



Monday, 27 November 2023

Dear Councillor / Honorary Alderman,

Meeting of the Council – Wednesday, 29th November, 2023

A summons was issued on 21 November 2023, for meeting of the Council which will be held at 10.00 am on Wednesday, 29th November, 2023, in The Council Chamber, Level 2, Town Hall Extension.

The following items marked as ‘to follow’ on the summons are now enclosed.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| 7. Scrutiny Committees | Pages |
| • Children & Young People – 8 November 2023 | 3 - 12 |
| 8. Proceedings of Committees | Pages |
| • Planning and Highways Committee – 16 November 2023 | 13 - 20 |
| • Licensing Policy Committee – 20 November 2023, and in particular, to consider: | |

LPC/23/04 Statement of Licensing Policy 2023 - 2028

To recommend to full Council to approve the Statement of Licensing Policy 2023 - 2028 policy for publication.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Joanne Roney'.

Joanne Roney OBE
Chief Executive

Councillors:-

Y Dar (Chair), Andrews (Deputy Chair), Abdullatif, Akbar, Azra Ali, Ahmed Ali, Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Alijah, Amin, Appleby, Bano, Bayunu, Bell, Benham, Brickell, Bridges, Butt, Chambers, Chohan, Collins, Connolly, Cooley, Craig, Curley, Davies, Doswell, Douglas, Evans, Flanagan, Fletcher, Foley, Gartside, Good, Green, Grimshaw, Hacking, Hassan, Hewitson, Hilal, Hitchen, Holt, Hughes, Hussain, Igbon, Ilyas, Iqbal, Johns, Johnson, T Judge, Kamal, Karney, Kilpatrick, Kirkpatrick, Lanchbury, Leech, J Lovecy, Ludford, Lynch, Lyons, Marsh, McCaul, McHale, Midgley, Moran, Muse, Noor, Northwood, Nunney, Ogunbambo, H Priest, Rahman, Rawlins, Rawson, Razaq, Reeves, Reid, Riasat, Richards, I Robinson, T Robinson, Rowles, Sadler, M Sharif Mahamed, Sheikh, Shilton Godwin, Simcock, Stogia, Taylor, Wheeler, Wiest, Whiston, White, Wills, Wilson and Wright

Further Information

For help, advice and information about this meeting please contact the Committee Officer:

Andrew Woods
Tel: 0161 234 3011
Email: andrew.woods@manchester.gov.uk

This agenda was issued on **Monday, 27 November 2023** by the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit, Manchester City Council, Level 2, Town Hall Extension (Library Walk Elevation), Manchester M60 2LA

Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 8 November 2023

Present:

Councillor Reid – in the Chair
Councillors N Ali, Alijah, Amin, Bano, Bell, Gartside, Hewitson, Judge, Lovecy, Ludford, Marsh, McHale, Muse, Nunney, and Sharif Mahamed

Co-opted Voting Members:

Mr G Cleworth, Parent Governor Representative
Canon S Mapledoram, Representative of the Diocese of Manchester

Co-opted Non-Voting Members:

Miss S Iltaf, Secondary Sector Teacher Representative

Also present:

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Finance and Resources
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People
Councillor T Robinson, Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care
Al Ford, Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS)
Victoria Smith, Greater Manchester Integrated Care
Tom Dainty, Greater Manchester Integrated Care

Apologies:

Councillors Fletcher and Sadler
Ms L Smith, Primary Sector Teacher Representative
Mr Y Yonis, Parent Governor Representative

CYP/23/46 Minute's Silence

The Committee held a minute's silence for all children caught up in conflicts across the world.

CYP/23/47 Minutes

Decision

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

CYP/23/48 The impact of COVID-19 on children and young people's mental health and well-being

The Committee considered a report and presentation of Al Ford, Director of CAMHS (Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services) which built on the report to the Committee on 20 July 2022 and provided an update on the exploration of the impact of COVID-19 on children and young people's mental health and well-being. Within this paper evidence suggested that children and young people's mental health and

wellbeing had been substantially impacted during the pandemic, which had resulted in higher prevalence, demand and acuity (complexity) for CAMHS.

