

Audit Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 25 July 2023

Present:

Councillor Lanchbury - In the Chair
Councillors Curley, Kilpatrick, Noor, and Stogia

Independent Co-opted member: Dr S Downs

Apologies: Councillor Simcock, Dr D Barker

Also Present:

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

AC/23/15 Minutes

Decision

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

AC/23/16 External Audit of Accounts 2020/21

The Committee received a report of the External Auditors (Mazars)

The report provided:

- An Executive Summary
- A summary of the audit's overall status
- An overview of the audit approach
- A discussion of findings of significance
- A list of Internal Control recommendations
- A summary of misstatements; and
- Information about Value for Money arrangements

Karen Murray introduced the report and explained that essentially the report was an update to the information Mazars had previously discussed in their report to the Audit Committee in July 2022 in which reference had been made to outstanding information on the consolidation of Group Accounts as well as infrastructure arrangements.

Ms Murray highlighted the information about amendments to infrastructure that had not been made. It was confirmed that, in line with the recent statutory override, the Council's accounting policies had been changed and whilst those impact had been calculated it had been subsequently determined that the impact of those changes were immaterial to the overall infrastructure value and the decision had been made not amend. The Committee endorsed this approach.

Changes were also highlighted in respect of consolidation adjustments to the Group accounts.

Ms Murray gave emphasis to the report containing no new recommendations regarding internal control and that the management responses that were previously provided were extant. She also outlined next steps in terms of the issue of the associated audit report, completion of which was described to be imminent.

The Committee conveyed its thanks to Ms Murray and her team at Mazars as well the Council's Finance team for the work undertaken to oversee completion in a particular challenging landscape.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/17 Final Statement of Accounts 2020/21

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that updated Members on the final 2020/21 accounts and associated amendments. The accounts had been updated from those reported to the 26 July 2022 Committee to take account of any changes that had arisen since that time and referred to national accounting changes to the reporting of infrastructure assets that had delayed the final audit of the accounts and had affected all Councils.

In addition to the background and introduction, the report included:

- A summary of the amended accounts including changes to the Main Accounting Statements since the July 2022 updated accounts
- An overview of unadjusted errors
- An outline of next steps

The Committee was asked to

- To note amendments to the annual accounts as detailed at Appendix 1.
- To agree the proposal not to amend the annual accounts in respect of a recalculation, on the basis that the value had been deemed immaterial.

The Deputy City Treasurer introduced the report with reference to earlier submissions to the Committee. He also outlined the timescale for progression of the finalisation of the 2021/22 Annual Accounts and the commencement of audit work on 2022/23 Annual Accounts.

The Committee conveyed its thanks to the Finance team and agreed the recommendations.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/18 Capital Outturn 2022/23

The Committee received a report of The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which provided confirmation of the final outturn and financing of capital expenditure for 2022/23. The committee was invited to note the information provided in the context of the report concerning the Final Statement of Accounts for 2022/23.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/19 Revenue Outturn 2022/23

The Committee received the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which set out confirmation of the final outturn position of for the Council's revenue budget in 2022/23, which the Committee was asked to consider in the context of the Final Statement of Accounts for 2022/23.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/20 Treasury Management Outturn 2022/23

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which discussed the Council's Treasury Management activities during the financial year 2022/23.

The report included information on:

- The background and context of the report
- The Council's Portfolio Position as at 31st March 2023
- A Review of Economic Conditions 2022-23
- An outline of Treasury Borrowing in 2022-23
- The Investment Strategy for 2022-23
- An overview of Temporary Borrowing and Investment for 2022-23
- The Implications of Rising Interest Rates; and,
- Concluding comments

The Deputy City Treasurer introduced the report and responded to questions about Salix funding, temporary borrowing, the implications of the cost of carry and the Council's reviewing and reporting strategy.

The impact of breaches was also discussed. The Deputy City Treasurer stressed the importance of transparency in this area and explained that these were largely attributable to unscheduled deposits or payments. He also outlined the principles on which the account was managed.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer spoke about the importance of the report's narrative and how this aligned with reports to the Resources and

Governance Scrutiny Committee on the Council's commercial activity. She referred to the recent focus on Local Authority failures in respect of treasury management and / or joint venture activities. She referred to the Office for Local Government's recent consultation on a list of Key Performance Indicators and the role of the Audit Committee and invited comments on future areas of training, skills and information in this area. The Chair indicated that this could be a matter for consideration in the Committee's annual training event in December.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/21 Draft Statement of Accounts 2022/23

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which presented the signed 2022/23 Draft Annual Accounts. The report presented information on the structure of the accounts, highlighted key issues and provided a summary of key accounting statements. The Committee was invited to note that the presently unaudited accounts would be made available for public inspection from 1 August 2023.

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

- The structure of the Annual Accounts
- A discussion of key considerations for the Accounts
- An Accounts Summary with specific reference to Comprehensive Income and Expenditure Statement (CIES), the Balance Sheet, the Collection Fund and Group Accounts
- The timeline of the Annual Accounts process

The Committee listened to a presentation by the Deputy City Treasurer and the Head of Corporate Finance about the progression of the 2022/23 Accounts which discussed:

- The Accounts Timetable
- The context of National Challenges
- DHLUC proposals to clear the audit backlog
- A Summary of Local Challenges
- Improvements
- Key points of consideration in the narrative report
- General Fund Revenue Outturn 2022/23
- Key Variations from Budget 2022/23
- The Housing Revenue Account Outturn 2022/23
- Key aspects of the Capital Outturn 2022/23
- The Comprehensive Income and Expenditure Statement
- Movement in the Reserves
- The Council's Balance Sheet
- Usable Reserves

The Deputy City Treasurer responded to questions about the capital outturn, associated budget adjustments, management of borrowing, the reserves strategy and the impact of pay awards.

The Executive Member for Finance and the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer expressed their thanks to the Finance team in producing the statement in a particularly challenging landscape.

Decision

To note the unaudited Annual Accounts for 2022/23 as signed by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer.

AC/23/22 Internal Audit Update – Quarter 1

The Committee received a report of The Head of Audit and Risk Management which provided an update of the progress on the agreed audit plan and detailed assurance opinions issued in the first Quarter of 2023/24.

In addition to the background and context, the report included:

- An outline of progress and delivery of the Audit Programme
- Audit assurance findings, risks and issues with specific reference to Payment Systems and Processes, Schools Financial Value Standards (SFVS) and Related Parties, Housing Services, Commercial and Contracts, and Climate Change.

The Head of Audit and Risk Management introduced the report with reference to its new format and enhanced focus on key issues arising from audit work and the incorporation of other sources of assurance. He referred to the Council's robust Overview and Scrutiny function which through established reporting arrangements provide assurance on a variety of Council functions.

In response to the new format, a member suggested added clarity could be given in respect of audit reviews and follow up activity.

In response to the report's discussion about a backlog of payments within the Council social care system (Liquid Logic) to providers, it was explained a number of payments had been actioned outside of the system to mitigate cashflow impacts on providers, where indicated. Reference was made to the associated challenge and complexity around payments outside of the establish process was also discussed. The deputy City Treasurer added that a working group had been constituted to review payment processes so that issues are identified and resolved at the earliest possible opportunity.

In respect of controls that are in place for any such transactions valued over £20,000 in the schools sector, the Head of Audit and Risk Management gave emphasis to the role of Governor oversight and challenge, to address concerns over transparency, in particular where payments to family members were found. He outlined a number of

planned actions to support schools in strengthening their governance arrangements.

With regard to the reports discussion about fire risk, the Head of Audit and Risk Management gave assurance that whilst those issues were of concern, he was satisfied that the challenge around identified compliance matters were well understood by managers and that there was a plan in place to address those concerns. He added that the key consideration for him was centred on the tracking and implementation of identified actions to address the issues around fire risk as well as the procedures that are in place to resolve and prevent a recurrence of outstanding works. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer gave assurance that the matter was considered with the highest possible regard and referred to the scope of work being undertaken by colleagues in Housing Operations to resolve a number of legacy issues since returning in-house. She referred to earlier engagement with the Regulator adding that a clear plan had been established with robust oversight from the Housing Improvement Board in terms of implementation. The Committee agreed to a further update on this matter being included in the next scheduled update (Quarter 2) planned for October 2023 with a focus on likely timescales for completion.

Discussions moved to the issue of damp and mould. The Head of Audit and Risk explained that a plan was in place to ensure that the Council remained cognisant of developing regulatory and legislative requirements as well as other requirements for Housing Services, including matters concerning procurement and contracts and that further work around contracts assurance. Further information on this would be brought to a future meeting of this committee.

The Chair asked a question about the aids and adaptations delivery model with regard to assessment, design and implementation. The Head of Audit and Risk Management confirmed that management were seeking to address the delays in service delivery performance and that a number of recommendations had been made arising from the audit.

Decision

1. To note the report.
2. To note the intention to provide a further update on Housing Services findings in the next scheduled update.

AC/23/23 Outstanding Audit Recommendations – Quarter 1

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer This report summarises the implementation position at the end of June 2023

In addition and introduction and background, the report provided a summary of overdue recommendations:

- over 12 months old,
- 6 – 12 months old; and
- 1 – 6 months old

The Head of Audit and Risk Management introduced the report with a particular focus on recommendations around monitoring and reporting of payment processes in Children's services which had been integrated into a new audit in view of ongoing challenges and complexity with foster payments. He gave assurance that a clear line of sight would be implemented to demonstrate progress on historic recommendations.

Reference was also made to outstanding recommendations for Avro Hollows Tenant Management Organisation (TMO) and next steps. The Committee noted that a meeting had been scheduled with the Chair of the Board, the Head of Housing Services and the Head of Audit and Risk to discuss ongoing issues in respect of repairs, governance arrangements and its relationship with the Council. It was clarified that concerns over fire risk and damp or mould were not particular areas of concern for the TMO.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/24 Work Programme

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which set out its future Work Programme for the remainder of 2023/24 municipal year.

