

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 19 September 2019**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Clay, Y Dar, Davies, Hitchen, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat, Watson, White and Wilson

**Apologies:** Councillor Madeleine Monaghan

**Also present:** Councillors: Flanagan, Kilpatrick, Leech, A Simcock, M Sharif Mahamed and Whiston

#### **PH/19/80. Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

##### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/19/81. Minutes**

##### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 22 August 2019 as a correct record.

#### **PH/19/82. 122300/FO/2019 - Merseybank Playing Fields, Waterford Avenue, M20 2ZN - Didsbury West Ward**

The committee considered an application for the erection of single storey building to form sports changing rooms, function room, cafe facilities and meeting room following demolition of existing changing facilities building together with car parking and creation of new vehicular and pedestrian access off Mersey Crescent, and associated external works.

The Planning Officer reported that additional representations had been received raising the following concerns:

- Parking arrangements and the impact on the surrounding residential areas.
- The incidence of crime resulting from the access and proximity of the river.
- Damage to road surfaces due to parking and road use by visitors to the facility with any damage to be repaired.
- Local accessibility to the facilities.
- A condition to prevent the sale of alcohol.

It was reported that in response to the concerns raised the applicant had responded the issues raised, in particular:

- All trees on the site would be retained.

- The creation of an access from the river would be subject to a separate application.
- There were no plans to apply for a licence for the sale of alcohol.
- The size of the facilities is based on guidance on the size of changing rooms from the Football Association.
- The design and location of the facility has been proposed to minimise the impact on residents.
- The opening hours of the facility will be – 0800 to 2100hrs Monday to Saturday and 0900 to 1800hrs on Sunday.

A representative for the applicant addressed the Committee and explained that the existing club site had gone beyond its useful life and the site was being used by unauthorised motorbikes and quadbikes as well as other anti-social behaviour also taking place. The proposal would provide new facilities for the local community to use and benefit from and this would make the site a safer area. Fletcher Moss Rangers Community Football Club had taken over the site as a community asset transfer and from lengthy consultations with stakeholders a business case was produced that had confirmed there is demand for the proposed facilities.

Councillor Kilpatrick (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee and in welcoming the proposal also referred to the concerns of local residents on the West Didsbury estate regarding limited road access via Mersey Crescent and Craigmoore Avenue. Other concerns included the proximity of the development to residential properties and the change to the footprint of the building on the site. Residents also requested that if the Committee was minded to approve the application, it was important to ensure that conditions were added to address issues such as:

- ensuring repairs to the road were carried out on damage caused by vehicles of visitors to the development;
- limiting hours on the sale of alcohol at the development;
- the use of marshals to control parking on match days.

Councillor Leech (Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee and referred to inconsiderate parking and the importance of including a condition to require marshals to control parking. The retention of a tree near to the entrance of the site was also welcomed.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to comment on the application.

Members referred to the retention of trees on the site, the proposed travel plan and the inclusion of additional cycle stands. Officers were also asked what controls could be introduced to prevent the sale of alcohol on the site premises.

Planning Officers reported that consideration had been given to the concerns of local residents and an amendment had been made to the access to the site, also the number of parking spaces had been increased to 103 spaces. The Committee was informed that all trees on the site would be retained. As part of the travel plan for the site, a requirement for car parking marshals and additional cycle stands would be added as additional conditions. The Committee was informed that the sale of alcohol was not a planning issue and would be subject to premises licensing legislation.

## **Decision**

To approve the application subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the amendments set out the late representations, as submitted and subject to additional conditions being added relating to the requirement for car marshals on match days and the inclusion of additional cycle parking stands.

### **PH/19/83. 124320/FH/2019 - 53 Kingston Road, M20 2SB - Didsbury East Ward**

The committee considered a request for a site visit to allow members to assess the proposed development site.

## **Decision**

To defer consideration of the matter to allow a site visit to be carried out by the members of the Committee.

### **PH/19/84. 121460/FH/2018 - 53 Kingston Road Garage and Wall, M20 2SB - Didsbury East Ward**

The committee considered a request for a site visit to allow members to assess the proposed development site.

## **Decision**

To defer consideration of the matter to allow a site visit to be carried out by the members of the Committee.

### **PH/19/85. 120607/FO/2018 - Platt Lane Complex, Yew Tree Road, M14 7UU - Fallowfield Ward**

The Committee had undertaken a site visit in the morning prior to the start of the meeting. This application was for the creation of an Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) for Multi-Sport Activity and installation of 6 x 18-metre high floodlighting columns, creation of a hard standing, formation of topsoil bund, erection of 5-metre high ball stop fencing and installation of 1.2 metre high barriers to artificial grass pitch.

The Planning Officer introduced the application and referred to the additional information included in the late representations submitted. The information included submissions from the Platt Lane/MMU Campus Residents Association. A letter had also been received from Councillor Ilyas (Ward Councillor).

A representative of the Platt Lane/MMU Campus Residents Association addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Reference was made to problems experienced by residents resulting from visitor parking in areas around Platt Lane. The parking causes gridlock and the existing parking in the complex could not cope with the demand. In addition, coaches were using residential streets to park.

Concerns were expressed regarding the noise levels generated from the use of the pitches which did not match the levels projected within the planning report. The flood lighting proposed is 18 metres from the nearest residential properties in an area that is already impacted by light pollution from the complex. The point was made that the close proximity of the lighting would affect children trying to sleep in the houses adjacent to the complex. The current flood lighting is 55 metres from the nearest residential property.

Councillor M Sharif Mahamed (Moss Side Ward Councillor) addressed the Committee and stated that there would be a detrimental impact on the residents of Moss Side living adjacent to the complex from the proposed development. Reference was made to increases in light pollution, noise levels and car parking problems resulting from the constant use of the complex.

The applicant addressed the Committee and informed the meeting that a total of £2million had already been invested in the Platt Lane Complex and the proposal would improve the facilities further. MMU had not received any complaints relating to noise levels, parking or light pollution. In acknowledging the points raised, additional conditions had been added to the application to address resident's concerns.

The Planning Officer reported that the conditions added to the application would address concerns raised. The additional conditions would require car park marshals and additional cycle parking stands. The proposal included an Environmental Health assessment on noise levels and this had been determined the levels to be acceptable. The floodlighting proposed was a modern design, however a condition could be added to address the lighting scheme if complaints were subsequently received.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to comment on the application.

Members referred to the pricing policy at the facility and the reasons for proposing to install a bund on one side of the pitch and not the other. Members also commented on the 18 metre distance of the flood lighting poles from properties and the potential use of offensive language by visitors to the complex which may be heard by residents. Concerns were expressed on the issues of parking and other highway issues and the use of the pitch throughout the year and the impact this could have on the amenity of local residents in particular the family routines.

It was reported that the pricing policy was not a planning matter and the installation of a bund was proposed as way of screening the pitch from resident's properties adjacent to the complex to mitigate concerns raised. With regard to complaints about the use of anti-social behaviour and language, a condition could be explored in the application for the introduction of a resident reporting mechanism.

## **Decision**

Minded to refuse for the reasons that the proposed development would impact on neighbouring properties with a loss of amenity. The Committee agreed that the proposal was therefore in conflict with policies Policy DM1 - Development Management, DC26.1 (Noise) and SP1 -- Spatial Principles.

(The Head of Planning has been requested to submit a report which addresses the concerns raised and whether there are reasons for refusal which could be sustained.)

**PH/19/86. 121979/FO/2018 - Blackfriars House, Parsonage, M3 2JA - Deansgate Ward**

The Committee received a request from the applicant to defer consideration of the application. The Committee agreed to defer the application.

**Decision**

To defer consideration of the application.

(Councillor Hitchen left the meeting at this point and took no further part in the Committee)

**PH/19/87. 123522/FO/2019 - Pearl Assurance House, 25 Princess Street, M2 4HH - Deansgate Ward**

The Committee had undertaken a site visit in the morning prior to the start of the meeting. This application was for alterations to Pearl Assurance House associated with its conversion to a proposed hotel in conjunction with proposals which also include a 7 storey extension to the rear of the site and a 2 storey extension to the roof (to replace existing 6th floor) to create a hotel (Use Class C1) with 70 bedrooms, rooftop bar (Class A4), a rooftop plant enclosure and ancillary accommodation (basement and ground floor) together with access and servicing proposal, external alterations and associated works.

**Decision**

To approve, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted.

**PH/19/88. 121375/FO/2018 - 20 - 36 High Street, including Church Street Market Stalls, M4 1QB - Piccadilly Ward**

The Committee considered a request from the applicant to defer consideration of the application. The Committee agreed to defer the application.

**Decision**

To defer consideration of the application.

(Councillor Shaukat Ali left meeting at this point and took no further part in the Committee)

**PH/19/89. 122599/FO/2019 - 1 Adair Street, M1 2NQ - Piccadilly Ward**

This application related to the demolition of the existing building and the erection of a 13 / part 14 (plant level) storey building to create a 275-bedroom hotel (Class C1) use.

No objectors were present.

The applicant addressed the committee on the application.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment on the application.

Members welcomed the proposed hotel and the design approach. A question was raised about the planters and how these would be maintained and the cleaning of the material to be used on the exterior of the building.

Planning Officers reported that the proposal included on street planting at street level and planters on the balcony areas of the proposed building. The design of the building would use rain water to water the planters. The exterior of the building is a high quality concrete based material and the construction and subsequent maintenance would try to avoid drip lines forming.

