

Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 18 June 2019

Present:

Councillor Russell (Chair) – in the Chair

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

Also present:

Councillor Leese, Leader

Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources

Councillor Stogia, Executive Member for Environment, Planning and Transport

Apologies: Councillor Ahmed Ali and Battle

RGSC/19/23 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on the 7 March 2019 as a correct record.

RGSC/19/24 Minutes of the HR Sub Group

Decision

To note the minutes of the meeting held on the 21 February 2019 as a correct record.

RGSC/19/25 Minutes of the Ethical Procurement Sub Group

Decision

To note the minutes of the meeting held on the 21 February 2019 as a correct record.

RGSC/19/26 Strategic Acquisition in the Northern Gateway (Part A)

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Development), which summarised the context and benefits associated with the provision of a commercial loan facility to Far East Consortium International Limited (FEC) to support strategic land acquisition as part of the Northern Gateway programme.

The main points and themes within the report included:-

- The Council had entered into a Joint Venture (JV) with FEC in April 2017 for the comprehensive redevelopment of the Northern Gateway for housing and ancillary development;
- The Executive had previously approved the Strategic Regeneration Framework for the Northern Gateway, which outlined the opportunity to deliver up to 15,000 new homes over a 15 - 20 year period;

- The JV had been preparing an infrastructure strategy with a specific emphasis on unlocking development sites over an initial five year period;
- There were some areas within the Northern Gateway area, most notably within the Phase 1 development area, where the JV partners would be seeking to make strategic land acquisitions to facilitate comprehensive development activity;
- Given the potential upfront costs associated with acquiring sites for future development, the parties had explored opportunities for a co-investment arrangement;
- The benefits that could be derived from co-investment in land assembly via a fully recoverable commercial loan (set at a rate of interest acceptable to both parties);
- The loan would be expected to be provided on a maximum loan-to-value rate of 50% with the Council having first charge on the land in order to protect its position and with a parent company guarantee provided by FEC; and
- The loan approach had the potential to facilitate delivery of the same, if not a greater quantity of new homes, at considerably lower risk, than if the Council were to acquire the land directly

The report was also to be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 26 June 2019.

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

- Why was the Council proposing to lend money to FEC in order to purchase the land as opposed to the Council purchasing the land itself and using the it as a form of revenue stream until such a time that it was subject to a planning application/development;
- What steps had been or would be taken to ensure the Council still had some control over the use of the land;
- What additional capital outlay activities would FEC be delivering as a result of this co-investment proposal; and
- Would it not be more pertinent to await for the completion of the Strategic Business Plan before the decision to provide a loan to FEC was taken.

The Leader advised that as part of the partnership arrangement between the Council and FEC, both bodies were required to be co-investors within the Northern Gateway. If the Council were to buy the land, there would still be a requirement for land assembly and land reclamation in order to deliver the proposed development. By entering into a loan agreement with FEC, the Council was ensuring it would be able to deliver the same, if not more, new housing at a considerably lower risk than if it was to purchase the land itself.

The Committee was advised that FEC were already committed to putting a larger investment into the site when compared to the Council's investment. The major control that the Council would have in ensuring the appropriate use of the land was that the Strategic Business Plan, would need Council approval before it could be implemented.

In terms of additional capital outlay activities would FEC be delivering as a result of this co-investment proposal, the Strategic Director (Development) referred to investment that FEC had already made in acquiring land for development across the city centre.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) notes the proposed approach to facilitating strategic land acquisitions within the Northern Gateway SRF area; and
- (2) notes the proposals to provide a term loan facility to Far East Consortium as set out at minute RGSC/19/36.

RGSC/19/27 Call In: Extension to the Joint Venture Agreement with NCP for the Management and Maintenance of NCP and MCC car parks

The Committee considered a call in of the decision taken by the Chief Executive, relating to the decision to enter into an agreement with NCP to extend the existing Joint Venture (JV) arrangements with the company, which was due to end in June 2019, for an 18 month period (with the ability to further extend the agreement for a further six months on a rolling basis if necessary) for the management and maintenance of those car parks listed in the JV, pending completion of the review of the future strategy for surface and multi-storey car parks.

The Call In had been proposed by Councillor Wheeler and supported by Councillors Douglas, Jeavons, Johns and Lyons. Councillor Wheeler outlined to the Committee the reasons as to why he had called the decision in and the concerns he had, which centred around:-

- a lack of information being received in a timely manner in relation to the revenue raise by the JV and its governance structure;
- the security of the sites given specific issues of criminality reported;
- why the agreement had not been renegotiated sooner given it was a twenty year agreement; and
- as the JV covered sites of particular strategic and local interest for city centre councillors, it was not appropriate to tie these sites up for a further 18-24 months at a time of rapid change for the city without proper analysis.

The Leader responded to the concerns raised by Councillor Wheeler. In doing so he advised that the financial information that had previously been requested had not been provided as this was not available at the time the original request had been made (January 2019). He expressed disappointment that there had been little attempt to contact Executive Members for any information in connection to the decision but also acknowledged that in retrospect, it would have been appropriate for City Centre Ward Councillors to have been made aware of the intended decision in advance of it being taken. He and the Executive Members for Highways, Planning and Transport advised that the decision had not been taken sooner in order to allow for a strategic review of the parking offer for the city centre. The Leader also advised

that if this decision was not made within the next eight days, the existing contract would expire, which was a situation that the Council could not afford to let happen.

An assurance was sought that at the appropriate point in the future when the contract would be subject to re-tender, there would be a focus on increasing the profitability of these sites, to which the Leader agreed. The Leader also said that the City Centre Councillors would be given more information as the process developed and Councillor Wheeler said that he looked forward to a productive working relationship going forward.

After all questions were asked, the Chair invited Councillor Wheeler and the Leader to add anything further to their presentations. No further information was added from either party.

Decision

The Committee agreed not to refer back the original decision taken by the Chief Executive.

RGSC/19/28 Review of the Council's Capital Outturn position 2018/19 and Revised Capital Programme for 2019/20

The Committee considered a report of the City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive), which informed Members of the outturn of capital expenditure and financing for 2018/19, the major variances between the 2018/19 outturn and the previous Capital Programme monitoring report submitted in February 2019 and the commitments to be carried over into the five-year Capital Programme 2019/20 to 2023/24.

The Deputy City Treasurer referred to the main points and themes within the report, which included:-

- The final spend position for the Manchester City Council Capital Programme in 2018/19 was £361.6m compared to a revised budget of £400.0m;
- The outturn for the 2018/19 Programme on behalf of Greater Manchester was £91.2m compared to a revised budget of £95.8m;
- There was a capital programme variance of -£43.0m between the budget and the outturn position.
- The variations by service area;
- The funding arrangements for the 2018/19 Capital Programme;
- The proposed capital programme budget re-phasing to reflect the planned delivery of projects in 2019/20 to 2023/24 and the cumulative impact of these adjustments; and
- Risks to future forecasts.

The report was also to be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 26 June 2019.

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

- Confirmation was sought that that cycleways, including the Manchester to Chorlton cycleway were being scrutinised appropriately;
- Clarification was sought as to whether variances in the Capital Programme were being measured against the original agreed budget or the revised budget position; and
- It was suggested that the variance in spend within the Parks programme should be scrutinised alongside the Parks Strategy by the Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee, especially given that Parks now appeared to anticipate that it would not be likely to be able to successfully apply for £8m of grant funding that had previously formed part of the capital strategy, as the application criteria have changed in the intervening period.

The Executive Member for Highways, Planning and Transport assured the Committee that the Council's Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee had previously scrutinised cycleways, including the Manchester to Chorlton cycleway and would continue to do so as part of its work programme for the current municipal year.

The Deputy City Treasurer advised that the variances in the Capital programme were measured against the revised budget position. The Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources advised that for future reports, the variance would be measured against both the original budget position and revised budget position for greater transparency. The City Treasurer reminded the Committee that unlike the revenue budget, the capital budget process was designed to be more fluid in order for greater flexibility and the need for appropriate adjustments.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report and recommendations asked of the Executive;
- (2) Recommends that all future reports to the Committee containing information on spend against budget of any kind, shows the variance against both the original and revised budget;
- (3) Recommends to Executive that in its future reports, it requests that variance figures are measured against agreed original budgets as well as the revised budget position for greater transparency;
- (4) Recommends to Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee that as part of its scrutiny of the Council's Parks Strategy, it also looks at the variance in spend within the Parks programme and the loss of the potential grant income that was anticipated.

RGSC/19/29 Update on Capital Projects

The Committee considered a report, which provided an update on the progress of four capital projects against the agreed costs, specifically The Factory, Manchester College, Central Retail Park and Life Sciences Development.

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

- The original agreed budgets for the four major projects, including how and where the funding would be sourced from;
- Any increases that had been made to the original budgets and the reasons for these increases;
- The current status of each project including spend to date and forecasted spend for 2019/20;
- Details of any legal agreements that were now in place in connection to each project; and
- Details of work packages that had been awarded to date in line with the agreed programmes.

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

- The Manchester College project had commenced sooner than anticipated and a consequence of this would be the closure of the College's campus in Ardwick, as such an clarification was sought as to what would happen to this site and associated buildings;
- An assurance was sought that control of the budget in relation to the Factory project was now in hand and it was not anticipated that there would be any further increases
- A request was made that any future consultation on Central Retail Park would be wide and inclusive; and
- Clarification was sought as to whether it was anticipated that the Council would be required to provide the £10m grant funding should BEIS not provide grant funding for industrial research and development.

