

## Health Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2019

#### Present:

Councillor Farrell – in the Chair  
Councillors Clay, Curley, Holt, Mary Monaghan, Newman, O’Neil, Riasat, Watson and Wills

#### Also present:

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing  
Councillor Wilson, Chair of the Public Health Task and Finish Group  
Nick Gomm, Director of Corporate Affairs, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
Dr Denis Colligan, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
Coral Higgins, Macmillan Cancer Commissioning Manager  
Veronica Hyde, British Menopause Society  
Paul McGarry, Strategic Lead for Ageing and Head of Greater Manchester Ageing Hub  
Katy Calvin –Thomas, Deputy Chief Executive Manchester Local Care Organisation  
Julie Taylor, Programme Director, Our Healthier Manchester

#### HSC/19/23                      Minutes

#### Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2019 as a correct record.

#### HSC/19/24                      **Age Friendly approaches across Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC) and Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO)**

The Committee considered the joint report that provided information on how MHCC and MLCO were developing age friendly approaches across service development and delivery.

The Strategic Lead for Ageing and Head of GM Ageing Hub referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Describing the background to the development of MHCC;
- Describing the background to the development of the MLCO to deliver integrated health and care services at neighbourhood, locality and citywide levels;
- The relationships with key stakeholders across the City, with particular attention of the relationship with Age Friendly Manchester;
- Describing the priorities that MLCO had identified that they could work with the Age Friendly team together on;
- Describing the Age Friendly Partnership structures;

- Progress to date across a range of new models and approaches that had been developed that better met the needs of older people or better connected and supported Manchester's age-friendly approaches; and
- Next steps.

The Committee welcomed the report and noted the progress to date, commenting that it demonstrated an Our Manchester approach to this issue. A Member further commented that consideration needed to be given to designing intergenerational spaces, noting the importance of these to tackle barriers between different age groups and promote a positive image of ageing, and that more needed to be done to improve employment opportunities for older people. The Member further commented that environmental issues needed to be considered also, noting that fuel poverty disproportionately impacted on older residents.

The Strategic Lead for Ageing commented that the importance of employment and its relationship with health outcomes was recognised and work was ongoing across GM to address the issue of employment for people over the age of 50. He further acknowledged the comment made regarding the importance of intergenerational spaces and stated that neighbourhoods with a mixture of ages tended to be more successful and the new Northern Gateway scheme presented an opportunity to deliver this type of neighbourhood model.

A Member commented that the health service was inherently ageist and the whole service nationally needed to be looked at to address this. She commented that hospitals were very age unfriendly institutions and they needed to acknowledge and challenge this. She further commented that GPs also needed to consider and review how their services adequately addressed the needs of their older patients.

The Deputy Chief Executive Manchester Local Care Organisation noted the comments from the Member and stated that it was the intention not to admit people to hospital unless absolutely necessary as it was recognised that this did not always deliver the best health outcomes for older people. She said that clinical teams were working together to ensure that patients were directed to the most appropriate services and care pathways so that they received the most appropriate care. In respect of GPs she said that she would discuss the issues raised with the Medical Director to ensure this was fed back and an update would be provided to the Committee at an appropriate time.

In response to a comment made by a Member regarding the importance of efficient public transport to ensure older residents could access health services the Strategic Lead for Ageing stated that this and community transport services would be a priority issue in the coming twelve months.

A Member stated that whilst she welcomed social prescribing as a positive development it was important to recognise that some local areas experienced many pressures and access to services and resources could vary and consideration needed to be given to this, as without these it would fail. The Director of Population Health stated that they were working with local areas to map assets and services and would consult with local Members to identify gaps and ensure that all local groups were involved and that the age friendly work was valued.

A Member recommended that the report that had been submitted to the Committee be forwarded to the Age Friendly Board for information.

## **Decisions**

1. To note the report.
2. To recommend that the report that had been submitted to the Committee be forwarded to the Age Friendly Board for information.

## **HSC/19/25                      Discussion Item: Menopause Awareness**

The Committee welcomed Veronica Hyde, member of the British Menopause Society who had been invited to the meeting to discuss menopause awareness.

Ms Hyde described her own journey and experience that had led to her establishing a charity and work with the British Menopause Society to educate people and raise awareness about the menopause. She stated that awareness of this issue was very poor amongst both the general public and health professionals. She described that the average age for the menopause to start was 51, and the life expectancy for women was 83 and that women could experience perimenopause symptoms in their early 40s.

She described that following the menopause women had a 20% reduction in their bone density and that cognitive function was effected that resulted in depression and anxiety. However due to a lack of understanding amongst GPs patients presenting with symptoms were often placed on the wrong care pathways, such as being prescribed antidepressants. She stated that this lack of understanding was replicated across the health service with the result that women's health and wellbeing was adversely effected with implications for their employment and personal relationships.

She requested that Members supported her campaign to raise awareness of the menopause and call for further research into this important area and support the call for GP menopause awareness training, in line with NICE guidance. She also requested support for voluntary groups to deliver Menopause Cafes that were invaluable to offer support, understanding and information to both men and women experiencing the menopause. She also stated that workforce policies should be reviewed to ensure that they did not discriminate women experiencing the menopause and examples of good practice could be provided.

She stated that she would welcome the support of Councillors to promote and facilitate events in support of World Menopause Day on 18 October 2019.

A Member commented that there was a gender bias in both the delivery of health care and health research.

The Director of Corporate Affairs, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning thanked Ms Hyde for her contribution and informed the Committee that he would

discuss the issues raised with the Manchester Health and Care Commissioning Executive Board and he would then liaise with Ms Hyde directly.

A Member recommended that the Chair of the Committee consider options for supporting World Menopause Day. The Chair commented that he would also speak with the relevant Executive Member to raise the issue of menopause awareness to ensure that this was reflected in the Council's workforce policy. A Member commented that she would also raise the issue of menopause awareness and employment at a GM level as part of the work on the GM Good Employment Charter.

## **Decisions**

1. To thank Ms Hyde for attending the meeting and addressing the Committee;
2. To recommend that the Chair of the Committee consider options for supporting World Menopause Day on 18 October; and
3. To recommend that the Chair speak with the relevant Executive Member to raise the issue of menopause awareness to ensure this is reflected in the Council's workforce policy.

## **HSC/19/26                      Manchester Health and Care Commissioning Cancer Improvement Programme**

The Committee considered the report of the Manchester Cancer Commissioning Manager, MHCC, Director of Population Health, MHCC and Director of Performance and Quality Improvement, MHCC that described the current overview of cancer services across Manchester, including commissioning arrangements, and outlined the proposed Cancer Improvement Programme for MHCC.

The Macmillan Cancer Commissioning Manager referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Providing a comprehensive overview of cancer programmes and services in Manchester;
- Data on the rates of cancer, social determinants of health, screening, referral and diagnosis and waiting times;
- Cancer Programmes and Initiatives in Manchester;
- Highlighting those workstreams contributing to the delivery of the NHS Long Term Plan and Operational Planning Guidance requirements;
- Clarifying MHCC role in delivery of each workstream;
- Indicating the resources required to deliver each workstream;
- Highlighting the likely financial implications for each workstream;
- Providing an indication of priority across the cancer commissioning agenda; and
- Recommending the priority areas for 2019/20 and 2020/21.

A Member commented upon the detection rates of cancer in younger patients, especially in relation to bowel cancer and asked what was being done to address this. The Macmillan Cancer Commissioning Manager acknowledged this comment

and stated that work was underway to promote bowel cancer screening and that a new, more efficient test was being rolled out.

A Member commented on the link between deprivation and rates of cancer. The Macmillan Cancer Commissioning Manager acknowledged this comment and made reference to the success of the Lung Health checks that had been delivered in neighbourhoods, noting that these had resulted in a significant uptake and in number of detections and referrals for follow up assessment and treatment.

In response to a question regarding workforce issues the Macmillan Cancer Commissioning Manager stated that this was a national issue and work was underway at a GM level to address this.

A Member expressed concern regarding the reported complex commissioning arrangements that were referred to as a potential risk to the provision of integrated, timely and appropriate services for the Manchester population. The Macmillan Cancer Commissioning Manager described that this was being looked at at a GM level with the ambition to rationalise this across GM.

In response to a Members question regarding the reported increase in the number of all suspected cancer referrals in Manchester, Dr Colligan informed the Committee that this was as a result of revised NICE guidance which had resulted in the lowering of the threshold for referrals, adding that this should be viewed as a positive development.

Dr Colligan further advised the Committee in response to a question from the Chair that information and training that was available to GPs had been improved to help improve their knowledge and awareness of cancer. He further described that a National Cancer Audit was undertaken across all GP practices in Manchester so that all new diagnosis were reported back to the home Practice so that a review and learning could be undertaken. He further described that he had been practicing as a GP in North Manchester for a number of years and he had witnessed a vast improvement in the service provided to cancer patients in the area, especially in relation to the provision of end of life palliative care.

A Member commented that he welcomed the HPV vaccination programme and the extension of this to include boys aged between 12 and 13 years of age, noting the reported benefits this had in preventing a number of cancers. He stated that this needed to be extended to all males aged 13-18 to ensure that there was not a cohort of males that were not protected by the vaccination programme. The Director of Population Health stated that he shared this concern and this would be relayed to NHS England.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **HSC/19/27                      Public Health Task and Finish Group - Update**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Population Health, Manchester City Council / Director of Population Health, MHCC that provided an update on the implementation of the final recommendations of the Public Health Task and Finish Group that had been endorsed by the Committee at their meeting of 4 December 2018. (See minute ref. HSC/18/53).

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing stated that she welcomed the work of the Task and Finish Group. She further commented that there had been no change in the Governments position in regard to funding and lobbying for fair and equitable funding would continue.

The Programme Lead, Living Well Team said that the smoking cessation service had been reframed as a Tobacco Addiction Service in recognition of the medical approach to the treatment of smoking and not to consider smoking as a lifestyle choice, commenting that this had traditionally been the approach of cessation services. She said that the commissioning of the service would be in line with NICE guidance and the service provider would be appointed in October to coincide with the national Stoptober campaign. The Director of Public Health commented that a report on the service would be submitted to the Committee for consideration at an appropriate time.

Councillor Wilson, who had Chaired the Public Health Task and Finish Group stated that he welcomed the report and the progress reported to date and expressed disappointment in the lack of funding from Government for public health. He said that he welcomed the progress to address smoking and enquired about the alcohol services and the learning from the Communities in Charge of Alcohol projects in Miles Platting and Newton Heath pilots.

The Director of Public Health informed the Committee that the learning from the Communities in Charge of Alcohol projects had been very positive and would inform the work of the Local Care Organisation, further commenting that the number of hospital alcohol admissions across Manchester had reduced.

The Chair commented that the Committee would continue to receive regular reports on various aspects of Public Health activity throughout the year and updates on the various recommendations of the Group would be included in these report. A member requested that comparative information on the levels of asthma and lung disease across the city be included in a report to be considered at an appropriate time.

### **Decision**

To note the report and recognise the progress to date on the implementation of the recommendations of the Public Health Task and Finish Group.

**HSC/19/28                      Overview Report**

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

**Decision**

To note the report and approve the work programme.

## Health Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 3 September 2019

#### Present:

Councillor Farrell – in the Chair  
Councillors Clay, Curley, Holt, Mary Monaghan, Newman, O’Neil, Riasat, Watson and Wills

#### Also present:

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing  
Cllr Ilyas, Assistant Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing  
Andrew Gilliver, Pride in Practice / Community Involvement Coordinator, LGBT Foundation  
Julia Stephens-Row, Independent Chair Manchester Safeguarding Adults Board  
Lynne Stafford, Chief Executive Gaddum  
Dave Williams, Chief Executive Manchester Carers Forum  
Reko Smith, Carer

#### HSC/19/29                      Minutes

#### Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2019 as a correct record.

#### HSC/19/30                      Discussion Item: LGBT Foundation’s Pride in Practice

The Committee welcomed Andrew Gilliver, LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and trans) Foundation who had been invited to the meeting to discuss Pride In Practice.

Mr Gilliver delivered a presentation that described that the LGBT Foundation’s Pride in Practice was a quality assurance and social prescribing service that strengthened and developed primary care services relationships with their LGBT patients within the local community.

LGBT people had told the LGBT Foundation that it was important to them to be open and honest about their sexual orientation, gender identity, trans status and lives with their GPs. Service users wanted to feel confident that health professionals understood and could respond to their specific needs. Pride in Practice was a simple way for practitioners to inform their patients that they understood them and they could trust them.

Pride in Practice aimed to ensure that all LGBT people had access to primary care services that were inclusive and understanding of the needs of diverse communities. Through Pride in Practice, LGBT people highlighted the health and care inequities they had experienced across primary care services, as well as sharing many examples of best practice around LGBT inclusion in primary care. These experiences helped demonstrate the project’s impact on the design and delivery of LGBT



inclusive services, highlighting the simple but important changes that could be made by health care providers to help reduce health inequalities and improve the health and wellbeing of our communities.

The Committee were informed that Pride in Practice was suitable for all Primary Care Services, including GP Practices, Dentists, Pharmacies and Optometrists and endorsed by The Royal College of GP's.

Members heard that Pride in Practice was a support package that enabled health professionals to effectively and confidently meet the needs of LGBT patients. It further supported practitioners in meeting the requirements of their Clinical Commissioning Group, the Care Quality Commission and other bodies that they worked with.

Pride in Practice provided Practices with an accreditation award, including a wall plaque and Pride in Practice logos for letterheads and websites. This enabled Practices to promote their equality credentials, and demonstrated their commitment to ensuring a fully inclusive, patient-centred service.

Members were informed that over 5000 healthcare professionals had received training, with 97% of those feeding back that their confidence in regard to this area had increased and 98% stating that they felt better informed.

Mr Gilliver informed the Committee that this project that had started in Manchester was beginning to be rolled out in areas of London and West Yorkshire.

A Member reflected upon his own personal experience when accessing health care and noted the positive improvements that had been achieved and enquired what were the challenges today. Mr Gilliver stated that the current challenge related to trans patients, stating that citizens had to wait a significant period of time to access specialist services and health professional had little or no training in the area of gender diversity.

He further commented that the LGBT Foundation would seek to train and support health professionals in this area and training could be tailored to suit the needs of different providers. He further commented that the LGBT Foundation served as a signposting service for wider sources of support, including special support in recognition of our diverse communities that could assist both patient and their families.

In response to a comment from a Member regarding GP Practices that did not engage with this project, Mr Gilliver stated that if they received a complaint regarding the service received they would seek to engage with the Practice Manager and enter into a dialogue to promote this project and offer training and support. In response to a question from the Chair regarding turnover of staff in GP Practices, Mr Gilliver confirmed that they would refresh the training as and when required and remained a point of contact for support and advice for Practice Managers.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing informed the Committee that the Manchester Health and Care Commissioning Board had agreed that this offer was to be mandatory for all GP Practices.

The Chair thanked Mr Gilliver for attending the meeting and discussing the project with the Committee. He informed Members that the LGBT Foundation would be invited back to attend the December meeting to discuss specific health improvement interventions for LGBT communities in Manchester, including the Greater Manchester Trans Health Service and Pride in Ageing.

### **Decision**

1. To thank Mr Gilliver for attending the meeting and addressing the Committee.

### **HSC/19/31                      Our Manchester Carers Strategy**

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director of Adult Services that provided an update on progress to implement the Our Manchester Carers Strategy since the last update to the Health Scrutiny Committee at the meeting held 17 July 2018. (See minutes of the Health Scrutiny Committee ref. HSC/18/31)

Officers referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Providing a definition of a carer;
- The estimated number of carers in the city, noting that studies suggested that up to 25% of Carers provided care in excess of 50 hours per week and that 1 in 9 employees across the city were balancing work commitments with caring responsibilities;
- Describing the vision for Manchester Carers;
- The objectives of the Our Manchester Carers Strategy;
- Information on the biennial carer survey and its findings;
- Information on Young Carers, noting the Young Carers Operational Working Group had been established and would refresh the strategy with the aim to increase the identification and support for Young Carers and improve pathways.
- Information on the seven areas of action for the Strategic Action Plan for Young Carers;
- An update on the Greater Manchester Carers Strategy and the Greater Manchester Exemplar model for Carer Support
- Providing an update on the Manchester Carers Network;
- Providing an update on the work of the Gaddum Centre, who manage the Manchester Carers Network which included 20 voluntary organisations providing information, advice and support to Carers' (including an existing helpline delivered through Manchester Carers Centre.);
- An overview of the funding arrangements and the progress made in respect of additional funding to implement the offer to improve the lives of Manchester Carers;
- Governance arrangements; and
- The voice of Carers, noting that the voice of Carers was important to this work on the basis of "nothing about us, without us" being a core philosophy.

The Committee heard from Reko Smith, a carer who spoke eloquently about his own lived experience as carer for his mother. He spoke of the challenges he had experienced, particularly at the time of transition from Young Person to Adult Services and of the various sources of support, both formal and informal.

The Chair thanked Mr Smith for attending the meeting and noted that due to time constraints he was unable to remain for the duration of the item. He recommended that Mr Smith be invited to a future meeting to allow enough time for Members to learn of his experience and discuss this with him in further detail. The Committee supported this recommendation.

The Committee heard from the Chief Executive Manchester Carers Forum who spoke of his own lived experience of being a carer. He stated that it was important to recognise the significant contribution that carers made to the city, noting that it had been estimated that if carers stopped caring this would result in an additional £854m cost to the Council. He further commented that it was important to understand the positive motives of carers and not to view them as victims. He stated carers chose to care for their loved ones and they should be supported in this role.

A Member acknowledged this statement and commented that all services, such as transport, housing and education should be designed with this taken into consideration. The Commissioning Development Specialist stated that work was also ongoing to raise awareness of carers with employees so that their policies and practices recognised and accommodated the needs of carers.

Members then discussed the challenges and support offered to Young Carers. The Chief Executive Manchester Carers Forum stated that the conservative estimate is that there was in excess of two thousand young carers across Manchester. The Strategic Lead (Commissioning) stated that a lot of work was undertaken with education establishments to help identify and offer appropriate support to young carers, adding that an officer was dedicated to coordinating and overseeing this area of work. The Chief Executive Manchester Carers Forum stated that work was also underway at a Greater Manchester level to address the support needs of Young Carers.

Members discussed the issue of people self-identifying as carers and young carers being reluctant to access support for fear of negative consequences for them and their families.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing informed the Committee that reports on the initiatives to support to Young Carers had been regularly considered by the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee and these would be circulated to the Committee for information. The Strategic Lead (Commissioning) responded to a question from a Member by confirming that the report referred to that had been published following research on Young Carer's experience of transition would be circulated to Members for information.

The Strategic Lead (Commissioning) stated that the Our Manchester Carers Strategy would drive out inconsistencies and standardise the advice and information offer to carers. She said consideration would be given to how this was promoted to ensure it

was appropriate. The Chief Executive, Gaddum acknowledged that sources of support had been fragmented in the past and stated that the establishment of the Single Point of Contact, that would provide a gateway for all Carers to be triaged and supported to the most appropriate services, advice and information they required at an early stage would address any inconsistencies and standardise the offer. She further stated that this would also assist professionals across a range of partner identify carers.

A Member commented on the importance to carers of the provision and availability of respite care, noting the relatively low cost of this offer compared to the cost of longer term, full time care. The Strategic Lead (Commissioning) acknowledged this comment and stated that respite care was now referred to 'replacement care'. She described that the intention was to commission a service that would enable Carers to be able to buy (using a Personal Budget approach) short term occasional support to help them have a break, attend appointments, knowing that the cared-for person is adequately supported and provided with the necessary care.

In response to a specific question regarding a reported underspend the Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing stated that this was related to staffing posts, and would be accounted for once posts had been filled.

## **Decisions**

The Committee: -

1. Note the report.
2. Recommend that Mr Smith be invited to a future meeting of the Committee to learn of his experience as a young carer.