Key points and themes in the report and presentation included:

- Information on the impact of COVID-19 on children and young people's mental health and well-being;
- Manchester CAMHS waiting time and demand; and
- CAMHS response and transformation.

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

- To welcome the work taking place;
- Work in relation to development trauma and Fetal Alcohol Spectrum Disorder (FASD);
- Waiting times and cancelled CAMHS appointments;
- Medication shortages for Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD);
- The role of schools in supporting children and young people, and support for schools; and
- The under-representation of males in the children and young people receiving treatment from CAMHS.

The Chair advised Members that the Committee would receive a report on FASD at a future meeting.

Al Ford, Director of CAMHS reported that CAMHS was not commissioned to provide a FASD service but that his service was developing a business case in relation to this as it was recognised that there was a gap in the health system in relation to FASD. He informed Members that children who did not have the typical physical symptoms of FASD were often misconstrued as having autism or ADHD and that the service had a social development clinic which worked with children who were difficult to diagnose and that this clinic could diagnose FASD. In relation to trauma, he reported that Greater Manchester was signed up to be a trauma-informed region and that CAMHS had a whole workforce transformation programme around trauma-informed practice. A Member commented that autism could arise from FASD and that these were connected. She also emphasised the importance of diagnosing developmental trauma.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People suggested that a larger piece of work on FASD was needed, involving both social care and health, and he asked the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services to discuss this further with the Member who raised it and CAMHS outside of the meeting. He expressed concern that children's well-being was not prioritised by the Government during the pandemic and that the COVID-19 Inquiry was not sufficiently focusing on this. He also highlighted the impact of the cost-of-living crisis and rising poverty on children's well-being.

The Chair supported the Executive Member's comments about children not being prioritised during the pandemic.

Al Ford confirmed that the service kept a record of all cancelled appointments, whether they were cancelled by the service or the family, reporting that capacity issues and industrial action had led to some appointments being cancelled. He informed Members that the service had a high level of demand and a finite capacity so had to prioritise children with the highest level of clinical need, meaning that some families were waiting for two years. He stated that he recognised that this was an unacceptable length of time to wait for diagnosis but that the service had been successful in receiving an NHS Pathfinder Pilot Award to develop an under-5s programme, delivering intervention alongside assessment, which was cutting assessment times by 50% and providing help and support upfront. He reported that Manchester Foundation Trust was seeking to stockpile an amount of ADHD medication for the most clinically vulnerable and that prescribers were being encouraged to move away from prescribing branded drugs and use alternatives as well. He informed Members that communications were being sent out in relation to this issue, including to schools, and offered to provide further information on this. He stated that it was hoped that the medication shortage issue would be resolved by the end of the year.

The Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care highlighted some of the key issues within the report and how he was responding to these, including informing Members about discussions taking place on how the Council could work in partnership with CAMHS on a whole-system approach.

Al Ford reported that Manchester Thrive in Education was currently providing support to 35% of schools in Manchester but that there was a commitment in the NHS long-term plan to cover all education settings, while recognising that this required a major workforce expansion. He informed Members that Manchester was further ahead on this work than most areas and that, as long as the national Government remained committed to this agenda, he was confident that all education settings in Manchester would have a Mental Health Support Worker within the next 5 to 7 years. He informed Members about a pilot project taking place in the Pupil Referral Unit, advising that education settings with greater need were being prioritised for quicker and more intensive support. In response to a question from the Chair, he informed Members that some primary schools were already covered by Manchester Thrive in Education and that all education settings in Manchester could contact the Mental Health Support Team Leads to obtain consultation support. He reported that schools could access CAMHS digitally or by telephone and that schools were encouraged to have a Mental Health Champion in their senior leadership team who could act as a conduit between the mental health support system, including CAMHS, and the school. In response to a question from the Chair, he offered to circulate contact details to schools via the local authority, in case any were not clear on who to contact with regards to mental health issues. He recognised that the large-scale transformation programme would require a large communications strategy to ensure schools were aware of the changes and how to access to the right support.