The Strategic Director (Development) advised that he had met with the Director of Education to discuss the future of the College's Ardwick campus in order to ensure appropriate plans were in place and developed in consultation with ward councillors.

The Director of Capital Programmes gave an assurance that the Factory project was keeping within the agreed financial model. There had been delay with the commencement of the project, however there was mitigation plans in place in order to ensure completion within the agreed 132 week construction programme.

The Strategic Director (Development) commented that any plans in connection to Central Retail Park would require endorsement by the Executive before consultation.

The City Treasurer advised that the Council was not anticipating receiving any grant funding from the Government in relation to the Life Sciences Development and as a consequence would likely have to borrow the £10m to ensure the delivery of the project.

Decision

The Committee notes the report.

RGSC/19/30 Update on Highways Maintenance Capital projects

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Operations (Highways), which provided a progress update on capital projects within Highways Maintenance, against the agreed costs.

The Director of Operations (Highways) referred to the main points and themes within the report which included:-

- A £100m, 5 year highways capital investment programme is currently underway, which would primarily be spent on improving the condition of Manchester's roads, footways and drainage, as well as supporting the maintenance of the bridge network;
- The budget for the highway maintenance element of the investment was £80m although there had been some additional grants that have increased the available spend to £80.5m;
- The spend to the end of March 2019 was £28.229m leaving approximately £52.3m available to spend;
- The reasons for the difference between budget and spend in year for years 1 and 2;
- Details of the various maintenance schemes undertaken in years 1 and 2;
- Year 3 (2019/20) programmes had all been agreed and work had commenced. The proposed year 4 and 5 resurfacing programmes had been drafted and would be shared with Members. These proposals would be subject to re-assessment at the end of the year, looking at new condition data, available budgets and liaison with other work programmes, with some schemes potentially added or removed dependent on assessed priorities; and
- The quality of the work had been good with a failure rate for microasphalt as low as 0.17% which was better than the industry standards. For those areas that had failed, contractors had made good any defects at no additional cost to the Council.

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

- Was the budget spend figures detailed in the report based against the original agreed budget position or a revised budget position;
- Was the Council getting value for money from its highways maintenance investment programme;
- What steps were taken to ensure work undertaken by contractors was of the required standard and what actions could the Council take if a contractors work fell below the required standard;
- As the original £100m investment was an "invest to save" initiative, had any calculations been undertaken to identify the savings the programme was achieving or would achieve; and
- What action was being done to address the problems that had been experienced with the former contractor of the Regent Road improvement works to ensure similar didn't happen elsewhere.

The Director of Operations (Highways) advised that the budget spend figures were based against the revised budget position and noted that as per the Committees

earlier discussion, future reports would contain the agreed original budgets as well as the revised budget position for greater transparency. He also provided an explanation for the slippage of spend in previous years and assurance was given that this was now being brought back in line.

In terms of value for money, it was reported that the Council was now getting significant social value returns from its highways contracts and Officers will be testing value for money through the reprocurement of all frameworks for the final two years of the maintenance programme.

The Director of Operations (Highways) confirmed that the Council did inspect all works that were undertaken and this was done jointly with the contractor. Contractors received 95% of the cost of the works undertaken upon completion and the remaining 5% was only paid at the end of a two year maintenance inspection period, subject to no deterioration in the works that had been carried out. He also reported that his staff were aware of the defect levels provided by different contractors. He was unable to give the Committee an assurance as to precisely how this was fed into the retendering process but asserted that it was. It was noted however that the main incentive for contractors to deliver high quality works, was the ability for them to be able to re-tender for future works, as opposed to the 5% retention payment.

In relation to “invest to save” calculations, it was reported that it would be 1 years 4 and 5 of the programme were the benefits of the investment into highways maintenance would come to fruition and that this would be reported to the Neighbourhood and Environment Scrutiny Committee.

The City Treasurer informed the Committee that the issue with the former contractor for the regent Road improvement works would be being considered at a future meeting of either the Council's Audit Committee or Neighbourhood and Environment Scrutiny Committee

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report;
- (2) Requests that the Director of Operations provides the Committee with information as to whether the seven contractors have Trade Union recognition; and
- (3) Requests that Committee Members are informed when a report on the former contractor for the regent Road improvement works is taken to either the Audit or Neighbourhood and Environment Scrutiny Committee

RGSC/19/31 Living Wage Accreditation

The Committee considered a report of the City Treasurer (Deputy Chief Executive), which summarised the recent work that has been completed to prepare the Council for potential Living Wage accreditation and set out the implications of accreditation in

relation to workforce and budgets, procurement and commissioning and communications.

The Committee sought clarification on the timescale in applying for accreditation with Living Wage Foundation and receiving accreditation. The Deputy City Treasurer advised that subject to Council support, an application would be submitted after the 10 July 2019 and once submitted an indicative result would be expected within approximately 10 days.

The report was also to be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 26 June 2019.

Decision

The Committee unanimously endorse the proposal for the Council to apply for accreditation as a living wage employer with the Living Wage Foundation and thanks all of those involved for their work on this project.

RGSC/19/32 Re-establishment of the Human Resources Sub Group

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit that provided Members with the current terms of reference and work programme of the Human Resources Sub Group. The Committee was invited to re-establish the group and agree the membership, terms of reference and work programme.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) agrees the Terms of Reference of the Sub Group;
- (2) notes the work programme for its first meeting on 31 July 2019;
- (3) agrees that the membership of the Sub Group for 2019/20 be Councillors Andrews, Clay, Rowles, Russell and Stanton (subject to any Member who is not a member of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee confirming that they wish to remain a member of the Sub Group); and
- (4) agrees that Councillor Russell is appointed as Chair of the Subgroup.

RGSC/19/33 Re-establishment of the Ethical Procurement and Contract Management Sub Group

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit that provided Members with the current terms of reference and work programme of the Ethical Procurement and Contract Management Sub Group. The Committee was invited to re-establish the group and agree the membership, terms of reference and work programme.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) agrees the Terms of Reference of the Sub Group;
- (2) notes the Sub Group's work programme for its first meeting on 31 July 2019;
- (3) agrees that the membership of the Sub Group for 2019/20 be Councillors Ahmed Ali, Clay, Lanchbury, Reid, Russell, Shilton-Godwin, Watson and Wheeler (subject to any Member who is not a member of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee confirming that they wish to remain a member of the Sub Group);
- (4) agrees that Councillor Russell is appointed as Chair of the Subgroup; and
- (5) agrees that the other Scrutiny Chairs are no longer formally appointed to the Sub Group but have standing invites for future meetings.

RGSC/19/34 Overview Report

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

Decision

The Committee notes the report and approves the work programme.

RGSC/19/35 Exclusion of Press and Public

A motion was moved and seconded that the public be excluded during consideration of the next items of business.

Decision

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

RGSC/19/36 Strategic Acquisition in the Northern Gateway (Part B)

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Development), which set out the draft Heads of Terms for a commercial loan between the Council and the Far East Consortium (FEC) to support strategic land acquisitions in the Northern Gateway SRF area as part of the Joint Venture programme.

The Strategic Director (Development) referred to the main points and themes within the report and answered questions from the Committee.

The report was also to be considered by the Executive at its meeting on 26 June 2019.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the following recommendations to the Executive as set out in the report, but in doing so, requests that the Executive first gives due consideration to purchasing the land itself as opposed to entering into a fully recoverable commercial loan arrangement with FEC:-

That the Executive:-

- (1) Notes the proposed contractual and commercial arrangements between the Council and the Far East Consortium (FEC), which are set out in the draft Heads of Terms in respect of a commercial loan to support strategic land acquisitions in the Northern Gateway SRF area as part of the Joint Venture programme;
- (2) Approves the proposed loan to FEC, the details of which are set out in the draft Heads of Terms;
- (3) Authorise the City Solicitor, Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and Strategic Director – Development, in consultation with the Executive Member for Finance and Human Resources to conclude the details of the contractual and commercial negotiations in respect of the proposed loan and associated ancillary arrangements as set out in this report;
- (4) Authorise the City Solicitor to enter into and complete all documents or agreements necessary to give effect to the proposed loan and associated ancillary arrangements the details of which are set out in this report; and
- (5) Recommends that the Council approve the funding of the loan from the capital programme budget.

Health Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 18 June 2019

Present:

Councillor Farrell – in the Chair

Councillors Curley, Holt, Mary Monaghan, Newman, Riasat, Watson and Wills

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults, Health and Wellbeing

Nick Gomm, Director of Corporate Affairs, Manchester Health and Care
Commissioning (MHCC)

Michelle Irvine, Director of Performance and Quality Improvement, MHCC and
Trafford Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG)

HSC/19/16 Urgent Business

A Member requested that a briefing note be circulated to the Committee that provided an update on the response to the recent reports in the media that six people had been diagnosed with a serious Listeria infection between April 25 and May 15 that had resulted in the death of two people at Manchester Royal Infirmary.

Decision

To request that a briefing note from the Director of Population Health and Wellbeing be circulated to Members that provides an update on the response to the recent Listeria outbreak.

HSC/19/17 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2019 as a correct record.

HSC/19/18 Delivering the Our Manchester Strategy

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

Members welcomed the report and commented that it was presented in a coherent manner and demonstrated that the Executive Member had a good command of her portfolio. The Member stated that this gave the Committee great confidence.

