directorate.

Decision

The Committee note the report.

PE/23/6 Creation of a new post - Director of Communities

The Committee considered a report of the Director of HR, OD and Transformation, which set out a proposal for the creation of a new Director of Communities post within the Neighbourhoods Directorate.

The Neighbourhood's directorate had an extremely broad and varied set of services. Over the last two years there had been significant changes within the directorate, including the transfer in of Northwards Housing bringing the management of 13,000 council owned social homes in North Manchester back under the direct management

of the Council and aligning it under the Director of Housing Operations within the Council's Homelessness Service.

Following the appointment of the new Strategic Director for Neighbourhoods, a review had been undertaken to determine the optimum reporting arrangements for the services within the Directorate, working within existing resourcing levels. The review, coupled with the departure of the Director of Commercial and Operations, had provided an opportunity to consider the approach and reporting arrangements to ensure that all accountabilities were apportioned more appropriately. In addition, a stronger emphasis on communities, bringing services together, communication and engagement with residents was required and as a result a realignment of resources was required to support this ambition.

It was subsequently proposed that a new Director of Communities post at SS4 Grade (£101,996 to £112,411) should be created to sit alongside the Director of Highways, Director of Housing Operations and the Director of Commercial and Operations. In connection to this it was also proposed to disestablish the post of Director of Commercial and Operations (SS4 Grade) SS4 in order to fund the new post.

Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Recommend to Council the creation of new post, Director of Communities grade SS4 Grade (£101,996 to £112,411).
- (2) Note the disestablishment of Director of Commercial and Operations Grade SS4.
- (3) Note the re-alignment of services to each Director position.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 13 April 2023

Present:

Councillor Curley – in the Chair

Councillors Andrews, Y Dar, Flanagan, Hewitson, Kamal, Leech, Lyons, S Ali

Apologies: Councillors Baker-Smith, Davies, Lovecy, Riasat and Sadler

PH/23/28 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding the combined application of 121195/FO/2018 & 121196/LO/2018.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/23/29 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2023 as a correct record.

PH/23/30 121195/FO/2018 & 121196/LO/2018 - Land at Shudehill Manchester, M4 2AD - Piccadilly Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that presented an application proposing the demolition of all non-listed buildings (with exception of partial retention of the Rosenfield Building facade), partial demolition and alterations to 29 Shudehill, and erection of a new building comprising ground floor plus part 2, part 7, part 8, and part 19 storey to include 175 residential units (Use Class C3) together with flexible ground floor commercial floorspace (Use Class E), new public realm, cycle parking (90 spaces), and other associated works.

The development would redevelop a largely vacant site that contains heritage assets. These make a positive contribution to the street scene, the character of the conservation area and setting of adjacent listed buildings. Their setting and character could be improved through appropriate regeneration. The site is fragmented and disjointed, but the wider townscape of the conservation area has visual cohesion, from its complementary massing, layout and form of its buildings.

The proposals would provide 175 homes and commercial units but the form of development: would not be of an appropriate quality; would not enhance its surrounding to an acceptable level; and would not deliver a coherent development which properly responds to context, or which maintains the areas prevailing character and setting. The harm to heritage assets would not be outweighed by public benefits.

The development would be car free. Cycle parking is proposed but this would be less than 1 space per apartment.

Objections have also been received from Historic England and the Victorian Society. 71 letters of objection have been received from 2 rounds of notification concerned about the use, design and impact on heritage assets impact on amenity including on future residents from existing noise sources (agent of change), servicing and highways impacts, construction impacts and sunlight and daylight impacts. An objection has also been received from and Save Britain's Heritage.

The Planning Officer stated that there had been 3 letters of objection and 1 of support since publication of the initial agenda.

The agent for the applicant addressed the Committee on the application, stating that this was a complex site requiring regeneration. The applicant had worked with Council Officers, and it was with regret that these Officers stated that they could not support the application. The applicant was of the opinion that the scheme should be approved and referred to information of some support within the report. The site was a current blight on the area, was in need of development and the agent stated that they did not share the views of objectors concerning the heritage aspect and scale. Regarding the scale of the project, the agent stated that all heritage assets were considered for retention, but this had been proved impossible. This viewpoint was included and validated by a third-party assessor. The agent expressed that the area was suitable for tall buildings. Regarding the design of the scheme, the agent stated that this had been undertaken by a leading design studio, Buttress, who had applied considerable skill. The façade and design were of a good standard with high quality brickwork proposed. With regard to the heritage aspect of the current plot, the agent stated that it was in need of repair, referring to the nearby Glassworks as an appropriate comparison which managed a mix of old and new in one setting. The agent agreed that there would be some harm from the development, but this would be less than substantial. The report set out other benefits, such as 220 associated jobs and pedestrianised area. In conclusion, the scheme would offer optimum use of this derelict site and would result in less than substantial harm to heritage assets, but this needed to be balanced against the public benefits. It is on the matter of this balance where the applicant disagreed with the opinion of Council Officers as it would outweigh any harm caused. The agent requested the Committee consider the NPPF test to determine the application and bring this site back into use.

The Planning Officer stated that this application was accompanied by a very long officer report, and all issues were covered within it. He stated that the agent had not raised any new issues in their representation at the meeting. The Planning Officer did agree that the scheme constituted less than substantial harm but added that this scheme was at the higher end of such measurements and the public benefits would need to be greater to outweigh this, but the scheme was too large and damaging. The Planning Officer considered the comparison with Glassworks irrelevant. The scheme has brought about long discussions as it is noted that the area needs developing, but not at any cost.

The Chair invited Committee members to ask questions/add comments.

Councillor Lyons stated that he was in agreement with the Planning Officer, in that the harm would be too great. Councillor Lyons stated he would have expected to see some affordable housing on the site to outweigh the harm and put some balance towards public benefit. He questioned if the area was perhaps better for less residential properties, such as hotels/hospitality due to the busy nature of the area with two transport hubs in the immediate vicinity.

The Planning Officer stated that housing/residential units could work in this location adding that there was no policy reason to refuse any such development at this site but did agree that other uses may work.

Councillor Andrews referred to the reasons for refusal on pages 131 and 132 of the printed report and stated that he felt these were adequate for him to move the recommendation of Refuse for both applications.

Councillor Lyons seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Refuse both applications for the reasons as set out in the reports submitted.

PH/23/31 135733/FO/2022 - Barlowmoor Clen Gas Governor, Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21 7GZ - Chorlton Park Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that presented an application regarding the installation of a replacement kiosk required to house a new gas governor following demolition of existing including installation of replacement weldmesh palisade fencing.

The site is of an irregular size located to the rear of residential properties on Barlow Moor Road and Houghend Avenue and to the west is the Manchester Crematorium with the wider Southern Cemetery beyond, an Electricity substation is located adjacent and to the south of the site. The site is not publicly accessible, with the alleyway that serves it having been subject to a City Council alleygating scheme approved in 2008. The wider area to the south, west and north is predominantly residential in nature whilst to the east is the western boundary of the Manchester Crematorium with the Grade II registered Southern Cemetery beyond. The site is located within the Chorlton Park ward of the city. In order for the replacement infrastructure to be compliant with current technical industry standards and guidance the new infrastructure requires larger clearance areas (3m minimum) around them. As such, the associated housing structure known as a kiosk is required to be larger than those that currently exist on site. The applicant has confirmed that the replacement infrastructure (gas governor) is to be installed under the applicants permitted development rights and it is the Kiosk and associated 2.4m perimeter weld mesh fencing that requires planning permission.

Amongst other matters that are set out within the main body of the report it is considered that the principle of the upgrade of existing energy infrastructure with

suitable mitigation around tree loss is acceptable in this instance.

The Planning Officer had nothing to add to the printed report.