Decision

To note the report and approve the work programme.

Audit Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 19 September 2023

Present:

Councillor Lanchbury - In the Chair
Councillors, Kilpatrick, Noor, Simcock and Stogia

Independent Co-opted members: Dr S Downs and Dr D Barker

Apologies: Councillor Curley

Also Present:

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Finance and Resources
Alastair Newall (External Auditor)
Suresh Patel, Mazars (External Auditor)

AC/23/25 Statement on the recent issue of a Section 114 Notice by Birmingham City Council

In light of the recent issue of a Section 114 Notice by Birmingham City Council, at the Chair's request, the Deputy City Treasurer made a statement to Committee members to provide assurance on the authority's financial position.

An outline of the factors that had contributed to Birmingham City Council's Section 114 notice was provided to the Committee. Members were informed that Manchester had settled all of its equal pay claims with no outstanding liabilities remaining as a result of its robust job evaluation processes. Members were also invited to note that some 27 Councils had to date either warned or had issued a Section 114 Notice due to significant funding pressures with more warning of similarly precarious circumstances should in-year budgets and/or savings not be delivered.

The Committee was invited to note that whilst the Authority's position was challenging with various overspends being reported, mitigations are being developed and the Council has a robust reserves strategy leaving the Authority in a sustainable yet challenging position. However, any reductions in funding (eg the forthcoming Business Rates reset due in 2025/26) would pose a significant risk to the Council's longer term financial sustainability. He gave assurance that the Council would continue its prudent approach to treasury management and would uphold its established track record of taking early and positive financial decisions.

AC/23/26 Minutes

Decision

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

AC/23/27 Mazars (External Auditor) Annual Audit report 2020/2021

The Committee received the Annual Auditors' report (AAR) from Mazars (External

Auditors) which summarised the work undertaken by Mazars in respect of audit work for the year ended 31 March 2021.

In addition to the background and introduction, the report included:

- The opinion on financial statements, including the scope of the audit and the results of the opinion.
- A discussion of Value for Money (VFM) arrangements, including the approach to VFM and a summary in respect of financial sustainability, governance and economy, efficiency and effectiveness; and
- An outline of wider reporting responsibilities, including fees

Alastair Newall (External Auditor) confirmed that this was the final report on the 202/21 audit which had been completed in August 2023 shortly following the Committee's previous meeting in July 2023. He gave emphasis to the information remaining unchanged to that which had been previously reported in July 2023 and had been submitted as a formality in line with National Audit Office requirements.

In response to a query from a committee member, he outlined the complexities in the approach required to ensure that valuations remained materially correct in the context of a five-year rolling programme and the Council's broad and complex asset base.

The Committee conveyed its thanks to the Finance Team and Mazars for the completion under challenging circumstances.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/28 Mazars (External Auditors) Audit Completion Letter 2020/21

The Committee received the Annual Audit Completion letter in respect of the 2020/21 Local Authority Accounts. Appended to the Letter was Mazars proposed audit report and opinion and a summary of additional fees to be requested from Public Sector Audit Appointments (PSAA). The letter confirmed that there were no matters to report to the Committee in relation to the audit.

The Committee acknowledged that the purpose of the letter's submission was to align with International Standards on Auditing - UK and Ireland (ISA (UK and Ireland)) requirements and that all matters relating to the 2020/21 Audit of Accounts was complete.

Decision

To note the audit completion in respect of 2020/21 Annual Accounts.

AC/23/29 Mazars (External Auditors) Audit Completion report 2021/22

The Committee received a report of the External Auditors (Mazars) which presented the Annual Audit Completion report for the year ending 31 March 2022.

The report included the following information:

- The Executive Summary,
- The Audit Status
- The Audit Approach
- Significant Findings
- Internal Control Mechanism recommendations
- Misstatements

The following were also appended to the report:

- The Draft Management Representation Letter
- The Draft Audit Report
- Independence
- Other Communications

Suresh Patel (External Auditor, Mazars) introduced the report with reference to its Executive Summary, highlighting familiar areas of risk and focus to the 2020/21 Audit of Accounts. Mr Patel indicated that Mazars were preparing to submit an unqualified opinion subject to a number of matters requiring completion and with an anticipated date of the end of September 2023. With regard to Value for Money arrangements, he endorsed the Deputy City Treasurer's earlier statement concerning the Council's financial sustainability as a result of unearmarked reserves. It was anticipated that the report on Value for Money audit work would be completed by the end of November 2023 at which the Annual Audit report for 2021/22 would be submitted. He added that no correspondence or objections from any sources including the public had been received in respect of the report.

Alastair Newall (External Auditor, Mazars) talked the Committee through the report's findings, providing a narrative for the similar areas of risk as identified in the previous financial year's audit. There was then a discussion about the factors that had contributed to those repeated risks which were said to be due in part to the impact of the five year rolling programme as well as ongoing considerations in respect of their individual nature and complexity, meaning that they may take longer to be appropriately addressed. He urged the Committee to note that this should not be seen as criticism of the Council's processes and that Mazars were satisfied with the progress that had been made thus far. The Committee acknowledged this.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/30 Final Statement of Accounts 2021/22

The Committee received the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer

which presented the Council's final accounts for 2021/22 and an explanation for the key audit adjustments to the draft. The accounts had been updated from the draft accounts previously reported (27 September 2022) and took account of changes that had arisen since that time. This included the national accounting changes to the reporting of infrastructure assets that had delayed the final audit of the accounts, and affected all Councils.

In addition to an introduction and background, the report discussed:

- Changes to the Single Entity Main Accounting Statements
- Group Accounts; and,
- Other changes

The following was appended to the report:

- A summary of changes to the Comprehensive Income and Expenditure Statement (CIES) and Balance Sheet
- The updated Annual Statement of Accounts 2021/22

The Committee was asked to:

- 1) Note the amendments made to the annual accounts since they were reported to the Audit Committee in September 2022
- 2) Approve the revised annual accounts including the accounting policies contained within them
- 3) Agree not to amend the annual accounts in relation to asset valuations as detailed in paragraphs 2.8, 2.11 and 2.12 and that the amounts are not considered material

The Deputy City Treasurer introduced the report's main points of consideration and responded to questions.

In response to a question from a Committee Member, the Deputy City Treasurer confirmed that the valuation regarding the National Football Museum (NFM) had been undertaken by professional valuers instructed by Mazars and that periodically differences of opinion can occur, and which highlighted the complexities of asset valuation. Mr Newall (External Auditor, Mazars) confirmed that the NFM sat amongst numerous city centre assets in which there had been a disparity over the land value rate applied when compared to other city centre sites. The Finance Lead added that in view of those complexities, a commitment was in place to have certain city centre assets valued on an annual basis. The Chair acknowledged the broad ranging asset base across the city resulting in the Council's decision to use a range of valuers to allow for the appropriate level of expertise.

Discussions moved to the report's discussion about the pensions liability as a result of the reintegration of former Northwards staff to the Council. The Deputy City Treasurer confirmed that the liabilities had been calculated correctly but had been posted in the incorrect subsection of the financial statement but had not been a discrepancy in terms of the amount of pensions liability.

Decision

- 1) Note the amendments made to the annual accounts since they were reported to the Audit Committee in September 2022
- 2) Approve the revised annual accounts including the accounting policies contained within them
- 3) Agree not to amend the annual accounts in relation to asset valuations as detailed in paragraphs 2.8, 2.11 and 2.12 and that the amounts are not considered material

AC/23/31 Mazars (External Auditors) Oral Update on Progress of 2022/23 Accounts

The Committee listened to an oral update on the progress of the 2022/23 accounts as delivered by Suresh Patel (External Auditor, Mazars).

Mr Patel set out the timetable for 2022/23 audit work. Planning and some interim audit work was scheduled to commence in November/December 2023 with detailed audit work scheduled for January 2024. The anticipated completion date for the audit was said to be the end of March 2024. No significant changes were highlighted for the audit plan itself, however with reference to earlier discussions in the meeting regarding repeated risks it was anticipated that those risks would reduce as a result of reviewed processes.

Discussions moved to the issue of Reinforced Autoclaved Aerated Concrete (RAAC) (aka RAAC concrete) and the scope for this to become an issue for the 2022/23 audit. The Deputy City Treasurer said that this was largely attributed to the schools sector with currently just one Voluntary Aided school partially affected though still operational. However a Task and Finish Group had been constituted to look at assets across the estate meaning that Council would soon be able to provide further information on the matter once those assessments had concluded with a view to whether any findings could significantly impair the Council's asset base.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/32 Work Programme

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which set out its future Work Programme for the remainder of 2023/24 municipal year.

Decision

To note the report and approve the work programme.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 27 July 2023

Present: Councillor Lyons - In the Chair

Councillors Shaukat Ali, Chohan, Curley, Davies, Gartside, Hughes, Johnson, Kamal, Lovecy and Riasat

Apologies: Councillors Andrews, Hassan, Hewitson and Ludford

Also present: Councillors Bayunu, Igbon and Wright

PH/23/54 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 135544/FO/2022 & 135545/LO/2022, 136721/FO/2023 and 130387/FO/2021.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/23/55 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2023 as a correct record.

PH/23/56 136934/FO/2023 - Greenheys Building, Pencroft Way, Manchester, M15 6JJ - Hulme Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for the erection of 7-storey building comprising office and laboratory floorspace (Use Class E); cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping, access and servicing.

An anchor tenant would occupy the ground, mezzanine and first floor, with the remaining floors available for occupiers in the life science and healthcare sectors. The anchor tenant is an internationally significant health research organisation that would bring substantial direct and indirect socio-economic benefits to Manchester Science Park (MSP) and the Corridor eco-system, and leverage MSP's advantages in terms of locational clustering with major knowledge and research institutions.

The proposal would contribute positively to the city's economy creating jobs and training opportunities in key growth sectors for residents and support growth through graduate retention.