A Member noted that she welcomed the introduction of a city wide smoking cessation service that would go live in October of this year and would welcome further information on this service.

A Member commented that it was important that the support offered to people with Autism or other Learning Disabilities was available to those individuals who had been engaged with the judicial system to ensure that the correct levels of support were offered. The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being acknowledged this comment.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being stated that the Autism Friendly Strategy had been launched across Greater Manchester and that it had been co designed to examine a wide variety of areas such as access to services; community support; health and care support, employment and transition. She described that the Manchester Autism Board had been developed to look at the specifics of this in a Manchester context and the work of this Board would inform future commissioning. She informed the Committee that a Joint Strategic Needs Assessment was being undertaken and the findings of this would be shared with the Committee at an appropriate time.

A Member commented that when the report on Autism and Learning Disability was scheduled for consideration by the Committee, Learning Disabled citizens, family and carers should be invited to the meeting to partake and inform the discussions. The Committee endorsed this recommendation.

In response to comments regarding Neighbourhood Teams and Neighbourhood working the Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being described that challenges had been experienced due to the different, and often changing 'foot print' that each partner had, and the challenge this presented to bringing services together. However, whilst this and other challenges around IT systems, data sharing and recruitment had resulted in a delay to the implementation of Neighbourhood Teams the commitment remained amongst all partners to work together to reduce health service variation and improve outcomes for the residents of Manchester, noting the positive impact that was being realised in North Manchester where this model had been introduced.

Members commented that feedback and lessons learnt from North Manchester experience should be shared across all teams to support them as they developed.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being stated that the ambition to connect services across Health and Social Care needed to be a broader, system wide approach and commented that this agenda needed to be included and considered across all directorates when planning services.

In regard to staffing within Neighbourhood Teams and the need for local knowledge the Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being said that wherever possible staff had been recruited who had an experience and/or knowledge of the local community and neighbourhood in which they would be working.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being further acknowledged a comment regarding the commitment to be a Carbon Free City and the need to ensure this was a key priority, stating that there was a strand of work to address this that included sustainable travel commitments for example.

In response to comments from Members regarding the services that would be provided in respective Neighbourhood Teams, the Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being said that the Health Plans for each ward were to be shared with Members in July and this would contain a directory of services and contact details. She further described that work was ongoing to produce infographics to explain services and how they related to each other within the new teams.

The Committee further welcomed the inclusion of Social Value in the Commissioning arrangements that were described within the report.

A Member requested that an update on the Mayor of Greater Manchester commitment given in 2018 to be part of the Fast-Track Cities Network to end all new transmissions of HIV within a generation. The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being stated that the Committee may wish to consider a report on this at an appropriate time and that colleagues from Greater Manchester be invited to the meeting.

Decisions

The Committee

1. Notes the report.
2. Recommends that when the report on Autism and Learning Disability is scheduled for consideration by the Committee, Learning Disabled citizens, family and carers should be invited to the meeting to partake and inform the discussions.
3. That a report be included on the Committee's work programme for consideration at an appropriate time that provides an update on the work to be part of the Fast-Track Cities Network to end all new transmissions of HIV within a generation.

HSC/19/19 Adult Social Care Improvement Programme

The Committee considered the report of the Executive Director Adult Social Services that provided an overview of the Adult Social Care Improvement Programme, including progress to date and upcoming priorities.

The Executive Director Adult Social Services referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Providing a background and context for the design of the Adult Social Care Improvement Programme, noting that the plan set out the complex, ambitious set of reforms that were needed to integrate services for residents;
- Detailed information on the various workstreams developed in response to the outcomes of diagnostic work;
- Information on the Governance and monitoring arrangements;
- Resourcing and budget arrangements; and
- Progress to date and upcoming priorities.

A Member requested that the information that was provided to the Performance Board that was referred to within the report was also shared with the Health Scrutiny Committee, commenting that this would enable the Committee to adequately scrutinise improvements and performance. The Executive Director Adult Social Services confirmed that this would be shared with the Committee and would include information on the agreed reporting metrics. The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being commented that she would welcome the continued challenge from the Committee regarding this important area of work.

A Member commented that whilst she acknowledged the reported roll out of the LiquidLogic system to support the strengths based approach to citizen's assessment and support planning, this should not replace face to face conversations, stating that these were very important. The Executive Director Adult Social Services acknowledged this comment and stated that examples of how this approach would be used would be provided to the Committee.

The Executive Director Adult Social Services further commented that the feedback from staff on the strengths based conversations / approach had been very positive and well received as a model, and work was currently underway to collate case studies and this would be shared with the Committee. She acknowledged that challenges had arisen around IT systems and data sharing, however this continued to be addressed.

The Executive Director Adult Social Services clarified that the recruitment of the 9 Social Worker Managers was in addition to the 3 that had already been appointed. In response to a Members' comments regarding a specific incident relating to falls in the home she said she would discuss the specific case with the Member outside of the meeting, commenting that reflective learning was important.

In response to reservations expressed by a Member regarding the use of assistive technology, especially for older residents, the Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being provided examples of how this could be used to support individuals and assist health professionals manage health conditions and manage risk in a non-intrusive manner. She stated that assistive technology was designed to assist health care and not replace health professionals. The Chair noted that a report on Assistive Technology and Adult Social Care was listed on the Committee's Work Programme.

The Executive Member for Adults, Health and Well Being responded to a comment from a Member by committing to providing information on how this area of work contributed to the Manchester Strategy outcome of a 'liveable and low carbon city'. She also informed the Committee that future funding arrangements for Adult Social Care would form part of the overall Council's budget considerations and decisions, noting that publication of the Government's Social Care Green Paper had been delayed again with no indication as to when this would be released.

A Member commented that she welcomed the upcoming priority listed for the development of more effective integrated hospital discharge services, noting that this was very important to assist people in their recovery and to help them maintain living in their own home. The Executive Director Adult Social Services acknowledged this comment stating that the Manchester Local Care Organisation would work in a

multidisciplinary team model to prevent people from being admitted to hospital in the first instance by coordinating care and services in an effective manner.

Decision

To note the report.

HSC/19/20 Stroke Services – Quality and Performance update

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Performance and Quality Improvement, MHCC and Trafford CCG that provided information on the new centralised model of stroke services that had been implemented across Greater Manchester in 2015. The paper outlined the positive impact this had for the people of Greater Manchester and focused on the city of Manchester provider units at Manchester Royal Infirmary, Wythenshawe Hospital and Trafford General Hospital.

The Director of Performance and Quality Improvement referred to the main points of the report which were: -

- Providing a background and context to the stroke services in Manchester;
- Information and data on National Stroke Quality Performance, noting that performance and quality of stroke services were measured nationally by the Sentinel Stroke National Audit Programme; and
- Data on current Stroke Unit Quality and Performance.

The Committee noted and welcomed the reported improvements in the services delivered to patients who experienced a stroke and acknowledged the comment made by the Director of Performance and Quality Improvement who stated that improvements had been achieved, in part by the delivery of the Single Hospital Service. The Chair commented that improvements would further be realised once North Manchester General Hospital, currently part of Pennine Acute Hospitals NHS Trust was transferred into Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust.

The Director of Performance and Quality Improvement informed the Committee that performance at North Manchester General Hospital continued to be monitored and reviewed, and Members welcomed the reported A rating for the Hyper Acute Stroke Unit in North Manchester.

The Director of Performance and Quality Improvement stated that challenges in performance could be attributed to winter pressures. She advised that whilst every attempt was made to protect stroke beds this was not always possible. The Chair described his experience of the difference in care received on a general ward compared to a specialist stroke ward within the same hospital.

A Member commented that to assess the performance and impact of the service it would be useful to have received comparative mortality figures. The Director of Performance and Quality Improvement stated that this would be circulated to the Committee.

In response to Members questions regarding the 48-hour window and appropriate care pathways following an initial stroke episode, the Director of Performance and Quality Improvement stated that this was based on clinical evidence.

Decisions

1. To note the report.
2. To recommend that the Director of Performance and Quality Improvement circulate to Members the comparative mortality figures relating to strokes.

HSC/19/21 Quality Accounts 2018/19

The Committee considered the report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit that provided the responses to the draft Quality Accounts provided by the Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust and Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust.

The draft Quality Accounts had been circulated to Members for comment and a response had been drafted by the Chair.

Decision

To note the responses that had been submitted to the respective Trusts.

HSC/19/22 Overview Report

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

In relation to the reported Care Quality Commission inspections, a Member asked if when inspecting GP practices, did they consult the relevant Patient Participation Groups. The Director of Corporate Affairs, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning advised that he would make enquiries with the relevant Primary Care Commissioning Team to enquire which Practices had an established Patient Participation Group and a note would be provided to the Member.

A Member requested that the report scheduled for the July meeting, entitled 'Age Friendly Manchester and Health Services' included information specific to the Local Care Organisation and Manchester Health and Care Commissioning.

Decision

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

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2019

Present:

Councillor Stone – in the Chair

Councillors Hewitson, T Judge, Kilpatrick, Lovecy, McHale, Madeleine Monaghan, Reeves, Reid, Sadler and Wilson

Co-opted Voting Members:

Mrs J Miles, Representative of the Diocese of Salford

Dr W Omara, Parent Governor Representative

Co-opted Non Voting Members:

Mr L Duffy, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools

Apologies:

Councillor Sameem Ali

Mr A Arogundade, Parent Governor Representative

Mr R Lammas, Primary Sector Teacher Representative

Ms Z Stepan, Parent Governor Representative

CYP/19/20 Minutes

Decisions

1. To approve as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 5 March 2019.
2. To receive the minutes of the Ofsted Subgroup meeting held on 12 March 2019.

