

## **Health and Wellbeing Board**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 2020**

**This Health and Wellbeing Board meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Richard Leese, Leader of the Council (Chair)  
Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults Health and Wellbeing  
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children's Services and Schools  
Vicky Szulist, Chair, Healthwatch  
Dr Tracey Vell, Primary Care representative - Local Medical Committee  
Dr Murugesan Raja, GP Member (North) MHCC  
Dr Vish Mehra, Central Primary Care Manchester  
David Regan, Director of Public Health  
Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services  
Dr Denis Colligan, GP Member (North) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Mike Wild, Voluntary and Community Sector representative  
Rupert Nichols, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust

#### **Apologies:**

Dr Ruth Bromley, Chair Manchester Health and Care Commissioning

#### **Also in attendance:**

Dr Sohail Munshi, Chief Medical Officer, MLCO  
Ian Williamson, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning

### **HWB/20/19 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 August 2020 were submitted for approval.

#### **Decision**

To agree as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 26 August 2020.

### **HWB/20/20 COVID-19 Update: Manchester's 12 Point Plan**

The Director of Public Health and Wellbeing submitted a report following on from the report submitted in July that detailed the COVID-19 Manchester Prevention and Response Plan. The report included a 12-point plan that incorporates all key programmes of work and mirrors the national and Greater Manchester approach. The Board also received a presentation from the Director of Public Health on the latest

available data and intelligence (point 1) and the latest information on Targeted Testing at Scale (TTaS) (point 2) and Mass Vaccination (point 12). The Board was advised of the latest data available on Covid for Manchester and comparisons to GM.

The Chair invited comments and questions.

In welcoming the presentation and acknowledging the scale of the of the tasks involved in the 12 Point Plan, a member of the Board referred to the mention of dashboards in relation to care homes and Covid19, in Manchester and asked if the dashboards are accessible to the public.

It was reported that key public information on Covid19 is published on the Council's website every Wednesday. The dashboard relating to care homes included information/data such as capacity levels and infection rates issues, however checks would be required for the information owners consent to ensure that no sensitive or commercial information is included in the dashboards before sharing with the public/partner organisations.

A member of the Board referred to Point 11 of the plan and the work to the roll out a national programme for Lateral Flow Testing for care home visitors and asked officers how the geographic spread for the provision of the test might look.

The Director of Public Health and the Director of Adult Social Services reported that in preparation, contact had been made with ninety care home providers in Manchester, via a webinar. Checks had been made with each care home to establish individual readiness for testing and this would take account of the size of the care home and facilities available. There is a combined approach to the provision of the Lateral Flow Testing and care home providers have been offered support and guidance during preparations in addition to weekly communications from the Council, as part of the implementation of the Winter Plan. The Lateral Flow Tests have started to arrive in larger homes across GM (these are care homes with resident numbers over 50, with twelve home of that size in Manchester). The Council will mobilise it's co-ordination plan to support those care home providers with a range of support and more would be known on the implementation of the tests in the following week/s. Officers are mindful of the high expectations of families and residents wishing to see each other and an assurance was given that everything is being done to facilitate family visiting in a safe way.

The Chair thanked officers for the report and presentation.

The Chair also thanked Health Service staff and Care staff for their work and commitment in continuing to provide important services over a very difficult ten months since the beginning of the Covid19 pandemic. It was noted that although there are positive signs beginning to emerge there would still be a challenging period during January and February 2021, which is the peak time for the provision of acute health services. The Chair also acknowledged the resilience of the primary health care sector following the challenges experienced during this period, which had reacted and performed well under such difficult circumstances. It was also noted that the challenge to the primary health care sector will extend into next year with the implementation of the mass vaccination programme.

## **Decision**

The Board note the report.

### **HWB/20/21 COVID-19 Governance Update**

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health that provided an update for the Board on the revised governance arrangements to incorporate the plans for delivering the Mass Vaccination and other COVID-19 programmes in Manchester.

## **Decisions**

1. The Board note the report.
2. The Board approve the governance arrangements for the delivery of the Manchester Mass vaccination Programme as set out in section 2 of the report submitted.

### **HWB/20/22 Manchester Partnership Board - Presentation**

The Board received a presentation from Ian Williamson – Integrating Health and Social Care – the next steps and the progress made. The presentation provided details of:

- Progress made over the last five years
- Rationale for change
- Ongoing work
- NHSE proposals
- Likely changes
- Health and Wellbeing Board – considerations for 2021

The Chair invited the Board to comment and ask questions.

A member of the Board referred to the difference between the provision of health care and social care and asked how will an integrated service combining both work in view of the provision of social care being means tested, unlike health care which is free at the point it is accessed. Reference was also made to the organisational nature of the presentation and how the issues referred to would look from a patient perspective.

It was reported that the impact of the strategic changes had involved closer working, which is already being seen by Neighbourhood Teams between professionals. On the ground, patients and residents are receiving more care and support that enhances the individual's freedom and is consistent with the 'Our Manchester Principles'. Work would continue to produce a simplified dashboard for the changes and their implementation. The Board was informed that there was no national view for

the provision of social care and the proposals describes were from the NHS which presented an incomplete picture for the services.

The Chair stated that there is a social care and public care absence with indications that proposals will be coming from the Government following the demise of Public Health England and what will follow on from it. Reference was made to the NHS England engagement paper - Integrating care - the next steps to building strong and effective integrated care systems across England. The theme of the paper related to NHS budgets, the paper presented wider context relating to Integrated Care Systems, involving:

- Stronger partnerships in local places between the NHS, local government and others with a more central role for primary care in providing joined-up care;

The document also describes four fundamental purposes:

- improving population health and healthcare;
- tackling unequal outcomes and access;
- enhancing productivity and value for money; and
- helping the NHS to support broader social and economic development.