## **HSC/19/32                      Annual Report of Manchester Safeguarding Adults Board**

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director of Adult Services and the former Independent Chair of Manchester Safeguarding Adults Board. It provided Members with an overview of the work of the Board for the period from April 2018 - March 2019.

The Independent Chair of Manchester Safeguarding Adults Board referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Noting the priorities of the Board that were rolled forward from 2017/18 into 2018/19;
- Noting the key activities described in 2018/19; and
- Future challenges and improvement.

The Executive Director of Adult Services paid tribute to the former Independent Chair of the Manchester Safeguarding Adults Board for her commitment and diligence in safeguarding adults in Manchester.

The Executive Director of Adult Services stated that in recognition of the reconfiguration of services in Manchester new safeguarding arrangements were due to be announced in September and information on these would be shared with the Health Scrutiny Committee.

A Member commented that the use of the word 'customer' in the context of Domestic Violence was inappropriate. The Independent Chair of Manchester Safeguarding Adults Board acknowledged this comment and stated that this would be corrected prior to the reports formal publication.

A Member commented that the report referred to the Learning from Reviews Subgroup and noted that it stated 'It had been a challenge to secure regular and consistent attendance from all agencies and the subgroup had three different Chairs which had led to some inconsistency and slow progress at times.' and asked what was being done to address this. The Independent Chair of Manchester Safeguarding Adults Board informed the Committee that the new Chair of the Subgroup was addressing this issue and Learning from Reviews would continue within the new arrangements. She said this would be aligned with the Learning and Improvement Subgroup, and she was confident that this new arrangement would improve this situation.

The Executive Director of Adult Services commented that the new safeguarding arrangements would strengthen learning reviews and ensure that the right action was taken at the right time by the right partner.

In response to a question regarding the number of, and costs of legal challenges and how this was monitored and reported, the Independent Chair of Manchester Safeguarding Adults Board stated that it was not the role of the Board to consider any legal challenge and responsibility for that rested with the relevant partner. She further stated that the Board were satisfied with the approach taken to The Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DoLS). The Executive Director of Adult Services informed Members that she met with legal officers on a monthly basis to review and monitor any challenges.

The Executive Director of Adult Services responded to a comment from the Chair who noted that the membership list of the Board was predominantly statutory health providers and there appeared to be little or no representation from the Voluntary and Community Sector, and asked if this was typical. She advised that the levels of representation would be reviewed and workshops around this had been delivered with the intention to include both statutory and non-statutory bodies represented on the Board. She further stated that the recently appointed Director of Homelessness would be joining the Board.

## **Decisions**

The Committee: -

1. Note the publication of the Manchester Safeguarding Adults Board Annual report 2018–2019.

2. Recommend that the word customer is removed and replaced with a more appropriate term when referring to victims of Domestic Violence.

[Cllr Watson declared a prejudicial interest in this item of business and withdrew from the meeting.]

### **HSC/19/33                      Overview Report**

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

The Chair informed the Committee that the report on Access to Primary Care was to be deferred to the November meeting, with invitations sent to Healthwatch. He further stated that the report on the Supporting People Housing Strategy would be deferred to a later meeting, with the date to be confirmed following discussions with the Executive Member. He further reiterated that the LGBT Foundation would be invited back to attend the December meeting to discuss specific health improvement interventions for LGBT communities in Manchester, including the Greater Manchester Trans Health Service and Pride in Ageing.

### **Decision**

To note the report and approve the work programme subject to the above amendments.

## **Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 16 July 2019**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors Andrews, Clay, Davies, Lanchbury, O'Neil, B Priest, A Simcock, Stanton, Wheeler and Wright

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources

**Apologies:** Councillors Ahmed Ali, Battle, Moore and Rowles

#### **RGSC/19/37 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2019 were submitted for approval as an accurate record of the meeting.

Councillor Wheeler requested that Minute RGSC/19/36 (Strategic Acquisition in the Northern Gateway (Part B)) be amended to include reference to the fact that he moved a motion that the Committee should not proceed with the venture, which was seconded by Councillor Clay, but not supported by the Committee.

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2019 as a correct record subject to the above amendment.

#### **RGSC/19/38 Revenue Budget Outturn 2018/19**

The Committee considered a report of the City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive), which outlined the Council's position for 2018/19 for the Council's revenue expenditure and income.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- For the previous financial year the outturn variance compared to the revised budget was an overspend of £293k;
- This was a reduction of £0.767m from the overspend position of £1.060m reported in February 2019;
- The large budget overspends in both Children's and Adult's Services were due to the need to cope with continuing high demands for support and service provision;
- The balance on the General Fund Reserve at 31 March 2019 was £22.045m, with the budget overspend being taken from the reserve, which was still deemed to be a reasonable amount for the risks the City Council is facing;
- The Housing Revenue Account (HRA) outturn position was a £11.064m favourable variance; and

- A summary of budget allocations and transfers to reserves that had been approved by the Executive at its meeting on 26 June 2019.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Clarification was sought as to whether Directorate underspends which had occurred due to vacant posts were not being used to offset the overspend in Children Services and Adult Services;
- Was the Council's ability to deliver a balanced budget dependent on Directorate underspends;
- Was there any instances where vacancies were contributing to a reduction in the ability to deliver agreed levels of service
- What was the level of vacant posts across all Directorates and at what grades were these vacancies;
- There was concern that the Council was holding posts open for staff that had been suspended which were then being filled by agency staff and, as such, the post was costing the council twice;
- What was the anticipated impact to Council Tax and Business Rates collection of arrears with the introduction to a 60 day breathing space payment and attachment to earnings;
- Were the number of external residential placements in Children's Services rising above the expect trend level;
- How had the Leaving Care accommodation service improved the support offered whilst reducing costs by 30%;
- Why had decision been made that there would be no increase in funding for SEND provision; and
- Were some of the overspends within Directorates due to "one off" instances/events;
- Concern was raised that the funding available to address the issue of homelessness in 2018/19 had been sourced from short term funding streams and that there was no guarantee that this funding would be available for 2019/20 or beyond.

The Deputy City Treasurer explained that the Council did not make budget assumptions on the levels of underspends in Directorates arising from vacant posts, but did allow for a small percentage (around 2%) of staff turnover in its budget planning process. She advised that an element of the vacancy saving would be due to internal recruitment and the subsequent vacancy created elsewhere in the Council which was difficult to predict. She confirmed that she did not have information available on the number of vacancies (and their grades) that currently existed across each Directorate but agreed to provide this information to Committee Members outside of the meeting. The City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive) commented that as part of the Council's recovery plan in 2018/19 it had been agreed that a number of posts would be held as vacant and that this was due to the climate of austerity faced by the Council. She added that there was sometimes a challenge to fill particular vacant posts and the Council would look to fill these internally before looking to appoint externally.

The Committee was advised that in terms of the Council's budget, it was anticipated that the rate of Council Tax and Business Rate collection would remain the same



even in light of the 60 day breathing space payment and attachment to earnings proposals and as such no adjustment was required at the present moment. The City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive) explained that there were a number of pieces of work underway on the possible impact of these proposals and once completed, the budget would be reset if necessary.

The City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive) advised that the original Leaving Care Service had not been the most cost effective for the Council and confirmed that the new service provision would provide an improved level of service at a reduced cost. In terms of external fostering trends, it was acknowledged that the original reduction in placement target had not been achievable and there had also been an increase in the number of Special Guardianship Orders, which was in line with the objective of promoting permanency for children and young people within families, as such, the budget had been readjusted.

The Deputy City Treasurer advised that the Council would seek to manage overspends in year and that these would then be looked at as part of the budget setting process for future years to identify any longer term implications. In terms of SEND funding, there was previously a proposed transfer of funding from the schools block to the high needs block of 0.5% per pupil (£2m) in 2019/20. However, in December 2018, the DfE announced additional funding nationally, of which the City received £1.281m per annum for 2018/19 and 2019/20 and as a result it had been agreed by the Schools Forum not to progress the proposed funding transfer from the schools block. It was also acknowledged that the budget to tackle homelessness was supported by a number of grants and external funding streams which were not guaranteed for future years.

## **Decision**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report and the decisions taken by the Executive at its meeting on 26 June 2019; and
- (2) Requests that Members are provided with a briefing note on the number of vacancies that exist across all Directorates, including the grade of these positions and how long they have been vacant.

## **RGSC/19/39 Global Revenue Budget Monitoring to the end of May 2019**

The Committee considered a report of the City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive), which outlined the projected outturn position for 2019/20, based in spend as at the end of May 2019 and future projections.

The Deputy City Treasurer gave a very brief introduction to the report. Some of the main points and themes within the report included:-

- The forecast for 2019/20 at the end of May 2019 is an overspend of £3.495m;
- The main differences between the 2019/20 original and revised budget were:-

- £5.084m for the annual pay inflation award which was included in the original Corporate Budgets and allocated across Directorates (Adults Social Care pooled budget was allocated £1.002m in the original budget);
- £2.7m Youth Services budget transfer from Children's Services to Neighbourhoods and Highways;
- £0.983m Decriminalised Parking Enforcement and Bus Lane income budget from Neighbourhoods and Highways to Corporate Services; and
- £279k Winter Pressures grant transfer from Adults Social Care to Homelessness;
- The HRA was forecasting a £1.333m favourable variance;
- Budgets still to be allocated on the assessment of individual business cases;
- The drawdown request from the Transformational Challenge Reserve to champion Manchester Fair Trade status;
- The proposed virements for a revised 2019/20 budget that required either Executive or Council approval; and
- The savings target for 2019/20 was £14.798m, which included an additional £5.776m of recovery plan savings.

The report was also to be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 24 July 2019.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Assurance was sought that the £2.7m Youth Services budget transfer from Children's Services to Neighbourhoods and Highways was still going to be spent on Youth Services;
- What work was being done to address the £374k overspend due to un-achievement of cross cutting savings in relation to the HR policies;
- Was the forecasted underspend of £373k on Community Safety and Compliance, City Centre Management, Licensing and the Out of Hours Team for the full year and where did the vacancies in these services exist as the Council had already invested significantly into community safety and compliance and it appeared that the Council was struggling to spend this additional investment;
- Did the Council have a policy for paying "out of hours" premiums to staff;
- Who were Redgate Holdings, what service did they provide on behalf of the Council and why was it proposed to pay them a further £355k; and
- What scrutiny had, or was planned to take place, on the identified savings of £0.775m from Mental Health assessments.

The Head of Finance assured the Committee that the £2.7m Youth Services budget transfer from Children's Services to Neighbourhoods and Highways would still be spent on Youth Services. He also advised that the overspend in relation to HR policies was more of a delay in savings being reported due to part year implementation of some of the already agreed saving proposals, some of which would be implemented from September 2019 onwards. These included a change to how additional voluntary contributions were managed which gave the Council benefits from an income tax perspective, and the staff annual leave purchase scheme which commenced in April 2019.

The Deputy City Treasurer also advised that in terms of the underspend in Community Safety and Compliance, this was the projected full year underspend. The Head of Finance explained that the money that had previously been invested into the service had been centred around the city centre and out of hour's support, which had been an area that had been difficult to recruit to and retain staff. An investment plan was in place and was being monitored and evaluated. The City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive) commented that the Council did have a policy for out of hours working but it would not be appropriate to comment on any additional payment of out of hours premiums without reviewing the existing policy first.

The Deputy City Treasurer explained that Redgate Holdings provided facilities for non-residential waste disposal for the Council. It was explained that the way that the Council budgeted for inflation, meant that companies that provided services to the Council were entitled to seek inflation under the contract that had been agreed. However, the Council did not allocate inflation to the budget until the case for it had been reviewed and the amount agreed was appropriate. In response to concerns that the amount of inflation proposed appeared to be quite substantial, the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources advised the Committee that inflation payments were included in all of the Council's contracts and in comparison to other contracts, the amount proposed was not deemed an unreasonable amount. He agreed to provide Members with details of the uplift between Redgate Holdings and the Council.

The Deputy City Treasurer advised that the proposed savings from mental health assessments would have or would be included as part of the business planning process that would go to the relevant scrutiny committees each year regarding planned changes to Council budgets.

## Decision

The Committee:-

(1) Notes the recommendations asked of the Executive, these being:-

The Executive is requested to:

- Recommend that the Council approve the proposed virements over £0.5m in paragraph 61;
- Approve the use of budgets to be allocated in paragraph 58;
- Approve the use of reserves in Paragraph 59;
- Approve the use of grants in addition to that already planned, as detailed in paragraph 60; and
- Approve the proposed virements under £0.5m in paragraph 61;

(2) Recommends that Officers review the Council's recruitment strategy and attractiveness of roles within the Community Safety and Compliance service;

(3) Recommends that as part of the HR Sub Group's Work Programme, it considers the challenges experienced in recruiting and retaining staff within the Out of Hours Service as part of a wider report on the Council's recruitment policy and process;

- (4) Requests that the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources provides Members with details of the contract between Redgate Holdings and the Council in respect of in-year allocations; and
- (5) Recommends that Chair of Health Scrutiny consider whether he wishes Health Scrutiny Committee to consider scrutinising the planned savings of £0.775m from Mental Health assessments in more detail.

### **RGSC/19/40 Income Generation**

The Committee received a presentation from the City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive), which provided an overview of income generating activities within the Council with a focus on what the Council proactively did to generate income, what more could be done in the future, and what other models exist.

The main points and themes within the presentation included:-

- Local Authorities had traditionally received fees and charges for the provision of services. These could be split into statutory or discretionary services;
- Local Authorities did not always control the level of fees that were charged. For statutory services the fee levels were often set by Government (eg. planning fees);
- During the years of austerity, income generation as well as reduced spending had been a key consideration;
- There needed to be a balance between risk/reward when considering income opportunities;
- A breakdown of budgeted income and actual income across key areas of the Council for 2018/19 and the projected income for 2019/20 within these areas; and
- The opportunities that potentially existed for further income generation in the future and key issues that would possibly have an impact on these.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussion were:-

- Did (or could) the income generated from parking include income from residential parking schemes;
- How was it anticipated to generate a further £1 million income from bus lane enforcement when it was anticipated that there would be change in driver behaviour;
- Had any additional bus lanes been introduced to help achieve this additional projected income and what account had been taken into consideration in regards to a number of highways major projects being behind schedule which might contain additional bus lanes that would contribute to this enforcement income;
- Clarification was sought as to whether budget underspends were considered as income in future years;
- The report did not reflect or explain how much surplus was made from income generating services with reference made to the income generated by Legal and Democratic Services and it was asked what this income was used for;
- Did the Council cover its costs for services that it provided on behalf on other local Authorities;

- What was the additional one off income from the investment estate;
- Considering some services (Facilities Management and Other Core Services) had only generated half of their expected 2018/19 budget income, had these services covered their costs and how was the level of income projected for 2019/20 considered realistic or achievable;
- Was there any specific reason why the 2019/20 projected income figures were just slightly below the actual income figures for 2018/19;
- It was felt that it would have been helpful if Members had been provided with information on where particular income streams had stipulations as to what they could or could not be spent on;
- It was felt that there needed to be some clarity around why the Council undertook certain services which were generating income, as not all services were used purely to generate a financial return, but rather it provided a strategic and/or community need for the city;
- It was considered that the information presented to the Committee did not contain enough detail to gain a true understanding of income generation across key areas, future opportunities around innovation and possible income these opportunities may offer, a distinction between those core services the Council provided for social reasons and those it provide solely to make profit and what other local authorities were doing around this which the Council could possibly emulate and as such a more detailed report should be submitted to a future meeting; and
- It would be interesting to see the amount of money the Council had accrued since its inception as Manchester Corporation and what this had generated for the Council.

The Head of Finance advised that there was opportunity to fund some activities within parking through income generated from residential parking schemes which would be contained within a report going before the Council's Executive later in the month. He advised that in terms of income from bus lane enforcement, the Council had been prudent in its assumptions with the fact that drivers would learn and change their behaviours and as such in future years it was expected that the income expected from this area would reduce. He also advised that the 2019/20 projected income included the net amount after what had been placed into Council reserves. In response to clarification of this, The Head of Finance explained that the Council was restricted on what it could use this income for and any surplus generated over the agreed budgeted amount went into a ring-fenced reserve for parking and bus lane enforcement. He advised that additional bus lane related income had been factored into the income figures for 2019/20 but there was nothing assumed in the forecast for new bus lanes going forward. On this issue, the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources clarified that there had been an underspend within bus lane enforcement for 2018/19 which had subsequently been included in the projected income for 2019/20.

The City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive) explained that the figures contained within the presentation related to the income that was credited to the Council's revenue budget. It was explained that bus lane and parking enforcement was quite a volatile area of income and was also tightly defined by statute as to what this income could be used for. This income was placed into reserve and the Council drew down a set amount each year to support the revenue budget. The Chair expressed

concern that whilst understanding the complexity associated with the Council's income and the Council's revenue budget, the information contained within the presentation was not clear on this matter.

The City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive) advised that the Council had been prudent in its assumptions around income generation from bus lane enforcement in 2018/19. Taking into account the costs eligible to be funded from the bus lane enforcement reserve, it had been determined that a higher level of reserve could be used to help support the budget for the next few years, which had been factored into the budget setting process for 2019/20.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources acknowledged the point on the need for clarity around why the Council undertook certain services which generated the income and agreed that, if minded to, the Committee could receive a future report on this.

The City Solicitor explained that the Council had restrictive requirements when it was providing services for other local authorities. These services were only provided where it was clear that they would generate further income for the Council, however, due to legislative requirements, the Council was not allowed to make excessive amounts of surplus on these services. She reassured the Committee that in providing these services, the income generated was in excess of the associated costs.

The Head of Finance advised that the one off investment estates income in 2018/19 was in relation to a lease arrangement with Manchester Airport for land use for car parking and this had been reflected in the budget reports for 2019/20 which had been considered earlier in the year.

In terms of the income generation for Facilities Management, the lower than forecasted amount generated was in part as a result of the adjustments to the Town Hall budget, specifically in relation to the loss in catering income. It was acknowledged that the projected 2019/20 budget income generation figure had been overstated and although this would be offset by a draw down from the reserve for the Town Hall Project budget, this figure needed amending. The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources commented that the loss of income from Town Hall activities had always been factored into the overall Town Hall Project budget. The City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive) also advised that as part of a previous budget setting process in relation to the Town Hall Project, a revenue reserve had been set up to meet the loss in this income. In terms of the proposed increase in budget income generation within Core Support Services for 2019/20, the Head of Finance agreed to provide details to the Committee as to how the increase would be achieved.

The Committee was advised that it was not Council policy to set future budgets at a level just below the current year's income and number of factors were taken into account when determining the Council's budgets, including previous years' performance, known demand and the need to consider any known expenditure.

The City Solicitor advised that any additional surplus generated by Legal and Democratic Services was re-invested into the service to help support the cost of the whole service. She explained that the Council was clear in its negotiations with all of its partners and careful business planning was undertaken to ensure that there was an appropriate resource available to support any additional work undertaken. The City Solicitor agreed to provide responses to queries around the shortfall in actual income for 2018/19 and the projected level of income to be generated in 2019/20 for by Legal and Democratic Services as part of a more comprehensive report.

The City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive) commented that the aim of the presentation was to provide an overview of the Council's income, the different categories of income and legislative background for particular parts including the issue around trading and profit. She and Officers noted the Committee's views around the level of detail requested to be included in a future report around income generation across key areas, future opportunities around innovation and possible income these opportunities may offer, a distinction between those core services the Council provided for social reasons and those it provides solely to make profit and what other local authorities were doing around this which the Council could possibly emulate.

### **Decision**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the presentation.
- (2) Notes that the Head of Finance will provide information on how the proposed increase in budget income generation within Core Support Services for 2019/20, will be achieved.
- (3) Requests Officers produce a further report that provides a greater level of detail on income generation across the key areas; and
- (4) Agrees that the Chair, in consultation with the City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive) will determine an appropriate date at which this report shall be considered.