CYP/19/21 Update on the Young Carers Strategy 2017 - 2019

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education which provided an overview of progress on work with Young Carers and proposed next steps in the refresh and implementation of the Young Carers Strategy.

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

- A summary of the key findings from the Young Carers Group research;
- Progress made so far, including the recruitment of a Young Carers Co-ordinator, who was present at the meeting;
- Next steps; and
- The Young Carers Strategic Action Plan.

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

- That Members welcomed the Young Carers Strategic Action Plan;
- The challenges relating to transition stages in education, particularly the transition to further and higher education;
- How young carers were being identified by schools; and
- Mental Health First Aiders in schools and sixth forms and how they could be used to support young carers.

The Head of School Quality Assurance and Strategic SEND acknowledged that the transition to sixth form was challenging for young carers. She reported that, following the introduction of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), schools had received conflicting messages about what information they could share with colleges and other education providers when pupils transitioned to the next stage of their education. The Director of Education informed Members that her service was working with the Council's Legal and Audit Services regarding this and reported that this work could include the creation of a standardised form which schools could use to pass on information at the transition stage while remaining compliant with the GDPR. The Young Carers Co-ordinator reported that a key part of her role would be to support young carers through the transition stages, including planning for university from the age of 14 and making sure that young people didn't have to keep repeating their stories at every stage.

The Head of School Quality Assurance and Strategic SEND commented that, although the Young Carers Strategy had been launched in 2017, its implementation and the identification of young carers had not been consistent across the city. She informed Members that there was a need to improve knowledge and understanding about and advocacy for young carers in schools and, therefore, the strategy was being refreshed to address this. She outlined how, when dealing with issues such as absence and lateness, schools were now encouraged to explore the possibility that the pupil could be a young carer. She reported that part of the Young Carers Co-ordinator's role would be to ensure that schools were aware of and consistently responding to these identification triggers. She informed Members that she would look into the Mental Health First Aiders model and how this could support young carers and report back to the Committee on this via the Chair.

Decisions

1. To note that the Head of School Quality Assurance and Strategic SEND will look into the Mental Health First Aiders model and how this could support young carers and report back to the Committee on this via the Chair.
2. To request that an update on the work to promote consistent, legally-compliant information-sharing at transition stages be included in a future report on the Promoting Inclusion and Preventing Exclusion Strategy.

CYP/19/22 Manchester's Promoting Inclusion and Preventing Exclusion Strategy

The Committee received a report of the Director of Education which provided an overview of the progress with the development and planned implementation of a multi-agency Promoting Inclusion and Preventing Exclusion Strategy for

Manchester.

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

- The context of this work, including data on permanent and fixed-term exclusions at Manchester primary and secondary schools in comparison to national figures;
- An overview of the strategy; and
- Next steps.

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

- To welcome the strategy;
- To request a breakdown of the reasons for exclusions;
- What was being done to address off-rolling;
- The importance of ensuring that school governors were trained on school exclusions and off-rolling;
- To request further information on the independent review of the use of fixed-term exclusions in the specialist provisions across the city for young people who experienced Social, Emotional and Mental Health Needs (SEMH), including the Secondary Pupil Referral Unit (PRU), and to ask for the number of fixed-term exclusions from the Secondary PRU which had taken place this year; and
- To note the positive examples in the case studies and ask how widespread this good practice was.

The Director of Education reported that, once the latest data on school exclusions was available, the reasons for exclusion could be provided to the Committee. The Head of School Quality Assurance and Strategic SEND informed Members that, following their questioning at a previous meeting of the number of exclusions classified as being for 'other reasons', officers were now going back to any schools which gave 'other' as a reason for an exclusion to obtain more precise information.

The Head of the Virtual School reported that off-rolling had been covered in the national Timpson Review of School Exclusions and was also addressed in this Strategy and she outlined conversations which were taking place with schools on this issue. The Director of Education informed Members that the issue of off-rolling had been incorporated into the new Ofsted Framework and that schools were likely to be judged as inadequate in the leadership and management category if they were found to be off-rolling children. She advised Members that Ofsted had made it clear that it was only acceptable for an agreement to be made to remove a pupil from the school roll when this was in the child's best interests, otherwise it would be classed as off-rolling. She reported that officers were using Chair of Governor briefings and other meetings to inform governors about the new Ofsted Framework and about the role of governors in identifying patterns and trends which suggested that off-rolling could be taking place in their school and challenging this.

The Head of School Quality Assurance and Strategic SEND reported that former Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI) were supporting the review of fixed-term exclusions in

specialist provisions, including the Secondary PRU, but that there had been a delay due to the health issues of one of the former HMIs. She advised Members that the report had been expected to be completed by the end of this half-term but that this might now be pushed back. She offered to circulate statistics on the number of fixed-term exclusions from the Secondary PRU this year to Members of the Committee. She also informed Members that the Council had been heavily engaged with the PRU over the last term in relation to the Promoting Inclusion and Preventing Exclusion Strategy and that the PRU had been fully engaged and supportive of the Strategy.

The Head of the Virtual School reported that there was a large amount of good practice taking place across the city and outlined some of the models including Rights Respecting Schools, the Adverse Childhood Experiences pilot and Mentally Healthy Schools. She reported that this work needed to be mapped and good practice shared across the city. The Executive Member for Children and Schools reported that it was planned to have a launch event for the Strategy in the Autumn term, including workshops where best practice could be shared. He offered to circulate the date of the launch event to Committee Members when it had been decided. He also informed Members that a national day of Rights Respecting Schools would be taking place on 4 July. The Chair requested that information on the Rights Respecting Schools national day be circulated to Members of the Committee.

Decisions

1. To note that the national Timpson Review of Exclusions Report has now been published and the recommendations contained therein are welcomed and are reflected in Manchester's Promoting Inclusion and Preventing Exclusion Strategy.
2. To note that the provisional school exclusions data for 2018-19 shows a reduction in the use of permanent exclusion compared to the 2017-18 data following the increased focus and challenge.
3. To request a further report on citywide school exclusion performance once the 2017-18 validated exclusions data is published, including information on the reasons for exclusions.
4. To request that this report include an update on the independent review of the use of fixed-term exclusions in the specialist provisions across the city for young people who experience Social, Emotional and Mental Health Needs (SEMH), including the Secondary Pupil Referral Unit (PRU), and information on the destinations of pupils at the PRU.
5. To request that the figures on fixed-term exclusions from the Secondary PRU this year be circulated to Members of the Committee.
6. To note that the Executive Member for Children and Schools will circulate the date of the Strategy launch event and to request that Members also be provided with information on the national day of Rights Respecting Schools.

[Councillor Stone declared a personal interest as a member of the governing body of the Secondary Pupil Referral Unit.]

CYP/19/23 Complex Safeguarding Report

The Committee received a report of the Strategic Director (Children and Education Services) which provided an update on the development of the Complex Safeguarding Hub and focused on the identification and response to vulnerable children and young people at risk of exploitation including the approach and impact from risk management. It also provided feedback on a recent Local Government Association (LGA) Peer Challenge in relation to Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE).

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

- Governance and Accountability Arrangements;
- The Complex Safeguarding Hub;
- Missing from Home and Care; and
- The LGA Peer Challenge in relation to CSE.

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

- The importance of safeguarding young people visiting Manchester, not just Manchester residents, including young people attending events in the city and trying to travel home afterwards;
- What was being done to address the emerging use of Xanax by young people; and
- The workloads of staff within the Complex Safeguarding Hub.

The Strategic Head of Early Help acknowledged the issue of young people being reported missing from home due to difficulties and delays in travelling home after events. She reported that work was taking place at a Greater Manchester level on the role of transport providers in relation to safeguarding and she offered to raise Members' concerns regarding this with the Greater Manchester Partnership.

The Strategic Head of Early Help outlined the work taking place in relation to the use of Xanax among young people. She reported that the Population Health and Wellbeing Team was leading on communicating public health messages on Xanax and was monitoring trends in relation to Xanax use. She informed Members that the Complex Safeguarding Hub was being used to co-ordinate intelligence-gathering in relation to the contextual safeguarding issues, looking not just at what was happening within peer groups but also issues relating to the supply of Xanax and the risk of exploitation.

The Strategic Head of Early Help reported that, as part of the implementation of the Complex Safeguarding Hub, an assessment had taken place of the resources required. She advised Members that demand and capacity were reviewed on an ongoing basis and that currently the Hub was well-resourced. She also informed Members that, while the Hub provided a specialist resource, ownership of cases was

shared, with staff in the Hub working alongside locality social workers and other partners.

The Executive Member for Children and Schools informed Members that, following the recent LGA peer review, the Council had received verbal feedback which had been largely positive, including in relation to Greater Manchester Police's role, while also highlighting a few areas for improvement. He offered to share the formal letter providing feedback, once this was available.

Decisions

1. To note that the letter from the LGA providing feedback on the review of the effectiveness of the Complex Safeguarding Hub and multi-agency arrangements in response to children at risk of sexual exploitation and those being exploited will be shared with Committee Members, when it is available.
2. To continue to monitor this area of work.

