

Health and Wellbeing Board

Minutes of the meeting held on 3 November 2021

Present:

Councillor Midgley, Executive Member for Adults Health and Wellbeing – In the chair
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children and Schools Services
David Regan, Director of Public Health
Rupert Nichols, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust
Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services
Paul Marshall, Strategic Director of Children's Services
Dr Murugesan Raja, Manchester GP Forum
Dr Doug Jeffrey, (South) Primary Care Manchester Partnership
Katy Calvin-Thomas, Manchester Local Care Organisation
Dr Denis Colligan, GP Member (North) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust

Apologies:

Dr Geeta Wadhwa, GP Member (South) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Dr Ruth Bromley, Chair Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Vicky Szulist, Healthwatch

Also in attendance:

Dr Manisha Kumar, Medical Director, MHCC
Ruth Denton, Our Year Lead
Sam Nicholson, Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency
Owen Boxx, Senior Planning and Policy Manager MHCC

HWB/21/24 Appointment of Chair

Councillor Midgley was appointed Chair for the meeting.

HWB/21/25 Better Care Fund (BCF) return

The Chair informed the Board that an item of urgent business had been agreed to accept the Better Care Fund return report of the Senior Planning Manager, MHCC. The report had been circulated to members of the Board in advance of the meeting.

The report described that NHS England had requested that a BCF return is completed for Manchester which demonstrated the plan to successfully deliver integrated health and social care.

The plan focused on the requirement to reduce long length of stay in acute settings and to provide support for people to remain in the community by having effective discharge pathways and social care provision.

NHS England requested that the plan was approved by the Health and Wellbeing Board prior to being submitted to them by 16 November 2021.

The Chair invited members of the Board to ask questions.

A member of the board referred to arrangement made for patients following their discharge from hospital and asked how a care package would be made available if needed.

It was reported that a reablement support package will be applied within the four to six weeks period after leaving hospital.

The Director of Adult Social Services informed the meeting that anyone requiring care as part of a targeted intervention, under the Care Act, would receive an assessment and a care package would then be set up and delivered by home care providers.

Decisions

1. To approve the Better Care Fund return.
2. To approve the narrative return in support of the Better Care Fund plan.

HWB/21/25 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 September 2021 were submitted for approval.

Decision

To agree as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 1 September 2021.

HWB/21/26 Winter Panning: COVID-19 and Flue

The Board received the joint presentation of the Director of Public Health and the Medical Director, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning that described the planned approach to delivering both the COVID-19 and flu vaccination programmes over the coming months. The Board noted that these programmes sat alongside the winter plans of local NHS Trusts and Adult Social Care and the overarching national Autumn/Winter Plan.

The Director of Public Health provided an update on the current data for Manchester at 13 October 2021. Manchester had a rate of 274.9 and was 9 within Greater Manchester and 285 of all local authorities in England. Transmission rates were currently highest within the 11 to 16 years age groups. Reference was made to the rates within the over 60 years age group, that have risen and the importance of continued messaging across the population to take up the offer of the first dose, second dose and the booster vaccine to help prevent hospitalisation. Details were also provided on the impact of covid on secondary care, in particular the number of patients in hospital, those discharged and the impact on staff absences.

The Medical Director, MHCC provided an update on the winter vaccine programme. Details of the first dose, second dose and booster vaccine uptake across Manchester

were provided and it was explained that the vaccine is openly available to encourage wide take up. Work is ongoing to directly notify residents that have not received a first or a second booster vaccine and to invite them to come forward to receive it. Changes to guidance on the provision of the vaccine booster allows the booster to be given before 6 months had past and this was being co-administered with the flu vaccine at the same time to reduce the need for multiple trips. The Board was advised of the timetable and programmes in place to engage with different groups to boost take up of the vaccine that has included various methods of communication to target and engage as widely as possible.

The Chair invited questions and comments from Members of the Board.

A member of the Board referred to the take up rates of the vaccine by the school age children and importance of increasing this and to ensure that schools across the city remain open.

Decision

To note the presentation.

HWB/21/27 Manchester Climate Change Framework 2.0

The Board received the report of the Director, Manchester Climate Change Agency that discussed the evidence of a strong correlation between climate vulnerability and health inequalities; to provide an update on the refresh of the city's Climate Change Framework (Framework 2.0) and to seek guidance on the best way to bring expert advice on Health and Wellbeing into the Framework refresh, both in the short and longer term.