### **RGSC/19/41 Delivering the Our Manchester Strategy**

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources, which provided an overview of work undertaken and progress towards the delivery of the Council's priorities, as set out in the Our Manchester Strategy (OMS), for those areas within his portfolio.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committee's discussions within the Executive Members report were: -

- How did the Executive Member intend to improve how the Council monitored and managed its contracts;
- What were the main concerns arising from the BeHeard 2018 survey results and what was the Executive member doing to address these concerns;

- What progress had been made with the appointment of a full time Director of HROD;
- What role did the Council have in relation to the Credit Union offer being promoted to staff and how was this being promoted;
- Does the Council offer payroll saving to a Credit Union and if so how is this being promoted;
- A request was made that the Executive Member assisted in getting a response to the Committee on the Trade Union recognition from Highways contracts;
- Could the Executive Member give an assurance that all staff employed on the Manchester International Festival (MIF) 2020 would be paid a minimum of the Manchester Living Wage;
- What involvement did the Executive Member in the Council's review of the diversity of its workforce, and if it did not already, would this review look at those staff subject to misconduct;
- What consideration or thought had the Executive Member given to incorporating the Council's recently adopted stance on climate change within the procurement process; and
- A request that the success of the recent Council Tax charge on empty properties pilot was included in the annual Revenue and Benefits report.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources advised that he had established a small working group of officers to look at contract management with a view to establishing a database. He had also met with Open Data for advice and guidance on how monitoring could be implemented. This work was on going at present but was intended to help shape how improvements could be made to how contracts were monitored and managed.

The main concerns arising from the BeHeard survey were in the main at Senior Leadership Group level and the feeling amongst staff at this level not having the flexibility to actually drive forward improvements. The Chief Executive and City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive) were meeting with these staff to address the concerns that had been raised. In the main, he advised that satisfaction levels were up amongst staff and there had been a 77% positive response from staff who felt that their managers helped fulfil their potential. He acknowledged that there was still work to be done to improve certain areas and ensure that Manchester City Council was a place where people wanted to come and work and this was being addressed through Listening into Action sessions.

The Committee was advised that at present there was an Interim Director of HROD in place and he anticipated that the role would be appointed to by the end of August 2019.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources advised that the Council had well established relationships with two Credit Unions within the city and the Council's role was purely in making staff aware of the services available through the Credit Unions and helped staff make a connection with one of the Unions should they require financial support. There had been a soft launch of the offer and a more formal wider communication was planned. In terms of a payroll saving scheme, the Council did offer this to its staff and agreed to provide information around the take up of this offer to the Committee and agreed that as part of the communication to staff



on the Credit Union offer, this would also be part of the communications. He agreed to chase officers for a response to the request around Trade Union recognition from the Highways contractors and gave an assurance that all staff employed at MIF 2020 would be paid the Manchester Living Wage as a minimum.

The Committee was advised that a Peer Review was being undertaken around the diversity of the workforce and this would also include a review of the diversity of staff subject to misconduct proceedings. The Executive Member advised that he was meeting regularly with the Interim Director of HROD and Trade Unions around a wider piece of work around ensuring equality and diversity across the workforce was embedded, which included all protected characteristics.

In terms of incorporating the Council's recently adopted stance on climate change within the procurement process, the Committee was advised that it was planned to include a 10% weighting in two of the major Highways contracts to address any environmental impact as well as the 20% weighting for Social value. He advised that it would be for the Highways department to determine and set the criteria for the 10% environmental impact weighting.

## **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

## **RGSC/19/42 Overview Report**

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

The Chair suggested that the Committee should receive a report at its next meeting on the progress that had been made with motions submitted and carried by full Council over the last three years, if possible.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Further information on the Register of Key Decisions:-
  - Velodrome (reference 2019/05/21E);
  - Airport Car Park Investment (reference 2018/12/14B); and
  - Collection, disposal and recycling of street cleansing and bulky waste (2019/03/01B); and
- A request to consider reviewing capital expenditure within the Highways Department at a future meeting.

The City Solicitor advised that she was already undertaking a piece of work in relation to the tracking of progress with Council motions. She commented that it would be possible to provide a report to the next meeting which provided information on the progress of motions submitted over the last 12 months, but it would take longer to provide this information on motions submitted over the last three years as suggested.

The City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive) advised that the Velodrome required a large amount of maintenance akin to all of the Commonwealth Games legacy estate, but could not give any specific detail at the current moment in time. She agreed to provide further information in due course. She also advised that the Airport Car Park Investment proposals had been to Executive and would provide the minute extract for the Committee.

The City Treasurer advised that she was not aware if Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee were planning on scrutinising the collection, disposal and recycling of street cleansing and bulky waste. The Chair commented that she would have a discussion with the Chair of Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee in relation to the scrutiny of the collection, disposal and recycling of street cleansing and bulky waste and the scrutiny of the delivery of Highway capital projects.

### **Decision**

The Committee:-

- (1) Agrees to receive a report at its next meeting on the progress that has been made with motions submitted and carried by full Council over the last 12 months and any future updates will also include the progress of motions older than 12 months;
- (2) Notes that the City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive) will provide the Executive minute extract in relation to the Airport Car Park Investment;
- (3) Notes that the Chair will speak to the Chair of Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee in relation to the scrutiny of the collection, disposal and recycling of street cleansing and bulky waste and the scrutiny of the delivery of Highway capital projects; and
- (4) Agrees the work programme for future meetings

## **Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 3 September 2019**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors Ahmed Ali, Battle, Clay, Davies, Lanchbury, B Priest, A Simcock, Stanton and Wright

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources

**Apologies:** Councillor Andrews, Moore, Rowles and Wheeler

#### **RGSC/19/43 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 July 2019 as a correct record

#### **RGSC/19/44 Revenue and Benefits Annual Performance Report 2018/19**

The Committee considered a report of the City Treasurer, which provided Members with an overview of the performance of the Council's Council Tax, Benefits and Business Rates service areas for the 2018/19 financial year. The report also provided an update on key areas of work and the welfare reform changes.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- The annual performance results for the Revenues and Benefits Unit, covering the collection of Council Tax collection, Benefits administration and Business Rates collection;
- Performance data in respect of areas of discretionary support including Discretionary Housing Payments (DHP), Discretionary Council Tax Payment Scheme (DCTPS) and Welfare Provision Scheme, including food poverty grants;
- Summary data on welfare benefit changes including the progress to transfer claims to Universal Credit and those areas of welfare reform administered by the Council, including spare room subsidy (bedroom tax) and Household benefit cap;
- Key issues affecting the Unit and service areas and details the headline performance targets and objectives for the year ahead; and
- Ward deprivation statistics that provided context and background to the ward based information within the report.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- How many empty properties existed where the Council was unaware of who the owner was and how did the Council go about trying to obtain this information;
- How difficult was it to implement Orders for Sale where property owners had failed to pay outstanding Council Tax debts to the Council;
- What happened in instances where owners who had failed to pay Council Tax sold on their properties;
- Did Officers ever undertake unplanned reviews of body camera footage from Enforcement Officers to ensure the Officers were operating appropriately and within the law;
- Were there specific reasons as to why Council Tax collection rate and the amount of Council Tax arrears collected had reduced from 2012/13 onwards;
- What was the Council's stance on pursuing debt owed by those on low income and/or benefits;
- In terms of the information sharing pilot with HMRC for recovering unpaid Council Tax, did the details of 4000 residents passed to HMRC related to just Manchester residents or was this nationally;
- Of the proportion of residents details that the Council had passed to HMRC did they fit a certain demographic or was the sample random
- What safeguarding was in place for people where the Council might have ordinarily identified through the use of Enforcement Officers some kind of vulnerability that it might no longer be able to identify as the Council adopted more automated methods for the collection of unpaid Council Tax, such as the pilot with HMRC;
- How would the model currently used by the Team for tracking down those who owed Council Tax work for those who were not based in the UK for tax purposes;
- Clarification was sought as to number of Council tenures in the city that were in award of discretionary housing payments
- How many families had benefitted from the £75,9990 Discretionary Council Tax Payment that had been awarded to help those with two or more children;
- It was suggested that if Universal Credit claim forms did not require details on the number of children within a household then the Council should lobby the DWP to collect this information;
- Concern was expressed as to the level of rent expected to be paid for dispersed temporary accommodation and it was asked how this level had been set; and
- Did the Council have figures in relation to the level of debt owed to the Council through the use of dispersed temporary accommodation.

The Corporate Revenue Manager advised that in most cases, the Council could only get information relating to property ownership off the Land Registry, however contacting the owner was not always easy as the only detail required by the Land Registry was an owners address. The Council did go through various processes such as credit reference agencies to try and trace the owners of properties. The Council did consider the use of Charging Orders as these could be served on a property, whereas Bankruptcy orders required papers to be served on an individual. He advised that he did not have the figures available in relation to how many properties existed where the Council was unaware of who the owner was but agreed

to look into this and provide the information to Members. In terms of Orders for Sale, it was explained that if this was pursued through a Charging Order, it required a judge to enforce the sale and was therefore not always guaranteed to be granted.

In instances where owners who had failed to pay Council Tax sold on their properties, the Director of Customer Services and Transactions advised that unless there was an order on the property when it sold, the Council could not lay claim to any unpaid Council Tax. Reassurance was given that the Council was relentless in trying to secure any unpaid monies and would look at the use of attachment of earnings orders, write to individuals and if necessary send Enforcement Officers to try and obtain the debt owed to the Council, even if they had moved outside of Manchester. The Director advised that at present the Council did not undertake any 'dip test' of body cameras, however Revenue and Benefits Officers would undertake visits with Enforcement Officers, which in some instances would reveal wider intelligence on families who were in need of support. The Director commented that there would be nothing preventing 'dip tests' to be undertaken and gave a commitment to undertake this and report back in next years report.

The Committee was advised that prior to 2012/13 residents who were on Income Support or equivalent, received Council Tax benefit equivalent to 100% of the Council Tax due. Due to changes in legislation by central government in 2012/13, that abolished Council tax benefit and replaced this with localised Council Tax Support Schemes, the Council no longer received the same level of funding to cover the full cost of Council Tax Support, as such, the Council's Local Council Tax Support Scheme was amended to ensure it remained affordable whilst taking into account other budgetary pressures, which resulted in the requirement for those in receipt of Council Tax support having to pay a contribution towards their Council Tax. This had started at an 8.5% contribution and had risen up to a 17.5% contribution at the present moment. Reassurance was given that the payment plans for those on a low income or benefits were based on their presenting circumstances, available income and level of engagement in order to try and recover the money owed and put them on debt repayment journey.

The Corporate Revenue Manager informed the Committee that the details of 4000 residents passed to HMRC did relate to just Manchester residents and this was broken down into 10 batches of 400, each batch with a different type of debt owed. In terms of safeguarding, the process the pilot had to go through before launching included a presentation to the Board, which included Debt Advice Agencies before it was signed off. The Council was required to send out warning letters to residents advising that they had been provided with their information from HMRC and that it was intended to implement Attachment to Earnings Orders unless they got in touch to make a repayment arrangement. The Council also referred individuals to the Citizens Advice Bureau where vulnerability was identified.

In terms of tracking down individuals who owed Council Tax but who were not based in the UK, it was reported that this was a challenge but if the Council had any contact details including their employers details, attachment of earnings could be considered. If the property was owned by a company then a Winding Up order would be considered.

Officers advised that the reason it appeared that the City had a high number of Council tenures in receipt of discretionary housing payments was due to the way the Council still recorded the payment of a proportion of these tenancies.

It was reported that the £75,990 Discretionary Council Tax Payment that had been awarded to help those with two or more children had helped 324 families across Manchester and the Council continued to work on this area to ensure all families that qualified for this support received appropriate payments.

In terms of dispersed temporary accommodation, it was explained that this type of accommodation was procured to place homeless families whilst a more permanent residency was sought. In effect this was often private landlord accommodation. The Director of Customer Services and Transactions advised that the rental levels were agreed some years ago and were set at a level the Council had committed to in order to secure the properties. It was reported that this had been an area that the Council had been reviewing to see if there was any savings or efficiencies that could be achieved but it was a very complex area to find an appropriate resolution to. The amount paid by the Council used to be recoverable through a government subsidy, however this had reduced and consequently there was now a cost incurred to the Council.

The Director of Homelessness advised that the system for dispersed temporary accommodation was to move away from the use of B&B accommodation and family type hostels. The difficulties the Council faced in securing these properties was due to the demand in the wider housing market and willingness of some landlords to house those who were deemed homeless. He advised that steps were being taken to review this area with a view to drive down costs and provide private rented solutions. He advised that he did not have the data to hand in relation to the level of debt owed to the Council through the use of dispersed temporary accommodation but agreed to provide this information to the Committee.

## **Decision**

The Committee

- (1) Welcomes the update on the performance of the Council's Council Tax, Benefits and Business Rates service areas for the 2018/19 financial year;
- (2) Requests that the Members be provided with a briefing note on the number of properties that existed where the Council was unaware of who the owner was and the action it could take to obtain this information
- (3) Note the commitment from the Director of Customer Services and Transactions that staff will undertake 'dip tests' of Enforcement Officers' body cameras and telephone calls, at the request of the Committee, and that this will be reported back in next years Annual Report;
- (4) Requests that the Director of Homelessness provide a briefing note on the level of debt owed to the Council through the use of dispersed temporary accommodation and that this includes a comparison with Local Housing Allowance rates on a ward basis.

## **RGSC/19/45 The impact of the Welfare Reform agenda on the Council's finances and its ability to provide support to residents of Manchester**

The Committee considered a report of the City Treasurer, which provided Members with an up to date position statement on the roll out of Universal Credit (UC) in the city and the impact on the Council's finances and its ability to provide support to residents of Manchester.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- The status of Universal Credit in Manchester including claim volumes and the transition from housing benefit to UC Housing element;
- The rise in homelessness in the city and its significant impact on the Council's finances in terms of direct costs, support services and on discretionary budgets;
- The volume and amount Discretionary Housing Payments made;
- The demand and payments from the Welfare Provision Support scheme continued to increase and it was expected that the budget would be overspent by the end of the financial year should the Council carry on receiving requests and approving payments based on the current demand;
- Collection issues, including the impact on Council Tax recovery and rent collection; and
- Details of financial support to the Council to provide support to UC

Officers also provided the Committee with details of work that had been undertaken between the Council, the DWP and Northwards Registered Housing Provider to try and address the payment of rental arrears of tenants.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Had the Council undertaken any projections in relation to how quickly UC was rolling out and at what point households were likely to tip into homelessness and the impact this was likely to have on the Council's presentation of homeless people;
- There was concern that the total rental arrears had increased by over £1million over the last 12 months within two key housing providers and the ability of the Council to be able to offer sufficient support needed to maintain tenancies; and
- How could the Council maximise direct rental payments to landlords for those tenants on UC.

Officers advised that due to the complexity of UC and its potential impact on homelessness it was very difficult to project the likely number of households that would possibly tip into being made homeless but it was acknowledged that this was a risk factor that the Council was looking at. The Director of Customer Services and Transactions commented that the challenge the Council faced was Government kept changing the date of UC roll out and as a consequence it was difficult to collate certain information. What the Council had done was use its Discretionary Housing Payment to help sustain tenancies and help avoid homelessness and this was aided by having good relationships with the Registered Providers. The Director of Homelessness added that the Council was undertaking a homelessness prevention

pilot in Moss Side as this was an area of the City that had a high proportion of private rented accommodation and UC claimants to test out what could be done to prevent entry into the homelessness system.

The Committee was advised it was the understanding of Officers that Landlords could apply for a direct payment when rental arrears reached a certain level, but this required Landlords to be engaged with their tenants. The Director of Customer Services and Transactions agreed to speak to Registered Providers for more information on this and provide an update to Committee.

## **Decisions**

The Committee

- (1) Notes the report;
- (2) Requests that the Director of Customer Services and Transactions contacts Registered Providers for more information on how they can maximise direct rental payments for those tenants on UC; and
- (3) Requests that all Members of the Council be provided with copies of the report for information.

### **RGSC/19/46 Discounting compensation payments for Windrush failings for the national Housing Benefit calculation**

The Committee considered a report of the City Treasurer, which provided Members with the proposal to use the Council's discretion under section 13A (1) (c) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 to reduce the Council Tax liabilities for those individuals receiving payments from the Windrush Compensation Scheme from the Home Office.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- DWP advice was that compensation payments made by the Home Office under the Windrush Compensation Scheme (WCS) and the Windrush Exceptional Payments Scheme should be disregarded for Housing Benefit purposes on an extra-statutory basis with the agreement of HM Treasury;
- Any payments made to claimants in respect of the WCS should be disregarded for the purposes of income or capital calculations indefinitely;
- The Council's current Council Tax Support (CTS) scheme did not include
- provision to disregard compensation payments from the WCS. This meant that beneficiaries of the WCS could lose some or all entitlement to Council Tax Support because of the compensation they receive;
- It was therefore appropriate that in this situation, scheme changes were made to ensure that the CTS scheme aligned to the new approach determined for the assessment of Housing Benefit.

The report would also be considered by the Executive at its meeting on the 11 September 2019



The Committee unanimously supported the proposals contained within the report and suggested that local MP's be made aware of the proposed changes to the Council's CTSS as it was felt that it would be MP's who would be contacted in terms of Windrush complaints.

## Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Endorses the recommendation to the Executive as detailed below:-
  - That the Executive is asked to approve the proposal to reduce the liability of a liable person for Council Tax under section 13 A (1) (c) of the Local Government Finance Act for people receiving payments from the Windrush Compensation Scheme.
- (2) Requests that the Executive instruct officers to share the proposal, once approved, with Manchester MP's so that they are aware of the changes.

## RGSC/19/47 Overview Report

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit, responses to previous recommendations. An item for information was included in the report which provided details of the progress made against motions passed by Full Council in the last 12 months.

Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- Responses to the outstanding recommendations should be provided as soon as possible;
- Further information was requested on the following Register of Key Decisions entries:-
  - Carbon Reduction Programme (2017/06/30C);
  - Manchester Active Annual Contract Renewal 2020 (2019/04/02B);
  - House of Sport (2019/07/26A); and
- Clarification was sought as to whether the Executive was required to give consideration to motions once passed by Full Council

The City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive) gave a commitment to ensure response to outstanding recommendations were provided before the Committee next met.

The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources advised that there was no requirement for the Executive to give consideration to each motion once passed by full Council and the only instance where this would happen would be if there was an ask of the Executive to undertake a course of action which fell within the functions of the Executive. The City Solicitor added the Council motions tracker set out the progress made against motions from the point of view of Officers. It was acknowledged that as Council motions were inherently political by their very nature, it

would not be appropriate that the tracker detailed a reflection of the political elements of any motions.

The Chair proposed that the Committee received a further update on the progress made with Council motions in six months time.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes that updates will be provided on the outstanding recommendations before the next meeting;
- (2) Agrees to receive an update on the progress of motions passed at Full Council in six months time; and
- (3) Agrees the work programme for future meetings

## **RGSC/19/48 Domestic Violence and Abuse (DV&A) Review (Part A)**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) and the Director of Homelessness, which set out plans for developing and delivering a strategic review into Domestic Violence and Abuse (DV&A) services, and the current procurement being undertaken to support this work.