CYP/19/24 Re-establishment of the Ofsted Subgroup

The Committee received a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which provided Members with the terms of reference and current work programme for the Ofsted Subgroup. The Committee was asked to re-establish the Ofsted Subgroup for the municipal year 2019 - 2020 and agree the terms of reference, work programme and membership of the Subgroup.

The Chair recommended that consideration of inspection reports and performance information for services for children in need of help and protection, looked after children and care leavers be removed from the Subgroup's remit. He also recommended that consideration of inspection reports for childminders be added to the Subgroup's remit.

Decisions

1. To re-establish the Ofsted Subgroup for the 2019 - 2020 municipal year and agree the terms of reference and work programme, subject to the above amendments.
2. That Councillor Lovecy be appointed as Chair of the Ofsted Subgroup and that Councillors Hewitson, Kilpatrick, McHale, Madeline Monaghan, Reeves, Reid and Stone, Mrs Miles and Dr Omara be appointed to the Subgroup.
3. To note that it is proposed to hold four meetings of the Subgroup during the municipal year and that Members' preference is for these meetings to be held on Wednesday afternoons.

CYP/19/25 Overview Report

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

recommendations and the Committee's work programme, which the Committee was asked to approve.

Decision

To note the report and agree the work programme.

Neighbourhoods and Environment Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 19 June 2019

Present:

Councillor Igbon – in the Chair

Councillors Azra Ali, Appleby, Butt, Flanagan, Harland, Hassan, Hughes, Jeavons, Kilpatrick, Lynch, Lyons, Sadler, Whiston, White and Wright

Councillor S Murphy, Deputy Leader

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods

Councillor Stone, Chair of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

Apologies: Councillor Strong

NESC/19/19 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 March 2019 were submitted for approval as an accurate record of the meeting. Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Neighbourhoods requested that his attendance be recorded on the minutes of the meeting held on 6 March 2019.

Decisions

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 6 March 2019 as a correct record subject to the above amendment.

To note the minutes of the Behaviour Change and Waste Task and Finish Group meeting of 20 March 2019.

NESC/19/20 Update on the work of the Section 21 team based within the Housing Solutions Team

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Adult Services that provided an update on the work of the newly created team in the Housing Solutions Service, whose role was to specifically focus upon supporting people who receive a Section 21 notice from their landlord to leave the accommodation.

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

- Data on the levels of homeless presentations within Manchester;
- A description of Section 21 notices and the legal process;
- A description of the Court Service that was based in the Manchester Civil Justice Centre and the offer that they deliver;
- The new process for homeless applicants who present with a Section 21 notice;
- Outcomes of the Section 21 Team, noting that the team had been established for four months;

- Analysis of the financial impact of the Section 21 Team; and
- The outcome of this service was that more people were able to remain in their accommodation longer; were avoiding emergency accommodation and having more opportunity to access a property in the area of their choice.

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

- Had recent changes announced in relation to the Landlord Tenant Act 2012 had any impact on Section 21 procedures;
- How was the service publicised across the city;
- How many staff were employed in the Court Service and how many people do they see each month;
- What 'incentives' could be used by the team to help negotiate with landlords to prevent evictions;
- More information was sought on the dispersal of homeless families, noting the detrimental impact this had on families and children's education and requested that the report that was to be submitted to the July meeting include comparative data on the numbers affected by this and case studies be provided; and
- What follow up support was offered to residents who had engaged with the service.

The Section 21 Team Manager informed the Committee that the recent changes announced to the Landlord Tenant Act 2012 did not impact on Section 21 procedures. He advised that the team negotiated with landlords to prevent evictions, advising that in certain circumstances the prevention fund could be used to clear arrears up to an agreed amount on the understanding that the Section 21 notice would be withdrawn by the landlord. He also advised that the team would also apply for Discretionary Housing Payments (DHP) on behalf of tenants experiencing a shortfall in their Housing Benefit. He further advised that the prevention fund could also be used to pay a bond to secure a tenancy with a private landlord.

The Section 21 Team Manager stated that there was currently two full time staff employed within the Court Service and that they dealt with approximately 80 people per month, noting that the breakdown was approximately 85% social landlord tenants, 7.5% mortgage repossession cases and 7.5% private rented sector tenants. Commenting that mortgage lenders were required to inform the local authority when there was an intention to instigate repossession proceedings and this allowed appropriate referrals for support and assistance to be made.

The Deputy Leader informed the Committee that a mapping exercise had been undertaken in relation to factors that caused homelessness and analysis of these results would then inform targeted prevention work. She further stated that the recently appointed Director of Homelessness would be attending the July meeting to address the Committee.

The Deputy Leader stated that she supported the Government's commitment to end the use of Section 21 notices, but they now needed to focus upon enacting this. The Deputy Leader further advised that following a recent Peer Review of the use of DHP she remained committed to working with colleagues in the Revenues and

Benefit Unit to ensure that DHP was best used to maximise the number of residents supported.

The Strategic Lead for Homelessness stated that for those residents who engaged with the service, support was offered by making referrals to various sources such as the Citizens Advice Manchester, Shelter, Cheetham Hill Advice Centre and Early Help Hubs. In relation to the issue of dispersed families she acknowledged the comment made by the Member, however stated that due to the levels of demand on the service it was not always possible to find accommodation within Manchester.

The Strategic Lead for Homelessness informed the Committee that relevant Partners had been made aware of the Section 21 Team, and as the service was relatively new she wanted to be confident that it was working as intended before publicising more widely, however the intention was to do this and consideration would be given as to how best to do that.

The Chair commented that homelessness was a very complex issue, including but not restricted to mental health and domestic violence, and requested that the report that was scheduled to be submitted to the July meeting include information on how the Homeless Service worked with other services and partner organisations to address homelessness.

Decision

1. To recommend that the report entitled 'Update on Homelessness and Housing' that is scheduled for consideration by the Committee at the 17 July meeting include information and comparative data on dispersed families and case studies. In addition, the report will include information on how the Homeless Service worked with other services and partner organisations to address homelessness.

2. Noting the impact that dispersal had on homeless families and children's education the Committee recommend that the Executive Member for Children and Schools and representatives from Children's Services be in attendance at the July meeting.

NESC/19/21 Progress Report: Activities to Tackle Flytipping

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Neighbourhoods that provided Members with an update on the activities to tackle flytipping.

The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- Providing a description of the teams that deliver the services that discharge the Council's statutory duties in respect of ensuring flytipping was removed from public land, protecting the environment and ensuring that businesses and residents comply with a range of legislation to ensure that waste was disposed of correctly;

- A description of the progress to date since the last report to the Committee in October 2018, including case studies;
- A description of the options for getting rid of waste;
- The responsibility of Biffa to respond to reports of fly-tipped waste on public land;
- The role of the Biffa Fly-tip Investigation Team and how they work with the Neighbourhood Project Compliance Team to pursue enforcement action;
- Performance against Service Level Agreements;
- Key flytipping statistics; and
- Next steps.

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

- What was the strategy to prevent flytipping across the whole of the city;
- Alleyways and passageways needed to be cleaned and weeded in conjunction with the highways department;
- Who had been involved with Great British Spring Clean and how would this link in with wider environmental campaigns across the city;
- Did Biffa operatives report incidents of flytipping that were left next to the household bins;
- Noting the number of prosecutions for flytipping was this satisfactory compared to the number of notices issued;
- What was being doing to address the increase in 'scrap man' advertising;
- Following discussions with Social Landlords consideration needed to be given as to how they could request bulky waste collections on the Council's CRM system;
- The bulky waste collection service needed to be advertised more widely and repeatedly and could a poster be made available to display in communal areas;
- Residents should still be able to request a bulky waste collection via other means, not just online.
- Noting the difficulties experienced in identifying private landowners and the challenges to remove flytipping from canals and rivers;
- The cost to businesses to dispose of waste at household waste recycling centres and was this counterproductive;
- CCTV needed to be utilised to identify and prosecute perpetrators of flytipping; and
- Could statistics be provided on the take up of the bulky waste collection service over the previous 12 months be provided at a ward level.

The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing acknowledged the comments expressed regarding the cleaning of alleyways and informed the Committee that Biffa were reviewing their approach to this with a view to improving the service. She said that a pragmatic approach would be adopted and the schedule would be reviewed and this would be shared with Members. She stated that a programme to invest in containers in passage ways would also be delivered this year.

In regard to bulky waste, the Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing confirmed that the data on bulky waste collections for the previous twelve months was available on a ward basis and this would be circulated to Members. She said this

service had been widely publicised as part of the apartment block service changes and consideration would be given as to how this could be promoted more widely. She said that residents could still request a bulky waste collection via other means in addition to online, and she noted the comments regarding the CRM system and the challenges experienced by Social Landlords when requesting bulky waste collections on behalf of their tenants. She further confirmed that Biffa crews did report incidents of flytipping when this was witnessed on their collection rounds and the appropriate teams would be deployed to remove this. She further advised that the approach to addressing flytipping was consistent across the city.

The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing acknowledged that delays in removing flytipped waste could be experienced when this occurred on private land, adding that access to remove flytipping could hamper removal. She said that complaints regarding incidents of this type would be dealt with by the local Neighbourhood Teams. She further advised that Keep Britain Tidy had undertaken a piece of research to understand why people flytipped and had provided a number of recommendations that were currently being reviewed and reflected upon. She said that the outcome of this exercise would be reported to the October meeting of the Committee.