**Decision**

To approve, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted.

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 17 October 2019**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Flanagan, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeleine Monaghan, Riasat, Watson and White

**Apologies:** Councillor Nasrin Ali, Y Dar, Davies and Hitchen

**Also present:** Councillors: M Dar, Douglas, Jeavons, Kilpatrick, Wheeler, Clay, Grimshaw, Karney, Wilson and Wright

#### **PH/19/90. Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

##### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/19/91. Minutes**

##### **Decision**

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

#### **PH/19/92. Membership Changes**

The Chair welcomed two new members to the Committee, Councillors Andrews and Flanagan, and thanked two former committee members, Councillors Clay and Wilson, for the service they had given to the work of the committee and the residents of the city.

#### **PH/19/93. 124181/VO/2019 - Former Central Retail Park Great Ancoats Street Manchester M4 6DJ - Ancoats and Beswick Ward**

This application was to retain the car park at the former Central Retail Park, Great Ancoats Street, Manchester as a public pay and display car park for a temporary period of two years.

The application site related to 1.5 hectares that was previously used as a 440 space car park as part of Central Retail Park, which had now been demolished. The land previously occupied by the retail units was not part of the site and was hoarded-off from the parking area. The original submission had been amended to reduce the temporary period from five years to two years, together with the removal of a

compound which was to the south western corner of the site and was being used by the Council as part of the improvement works to Great Ancoats Street. That was being taken forward under a separate planning application. Additional lighting would be provided within the north western and north eastern areas to ensure that the spaces were lit and safe to use in the evening. The location of CCTV and pay facilities remained to be confirmed as a management company had not yet been appointed. The car park would be accessed from the existing signalised junction at Great Ancoats Street and would operate on a 24-hour basis, 7 days a week.

The Planning Officer introduced the application and referred to the additional information included in the late representations submitted. The information included a submission from Lucy Powell MP and 15 additional objections including the grounds of these objections. In addition, a petition with over 10,000 signatures had been produced from the group 'TreesNotCars.com'. The petition contained key statistics and quotes from local parents in the area. The group believed that local residents would be negatively impacted by this application.

The Committee was addressed by a local resident who spoke as a representative of the 'TreesNotCars.com' group. She explained the group's objections to the application. She believed that when used as a car park for the retail park the site would have normally only had 20 to 30 cars on it, whereas with this proposal it would have 440, 24 hours of every day. She questioned the validity of the traffic management and air quality plans that had accompanied the application as the assessments had not taken into account traffic arising from football matches, concerts, at weekends and in the evenings. She argued that it was harmful to allow such a development next to a primary school, that the pollution arising from it and the vehicle movements could be harmful to the health of the children in the school, and that in doing so the Council would be acting contrary to its own declaration of a climate emergency in July.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee. She informed Members that the temporary use as a car park would be while proposals were being drawn up for the long-term regeneration of the retail park site. As the site had been previously used as a car park, this proposal was considered acceptable. There would be a neutral effect on levels of traffic and environmental impacts, including on air quality.

Councillor M Dar (Ward Councillor for Ancoats and Beswick) then addressed the Committee in objection to the application. He referred to the level of the local opposition to the proposal from the residents of the ward. He supported the objections of the residents and also felt that the proposed use would go against the Council's declaration of a climate emergency. He felt that under the 'Our Manchester' strategy the Committee should be listening to the voices of the local people and should refuse the application.

Planning Officers were invited to respond to the concerns raised in objection to the application. It was commented that the issues that had been raised were already contained within the report. It was stated that it was believed there had been a reduction in the number of car parking spaces within the city centre and the application before Committee would not result in any increase to the number of spaces available but would replace other surface car parks that had been



redeveloped. Officers also advised the Committee that there was no evidence to suggest that the application would result in an increase in the number of car journeys into the city centre. It was reiterated that the application was for a temporary period of two years.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to comment on the application. Members raised concerns in relation to air quality and concerns that this site was next to a primary school, and that the pattern of use under this proposal would be very different and heavier from the vehicle movements when the site was a retail park. They also felt it was important to ensure that a temporary consent was for two years and no longer. Members also felt that the use of the site should not discourage people from using public transport instead of driving a car into the city.

Councillor Flanagan proposed the following amendment, which was seconded by Councillor White:

“that the Committee is minded to approve the application subject to:

- the layout of the car park being amended so that the triangular area in closest proximity to New Islington Free School was not used for parking and instead was replaced with planting to increase the landscape buffer between the site and the school;
- that a commitment was given by the Council that the site would not be used as a car park for more than the proposed two years; and
- that any parking charges introduced did not undercut public transport costs to the city centre.”

The committee supported that amendment to the officer’s recommendation, and on that basis were minded to grant the temporary consent.

## **Decision**

Minded to approve the application, with the authority to approve the application delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the amendment proposed by the Committee.

### **PH/19/94. 124320/FH/2019 - 53 Kingston Road Manchester M20 2SB - Didsbury East Ward**

This application was deferred at the request of the applicant in order to allow for the preparation of a sample panel of the proposed brick tinting.

### **PH/19/95. 121460/FH/2018 - 53 Kingston Road Manchester M20 2SB - Didsbury East Ward**

This application was deferred at the request of the applicant in order to allow for the preparation of a sample panel of the proposed brick tinting.

**PH/19/96. 120607/FO/2018 - Platt Lane Complex Yew Tree Road Manchester M14 7UU - Fallowfield Ward**

This application had been formally withdrawn by the applicant in advance of the meeting.

**PH/19/97. 123757/VO/2019 - 53 Barlow Moor Road Manchester M20 6TP - Didsbury West Ward**

This application was for the retention of access onto a classified road. The application site related to an installed dropped kerb within the pavement to the front of number 53 Barlow Moor Road located approximately 200 metres to the west of Didsbury District Centre.

The Planning Officer introduced the application. He advised the Committee that the dropped-kerb was installed in November 2017 by the Council following a request by the owner of the property. As Barlow Moor Road was a classified road, planning permission was required for the formation, laying out and construction of a means of access to a highway. Following receipt of a complaint regarding the installation of the dropped kerb the Council's Highway Services had now submitted a planning application to regularise the installation that had taken place.

The Committee was addressed by a local resident who objected to the application. He explained the history of the development and why he believed that the installation of the drop kerb had been done without consent. He referred to a decision by the Local Government Ombudsman that the Council had been at fault for allowing the installation of the drop kerb to go ahead. He explained his knowledge of the use of the pavement, having lived nearby for 33 years, and why the installation of the drop kerb had created a very dangerous situation with the space insufficient to safely park a vehicle without obstructing the footway, making it too narrow for a wheelchair to pass by safely. He explained why the drop kerb and parking ramp were contrary to the requirements of building regulations.

Councillor R Kilpatrick (Ward Councillor for Didsbury West) then addressed the Committee in objection to the application and referred to how busy Barlow Moor Road is and the prevalence of mobility issues amongst local residents. He too said the driveway was not large enough to park a vehicle safely and that Greater Manchester Police had had to get involved to deal with the obstructions that the parked vehicles had been causing.

Planning Officers were invited to respond to the concerns raised in objection to the application. It was commented that planning permission was not being sought for parking a car on a private driveway, just the installation of the dropped-kerb.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to comment on the application.

Members were concerned that the existence of the drop-kerb was encouraging the use of the space in front of the house as a vehicle park, and that was leading to obstructions of the walkway, as was evident in the photographs in the officer's report.

The obstructions and the change of slope in the pavement were therefore making the walkway less safe for pedestrians and were harmful to the accessibility of the neighbourhood. Members were especially concerned about older and less able people trying to use the walkway, impeded by the parked vehicles and the change in the slope of the path.

Highways Officers advised the Committee that the concerns of Councillors were understood. He said that the site did present a difficult traffic situation and that the Highways service would not accept that a vehicle parked in front of the property should be able to overhang and partially block the footway. He stated that Highway Services had visited the site and were satisfied that an appropriately sized vehicle could park on the driveway without overhanging the pavement.

The members concluded that the application was detrimental to the safety of the public using the footway and requested that the Director of Planning bring a further report to the next meeting to address the concerns and with potential reasons for refusal.

### **Decision**

The Committee is minded to refuse the application for the reasons that the proposed drop-kerb would impact on the safety of the public in using the footpath directly in front of the property. The committee agreed that the proposal was therefore in conflict with policies Policy SP1 - Spatial Principles and Policy DM1 - Development Management.

(The Director of Planning was requested to submit a report which addresses the concerns raised and whether there are reasons for refusal which could be sustained.)

### **PH/19/98. 124313/FO/2019 - 67 Church Road Manchester M22 4WD - Northenden Ward**

This application related to the change of use to a café/bar of the ground floor of a two-storey end terrace property with cellar, and installation of rear fire escape door together with sundry ancillary alterations.

The property was located at the end of a commercial parade in a predominately residential area east of Northenden District Centre on the junction of Church Road and Consul Street. The site had historically been used as an off licence (Class A1), a hairdressers (Class A1) and an unauthorised yoga studio.

The officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted by the applicant that related to the proposed conditions on a consent, and also to further letters of objection.

No objectors were present.

The applicant's agent addressed the committee on the application. She described the application as providing a café bar for local people to enjoy. There was much local

support for the application. The proposal would be a vacant unit back into use and be a benefit to the local economy.

Members welcomed the proposed use of the premises, stating that the area would benefit from this type of establishment.