The Chair informed the Board that from the arrangements and from an NHS perspective there will be single GM budget. Decisions about the budgets will be made at the lowest possible level with an expectation that the budgets could be used at a neighbourhood level. It was noted that the presentation given was organisational, however this was necessary to demonstrate how a population, health and neighbourhood devolved agenda may be delivered. The point was also made that Manchester has been working on arrangements in advance of decisions being made by the NHS and is ahead in those preparations. The Chair referred future organisational change and the ongoing work to strengthen the clinical leadership role in primary care and the recognition this has received across all sectors as a strength and an area to be enhanced and built upon.

A member of the Board provided a summary response to the presentation the Local Medical Committee and highlighted some concerns, in particular: a lack of reference to the involvement of the LMC over the past five years, the work of primary care, recognising the work of GPs in fighting Covid19, representation of the LMC within a future structure and references to PCNs.

The Chair reported that Primary Care representation in a future structure would be for the LMC to determine. The Board was also informed that as part of the work on clinical leadership the Chair and members of the LMC had been invited to be involved in meetings of the PCN Group.

A member of the Board referred to the lack of a community involvement in the structure at a national level and could this be raised and addressed in Manchester's response to the consultation, in view of the engagement work that has taken place.

The Executive Member for Adults Health and Wellbeing acknowledged the strong role GPs and Clinicians have at all levels and the importance of showing how decisions are made. In noting the significant change at a national level, it was also important to use the changes positively to continue in Manchester by using the most successful elements of engaging the public to provide a voice on the provision of services. Also, to ensure that a public based voice is at the heart of a response made to a national consultation, including public health and social care.

A member of the Board referred to the commissioning of work carried out on a city-wide basis and questioned how this could happen under the arrangements suggested. Also, it was noted that PCNs were useful but were not a model for all types of engagement. The structure also appeared to include gaps for the involvement of patients.

The Chair stated that the purpose of the NHS engagement paper was the welfare of patients but also working to ensure that the public did not become patients. The point was also made that in a hierarchy of commissioning the starting point would be at a neighbourhood level and then, if necessary, to make a case to widen the provision to a city-wide level and not the other way around.

Ian Williamson thanked the Board for the comments and contributions made to the presentation which would be noted. Acknowledgement was also given to the valuable work of GPs and professionals for their valuable and pivotal work.

### **Decision**

To note the presentation and the comments received.

### **HWB/20/23 Children and Young People's Plan 2020 – 2024**

The Chair reported that in the absence of the Strategic Director of Children's Services, the consideration of the Children and Young People's Plan 2020 – 2024 report had been deferred to the next meeting.



## **Licensing Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 30 November 2020**

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

**Councillors:** Andrews, Chohan, Hassan, Hewitson, Hughes, Jeavons, Lyons, Madeleine Monaghan and Reid

**Apologies:** Councillor Evans, Ludford and Lynch

#### **LHP/20/6 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 October 2020 were submitted for approval.

#### **Decision**

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Licensing Committee meeting held on 27 October 2020.

#### **LHP/20/7 Update of Model Conditions**

The Committee were informed by the Principal Licensing Officer that the report was not yet ready for submission and would be presented at the next Licensing Committee meeting.

#### **Decision**

To defer consideration of the report until the next Licensing Committee meeting on 25 January 2021.





## **Licensing and Appeals Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 30 November 2020**

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

**Councillors:** Andrews, Chohan, Hassan, Hewitson, Hughes, Jeavons, Lyons, Madeleine Monaghan and Reid

**Apologies:** Councillor Evans, Ludford and Lynch

#### **LAP/20/5 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 October 2020 were submitted for approval.

#### **Decision**

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 27 October 2020.

#### **LAP/20/6 Amendment to the Hackney Carriage Fare Tariff**

The Committee were provided with information from the Licensing Unit Manager with information in relation to a recent increase in charges levied by Manchester Airport.

The Licensing Unit Manager informed the Committee that these charges related to all vehicles dropping off passengers on the forecourts directly in front of the three terminals and that the current Fare Card requires amending in order to allow Hackney Carriage drivers and proprietors to be able to recover these additional costs levied upon them by the Airport (if they are dropping off passengers on a forecourt). The Licensing Unit Manager's report recommended that the Committee agree to make a recommendation to the Executive to amend the Hackney Carriage Fare Tariff Extra - 'Manchester Airport Charge - Drop off at any terminal' from £1.80 to £3.

#### **Decision**

To approve the recommendation within the report.

#### **LAP/20/7 Impact of Covid on Vehicle Testing and Age Policies**

The Licensing Unit Manager informed the Committee that the report was to set out relevant information, considerations and risks for the Committee following approaches by both the taxi and private hire trades to consider temporary relaxation of vehicle testing and age policies arising from the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic.

The following recommendations to the Committee could be accepted in full, amended or rejected in full:

1. To extend the age limit of both HCVs and PHVs by an additional year, until the conclusion of the Clean Air and Minimum Licensing Standards work,

when both policies will be fully revised

2. To reduce vehicle testing requirements to 2 tests per year for all vehicles except brand new vehicles, which will continue to be subject to 1 test within the first 12 months. To continue to require vehicles beyond the set age limit to 3 tests per year.
3. For the changes to take effect immediately and be reviewed by the Committee in March 2021.

### **Decision**

To accept in full the recommendations within the report.

### **LAP/20/8 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.

### **LAP/20/8 Application relating to the renewal of HV602**

The Committee considered the content of the report, the representations of the applicant and the Licensing officer.