In response to questions from the Chair, Victoria Smith, Greater Manchester Integrated Care, reported that most of the schools already covered by Manchester Thrive in Education were secondary schools and that expansion had to be incremental as there was not capacity to provide this to all schools at present,

although other support was available to all schools. She confirmed that schools did not pay for Manchester Thrive in Education but could pay for additional support.

In response to a Member's question about looking for alternative approaches and best practice from elsewhere, Al Ford reported that his service was a national pathfinder on a number of initiatives and was happy to taking learning from elsewhere. In response to a Member's question, he provided information on the Adoption Psychology Service, advising that the service provided support to children living up to 40 or 50 miles from Manchester, and he offered to provide additional information on this service. In response to a further question, he provided information on the well-being support available to CAMHS staff. He reported that the under-representation of males in those receiving treatment through Manchester CAMHS reflected the national picture and that the service had a 16+ service which provided outreach to teenagers who were not accessing its services. The Chair commented on the level of suicide among young men, the other support which was available such as CALM and some of the ways that could be used to communicate this, such as billboards and social media.

The Chair expressed concern at the increase in students struggling with mental health and that teachers were having to deal with these issues on a regular basis. She also expressed concern at the increase in eating disorders. Al Ford reported that eating disorders had worsened due to the pandemic, when families had been unable to access early intervention and prevention, but that post-pandemic there was still a higher prevalence of eating disorders, not only in Manchester, for a range of reasons, including the increased pressures on children and young people. In response to a question from the Chair about staff absences, he reported that a third of his service's absences were due to stress and anxiety and that the service was providing programmes of work to ensure that its staff stayed healthy and in work.

In response to a question from the Chair about Educational Health and Care Plans (EHCPs), the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services reported that 78% were completed on time, which compared favourably to comparable local authorities, and that this was at a time of increased demand, without additional resources. He suggested that the Committee receive a report on children with Special Educational Needs and Disability (SEND) at a future meeting.

Decision

To note the report and support actions that enable services, including education settings, to collaborate effectively to meet the emotional wellbeing and mental health needs of children and young people.

[Councillor Nunney declared a personal interest as an employee of Manchester Foundation Trust.]

[Councillor Reid declared a personal interest as a Governor of Manchester Foundation Trust.]

CYP/23/49 Manchester - Child Friendly City

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided an overview of work for Manchester to become internationally recognised as a 'Child Friendly City'.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Background information;
- Main issues;
- Governance;
- Development stage; and
- Delivery stage.

The Committee watched a short video which provided an overview of the emerging themes throughout the Discovery phase of this work.

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

- To welcome the report and the video and the approach being taken;
- To welcome the wide expansion of the number of schools in Manchester which were Rights Respecting Schools from the three schools which had initially signed up for this;
- That this was building an expectation among young people that their voices would be heard and raising a generation to be active citizens;
- That climate change was a very important issue for children and young people, the effect of car fumes on children's health and that children and young people needed positive actions that they could take to address climate change and to see the outcomes of this;
- Making the city centre Child Friendly, including the advertisements on display;
- The importance of play and ensuring that inclusive play was at the centre of every development in the city; and
- Timescales for the action plan and the delivery stage.

A Member who was Lord Mayor during Our Year shared her experiences of the positive work that had taken place and emphasised the importance of listening to children and young people's voices. The Chair and other Members shared their experiences of taking part in the engagement with children and young people. The Chair also commented on the important role that Social Value could play in this work.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People emphasised the importance of engaging with young people in a respectful and non-patronising manner, including explaining obstacles to implementing a suggestion and collaborating on finding solutions. He provided an example from his ward about partnership working to ensure that public spaces were designed in way which provided an environment for children to play. In response to a question from the Chair, he confirmed that the launch event would be at the Council meeting in January 2024.