Planning Officers reported that the consent was for a temporary period of 18 months, and would have a restrictive condition controlling the hours that the premises could open

## **Decision**

The Committee approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted

[Councillor Madeline Monaghan was not present when the vote on this application took place]

### **PH/19/99. 121375/FO/2018 & 121447/FO/2018 - 20 - 36 High Street, Including Church Street Market Stalls and land Bound By The Northern Quarter Multi-Storey Carpark, Church Street and Red Lion Street, Manchester, M4 1QB - Piccadilly Ward**

This application was for the construction of a 22 storey building comprising 361 residential apartments, ground floor commercial floor space, associated landscaping, including new public realm and pedestrian route, together with servicing, cycle parking, access and other associated works following demolition of buildings at 20-22 and 24-26 High Street and 5 market stalls to Church Street and the erection of one and two storey market stalls for flexible commercial uses at ground and first floor (following demolition of a wall) and related access, landscaping and other associated works for a temporary five year period.

The proposals related to two sites which were inextricably linked. The first related to an island site measuring 0.35ha and bounded by High Street, Church Street, Birchin Lane and Bridgewater Place, in the south-west corner of the Smithfield Conservation Area, close to the Shudehill and Upper King Street Conservation Areas and immediately to the north of the Grade II Debenhams. The second was at the junction of Church Street and Red Lion Street adjacent to the Church Street Multi Storey Car Park and was on the edge of the Northern Quarter which contained a mix of commercial and residential uses including independent businesses that helped to distinguish the Northern Quarter from other parts the City Centre.

Councillor Douglas (Ward Councillor for Piccadilly) addressed the Committee in objection to the application. She raised three main concerns: the height and size of the building; the location of the development; and the heritage impact. She referred to the concerns of Historic England, and the impact of the loss of the Café Metro building, which she considered to be both a heritage and community asset, as well as a local employer. She said she would prefer a smaller and less imposing development on the site that would not result in the loss of the Café Metro building.

The Agent then addressed the Committee. He felt that at present the site was one of the poorest parts of the city centre and was making a negative contribution to the Conservation Area. He said that consultations undertaken by the applicant had supported the redevelopment of the site. All options to retain the Café Metro building had been examined but the constraints of the building had presented insurmountable challenges that it had not been possible to overcome. He said the new building would be considered a modern classic. He argued that the benefits of the development would outweigh and harms that would arise, articulating the many benefits of the scheme.

Planning Officers were invited to respond to the concerns raised in objection to the application. It was commented that the issues that had been raised were already contained within the report. The officer set out the benefits of the proposals and weighed those against the harm to the setting of the Conservation Area and the loss of the heritage asset. It was explained that officers had worked with the applicant to bring forward a building that was only as large as it needed to be to be viable.

Members raised concerns in relation to the loss of 20-22 High Street, the Café Metro building. It was proposed that the means to retain the façade of that building should be further examined.

In response to the concerns raised, Officers advised that the retention of the façade of that building could be examined, without an assurance being possible that a scheme that retained the façade of 20-22 High Street would still result in a viable development.

Councillor Flanagan proposed the following amendment, which was seconded by Councillor Andrews:

“The Committee is minded to approve the application subject to the Director of Planning fully investigating the feasibility of the retention of the façade of 20-22 High Street within the development proposals.”

He explained that he trusted the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, would carefully examine how the façade could be retained so as to do the best for the city. The committee accepted that amendment to the Officer's recommendation.

## **Decision**

The Committee was minded to approve the application, with the authority to approve delegated to the Director of Planning, in consultation with the Chair of the Committee, subject to the signing of a s106 legal agreement relating to a contribution towards affordable housing, the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the amendment passed by the Committee to fully explore the potential to retain the façade of 20-22 High Street.

[Councillor Watson left the meeting during consideration of this application]

**PH/19/100. 121979/FO/2018 - Blackfriars House Parsonage Manchester M3 2JA  
- Deansgate Ward**

This application was for the change of use of part of ground floor from office to café, works to rooftop comprising erection of a rooftop extension for use as a restaurant and refurbishment of roof space to house ventilation equipment and create roof terrace with intensive green roof.

The proposal related Blackfriars House, an eight storey building bounded by Parsonage, Blackfriars Street, the River Irwell and Alexandra House. It was located in the Parsonage Gardens Conservation Area. Blackfriars House was a substantial office building built in 1923 and its principal elevations were in Portland Stone. The building was not listed but was considered a non-designated heritage asset and made a positive contribution to the conservation area. Alterations included the demolition of existing rooftop buildings to allow for a rooftop extension constructed from bronze coloured aluminium and curtain wall glazing, an associated roof terrace and a green roof. Alterations would also be made to the service entrance at ground floor level on Parsonage, to provide access to the roof level.

Councillor Jeavons (Ward Councillor for Deansgate) addressed the Committee in objection to the application and referred to the history of the proposals for this site and the extent of objection there had been to those proposals. He acknowledged that the scheme now before the Committee had addressed many of those objections and he commended the developer for that. He raised remaining concerns that he called on the Committee to examine in relation to noise and recycling, congestion, traffic and pollution.

The Agent then addressed the Committee. He informed Members that the development would benefit existing users of the building, provide high quality amenities for the wider community, and new employment opportunities. He explained how the proposals had evolved to address the objections that had arisen from earlier schemes. He confirmed that the applicant was willing to accept and comply with the proposed conditions to reduce the potential harm to local residents.

Planning Officers were invited to respond to the concerns raised in objection to the application. It was confirmed that the conditions on the scheme had been proposed to reduce any potential nuisance to neighbouring residents.

Members stressed the need to ensure that the proposals to include a 'green roof' had to be included as part of the development. Subject to that the Committee supported the application.

**Decision**

The Committee approves the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report

[Councillor Raisat left the meeting during consideration of this application]

## **Audit Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 15 October 2019**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Ahmed Ali (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Clay, Lanchbury, Russell, Stanton and Watson  
Dr D Barker (Co-opted Member)  
Dr S Downs (Co-opted Member)

#### **Also present:**

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing  
Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources  
Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport

#### **AC/19/40. Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2019 as a correct record.

#### **AC/19/41. External Audit Progress Report and Update**

The Committee considered a report of Mazars, which provided an update on progress in delivering their responsibilities as the Council's external auditor. The report also highlighted key emerging national issues and developments which may be of interest to Members of the Committee.

It was reported that since the last meeting they had completed work on the Council's Whole of Government Accounts (WGA) return as required by the National Audit Office and had issued their unqualified conclusion on the Council's WGA submission on 20 September 2019. This had enabled Mazars to issue their Audit Completion Certificate for 2018/19 on that date.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A Member queried the net expenditure figure for the WGA. It was explained that the net expenditure figure was the difference between public sector income and expenditure with financing costs taken into account.

A Member welcomed the fact that the submission of the Council's accounts had been made on time and sought assurance that this would be repeated for 2019/20. It was reported that Mazars had already begun to have discussion with the Council in relation to this to identify areas of work that could commence earlier in order to ensure next year's account were also submitted on time.

#### **Decisions**

(1) The Committee notes the report; and

- (2) Thanks all Officers who had been involved in the submission of the Council's accounts.

### **AC/19/42. External Auditor Annual Audit Letter**

The Committee considered the Annual Audit Letter of Mazars, the Council's external Auditors, which summarised the work they had undertaken as the auditor for Manchester City Council for the year ended 31 March 2019.

The purpose of the audit was to provide reasonable assurance to users that the financial statements were free from material error. This was conducted in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Audit Practice issued by the National Audit Office. The report, issued to the Council on 31 July 2019, stated that, in the view of Mazars, the financial statements gave a true and fair view of the Council's financial position as at 31 March 2019 and of its financial performance for the year then ended.

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the Annual Audit Letter.

### **AC/19/43. Risk Review Item - Adults Improvement Plan and Assurance Update**

The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director Adult Social Services, which sought to provide an assurance update on progress made in responding to issues arising from Internal Audit reports of Adults Social Care and the planned actions to address areas of risk.

Many of the planned actions agreed in response to audit work were being delivered through the Adults Social Care Improvement Programme. This Programme incorporated findings and areas for improvement identified through audit work as well as a range of other sources including management reviews, partner engagement and staff feedback. This included the following areas:-

- Transition to Adult Services;
- Homecare Contracts;
- Disability Supported Accommodation Services Quality Assurance (QA);
- Management Oversight and Supervisions;
- Deprivation of Liberty Safeguarding (DoLS); and
- Mental Health Casework Compliance.

The Programme was focused on ensuring the basics were in place for adult social care to deliver high quality services for Manchester residents and to successfully deliver health and social care reform and integration. The programme plan for this work had been developed based on the outcomes of diagnostic work and the internal audits completed. The programme included workstreams on:-

- Assessment function;
- Safeguarding and Quality Assurance functions;
- Provider services;



- Workforce skill and capacity;
- Adult social care commissioning; and
- Front Door offer.

The Programme was governed by the Adult Social Care Improvement Board, chaired by the Executive Director of Adult Social Services and comprised of senior officers from the service and MLCO with support from the corporate core. The Board reported to the MLCO Executive through the Executive Director of Adult Social Services, and provided assurance to the Council's Strategic Management Team and the MHCC Executive on a quarterly basis.