The Licensing Unit Manager informed the Committee that this licence had not been renewed by the expiry date. From speaking to the licence holder, the Licensing Unit Manager relayed information to the Committee that the licence holder had been unwell and that the email regarding the renewal had been diverted to the licence holder's junk mail folder and had, therefore, not been seen by them.

The licence holder addressed the Committee and explained that they are now elderly with many decades service in the trade and that they had not knowingly made any mistake. The licence holder reported that they had attempted to visit the Town Hall offices to deal with the matter and found the building closed to the public due to the Coronavirus pandemic.

The Committee accepted the licence holder's version of events and, in light of exceptional circumstances brought about by the Coronavirus pandemic, felt that the renewal should be granted out of time.

#### **Decision**

To allow the applicant to renew the licence for vehicle HV602 out of time.

### **LAP/20/9 Application relating to the renewal of HV493**

The Committee considered the content of the report, the representations of the applicant and the Licensing officer.

The Licensing Unit Manager informed the Committee that this licence had not been renewed by the expiry date. From speaking to the licence holder, the Licensing Unit Manager relayed information to the Committee that the licence holder had been visiting a sick relative at the time of the renewal date.

The licence holder addressed the Committee and explained that there had been multiple illnesses in the family resulting in two deaths from COVID-19. The licence holder confirmed that when they went to renew the licence they had discovered it had already lapsed.

The Committee accepted the licence holder's version of events and, in light of exceptional circumstances brought about by the Coronavirus pandemic, felt that the renewal should be granted out of time.

### **Decision**

To allow the applicant to renew the licence for vehicle HV493 out of time.

### **LAP/20/9 Application relating to the renewal of HV685**

The Committee considered the content of the report, the representations of the applicant and the Licensing officer.

The Licensing Unit Manager informed the Committee that this licence had not been renewed by the expiry date. From speaking to the licence holder, the Licensing Unit Manager relayed information to the Committee that the reminder email to the licence holder had gone to their son-in-law's email address and the licence holder had not been made aware of it but had made attempts to resolve the matter when the Licensing Unit telephoned them on 15 October 2020.

The licence holder's grandson addressed the Committee on their behalf and explained that there had been two drivers on the licence who had both left the trade due to a lack of work arising from the effects of the Coronavirus pandemic. The licence holder's grandson also confirmed that the licence holder was not aware of the renewal date as this information had not been provided to him via his son-in-law.

The Committee accepted the licence holder's version of events and, in light of exceptional circumstances brought about by the Coronavirus pandemic, felt that the renewal should be granted out of time.

### **Decision**

To allow the applicant to renew the licence for vehicle HV685 out of time.

### **LAP/20/10 Hackney Carriage vehicle renewal – temporary delegated powers**

The Committee noted the existing established practice of out of time Hackney Carriage vehicle renewal applications being referred for consideration by the Committee. It considered that due to the current difficulties being faced by Hackney Carriage Proprietors due to the impact of the pandemic on the Hackney Carriage Trade this practice should be departed from as follows:

Applications received which are 7 days or less out of time can be granted under delegated authority by an officer, Applications received between 7-14 days out of time can be granted under delegated authority by an officer in consultation with the Chair of Licensing. All other out of time applications to continue to be referred to Committee. The Committee will review these arrangements in March 2021.

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 19 November 2020**

**This Planning and Highways meeting was conducted via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Hitchen, Kamal, Lovecy, Lyons, Madeline Monaghan, Riasat, Watson and White

**Apologies:**  
Councillor Flanagan

**Also Present:**  
Councillors Jeavons (ward Councillor) and Shilton-Godwin (ward Councillor)

#### **PH/20/63      Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications (126142/FO/2020, 126328/FO/2020, 127538/FO/2020, 127539/LO/2020 and 126912/FH/2020), since the agenda was issued, was circulated.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/20/64 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2020 as a correct record.

#### **PH/20/65      126142/FO/2020 Vacant Land to the North of 9 and 11 Ennerdale Avenue, Manchester, M21 7NR - Chorlton Park Ward**

This application relates to the erection of eight dwellings with associated vehicular access, parking and landscaping following demolition of two existing houses on Ennerdale Avenue. The eight dwellings are arranged to form two pairs of semi-detached properties (two (2 bedroom) three person and two (3 bedroom) 4 person dwellings) and two buildings to form four cottage flats (two (1 bedroom) two person and two (2 bedroom) 3 person dwellings). All the proposed buildings are to be developed to provide social rented properties and have been designed to meet Manchester's Space Standards and have been laid out to provide for future adaptations such as lift provision.

The proposed dwellings have been designed to have a contemporary appearance and reflect the design of other recent proposals brought forward by the applicant elsewhere in south Manchester. The main materials to be used in the construction are traditional in nature (red brick with grey brick detailing). Each dwelling is provided with outdoor amenity space, cycle parking, an off-street car parking space (2 spaces each for the larger semi-detached properties) and refuse storage space.

The Planning Officer reported that the supplementary information submitted contained details of an on-site indicative tree replacement scheme which were included within the proposed conditions.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the proposals contained within the application.

An objector to the application addressed the Committee and referred to concerns relating to the loss of hedges, the demolition of properties, the loss of trees, overlooking of neighbouring properties, loss of light and reduced security and the impact on the lives of residents as well as raising concerns in relation to the sustainability credentials of the proposed buildings and embedded energy in the houses to be demolished.

The Planning Officer reported that points raised including overlooking had been addressed and included within the proposed conditions, it was not considered that loss of light would be significant in view of the length of the garden areas, the orientation proposed and the issue of security that had been addressed through input of GMP Secure by Design, which proposed landscaping, boundary treatment and improvements to the natural surveillance of the area.

Councillor Shilton-Godwin (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee and welcomed the application that would help to address a shortage in the number of social dwellings.