The Strategic Director of Children and Education Services informed Members that supporting more schools to become Rights Respecting Schools was part of the Children and Young People's Plan. In response to a question about choosing the final three 'badges' from the five key top themes, he reported that innovation and creativity would be used to select the final three badges and that these would be announced in January 2024. He reported that the timescale for creating the development plan was two to four months and that officers were already giving consideration to the content of the plan, although it could not be populated until the three badges were decided. He reported that Cardiff had recently become the UK's first Child Friendly City and that it had taken the city about five years to achieve this status but that Manchester already had a lot of positive things in place in relation to participation and engagement and youth and play services so was already further along the journey. Therefore, he would hope Manchester would be able to progress a bit more quickly. In response to a Member's question, he recognised the challenge in changing officers' ways of thinking and approach to work across all Directorates across the Council. He informed Members that there were people acting as Champions and Ambassadors across the Council's Directorates, as well as in partner organisations, that training was important to help shape this and that the training needed to result in sustained changes in ways of working.

Decisions

1. To support the promotion of initiatives/programmes within areas of responsibility that create activities, opportunities and celebrate the success of Manchester's children and young people.
2. To endorse and support Manchester's journey in becoming a globally recognised child friendly city.

CYP/23/50 LADO Annual Report 2022 - 2023

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which provided an overview of the LADO Annual Report, which was included at appendix 1. The Annual Report provided an overview and analysis of the work of the LADO (Local Authority Designated Officer) in the management of allegations against adults who worked with children in a paid or voluntary capacity in Manchester, for the period 1 April 2021 to 31 March 2022. This included how effective the safeguarding partnership was in discharging its statutory responsibilities. The report considered the learning and development over the last twelve months and set priorities for 2023-2024 against this.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Background information; and
- The priorities identified in the Annual Report which were:
 - To safely and effectively support employers whilst managing the LADO demand;
 - To raise awareness and develop the training offer to the children's workforce; and

- To build on the performance framework, to quality assure activity to focus on learning and improvement.

The Chair reported that recent safeguarding training had highlighted the role of the LADO. In response to a Member's question on the take-up of the training referred to in the report, the Service Lead (Safeguarding) informed the Committee that they had now started gathering data on this and would be able to include it in the LADO Annual Report from next year, advising that it was important to compare this data against the agencies which were seeking advice and guidance from the LADO.

Decision

To note the report.

CYP/23/51 Revenue Budget Update 2024/25

The Committee considered the report of Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which informed Members that the Council was forecasting an estimated budget shortfall of £46m in 2024/25, £86m in 2025/26, and £105m by 2026/27. After the application of approved and planned savings, and the use of c£17m smoothing reserves in each of the three years, this gap reduced to £1.6m in 2024/25, £30m in 2025/26 and £49m by 2026/27. This position assumed that the savings approved as part of the Medium-Term Financial Strategy in February 2023 of £36.2m over three years were delivered.

The report provided a high-level overview of the updated budget position. The Committee was invited to consider the current proposed changes which were within its remit and to make recommendations to the Executive before it agreed to the final budget proposals in February 2024.

Key points and themes within the report included:

- Updates on the refreshed position including progress in reaching a balanced budget, reflecting preliminary savings and investment options;
- The government was expected to announce the Autumn Statement on 22 November 2023, but no major changes were expected;
- Government funding for 2024/25 would be confirmed in the provisional finance settlement, expected late in December 2023;
- The accompanying report set out the priorities and officer proposals for the services within the remit of this committee. This included a reminder of the savings proposals identified as part of last year's budget setting process (£36.2m across three years) and additional savings for consideration (£2.5m from 2024/25). As far as possible these were aimed at protecting the delivery of council priorities and represented the least detrimental options; and
- There remained a forecast shortfall of £1.6m next year. Any further reduction to the underspend this year would reduce the need to top back up General Fund reserve in 2024/25 and help bridge this shortfall. In addition, the Collection Fund position would be finalised in January and the final levy amounts from GMCA confirmed.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources expressed concern at the cuts to local authority funding over the last 14 years, the impact of inflation and the uncertainty caused by one-year financial settlements from the Government, which the Council would only be informed of in December. He called on the Government to adequately fund local authorities and to provide a financial settlement for a number of years, rather than a year at a time, to enable local authorities to plan ahead. In response to a Member's question about the use of reserves, he reported that the Council had a general reserve fund of £25 million and would need to use some of this during the year to meet in-year pressures but that this would need to be replenished the following year. He reported that after 2026/27 all the smoothing reserves would be depleted and the Council would only have its general reserve fund remaining.