The agent for the applicant, Cadent Gas, addressed the Committee and stated that the company supplied gas services for around 11 million homes and businesses. This was an important development as it currently serviced 20,000 customers. There was a need to keep gas pressure at a premium and the site was currently non-compliant. The kiosk needed to be maintained and inspected and would require dismantling and replacing due to its restricted size. The kiosk and surrounding fencing would be green to be in keeping with surroundings and it was regrettable that the trees on site would have to be lost. Referring to tree loss, the agent confirmed that replacement trees would be provided, as per a condition on the application. Any surrounding vegetation would be removed out of season to prevent habitat loss to wildlife but the needs of the unit to be functional and compliant would outweigh the loss of trees on site. The kiosk would be noise insulated and would be no louder in its operations than the current unit. Diligent planning had been implemented and there were clear public benefits for this upgrade.

The Planning Officer expressed regret about the tree loss associated with the upgrade but confirmed a condition to replace them had been agreed with the applicant.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions/make comments.

Councillor Lyons asked if Ward Councillors would be consulted on the replacement tree project.

The Planning Officer stated that the replacement scheme had an initial agreement to be planted in Southern Cemetery. Members had been informed.

Councillor Leech asked if the Planning Officer was aware that the Crematorium was adjacent to this site.

The Planning Officer stated that the replacement trees would be either in the area of the Crematorium or Southern Cemetery with appropriate species.

Councillor Leech stated that the Crematorium was privately owned, unlike the Cemetery which was Council land. Councillor Leech expressed surprise that Southway Housing Trust had not been consulted and asked why. He asked about the number of replacement trees, whether this would be 1 for 1, and asked why the clearance of the whole site, rather than work around it, had not been challenged.

The Planning Officer confirmed that notifications had gone to individual addresses, as per Government advice and not to land owners. The number of replacement trees had yet to be agreed and the City Council's own arboriculturist would be involved in selecting the age and appropriate species. The replacement project would be managed within Southern Cemetery and not the Crematorium. Regarding the clearance of the site, the Planning Officer confirmed that this had already taken place. The trees had been assessed and were not considered worthy of a Tree

Preservation order. The loss of trees was to be fully assessed and subject to a condition with full details of replacement tree details to be agreed.

Councillor S Ali moved the recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor Lyons seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application, subject to conditions, as set out in the reports submitted.

PH/23/32 134160/OO/2022 - Land to the north of 27 Capenhurst Close, Manchester, M23 2SL - Baguley Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that proposed an outline application with all matters reserved for the erection of one (3 bed) detached dwelling, with associated car parking and landscaping.

This application relates to a rectangular plot of land, approximately 495m² in size, which is located to the north of nos. 27 to 33 Capenhurst Close. The site is vacant and remained undeveloped after the Capenhurst Close and Stapleford Close development (F17127, approved 28 April 1982) was completed in the late 1980s.

The applicant is proposing to erect a three-bed detached dwelling on the site. Eleven letters of objections have been received, nine in relation to the original proposal, which was for a pair of dwellings, and two in relation to the proposal now before the Committee. The main concerns raised include impact on the existing on-street parking arrangements, residential amenity, pedestrian/highway safety and existing ecological features.

The Planning Officer had nothing to add to the printed report.

An objector to the application attended and addressed the Committee, stating that they were unhappy with the diagrams relating to the submitted scheme as they included no measurements and were more of a sketch. The objector stated that there were already problems in the area due to traffic on the cul-de-sac. There was a sign against heavy goods traffic and she questioned how construction vehicles would be allowed access, stating that the refuse collection vehicles have difficulty navigating the area. Hospital parking also created issues on the street and the objector stated their right to have 24 hour access for emergency services. Currently, there were pillars at the end of the footpath onto Capenhurst Close to stop motorbikes, quad-bikes and cycles and, if these were removed for construction purposes, the alleyway would become a rat-run. If construction equipment were to be left on-site it would attract vandals and thieves and this was another cause of concern. The objector stated that locals had not been informed of the length of time for any on-site works. In concluding, she stated that traffic was the main concern as the area was already busy.

The Planning Officer stated that this was an outline application, which previously had been for two houses on the site, now reduced to one. The application was in outline and therefore just sought approval for the principle of one house with all details reserved for future applications. All that was being considered today was the application to allow one house on the plot of land. Highways safety had confirmed that the road would not be adversely affected by one new house. Condition 20 within the report covered all aspects of construction vehicles and the associated compound.

Councillor Andrews stated that this was in his Ward and that he knew the area well. He asked the Planning Officer if the consultation for reserved matters application for the build etc. would be shared with local residents.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this would go through a full consultation period.

Councillor Andrews sought further clarification on whether this application would share plans of the house, build materials, construction plan etc.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the designs and layout will be included in a future application. He confirmed that there was a condition for the construction management plan to be submitted, but the developer could be asked for full details of the construction management plan as part of their reserved matters application in future.

Councillor Andrews stated that he wished for anyone to be able to understand the process and checked that, if this application to allow one house to be built on the land was agreed by the Committee today, that any future application to then build the house on the site would come back before the Planning & Highways Committee, should it attract any objections.

The Planning Officer confirmed Councillor Andrews' comments regarding future arrangements for any subsequent application.

Councillor Leech requested information on the status of the land for surrounding dwellings, seeking to establish if this was public highway land or private road as action could be taken against vehicles on public land. Councillor Leech acknowledged the concerns of residents regarding construction vehicles.

The Planning Officer stated that the driveways are private and would pertain to private issues between the developer and other neighbouring properties and confirmed that they would liaise with any developer on a construction management plan.

Councillor Leech felt that the construction management plan should refer to the areas concerned as private driveways.

The Director of Planning wished to address an area of concern raised by the resident regarding the bollards at the junction of a footpath and the end of the cul-de-sac which would have to be removed to give access to any future property. The Director

of Planning felt that it would be possible to replace a bollard in the future to prevent vehicular access and anti-social behaviour along the footpath. This could be added as a condition should the Committee approve the application.

Councillor Andrews stated that he was not against the proposal for a house on this plot of land but added that the reserved matters application would receive more scrutiny from the Committee. He thanked the Director of Planning for the additional condition regarding a bollard on the footpath and moved the recommendation of Approve with this extra condition attached.

Councillor S Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application, subject to the additional condition suggested by the Director of Planning and as set out in the report submitted.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 1 June 2023

Present: Councillor Lyons (Chair)

Councillors: Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Curley, Davies, Gartside, Hassan, Hewitson, Hughes, Kamal, J Lovecy and Riasat

Apologies: Councillor Chohan, Johnson and Ludford

Also present: Councillor Good (Ward Councillor Ancoats and Beswick) – application 133324/FO/2022 & 133323/LO/2022 only

PH/23/33. Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 135419/FO/2022, 133324/FO/2022 and 133323/LO/2022, 135419/FO/2022, 136551/FO/2023, 135647/FO/2022 and 135936/FO/2023

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/23/34. Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 13 April 2023 as a correct record.

PH/23/35. 135662/FO/2022 - Laystall Street / Great Ancoats Street Manchester M4 6DE - Piccadilly Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that presented an application relating to the erection of a 20 storey building to create a 154 bedroom hotel (Class C1) above 2 basement levels with ancillary café / bar / restaurant and gym and other associated works including highway improvements, cycle parking and creation of accessible parking bay following removal of on site structures.