Councillor Dar made a proposal to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor Shaukat Ali.

## **Decision**

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

(Councillor White declared a personal interest in the application for the reason that he is a Council appointed member of the Southway Housing Trust People and Places Committee.)

(Councillor Leech declared a prejudicial interest and withdrew from the meeting during the consideration of the application.)

**PH/20/66      126328/FO/2020 Speakers House, 39 Deansgate, Manchester, M3  
2BA – Deansgate Ward**

This application is for the erection of a seventeen-storey building comprising office use (Use Class B1a) and flexible ground floor commercial units (Use Classes A1 shop, A2 financial and professional services, A3 restaurant/cafe and A4 drinking establishment), new electricity sub-station, basement cycle parking and rooftop plant enclosure, together with access, servicing and associated works following demolition of the existing building.

Additional information had been included in the Supplementary Information.

Councillor Jeavons (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to request the Committee to hold a site visit.

An objector spokesperson addressed the Committee and referred to the size, height and overbearing nature of the proposed building which would result in a loss of light and overlooking on the existing adjacent residential accommodation.

Reference was also made to the contents of the deeds for the proposed site.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

The Planning Officer advised the Committee that the issues raised had been addressed within the planning application and the proposed conditions. The Committee was advised that the reference made to the deeds of the proposed site were a private matter and not a material planning consideration.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions on the application.

A member of the Committee supported the request for a site visit and commented that it would be useful for the Committee to visit the site.

A member acknowledged the request for a site visit but considered that the proposal would have a negative impact on St Anne's Square area. In addition, it was noted that the economic benefits had been set out in the report however, the heritage benefits would not be enhanced by the proposal.

A member requested if it was possible to view the land deeds for the application site.

The Director of Planning reported that the member could see the land deed but advised that it should not be discussed in the context of determining the planning application.

Councillor Davies made a proposal for a site visit and this was seconded by Councillor White.

## **Decision**

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

**PH/20/67 127538/FO/2020 and 127539/LO/2020 67-75 Piccadilly and 4-6  
Newton Street, Manchester, M1 2BS – Piccadilly Ward**

This application relates to an application for the erection of 11 storey building on site of 67 Piccadilly, as a Hotel (Use Class C1) with associated ground floor retail and leisure uses (Use Class A3 (Restaurant and Café), A4 (Drinking Establishment) and D2 (hotel leisure gym/ fitness area); provision of flexible amenity space at roof level; installation of external plant at roof level; provision of new public realm and associated works following demolition of 67 Piccadilly/4 - 6 Newton Street ('67 Piccadilly') including internal and external alterations to 69-75 Piccadilly (Halls Building) (comprising refurbishment and infilling of an existing rear void of to provide a 9-storey infill) relating to the reuse, refurbishment of the building for use along with the new 11 storey building. The application also refers to Listed Building Consent for internal and external alterations to 69-75 Piccadilly (Halls Building) (including refurbishment and infilling of an existing rear void of to provide a 9-storey infill and formation of connections) relating to the reuse, refurbishment and extension of the building for use along with an adjacent new 11 storey building as a Hotel (Use Class C1) on site of 67 Piccadilly (application ref no 127538)

Additional information had been included in the Supplementary Information and further representations had been received regarding noise levels and the use of the roof terrace.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions on the application.

A member welcomed the proposal and commented that the building would compliment and enhance Piccadilly. Reference was made to the use and roof top terrace and would a sound system be installed. Members requested that a condition is added to ensure there is no amplified music played on the roof terrace and local councillors be involved in the discussions regarding conditions on the hours of operation, capacity of the terrace.

The Planning Officer reported that the proposed roof terrace is a small area and would be used for organised events only. It would not have amplified music. The hours of operation would be determined in consultation environmental health officers.

## **Decisions**

1. The Committee approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted.
2. The Committee delegate authority to the Director of Planning Building Control and Licensing and consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee to determine conditions for the roof terrace aspects of the application relating to: capacity, hours of operation and playing of music.



**PH/20/68 1C Ardern Road, Manchester, M8 4WN – Crumpsall Ward**

This application relates to Erection of a two-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension together with the installation of a front dormer, including a Velux window and a dormer to the rear, porch and canopy to form additional living accommodation.

The Director of Planning reported that additional late information had been received from the applicant and objectors to the application. In view of the lateness of the submissions made, it was recommended that consideration of the application be deferred to allow officers time to properly consider the submissions.

**Decision**

The Committee deferred consideration of the application to the next meeting of the Committee, to allow the planning officer time to consider additional late information.



## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 17 December 2020**

**This Planning and Highways meeting was a hybrid meeting conducted in person and via Zoom, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Hitchen, Kamal, Leech, Lovecy, Madeline Monaghan, Riasat and White

**Apologies:**

Councillors: Flanagan, Lyons and Watson

**Also Present:**

Councillors: Jeavons (ward Councillor), Johns (ward Councillor) and Stanton (ward Councillor) and Taylor (ward Councillor)

#### **PH/20/69      Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications (126912/FH/2020, 128191/FO/2020, 122280/FO/2019, 128018/FO/2020), since the agenda was issued.

**Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/20/70 Minutes**

**Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2020 as a correct record, subject to the inclusion of Councillor Leech in the list of those present.

#### **PH/20/65      126912/FH/2020 - 1C Ardern Road, Manchester, M8 4WN - Crumpsall Ward**

This application relates to the erection of a two-storey side extension and a single storey rear extension together with the installation of a front dormer, including a roof light and a dormer to the rear, porch and canopy to form additional living accommodation.

The proposal includes at ground floor level the addition of a kitchen, hallway, WC and morning room. The first floor includes two bedrooms and a utility room and the roof space includes two bedrooms and a shower room.