4 letters of objection had been received. The grounds of objections concern design, the nature of the use, traffic impacts, impacts on the residential character of the area and sunlight and daylight.

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

An objector stated that the neighbourhood consultation did not make it clear what the building would be used for. The height would cause overshadowing and there were concerns over noise and possible unknown pathogens and the effect on air quality. He questioned the purpose and work that would be undertaken in the laboratories and commented on the change in class use. New drugs normally use some form of animal testing and the objector felt that Hulme should be an animal testing and vivisection free zone and asked the Committee to lead on ethical and political decisions when considering this application.

The applicant's agent that Bruntwood, have 40 years experience in delivering office, research and lab spaces. This proposal would be a milestone for the science park and enhance the capabilities of the university's NHS foundation trust. The anchor tenant and other high specification laboratories would attract occupiers in the science and technology sectors. The proposal would add employment opportunities and socio-economic benefits. No animal testing would be carried out on this site.

Ward Councillor Bayunu acknowledged the investment but also had to consider her residents. She felt the developer should work with the community. There had been some consultation but not all issues had been addressed. There would be more development and she asked for all involved to be brought together and added as a Council and Hulme as a Ward, should be animal testing and vivisection free zones.

Ward Councillor Wright noted that 9 trees would be replaced by 27 expressed having had difficulties with other developers on this issue. Previous construction activity at MSP had caused problems with contractors taking up parking spaces so a condition on a construction plan would be welcomed. Daylight and sunlight would affect a small number of residents but was still an important issue to raise. Some dwellings were below balconies and received less sun and daylight. Jobs should be targeted at the Hulme area and the area should be vivisection free. She supported the new pedestrian crossing.

The Director of Planning stated that the Committee could take land use into account but moral/ethical wishes could not be taken into account.

The Planning Officer stated that 27 trees are shown on the submitted plans. He offered apologies regarding the impacts of previous construction activity. The impacts on daylight and sunlight would be minimal because of existing overhanging balconies. The developer would work with the works and skills team and engage with the community.

Councillor Davies understood that the Committee could not take animal testing into account but felt that the developer would be well advised to consider this especially in this Ward. Bruntwood had caused problems to neighbouring residents and residents should be able to access and park cars during construction. Councillor Davies hoped for the construction plan would reflect this.

Councillor Johnson felt that a commitment to community engagement would be useful and could be added as a condition if the Committee moved a Minded to Approve decision and asked what this might look like. The Planning Officer stated that there could be an additional condition in the construction plan to engage with the community.

Councillor Curley expressed that this was a good report, well presented and felt that any ongoing discussions with Bruntwood would be successful. Councillor Curley then moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to move the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application subject to an additional condition whereby the developer amends the construction plan to include community engagement and subject to conditions set out in the report.

PH/23/57 135544/FO/2022 & 135545/LO/2022 - 466 - 472 Moss Lane East Manchester M14 4PJ - Moss Side Ward

The application was placed before Committee on 6 July 2023, where it was resolved to defer consideration of the proposal to allow for a site visit to enable Members to gain a better understanding of the impact the proposed development would have on the local neighbourhood, owing to concerns expressed regarding the height of the development.

The Committee considered the reports of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described that full planning permission was sought for the demolition of 470-472 Moss Lane East and conversion of 466 – 468 Moss Lane East, in order to facilitate the erection of a 7-9 storey building to form purpose-built student accommodation (sui generis) and provide in total 261 student bedrooms with a mix of studios and en-suite rooms set within clusters bedrooms.

Listed Building Consent was also sought for internal and external alterations and extension, in the form of a link building to the Grade II listed 466 to 468 Moss Lane East to facilitate its conversion to purpose-built student accommodation.

17 individual representations had been received, 12 of which objected and 5 of which supported the proposed development. Objections had also been received from Platt Claremont Residents Association, Moss Side Tenants Union, Great Southern to Western Community Action Network, The Victorian Society and from Councillor Emily Rowles on behalf of the Moss Side Councillors.

The Planning Officer addressed a note of clarification from Councillor Sharif Mahamed who had stated that the scheme would address and improve the needs of students in the city. As stated in the Late Reps report, the applicant had resolved to offer 20% of the bedspaces at a 20% discount on their base market value and to

make these rooms available on this basis. Furthermore, there would be no parking permits available to tenants.

Councillor Bayunu addressed the Committee as a Moss Side resident, stating that this was a sign of a creeping impact of student accommodation off the Oxford Road corridor. In terms of accuracy amongst those already living at this location, a door to door check had been made by residents and found lots of families on site. There should be clearer information about the impact this development would have on the area. It was expressed that the Council cannot open up to this kind of development. Councillor Bayunu objected to this application and felt there were inaccuracies that required addressing.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee and stated that this was a significant student accommodation offer which was greatly needed in Manchester, the shortfall of which was having an impact in retaining potential family homes as they were currently being used as HMOs. This site was 200 metres from Oxford Road and a 10 minute walk to the University. The University had written with a representation of support for the application. Purpose built student accommodation (PBSAs) were of high need. The application was sensitive to the context of the area and of suitable scale and massing. Preservation of the building style had been included. There were no impacts from loss of light and a 24 hour contact point was available. Manchester was an attractive destination and students were an addition to the city. The scheme now offered 20% reduced rate dwellings, as set out in the late report.

The Planning Officer stated that due diligence had been applied with units to be lost having been checked (a summary was in the printed report on page 103). There would be packages to rehome anyone affected by this demolition and re-development of this site.

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

Councillor Curley stated that the site visit had been very useful and felt that this scheme would improve the building. The footpath was noted to be in a poor state and it was put to the Planning Officer whether a condition could be added to improve this as part of adjacent public realm.

Councillor Johnson understood the need for student accommodation in Manchester and stated that Moss Side was densely populated and more homes for residents and families would be good. Disabled parking on the proposal was insufficient and this would be an ideal site due to the park and nearby public transport links. Councillor Johnson noted the use of terminology relating to the Oxford Road Corridor and raised that this site is not on Oxford Road, adding that taller buildings can be seen on Oxford Road and expressed that this should be a development of lesser height. Councillor Johnson was concerned that this would set a precedent and encourage further tall buildings in this residential area. Councillor Johnson stated that she may wish to propose a motion to address the height aspect later in the meeting.

Councillor Davies had concerns for any families living at the current site. Page 103 of the printed report referred to the standard of the building at present. Councillor Davies enquired about the details of these families who are due to be rehoused and needed reassurances before making any decision.

The Planning Officer stated that the footpath issues raised by Councillor Curley could be included as part of Highways. Regarding disabled parking, 3 spaces were available on the street and a further condition could be added. The University had plans for students already due to move into this development when complete. Regarding the height, this scheme was closely related to the Oxford Road Corridor and based on its own merits and that this application had been deemed as appropriate for this area. Families in this dwelling would be re-homed.

Councillor Davies considered that there was insufficient awareness of these families and their voices had not been heard as part of this aspect of the application.

Councillor Lovecy expressed that the site visit was very useful. She stated that she was not Minded to Approve for this application due to the scale being more in line with buildings on Oxford Road. The impact of 7 and 9 storey buildings in this area would impact negatively on the amenity of local residents. Also, the heritage aspect of this building should be considered. Whilst the building would be improved, it would then be dwarfed by the additional buildings.

Councillor Hughes stated that he was considering supporting the application after the site visit but now had concerns about the rehousing of families as this is always a difficult proposition with the potential for children having to change schools.

The Director of Planning stated that the rehousing issue is something that the Planning Team take very seriously and, having asked for information on current tenants, found that they were all under short term tenancies. If the Committee were Minded to Approve for the application, the Planning Team would work with the Chair of the Planning & Highways Committee to create a condition for development not to start until there was an awareness of ongoing arrangements. This would be taken away for discussion with the developer and legal services.

Councillor Johnson welcomed this proposal from the Director of Planning but added her concern that the overall scale and massing issue remains.

Councillor Riasat added that the site visit was useful, that there was a similar sized building close by and confirmed his support for the application, moving the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve.

Councillor Shaukat Ali seconded the proposal with the added condition stipulated earlier by the Director of Planning concerning a rehousing strategy.

Councillor Lovecy stated her preference for a maximum 6 storey height and raised concerns over the impact on the neighbourhood.

Councillor Johnson wished to propose a motion regarding the scale and massing.

The Chair explained due process, in that, if the proposal put forward by Councillor Riasat fell then another motion could then be considered for the Committee to make a decision on.

Councillor Davies felt that the onus should be on the developer to make rehousing arrangements.

The Director of Planning confirmed that this responsibility would lie with the developer.

Councillor Curley noted that a similar scheme in Chorlton had been agreed under the same process and asked the Director of Planning if the same process would be adhered to.

The Director of Planning confirmed this with Councillor Curley.

The Chair confirmed with the Committee that the Minded to Approve decision was for both applications concerning this development.

Decision

The Committee resolved to move the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve for both applications subject to an additional condition whereby the developer entered into discussions with the city council regarding the rehousing of current tenants and devise their own rehousing strategy and subject to conditions set out in the report.

PH/23/58 136721/FO/2023 - Site Of Former Day Nursery, Longhurst Road, Manchester, M9 8NS - Higher Blackley

The Committee considered the reports of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing concerning the erection of 14 x 3 storey semi-detached houses and 2 blocks of 2 storey apartments containing 8 flats in total (Class C3) with associated car parking, landscaping, regrading of ground levels and boundary treatment.

The principle of the proposal and the scheme's contribution to regeneration, as set out in the report, accords not only with national and local planning policies, but would also deliver key outcomes for the city delivering new homes for affordable rent (through a Registered Provider). Any potential impacts on local residents are fully set out and addressed. These include wider impacts from construction to operational impacts such as traffic, trees and visually from the development itself.

The site is located in Higher Blackley Ward, is broadly rectangular in shape, and covers 0.46 ha. It is vacant, with an area of hardstanding with areas of grass, self-seeded vegetation and trees. It is bounded to the east by St. Andrews Community Hall (single storey building), with two storey housing to the north of Longhurst Road, St. Andrews Church and rectory to the south, and Blackley Cemetery to the west.

