

EXECUTIVE

25 OCTOBER 2021

PRESENT

Leader of the Council (Councillor A. Western) (in the Chair),
Executive Member for Adult Social Care (Councillor J. Harding),
Executive Member for Children's Services (Councillor C. Hynes),
Executive Member for Communities and Partnerships (Councillor G. Whitham),
Executive Member for Covid-19 Recovery and Reform (Councillor M. Freeman),
Executive Member for Environmental and Regulatory Services (Councillor S. Adshead),
Executive Member for Finance and Governance (Councillor T. Ross),
Executive Member for Health, Wellbeing and Equalities (Councillor J. Slater),
Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration (Councillor J. Wright).

Also present: Councillors Acton, Blackburn, Boyes, Butt, K. Carter, Chalkin, Evans, Holden, Jerrome, Myers, Newgrosh and Young.

Officers in attendance:

Deputy Chief Executive and Corporate Director, Strategy and Resources (Ms. S. Saleh),
Corporate Director, Governance and Community Strategy (Ms. J. Le Fevre),
Interim Director of Strategy and Policy (Ms. D. Geary),
Governance Officer (Mr. J.M.J. Maloney).

APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors E. Patel; and from the Chief Executive.

38. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

It was noted that two questions had been received for consideration at this meeting. One related closely to the diversion of the CAT 5 bus service, on which a petition was also due to be considered at this meeting. (The following Minute refers.) The question would thus be addressed in the context of the consideration of the petition.

The second related to the integration of health and care, and the evolution of a One System Board, due to be considered later on the agenda. The questioner was present, to put the following questions:

- What are the benefits for the people of Trafford from the adoption of the One System Board in Trafford?
- Why support a One System Board for Trafford that has no power to make policy decisions for the Trafford residents you represent (or, indeed, those people from Trafford who need IVF services)?
- Why should Trafford representative support this new scheme?

- Shouldn't Trafford Council Executive also oppose the One System Board in the interests of Trafford residents?

The Executive Member for Health, Wellbeing and Equalities noted the similarity of the question to one which had also been raised at a meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board, in the presence of senior representatives of the CCG; and that a detailed response, incorporating input from the CCG, would be made to the questioner outside the meeting. For the time being, the Executive Member noted that changes were necessary, on a national basis, in response to a Government initiative; and that it was unlikely to have been the Council's choice to bring forward change on such a scale during the COVID-19 pandemic. Once further guidance had been received from Government, formal consultation would be undertaken. As set out in more detail in the report considered later on the agenda, shadow arrangements would be put in place until the formal ending of the CCG structure in March 2021. The Executive Member noted that to some extent she shared the questioner's concerns, and would be happy to discuss them in greater detail outside the meeting. In any event, she reiterated that a further written response would be supplied to the questioner in due course.

39. CONSIDERATION OF PETITION: DIVERSION OF THE CAT5 BUS SERVICE

The Executive gave formal consideration to the following petition.

"Six months ago the CAT5 between Warburton and Altrincham was put on a diversionary route due to a new advisory height sign erected by Trafford MBC following guidance issued by the Department of Transport. A similar issue on Barsbank Lane, Statham with a similar low underbridge was resolved this year, as the bridge was re-signed by Warrington Borough Council. We the undersigned insist that this situation is resolved without further delay by Trafford MBC. Also, until that time, TfGM arrange for a diversion that best serves the travelling public instead of just the operator by travelling down a route that is already well served."

A representative of the petitioners had submitted the following further material clarifying the concerns which had prompted the petition, and the Executive Member had taken this into consideration in responding on behalf of the Executive.

"It is my belief petitions with over 500 signatories will be considered at a full council meeting.

I therefore present the results of a current petition to date for consideration at said meeting.

The petition has the backing and support of Warburton Parish council, Lymm Parish Council, public house's and other business's and has been signed by people who live and or work in the catchment area and their social, business and family life has been affected by the ridiculous situation of the withdrawal of a service which historically extends over 60 years due to what we believe is the mis-signing of the height limit of the under-bridge in Dunham Massey.