The Planning Officer provided an update including drawing Members attention to the late representation report. The update related to the advice that if Members agree with the recommendation then it will be necessary to revise the wording of condition 9 which relates to tree protection in order to ensure an appointed tree consultant supervises the excavation element and ensure that adequate protection is in place to ensure root protection. To also include an additional condition to require and agree proposed levels within the rear garden. The Planning Officer also reported that additional correspondence had been received from a planning consultant representing a neighbouring occupier which claims that the advice given to Committee by officers within the report in relation to the assessment and conclusions reached on the impact of the Conservation Area is deficient and may be seriously and materially misleading. Reference is made to Section 72 of the Planning, Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act, Paragraph 193 and Paragraph 194 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Planning Officer advised Members that the Planning Service was satisfied that the relevant guidance had been fully considered and taken into account in the assessment and recommendation made and is proportionate to the scheme proposed.

The Committee undertook a site visit to the site prior to the meeting.

The Chair invited the objector's spokesperson to address the committee.

The objector's spokesperson referred to points raised within the report and highlighted the negative impact the application would have the neighbouring property through the loss of amenity, the conservation area (history and character), street scene through the terracing effect of the design and impact on trees. The application did not provide a balanced design and the size of the development did not provide any public benefit with the loss of an affordable home. It was added that there was no necessity for a six bedroomed property.

The Planning Officer responded to the points raised and informed the Committee that the application had been substantially amended since it was first submitted. The concerns outlined had been addressed and met national standards regarding conservation areas and design. A gap was introduced to the design to prevent terracing effect and the investment being made to the property would benefit and enhance the area.

The applicant's representative was not present at the meeting.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to ask questions and comment of the application.

A member referred to the width of the path at the side of the property and asked if it is sufficiently wide enough for a wheelie bin. Also, with reference to the rear garden, officers were asked what level the area would be.

It was reported that the width of the path had been raised with the applicant and the drawing submitted shows the path width is sufficiently wide for a wheelie bin. In response to the level of the rear garden the Committee was informed that the plan submitted stated that the grassy knoll would be retained. The proposed recommendation is that discussions would take place with the applicant and planning officers on the level of the garden.

A member referred to the size of the rear extension and the potential impact on the adjacent property and asked officers to explain the guidance on allowing an extension over 3.65metres.

The Committee was informed that the decision to agree the extension over the 3.65metres was considered acceptable due to the proposed building having a flat roof and its orientation. It was explained that the national guidance allows for larger extensions over 4 metres, with prior approval.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation to approve the application, subject to an amendment to Condition 9 and an additional condition relating to the rear garden level. Councillor Hitchen seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted, the amendment of Condition 9 and an additional condition regarding the rear garden level.

(Councillor Monaghan did not take part in the vote on the application.)

**PH/20/71      128191/FO/2020 - Land Bounded by Ashton Canal, Great Ancoats Street, Munday Street and Pollard Street, Manchester, M4 7DS - Ancoats and Beswick Ward**

This application is for the erection of five office buildings and new public realm comprising: 3 no. 8 storey mixed use buildings (Buildings A, D and E) comprising workspaces (Use Class E) together with flexible uses at ground floor (Use Class E) and/or theatre/bar (Sui Generis) together with a multi-use rooftop amenity area to Building A; and 2 no. 5 storey mixed use buildings (Buildings B and C) comprising workspaces (Use Class E) together with flexible uses at ground floor (Use Class E) and/or theatre/bar (Sui Generis); together with cycle parking, creation of pedestrian and cycle routes, external amenity spaces, new public realm and other associated engineering and infrastructure works.

The Planning Officer provided an update, as reported in the late representations received. The update related to the receipt of ten letters of support for the application and three letters of objection. The letters received in objection raised additional issues relating to loss of sunlight and daylight and reference to a newt located less than 500metres from the site. Ward Councillor (Councillor Majid Dar) had raised resident's concerns about the application and the impact it would have on the local community amenity and the belief that the proposal is very excessive and

overindulgent. It was reported that HS2 had no objections to the scheme subject to the additional detailed conditions on the implementation of the scheme.

The Chair invited an objector to address the Committee. The objector made reference to the Council's Core Strategy (Spatial Principle 6) regarding the provision of green infrastructure and questioned the development on valuable green space which is used by the local community. It was suggested that more recognition of changes to working behaviour should be given, in view the increase in office space and the ongoing increase in homebased working. Other issues were the lack of infrastructure for travel to the area and the number of objections received from local residents. Reference was made to the cost of the sale and purchase of the land involved in the proposal

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Taylor (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to voice the concerns of local residents and the other two ward councillors. The main concern related to the loss of space which is used by residents for leisure and recreation in an area with properties with little or no outdoor space. Concerns were raised that the loss of green spaces would have an adverse impact on the health and wellbeing of local people at a time when access to green spaces is very much valued. It was considered that the new green spaces proposed in the application are too small for the number of residents who currently use the existing space.

The Planning Officer reported that the Core Strategy should be considered as a whole and not as individual parts. The planning report submitted had addressed the Core Strategy and the relevant policies had been referred to. The green space identified for the proposal does not have any status and had been earmarked for development for many years. The proposal is consistent with a long-term vision for the area of New Islington and East Manchester. The Committee were informed that costs attributed to the sale or purchase of land is not a material planning issue and should not be considered. With reference to the proposed increase in office space it was reported that an economic recovery plan was in place and the increase in residential and office accommodation were integral to the plan. Discussions with a cross section of businesses within the city had indicated that there is a desire to return to work and there is a need for good quality office accommodation. The site is sustainable with a tram stop close by and the location also enables other form of transport to be used such as cycling. In addition, the proposal will provide large scale employment during the construction (1200) and afterwards.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and asked questions.