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

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application and stated that this scheme would offer 22 new houses at 100% affordable rent rate as part of Project 500.

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

Councillor Lovecy stated that this development was very welcome and added that she supported the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

Councillor Curley expressed that this was good news for those on housing waiting lists and looked forward to many more schemes of this nature.

Councillor Johnson raised a query regarding the comments on page 155 on opportunities to create improved areas of green infrastructure.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this was attached to the application as part of the landscape scheme.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application, subject to conditions set out in the report.

PH/23/59 130387/FO/2021 - The Former Gamecock Public House, Boundary Lane, Manchester, M15 6GE - Hulme Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for the erection of a part 7, part 11 storey purpose built student accommodation building comprising 197 bed spaces (56no. studios, 14 no. threedios, 10 no. cluster units (Sui Generis use class)).

The Committee was minded to refuse an application for a part 9 part 13 storey (PBSA) building providing 261 bed spaces on 31st May 2022 on the basis of the scale of the application and the shortages of parking spaces for disabled people.

There were objections to original scheme including neighbours, 'Block the Block' a resident-led campaign supported by Hopton Hopefuls, Aquarius Tenants and Residents Association, Hulme Community Forum and On Top of the World Hulme, Hopton Hopefuls, 2 employees of Manchester University, a GP practice on Booth Street West, the Guinness Partnership and One Manchester. 3 representations were also received from members of the public supporting the proposal. Councillor Annette Wright and Lucy Powell MP objected.

Revised drawings were submitted to address the above reasons for refusal; 25 objections from neighbours and an objection from 'Block the Block' were subsequently received.

Members were minded to refuse a revised scheme on 20 October 2022 on the basis of scale and dominant visual impact and the lack of parking in close proximity to the entrance for those with disabilities and the use of on-street spaces for disabled parking spaces.

The Late Reps report stated that 20% of the bedspaces would be available at a 20% discount of market rent. The recommendation was altered to Minded to Approve subject to a legal agreement regarding the containing affordable rent obligations.

An additional representation from Councillor Wright referred to the previous Minded to Refuse decision. The Chair confirmed that 2 objectors were to address the Committee, sharing the 4 minutes allotted speaking time between them.

The first was a tenant of Hopton Court and had lived in Hulme all his life. Hulme had undergone many changes, not all good. He got involved with the Tenant's Committee at Hopton Court and arranged for tables and benches to be placed outside. Then they managed to arrange for Hopton Court to be specifically for the 50+ age group and retired people. With the addition of Birley Fields campus and now this proposal for PBSA across the road he felt that this was too much for the neighbourhood. This was a piling in of students that would erode the community. Noise and litter were already a problem and Hopton Court was designed with bedrooms at the front of the building, making sleeping spaces only 20/30 yards away from the development. Other people in the building had been persuaded to join THOSE spending time in the outside area and this development would be a detriment to this outdoor space. The local GP were also concerned over the impact of this scheme and felt that the impact would be huge. In closing his objection statement, the objector stated that he did not know why this application had come before the Committee again.

The second stated that this proposal would negatively affect the amenity of residents and tenants. The north face of the apartments in her building were second bedrooms and, in many cases, children's bedrooms. This proposal was close to neighbouring dwellings and the overshadowing would have an impact on the energy bills. There were concerns over the disabled parking bays, a nearby cul-de-sac and loss of access. The objector stated that she was a blue badge holder and implored the Committee to refuse the application.

The agent stated that this is a sustainable location and recognised that the developer had to respect existing tenants. They took this seriously and offered a free community hub space. This developer was an experienced operator and would create a move-in and move-out strategy. 3 additional disabled parking spaces had been created on-site and students would not be permitted to own cars. Deliveries would be made within specified hours and an engagement plan had been created regarding litter picking in the vicinity and a contact point for regular liaison with the community. If approved, the proposal would regenerate the site. Access would be available throughout construction to all roads.

Ward Councillor Wright noted previous decisions in October 2022 and May 2023 and reasons for refusal plus other historical refusals from 2008 and 2012. She felt that the daylight and sunlight issues were more impactful due to dwellings being single aspect at Hopton Court. The only open space for tenants is an outside area and

some tenants already suffer with vitamin D deficiency. There was no need for student accommodation in this residential area. The application was opposed by the local GP and many more. Tenants had been assured there would be no impact on this site but were right to oppose this application. The accommodation on offer is not good enough to house students. Some areas of the development have no natural light, would be overshadowed and have no outside space. Developers see the site as a blight but residents see it as their area.

Ward Councillor Igbon stated that this site has looked the same for decades with no investment in the area. The developers were looking to make money and there were concerns over traffic and deliveries. The application stated that students would not be allowed to have cars but this was out of the developer's control and students with cars would have to use local on street parking which was also a concern. The local GP is the second busiest surgery in Manchester and the impact of an additional 200 people living in this area would create huge impacts to the community. Trees would have to be removed, one of which had a TPO. As a resident of the area, Councillor Igbon felt there was a blasé attitude from the developers and while a place for students to live was needed, this was the wrong site.

Ward Councillor Bayunu was shocked to see the officer's recommendation was no longer for refusal. Whilst she agreed that Manchester needed PBSAs, the impact to the community and amenities could not be ignored. 20% of the residents at Hopton Court have vitamin D deficiency, depression and anxiety. Allowing this development to go ahead would add to these problems. This was an area made up of older and deprived people and Councillor Bayunu wished to see the community improved.

The Planning Office stated that the previous Mind to Refuse decision was based on the scale and lack of parking. The Committee asked officers to identify reasons for refusal. A previous appeal had allowed a building of a similar scale and a reason could not be provided. 3 additional parking spaces for disabled people had been created on Camelford Close. Students are choosing where they want to live and are taking up family homes.

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

Councillor Lovecy stated that she had been present for other, previous applications on this site. Officers had stated that there were no grounds for a Mind to Refuse decision but Councillor Lovecy added that the area was not appropriate for a PBSA scheme. It was not a sustainable location for a mixed use of this kind. PBSA should be on sites where there would be no impact on residential neighbourhoods. Hopton Court has become a 50+ age group block and Manchester should allow for places that older people can remain in. In terms of the appeal against the previous decision, this was before the city council had confirmed their PBSA policy and the inspector will not have considered this policy in their decision. The impact of daylight and sunlight on adjacent buildings adds further weight against approving this development. Better sites were available and the sustained impact on this residential neighbourhood in addition to the scale and massing were grounds for the Committee to move a Mind to Refuse proposal.

Councillor Davies questioned whether the 20% reduced rate would be applied if the developer were to sell the building. She stated that she had lived in her building for 17 years with a north facing window, therefore having little natural light. To lose any more light, as would be the case for residents concerned here, would create an impact on health, energy bills and general wellbeing. This was a good location for older people who know their neighbours and enjoy life. The developer's suggestions on banning cars and late deliveries could not practically be implemented. In terms of the litter picking, while welcomed, shows that there is an expectation of increased litter problems and it was unlikely there would be litter picking early on a Sunday. Councillor Davies stated that she could not see this litter picking scheme working well. Residents already housed in this area enjoy living there and, whilst there was a need for students to free up housing stock for families, their lifestyles were often at odds with communities when mixed together

The Planning Officer stated that the 2008 decision was not based on PBSA but on scale and massing, which was more or less the same. A the Section 106 agreement was binding on the developer and any subsequent owner. It was residents who had identified existing litter problems that needed to be addressed. It was true that nobody could be stopped people from owning a car but students would not be allowed to have a residents parking permit. The issue of GP access is a problem across the city and the city council have many discussions about addressing this.

Councillor Curley stated that this was a difficult application of competing interests. Officers are working to the national framework, which should make decisions easier but for the concerns of residents and Ward Councillors. The council bought into the regeneration of Hulme for family lives and there was a commitment from people moving into the area. These competing pressures put the Committee in a position of having to have a full understanding of officer's and resident's viewpoints. Councillor Curley noted that some students come to Manchester, stay and contribute greatly to the city and the economy. The application here today was 2 storeys higher than the application from 2008. Councillor Curley concluded by stating that he was on the side of the residents as it was the right thing to do due to the potential for overlooking, shadowing, noise and parking issues. This way, it would be better for the communities in Hulme.

Councillor S Ali stated that he knew the site as a vacant eyesore for maybe 15 years. Previously, the application had been determined by the Committee with a Minded to Refuse decision due to parking issues and the height of the proposed development. Officers had been asked to take the application away and address these issues, which they had done and Councillor S Ali stated he would now support the application.

The Planning Officer addressed an earlier comment from Councillor Curley and confirmed that the current application was not for 2 extra storeys in height but was the same height as the 2008 application.

The Director of Planning stated that this was a very challenging application having its fourth appearance before the Committee. The application was not dismissive of issues surrounding the proposal and a very detailed report had been presented.

Having looked at a possible Minded to Refuse decision, it was deemed as not sustainable as the scale and parking had been addressed.

Councillor Johnson referred to the site designation in the report stating that this is the right site, yet it appeared that it was not and asked how this can be confirmed. The Planning Officer stated this was covered in the report under Planning Policy terms.

Councillor Lovecy proposed a Minded to Refuse decision due to a PBSA of this size being contrary to sustainable neighbourhoods. The city council's own PBSA policy does not mean that the Committee have to agree to approve this application. She added that this was not a suitable site.

Councillor Curley seconded the proposal.

The Director of Planning confirmed to all present that the Committee's decision was not a final determination but a deferral. The decision would be taken away to be determined whether the Committee's reason was suitable.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Refuse due to a PBSA of this size being contrary to sustainable neighbourhoods in keeping with the city council's PBSA Policy.