The report went on to detail the progress to date of a number of key priorities.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A Member commented that it was not clear what recommendations identified by Internal Audit were still outstanding and when and how these would be resolved. In response, the Executive Director Adult Social Services assured the Committee that the Improvement Programme would address all outstanding recommendations and that this would be monitored by both the Council's Senior Management Team and the MLCO Executive. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer also commented that an update report on the outstanding recommendations was due to come before the Committee in November.

The Committee queried whether the new Liquid Logic software provided a method for monitoring supervisions and also whether the consultation with staff on the proposal of weekend working to increase the impact of the reablement service was genuine.

It was reported that the Executive Director Adult Social Services had reviewed the Supervisions Policy and how it fitted with other Council policies and following the appointment of 12 Neighbourhood Team managers, these supervisions were now being undertaken. It was also reported that the consultation with staff on improvements to the reablement service were genuine and work was ongoing with staff and Trade Unions to identify suitable solutions.

A Member commented on the overuse of acronyms within the report; questioned whether the additional number of posts that were being created could be financed from the £4.225million that was being invested into the service to support delivery of the improvement programme; sought clarification as to how the Quality Assurance approach was being embedded, and with reference to Mental Health Casework Compliance, queried how the Council was able to have internal audit of systems that it did not own or manage.

The Executive Director Adult Social Services noted the point made around the overuse of acronyms, acknowledging that the report was complex and that this would be looked at in future reports. It was explained that the total number of posts being created would be funded from a number of funding streams in addition to the £4.225million that the Council had invested. In terms of quality assurance, it was explained that there had been a reduction in the number of staff each manager had responsibility for to ensure that this was being embedded within teams and in terms

of Mental Health Casework Compliance, it was explained that whilst the Council did not directly employ Mental Health Supervisors, it did have a statutory duty to deliver a Mental Health service and worked closely with Greater Manchester Mental Health Foundation Trust (GMMHFT) who delivered this on behalf of the Council. From a Council perspective, any recommendations for improvement to this service that Internal Audit identified would be directed to the Executive Director Adult Social Services who would then engage with GMMHFT.

The Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing commented that she strongly believed the role of Audit was to reassure the Council that all aspects of work and service delivery were being delivered effectively and efficiently and acknowledged that the governance of the integration of health services with the Council was complex.

In relation to a query on recruitment to the Disability Supported Accommodation Service, it was explained that new support co-ordinators had been recruited.

The Executive Director Adult Social Services advised that BiA's stood for Best Interest Assessors in terms of Safeguarding and DoLS and that in relation to recruitment to safeguarding positions 13 BiA's had been recruited.

It was commented that a progress table of the outstanding recommendations should be included in the report that was due to come before the Committee in November as well as some form of assurance mapping.

The view of the Council's External Auditors was sought and it was noted that the External Auditors role was to consider the governance arrangements of the Council and they had an assurance of the overall arrangements.

## **Decision**

The Committee note the actions being taken through the Adults Social Care Improvement Programme.

### **AC/19/44. Risk Review Item - Manchester Salford Inner Relief Route Lessons Learned**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Highways and Head of Audit and Risk Management, which summarised the key events surrounding the financial failure and subsequent administration of the principal contractor (Dawnus) on the Manchester Salford Inner Relief Route (MSIRR) highways programme and associated lessons learned.

The report highlighted the timeline of events from when the framework agreement for major highways works was let in October 2017, the award of MSIRR contract to the principal contractor in June 2018 and works commencing in August 2018 to the 12 March 2019, when Highways Service were contacted by TfGM to advise that subcontractor vehicles were blocking traffic work on the scheme and the principal contractor had failed to attend a planned site meeting.

The report provided detail of the subsequent steps taken by the Council, which included the formation of an Incident Management Team (IMT) to gain an understanding of the position of the principal contractor, key risks and issues, current planned actions and further planned actions. Subsequently, a range of options to secure a new contractor were developed and appraised through the IMT, with agreement on three phases to restart the works. Following confirmation on 18 March 2019 that the principal contractor had entered into administration, the formal process of procurement started, with the contract awarded to John Sisk and Son, as the new principal contractor for the completion of works.

The Committee was then appraised of the lessons learned from the incident, the current programme status in terms of progress, costs and funding and finally, the proposed actions that had been identified.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

It was acknowledged that without the swift action of the Council, it would not have been possible to rescue the contract and the Committee placed on record its thanks to all those that had been involved.

Concern was raised in relation to the ability for sub-contractors to report any issues of concern they had around payment with the principal contractor and it was suggested that there should be a mechanism for these concerns to be raised directly with the Council.

The Committee queried that given a known cause of delay to the scheme had resulted from the need for re-working aspect of the scheme that had been assessed as being of sub-standard quality, whether the original value of the contract was not sufficient or was the principal contractor providing substandard work. The Director of Highways responded, advising that there had been no evidence to suggest the principal contractor was delivering poor quality work, but what did become evident was that the progress of works had slowed down. He also added that the principal contractor was paid by the Council in accordance with works completed and it was their responsibility to ensure payment was made to any sub-contractors. It was reported that nothing had ever been raised directly with the Council on the issue of non-payments, but this would be a lesson learned for the future in regards to the whistleblowing policy.

In relation to a question on the identified changes in financial stability of the principal contractor, which had been identified on further accountant examination following the incident, the Head of Audit and Risk Management advised that the credit check report that was undertaken prior to the contract being awarded had identified the principal contractor as low risk and at the time there was nothing to make the Council concerned around their financial stability.

In re-awarding the contract, the Committee queried why it had been agreed that the contract for the completion of works should be let in accordance with NEC Option E, as payments were on cost reimbursement plus overheads and profit which transferred a greater level of financial risk to the Council. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer explained that although this was not a preferred form of

contract that the Council would normally enter, and had only been used in this occasion given the very specific and particular events that occurred on MSIRR and the intolerable risk of further, significant details on the programme following the unexpected collapse of original principal contractor.

It was suggested that in awarding any future contracts, consideration should be given to locally based contractors and that the ability for sub-contractors to report concerns directly to the Council should be built in to future contracts, should they not feel able to raise concerns with the principal contractor.

### **Decision**

The Committee note the lessons learned from the MSIRR programme.

### **AC/19/45. Annual Complaints Report**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the City Solicitor which presented the complaints and enquiries dashboard for the Council's annual performance for 2018/19 relating to corporate and social care complaints, Councillor and MP enquiries. The report also provided information of how the complaints and enquiries received had been used to influence service related improvements. The Director of Policy Performance and Reform introduced the report.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

Reassurance was sought that where praise was received for staff, this was passed on to the member of staff in question. It was also asked how much forward planning did the Council undertake in identifying areas of work that would possibly result in complaints being received.

The Feedback and Complaints Manager advised that all directorates received quarterly report on praise received for staff, which was circulated to all Managers for ensuring that this was then passed on to the appropriate members of staff. In terms of forward planning it was explained that the Complaints Team worked with all Directorates to identify areas of work that could potentially be problematic and result in a spike in complaints to try and communicate with residents in advance.

### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report.

### **AC/19/46. Work Programme and Audit Committee Recommendations Monitor**

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

It was commented that a number of previous recommendations made by the Committee in late 2018 and early 2019 still required responses.

In relation to the recommendation that the minutes of the Manchester Local Care Organisation Audit Committee be submitted to this Committee for information, the Head of Audit and Risk Management commented that the MLCO did not have its own Audit Committee and it was actually Manchester Health Foundation Trust (MHFT) that had an Audit Committee. He advised that a conversation would need to be had with colleagues at MHFT as to what could be provided to this Committee.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer agreed to arrange response to the outstanding recommendations in advance of the next meeting.

### **Decision**

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the Work Programme; and
- (2) Notes that the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer will arrange responses to the outstanding recommendations in advance of the next meeting.

### **AC/19/47. Exclusion of 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

### **AC/19/48. Annual Counter Fraud Report - PART B**

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Head of Audit and Risk Management, which provided a summary the outcome of reactive and proactive work undertaken during 2018/19 to investigate referrals of fraud and other irregularities.

The report set out the context for fraud risks in the Council and the response to these risks. It provided a summary of the work delivered by Internal Audit along with other teams across the Council during the year, resolution of issues and areas identified for further development during 2019/20.

The Head of Audit and Risk Management referred to the main points and themes within the report and responded to questions from the Committee.

#### **Decision**

The Committee notes the report

## **Audit Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 12 November 2019**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Ahmed Ali - In the Chair  
Councillors Clay, Lanchbury, Russell and Watson

Independent Co-opted member: Dr S Downs  
Independent Co-opted member: Dr D Barker

#### **Also Present:**

Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources  
Stephen Nixon, Mazars

**Apologies:** Councillor Stanton

#### **AC/19/49 Minutes**

##### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 15 October 2019 as a correct record.

#### **AC/19/50 Treasury Management (Interim) Report**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided Members with an update on Treasury Management activities of the Council during the first six months of 2019-20.

##### **Decision**

To note the report.

#### **AC/19/51 Internal Audit Assurance Report**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management that provided Members with a summary of the work of the Internal Audit Section from April to September 2019, including progress toward delivery of the annual audit plan, a summary of assurance opinions on completed audits and a summary position on the implementation of Internal Audit recommendations. Focus was on the work produced in the second quarter of the year July to September. The opinions and statistics had been shared with Directorate senior managers for discussion; to agree actions; and would be used to inform an overall annual assurance opinion in March 2020. The Chair stated that he welcomed the format of the Executive Summaries that had been provided throughout the report.