The Director of Homelessness outlined the main point and themes within the report.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- It was commented that not all Domestic Violence (DV) incidents were necessarily reported;
- Did the Council have a Domestic Violence strategy and if so what were the KPI's;
- Was there equitability in funding and allocated resources allocate to support vulnerable communities, such as LGBT and BAME;
- Decisions around the spend on domestic violence should not be unduly influenced by the desire to avoid the escalating cost of homelessness;
- Clarification was sought as to what was meant by the need for the Council to adopt an ethnographic approach in building a case for change;
- What had been the impact of the loss of supported accommodation which had been brought about due to austerity measures;
- Were people making themselves 'intentionally homeless' when they were actually fleeing DV, and what was being done to mitigate the problems associated with this for those individuals;
- Was there a risk of conflict between the aim in preventing homelessness and the need to help individuals get away from risks of DV;
- Further information was sought on re-locating individuals who had been subject to DV outside of the City and the Greater Manchester region and where there were instances of this, did the Council's outreach workers visit these victims;
- When was it expected that the strategy review would be fully scoped, what were the time scales for starting and finishing;

- There was concern that if it was intended that the strategic review was to keep within the existing financial envelope it was difficult to see what services could be provided that would be significantly better than those currently provided;
- What was the cost of the strategic review and had this been factored into the existing financial envelope; and
- There was a need to be cognisant of the fall in provision and the use of alternative forms of accommodation by those fleeing DV which were often not suitable and presented additional risks to those individuals.

The Director of Homelessness advised that the report set out some of the provision that existed for LGBT and BAME communities. In terms of cases of DV, it was acknowledged that the numbers reported did not necessarily represent the total number of cases that existed and this could be reflected by peoples trust in the Police or local circumstances and a point of the review was to try and get a handle on the extent of DV at a community level so that funding could be distributed equitably.

It was explained that an ethnographic approach required the Council to be open minded and set aside assumptions it may have as to what it thought constituted domestic abuse and instead it needed to build its commissioning strategy on actual evidence as opposed to what it thought was needed.

The Director of Homelessness commented that the loss of any form of supported housing was a tragedy in homelessness prevention terms. Whilst it was important to develop and ensure that there was the capacity available for people to stay as long as they needed to stay in supported accommodation, it was also important to ensure that they were able to move when they were willing to without putting an artificial limit on the length of time someone could stay in supported accommodation. He reported that instances where individuals who were making themselves intentionally homeless due to DV should be exceptionally rare. In a wider sense, there was a need for earlier intervention in order to prevent people getting to the point of presenting as homeless. It was also reported that there shouldn't be a risk of conflict between preventing homelessness and the need to help individuals get away from risks of DV but this would be dependent on the Council's approach. It needed to be recognised that if services were developed based on people's needs and were focussed on outcomes it would be more cost effective for the Council to deliver these services and this was the approach being taken with the review.

The Committee was informed that the Council where necessary, did commission temporary dispersal units outside of Manchester and Greater Manchester if it was in the best interests of an individual's safety and this would be part of any future commissioning process. It was also reported that everyone who was placed in dispersed accommodation had access to a link/support worker who would be able to provide specialist support. He agreed to provide the Committee with information on how quickly this support was accessible by individuals placed in dispersed accommodation.

The Director of Homelessness advised that he did not have the detail to hand in terms of when it was expected that strategy review would be fully scoped but gave a commitment to provide this information to the Committee. There was no named

individual leading on it, although it fell within his purview. In terms of the budget, the review would be working to the existing financial envelope across all the services.

The City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive) advised that this review was no different to any other service area in the Council. As the Council was constrained by the resources it had available, any service review would need to be undertaken within the existing financial envelope available. Any particular pressures or issues would be picked up as part of the medium term financial planning process. The Director of Homelessness advised that he would provide information on the cost of the review and projected time scale to Members.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report; and
- (2) Requests that the Director of Homelessness provides Members with information on:-
  - How quickly support was accessible by individuals placed in dispersed accommodation;
  - When the strategic review was intended to be fully scoped; and
  - The projected timescale for the strategic review to be completed and anticipated costs.

## **RGSC/19/49 Exclusion of the Press and Public**

### **Decision**

To exclude the public during consideration of the following items which involved consideration of exempt information relating to the financial or business affairs of particular persons and public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information

## **RGSC/19/50 Domestic Violence and Abuse (DV&A) Review (Part B)**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) and the Director of Homelessness, which provided contract information and contract values in relation to current Domestic Violence and Abuse (DV&A) services procured by the Council.

The Director of Homelessness referred to the main points and themes within the report and answered questions from the Committee.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Recommends that the Deputy Leader (Councillor S Murphy) and Officers look to ensure the continuation of all Domestic Violence and Abuse services until the strategic review has concluded, including but not limited to those services

where funding is sourced from other agencies and is due to expire in March 2020;

- (2) Recommends that whilst the Committee is cognisant of budgetary pressures, the Deputy Leader (Councillor S Murphy) and Officers undertaking the review do not restrict the review to its current financial envelope;
- (3) Recommends that Officers take on board the concerns of the committee in relation to the delivery of specialised commissioned services; and
- (4) Requests that Members be provided with an update that will provide information on:-
  - When the review will commence and conclude;
  - Who will be involved in the review; and
  - The budget provision afforded to the review

## **Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 17 July 2019**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Stone – in the Chair

Councillors Alijah, Cooley, T Judge, Kilpatrick, Lovecy, McHale, Reeves, Reid, Sadler and Wilson

#### Co-opted Voting Members:

Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative

Ms Z Stepan, Parent Governor Representative

#### Co-opted Non Voting Members:

Mr L Duffy, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools

#### **Apologies:**

Councillors Sameem Ali and Hewitson

Mr A Arogundade, Parent Governor Representative

Mrs J Miles, Representative of the Diocese of Salford

### **CYP/19/26 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2019.

### **CYP/19/27 Update on the Youth Justice Service**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which focused on the work and progress that had been made against the action plan arising from the Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Prisons (HMIP) Inspection of Manchester's Youth Justice Service undertaken in November 2018.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Progress on the HMIP Action Plan;
- An update on Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) in Youth Justice;
- Review of the Youth Justice Service; and
- Quality of Practice.

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

- To welcome the report and note that it would be useful to receive anonymised case studies;

- What provision there was for children with mental health issues;
- Of the 61 children known to Youth Justice who had an Education Health and Care Plan (EHCP) how many already had this in place before they entered the Youth Justice system;
- That Unconscious Bias training should be extended to all the staff, not just the Case Managers, and also to other organisations involved in Youth Justice such as Greater Manchester Police (GMP);
- What was happening at a Greater Manchester and wider level in this area; and
- To request to visit the Youth Justice Service at one of its current premises.

The Head of Youth Justice informed Members that there were three Children and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS) workers embedded in the Youth Justice Service who worked alongside the Case Managers and all cases where a child had or was suspected to have mental health issues were referred to them. She reported that more children were now entering the Youth Justice system with an EHCP already in place and that she could provide the figures on this after the meeting.

The Head of Youth Justice reported that, after a small number of staff had attended Unconscious Bias training and provided positive feedback on it, it had been agreed to roll this out to all Case Managers; however, she agreed that it should be rolled out to all staff. The Deputy Leader advised Members that he would raise the issue of addressing unconscious bias with GMP. He informed Members that conversations were taking place with the Department of Justice on devolution of some areas of the justice system and he suggested that the Committee could look at this and the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA)'s role in relation to Youth Justice in a future report.

### **Decisions**

1. To request an update report in 12 months' time to include information on the issues that Members have raised at today's meeting, including children with SEND and Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) children in the Youth Justice system and for this report to include anonymised case studies.
2. To note that the Head of Youth Justice will provide the figures on how many of the children in the Youth Justice system with an EHCP had one at the time they entered the Youth Justice system.
3. To arrange a visit for Members of the Committee to one of Youth Justice Services' premises.

### **CYP/19/28 Raising Standards of Practice in Children's Social Care**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided an overview of the work undertaken in regards to raising standards of practice in Children's Social Care.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Recruitment and retention of social work staff;
- The use of the Signs of Safety model across Children's Services;
- Learning and development;
- The Quality Assurance and Performance Improvement Framework; and
- Priorities for the year ahead.

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

- To recognise the progress made in recent years;
- Retention rates, including longer-term retention rates for those who had entered social work through a variety of methods such as the Frontline programme;
- Whether the social prescribing model could be used in Children's Services; and
- Request for information on the size of social work caseloads and the timeliness of allocation and assessments.

The Strategic Lead for Safeguarding and Practice Improvement reported that about 50% of the people who had undertaken the Step Up to Social Work course in Manchester stayed on as social workers for Manchester City Council and there was a range of reasons why the others did not, including that they returned to their home towns and pursued their social work careers there. The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services reported that the Council was now in a reasonably strong position in terms of the stability of its social work workforce. He advised Members that, while some turnover was natural, it was important to keep people in the profession as experience was critical.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools advised Members that, although social prescribing was primarily related to adult health services, there were similarities with the approach being taken to delivering children's services in a locality, which involved working with health and other partners and looking holistically at a family's circumstances.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services reported that information on caseloads was included in the proxy indicator reports which were submitted to the Committee on a quarterly basis. He informed Members that social work staff in their first year of practice were allocated approximately 15 children and that qualified social workers had an average caseload of approximately 17.3. He outlined how caseloads levels and the timeliness of allocation and assessment were monitored by senior managers within Children's Services, while emphasising that the service was now focusing on quality of practice, not just on compliance. The Strategic Lead for Safeguarding and Practice Improvement advised Members that the complexity of cases, not just the number allocated to each social worker, was important.

## **Decision**

To note that the Committee will continue to monitor the issues discussed through future reports.



## **CYP/19/29 Delivering Children's Services in a Locality**

The Committee received a presentation of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided an overview of the delivery of Children's Services through a locality approach.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the presentation which included:

- The Children's Locality Model;
- The underpinning principles;
- The intended outcomes and impacts;
- Locality leadership;
- The programme outline;
- Workstreams and milestones;
- The emerging impact;
- Upcoming priorities; and
- Challenges.

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

- Request for examples of how locality working in partnership with other agencies, such as health services, could address a range of issues, such as Foetal Alcohol Syndrome and safely preventing children from becoming looked after by the local authority;
- Recognising that locality boundaries were not a straight-forward issue, for example, because children attending a school within a particular locality could live within other neighbouring localities and how this was being addressed;
- That the findings from the Local Government Association (LGA) Peer Challenge on Child Sexual Exploitation, which were appended in full to the Overview Report, were encouraging, while recognising that they also identified areas for further development;
- To ask for further information on the implementation of the new social care ICT system, Liquid Logic; and
- To request that the presentation slides be shared with all Elected Members along with a covering note, explaining the context.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services informed Members about the role health services, such as midwifery, could play in enabling the identification of issues and intervention at the earliest stage. He cited a current initiative relating to pregnant women who had had a number of children removed from their care in the past, identifying at the earliest stage that there was a potential risk of this happening again and starting to work with the mother as early as possible to reduce the risk of the new baby needing to be taken into care.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools emphasised that boundaries were porous, as families could live in one area while accessing services across boundary

lines, and what was important was that families received the right support for them in the most appropriate place, which could be through a school or a GP's surgery.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services reported that all Elected Members would be briefed on the new ICT system. He informed Members that information was being migrated to the new system and that from 22 July 2019 the new system would be live.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools reported that, following a session for all Elected Members on corporate parenting and Regulation 44 visitors, some Members had requested a session on wider children's services issues. He suggested that, when the presentation slides were shared with all Elected Members, information on this session could also be included.

### **Decision**

To request that the presentation slides be shared with all Elected Members, along with a covering note explaining the context, and that information on the session on children's services for all Members also be included.

### **CYP/19/30 Delivering the Our Manchester Strategy**

The Committee received a report of the Executive Member for Children and Schools which provided an overview of work undertaken and progress towards the delivery of the Council's priorities as set out in the Our Manchester Strategy for those areas within his portfolio.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- The Council's Children's Services workforce;
- Leaving Care Service;
- Improvements in Children's Services;
- Promoting Inclusion and Preventing Exclusion;
- Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND);
- Poverty and homelessness;
- Serious youth violence; and
- The budget.

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

- The transition from children's health services to adult health services, particularly for vulnerable young people; and
- What progress had been made following the Council motion to end intentional homelessness for care-experienced young people.

The Chair reported that he had discussed the transition from children's to adult health services, particularly in relation to mental health services, with the Chair of the Health Scrutiny Committee, which was planning to scrutinise this area. The Executive Member for Children and Schools acknowledged that young people aged 18 and

over could still be vulnerable, for example, if they had health issues or were at risk of criminal or sexual exploitation and emphasised the importance of working with partner organisations and adult social services to address these issues. He informed Members that the Council already had practices in place so that care-experienced young people were not classed as intentionally homeless and denied support; however, he reported that the motion was important in establishing this as an explicit Council policy.

### **Decision**

To thank the Executive Member for Children and Schools for his report.

### **CYP/19/31 Overview Report**

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

The Chair commented on the motion which had been agreed at the Full Council meeting on 10 July 2019, declaring a Climate Emergency, and informed Members that he would be discussing with officers in Children's Services how they would take this forward.

### **Decision**

To note the report and agree the work programme.

## **Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 4 September 2019**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Stone – in the Chair

Councillors Sameem Ali, Hewitson, T Judge, Kilpatrick, Lovecy, Reeves, Reid, Sadler and Wilson

#### Co-opted Voting Members:

Ms Z Stepan, Parent Governor Representative

#### Co-opted Non Voting Members:

Mr L Duffy, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools

Julia Stephens-Row, Former Independent Chair of Manchester Safeguarding Children Board (MSCB)

Superintendent Rebecca Boyce, Greater Manchester Police (GMP)

Nicola Marsden, Assistant Director, Children's Community Health Services

Jenny Lewis, Head of Health Visiting, Central Locality Area

#### **Apologies:**

Councillors Alijah, Cooley and Madeleine Monaghan

Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative

Mr A Arogundade, Parent Governor Representative

Mrs J Miles, Representative of the Diocese of Salford

### **CYP/19/32 Minutes**

A Member updated the Committee about the visit which had which been arranged to the South Youth Justice Office, as requested at the 17 July meeting. She reported that the Members who had attended the visit had been very impressed and felt that the service had made progress over the last few years. She informed Members that staff listened to the young people and used a range of interventions, with the focus on enabling them to be able to engage effectively with adults and organisations, give them identity and a sense of purpose and get them onto a different pathway. She expressed concern that the caseloads appeared to be quite high for some teams. She also highlighted conversations that had taken place about child criminal exploitation and the need to ensure that those involved in exploiting young people were not able to visit them when they were in custody. She recommended that the Committee visit Wetherby Young Offenders Institute (YOI) and Barton Moss Secure Care Centre.

#### **Decisions**

1. To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 17 July 2019.
2. To arrange a visit for Members to Wetherby Young Offenders Institute (YOI)

and Barton Moss Secure Care Centre and to note that the former will take place once the new governor is embedded in their role.

### **CYP/19/33 Annual Report of Manchester Safeguarding Children Board April 2018 – March 2019**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services and Julia Stephens-Row, the former Independent Chair of Manchester Safeguarding Children Board (MSCB) which provided an overview of the MSCB Annual Report for the period from April 2018 - March 2019. The full report was appended.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Background information;
- Business priorities; and
- Future challenges and improvement.

Julia Stephens-Row informed the Committee that the report would be submitted to the Health and Wellbeing Board at the end of October and that the Committee could provide its comments for that meeting.

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

- That this was a good, comprehensive report;
- To ask whether there had been any prosecutions in Manchester in relation to Female Genital Mutilation (FGM);
- Work to address neglect and child obesity;
- The importance of partnership working, particularly in relation to tackling "county lines" (where vulnerable young people from the city were exploited by criminal gangs to transport and sell drugs in other areas), given the way this crossed borders into other local authority and police areas;
- The importance of consistent, effective training for teachers and other professionals on recognising signs of neglect or other safeguarding concerns; and
- The work of the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO), who managed allegations against adults who worked with children.

Julia Stephens-Row informed Members that there had only been one successful prosecution for FGM in the country, which had not been in Manchester. She reported that she had attended a conference on FGM where the North West Chief Crown Prosecutor had outlined the challenges in pursuing prosecutions for FGM but that she had been reassured that the Crown Prosecution Service would pursue prosecutions as necessary. She advised Members that, in her view, the key focus of work in this area, was to encourage women and girls to come forward and ensure that they were supported and protected.

Julia Stephens-Row reported that the MSCB had refreshed the Neglect Strategy and was continuing to fully roll-out the use of the neglect tool, which had already been

used in a number of cases. She informed Members about a range of work to address child obesity, primarily lead by the Population Health Team. She advised Members that this included a refresh of the Obesity Strategy which linked into the MSCB's Neglect Strategy. The Strategic Head of Early Help reported that early intervention was the best approach to tackling obesity so, in addition to learning from serious cases, work was taking place to reduce obesity through the Early Help Offer.

Julia Stephens-Row reported that work to address county lines required good links between organisations across the country as young people were being moved across borders. The Strategic Head of Early Help informed Members about the 'Trapped' campaign against child criminal exploitation and outlined some of the work taking place to address this problem through policies, training and complex safeguarding operations. She reported that it had been recognised that young people going missing from home was a significant risk factor so the established processes for dealing with children who went missing from home were now being used to enable early identification and intervention. The Executive Member for Children and Schools recommended that the 'Trapped' video be circulated to Members of the Committee, to which the Chair agreed.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services informed Members about the work of the Education Safeguarding team and how they worked with clusters of schools. He offered to provide further information on this in a future report. The Executive Member for Children and Education Services commented that partnership working and a change of culture were central to a lot of the issues raised during this item and suggested that, when the Committee received future reports on locality working and safeguarding arrangements, officers should include more information on these aspects.

Julia Stephens-Row reported that work had been done to raise the profile of the LADO role, although some organisations were better than others at referring cases. She informed Members that the LADO provided advice to organisations on dealing with allegations and that not all cases progressed to investigations.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools and the Chair thanked Julia Stephens-Row for her work as the Independent Chair of the MSCB.

## **Decisions**

1. To note the publication of the Manchester Safeguarding Children Board (MSCB) Annual report 2018–2019.
2. To recognise the need to promote the importance of safeguarding of children and young people across the Council and in the services that are commissioned ensuring that safeguarding is at the heart of all that is delivered.
3. To request that the 'Trapped' video be circulated to Members of the Committee.

4. To request that an extract of the minutes for this item be provided to the Health and Wellbeing Board when they discuss this report.

### **CYP/19/34 Child Sexual Exploitation**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided the context to the Local Government Association (LGA) Peer Review on Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE) and an update on progress that had been made against areas identified for further development.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Background information, including the independent assurance exercise, commissioned by the Greater Manchester Mayor, to explore the current and future delivery models across the region in response to CSE, which had yet to publish its findings;
- Findings of the LGA Peer Challenge; and
- Progress since and in response to LGA Peer Challenge findings.

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

- That the publication of the Greater Manchester findings on CSE had been delayed and how this was impacting on the work;
- Whether the practices referred to in the report under section 5 were working well; and
- Record-keeping, including how the implementation of the new case management system Liquid Logic was progressing.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services informed the Committee that it was not yet known when the Greater Manchester report would be published. He advised that this was a retrospective review of how CSE had been dealt with 15 years ago; however, regardless of when this was published, the Council, GMP and partner agencies would continue to work together to address current CSE. He outlined how current practice on CSE was reviewed and challenged through multi-agency safeguarding audits via MSCB, through Operation Phoenix peer support and challenge and through ad hoc peer challenges, such as the recent LGA Peer Challenge. He also recognised the role of scrutiny in challenging the work on CSE.

The Strategic Head of Early Help informed Members that the introduction of the Achieving Change Together Model and Clinical Psychology Case Formulation had improved understanding of young people, their vulnerabilities and resilience and different areas of their lives. She reported that the Peer Challenge findings had emphasised the importance of the balance between building relationships with young people and ensuring effective plans were put in place and that mechanisms such as My Safety Planning meetings were being used to achieve this.