PH/23/60 135028/FO/2022 & 135029/LO/2022 - Land Bound By King Street West, St Marys Parsonage, Garden Lane And Smithy Lane, Manchester, M3 2JP - Deansgate Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for the erection of 14 storey office building and the refurbishment of the existing buildings at 3 Smithy Lane and Carriage Works on Garden Lane / St Mary's Parsonage. The Committee considered an application for LISTED BUILDING CONSENT for the demolition of 31-33 King Street West and the refurbishment of the existing buildings at 3 Smithy Lane and Carriage Works on Garden Lane / St Mary's Parsonage with ground floor extension. Consideration of this proposal was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 6 July 2023 to enable a site visit to take place.

The proposal is for 4,849 sqm of office floorspace and the retention and improvement of the Grade II Listed 3 Smithy Lane and the Carriage Works, following the demolition of part of the listed complex and other buildings on site. Objections have been received from Historic England and Save Britain's Heritage about the loss of 31-33 King Street West and the impact of the new build on the retained listed buildings and the surrounding Conservation Area. Application referenced 135029/LO/2022 will need to be referred to the Secretary of State for a decision if Members are minded to approve this proposal.

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

The agent appreciated the concern over the demolition and noted that not much Victorian heritage survived World War II. The applicant had spent 4 years to find the best solution for the mix of heritage and development. Sustainability is key and this site would support Manchester's zero carbon emission strategy. There was an ongoing demand for workspaces in the city and new offices would support more jobs. This application would bring an underused site back into use and open up Garden Lane and Smithy Lane. The agent hoped that the Committee could support the application.

The Planning Officer stated that the building to be demolished had very little remaining heritage and was listed as part of a complex. The proposal is large but this supported the restoration of the remaining listed buildings.

The Chair of the Planning & Highways Committee noted that the retention of heritage aspects was welcomed and invited the Committee to make comments or ask questions.

Councillor Riasat stated that the site visit was very useful to understand the context of the building and the proposal and was happy to see this modernisation and confirmed he supported this application.

Councillor Curley agreed that the site visit was useful. Once on site he understood the poor condition of the building and could see the value of saving the two buildings at the rear. This application offered a good resolution.

Councillor Davies referred to the pictures supplied showing current and proposed images and asked for them to be taken from the same viewpoint in future. She inferred that this was not a strong heritage site and added that the site visit was very revealing in that it assisted the Committee members in understand the site. The 2 buildings to the rear were worth preserving and Councillor Davies felt that it would be nice for the public to be able to see, if just on Open Heritage days. The courtyard was also a great gain from the project.

Councillor S Ali moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve subject to conditions within the report.

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve for the application, subject to conditions set out in the report.

PH/23/61 136874/FO/2023 - Echo Street, Manchester, M1 3QJ - Piccadilly Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for erection of 3 interlinked towers of 27, 21 and 16 storeys together with intermediary link buildings (15 and 11 storeys) to form Purpose Built Student Accommodation (Sui Generis)

No objections had been received. MMU support the proposal.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this proposal included affordable student accommodation with 16% available at 80% of the market rate, secured via a Section 106 agreement that would bind the development and any successors.

The applicant stated that they were a leading provider and excited by the project on Echo Street. The scheme includes affordable accommodation. This was a high quality alternative to students living in HMOs and would free up housing stock.

The Planning Officer stated that this proposal essentially repurposed a previous approval for co-living and PBSA. It was now 100% student accommodation.

The Chair stated that this application would secure some affordable rental spaces for students which would be a positive outcome.

Councillor Curley concurred with the Chair's comments and noted that the development was made of the same sized units across the whole and this was welcomed.

Councillor Johnson stated that there was no concentration of large developments in this area. Piccadilly was growing but there was still a need for long term residents and the area was not established yet. Councillor Johnson asked if the cycle storage was under cover i.e., proper storage.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there was cycle storage inside and outside the building.

Councillor Kamal moved the officer's recommendation of Mind to Approve.

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Mind to Approve for the application, subject to conditions set out in the report.

PH/23/62 136763/FO/2023 - Etihad Stadium (North Stand), Etihad Campus, Manchester, M11 3FF - Ancoats & Beswick Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing for alterations to the Etihad Stadium North Stand and adjoining land to provide an overall increase in Stadium capacity, hospitality, and concourse facilities available for use both during and outside of event days, an ancillary TV Studio (Sui Generis), a Roof-Walk Attraction (Use Class F1(c)) together with the erection of a 9 storey, 391 bed hotel (Use Class C1) with a further 10 suites provided within the North Stand of the Etihad Stadium for hotel or hospitality space (Use Class C1 / Sui Generis); restaurant at Level 1 (Use Class C1 / Class E), erection of an 8-storey building comprising: a new Club Shop and Ticket Office (Use Class E) at Ground and

Level 1, City Museum at Level 2, Leisure Attraction at Level 3 (Class F1(c)); and workspace (Class E) at Levels 4, 5, 6 and 7 and a new covered City Square fan zone and flexible event space with ground floor commercial, leisure, food and drink use (Use Class E and/ or drinking establishment (Sui Generis)) within each of the interrelated buildings adjoining the proposed square with associated landscaping and public realm works, servicing and access arrangements, and other associated works.

The proposal would extend the North Stand and include hospitality and concourse facilities which would also be available every day. Ancillary elements include a TV studio, roof walk attraction, 391 bed hotel, club shop and museum plus workspace for start ups and small businesses linked to the other users at the Campus. There would be a covered square forming an enhanced fan zone which would be supported by new food and beverage outlets. New public realm was proposed.

Lucy Powell MP (Manchester Central) supported the proposal. There had been 3 individual letters of support and 5 objections.

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

The agent stated that the development involved over £300million of investment. It was a sustainable and world class proposal for a sports and leisure district which supports the economy and residents in East Manchester. The site would employ a 890 people over the construction period. £100million of supply chain expenditure and 3,000 jobs would also be created. The site would inject £70million into Manchester's economy and offer training and recruitment opportunities for local people. It would be a destination for football fans and other communities. The increased capacity at the Etihad as part of this development had been a relevant consideration. The scheme was future proofed and had been collaborated on with all stakeholders. This project also supports ambitions for net zero carbon by 2030.

The Planning Officer noted that all the agent's comments were within the report.

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

Councillor Hughes stated that he was a lifelong Manchester City supporter and felt that this was a great scheme for East Manchester. He noted that the club were staying in East Manchester for the long haul and the additional jobs provided by this development were much needed.

Councillor Riasat stated that this was a commercial investment that has transformed the area and added that this was the next step on that journey. Councillor Riasat spoke of his support for this application.

Councillor Curley added his support and stated that he was a fan of Manchester City's approach, naming Pete Bradshaw as a hard worker and congratulating the club on their work with apprenticeships which produced high quality opportunities.

Councillor Kamal moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve for the application.

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve for the application, subject to conditions set out in the report.

PH/23/63 Confirmation The Manchester City Council (Land at Sherwood Street & Wynnstay Grove) Tree Preservation Order 2023 - Old Moat Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing concerning the background and issues involved in the making of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on 18 April 2023 and to recommend the confirmation of this Tree Preservation Order.

The Director of Planning recommends that the Planning and Highways Committee instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the Tree Preservation Order on land at Wynnstay Grove/Sherwood Street, under Section 199 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and that the Order should cover the woodland as plotted T1 on the plan attached to this report.

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

An objector addressed the Committee, stating that he was here as Head of Estate Management for the charity, Railway Paths who own this land and 350km of other property attached to disused railway lines, lots of which are public access, such as Manchester's Fallowfield Loop Line which adjoins this site. This was in conjunction with sister charity group, Sustrans.

The charity do not receive external funding so rely on construction projects on and around their sites. The charity needed to generate £750,000/£1million per year to keep running. The objector expressed his concern at how this TPO had been brought forward. No trees were at risk and there was a proposal made to the city council for potential social housing on this site. He believed the TPO application was flawed stating "one high quality tree" but added that this was not high quality woodland, and not accessible to the public. The site was used for fly-tipping, ASB and attracted rats and, regarding its visual amenity, its value was questionable. The charity had not had any discussions with the city council on this piece of land and the TPO may halt some much needed development. The TPO was premature and this site could be enhanced via the planning process. There was access to the Fallowfield Loop Line through Sherwood Street. Sustrans would like to enhance this area and the city council were supportive but unable to fund. Confirmation of this TPO would make any enhancements more expensive to deliver which would be contrary to aims of the charities efforts for the loop line and for the benefit of the public. In his closing statement, the objector requested that the Committee do not confirm this TPO and stated his desire to engage with the council on a proposal for social housing.

The Planning Officer stated that this process had been difficult. An arborist had been consulted and found 1 good quality tree on site. The application may have been pre-emptive to have control over what happens with the site in future. The Planning Team would work with the charity to give the trees any credence that may be deserved.

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

Councillor Curley stated that this was an unusual TPO that could stop development on a brownfield site. It was the first time Councillor Curley could recall that a TPO did not feel necessary and he expressed the need to have discussions.

Councillor Riasat enquired as to why there had been a TPO over a piece of land, how many trees were on the site and why the site was chosen.

The Planning Officer stated that this TPO came from a number of agents/consultants who felt the site was being marketed. This was a former railway site with some trees of scale and the general setting had been taken into account. The arborist's view was that there was a group value to the site. The council would have control over any development in future and were willing to speak with charities, having not had that approach previously for this site.

Councillor Lovecy stated that she was generally supportive of saving trees and groups of trees. She asked, if supportive of the TPO, how could someone propose to use the land for a worthy project, such as affordable housing.

The Director of Planning stated that there were numerous approaches and that a TPO does not preclude developers if the benefit of the scheme is seen as more worthy than the scheme could be approved.

Councillor Lovecy was satisfied that she could support the recommendation after hearing the Director's comments.

Councillor Curley stated that the Committee may need to know if the land is included in development land pockets as, if there was a housing partner interested, they would have to back away from any project if the site was not within a developmental plot. Councillor Curley felt that the Committee would need to see partnership out of courtesy and accountability and asked how urgent a decision was and whether this could come back to the next Planning & Highways meeting. Councillor Curley then moved to defer the application.