Reference was made to section 4 of the report, that sought support from the Board with the third headline objective on 'health and wellbeing' for setting the right objectives and targets and tracking progress with their implementation. The report set out two proposals for consideration:

- a) The Health & Well Being Board itself acts as the independent Advisory Group for the Climate Change Framework's third headline objective.
- b) The Health & Well Being Board create a new sub-group of appropriate level members to be the independent Advisory group, which is then overseen by the Board.

The Chair invited questions and comments from Members of the Board.

Members of the Board welcomed the report and referred to the importance of focussing on the impact of climate change on health and making the commitment to the bringing together of the partner agencies to work towards this.

The Director of Public Health proposed that a sub-group be established to help support Climate Change Framework 2.0. The membership of the sub-group would be determined following consultation with partners.

Decisions

The Board agreed to:

1. Note the recent publication of a number of key reports that provide evidence of a strong link between climate vulnerability and health inequality.
2. Provide feedback on the type of indicators that could be adopted to show progress on addressing climate change and health inequalities.
3. Establish a Sub-Group to provide support for the Climate Change Framework 2.0.

HWB/21/28 'Our Year' 2022

The Board received the report and presentation of the Strategic Director of Children and Education Services that discussed the issues and key concerns identified during COVID-19 that must be addressed before they became entrenched and hinder, or even prevent the progress of our children and young people.

The Our Year Lead officer gave an overview and a presentation that described that a citywide approach is required to listening to what children and young people want; and then harness collective resources, support communities to bring more opportunities, training and experiences for the next generation. 'Our Year' 2022 will see partners listening and acting together to create an offer of activities, opportunities and experiences.

From the ongoing work the Board was informed that an expression of interest would be made by Manchester to become part of UNICEF's Child Friendly City and Communities Programme. This would include a number of themes that would be brought to the Health and Wellbeing Board for further work to develop and engage with partners. The engagement of young people had provided valuable data on what is important to young people in the city. These included: family and friends, Education, Environment, Healthy Lives, having fun things to do and feeling included. A calendar of key events is being developed to include key events throughout the year. Members of the Board were invited to be involved in the initiative and to become Active Advocates.

The Chair welcomed the report and in particular, the link to mental and physical health of young people.

Members of the Board were the invited to questions and comment.

Members of the Board noted the enthusiasm and motivation of the young people who had been engaged so far in the process and the richness of the responses they had provided as well as the modesty of some of the requests.

Officers were asked if a fund had been made available and how would the initiative be evaluated to determine how successful the year had been.

It was reported that some funding would be made available for the initiative. Contact had been made with the business sector to help raise support for proposed activities and through other means such as contributing resources via self-funding events, free tickets, mentoring, coaching, donations and work apprenticeships opportunities. The year would be evaluated to measure its success as well as the outcome of the UNICEF Child Friendly City application. Young people will be involved throughout the process and a framework would be developed to measure this through strengthening the voice of young people and how the young people in the city look back at their year.

The Director of Adult Social Services welcomed the initiative and suggested an intergenerational element be included in the initiative that could attract young people to opportunities within the Health and Social Care Sector.

Decisions

The Board;

1. Endorse and promote 'Our Year 2022'. A year to celebrate the successes of Manchester's children and young people and supporting their recovery from the impact of Covid19;
2. Endorse and support Manchester submitting an expression of interest to become part of UNICEF's Child Friendly City and Communities programme; and
3. Promote initiatives/programmes within areas of responsibility that create activities, opportunities and celebrate the success of Manchester's children and young people.

HWB/21/29 Councillor Richard Leese

The Board noted the decision of Councillor Leese to resign from his position of Leader of the Council and Chair of the Board. In acknowledging his involvement in the work of the Health and Wellbeing Board since it was first established, the Board expressed its gratitude to Councillor Leese for the active role he has played in health related matters, especially for his depth of knowledge and awareness of issues being considered and follow up work he has undertaken to ensure Manchester remains in a strong position.

Licensing and Appeals Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 25 October 2021

Present: Councillor Ludford – in the Chair

Councillors: Grimshaw, Andrews, Chambers, Connolly, Evans Hassan, Jeavons and Lynch

Apologies: Councillor S Judge, Flanagan, Hewitson, Hughes, McHale and Reid

LAP/21/3 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 September 2021 were submitted for approval.

Decision

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Licensing Committee meeting held on 13 September 2021.

LAP/21/7 Allocation of Hackney Carriage Proprietor Licence HV434

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 and was outside of the period for renewal that can be granted under delegated authority and was therefore referred to Committee to consider. 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 outside of the UK at the time of the renewal date and was unable to access the internet in the country he was in at the time to complete the renewal.

The licence holder addressed the Committee and explained that he had been caring for his parents and arrangements to complete the renewal, via a friend had not happened.