In response to the comments regarding the cost to dispose of commercial waste at household recycling centres the Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing stated that commercial operators had a number of options available to them to dispose of their waste and such centres were for domestic waste, not commercial waste.

Responding to the issue of 'scrap men' the Strategic Lead, Compliance Enforcement & Community Safety noted that there had been an increase in such services advertised across the city. She said whilst it may appear to residents that this was a simple way to have their bulky items removed it was important to realise that residents were ultimately responsible for the appropriate disposal of any rubbish. She said that residents could be subject to a Household Duty of Care Fine of £400 if the carrier they used to remove and dispose of their waste was not licensed.

The Strategic Lead, Compliance Enforcement and Community Safety stated that the agreed additional investment in 2019/20 to tackle flytipping of £500k would be used to fund additional Enforcement Officers to undertake targeted work and to invest prevention measures, such as investing in CCTV cameras and target hardening projects to design out flytipping hotspots by installing physical measures to deter fly-tippers.

The Keep Manchester Tidy, Project Manager advised the all partners and groups that had taken part in the Keep Britain Tidy Great British Spring Clean had registered via their website so the details of all of these groups had been collected. She said that all of the schools that had taken part would also be surveyed to understand the levels of participation and obtain feedback. She said that to build on the success of this and celebrate the work an event would be held at the Peoples History Museum on 25 June with all of the groups invited to attend. She said this would provide an opportunity to network and establish relationships between various community groups.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods stated that Manchester remained committed to tackling the criminal activity of flytipping and this had been demonstrated by the additional funding that had been allocated to address this. He stated that Manchester took this issue very seriously and would actively investigate and prosecute perpetrators. He advised that Manchester was responsible for 10% of all persecutions nationally, stating that this was an achievement when considering that all cases were subject to the criminal burden of truth test. He further acknowledged the comments made regarding publicising the bulky waste collection service and consideration would be given as to how best to do this to maximise the take up of this offer.

Decision

To note the report.

[Councillor Appleby declared a personal and non prejudicial interest as her partner is employed by Biffa]

NESC/19/22 Eco Schools

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Neighbourhoods that provided Members with information about the Eco Schools programme and the work currently being undertaken with young people in Manchester Schools.

The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing referred to the main points and themes within the report which included: -

- Providing a description of the Eco Schools programme;
- Describing The Eco-Schools Seven Steps framework that participating schools follow in order to achieve the internationally recognised Eco-Schools Green Flag award; and
- Providing case studies to highlight the range of activities undertaken by Schools around this programme.

Members also viewed a video presentation that showcased the activities and learning undertaken by the pupils at the Dean Trust Ardwick around the issue of plastic waste and recycling.

The Committee also heard from the Neighbourhood Officer for the Hulme ward who described the variety of work undertaken with residents to support them to engage with environmental projects and activities, such as developing walking plans for schools, wildlife project, greening projects and air quality. The Chair paid tribute to the wealth of activities undertaken in the Hulme Ward that were supported by officers within the Neighbourhood Team. She commented that that this should be replicated across all wards to drive forward this important work and she thanked all of the schools, staff and pupils for their work.

The Committee welcomed the Chair of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee who said that he welcomed the report, noting the importance of engaging

young people in this subject and that children could then influence the behaviour of adults. He stressed the important role of school governors to promote this work in their respective schools and he has raised this issue with the relevant Executive Member.

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

- Could a list of all schools and partners engaged in this programme be circulated;
- Noting that young people were taking the initiative in relation to the climate change agenda and they should be supported by the Council at every opportunity, for example using Section 106 money to plant trees and create green walls; and
- The importance of linking these activities into other related projects such as the zero carbon activities.

The Keep Manchester Tidy, Project Manager advised that Keep Britain Tidy organised a variety of events and deliver a number of projects throughout the year and that the Eco Schools programme was available to all schools. She advised that 202 schools and early years providers had registered as Eco-Schools in Manchester since 2005. She commented that an audit of school's progress against this programme would be undertaken and this would help understand any barriers. She commented that challenges were experienced when schools experienced staff turnover, and a member of staff who led on this activity left.

The Keep Manchester Tidy, Project Manager further advised that a list of partners was being collated by the Manchester Climate Change Agency.

The Strategic Lead, Waste, Recycling and Street Cleansing advised Members that the Litter Assemblies offered by Biffa were available to all schools and a list of those schools that had taken up this offer would be circulated. She further commented that the Social Value element of the Councils procurement policy would help support communities and neighbourhoods deliver environmental projects.

The Executive Member for Neighbourhoods stated that he welcomed the opportunity to work with Keep Britain Tidy to support young citizens in this important area of work, noting that budget restrictions had impacted significantly on the ability to deliver and support this work.

Decision

1. To note the report.
2. To request a list of all schools engaged with the Eco Schools Programme is circulated to Members of the Committee.
3. To request a list of those schools that had received a Litter Assembly is circulated to Members of the Committee.
4. To request a list of all partners engaged with the Eco Schools Programme is circulated to all Members of the Committee.

NESC/19/23 Re-establishment of the Behaviour Change and Waste Task and Finish Group

The Committee considered the report of Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit that provides the Committee with the current terms of reference and work programme of the Behaviour Change and Waste Task and Finish Group.

The Committee were invited to re-establish the Behaviour Change and Waste Task and Finish Group for the municipal year 2019-2020, agree the membership and agree the terms of reference and work programme.

Decisions

1. The Committee agree to re-establish the Behaviour Change and Waste Task and Finish Group for the municipal year 2019-2020;
2. The Committee approve the membership of the Behaviour Change and Waste Task and Finish Group as listed within the report and agree to appoint Cllr Whiston as an additional member.

NESC/19/24 Overview Report

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

The Chair invited the Committee to review the Work Programme and to inform her and the Scrutiny Support Officer of any specific areas that needed to be included in any of the reports listed.

A Member commented that there were a number of responses to recommendations still outstanding. The Chair advised that the Scrutiny Support Officer would follow these up for a response.

A Member commented that following conclusion of the Behaviour Change and Waste Task and Finish Group consideration should be given to establishing a Task and Finish Group to look at the issue of climate change.

Decision

The Committee notes the report and approves the work programme subject to the above comments.

Economy Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 20 June 2019

Present:

Councillor H Priest (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors Abdullatif, Green, Hitchen, Johns, Noor, Raikes, Shilton Godwin,
K Simcock and Stanton

Also present:

Councillor Leese, Leader

Councillor Richards, Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration

Apologies: Councillor Douglas and Hacking

ESC/19/23 Minutes

Decision

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 March 2019 were agreed as a correct record.

ESC/19/24 Minutes of the District Centres Sub Group

Decision

The Committee notes the minutes of the District Centres Sub Group held on 6 March 2019.

ESC/19/25 Overview of the economic characteristics of Manchester's population aged 50-64 and the implications for their economic participation

The Committee considered a report of the Age Friendly Manchester Lead, which provided an analysis of the economic characteristics of Manchester's 50-64 year old population, highlighting some of the significant health challenges for this group, new approaches which needed developing to respond to the challenge to support people to be able to remain in work for longer, address the significant health challenges people faced and create new opportunities for the most marginalised.

The report was complemented by a presentation from the Directorate Lead - Corporate Intelligence, who referred to the main points and themes, which included:-

- There were approximately 73,000 Manchester residents who were in the 50-64 year age group and this cohort was increasing with an expectant figure of 86,500 by 2028;
- Three quarters of this population were likely to have incomes of below the Manchester average of £29,000, with 40% below £15,000;
- The areas of the city in which these people lived correlated with those areas of highest health and income deprivation;

- Evidence showed that high deprivation correlated to high wider determinants of health such as smoking, alcohol and poor diets;
- Low wealth was also linked to depression in this age group;
- The average healthy life expectancy in Manchester was 56 years old, compared to the UK averages of 63 years old for men and 64 years old for women;
- Half of residents aged 50-64 registered with a Manchester GP had one or more diagnosed long term health conditions (e.g. smoking, hypertension, obesity);
- Premature death in 50-69 year olds was high, most commonly from heart disease and lung cancer and Manchester had the highest rate of preventable deaths and second highest rate of premature deaths (less than 75 years old);
- Social isolation and loneliness were linked to mortality, increased risk of heart disease, stroke, depression and cognitive decline in older people, particularly men and a challenging budget environment had reduced the range of social activities available to older people at a neighbourhood level and in turn access to the support available to them;
- 37% (26,689) of 50-64 year old Manchester residents were receiving some form of benefit payment, compared to the national average of 19%
- 13,840 (80%) of out of work benefit claimants were for ill health, with 77% of these being ESA claimants in a 'Support Group' so were not required to undertake interviews or work-related activity;
- 9 out of 10 out of work benefit claimants had been receiving benefits for over a year and 4 in 10 ESA claimants had been claiming for at least five years; and
- A high proportion were not skilled in today's industries and it was anticipated that the impact of changing industries on the 50-64 year old population would last until at least 2030.