The Director of Planning stated that there was a set period to confirm a TPO and made checks with Planning Team members. Following making checks, the Director stated that the TPO would have to be determined at the next Committee meeting on 31 August 2023.

Councillor S Ali seconded Councillor Curley's deferral proposal.

Decision

To defer the TPO until the next Committee meeting on 31 August 2023.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 31 August 2023

Present: Councillor Lyons - In the Chair
Councillors Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Chohan, Curley, Davies, Gartside, Hassan, Hughes, Johnson, Kamal and Lovecy

Apologies: Councillors Hewitson, Ludford, Riasat

Also present: Councillors Igbon and Wright

PH/23/64 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 136812/OO/2023, 136814/FO/2023, 136963/FO/2023 and 136791/FO/2023.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/23/65 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 27 July 2023 as a correct record.

PH/23/66 136812/OO/2023 - Land At Red Bank Victoria North Manchester

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that presented the outline of an application for a development comprising: Erection of a residential led mixed use development across severable plots comprising residential (Use Class C3a); non-residential floorspace comprising commercial, business, service and community uses (Use Classes E, F and Sui Generis); residents amenity space including within clubhouse buildings; health centre (Use Class E); a primary school (Use Class F); the final surface finish of the highway and footpath consented under HIF permission ref: 133143/VO/2022; creation of new public realm and associated landscaping, car parking provision, cycle storage, and other associated works (with all matters reserved). It also outlined an application for development with all matters considered: Demolition of existing buildings and structures.

The Outline application was for a residential led development, with a clubhouse, a health centre, a primary school, infrastructure, public realm and landscaping. One letter of support had been received.

The Planning Officer noted that it was unusual for an outline application to be brought before Committee but that the Planning team had accepted due to the size of the plans. The outline application was to establish the principle of the development.

The applicant addressed the Committee, stating that the outline application proposed a new district for the city that had been in planning and public consultation since 2021. The project would create a new population of 6,000 people. The aim of the project is to create a sustainable community, with affordable housing a key part of the project. It was noted that the project aimed to meet the requirement of 20% affordable housing across the plans, with 5% already secured. The homes built on site would be a mix of open market, built to rent and affordable. There were non-residential plans too, including the building of a new Primary School. There were extensive plans regarding the public realm. It was noted the project would create over 4,500 temporary construction jobs.

Members, in general, welcomed the proposals as put forward in the outline application. Concerns were raised regarding the lack of social housing in the application and the process of considering an outline application, whether discussion would be possible later when further planning applications are put forward due to the lack of commitment to certain proposals within the application in its current form.

The Planning Officer noted that there was an expectation of 20% affordable housing but without the detail, they could not be certain. They did inform the Committee that 20% affordable housing was being delivered elsewhere in the project. As this was an outline application, there were conditions set within it. The Planning Officer stated that the public realm was being looked at creatively, but more detailed proposals can be discussed at future phases of planning.

Members then queried why the application was being considered as an outline application and concerns over space for children to play.

The Planning Officer stated that an outline application was a legitimate part of the process and was not unusual in other places. The Planning Officer was confident of what was being supported but accepted that detail could not yet be confirmed. The scale of the investment was the reason for an outline application being accepted, noting they had not seen this level of thought at this stage before. The Planning Officer noted that there would be a lot of open space for children to play.

Members then queried if there was a possibility for priority to be given to certain residents for the affordable housing as part of this project and if there would be any constraints to the Committee in the future to agreeing the outline application.

The Planning Officer noted that a local lettings policy could form part of the project. They stated that the Committee were agreeing to the parameters in the report and that further detail would still need to be considered.

Councillor Andrews moved the Officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve.

Councillor Shaukat Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve the Application for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the report and subject to the signing a legal agreement in respect of affordable housing and to secure the retention of the project architect.

**PH/23/67 136814/FO/2023 - Land Bounded By Dantzic Street, Dalton Street
And The Railway Line Known As Plots NT02, NT03 And NT04
Manchester**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing concerning the erection of a phased residential led mixed use development comprising three residential towers (Use Class C3 and C2) (NT02 34 storeys, NT03 part 8, part 20 and part 31 storeys and NT04 part 8, part 27 storeys) with associated flexible non-residential floorspace comprising commercial, business, service and community uses (Use Classes E, F and Sui Generis); erection of a 6 storey residential amenity space within a clubhouse building (part of NT02), with associated car and cycle parking, hard and soft landscaping, improvement works to Dantzic Street, drainage infrastructure and associated engineering works following demolition of existing buildings and structures.

The application proposed 1551 homes of which 78 would be affordable (5%). It included a clubhouse, commercial uses, highway improvements, public realm and landscaping.

Three letters had been received providing comments on construction impacts and the impact of the height on nearby residential accommodation.

The Planning Officer noted that the Council had a land interest in the site and that needed to be disregarded by members of the Committee.

The applicant addressed the Committee, noting that this application was the first phase of a new sustainable community. The application proposed 1,551 new homes, with high-quality public realm. There was a commitment to affordable housing, with 5% secured and 20% the ultimate aim. Within the application, there would be 4,000sq. metres of non-residential uses. The application would create a 26% biodiversity net-gain, with energy efficiency measures in place in the design of buildings. The application would create over 1,800 temporary construction jobs.

A member raised a query regarding the proposals for Dulwich Street and if there would be actual play space for children or would the space be for parking for residents. A member also queried if the affordable housing as part of the application was 5% or if there would be 20%.

The Planning Officer noted that Dulwich Street would be restricted access and that was why there was reference in the report to it being gated. The application only proposed space for up to 100 cars, around 10% of the site which was not a large number. In terms of affordable housing, 5% was offered as part of the proposal but the objective was 20%, as had been secured in other proposals, leaving the Planning Officer with no reason to doubt it would not be secured for this application. A local lettings policy could also form part of the application.

A member noted the green and blue policy within the application that noted the target would be reached in 2025. They queried if that trajectory would continue post-2025. They also queried if the 10 disabled access points proposed satisfied the Planning Officer. They also questioned if, in relation to the new trees proposed, there would be any control over the wider area. A member then noted the 1,250 jobs created by the application and questioned if that would include apprenticeships for young Manchester residents.

The Planning Officer noted that this was the usual level of disabled access points. In terms of trees, there was lots of space to plant the trees and they were confident that the number proposed would be met. The Planning Officer was also confident that apprenticeships for local residents would form part of the jobs created by the application.

Councillor Shaukat Ali moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve.

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve the Application for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the report and subject to the signing a legal agreement to secure 5% on site affordable, a late-stage review of the viability and to secure the retention of the project architect.

PH/23/68 136963/FO/2023 - Loreto College 146 Chichester Road And The Former Probation Centre Bounded By Chichester Road South/Moss Lane East/Maher Gardens And Tamworth Street Manchester M15 5PB

The Committee considered the reports of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing concerning the erection of a three-storey Class F1 (a) (Provision of education) building comprising a 20 no. classrooms, an assembly space, study centre, staff rooms and associated accommodation following the demolition of the existing single-storey building and partial demolition of the St Vincent's building together with a phased landscaping scheme; boundary treatments; cycle parking; and, car parking.

The application proposals seek approval for the provision of a teaching block for the Loreto Sixth Form College on a site which lies to the immediate south of the existing College campus. The site is owned by the City Council and was previously leased to the Ministry of Justice who provided Probation Services from the single storey building on the site from the late 1980s early 1990s until 2021.

Due to its long-standing reputation of academic excellence, the college was consistently oversubscribed with nearly 3 applications received for each available place. It was operating at capacity with no further flexibility to accommodate the ever-growing demand for places. This situation will be exacerbated owing to demographic growth in the Manchester region. ONS data indicated growth of circa 20-30% in 16

18-year-olds over the next 5-10 years. In order to meet this forecasted demand, the college had put in place a capital plan that focused on a new teaching block located on the application site. A grant application was submitted to the Department of Education in November 2022, which was approved, and confirmation obtained in May 2022 for the provision of new teaching accommodation proposed by these application proposals.

Nearby properties were notified of the proposals with letters sent to 191 addresses, in addition a site notice was posted, and an advertisement placed in the Manchester Evening News notifying of the application proposals. In response, comments were received from 1 Manchester resident together with comments from ward members raising concerns around: the perceived inefficient use of land, impacts on air quality, transport implications of the proposals, and the notification process undertaken.

The Planning Officer noted that funding for the application had been received on a time-limited basis and that there was an urgent need to provide post-16 education places. The situation relating to transport and car parking was being looked at in more detail outside the application.

Councillor Igbon addressed the Committee as a local resident. It was noted that residents had not received information regarding the application and concerns had been raised that had not been addressed. The college has a negative impact for residents in terms of vehicles, pollution, noise, anti-social behaviour, and litter. The plan to extend was a lack of responsibility to the community, with an additional 500 people proposed to be attending the college. Within the application, there was a lack of an Active Travel Plan which would cause severe impact to residents. The Travel Plan enclosed as part of the application was not fit for purpose and a comprehensive plan should be worked on between the college and other stakeholders, including residents, according to Councillor Igbon in their capacity as a local resident.

The applicant then addressed the Committee, stating that there was a shortage of post-16 places, and the proposal would increase capacity at the college. The college had received a grant for the expansion. They were aware of the ongoing traffic issues and were happy to work with stakeholders and residents to alleviate those problems, as had already been happening. The college was involved in a wide range of environmental issues. The application proposed 96 cycle spaces. All students at the college would receive Carbon Literacy training. The applicant stated that they had consulted on the proposals locally and that they wanted to continue to support the local area.

Councillor Wright addressed the Committee as a ward councillor, querying why there appeared to be a separate process for the active travel plan. Councillor Wright noted that the issue related to traffic. A recent air quality assessment was completed that showed an improvement since stopping 2-way traffic, and more traffic would have a detrimental effect on this. Councillor Wright stated that the college had referenced it not being safe to cycle, yet the application contained a lot of information about cycling.