Seven letters of objection had been received (including three from the same party) and one anonymous letter. The grounds of objections were concerning the design, traffic impacts of reconfiguring the Laystall Street junction, inadequate pre-application consultation and the prejudicial impact of developing this site in isolation of the adjoining site.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report or late representations received.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee stating the design of the building proposed made efficient use of the site whilst not compromising any development on adjacent land. The applicant had an excellent track record and reputation for delivering and operating hotel development across the UK. Proposals were designed to deliver a high quality building, developed in close consultation with Council officers. The proposals had been subject to rigorous townscape and heritage assessments and would meet highest of sustainable construction standards and would reduce the demand for alternative form of visitor accommodation in the city.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Hewitson addressed the Committee and sought clarity on the proposed amendment to the road layout and direction exiting Laystall Street. In connection to this Councillor Davies sought clarity as to whether the proposed change had come from the Council's Highways department as part of a wider programme of changes to road layouts or whether any consultation with local residents had taken place. Councillor S Ali also expressed his concern in relation to the proposed traffic remodelling.

The Planning Officer confirmed that at present traffic exiting Laystall Street could turn left or right. Within the proposals submitted, traffic would only be able to turn left. This proposal had been subjected to traffic modelling and it had been determined that this proposal would have no adverse effect on traffic and would improve the environment for pedestrians around the site. In addition, it was confirmed that the proposed change had been submitted by the applicant and discussed and whist agreed by the Council's Highways Department. the proposal would still need to a formal Section 278 agreement and if it did not pass, alternative proposals would need to be considered, however, this should not affect the application going forward.

Councillor Andrews sought clarity on whether the application would need to be reconsidered by the Committee should the Section 278 agreement not be passed.

The Planning Officer advised that if the Section 278 Agreement was not passed, the application could still go forward subject to a minor modification to the application in relation to the proposed traffic modelling.

Councillor Curley enquired as to whether there was any possibility of increasing the number of proposed disabled parking bays.

The Planning Officer advised that in addition to the proposed disabled bay, the applicant would also be providing a valet parking service a spart of the operational management plan.

Councillor Andrews proposed a motion to approve the application.

Councillor Hughes seconded Councillor Andrews's proposal.

Decision

The Committee Approves the application as set out in the report submitted.

PH/23/36. 135675/FO/2022 - Tariff Street Manchester - Piccadilly Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that presented an application regarding the erection of two residential apartment buildings (Use Class C3) comprising Block 1 -part 9, part 10 and Block 2-12 storey building (comprising of 261 dwellings in total), with ground floor commercial units (Use Class E), associated residents amenity space, cycle parking, landscaping, access, street loading and other associated works following demolition of the existing building on site.

30 letters had been received from three rounds of neighbour notification from a total 24 objectors. The objections related to design, heritage, amenity, servicing, sunlight and daylight, wind impacts on external spaces, highways and non-compliance with the Piccadilly Basin SRF.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee on the application, raising concerns fire safety, specifically in relation to the proposed Block Two, which proposed only one staircase which was non-compliant. Concerns were also made around the wind report, that the application deviated from the SRF, no consultation had been given to local heritage assets and removable of public realms, loss of day light to neighbouring residential properties and overdevelopment of the site

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee, stating that the proposal before committee represented positive discussions with Planning Officers and was in line with key principles within the Piccadilly Basin SRF. The proposals met and exceeded design standards and the proposed scale and massing responded to the historic mills and would deliver well designed accommodation that would be sympathetic to the area. The proposal was consistent with the strategic vision for the area and there would be an initial £250k contribution to affordable housing with a further viability assessment secured to allow this to be reassessed . It was stated that the current site made little contribution to the heritage of the area and the proposal would contribute to the delivery of new homes in the city.

The Planning Officer provided clarification on the issues raised by the objector. Specifically in relation to fire safety, he advised the Committee that this was not an issue for the planning process. It was for the Committee to determine on land use planning issues. It would be for Building Control to determine on fire safety and if changes were needed, this would result in a new application which could be in the form of a non material change, material change or new application, which may need to be subjected to consideration by the Committee again.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Curley addressed the Committee, welcoming the securing of the Section 106 agreement toward affordable housing. He proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of *Minded to Approve* subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement in relation to an initial off site affordable housing contribution, with a future review of the affordable housing position

Councillor S Ali seconded Councillor Curley's proposal.

Decision

The Committee is *Minded to Approve* the application subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement in relation to an initial off site affordable housing contribution, with a future review of the affordable housing position.

PH/23/37. 133324/FO/2022 & 133323/LO/2022 - Ancoats Works Pollard Street Norfolk Street Manchester M4 7DS - Ancoats & Beswick Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that proposed the erection of two, part 8, part 4 storey buildings and refurbishment of the southern part of the Ancoats Works building to Pollard Street to form 183 residential apartments and 10 duplex apartments (Use Class C3a) together with flexible commercial space (Use Class E/Sui Generis) (274 sqm) with associated landscaping, car and cycle parking and associated works following demolition and partial demolition of existing buildings.

Listed building consent was also sought for removal of an existing roof structure between Hope Mill and Ancoats Works, the replacement of existing gates fronting Pollard Street, and associated works in connection with the residential led development of Ancoats Works.

Nine letters of objection, and one letter of support had been received from surrounding residents and businesses within Hope Mill. The objections related to, but were not restricted to, a lack of parking, loss of daylight to local businesses, scale and massing, loss of heritage assets and a lack of S106 contribution.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report and late representations received.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee on the application, raising concerns in relation to the size of the development and the impact it would have on the local community. It was stated that the application would remove a local historic landmark and the proposed development had non-descript features. Concern was also raised in relation to size of the development and associated loss of daylight to existing residents and the impact the development would have on the local infrastructure, including increased traffic that the proposed development would have.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee, advising that the proposals would be respectful of nearby listed buildings to ensure heritage assets in the area remained dominant. It was stated that the proposed development met and exceeded design standards and would result in £35m investment into the local

economy. Significant mitigation would be undertaken to protect existing commercial businesses that neighboured the site and extensive landscaping would also take place, providing attractive, safe communal areas for residents

Councillor Good (Ward Councillor Ancoats and Beswick) attended and addressed the Committee. He raised concerns about the lack of affordable housing in the development. The development proposed 193 units with none being affordable, which did not accord with the Council's policy around affordable housing

Further, he raised concerns that there was no proposed parking provision and he also felt that the sustainable transport element was not sufficient as there was little connected cycle infrastructure to the development.

He requested that the Committee reject the planning application in its current form. He stated that to meet Council policy the application should at a minimum provide 20% affordable housing units, or the applicant contribute an equivalent financial contribution (20%) for off-site affordable housing.

The Planning Officer provided clarification on the issues raised by the objector. He stated that the application was not a large development compared to surrounding developments and that the area needed to change as the impact of growth of the city centre continued to move outwards. He advised that the site was unappealing in its current form and contributed little to the area. In relation to affordable housing, he assured the Committee that the Council rigorously tested the viability assessments for all housing development proposals. The profit margin for the development was 17.5% and regardless of what this equated to in monetary terms, Government had set a minimum profit margin of 20% on site, therefore the Council wasn't able to secure a Section 106 Agreement that gave a financial contribution upfront. There would however, a clawback mechanism put in place.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Lovecy addressed the Committee and sought clarity as to whether the conditions attached to the application would ensure that all of the properties would be effective against becoming AirB&B type usage. She also sought confirmation as to who would have access to the new proposed public realm and what steps were being taken in relation to acoustic and noise mitigation

The Planning Officer advised that the conditions attached to the application would protect against the properties being used as AirB&B. He confirmed that the proposed public realm would be for residents only and acknowledged that the issue around acoustics had been challenging and work had been undertaken to ensure those neighbouring businesses could still operate

Councillor Curley enquired as to whether there was any opportunity for additional disabled parking provision and what mechanism was being used to exclude residents in this development from having to apply and purchase parking permits from the existing scheme.

The Planning Officer advised that a condition could be included to review additional disabled parking if the Committee was minded to agree this. He added that Officers were working with the City Solicitor to identify a mechanism that would exclude residents in this development from applying for a parking permit. This could not be achieved through a Section 106 Agreement but possible a Section 111 Agreement.