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

- There needed to be an acknowledgement of the potential counter productivity of encouraging/supporting people back into employment who were not physically or mentally ready to return to work;
- How many residents were subject to an Adult Social Care package of support and what was the cost of this;
- In terms of apprenticeships, was there any different funding available for the 50-64 age group compared to the younger population more often associated with apprenticeship positions;
- Was there any positive examples from other core cities where these issues had been addressed with some success;
- Had there been any opportunity to feed into the Greater Manchester Mayors Good Employer Charter to try and address the problems faced by this age group;
- Concern was raised as to the scale of the challenge that the city faced and the level of investment that would be needed to truly address the problems that existed;
- Was any work being undertaken to try and improve the average healthy life expectancy;
- Concern was raised that BAME residents often faced higher levels of discrimination and additional challenges which compounded the problems that already existed; and

- Had any consideration been given as to what the next industry would be that would face a decline and how would people in this industry be supported.

The Leader noted the point made about counter productivity of encouraging/supporting people back into employment who were not physically or mentally ready but stated that there was a lot of people within the 50-64 age range that suffered from depression through being out of work and it had been shown that being in work was a positive factor to a person's wellbeing.

The Directorate Lead - Corporate Intelligence advised that she would obtain the information on the number of Manchester residents who were subject to an Adult Social Care package and the associated costs and provide this to Committee Members.

The Age Friendly Manchester Lead reported that there was no alternative or additional apprenticeship budget for 50-64 population. He commented that there was a need to do more work to encourage businesses and employers to repackage and promote apprenticeship opportunities for all age groups, so that they were not perceived as only available or suitable for a younger cohort.

The Leader advised that an aspect of the Greater Manchester Industrial Strategy would be to address the problems faced by the 50 to 64 year old population in gaining meaningful employment. In terms of the Greater Manchester Mayor's Good Employer Charter he reported that this was now moving to an implementation phase which would include 20 voluntary companies working through the seven areas of what attributed to being a good employer identify measures that employers could be measured against. One of these would likely be the work offer to this population of Manchester residents. The Age Friendly Manchester Lead added that there had been limited examples of good practice in principle identified and gave examples of initiatives in Korea and Germany.

It was acknowledged that the level of investment required to address the challenges faced by those aged 50-64 was significant. The Council had been successful in securing funding from the Greater Manchester Transformational fund to try and tackle the issues and had also committed to using its resources in a different way through public service reform in order to deliver services at a local neighbourhood level. The Committee was advised that the Manchester Local Care Organisation (MLCO) was now looking to bring together multiple strategies to focus and tackle the challenges at a neighbourhood level. It was also suggested that a similar strategy to NEETS, but geared towards the needs of those aged 50-64, was required.

In relation to by BAME residents within the age range, it was reported that there was a lack of data available to determine whether BAME residents were being subjected to additional challenges, and if so by which employers. Furthermore, the Leader advised that LGA research had indicated that there was likely to be a shortage in skilled workers in the future.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Notes the report;
- (2) Requests that the number of Manchester residents who are subject to an Adult Social Care package and the associated costs is provided to Committee Members; and
- (3) Request that Committee Members are informed of any future planned engagement/workshop activities and are updated on the proposals that came from the workshop as these are developed and worked up further.

ESC/19/26 Greater Manchester Industrial Strategy and Independent Prosperity Review update

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director (Development), which provided an update on the development of the Greater Manchester Local Industrial Strategy and the outcome of the Independent Prosperity Review (IPR).

The Assistant Director – Research and Strategy, Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) referred to the main points and themes in the report, which included:-

- The Greater Manchester Local Industrial Strategy was formally launched with Her Majesty's Government on Thursday 13 June 2019;
- It considered Greater Manchester's strengths (Health Innovation, Advanced Materials, Digital, Creative and Media and Clean Growth) and also suggested how the city region should strengthen its position on the five foundations of productivity (Ideas, People, Infrastructure, Business Environment and Places);
- It also set out Greater Manchester's long-term aspirations and the specific outcomes local partners were aiming to achieve;
- The IPR provided a clear set of priorities where evidence suggested there was potential for policy to have the greatest impact on the productivity of the city region and the lives of the people who lived in it;
- The Greater Manchester Local Industrial Strategy considered the IPR's findings and aimed to address them in its shared priorities between local leaders, Government and local stakeholders; and
- Where relevant to Manchester, this evidence base would also be considered during the development of the Manchester Local Industrial Strategy.

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

- The development and implementation of the Manchester Industrial Strategy will require a number of Manchester resources. How would the strategies work together and what role would Manchester have in scrutinising the delivery of the strategies;
- Where would the necessary investment to deliver the ambitions within the strategy come from;
- Why did the strategy not make any reference to the work opportunities that will arise from the construction industry;
- How was it envisaged that the strategy would change things in practice;
- What consideration would the GM Industrial strategy and the Manchester Industrial Strategy give towards the development of residents skills, the

introduction of T-Levels, the work being done around STEM learning and the inclusion of the over 50 population;

- What would be the output of the proposed joint project with the City of London in reviewing the city region's venture capital funding landscape;
- It was questioned how successful 'horizontal' economic policies that cut across sector boundaries, creating an environment for businesses to thrive would actually be;
- What consideration was being given to supporting start-up businesses; and
- It was questioned as to how much the government had 'bought into' the findings of the IPR.

The Assistant Director advised that the development of the implementation plan for the GM Industrial Strategy and the Manchester Industrial Strategy would be undertaken at the same time, with the implementation plan focusing on the areas where government had committed to investing. The Leader added that it was likely that there would not be a vast amount of difference to how the Council was currently operating once both strategies were in their implementation phases. He commented that the Council would continue in the direction of inclusive growth and developing its education and skills offer for Manchester residents. It was also reported that the Strategy did not attempt to cover every employment sector, but rather concentrated on the foundational economy of the region.

The Committee was advised that Greater Manchester had informed government that with the launch of the strategy, a nine month review of the skills system would commence, which would incorporate future requirements, including the provision of T-levels and STEM learning. In terms of the joint project with the City of London, it was reported that this was being scoped at present to identify and agree appropriate terms of reference and key lines of enquiry.

In relation to support for start-up businesses, it was reported that Greater Manchester had established a programme of support which was delivered and managed through the Manchester Growth Company. Furthermore the Assistant Director advised that the buy in to the findings of the IPR varied across government departments, however, he did highlight that HM Treasury was very much on board with the findings and proposals.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Welcomes the Greater Manchester Industrial Strategy; and
- (2) Agrees to receive a draft of Manchester's Local Industrial Strategy at its next meeting in July 2019.

ESC/19/27 Re-establishment of the District Centres Sub Group

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit that provided Members with the current terms of reference and work programme of the District Centres Sub Group. The Committee was invited to re-establish the group and agree the membership, terms of reference and work programme.

The Chair of the Sub Group informed the Committee that there had been a slight revision to key line of enquiry No.4 and that the Sub Group would look to present its findings back to this Committee in January 2020.

Decision

The Committee:-

- (1) Agrees the Terms of Reference of the Sub Group, including the revision to key line of enquiry No.4;
- (2) Notes the Sub Group's work programme for future meetings;
- (3) Agrees that the membership of the Sub Group for 2019/20 be Councillors Hughes, Karney, Kirkpatrick, Madeline Monaghan, Shilton Godwin and White; and
- (4) Agrees that Councillor Shilton Godwin is appointed as Chair of the Subgroup;

ESC/19/28 Overview Report

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

Decision

The Committee notes the report and approve the work programme.

Communities and Equalities Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 20 June 2019

Present:

Councillor Hacking - In the Chair
Councillors Andrews, Chambers, Collins, M Dar, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Grimshaw, Kirkpatrick, Rawson and Rowles

Councillor S Murphy, Statutory Deputy Leader
Councillor Rahman, Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure
Councillor Leech, Leader of the Opposition
Councillor Rawlins, Lead Member for Disability
Councillor Davies, Ward Councillor for Deansgate
Eabha Doherty, Sister Supporter Manchester
Brian Hilton, Greater Manchester Coalition of Disabled People
Mark Todd, Peterloo Memorial campaign group

CESC/19/20 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2019 as a correct record.

CESC/19/21 Petition for Debate - Add Public Space Protection Orders around all abortion-providing clinics to end harassment of service users and staff

The Committee considered the report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which provided details of a petition to add Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) around all abortion-providing clinics. The report also outlined the procedure for the Committee to debate the petition in accordance with the Council's Petitions Scheme.

The Committee welcomed Eabha Doherty from Sister Supporter Manchester who outlined the reasons for submitting the petition. She reported that so far two other local authorities – Ealing Council and Richmond Council – had introduced PSPOs around abortion-providing clinics in their areas. She emphasised that women should be able to access health care facilities to which they were legally entitled without harassment or intimidation and while retaining their anonymity. She informed Members that her organisation had been collecting evidence of harassment of service users and staff around the Marie Stopes Clinic in Fallowfield for 18 months and that the Marie Stopes Clinic had also gathered evidence. She outlined some of the tactics used by the protesters, including carrying placards showing graphic images, approaching and filming women trying to access the clinic and spreading unfounded claims about the health effects of having an abortion. She advised that, as well as having a traumatic effect on women using the clinic, this behaviour also impacted on local residents who had been living with this problem for many years. She reported that the women harassed often did not report the harassment to the police, due to feelings of shame, and stated that the protesters were targeting

vulnerable women with the aim of stopping them from going ahead with their own choice.