The Chair questioned if an active travel plan can be included as a condition. The Chair also asked if the Director of Planning could write to the college to stress the importance of engagement with residents.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing stated that they would write to the college regarding engagement. It was noted that there is a proposed condition attached to the application regarding a travel plan [Condition 16]. The Director suggested that this condition could be reworded to link this travel plan with the wider travel plan for the whole of the college and to develop a plan for communication and engagement; and that if the Committee were minded to approve the application, the wording of this condition could be delegated to the Chair and Director of Planning.

The Planning Officer noted that 191 addresses were provided notification of the application, with more also sent by the college. It was stated that this went beyond the statutory requirements. The Planning Officer accepted that a formal travel plan would be included, alongside improvements to the public realm. They noted that the proposed extension would be an energy efficient building.

A member raised concerns that there would be an impact on residents from the increased traffic. They stated that resident should be involved in the creation of the travel plan and improvement is needed in the ongoing engagement strategy.

A member also stated that the travel plan needed to include a reduction of air pollution, but noted their support with the amendments to conditions as referenced by the Director of Planning.

Councillor Shaukat Ali moved the officer's recommendation of Approve.

Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application subject to conditions with authority delegated to the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing in conjunction with Chair to redraft Condition 16 as discussed.

PH/23/69 136791/FO/2023 - Former Chorlton Leisure Centre Manchester Road Chorlton Manchester M21 9PQ

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing concerning the erection of 2 no. 5 storey residential buildings comprising 50 no. dwellings (Class C3) with ancillary communal facilities; and, associated access, car parking, bin store, amenity space and landscaping, following the demolition of the existing building. The proposal was for a part 7 part 11 storey purpose built student accommodation (PBSA) building providing 197 student bed spaces.

The application related to the erection of a 5-storey residential development comprising 50 affordable apartments for the over 55s, following demolition of an existing vacant leisure centre. Following notification of the application 9

representations had been received, including 3 objections, 2 in support and 4 neutral responses with comments.

The Planning Officer had nothing to add to the report.

The applicant addressed the Committee, noting that the application would make a contribution to the local area. They had consulted widely, which had informed the application as submitted. The proposal was for 50 affordable homes for elderly residents. The proposals were energy efficient and in a sustainable location. They noted there had been no objections from the statutory consultees. They noted that the existing building could not be converted, and that this application would bring significant benefits to the site.

A member queried if there was parking space for carers. Another member queried if the 19 spaces proposed was sufficient.

The Planning Officer noted that the 19 spaces were sufficient for the application, allowing both visitors and occupiers to park.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation to approve.

Councillor Curley seconded the proposal, noting that no issues had been raised regarding the application by Historic England.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the application as set out in the officer's report.

PH/23/70 137579/FO/2023 - 12 And 12A Errwood Road Manchester M19 2PA

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing confirmed that this item had been withdrawn and therefore no decision was required.

PH/23/71 Confirmation of The Manchester City Council (Land at Sherwood Street & Wynnstay Grove) Tree Preservation Order 2023

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing informing the committee about the background and issues involved in the making of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on 18 April 2023 and to recommend the confirmation of this Tree Preservation Order.

The Director of Planning recommended that the Planning and Highways Committee instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the Tree Preservation Order on land at Wynnstay Grove/Sherwood Street, under Section 199 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and that the Order should cover the woodland as plotted W1 on the plan attached to the report.

The Planning Officer noted that this report had been deferred from the previous meeting and a meeting had since taken place between Planning officer's and the landowners.

An objector addressed the Committee, noting their belief that the TPO appeared a blunt instrument. They stated there was considerable tree issues on the street. They felt that the TPO was unnecessary. They stated that some trees were coming to the end of their natural life on the life. The objector stated that the trees on the site were not in any danger.

The Planning Officer was happy to enter engagement with the landowner and that was not prevented by the TPO. Any end-of-life trees could be independently assessed where necessary whilst the TPO was in place. The TPO simply served as extra protection.

A member noted that the TPO was a positive and that it was nothing against the landowners.

Councillor Curley moved the officer's recommendation to instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the TPO, noting that Planning Officer's had alleviated members concerns.

Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the Tree Preservation Order on land at Wynnstay Grove/Sherwood Street, under Section 199 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and that the Order should cover the woodland as plotted W1 on the plan attached to this report.

Personnel Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 13 September 2023

Present: Councillor Akbar (Chair) – in the Chair

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

Apologies: Councillor Moran and Rahman

PE/23/7 Minutes

Decision

The Committee approve the minutes of the meeting held on 31 May 2023

PE/23/8 Recruitment and Selection Policy

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Human Resources, Organisational Development and Transformation, which sought approval of a proposed revision to the Council's Recruitment and Selection Policy.

The revised Recruitment and Selection Policy had been developed to incorporate critical strategic aims arising from the Race Review (2019) and the Workforce Equality Strategy (2022). The policy was last approved by Personnel Committee in June 2018.

The main changes reflected the strategic aims of the Workforce Equality Strategy. The central ambition of the Workforce Equality Strategy (WES) was that the Council's workforce should reflect the rich diversity of talent in the community it served by 2025.

The aim of diversifying the workforce to better reflect the city's community required internal and external candidates to be recruited on a more equal footing. This was to facilitate a wider and more diverse pool of candidates from which to select the best candidates. Therefore, one key change set out in the revised policy was that, normally and by default, roles would be advertised externally and internally at the same time.

Trade Unions had been consulted on the proposed revisions and had not raised any issues.

Decision

The Committee approve the revised Recruitment and Selection Policy.

PE/23/9 Recruitment to the role of Director of Population Health and Wellbeing

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Human Resources, Organisational Development and Transformation, which outlined the approach for recruitment to the upcoming vacant post of Director of Population Health and Wellbeing, in line with the guidance from the Department of Health and Social Care.

The Director of Population Health and Wellbeing carried out the statutory functions of the Director of Public Health under Section 73A(1) of the National Health Service Act 2006. The current substantive grading level was SS4 (£105,566 to £116,346). As a result of the imminent departure of the postholder, benchmarking had been undertaken against core cities and regional comparators, to ensure the Council positioned the role appropriately for a successful recruitment episode. On the basis of the benchmarking, it was proposed to retain the salary of the post in line with its current substantive grading level of SS4, with an optional static market rate supplement of up to £5000. This would be applied at the discretion of the Director of Human Resources, Organisational Development and Transformation (in discussion with the Chief Executive) based on the calibre of the candidate selected by the panel.

There was a standard national appointment process which must be followed for all appointments to roles with the statutory functions of the Director of Public Health. This would operate alongside the stipulations within the Council's Constitution in relation to the appointment of Statutory Chief Officer posts. The recruitment process would also be supported by an Executive Search Company, on which a recommendation had been made and authorised by the Chief Executive.

In compliance with the National Health Service (Appointment of Consultants) Regulations 1996 on recruiting to roles with the statutory responsibility of the Director of Public Health, an Advisory Appointment Committee would also be set up as the final panel to make recommendations on the appointment to the Leader of the Local Authority. All members of the Advisory Appointment Committee would be required to participate in all elements of the recruitment process, including shortlisting and the core make up of the Advisory Appointment Committee was set out in legislation.

In addition, the Personnel Committee was required to establish a sub-committee to act as the appointment panel for the appointment to any Statutory Chief Officer. To comply with the stipulations set out in the Council's Constitution, it was proposed that the Personnel Sub-Committee formed part of the required Advisory Appointment Committee

Whilst it was mandatory for the Advisory Appointment Committee to be the final panel, it was proposed that there was an additional panel with stakeholders as part of the process. The Faculty of Public Health Assessor would check the technical and professional expertise of the candidates at this stage.

Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Places on record its most sincere thanks and appreciation to the Director of Population Health and Wellbeing, David Regan, for his contribution to the city of Manchester across the past 23 years and his strong and inspiring leadership that has enabled Manchester to navigate through some difficult times, including the COVID-19 pandemic, and to embark on new programmes to reduce inequalities and improve the lives of Manchester residents.
- (2) Agree to establish a Personnel Sub-Committee for the purposes of this appointment and invite nominations from Personnel Committee members to determine its membership.
- (3) To request Council agree the recruitment for the role to be at its current substantive grading level of SS4 (£105,566 to £116,346), with the optional inclusion of a market rate supplement up to a fixed maximum of £5,000 to be applied at the discretion of the Director of HROD and Transformation (in discussion with the Chief Executive).
- (4) Endorse the outlined approach to the recruitment of the Director of Population Health and Wellbeing for Manchester City Council.

Health and Wellbeing Board

Minutes of the meeting held on 20 September 2023

Present:

Councillor T Robinson, Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care (Chair)
Councillor Chambers, Deputy Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care
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, Deputy Place Based Lead
Dr Murugesan Raja, Manchester GP Board

Apologies:

Dr Doug Jeffrey, Manchester GP Board
Bill McCarthy, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust
Katy Calvin-Thomas, Manchester Local Care Organisation
Dr Geeta Wadhwa, Manchester GP Board

Also in attendance:

Tim Griffiths, Manchester Local Care Organisation
Sarah Doran, Assistant Director of Public Health
Leesa Benson, Lead Nurse Health Protection
Dr Anna Trelfa, Consultant Health Protection, UK Health Security Agency
Ryan Noonan, Lead TB Nurse Specialist, MFT
Kenny Li, Chief Pharmacist, Greater Manchester ICS
Cordelle Ofori, Deputy Director of Public Health, MCC
Katie McCall, Strategic Lead, Making Manchester Fairer
Guy Cresswell, Executive Director, Great Places Housing Group
David Ashmore, Director of Housing Services, MCC
Neil Walbran – Chief Officer, Healthwatch

HWB/23/13 Urgent Business – Manchester Partnership Business

The Chair agreed to an item of urgent business to provide the Board with an update on the work of the Manchester Partnership Board following its most recent meeting.