A Member commented upon the Limited Assurance given for the governance arrangements between the Council and the Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO). The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated the challenges arose due to multiple organisations, acting as commissioners and providers and their respective reporting mechanisms and decisions making arrangements. He stated that whilst this was a complex landscape he reassured Members that non were acting beyond their legal power or authority. He stated that he was confident that this could be resolved and added that all partners were committed to this.

The Member further commented that KPIs needed to be agreed and monitored for the Manchester Local Care Organisation so that the benefits to residents could be monitored and assessed. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer reported that KPIs needed to be appropriate and she stated the clear line of accountability rested with the Executive Director, Adult Social Services and her Deputy. She added that the benefits of the MLCO and the Integrated Neighbourhood Teams were beginning to be realised by preventing people going into hospital unnecessarily and moving people safely out of acute hospital care into a community setting.

A Member requested that further to the report that had been considered by the Committee at their October meeting she still had concerns in relation to Adult Social Care and recommended that a further report on all of the outstanding recommendations identified by Internal Audit for Adult Services be submitted for consideration at a future meeting. The Member also stated that the Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing and the Executive Director, Adult Social Services should be in attendance.

A Member enquired what were the arrangements for the incidents reported where management did not agree with an internal audit assessment. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management informed the Committee that this was flexible and could be negotiated as long as Internal Audit were satisfied that appropriate actions were taken to address any identified risk.

In response to the Corporate Services, Integrated Commissioning and Procurement information provided a Member requested that further details on all low value contracts and associated timescales be provided. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated that he would circulate information on these outside of the meeting.

## **Decisions**

The Committee recommend:

1. To receive a report on the all the outstanding recommendations identified by Internal Audit for Adult Services be submitted for consideration at a future meeting and that the Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing and the Executive Director, Adult Social Services be in attendance.
2. To receive an update report on the Management Oversight and Supervision – Children’s Services be submitted for consideration at a future meeting and that the

Deputy Director Children's Services and the Executive Member for Children and Schools be in attendance.

3. That the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management circulate information on the value of contracts referenced within the Integrated Commissioning and Procurement information.

4. To confirm the proposed changes to the Internal Audit Plan 2019/20, subject to the comments from the Committee above.

### **AC/19/52 Outstanding Audit Recommendations**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management that provided the details of progress to address outstanding recommendations in the High Priority categories.

The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management reported to the Committee that the recommendations relating to Children Missing from Home had been completed. Members welcomed this.

Members noted that the Transition to Adults recommendations remained outstanding and noted that this was a longstanding issue. A Member commented that it was important to recognise the importance of this and the impact this had on citizens of Manchester. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management responded by stating that this was a complex area of activity, involving a number of services. He stated that the Executive Director Adult Social Services was seeking to deliver a holistic approach and that transitions was an area of high priority in the Adults Improvement Plan. He recommended that a further update on this specific activity is reported to the Committee at an appropriate time. Members endorsed this recommendation.

In response to a comment from a Member regarding Disability Supported Accommodation Services, the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated that the issue of capacity did present a challenge. He stated that the outstanding recommendations had been escalated to the relevant Strategic Lead and Executive Member. He recommended that a further update on this specific activity is reported to the Committee at an appropriate time. Members endorsed this recommendation.

The City Solicitor addressed the Committee in regard to Purchase Cards. She reported that the guidance in respect of purchase cards had been provided, and the intention was to appropriately embed these into both the Members and Employees Code of Conduct. She said that this would be done in consultation with both Human Resources and Trade Unions and it was anticipated that this would be completed by July 2020. She advised that the Codes of Conduct would be reported to Standards Committee for consideration and comment.

### **Decisions**

The Committee recommend:



1. To note the report.
2. That a report on the overdue recommendations in relation to the Transition to Adults be submitted for consideration at an appropriate time, and all relevant Strategic Leads and Executive Members be in attendance.
2. That a report on the overdue recommendations in relation to Disability Supported Accommodation Services be submitted for consideration at an appropriate time, and all relevant Strategic Leads and Executive Members be in attendance.

[Councillor Lanchbury declared a personnel and non-prejudicial interest as she is a Reg 44 visitor (an Independent Person who visits a children's residential home on a monthly basis.)]

### **AC/19/53     Annual Governance Statement Update**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that set out a brief summary of the progress that had been made to date in implementing the governance recommendations from the 2018/19 Annual Governance Statement (AGS). It also outlined the next steps in the process of producing the Annual Governance Statement 2019/20.

A Member noted the information provided that described that the Chief Executive of Liverpool City Council, had been appointed as the North West regional coordinator for Brexit preparations and reporting, and enquired when had that happened. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that she would confirm the date and circulate this information to the Committee.

A Member noted the information provided in relation to Cyber Security and enquired if this was to be available to Members. She requested that if it was not then this training be extended to Members and information be shared with the Members Development Working Group.

A Member commented on the reported 10% increase in managers completing Return To Work information promptly when compared to the same reporting period last year, stating that this was to be welcomed.

In regard to the information provided against Action Point 3, Members noted their discussion when considering the previous agenda item, AC/19/51 and recommended that Officers take the concerns and views of the reporting of Adult Services into consideration. The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform stated that comments of Members had been noted.

In response to a question from a Member regarding ethnic diversity in senior management roles, the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform stated that consideration would be given as to how this information, and wider equalities data could be reported within these reports to the Committee.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

**AC/19/54 Governance Improvement Progress for Partnerships with Low or Medium Strength of Governance Assessment Ratings**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update on progress made to strengthen governance arrangements in the sixteen partnerships where a 'Low' or 'Medium' Partnership Strength of Governance rating was recorded in the 2018 Register of Significant Partnerships, as requested by the committee in February 2019.

In response to a question from a Member the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform stated that substantive report on the Register of Significant Partnerships would be submitted to the February 2020 meeting for consideration, adding that the register was a live document and could be reviewed throughout the year.

In regard to the Hulme High Street entry, the Performance and Intelligence Officer reported that the Council had now commenced the process of acquiring the shares in Hulme High Street Ltd currently held by AMEC/Muse. The result being that the Council would become the sole shareholder of the company hence no longer a joint venture or partnership. The Council's legal team continued to prioritise this area of work; in the interim the partnership remained as 'Low' governance strength. Members welcomed this update.

In response to the governance arrangements of the Northern Gateway, Members were informed that any changes to the business plan would need to be agreed by the Executive.

Members welcomed the reported establishment of the Manchester Safeguarding Partnership (MSP) that had replaced the Manchester Safeguarding Children's Board, which consisted of the Manchester Safeguarding Children Board and Manchester Safeguarding Adults Board. The new MSP had been established in response to new legislative guidance that required all local areas to publish their new multi-agency safeguarding arrangements for children by 29 June 2019.

A Member commented that consideration needed to be given to all Tenant Management Organisations, not just the two that were referenced within the report when reporting the relationships between the Council and TMOs.

In response to a specific question regarding the Brunswick PFI the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer informed Members that all such schemes were monitored. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management suggested that the Committee may wish to consider a specific report on this activity when reviewing their Work Programme.

**Decision**

To note the report.

**AC/19/55 External Audit Progress Report and Update – Oral Report**

The Committee heard from Stephen Nixon, Mazars the Council's External Auditors. He advised Members that work was progressing and the detailed plan would be submitted to the Committee in the new year.

**Decision**

To note the oral report.

**AC/19/56 The Committee's Work Programme**

A Member recommended that both the Children's and Adults Directorates be included in the Risk Review Item scheduled for consideration at the December meeting, with all relevant Strategic Leads and Executive Members in attendance.

**Decision**

To approve the Work Programme subject to the above amendment.

**AC/19/57 Exclusion of the 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

**AC/19/58 Oral report on Cyber Security Audit Findings (Public Excluded)**

The Committee received an oral report from the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management that provided Members with an update cyber security audit findings.

The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management then responded to questions from Members.

**Decision**

To note the oral report.

## **Personnel Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 16 October 2019**

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

**Councillors:** Akbar, Bridges, Craig, , N Murphy, S Murphy, Rahman, Richards, and Stogia

**Apologies:** Councillor Leech and Leese  
**PE/19/23 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 11 September 2019 as a correct record.

#### **PE/19/24 Employment Policy – Domestic Abuse**

The Committee considered a report of the Interim Director of HROD which set out a revised and strengthened approach to supporting staff who are subject to or affected by domestic abuse. The existing policy had been refreshed to reflect changes in best practice and learning over the last three years as well as consultation with the Council's Community Safety team. The policy had also been aligned with the Council's zero-tolerance 'Delivering Differently' Domestic Violence and Abuse Strategy. The Committee was invited to approve the policy and its implementation.

The Committee noted that an internal communication strategy would be rolled out to staff to inform them of changes to the policy. Members also discussed the importance of leading by example and exerting influence to larger employers in the city to adopt similar ways of working.

No Trade Union comments had been submitted for the item. The Committee fully supported and welcomed the proposals.

#### **Decision**

#### **PE/19/25 Director of Commercial and Operations**

The Committee considered a report of the Chief Executive which put forward a proposal to redesignate and regrade the post of Operations and Commissioning Director in the Neighbourhoods Directorate to Director of Commercial and Operations in order to reflect increased responsibilities. The increased responsibilities were set out in the report as well as the financial implications of the proposals.

No Trade Union comments were submitted for consideration of the item. The Committee agreed the proposals.