Decision

To note the report.

CYP/23/52 Children and Education Services Budget 2024/25

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services which set out the priorities for the services in the remit of the Committee and detailed the initial revenue budget changes proposed by officers. The Committee was invited to consider the current proposed changes which were within its remit and to make recommendations to the Executive before it agreed to the final budget proposals in February 2024.

Key points and themes in the report included:

- Service overview and priorities;
- Service budget and proposed changes;
- Use of reserves;
- Grants;
- Commissioning and procurement priorities;
- Workforce implications; and
- Equality and anti-poverty impact.

The Head of Finance (Children, Education and Schools) informed the Committee that, since the report had been published, officers were no longer considering consulting with schools on a 0.5% transfer from the school block to support High Needs Block pressures for the next financial year, although it might be something that would need to be considered in 2025/26.

In response to a question from the Chair, the Director of Education confirmed to the Committee that the Council was continuing to claw back money from schools with excessive budget surpluses in order to support the High Needs Block.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People supported the earlier comments made by the Executive Member for Finance and Resources, under the previous budget item. and also expressed concern at profiteering in children's placements, the Government's handling of Unaccompanied Asylum-Seeking Children and the lack of funding for school buildings; however, he welcomed that Manchester

had managed to reduce its number of Looked After Children and had a more stable workforce than other areas.

The Chair highlighted the progress that had been made since 2014, including the valuable role of edge of care services, while expressing concern at the cuts to Council budgets. She stated that the level of cuts was unsustainable and that it was having a negative impact on children and families who were also being badly affected by Universal Credit cuts, increasing heating bills, rising rents and the cost-of-living crisis.

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

- To welcome the focus on early intervention and cost avoidance;
- To express concern that deprived areas of the country were most affected by budget cuts;
- To thank officers for their outstanding work, in the face of significant cuts;
- Concern about school budgets, in particular how schools would manage to fund the agreed pay rise out of their existing budgets; and
- The importance of ensuring that as far as possible Manchester children were placed through providers which shared the Council's values and were not profiteering.

In response to a request for clarification on workforce implications, the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services reported that there were no workforce implications from the budget proposals but that a lot of funding came from grants which were for a limited period of time, which presented a risk and challenge for the service to manage.

In response to the question on ethical providers, the Deputy Director of Children's Services explained how values and behaviours were built into the Sufficiency Strategy, with mechanisms to support that. He reported that the need for changes in the market was also recognised in the Government's Stable Homes, Built on Love strategy.

The Executive Member for Early Years, Children and Young People advised Members that, having to fund the agreed pay rise out of existing budgets, as well as dealing with inflation, effectively represented a budget cut for schools. He also expressed concern that the Department for Education had miscalculated its school settlement for Manchester so at short notice Manchester schools had been informed that they would receive £3.8 million less than they had anticipated.

The Director of Education informed the Committee that the miscalculation was due to an error on pupil numbers. She reported that in a small primary school the difference would be approximately £1000 and for the biggest secondary schools it would be around £94,000. She advised Members that a report on this would be considered by the Schools Forum.

The Executive Member for Finance and Resources shared the Member's concern that urban, deprived areas had been disproportionately affected by Government cuts,

stating that if Manchester had received a fair settlement, it would be £70 million per year better off and that he wanted Manchester to be treated fairly by the next Government.

The Chair noted that the Committee would receive a further budget report in February 2024.

Decision

To note the report.

CYP/23/53 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.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 16 November 2023

Present: Councillor Lyons - In the Chair

Councillors: Andrews, S. Ali, Chohan, Curley, Gartside, Hewitson, Hughes, Johnson, Lovecy, Kamal and Riasat

Apologies:

Also present: Councillors Bayunu and Wright

PH/23/80 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 130387/FO/2021 and 135952/FO/2023.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/23/81 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2023 as a correct record.

PH/23/82 130387/FO/2021 - The Former Gamecock Public House Boundary Lane Manchester M15 6GE

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the proposal for a part 7, part 9 storey purpose-built student accommodation building comprising 146 bed spaces (Sui Generis use class) with ancillary amenity space, a ground floor community hub (proposed for Use Classes F2(b), E(b), E (3), E(f)) and associated landscape works and infrastructure.