Executive (25.10.21)

The under-bridge itself was rebuilt (I believe) some 39 years ago and was specifically redesigned to accommodate single deck buses.

Despite the fact that it is 11' 9" in height from the road surface to the lower deck it is signed at 9' I am lead to believe that this complies with new government guidelines. Guidelines are there to guide and are not law. Can we please see some common sense applied, as this diversion is causing a lot of disruption to peoples lives.

The new CAT5 buses at a height of 9' 6" have been transiting safely since their introduction in spring of 2018.

Increasing the height by 6" to allow the buses to continue would surely not encourage a deluge of high heavy vehicles to use this route!

Please find attached the signatories who have signed to enforce the statement:

We the undersigned insist that this situation is resolved without further delay by Trafford MBC. Also, until that time, TfGM arrange for a diversion that best serves the travelling public instead of just the operator by travelling down a route that is already well served.

Thanks and Regards"

It was noted that a related question had also been received from the petitioners' representative, as follows:

"In all correspondence with the various authorities and various Paris Councils. The word new laws is used in defence of the bridge signage:

I can find no such 'new law'. But have discovered the following guidance:-

Prevention of Strike on Bridge over Highways

A Protocol for Highway Managers & Bridge owners ISSUE 2

Which in Section 2.29 states:-

Measurement of headroom

2.29 All bridges with headroom of less than 16'6" (5.03m) at any point over a carriageway should be signed in accordance with the guidance given in the tsM43 section 7. this will, in all situations, allow a minimum safety margin for vehicle (suspension) bounce etc. of 3" or 0.1m (these are not equivalent values but each is applied in accordance with the measurement guidelines).

"I personally, have measured the distance from the tarmac road deck to the bottom of the 'collision protection beams' and it is 11' 9" at it's lowest, the signage is 9', the CAT5 vehicles height is 9' 6". This leaves 2' 3" clearance". 2' in excess or the guidelines.

I therefore request that the council reassess the situation and install more accurate signage to enable the CAT5 buses to transit this underbridge as they have been doing for a period of 2.5 years prior to the diversion”

As indicated above, the content of this question had been taken into account by the Executive Member; and it was noted that a detailed written response would also be provided to the questioner following the meeting.

The Executive Member responded as follows.

“As some Members may be aware the decision to re-route the Cat 5 service away from the Dunham Underbridge was made by Warrington’s Own Buses based on their own Legal Department’s advice and despite many months of discussions between Council officers, WOB and Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM).

Their decision followed an increase in bridge strikes around the country, that resulted in the Traffic Commissioner issuing national guidance to bus operators to take additional steps to remove the potential for any bridge strikes. Traffic Commissioners are responsible for the licensing and regulation of bus, coach and goods vehicle operators, and registration of local bus services.

The bridge itself is owned by the Bridgewater Canal Company Limited (BCCL), a subsidiary of Peel Holdings, and is signed at 9’0”, which is itself an increase on the signed height on the previous structure that was replaced here over 40 years ago. WOB approached the Council and TfGM to ask whether the signage could be amended to 9’6”, which is the current height of their low roof service buses. They advised that Warrington Council had made a change to the signs on one of the canal bridges in their area around Barsbank Lane.

The previous approach taken by WOB on this route for many decades, was that their single deck buses could pass through the bridge safely. In addition, WOB actually purchased several low height (9’6”) high buses because standard single decker buses were considered too high and the lower unit gave an increased clearance.

Since WOB’s request to change the sign the bridge clearance was re-measured, and the sign height calculation checked to ensure this remains applicable which it does. Importantly the owner of the bridge have stated that they do not want the height on the signs increased at Dunham due the risk to their asset. We are aware that a number of issues have occurred in Warrington on Barsbank Lane with over height vehicles being stuck since the signage was amended.

Trafford Council and Transport for Great Manchester (TfGM) initially offered an option of a way forward to ask the Traffic Commissioner whether a formalised “Memorandum of Understanding” between all parties was appropriate to ensure the service could still be in use. Unfortunately the Traffic Commissioner did not consider that this was an issue for them to get involved with.