Superintendent Rebecca Boyce from GMP informed Members about an ongoing investigation into CSE involving multiple offenders and multiple victims, reporting that this had recently resulted in the successful prosecution of four offenders. She

reported that this had been achieved through multi-agency working via the Complex Safeguarding Hub. The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services reported that practice was now intelligence-led rather than complaint-led, which had been the historical approach. He suggested that Members visit the Complex Safeguarding Hub, to which the Chair agreed.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services informed Members that the implementation of Liquid Logic had been successful but that moving to a new system did present some challenges which the Deputy Director of Children's Services was working with staff to resolve. He advised the Committee that this would have some impact on data reporting over the next few months and that Ofsted had been informed of this. He suggested that the Committee receive a report on this at its next meeting.

### **Decisions**

1. To receive a further update report, including the impact of the identified actions within the annual Complex Safeguarding Report 2019/20.
2. To request that a visit to the Complex Safeguarding Hub be arranged for Committee Members.

### **CYP/19/35 Early Years Service**

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided an overview of the Early Years Offer in the city and the outcomes from the Early Years Delivery Model (EYDM) and the Healthy Child Programme.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Strategic Priorities and Governance Arrangements;
- The EYDM;
- The Use of the Ages and Stages Questionnaire 3 (ASQ3) in the Model;
- The Sure Start Core Purpose;
- The Healthy Child Programme;
- Health Visitor pressures impacting on performance;
- ASQ3 Developmental Review outcomes;
- Communication and Language Pathway;
- Support for parenting; and
- Summary of impact.

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

- The importance of Early Years for a child's brain development and school readiness;
- What progress was being made in recruiting to Health Visitor roles, following the additional funding secured from Manchester Health and Care



Commissioning (MHCC) to provide some additional Health Visitor training places;

- The uptake of the offer of the free childcare places for two and three-year-olds; and
- Concern about the number of children with a delay in the development of their language skills.

Nicola Marsden, Assistant Director of Children's Community Health Services, reported that stages one to five of the eight-stage delivery model had been rolled out and that the contacts made were broadly in line with the national picture. She outlined the contacts made with and support available to mothers and their children under the age of five. She advised Members that recruiting Health Visitors was more of an issue than funding for posts.

Jenny Lewis and the Strategic Lead (Children and Young People's Population Health) outlined the work to recruit to Health Visitor posts and investment in Health Visitor training. The Strategic Lead reported that, to become a Health Visitor, candidates needed to be a qualified nurse and then undertake a one-year training programme. She reported that increasing the starting salary for trainees had led to an increase in high quality applicants as nurses had previously been deterred from undertaking the training as it had meant taking a pay cut.

The Early Years Strategic Lead reported that a recent childcare sufficiency audit had shown that there were enough childcare places across the city as a whole but that some areas had a small shortfall and that the Council was working with providers and agencies to address this. She informed Members that there had been a national decrease in the take-up of the two-year-old childcare offer, primarily due to changes in the benefit system, but that in Manchester the take-up of places was at 70%. She advised Members that take-up of the three-year-old offer was at 96% in Manchester.

The Strategic Head of Early Help informed Members that targeted work was taking place to help parents to develop their child's language skills. Nicola Marsden reported that children who required additional support in speech and language development were identified at the two-year-old review and were referred to commissioned services.

## **Decisions**

1. To request a report in respect of the outcome and findings from the Local Government Association Peer Challenge in the Early Years and the Quality Assurance arrangements.
2. To support the Health Visitor requirement for additional staffing and for the pay for training to become a Health Visitor to be commensurate with other nursing roles.
3. To request that further information on take-up of the two-year-old offer be incorporated into a future report.

4. To note that the Ofsted Subgroup would also be considering reports and carrying out visits in relation to Early Years, and that this included all Early Years settings, including childminders.

#### **CYP/19/36 Update on National School Absence 2017/18 and Autumn Term 2018/19, Manchester's Provisional Absence Data for HT1-5 2018/19 and School Attendance Statutory Action**

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education which provided an update on school absence for the academic year 2017/18 comparing Manchester's school absence data with national data. It also reported on the national absence data for the autumn term 2018/19 for primary and secondary schools and Manchester's provisional school absence data for half terms one to five in 2018/19.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:

- Overall absence data;
- Persistent absence data;
- Absence data for pupils with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND);
- Absence data broken down by other pupil characteristics;
- School attendance statutory action; and
- Key priorities.

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

- To welcome this report and recognise the hard work of all involved in achieving these figures, which compared favourably with other Greater Manchester authorities, statistical neighbours and the national average;
- To thank Tracey Dunn, Lead for School Attendance and Education Other than at School (EOTAS), who was leaving the Council, for her work in this area;
- How was the education of children recorded as being home educated monitored; and
- Concern that rewards for good attendance could disadvantage pupils with low attendance due to medical conditions.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools informed Members of the role the Early Help Hubs were playing in helping families to improve school attendance. The Lead for School Attendance and EOTAS reported that partnership working between the School Attendance Team and the Early Help Hubs had significantly reduced the number of parents being prosecuted over their child's attendance, while achieving improvements in their attendance.

The Head of Schools Quality Assurance and Strategic Lead SEND reported that the Council had always had a robust approach to ensuring that children in Elective Home Education (EHE) were safe and receiving a suitable education. She advised Members that the national government had recently strengthened its stance and that the Council was reviewing its policy in light of the government's new guidance.

The Lead for School Attendance and EOTAS informed the Committee that schools were encouraged to recognise pupils who had made progress in improving their attendance, not just those who had 100% attendance.

**Decision**

To request that the Committee receive a report on Elective Home Education (EHE) once the Council's policy has been updated in light of the government's guidance.

**CYP/19/37 Overview Report**

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

**Decision**

To note the report and agree the work programme.

## Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee

### Minutes of the meeting held on 17 July 2019

#### Present:

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair  
Councillors Azra Ali, Appleby, Butt, Flanagan, Jeavons, Kilpatrick, Lynch, Sadler, Whiston, White and Wright

Councillor S Murphy, Deputy Leader  
Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods  
Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport  
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools  
Councillor Midgley, Assistant Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration  
Jonny Sadler, Programme Director Manchester Climate Change Agency  
Chris Paul, Citizen of Manchester  
Callum, Citizen of Manchester, Climate Emergency Manchester  
Louise Sheridan, Bentley House Estate Tenant and Resident Association

**Apologies:** Councillors Harland, Hassan, Hughes and Lyons

#### **NESC/19/24          Urgent Business**

The Chair introduced the highways improvements to Great Ancoats Street as an item of urgent business, stating that she had been approached by a number of Members and concerned residents regarding the scheme and the provision of cycle lanes within the design.

Chris Paul addressed the Committee and stated that in his view the scheme was not in keeping with the Our Manchester Approach and was contrary to existing policies regarding emission reductions, climate change, health and the promotion of alternative transport. He stated that he felt that the design was constructed around the need of car users and was not logical. He stated that other countries had successfully delivered cycling schemes in consultation with communities and all road users and provided examples of where this had been achieved. He stated that he believed that the consultation had been unsatisfactory and more citizen involvement and participation in the design of such schemes was required.

The Committee then heard from Callum, Climate Emergency Manchester. He said that the scheme would maintain the current levels of car use and was not appropriate and contrary to the Climate Emergency that had been recently adopted by Council.

A Member commented that he welcomed the spend and investment in the highways and the improvements to the footpaths, green planting and road crossings that had been included in the design, however he expressed concern on the level of consultation with local residents.

A Member commented that the scheme should be reviewed in light of the Climate Emergency that had been adopted by Council at their meeting of 10 July 2019.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport responded by stating that she recognised that people did care about safe cycling and made reference to the significant investment of new cycling infrastructure across the city and in particular in the area itself. She commented that the scheme had started to be delivered, stating that Great Ancoats was an extremely busy route and the scheme would deliver twelve new safer crossings for pedestrians and cyclists and deliver an improved and safer connectivity to the city centre for residents in Ancoats. In addition, the scheme would deliver physical improvements, such as wider pavements, tree planting and reduced noise from vehicles as a result of new materials used in the highway.

She stated that the existing cycle lane was a line of paint 250m long and inefficient and the two parallel cycle corridors was an enhanced offer to cyclists. She also said that Great Ancoats Street is not on the Bee Network map.

In regard to the issue of consultations she stated that she always sought opportunities to review and improve how these were delivered, commenting on the recent consultation exercise in relation to the Chorlton cycle route where additional events had been facilitated, walkabouts with Councillors and businesses organised and the consultation period extended.

In response to a question from a Member, the Director of Operations Highways confirmed that the funding deadlines or alternative funding did not influence the final design and the scheme would be completed by February 2021.

The Chair commented that the Our Manchester approach needed to be applied to all consultations with local residents and ward Members involved. In response to Members comments regarding the need to ensure that similar large scale schemes were subject to scrutiny at an earlier stage to allow Members to adequately scrutinise proposals, the Chair said she would look into how this could be scheduled into the Committee's work programme.

A Member commented that he did not want to block the development as there were a number of positive proposals within the scheme. He recommended that a consultation exercise on the scheme be undertaken over the summer period that included a number of drop in events organised for local residents, businesses, cycle users and local Members, and that any recommendations from local Members following the consultation exercise should then be relayed to the Chair of the Committee, and as long as the Chair was satisfied that the consultation had taken place the Committee should accept her recommendations.

The Chair stated that the Committee could not put the development on hold as it was not a decision for the Committee and she supported the recommendation proposed by the Member, noting that it would be an opportunity to provide information to the public.

## **Decision**

To recommend that a consultation exercise on the scheme be undertaken over the summer period that included a number of drop in events organised for local

residents, businesses, cycle users and local Members, and that any recommendations from local Members following the consultation exercise should then be relayed to the Chair of the Committee, and as long as the Chair was satisfied that the consultation had taken place the Committee should accept her recommendations.

### **NESC/19/25            Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2019 were submitted for approval as an accurate record of the meeting. Councillor Razaq requested that his apologies be recorded.

### **Decisions**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2019 as a correct record subject to the above amendment.

### **NESC/19/26            Manchester Climate Change Annual Progress Report**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships Head of Local Planning and Infrastructure and the Manchester Climate Change Agency that provided an update on the progress that had been made towards the delivery of the existing 2020 targets for the City of Manchester as a whole and Manchester City Council.

The Strategic Lead Policy and Strategy referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- An update on the activity which was underway to develop new plans to ensure progress towards the new zero carbon 2038 targets;
- Information on the activity of the Manchester Climate Change Agency;
- An update on citywide progress to date, noting that to date the city has achieved a 5% reduction in carbon emissions since 2017, versus the 13% target;
- An update on Manchester City Council's emissions noting that the Council had committed to reducing its direct carbon emissions by 41% by 2019/2020 from a 2009/10 baseline;
- Data for the 2018/19 financial year showed that the Council's direct emissions had reduced by 48.1% since the 2009/10 baseline meaning that the 41% target had been achieved and surpassed a year ahead of schedule; and
- New plans for the Council and the City would be published in March 2020, noting that the Council would need to play a critical role in supporting the city as a whole to reach its zero carbon ambitions through a variety of roles and responsibilities.

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

- Noting the importance of this issue and recognising that the Council had declared a climate emergency;

- Would Council plans and policies be reviewed to take into consideration the Climate Emergency motion;
- Noting that some reductions could be attributed to external factors that had been imposed on the Council as a result of budget cuts; such as the loss of staff and subsequent building closures;
- Why was crowd funding used to finance the Youth Board within Manchester Climate Agency;
- Aviation emissions could not be ignored and more needed to be done to encourage journeys to and from the airport via public transport;
- More alternative transport should be provided across the city, noting that the tram service did not cover all of the city;
- An explanation was sought as to the reported Red, Amber and Green ratings;
- The Committee should establish a Subgroup to consider the issue of Climate Change on a regular basis in addition to regular reports to the Committee;
- The importance of engaging local residents in this agenda and to support this all Neighbourhood Officers should receive carbon literacy training as soon as possible; and
- The need to engage the business sector in this important area of work to deliver the ambitious targets.

The Strategic Lead Policy and Strategy said that policies and the plan would be reviewed in consideration of the recent Council motion including procurement policy. In regard to the Red, Amber and Green ratings that were referred to in Appendix 3 of the report, he said that these were officer decisions at present and a new action plan would be developed. He further stated in response to a question from a Member that the vehicles used by Biffa were emission compliant and the options for using electric vehicles were already being explored. Noting the comment from the Committee regarding the carbon emissions saved by buildings, he said that he acknowledged the impact of external factors such as national emissions factors, budget reductions and rationalisation of the Council's estate, however other factors, such as the refitting of Moss Side Leisure Centre had realised emissions savings. He further stated that discussions were currently ongoing with the HROD department to explore options for delivering the carbon literacy training to priority staff groups.

Mr Sadler commented that the funding and financial balance that the Member referred to was EU funding provided to the Agency as 'pre-financing', in advance of the delivery of activities over the five-years of the project. He added that the Manchester Climate Change Youth Board had proven to be successful in starting to reach and connect with young people across the city, and representing their views to decision-makers. However, that their capacity was limited and that the decision had been made to raise funding for a designated Youth Climate Action Champion. Fund raising was currently underway. Regarding Manchester's climate change targets he stated that the adoption of a carbon budget for the City that had been independently set by experts in the field of climate change was an important development, noting that the carbon budget of 15 million tonnes CO<sub>2</sub> for 2018-2100 was limited and could not be exceeded. He added that framing Manchester's climate change targets as a limited budget was more helpful than focusing on the end-date for achieving zero carbon. He stated that all citizens, organisations and partners were important to achieving this goal and invited all Members to lead on this within their communities and neighbourhoods to facilitate change and challenge. He set out that the Agency

were looking to engage with residents and organisations during 2019 to a) set out what Manchester needs to do to meet its targets b) to understand the work that is already underway and c) to understand the additional support that residents and organisations need to enable them to act.

The Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport commented that all citizens, businesses, schools, were collectively responsible for delivering this work as the Council alone could not deliver this, adding that the Council accounted for approximately 2% of the city's overall carbon footprint for the city as a whole. She acknowledged that the Airport was an important issue, stating that all ground services at Manchester Airport were carbon neutral. She said that the Council would continue to seek to influence and challenge the aviation industry and lobby national government regarding aviation emissions and would also work with the Tyndall Centre to understand the emissions from the airport as a percentage of the overall carbon budget for Manchester. She commented that whilst this was an important area of work it was important to recognise that aviation emissions nationally accounted for 2% of overall emissions.

The Chair stated that she supported the recommendation proposed by a Member to establish a Subgroup of the Committee to review and monitor the work related to Climate Change. She informed the Committee that she would consult with the Members to consider the best options for progressing this and report back to the Committee.

### **Decision**

1. The Committee recommend that a Subgroup of the Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee be established to review and monitor the work related to Climate Change.
2. The Committee recommend that the Chair of the Committee consult with the Member proposing the Subgroup to consider the best options for progressing this and report back to the Committee.

### **NESC/19/27            Mandatory Houses in Multiple Occupation Licensing update**

The Committee considered the report of the Strategic Director of Neighbourhoods that provided information on the approach taken to deliver the extension to mandatory licensing nine months after the scheme had been implemented.

The Strategic Lead, Community Safety, Compliance and Enforcement referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- Providing a background to Mandatory Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) Licensing, noting that in 2018 legislation was amended and now required properties let to 5 or more people from 2 or more households who share amenities (kitchens and bathrooms) to be licensed by the local authority;
- Information on the work to identify Licensable HMO properties;
- Engagement with Landlords;



- The impact of Landlord Licensing, noting that Pre-licensing inspections were carried out before a licence was issued and compliance inspections were then undertaken during the course of the licence to determine whether the conditions of the licence were continuing to be adhered to; and
- Noting that the Housing Compliance and Enforcement Team were working closely with Strategic Housing and the Executive Member for Housing to refresh the Private Rented Sector Strategy.

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

- Were there any intentions to extend Selective Licensing to other areas of the city;
- Were temporary accommodation properties that were HMO's inspected and subject to the same conditions;
- What was being done to improve the number of properties identified as HMO's, noting the number of visits undertaken compared to the numbers identified;
- Had the benefits that Selective Licensing was intended to bring to neighbourhoods been realised;
- How could residents report a suspected HMO; and
- Could the number of licensed HMO's be provided by ward.

The Strategic Lead, Community Safety, Compliance and Enforcement commented that a further, detailed report on Selective Licensing was scheduled for consideration by the Committee at their February meeting. She advised that this report would include the detailed specific information that had been requested, however she commented that initial observations from the Crumpsall pilot, which has been running the longest, were that the Selective Licensing scheme appears to have been successful with positive feedback from residents, the local neighbourhood team and Members, noting however that Selective Licensing is only one aspect of neighbourhood management. She advised that consideration would be given as to where any future focused schemes would be implemented.

The Strategic Lead, Community Safety, Compliance and Enforcement stated that information on the number of all licensed HMO properties was available and would be circulated to Members.

The Neighbourhood Manager, Environmental Health, Trading Standards and Housing informed the Committee that where temporary accommodation properties met the criteria for licensing as an HMO they were subject to HMO conditions and property inspections were done.

She stated that the initial exercise to identify properties that are now required to be licensed as HMOs had been done using desk top information which was available at the time. The intention is now to focus more on local intelligence and knowledge from a wider range of sources. A Member commented that there was a useful tool on the Council's website that allowed residents to check if a property had a licence and report any suspected non licensed properties.

The Neighbourhood Manager, Environmental Health, Trading Standards and Housing further advised that all HMO properties were inspected prior to a licence being issued and periodic inspections were carried out throughout the life of the

licence period. She commented that if there were any concerns a licence could be granted for a lesser period than five years, however the cost of the licence remained the same.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **NESC/19/28            Update on work to tackle counterfeit activity and environmental issues in the Strangeways area**

The Chair recommended that this item of business be deferred to the December meeting.

### **Decision**

To defer this item of business to the meeting of 4 December 2019.

### **NESC/19/29            Update on Homelessness and Housing (Cllr Flanagan in the Chair)**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Adult Services and The Strategic Director, Development that provided an update, subsequent to the report to Neighbourhoods and Scrutiny on the 6 March 2019, on the work that was taking place to tackle homelessness and rough sleeping in the City. This includes the work being progressed on helping the number of people sleeping rough access accommodation and support, emergency accommodation and temporary accommodation.

The Deputy Leader referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- Noting that across Manchester an increasing number of individuals and families were becoming homeless and were at greater risk of homelessness;
- The main reason for statutory homelessness was the loss of a tenancy in the private rented sector which had become the number one cause above domestic abuse;
- An update on the work that had been progressed to help those who were sleeping rough in the city;
- Describing the work undertaken to improve standards in temporary accommodation; and
- Describing the work that was progressing to prevent people from becoming homeless.

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

- Recognising that the increase in homelessness and rough sleeping was a direct result of austerity and welfare reform;

- Noting the report detailed a variety of positive work to respond to homeless people and rough sleepers;
- Was the reported funding from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) which would fund a Navigator Service for 12 months be used to support rough sleepers;
- When was the Navigator Service due to commence;
- What work was being done to support people who were victims of domestic violence;
- Welcoming the tailored Psychologically Informed Environment at Women's Direct Access;
- Was there a breakdown by characteristic of the number of presentations to the homelessness service due to domestic violence;
- What work was being undertaken across services to support families, especially those in dispersed accommodation;
- Noting that over the winter period to 18 March 2019, Manchester had 529 unique individuals referred to it through A Bed Every Night, and accommodated 377 unique individuals, what happened to the other 152 that were not accommodated;
- What support was offered to people who had been made homeless from the Private Rented Sector (PRS) and their only viable housing option would be to be to return to accommodation in the PRS;
- Noting the importance of prevention work, where would the two pilot schemes be delivered;
- Housing Act legislation should be used during inspections of temporary accommodation rather than Environmental Health Act powers;
- Could the audit report of temporary accommodation policies, procedures and provisions of support to families be shared with the Committee;
- The importance of humanising rough sleepers; and
- Did the Task and Targeting Group record equality data.