The Deputy Place Base Lead addressed the meeting and referred to the meeting of the Partnership Board, held on 15 September 2023 which considered proposals for the winter plan for Manchester and the Manchester Board priorities for ensuring the health and wellbeing of residents and the accessing of services.

Hospital at Home programme

Reference was made to the development of the Hospital at Home programme in place to avoid the need for hospital admission, using virtual wards or other technology-enabled care within a patient's home. The pilot scheme has in six months seen a reduction of over two thousand hospital bed days. A further information sharing event is planned for 28 September 2023, for the next stage of the rollout of the programme. It is planned that the 'Hospital at Home' team will be in place to support the Central Manchester area by the end of 2023, and it is expected that this will be extended to the north and south areas of the city by the first quarter of 2024.

Integrated Care Board

An update was also provided on the Integrated Care Board (ICB) and the financial position. It was reported that a turn around director has been appointed to look examine the finances across the integrated care system to work towards improving the current financial position. The current deficit stands at £606 million across the integrated system for 2023/24 financial year. Work continues to ensure financial sustainability for Manchester and a financial stability programme is in place and to integrate services for best value.

Carnall Farrar Leadership and Governance Review

It was reported that following the review, work has proceeded and there is now a revised model for the Integrated Care Board that will be considered by the Board of the ICB, today. The proposed model will set up more clearly the division of responsibility held at a Greater Manchester level. Work is continuing to embed and operationalise the new system, in particular the commissioning of services at a Greater Manchester level.

The Chair reported that he with the Chair of the Health Scrutiny Committee (Councillor Green) had written to the Secretary of State (Health) to highlight concerns regarding the transition of Integrated Care, in view of the financial deficit (£606 million) so late into the financial year. The Secretary of State has been requested lobby the Treasury to highlight the situation, ahead of the Government's Autumn Statement. The Chair made the point was made that, as the winter period approaches there are clear indications of increasing numbers of seasonal illness and health service partners have implemented changes to accommodate additional pressure on existing services.

Decision

HWB/23/14 Minutes

The chair made a correction to the title of members present at the previous meeting.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 7 June 2023 as a correct record.

HWB/23/15 Health Protection - Operational Local Health Economy Outbreak Plan Manchester and Update on Tuberculosis

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health that provided background information about the refresh of the Operational Local Health Economy Management Plan for Manchester and includes the draft plan for approval. It also provided a detailed focus on current epidemiology and issues relating to tuberculosis (TB).

The Board was informed that the Health Protection Board had focussed on covid during the covid pandemic, however other diseases such as TB remain a serious public health concern and present a challenge to public health funding. Reference was also made to the Outbreak Management Plan (appendix 1, of the report), concerning the operational arrangements in place specific to Manchester. The operational arrangements in place address several diseases specific to the complexity and diversity of city. It was reported that the covid pandemic had highlighted the lack of public health protection capacity and work had been ongoing to address this. The report also addressed the incidence of TB in Manchester which had risen in the latest reporting period. It was reported that there are current funding and capacity challenges regarding levels of latent TB and screening.

The Assistant Director of Public Health reported on the good working relationship with health service partners to help identify and treat TB cases through MFT. It was reported that current funding levels have limited preventative screening work to identify latent TB and this has been highlighted from outbreaks of TB across the city in different settings such as care homes and schools. Health partners were requested to consider the provision of services to ensure health equity for all the city's population.

The Chair thanked officers for their ongoing important work in tackling TB within the city and noted that current funding allows screening for 26% for latent TB, and highlighted the necessity for anyone newly arriving in Manchester to be provided with health screening checks to identify illnesses at the earliest stage.

Members welcomed the report and noted the difficulties of detecting and treating latent TB across communities. The importance of developing a joined-up communications strategy to raise public awareness and provide information to a range of communities on recognising TB symptoms must continue as well as encouraging attendance for screening appointments. The approach taken to engage with communities, in particular migrants, is important to ensure health screening and the take up of vaccination at the earliest opportunity before individuals were resettled to other areas.

The Board was informed that a business plan is in place to address funding issues for services across the city and the help of the Health and Wellbeing Board is welcomed in progressing that work.

Reference was made to those individuals with no recourse to funds, in particular homeless people leaving hospital and requiring accommodation to help sustain their recovery. A recovery pathway has been produced to help homeless people recovering from TB, where accommodation will be provided and located close to hospital to ensure treatment is continued. The system has been recognised nationally as unique to Manchester and will be shared with other public health

providers. Funding for the service has not yet been determined and is currently provided via the Public Health team until NHS funds are available.

The Director of Public Health reported that the NHS GM Migrant Health Group had met on 18 September 2023, and would be the appropriate forum to escalate the matters raised concerning TB. The Group can provide a lobbying role on the subject which is a national issue, and this may provide access to funding to increase TB screening.

Decisions

The Health and Wellbeing Board;

1. Approve the Operational Local Health Economy Outbreak Management Plan for Manchester, as detailed in appendix 1, of the report submitted.
2. Are informed of the current issues around TB and recommend that the Director of Public Health a) escalates migrant health related issues to the newly established NHS GM Migrant Health Group; b) advocates through professional networks for more latent TB testing to be available for all residents with higher risk of TB, not just new entrants and not just adults.

HWB/23/16 Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategies

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health that described that in November 2022, the Department of Health and Social Care confirmed that local Health and Wellbeing Boards would continue to be responsible for assessing the health and wellbeing needs of their local population through the publication of a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) and a Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy (JLHWS). The report focused specifically on the statutory guidance and the November 2022 update and what it meant for Manchester.

Reference was made to section 3 of the report regarding the Manchester Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy and the proposal to not write another new strategy but use Our Healthier Manchester Strategy which was refreshed in 2021 alongside Making Manchester Fairer to constitute the Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy. The Our Healthier Manchester Strategy will reflect both the Greater Manchester Strategy and the five year forward view.

The Chair referred to the number of changes to health arrangements, outlined between paragraphs 3.4. and 3.6 and asked how these may be scrutinised or assessed between the Manchester Partnership Board and the Health and Wellbeing Board.

The Board welcomed the proposal to bring the strategies together and refresh them to produce a strategy that aligns with the Greater Manchester framework and that is specific and works for the city, noting also the need to include greater focus on the needs of children and young people and the measurement of outcomes delivered.

Decisions

The Health and Wellbeing Board;

1. Note the report and its statutory duties and powers in relation to the Joint Local Health and Wellbeing Strategy.
2. Agree to delegate the co-ordination of the approach to comply the statutory duty to the Director of Public Health and the Deputy Place Based Lead.

HWB/23/17 Armed Forces Community Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA)

The Board considered the report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services that provided a summary of the evidence and data regarding the health of the armed forces community. It described some of the health issues that may affect members of the armed forces community and what the data from the 2021 Census told us about UK armed forces veterans living in Manchester.

The report also described what Manchester City Council and other organisations working in the city are doing to support members of the armed forces community and their families as well as some of the opportunities for action that existed.

The Chair welcomed the report and referred to the provision of support at a national level to ex-service personnel returning to civilian life, suffering from mental health issues and/or physical injuries or other illnesses. The production of a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment will help to bridge the gap of the national strategy and better focus services for veterans and serving members of the armed forces and their families living within Manchester, to help them to settle and access help with medical issues and employment opportunities.

Members of the Board welcomed the report and acknowledged the work of those to help ex-service personnel and their families to settle within communities and help with employment. Also, the work to help those who are employed and who are members of the TA and serve and return to work. It is important for those employers who have employees serving in the armed forces to allow them time to return and readjust to civilian life. Reference was made to the importance of raising of awareness of local GPs on the process to access the mental health support pathway. There are currently twenty-two GP surgeries involved under the OP Courage and Transition intervention and liaison service operated by MFT. Recognising skills that can be transferred to the civilian workplace is a major factor in helping ex-service personnel, and employers are asked to look further than the individual's academic achievement to include other important skills that have been developed in the armed services, when considering an offer of employment.

The Director of Public Health reported that the new style to the production of Joint Strategic Needs Assessments will be a briefer concise document that will include a structure to include the nature of challenges involved in an area of service and provide opportunities for action. This model will be developed to allow contributors to take ownership of the document. The proposal to include consultation with GPs to raise awareness of OP Courage and Transition intervention and liaison service will

be included in the JSNA to move the matter forward in promoting the service to veterans and armed forces personnel.

Decisions

The Health and Wellbeing Board;

1. Note the content of the Joint Strategic Needs Assessment.
2. Support the opportunities for further action described in the JSNA.
3. To endorse the inclusion within the JSNA of GP surgery liaison and consultation to raise awareness of the OP Courage and Transition intervention and liaison service.

HWB/23/18 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 June to August on the Making Manchester Fairer Action Plan and a case study on Manchester Housing Provider Partnership's approach to Making Manchester Fairer and tackling health inequalities.

The Board welcomed the report and acknowledged the role of housing providers in communities by providing more than just good quality homes and working to empower local people and helping maintain the health and wellbeing of residents through maintaining communication and involvement of service provider partners.

The Chair welcomed the report and looked to use the subject matter for inclusion in future meetings of the Making Manchester Fairer Board. The chair requested the amendment to the first bullet of paragraph 4.1 of the report to replace the word 'launch' with 'development'.

Decision

The Health and Wellbeing Board note progress made in implementing the Making Manchester Fairer Action Plan. As well as noting the work that is taking place across partner organisations to integrate the Making Manchester approach and principles system wide.

HWB/23/19 Children and Young People's Health Summit

The Board considered the report of the Deputy Director of Public Health that described that the Children and Young People's Health Summit brought system leaders together to develop, drive and own the future direction and delivery of Manchester Locality's priorities for the health of our children and young people. The report summarised the event and next steps.

Decision

The Health and Wellbeing Board note the key outputs from the event and proposed next steps.