Officers have met many times with TfGM and WOB this year to try and resolve this issue and I can advise that this matter has progressed recently, and that TfGM

Executive (25.10.21)

have confirmed the restoration of public transport links to the western side of Bowdon, Dunham Massey and Dunham Woodhouses. This has been as follows:

From Sunday 29 August, the Little Gem service 287 was revised in Bowdon; this service now runs from Altrincham Interchange via Ashley Road, Langham Road, Park Road, Dunham Road, Bow Green Road and return via Bowdon Vale and Upper Bowdon to Altrincham Interchange. This revised service now calls at bus stops on Park Road which are close to the A56, a 25-minute walk through Dunham Massey grounds to the entrance of Dunham Massey.

Also with effect from earlier September, the Partington Local Link provision has also been extended to provide a service to the rural part of this area; this pre-booked service can be used for journeys to and from Dunham Massey, Dunham Woodhouses and Dunham Town. In addition, services CAT5 and CAT5A will continue to operate as they have and provide a link between Altrincham, Warburton, Lymm and Warrington. Information about this service is on TfGM's website.

Trafford Council and all parties remain committed to trying to find a solution to resolve this issue and to enable a service to return to the original route.

I hope this clarifies the current position for Members.”

40. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Leader of the Council declared a Personal Interest in the Stretford Future High Streets Fund Project item by virtue of his position as Chair of the Management Board of the Trafford Bruntwood LLP.

41. MATTERS FROM COUNCIL OR OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES (IF ANY)

As Chair of the Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Acton provided an update on the ongoing review of the Scrutiny function, expressing his thanks to all who had responded to the associated survey. The Executive would be advised of the outcome in due course. The Leader added his thanks, acknowledging the significance of the review for an important aspect of the Council's work.

42. STRETFORD FUTURE HIGH STREETS FUND PROJECT

The Executive Member for Housing and Regeneration submitted a report which advised that a bid to the government's Future High Streets Fund had been successful in securing over £17m for a range of schemes to regenerate and transform Stretford Town centre for the benefit of local residents, businesses and visitors. The report identified those schemes and provided an update on progress. In discussion the Executive noted a number of comments including in relation to the current guard rails along Edge Lane, the potential for a taxi rank on Kingsway, and proposals for, and communication of, measures to reduce the carbon impact in the locality. These issues would be addressed as the project progressed; and it was noted that dialogue with stakeholders would continue.

RESOLVED -

- (1) That the undertaking of the schemes identified in Section 2.0 of the report be approved and authorised in principle.
- (2) That authority be delegated to the Corporate Director of Place to make minor amendments to the schemes as necessary in consultation with the Executive Member for Regeneration and Housing.
- (3) That authority be delegated to the Corporate Director of Place to deliver the schemes, including engaging external resources, commissioning surveys, investigations and any other works required to deliver highways and public realm improvements; and applying for planning permission if required.
- (4) That the Corporate Director of Governance and Community Strategy be authorised to finalise and enter into all legal agreements required to implement the above decisions.
- (5) That an update be provided to the Executive following the public consultation identified in Section 5.1 of the report and every six months thereafter.

43. INTEGRATING HEALTH AND CARE: EVOLUTION OF ONE SYSTEM BOARD TO PROVIDE FIT AND PURPOSEFUL OVERSIGHT OF TRAFFORD LOCALITY LEADERSHIP FROM APRIL 2022

The Leader of the Council and Joint Chair of Trafford One System Board, Executive Member for Adult Social Care and Executive Member for Health, Wellbeing and Equalities submitted a report which gave details of the proposed governance arrangements for the Trafford One System Board for both shadow arrangements and beyond March 2022, in relation to the formal introduction (pending legislation) of Integrated Care Systems. The report outlined the various governance options for the One System Board for shadow operation from October 2021 and formal implementation in April 2022, and articulated the option as agreed in principle by the One System Board. It was noted that the situation was developing rapidly, and that there was therefore a commitment to bringing regular updates to the Executive on related system governance issues and plans, as legislation materialised and enhanced clarity on the GM ICS operating model and therefore locality operating model.