The Committee were 'minded to refuse' a scheme on 27 July 2023 for a part 7, part 11 storey PBSA building providing 197 bed spaces, on the basis that PBSA of this size would be contrary to maintaining a sustainable mixed residential neighbourhood.

6 objections had been received, along with two neutral comments. The Planning Officer noted a further 31 objections had been received, raising similar concerns to those already raised. Over 100 students had signed a petition against the proposal, and a letter of support had been received. The Planning Officer stated that there was no policy-based reason to refuse the modified scheme. The modifications included reduced scale and reduced bed spaces.

Two objectors addressed the Committee, stating that the reduced scale did not address their concerns. They accepted that the site needed development but not

PBSA. The development could increase anti-social behaviour with issues such as noise and litter. The reduced development would still overlook nearby properties.

The applicant's agent identified the changes made to address previous feedback. The proposal was now 30% smaller in volume and height, with 44 less rooms. The scale and mass are similar to other buildings in the area. The site is a blight on the local area. A Community space would be provided on the ground floor. All bedrooms, kitchens and dining areas now have large windows. The applicant's agent felt the proposal to be no different to similar applications previously approved by the Committee. They noted that 20% of the bedrooms would be affordable.

A ward Councillor noted that this is a residential area, not a student area. The need for PBSA had not been shown, and the reduced scale and mass had not addressed their concerns. The changes did not alter the effect on the light at Cooper House. Nothing had really changed with the applicant not listening to the local community.

Another ward Councillor noted that student properties seemed to be progressing into residential areas. They noted ongoing issues with litter at similar developments, feeling there was no reason that this would not become an issue here. The trees have TPO's which was being ignored. The development would be a disruption during its build. They felt a development for the needs and demands of local people was what was needed at the site.

The Planning Officer stated that the reduced scale and mass would make a difference. Any highways issues throughout the build would be managed. There is a shortfall of around 10,000 student bedspaces. Students are residents and many live in the Hulme area. The Planning Officer noted that the upper level of the amended proposal would be around 1.5m closer to Cooper House. The applicant had committed to litter picking. The trees had not been ignored and the strategy was set out clearly in the report.

A member was concerned that the proposal had not addressed their concerns about whether the PBSA was appropriate for this area. They queried whether there had been any significant difference in square footage. A member noted that previously approved student accommodation was yet to be built. The litter picking offered by the applicant was insufficient. They had to consider the application as elected members and have a level of engagement with residents. A member queried if the shortage of 10,000 places in student accommodation included those developments approved but not yet completed.

The Planning Officer stated that the footprint was the same but had been reduced by two floors. It is predicted that up to 10,000 places would be required by 2030. The application must be considered in terms of Planning Policy and not in any other way. Applications for PBSA bring the same issues in any area but there was no reason for refusal that could be sustained in policy.

A member noted that the proposed site was close to the University's but felt that was not a sufficient argument for the application. Students were an important part of the city, but that residential areas had to be preserved. The member recognised that family homes were being used by students due to a shortage of PBSA. However,

they felt that there were still areas of the city that were not residential where accommodation could be situated. A member queried the size of the community room offered on the ground floor.

The Planning Officer stated that the community room was 85 square metres. The issues raised by the previous member would be the same in any area proposed for PBSA.

The Director of Planning reminded the Committee that a recent appeal, where distance from the universities had been an issue, had been lost and the development proposed in this application was closer than that proposed in the appeal case. They reminded the Committee that, in making their decision, they were a Planning Committee and had to make their decision based on policy, in terms of which there was no reason to refuse.

A member recognised the need for student accommodation but did not see the benefits this application brought to the area, except the community room. They felt that they were minded to refuse on the basis of disamenity and lack of benefit to the community.

Councillor Lovecy moved minded to refuse due to the need to have a sustainable community and that required a balance of students across the city, not in established residential areas. She also noted the level of disamenity brought by the application.