Councillor Andrews proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to the completion of the legal agreement associated with planning application 133324/FO/2022 and the inclusion of a condition to review additional disabled parking provision.

Councillor Curley seconded Councillor Andrew's proposal.

Decision

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application subject to the completion of the legal agreement associated with planning application 133324/FO/2022 and the inclusion of a condition to review additional disabled parking provision.

PH/23/38. 135419/FO/2022 - One Medlock Street Manchester M15 5FJ - Deansgate Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the demolition of the existing hotel building and structures and redevelopment of the site to comprise two separate buildings: one 13 storey office building with commercial unit (Use Class E) at ground floor; a part 11, part 38 storey building comprising 1,014 purpose built student accommodation units (sui generis) with ground floor office/community uses (Use Class E, F1 or F2); and associated ancillary internal and external amenity space, hard and soft landscaping and associated highway works.

There had been 11 representations received objecting to the proposed development. The objections related to, but were not restricted to, increased noise and disturbance, scale and massing, over-development, loss of daylight, lack of suitable infrastructure and loss of privacy.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report and late representations received.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. He stated that the site occupied a key location to the southern gateway of the city centre. The application supported the positive change of the wider area as part of the First Street Regeneration Framework. The proposals had been developed through local engagement and working with local teams. The proposed design would provide an improved street level experience, which would be greener and work better for pedestrians and cyclists. The office building proposed would provide over 2200 jobs and there would also be a community hub available for all of the community. The application would also provide high quality purpose built student accommodation for approximately 1000 students. Positive conversation had taken place with

Universities who supported the proposals and would form part of the PBSA pipeline identified by the Council

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Lovecy addressed the Committee and sought clarification as to how the affordable low market rent level was set in relation to the proposed student accommodation

The Planning Officer advised that there was no Council policy position for affordable student accommodation but this would be picked up as part of the review of the Council's Core Strategy. It was reported that 20% of the proposed student accommodation would be at 80% of the market rate with equal access to all facilities.

Councillor Curley commented on responses received from Sport England and use of facilities and asked if any provision could be made to address these.

The Planning Officer advised that there was no policy position that required the Council to address the comments received from Sport England.

Councillor Davies welcomed the proposed landscaping and sought clarification as to whether appropriate traffic modelling had been undertaken in connection to safe cycling provision in the area. She also asked if consideration had been given to the potential increase in traffic arising from the use of Uber and online food delivery companies that could be attributed to student accommodation

The Planning Officer confirmed that the Council was looking at an Active Travel Scheme along the whole length of Medlock Street but this was not yet funded. The proposed development would help make a significant improvement to the local environment in terms of tree planting, the widening of pavements and better use of the site. In addition he advised that travel plans had been updated to account for the potential increase use of ridesharing companies and online food delivery companies

Councillor Davies requested the Committee be provided with a note on how travel plans had been updated to account for the potential increase use of ridesharing companies and online food delivery companies

Councillor S Ali proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to a legal agreement for the provision of on-site affordable accommodation, waste management to be provided by a private contractor and a financial contribution towards off site tree planting.

Councillor Kamal seconded Councillor S Ali's proposal.

Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Is minded to approve the application subject to a legal agreement for the provision of on-site affordable accommodation, waste management to be provided by a private contractor and a financial contribution towards off site tree planting.
- (2) Requests a note on how travel plans had been updated to account for the potential increase use of ridesharing companies and online food delivery companies

PH/23/39. 136170/FO/2023 - Land Bounded By River Street To The North, River Street And Vacant Lane To The East, Hulme Street to The South And Plot 10A Of The First Street Masterplan To The West Manchester - Deansgate Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the erection of a 14-storey building comprising of purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA) (Sui Generis) and ground floor Food Hall (Sui Generis Use), and other associated works including external amenity spaces, public realm, secure cycle parking, access and servicing arrangements (Plot 10B).

No objections had been received.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. He stated that the proposed development had received no objections from local residents, statutory or non-statutory consultees. The development would provide high quality student accommodation to meet the demand in the area from students. It also aligned to the Council's pipeline of further PBSA and would help draw students out of main stream homes, freeing up these properties and reduce rent pressure for the city's residents. The development would also offer 15% of the total accommodation at an affordable rate. The development was also significantly lower in height than that envisaged in the SRF. Designed well the development would successfully transition from the modern developments of First Street to the traditional mill buildings of Macintosh Village.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Davies addressed the Committee. She welcomed that the proposed development would be sympathetic to the surrounding area. She sought clarification that the proposed 15% of accommodation being at an affordable rate would be for the perpetuity of the development and asked what impact the development would have on traffic in relation to the potential increase in the use of ridesharing companies and online food delivery companies.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the proposed 15% of accommodation at an affordable rate would be required through a Section 106 Agreement and would last for the perpetuity of the development. He also agreed to provide information on how

travel plans had been updated to account for the potential increase use of ridesharing companies and online food delivery companies.

Councillor Kamal proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to a Section 106 to secure affordable student housing and commercial waste disposal.

Councillor Hewitson seconded Councillor Kamal's proposal.

Decision

The Committee is Minded to Approve subject to a S106 to secure affordable student housing and commercial waste disposal.

PH/23/40. 135834/FO/2022 - Albert Bridge House Bridge Street Manchester M3 5AH - Deansgate Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the creation of a mixed use development comprising two separate components in the form of an office building of up to 19 storeys with ground floor commercial, leisure, food and drink uses (All Use Class E (g)) and/ or drinking establishment (Sui Generis), and, a residential building up to 45 storeys (Use Class C3a) with additional roof top plant, basement car parking, cycle parking, landscaping and public realm, servicing and access arrangements, highway alterations and other associated works following demolition of the existing building complex.

Seven letters of objection and one neutral comment had been received. The objections related to, but were not restricted to, loss of daylight and overbearing, traffic congestion,

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the report.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. He stated that the design of the development offered a welcoming and thriving new city centre destinations. The proposed development aligned with the Council's Parsonage Gardens SRF which identified Albert Bridge House as significant redevelopment opportunity for high density commercially led mixed use accommodation. The development would provide approximately 3000 full time jobs and had been designed to deliver best in class, inclusive employment space. The proposed residential accommodation would meet the Home Quality mark standards and the scale and massing of the buildings had been informed by the SRF with consideration to local heritage assets.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer. The development would support the ongoing economic regeneration of the area and form a key part of the city's blue and green infrastructure, providing a 20% biodiversity net gain

Councillor Davies addressed the Committee. She welcomed the success of the Tree Preservation Orders but raised concern in relation to the percentage of parking spaces proposed. She sought clarification as to whether there had been a decision as to whether all the proposed residential accommodation would be for rent or would some be for purchase and whether the proposed ground floor independent retail proposals could be guaranteed as these types of businesses could not often commit to long term leases.

The Planning Officer clarified that there were 12 accessible spaces overall, but if Committee was minded, a condition could be included to review this provision. It was confirmed that all of the proposed residential accommodation would either be for rent or purchase and insofar as the ground floor retail proposals, the applicant would be offering a profit rent or turnover rent to ensure an independent business occupied the space. If not already within the conditions, the Planning Officer proposed a suitable condition could be included in the application

Councillor S Ali proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement in relation to a future review of the affordable housing position, to secure monies associated with highway improvement works along Bridge Street and secure the retention of the project architect and the inclusion of conditions to review the overall provision of residential parking spaces and the rental arrangements for the proposed independent ground floor retail offering.

Councillor Hewitson seconded Councillor S Ali's proposal.

Decision

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application, subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement in relation to a future review of the affordable housing position, to secure monies associated with highway improvement works along Bridge Street and secure the retention of the project architect and the inclusion of conditions to review the overall provision of residential parking spaces and the rental arrangements for the proposed independent ground floor retail offering.