A member referred to the number of blocks involved in the proposal and the amount of green space proposed and considered this to be insufficient to replace what is currently there. Reference was also made to the New Islington Metrolink stop and whether any conditions included for the increase of green coverage.

The Planning Officer reported that a third of the proposed site would be used as green and open space and access will be opened onto the canal towpath. With reference to the Metrolink it was reported that HS2 may potentially result in changes

to the Metrolink network and it would be anticipated that Metrolink would be encouraged to provide a suitable tram stop for a popular area, such as the tram stop located at Castlefield.

In welcoming the proposal, a member referred to the accessibility of the routes into and around the proposed buildings and the potential loss of light on green spaces and the current access road currently used by residents of adjacent buildings which may become congested.

The Planning Officer explained to the Committee that the development design must take into account elements of access, green space the proposed build and the integration with the surroundings and the residents living there. It was reported that the proposal combines different routes to allow access. With reference to light on open spaces it was reported that an assessment was made on the impact of the proposed buildings on the loss of day light and it was considered that the level of sunlight/ daylight would be adequate in those areas of green space. The proposal would mean that there will be eighty less parking spaces and this would reduce the number of cars and congestion. It was explained that light levels to the existing buildings is high due to the open nature of the space. The proposal will impact on the amenity of the residents of the adjacent buildings however, officers did not believe that this was unusual in this type of development elsewhere in the city centre.

A member asked officers why Condition 26 had been omitted and what other conditions would be expected as a result of HS2.

It was reported that Condition 26 had been removed at the request of Metrolink which had originally requested it to be added. The input of HS2 for specific conditions for the scheme were for the purpose of future proofing the site for potential changes to the Metrolink Network as a result of HS2 to enable co-ordination of both schemes.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation to approve the application.  
Councillor Shaukat Ali seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted, the removal of Condition 26 and the addition of Conditions relating to arrangements for HS2 developments.

(Councillor Leech declared a prejudicial interest and took no part in the consideration of the application.)

### **PH/20/72      122280/FO/2019 - Land Bounded by Great Ducie Street and Mirabel Street, Manchester, M3 1PJ - Deansgate Ward**

This application relates to an application for the erection of new mixed-use development to comprise of one 10 storey building fronting Mirabel Street to accommodate 45 no. Use Class C3 residential apartments (9 no. 1-bed studios, 27

no. 2-bed 3 person apartments and 9 no. 2-bed 4 person apartments) and 8 no. residential car parking spaces at ground level and one part 10, part 14 storey building fronting Great Ducie Street to accommodate 84 no. Use Class C3 residential apartments (31 no. 1-bed 2 person apartments, 26 no. 2-bed 3 person apartments, 18 no. 2-bed 4 person apartments and 9 no. 3-bed 5 person apartments) and 345 sq. m of commercial floor space at ground level (flexible use Use Class A1 shop, Use Class A2 financial and professional services and Use Class A3 cafe/restaurant) together with creation of roof terrace amenity space, cycle parking, access, servicing and associated works following demolition of existing building

The Planning Officer provided an update, as reported in the late representations received. The report referred to representations received from ward Councillors to object to the development for the reasons that:

It is an overdevelopment;

The proposed building is too tall and fails to meet the requirements of Core Strategy Policy EN2;

The development would cause overlooking;

The development does not appropriately reflect the character of the area;

The proposal harms the setting of heritage assets;

The development would strain local roads;

The proposal would promote crime and anti-social behaviour;

The proposal does not address the existing and future deficiencies in physical, social and green infrastructure;

The proposal fails to meet Core Strategy Policy H8 and mixed communities (H1).

One further objection had been received.

The late representation report included amendments to the conditions and additional conditions.

The Chair invited the objector's spokesperson to address the Committee. The objector's spokesperson referred to the area of the proposal and suggested the Committee visit the site. Reference was also made to the listed building on Mirabel Street which had not received a response from Historic England. The objector spokesperson stated that the responses that had been received from the developer on the issues raised by objectors were considered misleading and the comparisons given cannot be relied upon. The design of the building using a blue grey colour material, was not considered to be in keeping with the surrounding area which are predominantly red brick and would be an eyesore. Concern was expressed on the narrow street which is in a state of poor repair and causes access issues for vehicles and may result in issues for emergency vehicle access. The area suffers from vehicles parking on the pavement and the number of vehicle journeys would increase as a result of the development. There are concerns on the lack of light already for buildings adjacent. A request was made that if agreed the undertakings proposed by the applicant are taken up.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Davies addressed the Committee to oppose the application as a Ward Councillor and then left the meeting for the consideration of the application.



The Planning Officer reported the in response to points raised: the roof terrace element of the proposal would be carefully controlled by a condition (Condition 14). The location of the bin store access gates provides to best access to the premises and the Condition will require this is managed properly. A further condition could be added to the address the issue of pavement parking by installing bollards. It was reported that the area of the development does not hold any heritage status, although there are listed buildings within the vicinity. The Committee was informed that this is a development site and is on a major access road into the city centre. The Committee has also previously agreed to a seventeen-storey building in this location.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

A member of the Committee referred to the previous 106 agreement made in 2007 and asked officers to provide more information. Officers were also asked to clarify the contribution to affordable housing, although no reason has been provided on why no affordable housing is being provided on site. Reference was made to a condition being added to introduce bollards and if this would increase access and egress from the area.

The Planning Officer reported that information would be provided on the details of the 106 agreement. The contribution for affordable housing is £615,000, as stated in the report. In response to the installation of bollards and the impact on access, the Committee was informed that accessibility or obstruction issues on the highway would be subject to enforcement action. The Committee was informed that the application had received an independent viability appraisal, that is publicly available, which had identified £615,000 allocation for affordable housing.

