

## **Licensing and Appeals Sub Committee Hearing Panel**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 1 June 2020**

**Present:** Councillor Grimshaw – in the Chair

**Councillors:** Andrews and Hassan

**LACHP/20/56. Renewal of Sex Establishment Licence - Clone Zone, 36-38 Sackville Street, Manchester, M1 3WA**

The Hearing Panel noted there were no objections to the application for renewal and neither the mandatory nor the discretionary grounds for refusal were made out.

The Hearing Panel was satisfied after considering the application that they could grant the renewal. In making their decision they considered their Sex Establishment Policy Document.

#### **Decision**

To grant the renewal.

**LACHP/20/57. Exclusion of the Public**

#### **Decision**

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

**LACHP/20/58. Application for a Street Trading Consent - Caribbean Lifestyle Takeaway, Inkerman Street, Harpurhey**

The Hearing Panel considered the content of the application along with the written and oral representations of the applicant and objectors.

In particular the Hearing Panel noted that this was a small public car park which is close to two schools and is heavily utilised at certain times of day. The Hearing Panel therefore considered that the presence of the applicant's catering unit would cause added congestion in the area with more vehicles trying to access the area and reduced space in the car park. The Hearing Panel considered that this would also cause a safety risk to customers queueing at busy times. Concern was also raised that school children trying to access the business would have to cross a very busy road which created a further safety risk and noted the proximity of the proposed unit with two major road junctions.

When questioned by the Hearing Panel it transpired that the applicant had not properly considered a waste management plan and it was felt that this would also have a negative impact on the location.

Overall, the Hearing Panel did not consider this to be an appropriate location for a street trading consent to be granted for the business.

### **Decision**

To refuse the application for street trading consent.

### **LACHP/20/59.            Application for a Street Trading Consent - Daylicious, Sharston Industrial Estate**

The Hearing Panel considered the content of the application along with the written and oral representations of the applicant and the objector.

The Hearing Panel noted that Shentonfield Road is a busy road in an industrial area which has caused some problems for some businesses struggling to access their sites in large vehicles.

The Hearing Panel noted however that the applicant had traded in the area for over a year without any complaints in relation to his business. The Hearing Panel further noted that the applicant had himself moved the business to a quieter location on Shentonfield Road and the applicant explained that he had moved to this area as the businesses in that location did not require large vehicle access and his vehicle was not causing an obstruction. The objector informed the Hearing Panel that he was satisfied if the business remained on this part of Shentonfield road.

The Hearing Panel therefore considered it fit to grant a street trading consent for this specific location on Shentonfield road.

### **Decision**

To grant the renewal for street trading consent for the area on Shentonfield Road, east of the junction of Shentonfield Road and Carsfield Road .