PH/23/41. 136551/FO/2023 - 393 Wilmslow Road Manchester M20 4WA - Withington Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the retention of use of former Hotel (C1) as Temporary Living Accommodation for Single Homeless People (Sui Generis). The applicant proposed to retain the use of the property as short term residential accommodation providing 30 en-suite rooms to single homeless people.

Objections had been received from 24 local residents, Fallowfield Community Guardians and South East Fallowfield Residents Group.

Councillors Wills, Gartside and Chambers had indicated their support for the proposal in principle, subject to consideration of the issues and the attachment of appropriate conditions, as did Withington Civic Society.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the printed report.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee on the application. She stated that she had requested Planning Officers to defer consideration of this application to enable a more in-depth review as to whether the area was the most suitable location to deliver the type of accommodation being proposed. She stated that there was already 12 supported living units within 200 meters of the proposed development and only 21 properties had been consulted on this planning application, all of them bar two, housed mostly students and at least two of them were other supported living accommodation. She felt that more information was needed in relation to police and ambulance call outs in connection with the existing supported living premises in the area before an informed decision could be made. There was also concern about the additional pressures that this development would place on the local infrastructure, such as access to GP surgeries.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. He stated that the applicant had worked in partnership with the Council's homelessness department since March 2020, which had worked very well and wished for this to continue. The site had previously been utilised as nursing home and more recently as a hotel use. The property was currently set up to provide 24 hour support to all residents to help those seeking permanent accommodation. There was a good relationship with direct neighbours and residents. Security staff were on site 24 hours a day seven days a week. The concerns raised by local neighbours were acknowledged and the applicant would seek to minimise any impact. The application would also help reduce the use of emergency temporary accommodation, such as Bed and Breakfast accommodation.

The Planning Officer responded to issues raised by the objector. He advised the Committee that the notification process had gone beyond the Council's statutory requirements and comments received had been taken into account. He added that it was important for the Committee to assess the application on its individual merits and land use planning issues. The existing use of the premises was as a hotel with 30 beds which could be used to home homeless people without the need for planning permission and it was the care package and management facilities to support the occupiers meant that planning permission was now required. The Officer also stated that comings and goings associated with the proposed use would be very similar to a 30 bed hotel but the hotel could also be used for multiple occupancy in each room. As part of the conditions, there would be a requirement for a management regime to be in place which would require the premises to be staffed at all times and occupation would be by referral only.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Lovecy addressed the Committee. She commented that in its current designation the situation could be worse for local residents and felt that with the information provided to the Committee, Members were in a position to make a decision on the application before them.

Councillor Curley leant his support to the application and requested that Officers ensured that a strong management team was put in place to manage the facility. In addition, Councillor Davies sought clarification as to whether there was any condition that could be put in place to ensure the applicant worked closely with the Council's Homelessness team.

The Director of Planning and Building Control advised that there was already a strong relationship between the Council's Homelessness Department and the Operator of the premises and agreed to feedback the Committee's views to officers within the Council's Homelessness Department.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there was a condition in place for a management plan to be submitted and agreed which would include occupancy, arrangements for staffing and accommodation referrals, timings for moving in and out and contracts between occupants and the operator.

Councillor Lovecy asked if it was possible to strengthen this existing condition.

The Director of Director of Planning and Building Control proposed that, if minded, the Committee could approve the application subject to her being able to have discussions with colleagues Homelessness as to how best to strengthen this condition and the subsequently approve the application in consultation with Chair

Councillor Kamal proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor S Ali seconded Councillor Kamal's proposal.

Decision

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application as set out in the report, subject to the Director of Planning and Building Control discussing with colleagues in the Council's Homelessness Department as to how best to strengthen the condition for a suitable management plan.

(Councillor Gartside declared an interest in this application as she had fettered her discretion by making her views known as part of the consultation with Ward Councillors. She left the meeting during consideration of the application).

PH/23/42. 135647/FO/2022 - 550 Mauldeth Road West Manchester M21 7AA - Chorlton Park Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the erection of a new Lidl foodstore (Use Class E) with associated car parking and landscaping.

This application was deferred at the meeting of the Committee held on 16 March 2023; where the Committee resolved to be 'minded to refuse' the proposal and requested that Officers bring a report to a future meeting to address their concerns.

which related to highways safety and specifically to traffic management and the impact that this would have on pedestrian and cycle users of the area.

In response to issues raised at the previous meeting, additional information had been submitted by the applicant in order to further address these concerns. The Planning Officer provided a brief outline of the additional measures proposed and advise that both the Council's Highways department and Transport for Greater Manchester were satisfied with what was now being proposed and would add an additional layer of safety for all users of the highway and footway. On this basis, Planning Officers could not provide appropriate planning grounds for refusal.

An objector attended and addressed the Committee on the application. She raised concerns that the amendments to the highways safety had not and could not make the site suitable for a large supermarket. The proposed development was in the middle of a four school campus and would have an adverse impact on pedestrian and child safety as well as an increase in traffic within the locality. It was felt that the updated highway safety proposals still did not mitigate the concerns already raised. The proposed development was expected to increase traffic by up to 300 cars per hour at peak times and it was felt that the new proposals still did not address the concerns raised by the Committee when it first considered the application.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. He stated that the original application had been amended following concerns raised around highways safety. The measures now proposed were in addition to existing safety measures proposed. The applicant was also willing to review traffic patterns in the first three months of operation by way of a condition with a view to ensure it operated in a safe and appropriate manner. He commented that the Council's Highways Department and Transport for Greater Manchester were now satisfied with the additional safety proposals. As previously presented the development would deliver a significant number of tangible benefits to the local community.

Councillor Midgley (Ward Councillor Chorlton Park) state that whilst she recognised the different views on the application from local residents, in her view the additional highways safety mitigations now addressed concerns previously raised. If approved, she hoped the applicant would work with the local community to ensure they were responsible and responsive neighbours.

The Planning Officer reminded the Committee that the current office building on the site provided 105 car parking spaces that could be brought back into use or changed under to retail units under permitted development without the need for the proposed highway safety measures now being proposed, which was a material consideration.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Hughes addressed the Committee. He sought confirmation that the Council's Highways Department were now satisfied with the safety proposals that had been put forward.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the Highways Department was satisfied with the safety measure now being proposed.

Councillor Andrews proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor S Ali seconded Councillor Andrews's proposal.

Decision

The Committee approves the application as set out in the report.

PH/23/43. 135936/FO/2023 - Bignor Street Park Heywood Park Manchester - Cheetham Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the erection of part single, part two storey building to form purpose-built primary school (Class F1) with associated open space, access, landscaping, boundary treatment and other infrastructure works.

The proposals were subject to notification by way of 395 letters to nearby addresses, a site notice was posted at the site and an advertisement placed in the Manchester Evening News. In response to the neighbour notification four comments were received, two objections to the proposals, one comment in support and one neutral comment.

The Planning Officer advised that the mitigation measures proposed by the applicant following comments received from Sport England, now resulted in the recommendation of the Director of Planning and Building Control being altered to Minded to Approve, subject to the signature of an appropriate legal agreement and conditions, and the signing of a Section 106 agreement securing offsite mitigation for re-provision of play. As such, the application would no longer be required to be referred to the Secretary of State.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. She stated that the proposal would contribute to additional primary school places in the city. The proposed mitigation package addresses the loss of the playing field on site. There would be no significant on the highways network and the proposed development was in accordance with the relevant policies within the Council's Development Plan.