#### **Decisions**

1. To approve the redesignation of the Head of Commissioning and Delivery to Director of Commercial and Operations.
2. To recommend that Council approves the regrade of the Director Commercial and operations from SS3 (£78, 715 - £87, 217) to SS4 (£95, 953 - £105, 940) and agrees to appointment at a salary of £105, 940

## **Health and Wellbeing Board**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 30 October 2019**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Richard Leese, Leader of the Council (Chair)  
Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults  
Dr Murugesan Raja GP Member (Central) Manchester Health and Care  
Commissioning  
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Jim Potter, Chair, Pennine Acute Hospital Trust  
Mike Wild, Voluntary and Community Sector representative  
Vicky Szulist, Chair, Healthwatch  
Paul Marshall, Strategic Director of Children's Services  
David Regan, Director of Public Health  
Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services

#### **Also Present:**

Professor Matt Makin, Medical Director, North Manchester General Hospital  
Peter Blythin, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Jonny Sadler, Programme Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency  
Claire Igoe, Head of Environmental Sustainability, Manchester University NHS  
Naomi Makin, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust  
Martina McLaughlin, Planned Care Reform Manager, MHCC

#### **Apologies:**

Rupert Nichols, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust  
Dr Claire Lake Member (South) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
Dr Ruth Bromley, Chair, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
Dr Vish Mehra, Central Primary Care Manchester

### **HWB/19/31 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held of 28 August 2019 were submitted for approval.

#### **Decision**

The approve the minutes of 28 August 2018 as a correct record.

### **HWB/19/32 Improving Adult Mental Health Services in Manchester**

The Board considered the report and accompanying presentation of the Chief Executive, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust that provided a progress report on developments in Manchester mental health services following the acquisition of Manchester Mental Health and Social Care Trust on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2017.

The Chief Executive, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust referred to the main points and themes within the presentation which included information and updates on the following areas of activity: -

- Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT);
- Reducing Out of Area Placements for Adult Acute Patients;
- Developing an Enhanced Community Mental Health Model;
- Mental Health Liaison in Acute Hospitals;
- Provision of a dedicated Section 136 Suite;
- Rehabilitation Pathway and Housing and Mental Health Strategy;
- Community Engagement and Manchester Wellbeing Fund;
- Improving our environments;
- Integrating with Manchester Local Care Organisation;
- Greater Manchester Transformation Programme; and
- Update on CQC Well Led Inspection of GMMH – July 2019.

The Chief Executive, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust reported that the Trust employed the highest number of apprentices in the UK and the Trust was recognised as Living Wage Foundation Employer. He stated that this was important to assist in the recruitment and retention of the best workforce to deliver services for the benefit of Manchester citizens. He further commented that the Trust had recently commissioned a dedicated student mental health service; was delivering mental health services for a Housing First project, delivered by a local housing provider to support 400 homeless people; delivering a mental health and criminal justice service and that the substance misuse service had been extended across the city.

The Board welcomed the reported improvements and noted that both areas of challenge and improvement had been identified. In particular, the Board welcomed the work undertaken to address the number of out of area placements for patients requiring care.

In response to a question from a Member the Director of Operation, GMMH stated that individuals could self-refer for treatment, however the waiting time for face to face advice was approximately 6 weeks for an IAPTS appointment.

The Chief Executive, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust acknowledged a comment from a Board Member by advising that work was underway at a Greater Manchester level to improve the transition from CAMHS (Child and adolescent mental health services) to Adult Services. The Director of Operation, GMMH also commented that opportunities did exist to work with families and deliver targeted preventative work.

The Chief Executive, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust welcomed the suggestion to work closely with Partners to continue to address out of area placements and delayed transfer of care cases. He further acknowledged a comment regarding sustainability of community projects and commented that opportunities to use the Manchester Wellbeing Fund to achieve this were being explored, and he provided an example of where this Fund had been used to then attract alternative sources of funding to support projects long term.

## **Decision**

To note the report and welcome the progress reported.

### **HWB/19/33 North Manchester Strategy**

The Board considered the report and accompanying presentation of the Chair, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning that provided an update on the North Manchester Strategy with particular reference to the two major capital announcements that had been made by Government to invest in facilities at the North Manchester General Hospital (NMGH) site.

The Executive Director, Strategy, MHCC referred to the main points and themes within the presentation which included information and updates on the following areas of activity: -

- Providing a context for the site in terms of area and population;
- The case for change and a summary of the proposition to deliver a modern health and care offer;
- The opportunity for health to deliver wider economic benefits to the area;
- A description of the financial investment required; and
- The approach to partnership working.

Professor Matt Makin, Medical Director, North Manchester General Hospital commented that there was a genuine positive culture amongst all staff working at NMGH and staff were engaged in the delivery of an improved offer for the area. This was recognised by members of the Panel who commented that they had witnessed this also.

Peter Blythin, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust (MFT) reiterated the commitment to bringing NMGH into the Single Hospital Service model.

The Chair, on behalf of the Board thanked all of the staff working at the site for their continued dedication to the residents of North Manchester. He further commented that the proposals represented a unique opportunity to transform the provision of health and care services in North Manchester and provide a stimulus for economic regeneration. A Board Member further commented that people have an emotional attachment to the hospital site and it was valued by the local population.

In response to a question regarding public transport and access to the site the Executive Director, Strategy, MHCC said this would be considered as part of the wider strategy considerations. He further responded that the Board would have oversight of the delivery of the strategy and reiterated the importance of community engagement with this project, noting the comment regarding local pride in the site.

## **Decision**

To note the report.



### **HWB/19/34 Locality Plan Refresh**

The Board considered the report of the Executive Director of Strategy, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning that described how the Manchester system was approaching the development of its 3<sup>rd</sup> Locality Plan Refresh and the proposed content.

The Chair noted that this was the third Locality Plan and consideration needed to be given to devising a longer term plan. The Executive Director of Strategy, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning acknowledged this comment.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **HWB/19/35 Zero Carbon and Health**

The Board considered the joint report that provided an update on the following areas of activity, Zero Carbon Framework (2020-38); Air Quality and Respiratory Disease. The report also provided an update on the recommendations of the Manchester Public Health Annual Report 2018 on Air Quality.

The Board welcomed Jonny Sadler, Programme Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency who described that in November 2018, Manchester City Council had adopted new climate change targets for the city, based on work by Manchester Climate Change Agency and the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research at the University of Manchester. The targets commit Manchester to limit its CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to 15 million tonnes during the period 2018-2100, our 'carbon budget' (recognising that the city currently emits 2 million tonnes per year); rapidly reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, by an average of at least 13% year-on-year and; and become a zero carbon city by 2038 at the latest.

Mr Sadler said that he recognised and welcomed the stated commitments and ambitions of all Partners to achieve these challenging targets, however challenged them to do more. He said the NHS needed to consider their direct emissions from buildings and the 'hidden' emissions generated and provided examples of these.

The Board then heard from Claire Igoe at MFT, Martina McLaughlin from MHCC and Naomi Makin from the Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust who described the actions and initiatives delivered and planned for their respective sites to engage with staff around the issue of climate change.

Dr Murugesan Raja described that emissions as well as contributing to global climate change, carbon-based activities in Manchester also exacerbate the city's air quality and associated respiratory problems. He stated that action was needed to address the risks to Manchester residents from the changing climate, such as extreme heat; heavy rainfall and potential flooding and other local risks due to climate change.

Dr Murugesan Raja informed the Board that MHCC continued to focus on respiratory disease as one of the key long term conditions to address poor health outcomes in Manchester. He advised that it was recognised that in order to address respiratory inequalities a system wide approach to change was required. He said that MHCC were therefore working in partnership with primary care, community care, secondary care, patient engagement and RightCare to address this.

Dr Murugesan Raja informed the Board that MHCC had developed a set of Manchester wide standards, based on the Greater Manchester Standards for primary care that would focus on Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease (COPD) patient reviews; review of COPD patients following an exacerbation; asthma reviews in adults; asthma reviews in children; COPD Virtual Clinic for 2019/20 and pharmacotherapy for smoking cessation 2019/20.

The Director of Population Health informed the Board of the updates to the recommendations of the Manchester Public Health Annual Report 2018 on Air Quality as detailed within the report.

The Board discussed the challenge presented to becoming a zero carbon city by 2038 at the latest. Members of the Board discussed the need for an improved public transport infrastructure and the need to engage with SME's (Small and medium-sized enterprises) in relation to reducing their carbon emissions.

A Member of the Board commented that the voluntary and community sector (VCS) predominately used rented accommodation which limited the influence they had over the physical building and the associated emissions. The Board member suggested that consideration needed to be given as to how partners could collectively use their estates to support VCS partners.

A Member of the Board commented that all Partners should use all communications channels and opportunities to promote the importance of climate change and celebrate positive news stories and promote good practice.

The Chair commented that it was important to recognise that many residents in Manchester experienced challenges and climate change may not be a priority consideration for them, however the health service was ideally placed to engage with residents, in a relevant and meaningful way to influence individual behaviour change.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **HWB/19/36 Annual Reports of the Safeguarding Children and Adults Boards**

The Board considered the report of the Former Independent Chair of the Manchester Safeguarding Boards, Strategic Director of Children and Education, Executive Director of Adult Services that provided the annual reports of the Manchester

Safeguarding Adults Board and the Manchester Safeguarding Children's Board covering the period from April 2018 to March 2019.