The Strategic Director (Neighbourhoods) was then invited to respond to the issues raised. She outlined the purpose of PSPOs and the Home Office guidance, highlighting that they had to be used responsibly and proportionately. She acknowledged the issues that Ms Doherty had raised and reported that mediation had been tried to resolve this issue but that this had not been successful. She reported that the Council now had significant evidence of the issues around abortion-providing clinics, including evidence provided by the petition organisers. She outlined the steps involved in making PSPOs, informing Members that officers were engaging with the Council's Legal Service with a view to undertaking a consultation on this issue.

The Statutory Deputy Leader expressed her support for women to be able to access health care to which they were legally entitled without fear of harassment. She drew Members' attention to the motion that the Council had passed in January 2018 which, she advised, demonstrated the Council's support for this; however, she reported that there were some challenges relating to the implementation of PSPOs around clinics. She reported that the Council was committed to addressing these challenges and outlined what the Council had done so far, including speaking to groups on both sides, as well as local residents and clinic staff. She informed Members that the Council was in contact with Ealing Council, which had already introduced buffer zones around abortion-providing clinics in its area and which was now facing a legal challenge. She reported that this would be considered by the Court of Appeal in about a month's time and that the outcome would have implications for the course of action that Manchester City Council would take. She reported that evidence was being gathered and legal advice was being sought and that, in the meantime, the Council was liaising with the police to ensure that, where the behaviour of protesters breached existing laws, action was taken now. She also suggested that Members should be campaigning to extend the right to attend abortion-providing clinics without harassment to all women across the United Kingdom.

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

- Expressions of support for the right of women to access medical care without harassment and for necessary steps to be taken to ensure this;
- That Members wanted this work to progress as quickly as possible, while ensuring that it was legally sound, and to request that the Committee be updated on progress and any issues that arose so that this could be scrutinised;
- To suggest Members could visit the location of the Marie Stopes Clinic to see the issues for themselves;
- To ask what evidence was needed to make a PSPO;
- How a PSPO would be enforced; and
- Whether PSPOs were in place for a particular period of time.

The Community Safety Lead reported that evidence would be required of behaviour which was having or was likely to have a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality, that it was persistent or continuing in nature and that it was

unreasonable. She informed Members that PSPOs could be enforced by police officers, police community support officers or council officers. She advised the Committee that PSPOs could be put in place for up to 3 years and would then be reviewed and extended if necessary.

Decisions

1. To support the petition and to ask the decision-maker to work with the petition organisers and others to progress this within a reasonable timescale.
2. To receive a progress report at a future meeting.
3. To express the Committee's support for the campaign to extend the right to attend abortion-providing clinics without harassment to all women across the United Kingdom.

[Councillor Evans and Councillor Grimshaw declared a prejudicial interest as Members of the Licensing and Appeals Committee and withdrew from the room for this item.]

CESC/19/22 Peterloo Memorial Design

The Committee received a report of the Director of Strategic Development which provided an overview of the design process and the work undertaken as part of the design of the Peterloo Memorial.

The main points and themes within the report included:

- The inception of the project;
- The design formation; and
- The current position.

The Lead Member for Disability commented that the Our Manchester Strategy Outcomes at the front of the report did not mention equalities and suggested that the Committee might want to give consideration to how equalities could be incorporated into this. She informed Members that she supported the creation of a memorial to the Peterloo Massacre but that it had to be for everyone. She advised Members that this issue should have been identified and addressed earlier in the process and that it was not acceptable for non-disabled people to decide that a ramp which enabled partial access to the memorial enabled 'meaningful participation' for wheelchair users. She expressed concern that the process through which the memorial had been developed had failed to ensure accessibility and called for a review of the Council's processes, as well as training for Members and officers, to ensure that the issue of accessibility was central in future work. She questioned why there was no reference to the social model of disability in the documents and whether an equality impact assessment had been carried out. She also questioned whether there was any ongoing dialogue taking place between the Council and disabled people's groups and advised that it was important for this to happen. She emphasised the importance of pro-actively consulting with the public, including disabled people's

groups, rather than putting a consultation on the Council's website and assuming that was sufficient.

Brian Hilton from the Greater Manchester Coalition of Disabled People (GMCDP) reported that his organisation supported the creation of a fitting memorial to the Peterloo Massacre but that a fitting memorial could not involve the segregation, discrimination and humiliation of disabled people. He stated that the consultation had been flawed and that the consultation period had not been long enough. He reported that the campaign to make the memorial fully accessible had been widely supported, including by local, national and international disabled people's organisations, by the group which had campaigned to have the memorial built and by a number of high profile individuals including the singer-songwriter and political activist Billy Bragg. He commented that the Peterloo Memorial had been described as a memorial that people could interact with in a number of ways, including viewing it, climbing on it and speaking from it, but that disabled people could not do this and that, in its current design, the memorial was a metaphor for segregation, with disabled people at the bottom being talked down to. He advised Members that what was important was not completing the memorial in its current form by the 200th anniversary of the Peterloo Massacre but getting it right by ensuring that it was accessible for all.

Mark Todd informed Members that he was representing a grassroots campaign group which included disabled people, their organisations and non-disabled people who wanted an accessible, inclusive memorial. He referred to documents which, he informed the Committee, indicated that the memorial was not just public art but an interactive memorial which people could speak from and expressed concern that the current design made disabled people passive spectators rather than active participants. He informed Members that the changes agreed so far to make the memorial more accessible would only raise wheelchair users seven inches off the ground and did not provide them with access to a speaking platform. He reported that campaigners had been working with the artist to improve the accessibility of the memorial design and that he believed a solution could be found; however, he advised Members that on 14 May 2019 the Council had halted these discussions, citing time constraints. He questioned this, stating that the timescales were all decided by the Council and that the memorial was not intended to play a major role in the 200th anniversary commemorations. He reported that his group would be happy to contribute their views on how consultation processes could be improved in future but that their priority now was the memorial. He informed Members that the artist and the campaigners were still willing to work together to resolve this and asked that the Council join them in finding a solution.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure reported that the Council took pride in being inclusive and in its commitment to equality but that this had failed during this process. He reported that the Peterloo Memorial had originally been commissioned as a public art installation but acknowledged that later changes to make the design interactive had not been fully inclusive. He proposed to revert to the original brief that this would be a piece of public art which was not to be climbed on by anybody and that signs be put up to this effect.

The Leader of the Opposition supported the comments of the Lead Member for Disability and thanked Mr Hilton and Mr Todd for their contribution to the discussion. He expressed concern that, despite the multi-staged process that the proposal had been through before going to the Planning Committee, the lack of accessibility was only identified at that stage and advised that processes should be reviewed to address this. He advised Members that the memorial should be fully accessible to all, including people with different types of wheelchairs and mobility scooters. He stated that he did not believe that the Executive Member's proposal was acceptable and recommended that the relevant parties meet to find a way to make the memorial accessible to all.

The Ward Councillor for Deansgate reported that there had been a long-term commitment to building this memorial. She reported that during the consultation period councillors had raised the issue of access and had been assured that this issue would be addressed. She stated that she did not believe that the Executive Member's proposal was a workable solution and suggested that the work go ahead as planned in time for the commemorations with a clear statement from the Council which acknowledged the mistakes that had been made and gave a commitment to make appropriate changes.

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

- To question whether a meaningful consultation had taken place;
- To question the proposal that the memorial be re-designated as a non-interactive piece of public art as the artist had said that people would get the most out of it from the top of the memorial and members of the public were still likely to climb it due to having been told previously that it was interactive;
- That the Equality Act referred to people with a protected characteristic being encouraged to participate in public life on the same level as people who didn't possess that protected characteristic and that preventing everyone from using the memorial as a speaking platform was not in keeping with this and was contrary to the message of Peterloo; and
- That this situation should be rectified in consultation with and using the expertise of disabled people's groups and that the Executive Member should meet with Mr Hilton, Mr Todd and the Lead Member for Disability as soon as possible to discuss options.

The Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure informed Members that the unveiling of the Peterloo Memorial would be part of the 200th anniversary celebrations but that the original intention of the memorial had not included it being a speaking platform and that all elements of the memorial could be seen from the lower level. He reiterated his proposal to revert to the original brief for the memorial, that it was not intended to be stood on and that people should be discouraged from doing so. He stated that he was trying to find a practical solution and that it was difficult to adapt it to the degree that the campaigners wanted.

The Development Manager outlined the consultation process, stating that 14% of respondents had raised issues relating to accessibility but that this included a range of accessibility issues, such as access during party political conferences, in addition to disabled access. In response to a question from the Lead Member for Disability,

he reported that disabled people's groups had not been pro-actively engaged with during the consultation process. He advised Members that, following the consultation period, Mr Todd had raised concerns about accessibility and that a meeting had been arranged with him, the Council and the artist but he acknowledged that it had taken too long for that meeting to take place.

Decisions

1. To express concern that the Council's processes had failed to identify and address the accessibility issues at an early stage, to ask the Lead Member for Disability to liaise with the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure and other relevant Members on the best way to review the processes to ensure that this does not happen in future and to request that the Committee be updated on the progress of this work.
2. To request that the Executive Member for Skills, Culture and Leisure and relevant officers meet with all the relevant parties, including the Lead Member for Disability and representatives of disabled people's groups, to find an acceptable solution.

CESC/19/23 Overview Report

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

The Chair requested that the Committee receive an update report on the Peterloo Memorial at its September meeting and that it review progress on PSPOs around abortion-providing clinics in six months' time. He informed the Committee that the proposed Terms of Reference for the Advice Services Review would also come to a future meeting.

Decision

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