The Planning Officer clarified that in the late representations received, condition 33 was to be removed as this was a repetition of condition 32 and a slight amendment to the wording of condition 4 was also required.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Riasat addressed the Committee, stating that he welcomed the securing of the Section 106 Agreement and was in full support of the application now that all concerns had been addressed. He proposed a motion to approve the officer's

recommendation of Mind to Approve subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement securing offsite mitigation for re-provision of play and the deletion of condition 33 and rewording of condition 4 as outlined by Officers.

Councillor Andrews seconded Councillor Riasat's proposal.

Decision

The Committee is Mind to Approve the application, subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement securing offsite mitigation for re-provision of play and the deletion of condition 33 and rewording of condition 4 as outlined by Officers.

(Councillors S Ali and Hassan declared interests in this application as they had fettered their discretion by having a pre meeting with the applicant at which they made their views on the application known. They left the meeting during consideration of the application).

PH/23/44. 135576/FO/2022 - 88-90 Carmoor Road Manchester M13 0FB - Ardwick Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that related to the demolition of a number of existing buildings, the erection of part three storey, part six storey purpose-built student accommodation (sui generis) with 172 beds in a mix of studio and cluster units, together with ancillary facilities, shared amenity space, site access and other associated works following demolition of existing buildings.

130 representations had been received, 129 of which objected to the proposed development, along with a third-party objection on behalf of Afro Caribbean and Friends Community Association (ACFCA). A further letter of objection had been received from a patron of the community centre following the submission of revised details and a further period of re-notification.

The Planning Officer did not have anything to add to the printed report.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee. She stated that the development would deliver high quality student accommodation and already had over 10,000 student beds under its management across the UK. The applicant had met with a number of community representatives and as a result of these discussions the proposed scheme had been significantly reduced to mitigate the impact on the local community centre. The site had been identified as part of the Council's future student accommodation pipeline and would be of a high quality design protected by secure access and 24-hour site management. A travel plan commitment to sustainable travel had also been made by the applicant. The development would also look to provide 20% of all bed spaces being advertised below market rent level in each academic year.

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions to the Planning Officer.

Councillor Andrews proposed a motion to approve the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to a legal agreement containing affordable rent obligations for up to 20% of all bed spaces being advertised as being below market rent level in each academic year.

Councillor Kamal seconded Councillor Andrew's proposal.

Decision

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application, subject to a legal agreement containing affordable rent obligations for up to 20% of all bed spaces being advertised as being below market rent level in each academic year.

(Councillor Hewitson declared an interest in this application as she had fettered her discretion by having a pre meeting with the applicant at which she made her views on the application known. She left the meeting during consideration of the application).

Health and Wellbeing Board

Minutes of the meeting held on 7 June 2023

Present:

Councillor T Robinson, Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care (Chair)
Councillor Chambers, Assistant Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care
Katy Calvin-Thomas, Manchester Local Care Organisation
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust
Amanda Smith, Chair, Healthwatch
Neil Walbran, Healthwatch
Paul Marshall, Strategic Director of Children's Services
David Regan, Director of Public Health
Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services
Tom Hinchliffe, Permanent Deputy Place Based Lead
Dr Murugesan Raja, Manchester GP Board
Dr Geeta Wadhwa, Manchester GP Board
Dr Doug Jeffrey, Manchester GP Board

Also in attendance:

Ben Squires, Head of Primary Care, NHS Greater Manchester
Jenny Osborne, Strategic Lead, Population Health Programmes
Sarah Hardman, Assistant Directorate Manager, Dental Hospital
Professor Jane Eddleston, Medical Director, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust
Simon Walsh, Procurement Director, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust
Nick Bailey, Director of Workforce, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust
Kate McAuley, Team Leader, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust

HWB/23/08 Urgent Business

The Director of Public Health informed the Board that due to reporting deadlines, the Better Care Fund that was referred to at section 2.4 of the report titled 'The Formal Establishment of the Manchester Partnership Board' listed as item 5 on the agenda had been signed off by the Chair. He advised that a note for information relating to this would be circulated to members of the Board following the meeting.

HWB/23/09 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 25 January 2023 as a correct record.

HWB/23/10 The Formal Establishment of the Manchester Partnership Board

The Board considered the report of the Deputy Place Based Lead and the Director of Public Health that described that in January 2023, the Health and Wellbeing Board

(HWB) had agreed the changes to the membership and chairing of the HWB. The report also referenced the work to establish the Manchester Partnership Board (MPB) as a hybrid committee of the NHS Greater Manchester Integrated Care Board. The report provided an update on the role, purpose and priorities of the MPB.

The Director of Public Health stated that the Health and Wellbeing Board would remain a statutory committee and would consider the wider determinants of health, utilising and bringing together the expertise and knowledge of all partners. He commented that the HWB would receive update reports from the MPB, adding that they were due to meet formally in public for the first time that afternoon.

The Deputy Place Based Lead added that the MPB was a formal subcommittee of the ICB and had a distinct identity that was separate to the HWB.

The Chair commented that the HWB would be a critical friend of the MPB, adding that the HWB would receive quarterly update reports on the strategic priorities of the MPB. The Chair further noted the comments raised by a Board member who discussed the need for clarity on the process of decision making, adding that he would discuss this with the Chair of the MPB.

Decision

The Board note the report.

HWB/23/11 Oral Health and Dentistry

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health that provided a position statement on the oral health of the city's population and access to NHS dental services. It used a range of data to profile the oral health of Manchester residents, described the provision and use of NHS services, including action to recover from the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic, and information on patient and public feedback.

The report further summarised commissioned prevention and oral health improvement services for children and young people, adults and older people. The report placed a focus on health equity, highlighting known gaps in our knowledge and intelligence and the limitations this placed on our ability to understand and address health inequalities, and provided feedback from partners/providers in relation to a range of vulnerable or health inclusion groups.

Noting that the report made a distinction between dental oral health and wider oral health conditions (such as mouth cancer, gingivitis, halitosis etc).

The Board welcomed the comprehensive and detailed report, noting the stark picture it illustrated in relation to oral health across the city. The Board discussed that the work to tackle this was fundamental to the commitment to address wider health inequalities, in particular, noting the detrimental impact poor oral health had on vulnerable residents' health outcomes, with specific reference to Learning Disabled citizens and older citizens. The Board further discussed and recognised the importance of preventative initiatives around the issue of oral health, particularly in

relation to young people. The Board stated that all opportunities and available levers should be used to address poor oral health.

The Head of Primary Care, NHS Greater Manchester advised the Board that work between commissioners and providers continued in an attempt to address this issue, adding that demand on NHS dental services outweighed provision, adding that this was a national issue and not confined to Manchester. He advised that work was ongoing to review the redistribution of provision across Manchester and Greater Manchester following a number of NHS contracts being 'handed back'. He advised that negotiations were ongoing with providers to encourage them to increase the number of NHS patients they would treat. He advised that information on individual practices could be found on the NHS UK website. He further referred to the ongoing discussions at a national level regarding an enhanced tariff to encourage and support practices to increase the number of NHS patients they could accommodate. In response to a request from the Chair he advised that he would provide a written summary of these activities so this could be circulated to all elected members for information.

A member of the Board stated that all partners should support activity and awareness regarding the importance of oral health. The Strategic Lead, Population Health Programmes commented that all partners would be consulted with as the Manchester specific action plan was developed, and she further welcomed the support offered from the Board in relation to this activity.

The Strategic Director of Children's Services welcomed the inclusion of looked after children in the list of groups identified as being vulnerable, adding that he would discuss with the Chair of the Corporate Parenting Panel the need to include consideration of this topic when they had a health themed meeting. In relation to a specific question raised regarding Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children (UASC) the Head of Primary Care, NHS Greater Manchester advised that he would clarify the position following the meeting.

The Chair stated that explicit consideration needed to be given to the impact of COVID-19 and young people within the action plan. The Chair further recommended that an update report on this and the wider activity be submitted for consideration by the Board towards the end of the year.