Councillor Johnson seconded Councillor Lovecy's proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Refuse the application due to the development proposed having an adverse impact on the balance and sustainability of the neighbourhood, in keeping with city council policy, and also because of the disamenity brought by the application.

PH/23/83 137346/FO/2023 - Land Bounded By Naval Street To The North, Poland Street To The East, Jersey Street To The South And Radium Street To The West Manchester

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of a part 5, part 10 storey building comprising 256 apartments and townhouses, residents' amenity space (Use Class C3a), ground floor commercial (Use Class E), cycle and car parking, landscaping, access and servicing, and other associated works following demolition of existing structures.

2 letters of objection were received.

The applicant's agent noted that the applicant had delivered homes to Manchester previously. This application was the next phase of the development of this area, with the first phase already approved. They noted that the application would deliver 256 new, high-quality homes to the area, alongside commercial use spaces. The varied height of the proposed development had been welcomed by Historic England. The

proposed site was in a sustainable area with nearby public transport available. The development would be low carbon.

A member noted that there was a lot to welcome in the innovative development, particularly welcoming the tree planting. They were, however, disappointed that there was no affordable housing due to financial viability grounds and queried if there was any way to change this.

A member then queried if, at the end of the business plan, properties could come back to the council, and sought clarity as to why there was a reference to appointing the architect in the recommendation.

The Planning Officer noted that the scheme did not reach the profit level required to be viable for affordable housing, however that would be retested. The Planning Officer that under a Section 106, they want to ensure that what was presented in the application was delivered. This agreement would seek to ensure that the architect who designed the proposals would be retained throughout.

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

Councillor Curley seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve, for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in the Officer's report, subject to the signing of a legal agreement to secure a re-testing of the viability to determine whether a future affordable housing contribution can be secured and to secure the use of the project architect.

PH/23/84 135952/FO/2023 - Atlas Business Park Simonsway Manchester M22 5PR

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding an application for full planning permission for the severable and phased construction of five units (light industrial (Use Class E(g)(iii), general industrial (Use Class B2) and/or storage or distribution (Use Class B8), together with ancillary offices (Use Class E(g)(i)) providing a total gross external area of 36,706 sqm; and associated service yards, parking, landscaping, amenity space and infrastructure, with vehicular access off Simonsway.

The Planning Officer made reference to the Late Representation Report and stated that this includes the correct images to replace those included on pages 157 and 178 of the main report which show the scheme prior to revised drawings being received. Assurance was provided that the scheme had been fully assessed in relation to the submitted revised drawings. The officer also stated that the applicant had made reference to a severable phased development but in assessing the overall details of the scheme it is not considered that the part of the scheme located outside of the Green Belt could be looked upon favourably as it is integral to a wider scheme which as a whole is unacceptable and out of character with the area in general. On this

basis additional wording is proposed to Reason 2 to state that the scheme could not be severed or phased in order to overcome the harm caused.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee, stating that application responded to the need for logistic space in South Manchester, delivering Grade A floor space. They acknowledged that a portion of the site was composed of the Greenbelt and by definition the scheme proposed represents inappropriate development but would only result in moderate harm, however the area was poorly kept, and would therefore improve the appearance. The height and scale of the application was consistent with the area, with the development 78 metres from the nearest residential property. The application would retain some of the existing trees at the site. The application would bring economic benefits to the area in terms of jobs and business rates, whilst continuing the regeneration of the area. They noted that the development would also support the transition to a low carbon future.

The Planning Officer stated that the report covered the benefits of the application, but the key point was the impact on the Greenbelt, and it is the case that the proposal represents inappropriate development that is harmful to the open character and special circumstances have not been demonstrated. The impact is considered to be significant. The area not being well kept was not a consideration that outweighs the harmful impact. The land outside of the Greenbelt within the application was acceptable in principle. The Airport maintained their objection to the application.

Councillor Andrews moved the Officer's recommendation of Refuse, for the reasons provided by Officer's in the written report.

Councillor Johnson seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Refuse the application for the reasons set out in the Officer's report, including the additional wording to reason 2 referred to by the Planning Officer during the meeting.

PH/23/85 137172/FH/2023 - 126 Chichester Road Manchester M15 5DZ

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of a single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation.