The Deputy Leader stated that there was a lot of work done to support the victims of domestic violence, however she stated that there was still more to be done and this was continually reviewed. She described that the Sanctuary Scheme had been developed to enable victims of domestic violence to remain living safely in their home via the installation of number of safety measures such as panic alarms. She described that work was also undertaken with perpetrators of domestic violence to address their offending behaviour through the Talk, Listen, Change service. She informed the Committee that the tendering of domestic violence service, that included specific services for BAME victims had been reported to the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee. She further confirmed that breakdown by characteristic of the number of presentations to the homelessness service due to domestic violence was recorded and would be shared with the Committee. She further stated that the project that was being progressed by the Greater Manchester Combined Authority's (GMCA), Mental Health and the Homelessness service for a psychologist to be placed at the Women's Direct Access Centre for a period of 2 year was specifically tailored to meet the often complex needs of the women accessing that service.

The Deputy Leader stated that the single most effective action the Government could take would be to review the Local Housing Allowance rates, adding that Manchester

had submitted evidence as part of the Local Governments Association campaign around this issue.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools informed the Committee of the work being delivered to support families and children who were homeless or threatened with homelessness as a result of domestic violence. He invited the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services to inform the Committee of the work of the strength based, Safer Together service that he stated had received a positive reception.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services described how this service was designed to improve practice and how services worked together with families where there was domestic abuse and concerns about children. It helped workers to partner with domestic abuse victims and engage with people who had committed domestic abuse to enhance the safety and wellbeing of children. He stated that Greater Manchester Police had collocated to work with Social Work teams to identify and intervene at an earlier stage if any concerns regarding domestic abuse were evident. He further described that Operation Compass alerted schools of any concerns so that the appropriate support could be offered to the child.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services further advised the Committee that bus passes were offered to enable children to travel to schools if placed in temporary displaced accommodation, however it was recognised how disruptive and detrimental this could be to a families and child's social and support network.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools described the importance of recognising the impact that homelessness and the threat of homelessness had on families and children. He reported that a third of all families that came into contact with the Early Help Teams experienced this and they worked to support them, worked with landlords and sign posted them to the most appropriate sources of support.

The Assistant Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration informed the Committee that she would be reviewing how a range of services worked together to deliver the best outcomes for people who were homeless or were at risk of becoming homeless. She said she had undertaken a number of visits to meet with teams and people accessing services to help identify where any gaps in service existed. She paid tribute to the hard work and commitment of the staff in the Floating Support Service.

The Director of Homelessness informed the Committee the difference in the numbers reported as being referred through A Bed Every Night and not accommodated could be explained because individuals refused accommodation or moved out of Manchester. In response to homeless people being rehoused within the PRS he stated that support staff would work with individuals to ensure any potential property was affordable and of good quality. He stated that the intention was to have the Navigator Service commence as soon as possible and that the two pilot areas for the prevention service were to be announced shortly and these would be based on the prevalence of PRS accommodation and prevalence of welfare reform, stating that

use of prevention methods with teams working at a neighbourhood level was important to reduce the numbers of people presenting as homeless and he made reference to the success of the Section 21 team in challenging notices that had been served on tenants. He further acknowledged the comment from the Member regarding the importance of humanising rough sleepers.

In response to the specific questions relating the Audit report and the Housing Act he advised that he would look into this before responding.

The Chair commented that he welcomed the report and the level of information provided. He stated that the Committee were of the opinion that the increase in homelessness and rough sleeping witnessed across Manchester was as a direct result of austerity and welfare reform and the Committee recognised the commitment from the Executive Members and officers to respond to this challenging issue.

The Chair recommended that a progress report be provided for consideration at the November meeting, and that the report included information about the levels of support offered to ex-service personnel accessing A Bed Every Night and the work with charitable organisations to sign post and support ex-service personnel. He further recommended that the Deputy Lord Mayor be invited to attend the meeting.

### **Decision**

1. To recommended that a progress report be provided for consideration at the November meeting, and that the report included information about the levels of support offered to ex-service personnel accessing A Bed Every Night and the work with charitable organisations to sign post and support ex-service personnel.
2. To recommended that Councillor T. Judge, Deputy Lord Mayor be invited to attend the November meeting.

[Councillor Igbon declared a prejudicial interest and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of this item and Councillor Azra Ali declared a personal and non prejudicial interest as she is employed by CGL Manchester and the Chair of Saheli Asian Women's Project.]

### **NESC/19/30            Delivering the Our Manchester Strategy - Executive Member for Neighbourhoods**

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Member for Neighbourhoods that provided an overview of work undertaken, and progress towards the delivery of the Council's priorities as set out in the Our Manchester strategy for those areas within the respective Executive Member's portfolio.

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

- The need to raise the standards of private hire taxis and hackney carriage drivers across all boroughs to ensure they met the same high standards as required in Manchester;

- Taxi Licensing conditions should be standardised across Greater Manchester;
- The need to lobby central government to ensure adequate subsidies were available to enable taxi drivers to scrap, upgrade or retrofit their vehicles if a Clean Air Zone was introduced;
- Welcoming the improved rates of recycling in apartment blocks, noting that Committee had provided a challenge to the Executive Member on this issue.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods stated that he valued the taxi trade commenting that they were responsible for public safety. He stated that Manchester was proud of the high standards required by the trade and noted that the deregulation of the trade had regrettably allowed operators licensed by other authorities with less rigorous standards to enter Manchester to ply their trade. He stated that work was ongoing at a GM level to consider this and to drive up standards across the boroughs.

In response to the implementation of any Clean Air Zone he said lobbying of Government would continue to ensure that adequate funding was available to both the taxi trade and other effected business to ensure they paid for an adequate scrappage scheme.

The Executive Member welcomed the comment regarding the increased rates of recycling and stated that thanks needed to be sent to all the officers, teams and operatives who had worked very hard, and continued to work hard in often challenging circumstances to deliver services on behalf of the residents of Manchester.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **NESC/19/31            Delivering the Our Manchester Strategy - Executive Member for the Environment, Planning and Transport**

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Member for the Environment, Planning and Transport that provided an overview of work undertaken, and progress towards the delivery of the Council's priorities as set out in the Our Manchester strategy for those areas within the respective Executive Member's portfolio.

Louise Sheridan, Bentley House Estate Tenant and Resident Association addressed the Committee and raised specific issues in relation to the Princess Road /Medlock Street development. The Executive Member said she would respond to the resident and the Ward Member on the issues raised outside of the meeting.

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

- Acknowledging the scale and challenge of the portfolio held;
- The frustration experienced in escalating highways issues; and
- Noting that the flow of traffic across the city was important for a successful economy.

The Chair informed the Committee that a new CRM system was due to be launched that should hopefully address the issue raised regarding escalating highways issues and that she would continue to work with Cllr Stogia to resolve any issues.

The Executive Member said that she enjoyed her role immensely and the challenge it presented and that she remained committed to delivering the best services on behalf of the residents of Manchester. She paid tribute to the hard work and commitment of her officers in delivering this work.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **NESC/19/32            Overview Report**

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

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report and approves the work programme.

## **Economy Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 18 July 2019**

#### **Present:**

Councillor H Priest (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Abdullatif, Green, Hacking, Hitchen, Noor, Raikes, Shilton Godwin,  
K Simcock and Stanton

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Leese, Leader  
Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader  
Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure  
Councillor Richards, Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration  
Councillor M Dar, Ward Member Ancoats and Beswick (ESC/19/31 only)  
Councillor Flanagan, Ward Member Miles Platting and Newton Heath (ESC/19/31 only)  
Councillor Taylor, Ward Member Ancoats and Beswick (ESC/19/31 only)

**Apologies:** Councillor Douglas and Johns

#### **ESC/19/29 Urgent Business**

The Chair introduced an item of urgent business which was in relation to the omission of the report in relation to Officers response to the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration's Affordable Housing proposals from the agenda, as this had been scheduled for consideration at this meeting

She invited the Director of Housing to provide a brief verbal update to the Committee.

The Director of Housing apologised that the report had not been completed in time for inclusion on the agenda for this meeting and advised that the report would be completed and submitted to the meeting of the Committee in September. He advised that the report will contain comprehensive responses to the proposals set out by the Executive Member.

#### **Decision**

The Committee notes that the report will be submitted to the Committee's meeting on 5 September 2019.

#### **ESC/19/30 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2019 were agreed as a correct record.



## **ESC/19/31 Eastlands Regeneration Framework update**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director – Growth and Development, which sought the Committee’s endorsement to the Executive’s approval of the Eastlands Regeneration Framework, following consultation with residents, businesses, landowners and other stakeholders.

The Leader referred to the main points and themes within the report, addressed the recent consultation undertaken by interested parties and also addressed the national press coverage in relation to the proposals. This included:-

- Although this was an updated Eastlands Regeneration Framework, it was not fundamentally different to what had previously been considered and agreed;
- An overview of the public consultation approach, with two specific matters that had drawn a significant interest –
  - the proposals within the Etihad Campus Commercial Zone Sub Area for a second large indoor arena; and
  - the proposals to bring forward a commercial led scheme – MXM – on Pollard Street, in and around the New Islington tram stop.
- In relation to the MXM proposal, the Framework did not propose any changes to what had previously been identified for the use of this brownfield site, other than a specific proposal had now been received which was consistent with the existing Framework;
- It was proposed that 50% of the land at Pollard Street would be green public space of high quality, including a linear park proposal.
- The MXM proposal would also create 2,500 jobs for the East Manchester area;
- The proposal for an Arena within the Etihad Campus area was consistent with the Framework for East Manchester going back over 20 years, as a key aim of the Framework (historically referred to as Sport City) had always been to deliver a large scale leisure provision;
- Any proposal for a large scale leisure provision on this site would be subject to a whole range of particular tests, including a significant ground transformation plan, a market analysis of sustainability;
- Clarification on how an expression of interest in a possible Arena had arisen and that there had been no planning application submitted for an indoor Arena within the Etihad Campus area; and
- Addressing misleading information contained within a leaflet from SMG Europe (current operators of Manchester Arena), which had been circulated to residents in East Manchester which had had impacted on the consultation responses.

The Chair of the Committee outlined and clarified the purpose and role of the Scrutiny Committee in considering the report, reaffirming that the Committee was not scrutinising a proposal for a new arena as no proposal had been received, but rather it would concern itself with the decision making process, looking at the Council’s consultation on the Framework, how it worked, the feedback and responses and recommendations to the Executive.

The Chair of the Committee invited Mr John Sharkey, Executive Vice President of European Operations for SMG Europe, to address the Committee on the proposals within the Framework. He set out the concerns SMG Europe had in relation to the

proposals within the Framework. The main concern being the inability for the Manchester market to adequately support two large seater arenas, which he advised had been supported by independent experts (Black, Grant Thornton and Oxford Economics), and the potential impact such a development would have on the existing Arena and other city centre businesses. He offered to share the findings from the independent experts with the Council or alternatively suggested that the Council undertook its own independent assessment before including the opportunity for a new 20,000 capacity Arena within the framework.

The Chair of the Committee then invited Councillor Flanagan (Ward Councillor for Miles Platting and Newton Heath), Councillor Taylor and Councillor M Dar (Ward Councillors for Ancoats and Beswick) to address the Committee with their views and comments on the proposed Framework. The key points referred to by the Ward Councillors included:-

- The regeneration of East Manchester was long overdue;
- Whilst the Council was required to maintain a neutral stance during any consultation, its position had been compromised by the misleading information contained within the information published by SMG, which potentially had a long term negative impact on the Council;
- Ward Councillors were disappointed that they had not been engaged with by SMG Europe prior to their canvassing of East Manchester residents;
- Whilst Ward Councillors would be supportive of a 21<sup>st</sup> century world class sport, leisure and recreational offer and the associated employment opportunities this would bring for East Manchester and its residents, they would not be supportive of any development at the Etihad Campus which would have a detrimental impact on congestion within their wards area;
- It was suggested that the Regeneration Framework needed to take into account the commitment the Council had recently made in tackling climate change and reducing carbon emissions;
- It was felt that Phillips Park should be included within the Regeneration Framework as it could be a key asset for the area;
- There was concern about any potential loss of green space as a result of the Pollard Street development and assurance was sought that the Council would take all necessary steps to ensure as much green space was maintained; and
- It was suggested that any development within the East Manchester area needed to be inclusive of local residents views and that they were given priority when it came to job creation and affordable homes in the area.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- The decision taken by Council to bring forward the target date to 2030 for zero carbon had major implications for this Framework and there needed to be detailed consideration around all aspects of how the Framework would be delivered, including the building of homes, energy use, the use of grey water and transport opportunities;
- As there had been a 20 year ambition to regenerate the East Manchester area, had there been any viability assessment undertaken to see if there was an appetite for a second internationally significant venue and, if so, what the possible implications on local businesses and trade would be;

- A Member expressed concern in relation to the potential “value loss” within the city centre if a new Arena was developed at the Eastlands campus due to its possible negative impact on the existing city centre provision and queried if any modelling had been conducted on what this would look like for businesses owners in the city centre;
- Clarity was sought as to what was referred to in the report as market driven as it appeared to be contradictory at points;
- How would the Council look to mitigate the negative publicity that has taken place so far;
- How much of the ambition within the Framework is a reflection of East Manchester residents needs and wants;
- Concern was expressed as to why had the Council only consulted with 4000 households whilst SMG Europe’s own consultation had been distributed to 5,700 households;
- Was the MXM proposal in progress and if so what was the purpose in consulting on this;
- It was felt that the comments made by Bridge 5 Mill around local and regional investment into the area and an over-emphasis on national and international investors, had not been properly addressed in the report; and
- Had the meeting request by Hope Mill Theatre been organised yet and if so what was the outcome.

The Leader advised that prior to the Council’s decision to declare a climate emergency and bring forward the target date for zero carbon emissions, he had held discussions with the Strategic Director – Development and Growth and agreed that all future SRF’s should have our carbon ambitions as a key pillar and that when this Framework was to be considered by the Executive on 24 July, he would be proposing that it be amended to reflect this. In terms of the Council’s ambition over the last 20 years to regenerate East Manchester, this had been based on detailed discussion with local communities. Until 2010, there had been significant government support in terms of resource to have this level of interaction with communities in East Manchester. However, from 2010, funding had been cut and as such had taken a significant period of time to be able to get the regeneration of East Manchester back on track.

The Committee was advised that Marketing Manchester had undertaken pieces of work on the impact of events on the overall economy of the city, which included hotel stays, the use of food and beverage outlets and retail. They did not specify where the events took place, but had identified that the biggest single generator of footfall for these businesses was from football.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration commented that there was a real opportunity within the Framework to deliver zero carbon in terms of housing supply and a new partnership between ManLife and Great Places would help deliver additional affordable and social housing as part of the New Islington area.

The Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing reminded the Committee that the Framework set out a broad vision for the Eastlands area and was not a planning policy document or site allocation document. Fundamentally, if the Council was to go through a planning policy review, it would be at this stage where the

modelling of the impact of a proposal such as an Arena would be undertaken or if an application came forward there would need to be a long robust process, including a market assessment and analysis which would include the impact on any other venues in and around the city centre.

The Leader advised that both the Executive Member for Leisure, Culture and Skills and himself had met with the proprietors of Hope Mill Theatre and there had been an agreement to work together in order to sustain what they have achieved. In terms of the MXM proposal, there had been discussions taken place around this development over the last 18 months to 2 years and it was expected that a planning application would be submitted later in the year. He advised he was not able to provide an answer as to why the Council had consulted with 4000 households whilst SMG Europe had consulted with 5,700 but agreed that Officers would look into this and provide a response to the Committee.

Furthermore, the Leader advised that in terms of local and regional investment, there was a range of investment within the proposals. In terms of businesses, MXM was very much based at local regional business rather than national or international businesses. With any investment there was a need to consider who invested, but it wasn't often known where the money came from. He added that there was a clear objective to have local, regional and national businesses represented in the East Manchester area.

## **Decision**

The Committee:-

- (1) Endorses the recommendations asked of the Executive as detailed below.

The Executive is recommended to:-

- Note the summary of issues and comments received from residents, businesses and other interested parties set out in Section 3 to 5 of this report and approve the suggested amendments set out in these sections to the final version of the Eastlands Regeneration Framework;
  - Approve the proposed approach set out in Section 3 of this report in respect of new commercial led opportunities associated with the Pollard Street Sub Area;
  - Approve the proposed approach set out in Section 5 of this report in respect of new commercial led opportunities associated with the Etihad Campus Commercial Zone Sub Area; and
  - Delegate to the Strategic Director – Growth and Development, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration, authority to approve the final version of the Eastlands Regeneration Framework, with the intention that, if approved, it will become a material consideration in the Council's decision making as a Local Planning Authority.
- (2) Recommends that the Executive incorporates the Council's carbon reduction targets into the final version of the Eastlands Regeneration Framework;

- (3) Recommends that in approving the proposed approach in respect of new commercial led opportunities associated with the Pollard Street Sub Area, the Executive agrees to incorporate the preservation and promotion of high quality public realm and green space within the proposals; and
- (4) Request that the Executive take into account the views of the Committee and Local Ward Councillors in respect of new commercial led opportunities associated with the Etihad Campus Commercial Zone Sub Area.

[Councillor Hitchen declared that she had a conflict of interest in considering this item as she was a member of the Council's Planning Committee which potentially could receive planning applications in relation to proposals within the Regeneration Framework. Consequently, she left the meeting during consideration of this item].

[Councillor Hacking declared a personal and no prejudicial interest in this item as he is a Governor of Manchester College and Board Member of the LTE Group].

### **ESC/19/32 Progress update on the Manchester Local Industrial Strategy**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Executive, which provided an update on draft "Developing a More Inclusive Economy – Our Manchester Industrial Strategy" and the associated draft delivery plan and the methodology and findings of the wide-ranging engagement exercise undertaken to inform the development of the Strategy.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- The Strategy set out Manchester's vision for developing a more inclusive economy that all residents could participate in and benefit from;
- The Strategy aligned to the Greater Manchester Local Industrial Strategy and specifically set out Manchester's unique position as the conurbation core, and our responsibility to promote and drive inclusive growth within its economy;
- The Strategy considered Manchester's successes and challenges, and focused on three pillars – People, Place and Prosperity;
- Each of the pillars contained a number of themes to be prioritised to promote economic and social justice in Manchester;
- To implement the vision of the Strategy, a delivery plan containing a small number of evidence-based initiatives to make Manchester's economy more inclusive had been developed;
- These initiatives are in addition to existing work programme and will add value; and
- A wide ranging engagement exercise was undertaken in winter 2018/19 to inform the development of the Strategy. Alongside this, a literature review and analysis of quantitative data was also undertaken;

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

- Given the expected significant increase in population within the city, had any thought been given to ensure the required infrastructure was in place, for example school provision;

- What support was offered to local businesses to help in relation to reducing carbon emissions and payment of Business Rates;
- There was a need to consider how the Council's recently adopted position in declaring a climate emergency impacted on this strategy
- There was a key opportunity to develop a skills led industry within the area of carbon retrofitting and what work was being done to develop this;
- The Strategy needed to also reflect the opportunity to develop District Centres and the support available to businesses in these areas;
- It was noted that the Inclusive Economy section of the draft strategy was particularly strong and the Council should be promoting further the positive work it was doing in this area;
- Whilst it was pleasing to see the inclusion of Community Wealth building, it was felt that more could be done to strengthen this area, incorporating people and the impact on health;
- There was an opportunity to look at wellbeing (within its holistic sense), as part of the Strategy;
- There was concern around the higher digital skills that will be needed in future labour markets and the lack of reference to the linkage of these skills to an academic maths qualification;
- Whilst it was welcomed that Manchester was aspiring to be an international hub of creative industries, it was felt that there was a lack of reference to grass roots creative industries, such as Manchester International Festival and the Manchester Fringe, as these provided opportunities for horizontal relationships and community wealth building;
- Noting the detrimental impact of technology on those working in the distribution sector, where salaries were usually low paid;
- With the proposed increase in passenger numbers at Manchester Airport, how was this going to impact on reducing the city's carbon emissions;

The Head of Work and Skills advised that in terms of carbon retrofitting and being a skills led industry, there was a workshop planned within the coming weeks with stakeholders to start to look at what could be done in the short and medium term. The main challenge however was to determine what the Council's priorities would be for delivering carbon neutral by 2030 and which specific actions were going to be progressed.