Decisions

The Board:

1. Support the development of a Manchester specific action plan to address poor levels of oral health in the local population, drive improvements to NHS dental services and reduce inequalities for the Manchester population.
2. Support the development of GM strategy and action to address locality requirements around oral health promotion and improved access.

3. Request that the Director of Public Health, in consultation with Greater Manchester NHS and the Manchester Local Care Organisation reports back to the Board on progress and the priority actions agreed by the end of the year.

4. Recommend that the Head of Primary Care, NHS Greater Manchester provide a briefing note that describes the actions being taken to improve NHS dental access across the city that can be circulated to all members of the Council.

HWB/23/12 Making Manchester Fairer: Tackling Health Inequalities in Manchester 2022-2027

The Board considered the report of the Deputy Director of Public Health that provided an overview of progress made during 2023 on the Making Manchester Fairer (MMF) Action Plan.

The Board noted that the Anti-Poverty Strategy (APS) had been formally adopted at Executive in January 2023 and was the main route to delivering against the MMF theme of reducing poverty and debt. It set out our vision that the whole of Manchester would work together to reduce poverty and lessen the impact of poverty on our residents. The strategy contained 53 actions across 12 priorities and 4 themes.

The report described that an overarching narrative had been developed by the Communication Teams that reflected that the Anti-poverty strategy was now part of the Making Manchester Fairer plan. This has also included bringing in the immediate Cost of Living support, so that there was a unified stance to the work and made the most of the city's combined networks.

The Board were informed that the first Making Manchester Fairer Programme Board took place in May after an extensive Expression of Interest process that recruited people to the board that were visibly reflective of Manchester's diverse communities (particularly those most impacted by health inequalities) and had a balance of different types of perspectives including organisational, professional and lived experience.

The Board were further informed that the development of governance and approval process for the Kickstarter Schemes allowed for the Children's element of the Supporting children, young people and their families scheme to begin implementation.

Further to the workstream and programme development, a number of theme leads had developed projects and initiatives that were designed to meet the aims and objectives of the actions under their themes and Manchester NHS Foundation Trust (MFT) had developed a Health Inequalities programme.

The Board heard from representatives from MFT who described the many actions and initiatives that had been implemented to address health inequalities. These included the establishment of an Equalities Lead at each site so as to develop local actions to respond to specific local needs; the establishment of an equalities dashboard; MFT acting as an anchor institution and supporting their staff; initiating

programmes to recruit staff from the local population, recognising that this would further support the issue of staff retention and staff acting as advocates for health equity; using patient data to understand the needs of the local population and identify issues or gaps in provision so that interventions and programmes could be targeted by working at a local level with Primary Care Networks and the Manchester Local Care Organisation. The Board were further advised that the Trust was seeking to employ a Consultant in Public Health to inform and support this area of activity. In response to a comment regarding digital exclusion, Professor Eddleston stated that the Trust were very mindful of this issue and due consideration would be given as to how this could be addressed as part of the ongoing work.

The Board welcomed the report and the update reported by the representatives from the Trust, stating that the work described demonstrated a commitment to place based working, the strength of genuine partnership working and an understanding of the needs of the local population that demonstrated that people were at the heart of everything that was described. The Board stated that the outcomes and impact of this approach needed to be reported and articulated, both at a local and national level and the Board was happy to support this. Professor Eddleston commented that she would be happy to provide an update presentation to the Board in six months' time.

The Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust stated that the MFT Board fully supported the vision and the work described. She stated the described approach provided a strong foundation on which to address health inequalities, support residents and end the 'revolving door' of health provision.

The Chair concluded the discussion by thanking the representatives from MFT for attending the meeting. He stated that it had been an important and constructive discussion. He invited MFT representative to attend all future meetings of the Board when Health Inequalities was to be discussed.

Decisions

1. The Board note progress made in implementing the Making Manchester Fairer Action Plan, the incorporation of the Anti-Poverty Strategy within the programme, and the work that is taking place across partner organisations to integrate the Making Manchester approach and principles system wide.
2. The Board recommend that a progress presentation be submitted for consideration in six months' time.

Audit Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 13 June 2023

Present:

Councillor Lanchbury - In the Chair
Councillors Curley, Noor, and Stogia
Independent Co-opted member: Dr D Barker
Independent Co-opted member: Dr S Downs

Apologies: Councillor Simcock

Also Present:

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Finance and Resources
Karen Murray, Mazars (External Auditor)

AC/23/08 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14 March 2023 as a correct record.

AC/23/09 Update on Progress on the Audit of the Final Accounts for 2020/21 and 2021/22 and finalising the Draft Accounts for 2022/23

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that updated the Committee on the progress of the audit of the council's final accounts and outlines the national and local context behind the delays.

The report provided information on:

- The national and local context for the delays to the completion of the audits for the council's final accounts;
- Describing the Manchester City Council position, noting that the Manchester position echoed the national one;
- Noting that Manchester's Annual Accounts were particularly complex due to both the range of joint ventures, the value and complexity of assets held and the requirement to consolidate Manchester Airport Group and Manchester Central into the group accounts.

The report concluded that the completion of the Audits are a statutory requirement and the issues outlined pose a real threat to the reputation of local government. The City Treasurer and the Council's S151 Officer had taken the audit of our accounts extremely seriously and expressed concern about the issues raised with an increase in focus to provide a resolution to ensure the situation is not repeated.

In receiving the report and the verbal update provided by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, the Chair stated that the Committee recognised the significant challenge presented in delivering the final accounts.

The Committee paid tribute to all of the staff in the finance team and the external Auditors for their continued dedication and hard work. This sentiment was reiterated by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, adding that they were a very skilled team and she was immensely proud of them. She acknowledged the comments from the Committee regarding the complexity of the reporting requirements, adding that the issues relating to pensions would not be experienced in future reporting.

She stated that this issue of highways assets was being consulted upon at a national level with a view to clarifying the requirement for once the statutory override has ended, adding that this will continue to be a challenge. She stated that despite this it remained important to deliver accurate and professional accounts, recognising the complexity and breadth of the Council activity.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/10 Annual Internal Audit Assurance Opinion and Report 2022/23

The Committee received a report of the Head of Audit and Risk Management that provided Members with the annual assurance opinion and report on the Council's system of governance, risk management and internal control.

The report provided information on:

- Describing the methodology used to produce the report;
- Providing a narrative as to the overall opinion;
- Describing key strengths;
- Describing risks and issues arising from the audit work;
- Information on the delivery of the audit plan;
- Audit Assurance, Risks and Issues across a range of services and activities; and
- Describing reactive and proactive activities.

In response to questions the Head of Audit and Risk Management clarified the process and follow up work undertaken by the team to ensure that returns are provided by schools to enable completion of the Schools Financial Value Standard return to the DFE. The Chair suggested that consideration should be given to delivering briefings on this and other relevant related activities, such as resilience in schools to Chairs of Governors at their regular briefings organised by the School Governors Team. The Head of Audit and Risk Management acknowledged this comment.

In response to a question raised regarding the audit assurance option offered for Greater Manchester strategies, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that the governance arrangements of these fell within the remit of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee.

Noting recent tragic events, the Committee commented upon the importance of maintenance and repairs within Housing Services, especially in regard to the issue of

damp and mould. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that it had been correct to self-refer to the regulator following the assurance that had been given. She informed Members that an improvement board had been established, chaired by the Chief Executive. She further added that a review of the Housing Revenue Account would be undertaken.

In response to a comment raised regarding the capacity and resources within mental health services, the Head of Audit and Risk Management stated that work was ongoing on these issues.