The proposal sought planning permission to retain a single storey rear extension in the rear garden of 126 Chichester Road, located within the Hulme Ward of the City. The extension has a rearward projection of 4.54 metres, a lean to roof with a maximum height of 3.54 metres and an eaves height of 2.26 metres. The extension has a width of 3.83 metres which is approximately just under the width of the full dwellinghouse.

7 addresses were notified of the application and a number of representations had been received from the same address in response to the notification letter.

The Planning Officer had nothing to add to the printed report.

A member noted that it was disappointing the applicant was not available to attend. They stated that they would like more imagery of what had happened before making a decision.

Councillor Andrews moved a proposal to defer the application to allow Officer's to provide more images as part of the report.

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to defer the application to allow Officer's to provide more images as part of the report.

Licensing Policy Committee

Minutes of a meeting held on 20 November 2023

Acting under Delegated Powers

Present: Councillors Grimshaw (Chair), Davies, Evans, Flanagan and Leech

LPC/23/05 Minutes

Decision

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 31 October 2023.

LPC/23/06 Statement of Licensing Policy 2023 - 2028

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing which presented the proposed final revised Statement of Licensing Policy to set out how the Authority's licensing duties would be carried out, in line with the requirements of the Licensing Act (2003).

The Committee was invited to recommend that, at its 29 November 2023 meeting, Council approves the revised policy for publication having regard to the responses that were received following consultation as well as any recommendations from the Licensing Committee.

The Principal Licensing officer introduced the report outlining the reasons for the Licensing Committee's recommendation to include indicative area boundary maps for the Fallowfield and Withington Special Policies and to amend the names of special policy areas to reflect a specific area as opposed to an entire ward. A recommendation was also made concerning a delegation to the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing in consultation with the Chair of Licensing be duly endorsed to establish a commitment to annual reviews in consultation with ward members and officers to consider any changes that may be required for special policy areas. The outcomes of the publication were included at Appendix 1. It was subsequently recommended that the revised policy be endorsed by the Committee prior to ratification at the upcoming Full Council meeting.

In response to a question about the proposal that the annual review be undertaken in consultation with ward members, the Principal Licensing Officer explained that whilst the final format of that process had not yet been fully established, it would likely be focussed on evidence gathering exercises. Information would therefore be sought from ward members, neighbourhood teams, and existing resources. Any proposed policy changes would then need to be considered and agreed by this committee as well as the Licensing Committee before any amendments could be implemented.

There was a discussion about the challenge of implementing a change to the characterisation of venues and the importance of a fully aligned and joined up

approach across the planning and licensing regimes with a focus on residents' experience. It was recognised that some businesses were likely to have some degree of overlap in terms of its characterisation and that venues could typically switch character over the course of an evening. One of the key aspects of the approach would therefore require careful consideration of the role that alcohol consumption may play in the operation of such premises. Future consideration would therefore be given to how officers can promote greater detail of the nature of the business being provided by applicants in the application form. He added that the policy would also seek to reflect expectations around the extent of information that applicants should be setting out in terms of the detail about proposed business on the application form so that a greater understanding of the focus of the proposed business could be achieved.

The Committee conveyed its thanks to the officers in quickly responding to earlier concerns over the implementation of a ward-based approach and the preference for an area-based focus. It was also suggested that consideration be given to the involvement of the Communications team to raise awareness about the changes within revised policy, with particular reference to ward members where a special policy area was in place to advise them of changes applicable to their area. This communication would be in addition to the statutory requirement to annually publish the Statement of Licensing Policy in a stand alone document. The Committee agreed to this.

Decisions

1. To agree the revised Statement of Licensing Policy and recommend that Council approves the policy for publication, having had regard to the responses received to the consultation and the recommendations by the Licensing Committee.
2. To delegate authority to the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing in consultation with the Chair of Licensing to establish a process to consult with ward members in respect of proposed changes to special policy areas in their ward.
3. To request that the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing explores the feasibility of working in consultation with the Communications team to raise awareness about agreed policy changes, with particular reference to ward members where a special policy area was in place to advise them of changes that apply to their area.