The Leader commented that from a Greater Manchester perspective, zero carbon was one of the nine priority areas identified in the GM Local Industrial Strategy. Whilst there were some actions that could be taken locally in terms of zero carbon retrofitting, he advised that there would need to be a market at least the size of Greater Manchester in order to develop a skills led industry.

In terms of support for businesses, it was explained that this was provided by the GM Business Growth Hub and they had been invited to the Committee's meeting in October 2019 to report on how they were supporting businesses. In terms of Business Rates support, there was a national determined set of criteria to exempt businesses from paying these if they were below a certain size, but other than that there was limited local discretion as to what further support could be offered. It was noted that the work of the District Centres Sub Group would be reported back to the

Committee later in the year and as part of this, the role District Centres and support available to them could be discussed.

The Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships advised that the Manchester LIS was only at a draft stage currently and there was still opportunities to develop the broader themes based on the views of Members. The next steps would be the need to identify in greater detail how these themes will be delivered.

Officers acknowledged the point made around population growth and its impact on both social and physical infrastructures. He confirmed that this was something being considered as part of wider discussion relating to the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and agreed to pass on the Committees comments to relevant officers.

The Deputy Leader agreed that changes to the Strategy would be required following the Councils declaration of a climate emergency and this would be reported at the next meeting of the Executive.

The Strategic Lead Policy and Partnerships acknowledged the comments and points made around the inclusion of grass roots creative industries and agreed to address the community wealth building point and include people as well as places. The Head of Work and Skills noted the points made around digital skills and the linkages to academic qualifications. She advised that work was taking place with schools, colleges and post 16 providers which was focussing on the need to have more of our young people to undertake STEM related academic subjects. She advised that the real challenge was meeting the needs of the sector at the present moment.

The Leader advised that there was need to distinguish between the Airports carbon emissions and the aviation industries carbon emissions. He advised that the Airport itself was actually almost at zero carbon emissions in terms of its operations. He commented that the Council had limited levers it could use to try and address the aviation industries emissions and this was something that required international support. The Chair requested that Members be provided with information on what levers the Council and The Airport could use to put pressure on the aviation industry and that it would be good to see this point acknowledged in Manchester's Local Industrial Strategy

## **Decision**

The Committee:-

- (1) Note the draft Developing a More Inclusive Economy – Our Manchester Industrial Strategy;
- (2) Request that Officers take into account the comments made by the Committee in producing the final version of the Strategy; and
- (3) Agree that the final version of the strategy be taken for consideration by the Executive in Autumn 2019.

## **ESC/19/33 Delivering the Our Manchester Strategy - Leader of the Council's portfolio**

The Committee considered the report of the Leader of the Council, which provided an overview of work undertaken and progress towards the delivery of the Council's priorities, as set out in the Our Manchester strategy, for those areas within his portfolio.

By way of a further update the Leader informed the Committee that the Executive would be considering a report at its meeting on 24 July 2019, requesting that he Executive agreed the elements of the Council motion on climate emergency that were an executive function and advised that the Executive would be supporting the motion in its entirety and subsequently an Action plan would be presented back to the Executive in the Autumn

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions within the Leaders report were:-

- It was concerning that given the current level of political uncertainty and no indication as to whether or not a government spending review will take place, what the implications would be for the Council's budget from April 2020 onwards;
- Was there any possibility for Council investment into the refurbishment of the Sharp Project or was this to be externally funded; and
- What had the Leader done differently as a result of scrutiny;
- What was the Leader doing to ensure Manchester and local authorities would be potential beneficiaries of the comprehensive spending review (CSR);
- How was the Council engaging with relevant bodies in regards to Brexit and a possible Shared Prosperity Fund; and
- How well was the relationship working between the Council and the GMCA.

The Leader advised that in terms of the Sharp Project and Space Studios and One Central Park, these had initially required significant Council investment, however, over the last five years it had been expected that any further expansion or further investment would be funded out of the businesses themselves. In terms of expansion, Fujitsu tower had been removed at Space Studios resulting in a very significant site being available and a range of opportunities were being considered, including the potential for additional sound stage provision and workshop space. Similarly with the Sharp Project, it did require a level of upgrading in order to maintain its unique offer.

In terms of what he had done differently as a result of Scrutiny, he commented that scrutiny had introduced more rigor into the Officer process of preparing reports and the Executive gave very careful considerations to any recommendations that had come from Scrutiny.

He advised that he Chaired the LGA's City Region Board which one of its main areas of focus was to ensure funding solutions for local authorities were advantageous as possible. The LGA had already made representations to Government around the CSR and where local authorities largest pressures rested (Adults and Children's



services). From a Greater Manchester perspective, there would be a focussed submission around skills, infrastructure and building a more inclusive economy, as, as a region, it was more advantageous by having a collective voice. The Chief Executive added that Manchester was good at using evidence based initiatives to demonstrate how investment in an Our Manchester approach reduces demand on services.

The Leader advised that there were Political and Chief Officer networks engaging with Government around Brexit. As Leader he received regular reports from the Strategic Director – Neighbourhoods who was the lead officer for planning for a no deal Brexit. The Statutory Deputy Leader (Councillor S Murphy) was a member of the LGA body that was having regular engagement with ministers on Brexit. In terms of a shared prosperity fund, the Leader advised that the LGA City Region Board, which he was Chair of, had lead responsibility for looking at governance arrangements post any exit from the EU and ensuring any powers from Brussels were devolved down from Whitehall.

Finally, he advised that in terms of governance, the GMCA was evolving and gaining some significant powers as a result of the devolution arrangements and introduction of the GM Mayor. He advised that he was now the only GM Leader who had signed the original devolution deal in 2014 and as a consequence, this had meant some key elements of public service reform had required work to ensure new Leaders were familiar with these.

## **Decision**

The Committee notes the report

### **ESC/19/34 Delivering the Our Manchester Strategy - Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration's portfolio**

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration, which provided an overview of work undertaken and progress towards the delivery of the Council's priorities, as set out in the Our Manchester strategy, for those areas within his portfolio.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions within the Executive Member's report were:-

- Would it be possible to roll out selective licensing to high streets in the future;
- Would the right to buy back policy for Council houses be included in the report expected at Septembers meeting;
- What had the Executive Member done differently as a result of Scrutiny;
- What was meant by management companies within selective licensing; and
- How would local ward Members have an input into the community led housing event and consultation on the final strategy;
- It was suggested that the community led housing strategy should be more ambitious and look at wider and larger schemes.

The Executive Member advised that in terms of the rollout of selective licensing, a further four areas had been identified to roll this out to which would be reported to Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny in early 2020. In relation to selective licensing on high streets, targeted work on flats above shops had taken place to address issues of standards of accommodation and the vulnerability of occupants. Further work would be undertaken to extend the selective licensing process. She added that the reference to management companies within the selective licensing pilot was another terminology for letting agents, who were used where struggling landlords were not able to manage or were not aware of their responsibilities and this direct support had been welcomed.

In terms of the Council's Right to Buy policy, the Executive Member confirmed that this would be covered in the report expected at September's meeting on Officers responses to her affordable housing policy proposals. She added that although the Right to Buy Policy would not solve the City's housing crisis it was important in terms of the message it sent to government and the cost that it generates for the Council.

The Executive Member advised that Scrutiny had made her look more closely at the relationship between strategic development and local ward members and the importance of consulting appropriately with local ward members on strategic housing and residential growth proposals/developments. She also commented on the positive work that had been undertaken by the District Centres Sub Group.

Furthermore, the Executive Member reported that the community housing strategy was about ensuring groups of residents in the City who wanted to come forward with their own schemes had a very clear understanding of how the Council would engage and support them. This would come to scrutiny for the opportunity to feed into this.

## **Decision**

The Committee notes the report

### **ESC/19/35 Review of Post-18 Education and Funding (Augar Review)**

The Committee considered a report of the Head of Work and Skills, which provided an overview of the key recommendations of the Independent Panel Review of Post-18 Education and Funding, chaired by Dr Philip Augar.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- Key findings of the review;
- Key messages for Greater Manchester;
- Guiding principles and the panel's proposals
- Cost of implementation; and
- Implications for the delivery of both the Manchester and Greater Manchester Local Industrial Strategies.

The Committee was advised that report was for information only at this stage, and set the context for bringing back a more detailed report to a future Committee meeting,

subject to the Government agreeing the implementation and funding of some or all of the recommendations.

A key point that arose from the Committees discussions was a proposal that the Council lobbied central government to influence that this review remained on their agenda and the recommendations were taken forward

The Executive Member of Skills, Culture and Leisure noted that the review had been long overdue and there had been a disproportionate balance between further education and higher education. He gave a commitment to lobby government to try and ensure that it took on board the findings of the review.

The Chief Executive advised that she led on skills on behalf of Greater Manchester and outlined the work being undertaken regionally and nationally to look at how the findings of the review could be taken forward, including the possibility of devolution of funding for further education. The Head of Work and Skills gave a brief outline of the opportunities that existed for the City to raise the profile and offer of Further Education.

## **Decision**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report;
- (2) Requests that the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure lobbies government to ensure it takes up the recommendations of the review; and
- (3) Agrees to receive a more detailed report at a future meeting, subject to the Government agreeing the implementation and funding of some or all of the recommendations

## **ESC/19/36 Overview Report**

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

The Chair proposed that the Committee received a report at its next meeting on the impact to date on Manchester resulting from the ongoing Brexit discussions, which was listed as an item to be scheduled on the work programme.

## **Decision**

The Committee:-

- (1) notes the report;
- (2) agrees to include a report on the impact of ongoing Brexit discussions on Manchester, as outlined in the work programme, at its next meeting on 5 September 2019.

## **Economy Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 5 September 2019**

**Present:**

Councillor H Priest (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Abdullatif, Noor, Raikes, Shilton Godwin and Stanton

**Also present:**

Councillor Leese, Leader  
Councillor Richards, Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration  
Councillor Midgely, Assistant Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration

**Apologies:** Councillor Douglas, Green, Hacking, Hitchen, Johns and K Simcock

#### **ESC/19/37 Minutes**

Decision

The minutes of the meeting held on 18 July 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

#### **ESC/19/38 Delivering Manchester's Affordable Homes to 2025**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Development and Growth), which provided an update on progress against the policy proposals contained in the Affordable Housing Report considered by the Committee and the Executive in December 2018, taking into account the demand for and supply of affordable homes in the City. The report also provided further details of how the Council and its partners would deliver a minimum of 6,400 affordable homes from April 2015 to March 2025.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration addressed the Committee, setting out the challenges the Council faced in meeting the policy proposals and in doing so referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:-

- Manchester's economic context in relation to employment growth and associated housing demand;
- The reasons for the reduction in the completion of new homes in the City since 2007/08;
- The impact of austerity measures and associated welfare reforms on those on low incomes and a range of vulnerable households, particularly but not exclusively those living in the private rented sector;
- The role of Homes England and Registered Partners in supporting the Council to deliver new affordable homes, including the number of new affordable homes that had been delivered/were planned to be delivered between April 2015 to March 2021;
- Details of proposals for a further three additional Council funded affordable housing schemes in addition to the schemes that were already under construction;

- Detail on the level of significant investment needed to deliver the scale of Affordable Homes needed in the city between now and March 2025 and the funding streams that this funding would be derived from, which included the Council's HRA, grant support from Homes England, investment capacity of Registered Providers, Section 106 monies and the Council's Housing Affordability Fund
- Issues around availability of land for affordable housing;
- Proposals to address the adverse impact of the Governments Right to Buy scheme;
- Consideration Community Led Housing projects; and
- The need to take into consideration the Council's commitment to becoming Zero Carbon by 2030 and the consequences of this in terms of future housing design and quality.

The report would also be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 11 September 2019

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- A real opportunity existed to make future affordable homes better than zero carbon and it was asked what work had taken place to date on this;
- It would be important to ensure that all Council Housing partners and organisations within the housing construction supply chain were aware of the Council's climate emergency declaration and the associated commitments it had made;
- There was concern that the majority of the level of investment required rested with Registered Providers and what securities had they against this risk;
- Would this strategy address the 13,000 plus people currently on the housing register and particularly those who were most vulnerable and those dependent on some of housing benefit;
- How many social rented properties had been built over the last five years through S106 monies;
- Could the Council strengthen its Housing Affordability Policy to ensure more social/affordable homes were built by developers through removing any clauses that permitted developers to provide a financial contribution in place of housing;
- Further information was requested on the review of site availability on the establishment of Manchester Housing Providers Partnership (MHPP);
- To what extent had transport infrastructure been factored into the impact on land prices and house prices within the city region;
- What measures were in place to ensure the quality of new affordable homes was of the highest standard possible;
- There was concern around the level of burden that would be placed on volunteer groups to be required to submit applications for funding for suitable community led housing projects and also the accountability of taking on a formal role of stewardship/management of these projects; and
- It was proposed that local ward Members should be consulted with prior to any decision made around the disposal of sites within Council ownership for the provision of affordable homes

The Strategic Director (Development and Growth) acknowledged the point made around zero carbon. Officers were cognisant of the decisions the Council had made in terms of declaring a climate emergency and work was ongoing in the development of an Action Plan to address the challenges and thresholds set through the declaration. This would include addressing the Council's relationships with its partners and supply chain as well as its commissioning and procurement strategies. It was recognised that the affordability of delivering the proposals were a significant challenge for the Council and it was this in particular that would likely be at the heart of political discussions going forward. The Head of Housing commented that Registered Providers were already undertaking a lot of initiatives to aid in their properties reducing their carbon footprints, such as the installation of solar panels and ground/air heat pumps.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration commented that there was approximately 6,000 residents in Manchester in housing need and this strategy aimed to tackle this through targeting Council resources at affordable homes at Local Housing Affordability level or below. In terms of the allocation system, there was currently a consultation and review of this taking place which would look to ensure that those homes that were becoming available were targeted at those most in need. There was also a review taking place of the Council's Private Rented Sector strategy and standards to try and more effectively enforce landlords meet their obligations and duties to their tenants. The Strategic Director (Development and Growth) advised that a briefing note could be provided to Members on the number of social rented properties built through on site S106 contributions. He added that the majority of S106 contributions for affordable housing was through off site contributions and due to the scale of funding required, the majority of affordable homes would need to come from Registered Providers and Homes England, as S106 monies through planning obligations would only deliver a minimal amount.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration advised that there would be a piece of work undertaken over the next 12 months that would look to strengthen the Council's HRA to see what options existed to improve the 30 year outlook. The Committee was also advised that the MHPP had recently launched its own website and it was suggested that the Committee may want to invite representatives from the MHPP to a future meeting when it considered housing issues. It was also reported that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) was a public document and this would be made available to all Members.

In terms of the financial risk to Registered Providers, the Housing Strategy and Partnership Manager advised that conversations had already begun to take place as to how this could be addressed. He advised that to mitigate the risk, there was a need to maximise the funding from Homes England and ensure that the rental streams for the new homes provided covered the financial borrowing by the Registered Providers.

The Strategic Director (Development and Growth) advised that in terms of the Council's land ownership, it had previously identified areas of land which had been determined as Housing Affordability Zones, the majority of these were set alongside or adjacent to major transport corridors and would be utilised for an affordable housing product rather than sold to the open market. It was acknowledged that there

was a separate issue in terms of Registered Providers competing for land against private developers in the open market, which provided a challenge in driving this program forward.

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration commented that the Council's affordable homes were some of the highest quality built and Manchester had its own quality standards around design which were higher than the national standards. In terms of community led housing concerns, she advised that the strategy proposed a more defined approach in order to respond to some of the concerns and risks identified. It was reported that the City already had a small number of community led housing schemes and there had been a number of groups approach the Council expressing an interest in setting up future projects. The Executive Member agreed to provide more detail around this as the strategy was further developed.

## Decisions

The Committee:-

- (1) Endorses the recommendations to the Executive as detailed below with the proposed additional wording (highlighted in bold)

The Executive:-

1. Note the increase in the forecast Residential Growth delivery target for new homes in Manchester from April 2015 to March 2025 of an additional 7,000 homes to 32,000 homes.
2. Note the proposed increase in the delivery target between April 2015 and March 2025 from 5,000 Affordable Homes to a minimum of 6,400 Affordable Homes.
3. Note the limited capacity of the Council's Housing Revenue Account and the Council's Housing Affordability Fund to support new additional Affordable Homes in the city and that significant new Affordable Home delivery in the city is dependent on robust partnership relationships with Registered Providers, which currently have the financial and delivery capacity to deliver those homes.
4. Delegate authority to the Strategic Director - Growth and Development, and the Deputy Chief Executive in consultation with the Executive Members for Finance and Resources and Housing and Regeneration to negotiate and formalise a Strategic Partnership with Homes England
5. Delegate authority to the Deputy Chief Executive, Strategic Director - Growth and Development and Head of Development in consultation with the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration, to agree the disposal of sites in Council ownership for the provision of affordable homes as set out in this report **following consultation with local ward members.**
6. Delegate authority to the Strategic Director - Growth and Development and the Deputy Chief Executive in consultation with the Executive Members for Finance and Resources and Housing and Regeneration, to establish partnership arrangements with Registered Providers together with their partners/consortium for defined areas in the North, Central, South and Wythenshawe areas of the City.

7. Note progress against the Policy Ideas presented to Executive in the December paper by the Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration
  8. Delegate authority to the City Solicitor to enter into and complete all documents and agreements necessary to give effect to the recommendations in this report.
- (2) Notes the possibility of representatives from MHPP attending a future meeting when it next considers housing related issues;
  - (3) Notes that more information on Community Led Housing projects will be provided to the Committee as the strategy develops; and
  - (4) Requests that Officers circulate the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) to all members of the Committee.

### **ESC/19/39 The Impact of Brexit on the Manchester Economy**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Development and Growth) which provided an update on current evidence about the impact felt by Manchester's economy since the European Union Referendum in 2016, as well as identifying a number of potential risks arising from the decision to leave the European Union.

The Leader informed the Committee of the developments that had taken place since the report had been published and also referred to the main points and themes within the report included:-

- Manchester's current economic position was broadly positive and continued to exceed both regional and national averages;
- Despite Brexit uncertainty, demand within the city centre office market was strong, with recent estimates suggesting that further new Grade A supply was urgently required;
- The continued success of the office market in the city had been somewhat tempered by a decline in retail linked to the growth of online retailing. Nevertheless, the Arndale continued to buck the trend with a series of new lets recently announced;
- There was a great concern to the city that vital research links with the EU could be compromised by Brexit which would have detrimental impacts on the burgeoning knowledge economy sector within Manchester, mainly located in the Oxford Road Corridor;
- Several of Manchester's employment sectors currently relied heavily on the employment of skilled EU nationals. If there was a decrease in EU nationals working in the city, the following sectors could face challenges, impacting on Manchester's growth ambitions;
- The implementation of a UK Shared Prosperity Fund to replace current EU funding had been delayed by a year, consequently EU funding would continue to be spent for the next two years;
- The most significant economic impact of the EU Referendum result had been the striking devaluation of the British Pound. The consequences of which had had different levels of impact on different sectors and aspects of the economy.



- Whilst there was a reduction in EU migration into the city, these reductions were being offset by a rise in the number of those entering the city from Pakistan, China and India;
- The consequences to Manchester companies in terms of import and export trade tariffs should the UK leave the EU without a deal; and
- Even at this advanced stage of the Brexit negotiations, there was no consensus on what the actual effects of Brexit would be on any aspect of the economy at any level.