The Chair welcomed consideration of cyber risk and the related cyber security training mandated for all staff, adding that this training had also been extended to all Councillors. The Chair further commented on the importance of adults' payments and foster care payments, especially in the context of the current economic climate. The Head of Audit and Risk Management stated the challenges related to payments to providers rather than individuals and there was a commitment to address this.

Clarification was sought by a member of the Committee as to the arrangements to protect the Council against claims or legal action taken following any breaches by contractors. The Head of Audit and Risk Management stated that established protocols in relation to risk assessment across a range of activities were established, using the example of the Highways Department to illustrate the steps taken to defend the Council against any potential claims. He advised that third parties would have their own arrangements and systems.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/11 Annual Internal Audit Plan 2023/24

The Committee received a report of the Head of Audit and Risk Management.

The report provided information on:

- The context and rationale relating to the production of the Plan;
- The Audit Plan for 2023/24 setting out the areas of proposed audit coverage for the year;
- Describing that the delivery of this plan would be reported to the Senior Management Team and Audit Committee as part of regular audit reporting arrangements;
- Further describing the basis, context, timeframe and structure of the Plan; and
- Describing planned areas of Audit work.

The Chair noted and welcomed the section within the report that discussed the issues of resources to deliver the plan and recognised that the department had undergone a recent restructure.

The Chair asked whether the findings of individual audits were communicated to all relevant parties, especially in regard to any known challenges or barriers. The Head

of Audit and Risk Management commented that this issue of roles and responsibilities were considered as part of an audit, and services were encouraged and learn from each other following and audit to address shared issues and challenges.

In response to a comment raised regarding the Greater Manchester Trailblazer Devolution Deal, the Head of Audit and Risk Management stated that he would discuss this further the GMCA Audit Team regarding assurances. He advised that the points raised by a member regarding consideration of all parking, not just resident parking and road sweeping contracts would be followed up outside of the meeting.

Decision

To approve the Annual Internal Audit Plan for 2023/24, noting the above comments.

AC/23/12 Draft Annual Governance Statement 2022/23

The Committee received the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which has been produced following completion of the annual review of the Council's governance arrangements and systems of internal control.

The report provided information on:

- The background and introduction to the report;
- The format of the Annual Governance Statement (AGS) and the process followed to produce the AGS;
- Communication of the Governance Arrangements; and
- Next steps.

The Chair commented that the committee welcomed the revised and improved format of this annual report.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/13 Register of Significant Partnerships 2022

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an overview of the Register of Significant Partnerships 2022, outlining the review and assurance process which has taken place as part of the annual review.

The report provided information on:

- Any new partnerships which have been added to the register;
- Entries recommended to be removed;
- Information relating to any partnerships where the assurance rating has increased to 'Substantial' since the last review; and
- Providing an update on those partnerships now classed as 'Reasonable' or

'Limited' strength following completion of the latest self-assessment.

Following on from a question raised by a committee member ,the Chair requested that a briefing note be circulated to members of the Committee on the Manchester Schools Alliance, with particular reference to the subscription fees and the services and training for schools that this fee contributes to.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer responded to a comment raised by a member in relation to the arrangements for senior officers identified as Leads for several partnerships by explaining the established governance arrangements. In response to a question asked in regard to AVRO Hollows the Head of Commercial Governance, Assurance and Initiatives stated that there was active dialogue ongoing with the Chair of the AVRO Hollows Board, which included colleagues from Strategic Housing to address identified issues and to seek and assurance that tenants are receiving quality services and that the tenancy management arrangements and standards were robust and transparent.

Decision

To note the report.

[Dr Downs declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest as his partner is employed as the Deputy Director of Finance at the Greater Manchester Mental Health Trust.]

AC/23/14 Work Programme

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

Decision

To note the report and approve the work programme.

Standards Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 15 June 2023

Present:

Nicolé Jackson, Independent Co-opted Member – In the Chair
Councillors Andrews, Connolly, Evans, Good, Lanchbury and Simcock

Ringway Parish Council: Councillor O'Donovan
Geoff Linnell, Independent Co-opted Member

Apologies:

Alan Eastwood, Independent Person

ST/23/08 Interests

Geoff Linnell, Independent Co-opted Member declared a personal and non-prejudicial interest as he has been recently elected as a Councillor to Nether Alderley Parish Council.

ST/23/09 Minutes

In receiving the minutes, a Member requested that an update be provided in regard to Member cyber security training (see ST/22/05 Member Development and Training). The Deputy City Solicitor advised that this would be provided following the meeting.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2023 as a correct record.

ST/23/10 Draft Annual Governance Statement 2022/23

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that contained the draft 2022/23 Annual Governance Statement (AGS) which had been produced following completion of the annual review of the Council's governance arrangements and systems of internal control. The processes followed to produce the AGS were outlined within the report.

The Chair welcomed the accessible format of the report, commenting that this was useful for the lay reader. A Member stated that this report had also been recently considered by the Audit Committee and the same opinion had been articulated by Members of that Committee.

A Member stated that he welcomed the section of the report that described:

'This includes consideration of the CIPFA Financial Resilience Index which shows the Council to be relatively well placed on earmarked reserves and in a reasonably comfortable mid position on the other indicators.'

The Member commented that this recognition was important and needed to be highlighted.

A Member commented that consideration needed to be given to the wording at the section of the report that discussed data protection to ensure this captured and reported all of the work that is undertaken around this activity. Acknowledging this comment, the Reform and Innovation Manager stated that this would be reviewed.

Decision

To note the report, subject to the above comments.

ST/23/11 Planning Protocol

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that advised on the operation and efficacy of the Planning Protocol. The report described that whilst the Protocol mainly used gender-neutral language, there were some instances where amendment was needed in order to ensure gender-neutral language was used throughout.

In response to a question the Section Planning Manager advised that site visits worked very well, making reference to the protocol.

A Member commented that she welcomed the adoption of gender-neutral terminology and recommended that all Council policies and protocols should adopt this approach when they were reviewed and updated.

Decisions

1. To note the position regarding the operation/efficacy of the Planning Protocol; and
2. To note the proposed amendment to the Planning Protocol.
3. Recommend that all Council policies and protocols should adopt gender neutral terminology when they were reviewed and updated.

ST/23/12 Gifts and Hospitality Guidance for Members

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer that considered the operation and efficacy of the Gifts and Hospitality Guidance for Members.

The Chair noted that the reporting of Gifts and Hospitality received by the Lord Mayor's office was a relatively recent development and was important for the purposes of openness and transparency. She stated that it was her experience that the majority of gifts given were to the city rather than in a personal capacity.

Decision

To note the report.

ST/23/13 Review of the Operation and Efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that provided an update on the operation and efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol. The report described that the Monitoring Officer did not consider that any amendment of the Protocol was required at this time. However, should a revised Code of Conduct for Members be adopted by full Council a full review of the Protocol would be undertaken to ensure the Protocol aligned with the revised Code.

A member commented that section 2.1 of the report stated, 'Officer and member relationships are good at MCC' and this recognition was particularly welcomed and important to note.

Decisions

To note:

1. The position set out in the report regarding the operation and efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol.
2. That the Protocol will be reviewed in the event that full Council adopts a revised Code of Conduct for Members.

ST/23/14 Review of the Operation and Efficacy of the Use of Resources Guidance for Members

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that provided an update on the operation and efficacy of the Use of Resources Guidance for Members.

In response to a question the Group Manager, Legal Services reiterated to Members that any council resource, including council issued mobile phones should not be used for any party-political activity.

Decisions

1. To note the report.
2. Recommend to full Council the adoption of the revised guidance as attached.

ST/23/15 Work Programme for the Standards Committee

Consideration was given to the report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit that presented the Work Programme for the Committee. The Committee were invited to approve or amend the Work Programme as appropriate.

Decision

The Committee note and approve the Work Programme.