The Chair on behalf of the Board thanked the Former Independent Chair for her commitment and dedication on behalf of the residents of the city.

**Decision**

To note the report.

**HWB/19/37 Better Care Fund 2019/20**

The Board considered the report of the Executive Director of Strategy, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning that provided an outline of the Manchester Better Care Fund Plan 2019/20, the linkages to support performance with regards to Delayed Transfer of Care (DTC) and associated key performance metrics.

The Chair commented that more needed to be done to employ staff on permanent contracts that would reduce the cost incurred by agency staff. The Executive Director of Strategy, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning acknowledged this comment.

**Decision**

To note the report.

## **Constitutional and Nomination Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 4 November 2019**

**Present:**

Councillor Karney (Chair) – in the Chair  
Councillors Curley, Flanagan, Lanchbury, Leech and S Murphy

**Apologies:** Councillor Leese, N Murphy, Razaq and Reeves

#### **CN/19/24 Urgent Business - Amendments introduced at the meeting**

The Chair agreed that amended proposals and updates on the information printed in the report for item 5 could be introduced and considered as urgent business.

#### **CN/19/25 Minutes**

To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting on 2 October 2019.

#### **CN/19/26 Statutory Review of Polling Districts and Polling Places: Draft Proposals**

A report from the Chief Executive was considered relating to a review of the polling districts and polling places arrangements in the city. The Council's scheme operated for parliamentary, local elections and other polls making it a key part of the city's governance arrangements. As required by the Electoral Administration and Registration Act 2013, compulsory reviews of parliamentary polling districts and polling places must take place every 5 years, reflecting the Fixed Term Parliament Act 2011. The Council undertook a compulsory review in the autumn of 2013, coming into effect in February 2014. An interim review of the city's parliamentary and local polling districts and polling places was needed to take into consideration the city's ward boundary changes, following an Electoral Review by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (LGBCE). That took place in the autumn of 2017 and came into effect when the register was re-published on 1 February 2018. The Council's next compulsory review was required to be within the 16 month period beginning on 1 October 2018, so had to conclude by 31 January 2020. In July 2019 The committee had authorised the initiation of the compulsory review of polling districts and polling places within the Council's area, to begin on 15 July 2019, and delegated authority to the Chief Executive to undertake the review (Minute CN/19/17).

The report explained the timetable and process that had been used for the review. Revisions were being proposed in 16 of the city's 32 wards, affecting all five of the parliamentary constituencies:

- Harpurhey, Higher Blackley, and part of Deansgate in the Blackley and Broughton Constituency;
- Part of Deansgate, Hulme, Miles Platting & Newton Heath, Piccadilly, and part Whalley Range in the Manchester Central Constituency;

- Fallowfield, Levenshulme, Longsight, Rusholme, part of Whalley Range in the Manchester Gorton Constituency;
- Chorlton Park, Didsbury East, Didsbury West in the Manchester Withington Constituency;
- and Sharston, and Woodhouse Park in the Wythenshawe and Sale East Constituency.

Maps showing the proposed revised polling districts were included in the report for 14 of the 16 wards. The proposed changes in Fallowfield and Woodhouse Park were just changes to a Polling Place within one of the current Polling Districts, so no new map was needed for those two wards.

The report set out the justifications for all the changes being proposed on a ward by ward and a constituency basis. A schedule of the reasons is appended to these minutes.

As had been agreed by the Chair, a revised map for the Didsbury East ward (A34 Version) was considered under urgent business. It was explained that the boundary of the new polling district for 4DEJ was incorrect in the report. The proposed boundary should be taken along the A34 and not the railway line. A map and revised list of properties now included in 4DEJ streets was submitted, amending appendices 1 and 2 in the report.

Also at the meeting an update was given for Deansgate Ward regarding polling district boundaries for 2DGE and 2DGD where a polling place was needed. It was proposed that the INNSiDE Hotel on First Street be used as a polling place for 2DGE, which was just outside the boundary but would work well for electors.

At the meeting the implications on this review of the parliamentary general election being on 12 December were explained. The Council was required to publish the annual electoral register on 1 December 2019 but this could not now reflect the new scheme proposed in this review. That would require the Register to be re-published on 2 February 2020, so then reflecting the new scheme. That would allow the existing register, and polling districts to be used in the parliamentary general election. A number of re-designations of polling places have been required for the general election, those had been made using the Chief Executive's delegated powers, given the short timescales for poll card data needed for that election. Any further re-designations required for the parliamentary general election would be dealt in the same way.

The committee supported the changes proposed in the review, including the revisions presented at the meeting.

## **Decisions**

1. To note the submissions made to the Council in respect of the review of polling districts and polling places for the City of Manchester.
2. To note the proposals in respect of the review.

3. To recommend to the Council the adoption of parliamentary polling districts and parliamentary polling places as set out in the scheme contained in Appendix 1 and in the maps found at Appendix 2, replacing the Didsbury East map with the revision that was submitted at the meeting.
4. To recommend to the Council the approval of the reasons given in the report for the in respect of the designation of parliamentary polling districts and parliamentary polling places.
5. To recommend to the Council that the scheme contained in Appendix 1 be adopted in relation to both Parliamentary and Local government elections, including the revision to the scheme that were introduced at the meeting in relation to Didsbury East ward.
6. To recommend to the Council that the Chief Executive is requested to publish such notices and other documentation required by law on completion of the review.
7. To recommend that the Council requests that the Electoral Registration Officer makes the necessary amendments to polling districts for the publication of the revised Electoral Register, noting that one of the implications of the Parliamentary General Election on 12 December was that the new Register would need to be published on 2 February 2020, to reflect the new scheme.
8. To recommend to the Council that authority continues to be delegated to the Chief Executive to make, where necessary, alterations to the designation of any polling place prior to the next full review in consultation with ward councillors, group leaders and the Chair of Constitutional and Nomination Committee.

## **Schedule of Reasons for Changes**

### **Blackley & Broughton Constituency**

#### **Harpurhey**

- To create a new Polling District 1HAL from the properties at the bottom of 1HAH south of Fitzgeorge Street. The new polling district will have approx. 438 electors. The remaining properties in polling district 1HAH will have 591 electors. Electors in 1HAH will continue to vote at Saviour Church, it is proposed that electors in the new polling district 1HAL will vote at the Community Room in Roach Court. This new location is more central to the electors in the new polling district than their current polling arrangements and better takes into account the geography of the area. Currently electors south of Fitzgeorge Street have a long walk up Rochdale Road to vote at Saviour Church which is at the opposite end of the current polling district.

#### **Higher Blackley**

- Electors in 1HBF will vote at Redeemed Christian Church of God Strong Tower Miracle Arena. It is proposed that the 1HBF polling district is redrawn so that this polling place comes within its boundary. Properties south of Poolton Road along Crab Lane (affecting approx. 66 electors who presently reside in 1HBE) will be moved into 1HBF. This change will allow voters in 1HBF to have a permanent location for their polling place instead of the Temporary Building on Riverdale Road, given the site on which it has been located is no longer available. The electors remaining in 1HBE will continue to vote at St Andrew's Hall.

#### **Deansgate (1DGA)**

- Whilst it is recognised that the current polling place (Park Inn) is not ideally located for all electors in this polling district, it has not been possible to identify an alternative. This situation will be kept under review in the future due to ongoing development in the area. The boundaries of this polling district cannot be changed as it falls within the Blackley and Broughton constituency unlike the rest of Deansgate ward.
- Electors will continue to vote at Park Inn.

---

### **Manchester Central Constituency**

#### **Deansgate**

- To create a new Polling District 2DGF from part of 2DGB. This polling district will take in properties to the east of Oxford Road to accommodate future growth in this area. There are currently approx. 549 electors in these properties. The predicted growth of electors over the next 3 years for this polling district would increase the electorate to approx. 2119. In the remaining properties in 2DGB there will be approx.

1344 electors, with a projected growth to approx.1800. Electors in the existing 2DGB currently vote at Anthony Burgess Foundation and it is proposed that electors in both polling districts will continue to vote here until the electorate increases in the new polling districts (2DGF) has grown to a level which will justify it having its own polling place.

- To create a new polling district 2DGE from part of 2DGD. This new polling district would be formed from properties to the east of Chester Road / Bridgewater Viaduct and take in the large new Deansgate Square development. The new polling district 2DGE will have approx. 1717 electors with a projected growth to approx. 4200 electors. The INNSiDE Hotel has been identified as the best polling place.
- The remaining properties in 2DGD will have approx. 1526 electors. Electors will continue to vote at Castlefield Hotel.

### **Hulme**

- It is proposed that two new polling districts are created in part of the existing 2HUA, north of Chester Road, due to the significant growth expected in this area over the next 3 years. A new polling district 2HUF will contain properties west of Hulme Road and will have approx. 968 electors with a projected growth of approx. 1785 electors. A second new polling district 2HUG will contain properties to the east of Hulme Road and will have approx. 1493 electors with a projected growth of approx. 2853. It is proposed that electors from both 2HUF and 2HUG will vote at Urban Splash Offices in Timber Wharf which is located within 2HUG. In the future a dedicated polling place is likely to be required in 2HUF as the electorate size increases over time.