A member referred to the provision of electric vehicle charging points and asked officers if additional points were required in the development, in view of the phasing out of new diesel and petrol cars by 2030.

The Planning Officer referred to the sustainable location of the site which would reduce the need for vehicles and the need for resilience within the development to provide additional charging points for future use.

Councillor Leech proposed a Mind to Refuse the application based on the lack of affordable housing within the application and for the reason that the application is an over development. The proposal was not seconded.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation to be minded to approve, subject to an additional condition to address parking issues through the installation of pavement bollards to prevent pavement parking and improve vehicular access to the development. Councillor White seconded the proposal.

## **Decisions**

The Committee is minded to approve the application, subject to a legal agreement in respect of a reconciliation payment of a financial contribution towards off-site

affordable housing and subject to an additional condition to address parking issues through the installation of pavement bollards to prevent pavement parking on Mirabel Street.

(Councillor Davies declared a prejudicial interest and spoke as a ward Councillor and then left the meeting and took no part in the consideration of the application.)

**PH/20/73      126328/FO/2020 - Speakers House, 39 Deansgate,  
Manchester, M3 2BA - Deansgate Ward**

This application relates to the erection of a 17 storey building comprising office use (Use Class B1a) and flexible ground floor commercial units (Use Classes A1 shop, A2 financial and professional services, A3 restaurant/cafe and A4 drinking establishment), new electricity sub-station, basement cycle parking and rooftop plant enclosure, together with access, servicing and associated works following demolition of the existing building.

The Committee held a site visit at the proposed development site prior to the meeting.

The Planning Officer did not provide any additional information to the report submitted.

The Chair invited the objector's spokesperson to address the Committee.

The objector's spokesperson made reference to the concerns raised to the application regarding the height of the structure, overlooking on existing residential buildings adjacent to the proposed site, loss of light and opening hours.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Johns (ward councillor) Addressed the Committee and opposed the application.

The Planning Officer reported that the issues raised by objectors had been addressed within the planning report. The Committee was also informed that the building One Deansgate does not have special status and the impact of the proposed building on light and views would be no different to that of other new buildings within the city centre.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members of the Committee referred to the impact of the development on the amenity of residents and heritage assets, conservation area, due to its location, height, scale and dominance of the area and indicated that they would not support the application.

Councillor White moved a proposal to Mind to Refuse the application the reasons stated. The proposal was seconded by Councillor Davies.

## Decision

The Committee is Minded to Refuse the application for the reasons that the negative impact of the development on the amenity of residents, heritage assets, conservation area, due to its location, height, scale and dominance of the area.

(Councillor Shaukat Ali left the meeting room during consideration of the application and took no further part in the meeting.)

Councillor Nasrin Ali lost connection to the meeting during the consideration of the application and took no further part in the meeting.)

### **PH/20/74      126308/FO/2020 - 2-4 Whitworth Street West, Manchester, M1 5WX - Deansgate Ward**

This application relates to the demolition of 2 to 4 Whitworth Street West and the construction of a mixed-use building, comprising flexible units for retail, food and drink use at ground floor level with a hotel at upper storeys, together with associated landscaping, servicing, cycle parking and other associated works.

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

No objector attended the meeting.

Councillor Jeavons (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to oppose the application for the reasons that the purpose as a hotel and appearance of the proposed building, due to poor architecture, would not fit in with the surroundings and the development would result in the loss of two important, although not listed, heritage buildings and a rise in anti-social behaviour. The Committee was also reminded that there are residential dwellings to the rear of the proposed building that would suffer a loss of amenity.

The Planning Officer reported that a hotel would be appropriate for this area of the city centre. The existing buildings on the site are not listed. The proposed building being offered is a high quality modern design that has been amended that would fit in with the surrounding area.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

A member of Committee referred to the existing buildings, which although did not have architectural merit, do have historic merit and commented that the buildings in question could be demolished at any time.

A member referred to the number of street trees to be included in the development and whether additional trees could be included.

The Planning officer informed the Committee that Historic England had been approached regarding the listing of the buildings which was refused. With reference to street trees it was reported that agreement would be reached to ensure that the maximum number of street trees would be included in the development.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation to approve the application.  
Councillor Y Dar seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

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

#### **PH/20/75      128002/FO/2020 - One City Road, 1 City Road East, Manchester, M15 4PN - Deansgate Ward**

This is for a full Planning Application for demolition of existing structures on site, erection of one 11-storey plus basement office building (Use Class E) and one 14-storey plus basement office building with ground floor commercial unit (Use Class E), landscaping, highways works, and associated works.

The Planning Officer did not make any additional comment on the report submitted.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Jeavons (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to oppose the application. The Committee was informed that the objector to the application had left the meeting. Reference was made to the objections submitted regarding the development and the impact on over four hundred apartments. There would be overlooking and overdevelopment for the area and loss of mature trees as well as amenity, privacy, sunlight and daylight. The Committee was asked to reject the application or to defer consideration to undertake a site visit.

Councillor Davies referred to the issues raised and objections received and requested that in view of this it would be appropriate for the Committee to hold a site visit.

Councillor Davies made a proposal for a site visit and this was seconded by Councillor Hitchen.

### **Decision**

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

#### **PH/20/76      128018/FO/2020 - Jessiefield, Spath Road, Manchester, M20 2TZ - Didsbury West Ward**

This application relates to the erection of a part three, part four storey building to provide 34 retirement apartments with associated communal facilities, landscaping and car parking following the demolition of the existing dwelling.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Kilpatrick (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to object against the application.