In discussion the current lack of definitive clarity was noted, and the importance of effective scrutiny of developing proposals at Greater Manchester level. It was acknowledged that further information was awaited from Government. The Executive Member for Health, Wellbeing and Equalities advised that she was happy to discuss Members' concerns further; and the Leader emphasised and

Executive (25.10.21)

agreed the priority of effective local oversight and scrutiny, to ensure that the system developed in the interests of Trafford residents.

RESOLVED -

- (1) That the setting up of a joint committee (formally from April 2022 and in Shadow form from October 2021) be agreed in principle.
- (2) That the proposed arrangements operate in shadow form from October 2021 with accountability and decision making remaining with individual statutory organisations.
- (3) That the suggested locality board functions be agreed, noting that clarity on the finer detail is still to be fully determined.
- (4) That the proposed revised membership from October 2021 be agreed.
- (5) That the arrangements for the appointment of a chair to the proposed shadow joint committee, as set out in the report, be noted.
- (6) That it be noted that the details relating to the terms of reference, delegations, voting and quoracy of the joint committee will be brought back to the Executive for further consideration at a later date.

44. FAIR PRICE FOR CARE

The Executive Member for Adult Social Care submitted a report which provided the Executive with an update on recent and planned activity relating to the setting of a "Fair Price for Care", in the context of the Ethical Care Charter. The revised timescale facilitated a consultation exercise, the results of which would be reported to the Executive later in the year.

RESOLVED –

- (1) That the content of the report be noted.
- (2) That the lengthened time frame for the analysis of day care costs be noted.

45. DOMESTIC ABUSE JOINT STRATEGIC NEEDS ASSESSMENT AND DOMESTIC ABUSE STRATEGY 22/23

The Executive Member for Communities and Partnerships submitted a report which advised that the Council had commissioned an external consultant to complete a Domestic Abuse Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (“JSNA”) and to co-develop a Domestic Abuse Strategy. It provided information on the scope and outcome of the JSNA and planned activities which would enable the Council to respond to identified priority areas.

In considering the report, Members discussed the significance of awareness of domestic abuse, because of its impact on children, in schools; and it was agreed that consideration would be given to appropriate training and awareness-raising. The Executive would be kept informed of progress on the JSNA, with its final authorisation expected early in the coming year.

RESOLVED – That the content of the report and planned actions detailed within it be noted.

46. CORPORATE PLAN 2021/22 QUARTER 1 REPORT

The Executive Member for COVID-19 Recovery and Reform submitted a report which provided a summary of performance against the Council’s Corporate Plan, 2021/22, with the Q1 report covering the period 1st April to 30th June 2021. In discussion, comments were raised by Members regarding the limited nature of detailed metrics, in relation to carbon reduction targets, and more generally. It was noted that in many cases the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic had rendered the collation of such metrics impracticable; but that it was planned that this issue would be addressed as part of the refresh of the Corporate Plan (as set out in the next Minute). For the time being, due consideration would be given to any suggestion made by Members regarding the inclusion of additional items as part of the refresh exercise.

RESOLVED – That the content of the Corporate Plan Quarter 1 Report be noted.

47. CORPORATE PLAN REFRESH 2021/24

The Executive Member for COVID-19 Recovery and Reform submitted a report which provided a summary of the Council’s Corporate Plan refresh. The Executive was advised of the level of response received to date from the public engagement exercise; and that the intention was to seek approval for the refreshed Plan from the Executive and Council in November. In response to the issues raised under the previous item, Members were advised that the draft Plan was a working document, and that its current Appendix provided a sample of potential measures, not a definitive or exhaustive list. The invitation was reiterated to Members to raise suggestions, for consideration, of additional issues which might be included. It was noted that further research would also be undertaken into the timeliness of data sets used for evaluation and comparative purposes.

Executive (25.10.21)

RESOLVED –

- (1) That the content of the report be noted; and that it be noted that a further report will be presented to the Executive in November 2021.
- (2) That the intention be noted to seek a recommendation to adopt the refreshed Corporate Plan to Council from the Executive in November 2021.
- (3) That the detail in relation to the citizen space survey be noted.
- (4) That the reporting schedule for corporate plan updates be noted.

The meeting commenced at 6.30 p.m. and finished at 7.37 p.m.