### **Miles Platting & Newton Heath**

- To create a new polling district 2MNJ from part of the existing 2MNF polling district to take in properties north of Briscoe Lane and part of the existing 2MND polling district to take in properties west of Old Church Street. This polling district will have approx. 835 electors with some small electorate growth also predicted in the future. It is proposed that electors will vote at the Yes Building. This is an Adult Education building well known to the local community and it is located centrally within the main residential area of this proposed polling district.
- The boundary for 2MNF will change on its western border with 2MNG and will take in the properties south of Briscoe Lane and north of Riverpark Road where the abattoir is situated. 2MNF will have approx. 2356 electors and electors will continue to vote at The Stirling Centre.

### **Piccadilly**

- To accommodate the significant growth expected in this area over the next three years, it is proposed that 2PYB is split. Properties west of London Road will remain in 2PYB and will continue to vote at polling place Manchester College, Shena Simon Campus, as there are no other suitable premises available in this polling district. This polling district will have approx. 1653 electors with a projected growth to



approx. 3600. The remaining properties in the existing 2PYB to the east of London Road as well as properties in 2PYD east of Rochdale canal will become 2PYF with approx. 464 electors, but with a projected growth to approx. 2000 electors. It is proposed that electors in 2PYF will continue to vote at Shena Simon Campus until the elector increase in the new polling district has grown to a level which will justify it having its own polling place.

- To accommodate the significant growth expected it is proposed 2PYC is split, properties to the east of Rochdale Road will remain in 2PYC with approx. 237 electors and a projected growth to approx. 3100 electors. Properties to the west of Rochdale Road will form 2PYE with 1272 electors. Electors in 2PYC currently vote at Abbott Primary School, but it is proposed that they will vote at the Marriott Hotel on Mason Street. Moving to this new polling station will allow electors to vote at a polling place in a more convenient location for electors, nearer to the city centre.

### **Whalley Range - 2WRF**

- Significant development is currently taking place on the old Stagecoach depot on Princess Road. It is expected that a new polling place for this polling district will be required once it is completed due to the increase in electorate. A community hub is planned as part of the new site which is likely to be able to accommodate a polling place within in it.
- 

## **Manchester Gorton Constituency**

### **Fallowfield**

- Electors in 3FAA will vote at The Place (Fallowfield Community Library). Electors currently vote at Wilbraham Primary School. Due to the large campus at this site there has historically been voter confusion regarding which entrance to use. The Place, which is located next to Wilbraham Primary School, will provide a more suitable and easily accessible premises.
- Electors in 3FAD will vote at Owens Park. Electors currently vote at The Armitage Centre but negative elector feedback has been received regarding the distance from the road. It is therefore proposed that this polling place is moved to Owens Park, which is more conveniently located for electors and which is already a polling place for 3FAE.

### **Levenshulme**

- Electors in 3LEA will vote at Arcadia Library and Leisure Centre. Electors currently vote at The Klondyke but since the Local Government Boundary Commission for England's Electoral Review this polling place is now located within the Burnage ward, and already used by another polling district. Due to high turnout in the area, it is necessary for them to use different premises going forwards. Arcadia Library and Leisure Centre is located within the correct polling district, has good access and is well known to the local community.

- Electors in polling districts 3LEC and 3LEE will merge and be renamed as 3LEC and vote at the new polling place St Mary of the Angels and St Clare Parish Centre, Elbow Street. 3LEE currently has approx. 230 electors and 3LEC has approx. 1611. Electors in 3LEE currently vote at Alma Park School but this will no longer be available for future elections. Electors in 3LEC currently vote at Levenshulme Baptist Church, Elmsworth Avenue, but it is considered that St Mary of the Angels and St Clare Parish Centre is more central for electors of the new merged polling district.
- Polling district 3LEH will be renamed to 3LEE for sequential naming purposes only

### **Longsight**

- That current polling district 3LOE is split. Electors in 3LOE currently vote at Belle Vue Leisure Centre. It is proposed that electors above Kirkmanshulme Lane will be the new polling district 3LOJ and will continue to vote at Belle Vue Leisure Centre. There will be approx. 608 electors in this new polling district, but future development on this site is expected. Properties south of Kirkmanshulme Lane and on Mount Road will continue to be in 3LOE with approx. 1731 electors. It is proposed electors in the revised 3LOE will vote at Gorton South Surestart Centre which is central to the properties in 3LOE and is more conveniently located for electors. The new polling district 3LOE will also take in properties from 3LOG above East Road and Thompson Road.
- The remaining part of 3LOG is further split with properties in the lower right of the polling district with Wembley Road and Hamilton Road forming the border and becoming 3LOH. It is proposed that electors within this new polling district will vote at Rushbrook Primary Academy which is conveniently located for electors in this part of the polling district. It is proposed that electors in the original part of the polling district 3LOG will vote at The Grange School after Gorton Primary School became unavailable this year. 3LOG will have approx. 1165 electors and 3LOH will have approx. 1459 electors.

### **Rushlome**

- After reviewing the operation and location of this polling place at Hulme Hall, Oxford Place (3RUC) which was used for the local elections and European Parliamentary Elections in May, it is considered that Xaverian College, Lower Park Road, would be a more suitable location for the polling place within the polling district and is well known by the electorate.
- The current polling district 3RUB is split to make a new polling district 3RUG to incorporate the Unsworth Park (a Manchester University student accommodation development). The boundary of the new 3RUG being from the rear of properties on Birchfield Road to the north of the Pavilion on the playing fields west across the playing field to Whitworth Lane and following the southern edge of the ward boundary. The polling place for this new polling district would be Owens Park which will be easily accessible to electors living in the Unsworth Park development. There will be 1120 properties which will be occupied by University Students in this new polling district. After full occupation of the development it is expected that there will

be an electorate of at least 2000. The remainder of the existing polling district 3RUB will have approx. 1424 electors. They will continue to vote at Birchfields Primary School.

### **Whalley Range:**

- For 3WRA the eastern boundary is changed so that the properties on the eastern side of Wood Road are included in 3WRA from 3WRB. While electors north of Russell Road on Dudley Road are moved into 3WRB. 3WRA will have approx. 1674 electors.
- For 3WRB, as well as the changes highlighted above, the eastern boundary of 3WRB is extended to include all of the properties on Stanley Road, Wellington Road, Mayfield Road, Range Road, Deepark Road and Acron Drive, as well as all of Alexandra Park which were previously in 3WRD. On the western side of the ward electors in Churchill Avenue, Blenheim Avenue and the north section of Bedford Avenue are moved into 3WRE. 3WRB will have approx. 3098 electors.
- For 3WRC the northern boundary is to become Wilbraham Road, electors north of Wilbraham Road who were previously in 3WRC will move into 3WRD. 3WRC will have approx. 1181 electors.

All these proposals will assist in improving elector accessibility to polling places.

---

## **Manchester Withington Constituency**

### **Chorlton Park**

- The 2 properties in Southern Cemetery which are currently in 4CPA, are moved in 4CPB to allow the electors within these properties to vote at a polling station more conveniently located. This will move approx. 3 electors from 4CPA to 4CPB voting at Barlow Hall Primary School.

### **Didsbury East**

- For both 4DEE and 4DEF the polling districts are split to the east of the railway track with the properties to the east of the railway track to be combined into a new polling district 4DEJ, but with the boundary of 4DJE being the A34 and not the railway line (amendment made at the meeting). It is proposed that electors in this new polling district will vote at Parrs Wood High School which is located within the polling district. This is more easily accessible to electors to the east side of the railway line, and is well known to the local community. 4DEJ will have approx. 1259 electors, 4DEE will have approx. 1111 electors and 4DEF will have approx. 882 electors.

### **Didsbury West**

- The polling district boundary line between 4DWB and 4DWF is redrawn so that 4DWB takes in the properties south of Nell Lane and all of Northern Grove. Electors

in 4DWB will continue to vote at Fielden Campus and have approx. 1870 electors. 4DWF will gain a section of properties on Burton Road north of Nell Lane and electors will vote continue to vote at Cavendish Primary School. 4DWF will have approx. 2372 electors. These changes mean that electors in the areas where changes have been made will be voting at a polling place which is more conveniently located than where they currently vote.

- A number of representations have been received relating to the use of Cavendish Primary School. Whilst it has not been possible to identify an alternative premises at this time, the Electoral Services Unit will continue to work with the school to find ways to minimise the impact of its use in the future.
  - Representations have been made regarding the current configuration of 4DWA and 4DWD, with the aim of increasing elector convenience. However, it has not been possible to identify an alternative or additional polling places suitable for use at this time within the ward.
- 

## **Wythenshawe and Sale East Constituency**

### **Sharston**

- 5SHB is split down the middle of Brownley Road. Properties in the west of the polling district will remain in 5SHB and continue to vote at Manchester College, Wythenshawe Campus. Properties to the east of Brownley Road will form the new polling district 5SHH and it is proposed that electors will vote at Wythenshawe Community Church, which has previously used as a polling place before the Local Government Boundary Commission for England review. Electors are familiar with the building and it is more conveniently located in the polling district.
- That polling district 5SHE boundary lines are redrawn and to bring in properties from 5SHC south of Glenby Avenue and Cadnam Drive. While properties to the west of Calve Croft Road will join 5SHF. These changes mean that electors in the areas where changes have been made will be voting at a polling place closer to where they currently vote. 5SHC will have approx. 1491 electors, 5SHE approx. 2359 electors and 5SHF approx. 964 electors.

### **Woodhouse Park**

- That electors in polling district 5WPD vote at St Anthony's RC Primary School due to the unavailability of St Anthony's Parish Centre. Electors have voted at the school previously and is located a short walk from the Parish Centre.