Councillor Leech addressed the Committee as a ward Councillor to object against the application and then left the meeting.

Councillor Stanton (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to object against the application.

The objections received related to overdevelopment, detrimental impact on the character of the area, impact on highways and road safety, impact on residential amenity including overbearing, overlooking, loss of privacy and increase in noise disturbance; loss of green space, trees and associated impacts on ecology including bats.

The Planning Officer reported that there were 26 parking spaces included in the proposal to serve the 34 units. The location of the development is within walking distance of transport links and is in a sustainable area.

Members commented that the proposed application is excessive and would be an over development of the site and for that reason should be refused.

Councillor Hitchen proposed that the Committee refuse the application for the reason that the application would be an over development. Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee refuse the application, for the reasons set out in the report submitted.

(Councillor Leech declared a prejudicial interest and spoke as a ward Councillor and then left the meeting and took no part in the consideration of the application.)



## **Personnel Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 20 January 2021**

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

**Councillors:** Akbar, Craig, Leech, Murphy, Rahman, Richards, Sharif-Mahamad, Sheikh and Stogia

**Apologies:** Councillors Leese and Ollerhead

#### **PE/21/01 Appointment of a Chair for the meeting**

In the absence of the Chair the committee appointed a member to chair the meeting.

##### **Decision**

To appoint Councillor Bridges as Chair for the meeting.

#### **PE/21/02 Minutes of the previous meeting**

##### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 11 November 2020 as a correct record.

#### **PE/21/03 Revised Employee Code of Conduct, the Smoking and Vaping Policy and Digital Media Policy**

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the City Solicitor which presented new revised employment policies in respect of the revised Employee Code of Conduct, the Smoking and Vaping Policy (previously known as the Tobacco Control Policy) and the Digital Media Policy (previously known as the Social Media Policy).

The Committee had been asked to give its approval the of the new policies, all of which were attached as an appendix and was invited to note the reports would also be considered by the Council's Constitution and Nominations Committee prior to submission to the full Council meeting on 3 February 2021.

The Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development introduced the report, setting out the scope and purpose of the Code. The reasons for review where also set out - these were largely attributed to alignment with current legislation and improvements of governance arrangements that had been highlighted by internal and external audit. The review had also provided an opportunity to align the policies with Our Manchester behaviours, Nolan Principles and the values that guide the organisation.

No Trades Union comments were submitted for consideration and the Committee agreed the recommendations.

### **Decision**

To approve the Digital Media and Smoking and Vaping Policy, and to commend the revised Employee Code of Conduct to Council at its meeting on 3 February 2021.

### **PE/21/04 Kickstart Scheme**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development which discussed the recently launched government (Kickstart) scheme, aimed at Universal Credit claimants aged 16- 24 years who had been identified as at risk of long-term unemployment. The intention was for the Authority to create placements under the scheme to provide opportunities to build workplace skills and experience and improve chances of securing long-term employment. A collaborative approach would be fostered with partners such as Department for Work and Pension and The Growth Company to fully implement the scheme.

Reference was made to recent work undertaken by the City Council to identify issues relating to race equality in the organisation as well as workforce equality generally. The outcome of this work being a renewed commitment to developing a workforce that reflects the rich diversity of the city.

The Committee noted that It is the intention of the Authority to pay all young people who are offered a placement, the Manchester Living Wage. The anticipated costs of the scheme were therefore provided with a caveat that actual costs would ultimately be dependent on the age profile of those taking up placements. It was explained that the budget for the operation of the scheme was already within the 2021/22 budget proposals being developed by the Executive.

The Committee welcomed Manchester's proposed approach. It was accepted that the number of positions the Council would initially be able to offer was constrained. However, the Committee hoped that in time this scheme would be developed and expanded to offer more younger people these opportunities. The committee also welcomed the example the Council's participation in this scheme would set to other employers in the city, and hoped that other would now follow this lead. The recommendations in the report were agreed.

### **Decision**

1. To endorse Manchester City Council's approach to implementing the Kickstart scheme across the organisation.
2. To welcome the Authority's commitment to fund each Kickstart placement to the Manchester Living Wage level.



## **PE/21/05 Chief Executive's Senior Management Arrangements**

The Committee considered a report of the City Solicitor which sought approval to regrade the position of Head of Electoral Services and to re-designate and regrade the position of Registration and Coroners Service Manager to Head of Registration and Coroners. The proposed change in grades reflected the increase in responsibilities. A full breakdown of the key responsibilities of each respective role was provided for the Committee to consider.

As part of the consideration of the re-designation and regrade of the post of Registration and Coroners Service Manager, members noted the change in the roles and responsibilities of the post and the way those responsibilities were linked to other changes in the role and work of the Coroner.

With regard to the post of Head of Electoral Services, the Committee accepted the growing strategic responsibilities of the role for the city and that the city itself now represented one of the largest and most complex metropolitan services in the country. The Committee also took into consideration the frequency with which the service had been required to deliver numerous, consecutive elections prior to COVID-19 pandemic.

Having supported the specific proposals for these two posts, the Committee also felt that future proposals for regrading and resignations of senior posts would benefit from being supported by more information on the wider reorganisation and re-evaluations that had also been undertaken within a particular section or department. Officers were requested to consider how best that could be achieved.

No Trades Union comments were submitted for consideration. The Committee therefore agreed the recommendations.

### **Decisions**

1. To approve the regrade of the Head of Electoral Services from Grade 12 (52,716 - £56,178) to SS1 (£62,531 - £67,676)
2. To approve the re-designation of Registration and Coroners Service Manager to Head of Registrars & Coroners with a salary regrade from Grade 12 (52,716 - £56,178) to SS1 (£62,531 - £67,676)