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

- What work, if any, had the Council undertaken to help prepare residents to fill employment gaps that would be left by those posts currently filled by EU nationals, who were leaving Manchester as a consequence of Brexit;
- How would Manchester's professional services be impacted by Just In Time manufacturing being delayed and the possibility of the EU cutting out British companies from supply chains;
- Concern was expressed that although the Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) figure for the North West had increased slightly, overall it was still lower than before the referendum took place;
- What preparations had been made in terms of the labour market following exiting the EU and any possible recession as a consequence of a no deal;
- Concern was expressed in relation to the impact Brexit had had and would continue to have on health and social care services for Manchester residents due to the migration of a large proportion of the workforce and the impact on the City's cutting edge research sectors and it was asked what work had been done to mitigate these impacts;
- Had the Council considered undertaking an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) of Brexit;
- Had any consideration been given yet to the impact of Brexit on the contribution that voluntary and community sectors provided to various sectors of the City's economy;
- Had the Council undertaken any planning for Brexit not taking place and the potential economic upturn that this might bring; and
- To what extent would Manchester be impacted by the effect of Brexit on other Greater Manchester local authorities.

The Head of Local Planning and Infrastructure/City Policy acknowledged that the potential skills gap was a critical issue and providers were aware to this risk. There was potentially a large challenge to a number of sectors but this would be dependent on the UK's future immigration policy which was still not clear. Reassurance was given that Officers and partners were working hard to ensure that they were doing everything they could to mitigate the potential level of impact this would have on the city. The Leader added there was also the willingness of people to be trained and developed and also the length of time it took to obtain the necessary skills and qualifications in certain sectors, such as Nursing, that would have an impact on filling any skills gaps.

It was acknowledged that in terms of FDI, Manchester was doing comparatively well when compared nationally, however, this was in relation to only Manchester and not Greater Manchester or the Northern region.

In terms of Professional Services and EU companies supply chains, it was reported that all services would be impacted in terms of labour issues and there were a whole series of issues around data that the Council had been working with the Combined Authority on to try and ensure companies were made aware of what they needed to do to minimise the shock of any withdrawal on information flow and GDPR. More generally, in terms of mitigating the impact to the labour market, it was explained that there were parallels to the 2008/10 period and recession that followed and experiences were being drawn from this to try and mitigate the likely impact to the City's labour markets.

The Committee was advised that Greater Manchester was probably in a better place than anywhere else in the country in terms of keeping businesses informed of Brexit implications through the work of Manchester Growth Company. He advised that in terms of the potential impact on Universities and the Research Sector, Manchester had strong footings in these areas and as a consequence, these would likely be sustained regardless the outcome of Brexit. He advised that alongside the Universities the Council would continue to lobby government to ensure it still bought in to European Programmes and had an appropriate visa programme to allow researchers to come and work in Manchester.

In terms of undertaking an EIA, it was acknowledged that there would be a range of broad issues that would require addressing going forward. It was commented however, that all current environmental EU Legislation would be transferred into UK law upon exiting the EU. The Leader added that if there was a no deal then the UK would not be part of any supply chains with EU countries and there was no provision to export British products to the European Union. This however was somewhat beyond the control of the Council and was entirely dependent on what deals the UK Government could reach with the EU going forward.

The Leader acknowledged the point made around the potential impact on the voluntary and community sector and advised that further consideration would be given to this going forward. In terms of Brexit not happening, he advised that Manchester was in a very strong position to reap any benefits from a growing economy as a result of international trade. He also added that In terms of how Manchester would possibly be impacted by the effect of Brexit on other Greater Manchester local authorities, the City had proven its resilience in the past by its ability to recover quickly from past recessions, more so than other GM authorities, and as such it would likely be required to provide employment opportunities for a far greater geography than its own boundaries. He added the caveat that this would be dependent on the ability to deliver appropriate residential and commercial development in the long term to ensure future job creation.

## **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

## **ESC/19/40 Northern Powerhouse Rail Update**

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Development and Growth) which provided an update on High Speed 2 (HS2) and Northern Powerhouse Rail (NPR) and outlined the latest position on both initiatives. The report also provided information on a campaign by Northern leaders for rail investment in the north and a summary of the Council's response to HS2 Ltd.'s Design Refinement Consultation.

The Leader informed the Committee of the developments that had taken place since the report had been published and also referred to the main points and themes within the report included:-

- Government had recently announced an independent review into HS2 which was due to report back within a six week time period and would examine cost estimates and opportunities for savings and changes to the scheme, the environmental impact, and the economic and business cases for both Phases 1 and 2;
- The Secretary of State for Transport had recently announced that the cost of HS2 was anticipated to increase by a further £30 billion to approximately £85 billion and that the timescale for delivering Phase 2 would be delayed by seven years;
- Northern leaders had written to both the Prime Minister and new transport secretary, to express the importance of delivering HS2 and NPR together in the north, delivering the right stations and infrastructure and not stepping back from other committed schemes;
- Leaders were now moving forward to deliver a joint campaign, supported by other areas and existing groups, including Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) and the GMCA to target business, media, MPs and senior Government Officials, with an aim to gain the support of prominent figures to influence the wider general public of the opportunities and benefits to the north of HS2, NPR and wider rail investment;
- HS2 Ltd. was currently at the Control Point 3 (CP3) of the design stage, which was due to complete in October 2019. This stage of design would be included in the plans which would make up the hybrid Bill, which was currently due to be submitted to Parliament in June 2020;
- HS2 Ltd. was consulting on design refinements (DRC) to the Phase 2b route consulted on in 2016. The changes that impacted Manchester were the proposed relocation of vent shafts and their associated infrastructure, at Lytham Road and Palatine Road. The proposed new locations were at Fallowfield Retail Park on Birchfield's Road, and on Withington Golf Club land at Palatine Road; and
- The Council's response to the DRC included previous concerns set out in its response to HS2 Ltd.'s Working Draft Environmental Statement (WDES) in December 2018.

Some of the key points that arose from the Committees discussions were:-

- What could be done to improve the promotion of the benefits that HS2 would bring to the region other than just the reduction in journey times to London;

- Reassurance was sought that the Council would be supporting objectors in relation to the proposed location of the ventilation shaft on the Birchfield site;
- Was there any update on the proposed design of a new station at Piccadilly station given the lack of agreement between GM stakeholders and the TfN Partnership Board as to what should be proposed;
- What could be done to improve the capacity on the existing rail network in order to deliver more services for commuters
- There was concerns about the current volume of rail users wanting to access Piccadilly station and whether it had the capacity to accommodate any more users.

The Leader advised that the previous location of the ventilation of the ventilation shaft on the Birchfield site was were a new school was being built so it was necessary that it was relocated. He informed the Committee that the Executive would be requested to oppose the proposed re-location at the Birchfield site and consider two alternative locations.

In terms of the proposals for a new station at Piccadilly, it was reported that it had been agreed with Transport for the North as to what was to be included in the report to the Partnership Board but this was not what was actually reported. This had been acknowledged by TfN and they had confirmed that they would proceed in considering both Department for Transport's proposal for a turn back station alongside the Council's and GM Stakeholders preference for an underground station. In addition to this, additional independent research had been commissioned alongside TfGM to report back on the viability and benefits an underground station would bring to the city and wider city region.

The Committee was advised that in order to provide more commuter rail services in and around Manchester, there needed to be greater capacity on the existing rail networks and this could only be achieved by the removal of long distance services from the existing networks onto the new HS2 network. He acknowledged that the case for improved capacity on local networks had been overshadowed by the reduced journey times HS2 would achieve and the argument for HS2 should be driven by capacity and reliability rather than purely speed.

## **Decisions**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report
- (2) Welcomes the reference to a future a focus on the benefits that HS2 would have beyond reduced journey times to London;
- (3) Requests that the Committee is provided with further information on the Connecting Britain campaign

## **ESC/19/41 Overview Report**

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which contained key decisions within the Committee's remit and responses to

previous recommendations was submitted for comment. Members were also invited to agree the Committee's future work programme

In terms of future work programmes, the Chair of the District Centres Sub Group (Councillor Shilton Godwin) informed the Committee that it was anticipated that the final report of the District Centres Sub Group would not be ready for consideration until February 2020 at the earliest and requested that this be reflected on the Committee's work programme.

### **Decision**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report;
- (2) Agrees that the final report of the District Centres Sub Group will be considered by the Committee would not be ready for consideration until February 2020 at the earliest.

## **Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 18 July 2019**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Hacking - In the Chair

Councillors Chambers, Collins, M Dar, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Grimshaw, Kirkpatrick and Rawson

Councillor N Murphy, Deputy Leader

Councillor S Murphy, Deputy Leader

Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure

Councillor Wills, Lead Member for LGBT Men

Chief Superintendent Umer Khan, Greater Manchester Police (GMP)

#### **Apologies:**

Councillors Andrews, Rawlins and Rowles

#### **CESC/19/24            Minutes**

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure informed Members that, following the item at last month's meeting on the Peterloo Memorial, discussions had taken place with relevant stakeholders, including the artist, disability campaigners and architects, which had identified a number of possible solutions. He advised Members that he would be meeting with representatives of disabled people's groups the following day and, once this meeting had taken place, he would be able to update Members on which of the possible options would be pursued.

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2019 as a correct record.

#### **CESC/19/25            Update Report on Issues of Interest**

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Mayor for Police, Crime, Criminal Justice and Fire from the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) which provided an update on a range of issues relating to policing in Manchester.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- Chief Superintendent and Superintendent promotions and postings;
- How elected members could influence policing priorities in neighbourhoods and precept priorities;
- The performance of the 101 non-emergency number; and
- Road safety plans and priorities.

Deputy Leader Councillor N Murphy drew Members' attention to the personnel changes at a senior level in GMP. He thanked the outgoing officers for their work over recent years and stated that he looked forward to working with the new team.

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

- Request for further detail on how the police precept was being spent, particularly at a Manchester level;
- Concerns of local residents regarding police response to incidents and to calls to the 101 non-emergency number and that some local residents were losing confidence in the police;
- That neighbourhood policing teams in some areas were very effective at communicating with Members and community groups but that this is not consistent across all areas;
- What was being done to address issues in the city centre, such as drug-dealing and anti-social behaviour in Piccadilly Gardens, which negatively affected both local people and visitors' impressions of Manchester;
- What was being done to improve traffic policing; and
- Request for more information on the work to tackle knife crime, following the allocation of additional funding from central government to address this.

Chief Superintendent Umer Khan informed Members that the precept had funded 50 additional police officers across Greater Manchester, 14 of whom had been allocated to Manchester. He advised that these had been split between the three police districts in Manchester and that the officers would be undertaking problem-solving and targeted work as part of the neighbourhood teams. He informed Members that, while the rest of the precept funding was being used at a Greater Manchester level, it was funding work such as TravelSafe and improvements to the 101 non-emergency number which would also benefit Manchester.

Chief Superintendent Khan outlined the work taking place at a neighbourhood level, including specific examples of work in a Member's ward to address local people's concerns. He recognised that there were challenges and commented that he would like to do more but advised Members that he and his colleagues at GMP was doing their best with the resources they had. He invited Members to join him on a tour of duty to see the work that police officers were doing and the challenges they were facing. He reported that he was working with partners to introduce a consistent model of delivery across all neighbourhoods. He outlined how he was promoting the importance of communication, including with Ward Councillors, across the neighbourhood policing teams and informed Members that he would welcome feedback.

The Deputy Leader Councillor N Murphy reported that, while he would like to see more police officers, GMP was having to work with limited resources. He also advised Members that, in addition to visible neighbourhood policing, GMP was doing a lot of less visible work on issues which as Child Sexual Exploitation and organised crime. He reported that steps were been taken to improve the 101 non-emergency number, citing the introduction of live chats to enable members of the public to communicate with GMP through their website. He advised Members that it was also important to review the type of calls which were being received through the 101 number, including whether some of them were non-police-related calls, and stated that a public awareness campaign was needed on when to contact the police and what issues to contact other agencies about.

Chief Superintendent Khan informed Members that he had attended a meeting of the City Centre Accountability Board the previous day which had provided an in-depth update on the partnership response to crime and anti-social behaviour in the city centre. He reported that, while he recognised the challenges in the city centre, there had been some progress in recent times, including a reduction in robberies in Piccadilly Gardens as well as reductions in some other types of crime. He outlined police operations which had taken place to tackle crime in the city centre and reported that a partnership approach to addressing other issues such as homelessness and begging had also contributed to improvements. He suggested that the Member who had raised this issue could be provided with the minutes of this meeting as an update of the work taking place in the city centre and invited her to speak to GMP's city centre team to give her a fuller update on the issues she had raised.

Chief Superintendent Khan reported that, due to reductions in police funding from central government, local traffic policing had been centralised into one force-wide resource, which was then allocated based on an assessment of threat, risk and harm; however, he reported that GMP was also investing in community initiatives, working with local residents on a range of preventative work.

The Community Safety Lead informed Members about work to develop an approach on how to use the recently allocated funds to address knife crime. She reported that an engagement session would be taking place on 7 August 2019 and that youth service providers and partner organisations were invited to get involved in this work.

## **Decisions**

1. To express the Committee's thanks for the work of GMP officers, recognising the challenges that they face in performing their role.
2. To request clarification on whether any of the precept was being used to address the deficit in police pensions.

## **CESC/19/26 Trans Update Report**

The Committee received a report of the City Solicitor which provided an update on the work undertaken in Manchester to improve outcomes for its trans residents including progress against the recommendations within the Research Study into the Trans Population of Manchester, commissioned by the Council and published in 2016. Aligned to the overarching themes of the research study, the report provided details of ongoing work aligned to each theme, along with other examples of relevant work in this area. Additionally, the report considered the significant increase in reported trans hate crimes in Manchester and outlined the reasons for and responses to this as an area of focus.

Officers referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:

- Young people and education;
- Health;
- Housing;



- Domestic abuse;
- Trans hate crime;
- Additional activities; and
- Gender Recognition Act consultation.

The Virtual School Head informed Members that the Trans Action Group referred to within the report was holding a meeting the following week and invited Members to attend that meeting or a future one. The Chair asked that details of this meeting be circulated to Members of the Committee.

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

- How the specific needs of trans people would be taken into account in the work on the LGBT-Affirmative Extra Care scheme, given that their needs differed from those of LGB (Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual) people; and
- Hate crimes against trans people, including the reluctance of some trans people to report hate crimes, prosecutions for hate crimes and which Third Party Reporting Centres (TPRC) trans people would feel comfortable using.

The Project Manager for Extra Care reported that those providing the extra care services should receive additional training on the needs of the LGBT communities, including needs specific to trans people, and that the information in the Research Study into the Trans Population of Manchester would also be used to inform the care provided. She informed Members that there had been an initial workshop at the LGBT Foundation which had sought views from LGBT people on what they wanted within the Scheme and that the representative of the Pride in Ageing Advisory Group who was sitting on the steering group was a member of the trans community who provided feedback from the wider trans community.

The Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager advised Members that the increase in reported hate crimes against trans people appeared to be due to an increased confidence in reporting hate crimes to the police. He advised Members that he would do some further work to look at prosecution rates and trans-friendly TPRCs. A Member asked to be provided with further information on the trans-friendly TPRCs, which the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Manager agreed to provide.

The Lead Member for LGBT Men informed Members that he agreed that there was an increased confidence in reporting hate crime which partially explained the increase in reported hate crimes but he also believed that there had been an increase in hate crimes being committed against LGBT people generally. He advised Members that it was important to continue to work with the police and other agencies to address this and to share best practice. He also stated that it was important to address misinformation and asked that a 'mythbuster' leaflet on trans issues produced by LGBT+ Labour be circulated to Members of the Committee, to which the Chair agreed.

## Decisions

1. To request that details of the Trans Action Group meeting be circulated to Committee Members.

2. To request that the 'mythbuster' leaflet on trans issues produced by LGBT+ Labour be circulated to Members of the Committee.

### **CESEC/19/27            Delivering the Our Manchester Strategy**

The Committee received reports of the Deputy Leaders Councillor N Murphy and Councillor S Murphy and the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure. The reports provided an overview of work undertaken and progress towards the delivery of the Council's priorities as set out in the Our Manchester strategy for those areas within their respective portfolios.

The main points and themes within Deputy Leader Councillor N Murphy's report included progress and outcomes in relation to:

- Policing;
- Anti-social behaviour;
- Ensuring that high quality jobs were being created in the city and were available to local people; and
- Implementation of the Good Employment Charter.

The main points and themes within Deputy Leader Councillor S Murphy's report included progress and outcomes in relation to:

- The Our Manchester Strategy;
- Social inclusion;
- The Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS);
- Homelessness and rough sleeping;
- International work; and
- The Local Government Association (LGA).

The main points and themes within the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure's report included progress and outcomes in relation to:

- Widening access and participation in libraries, culture and parks;
- The Youth Offer; and
- Manchester schools, which was within the Executive Member's portfolio until May 2019.

Members asked a range of questions of the Executive Members. Those which related to the Committee's remit included:

- Whether the Council consulted with relevant groups to ensure that parks met the needs of older people;
- How leisure services could be made accessible to working people on low incomes;
- How local history projects could be used to engage with older people;
- Request for more information on the expansion of the Anti-Social Behaviour Team; and

- To suggest that the Committee receive a report on the impact that the Our Manchester Strategy was having on local communities, including levels of engagement and whether things were being done differently.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure informed Members that a wide-scale consultation had been carried out when the Parks Strategy was developed two years ago. He reported that the membership of the 'Friends of' parks groups tended to be older and that work was taking place to try to make them more representative of park users. He advised Members that bespoke plans were now being developed for individual parks, in consultation with a range of people, and that this included work to make the parks accessible for all residents. He informed Members about local history projects taking place in libraries and he also reported that a Love Exploring app had been developed which could currently be used in seven Manchester parks to learn more about the park, including its history.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure informed the Committee about the work taking place to widen access to and participation in leisure and cultural activities, which involved identifying and addressing the barriers that different people faced. He also informed Members that all Manchester residents were entitled to a 30% discount at Council leisure facilities, through the Mcr Active card scheme, and that free swimming was now offered to under-17s throughout the year; however, there was a challenge in communicating what was on offer to local communities. He informed Members that, following the trialling of the Mcr Active website, a company had been procured to develop a platform that residents could use to find out about local leisure activities.

The Deputy Leader Councillor N Murphy reported that the Anti-Social Behaviour Team had previously been reduced due to austerity measures but that, due to the level of demand and following a Council Motion, funding had been identified to double the size of the team, which included additional staff for out of hours support and support in the community; however, he advised that the staffing level was still below what it had been before the cuts.

The Deputy Leader Councillor S Murphy welcomed the suggestion that the Committee look at the impact of the Our Manchester Strategy. She reported that some of the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) groups which had received funding through the Our Manchester VCS Fund were undertaking projects based within communities and she suggested that some of these groups be invited to the Committee's September meeting for the item on the Our Manchester VCS Fund to talk about what they had done. The Chair supported this suggestion.

In response to a question about the declaration of a Climate Emergency, which was passed at the Full Council meeting on 10 July 2019, the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure outlined how actions to address this were already being taken in relation to culture and events. He reported that this included energy efficient cultural venues and events, including ensuring that all Council-led events had a zero carbon footprint and were sustainable. He advised the Committee that the next step was to share this best practice with those running community events.

## **Decisions**

1. To receive a report on the impact that the Our Manchester Strategy is having on local communities, including levels of engagement and whether things are being done differently.
2. To invite some of the Voluntary and Community Sector (VCS) groups which have received funding through the Our Manchester VCS Fund for community-based projects to the Committee's September meeting to talk about what they have done.

## **CEESC/19/28 Overview Report**

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

## **Decision**

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