The Committee accepted the licence holder's version of events and in light of the circumstances outlined and considered that the renewal should be granted, out of time.

Decision

To allow the applicant to renew the licence for hackney carriage proprietor [vehicle] licence application for HV434, out of time, subject to the vehicle being required to be submitted for mechanical test in the normal way.

Licensing Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 25 October 2021

Present: Councillor Ludford – in the Chair

Councillors: Grimshaw, Andrews, Chambers, Connolly, Evans Hassan, Jeavons and Lynch

Apologies: Councillor S Judge, Flanagan, Hewitson, Hughes, McHale and Reid

LHP/21/8 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 July 2021 were submitted for approval.

Decision

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Licensing Committee meeting held on 19 July 2021.

LHP/21/9 Review of Gambling Policy 2022-2025

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that provided responses to the public consultation to the proposed revision of the revised Gambling Act Policy.

The Principal Licensing Officer introduced the report and the committee was advised of further comments received from Trafalgar Leisure and a copy of the letter received was circulated to the Committee. The comments referred to Gaming Machines at Bingo Premises. The points raised had been accepted and the policy would be amended accordingly. Reference was also made to the comments received and the responses to them.

The Committee was advised that the Policy would be submitted to the Licensing Policy Committee on 15 November 2021 before submission to the meeting of Council on 1 December 2021 for consideration. The Gambling Policy would be implemented in January 2022.

Decision

The Committee noted the report and the responses received from the consultation process.

Licensing Policy Committee

Minutes of a meeting held on 15 November 2021

Acting under Delegated Powers

Present: Councillor Ludford (Chair).
Councillors Grimshaw (Deputy Chair), Davies and Rawlins

Apologies:

LPC/21/06 Minutes

Decision

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 August 2021.

LPC/21/07 Revised Gambling Policy 2022 - 2025

The Committee considered a revised Gambling Policy report.

The Principal Licensing Officer presented the report, stating that this was the forthcoming Gambling Policy which is published every three years and that this revision was in response to consultation. The Committee were informed that Annex 3 contained these proposed changes from the responses. There was an anti-gambling stance taken within the responses which could not be considered, but the Principal Licensing Officer confirmed that the policy did take account of harm from gambling which was still in development. Changes in the policy, it was stated, were in line with the objectives and the protection of children. Trafalgar Leisure had given a response relating to gaming machines at bingo premises (Annex 2). The Principal Licensing Officer confirmed that there were still some minor amendments to typographical errors to be fixed and confirmed that enhanced DBS checks could not be applied for all roles within the gambling industry, therefore this would be reworded. In his final statement, the Principal Licensing Officer stated that the policy would come into effect in January 2022.

The Committee were invited to comment and ask questions.

In responding to a question from the Committee, the Principal Licensing Officer stated that the policy contained standard wording for countrywide use but that there would be a varied approach from local authorities and that the policy reflects Manchester City Council's detailed approach and benefitted from additional work done in Manchester around gambling related harm, such as the work of the Greater Manchester Gambling Harm Reduction Board. The Principal Licensing Officer confirmed that project has been funded through the Gambling Commission's regulatory settlement scheme following a successful bid by MCC and colleagues in public health services. A report on the progress of the programme will be brought to this Committee in future.

In responding to a further question from the Committee, the Legal Advisor to the Committee stated that she had concerns over the suggested re-wording from “expectations” to “a requirement” regarding gambling companies social responsibilities, stating that no mandatory conditions could be added to the policy.

The Principal Licensing Officer added that there was a Gambling Code of Practice for use within the industry and confirmed this would be circulated to the Committee.

The Principal Licensing Officer then confirmed that the DBS issue was a legal issue and not linked with costings.

Decision

The Committee noted the report and recommended that Council approve and adopt the Gambling Policy 2022-2025.

Personnel Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2021

Present: Councillor Rahman – in the Chair

Councillors: Akbar, Bridges, Craig, Midgley and White

Apologies: Councillors Leese, Rawlins and Sheikh

PE/21/09 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 Rahman as Chair for the meeting.

PE/21/10 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 17 March 2021 as a correct record.

PE/21/11 New and Revised Policies

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Human Resources and Organisational Development that outlined new and revised employment policies for the Committee's consideration relating to the Third-Party Harassment and Abuse Policy and the revised Disciplinary and Employee Dispute Resolution Policies.

The Committee was informed that policies have been developed in response to the recommendations of both the 2019 Race Equity Review, and the subsequent Race Equality Working Group which highlighted the need to be more explicit within the Council's workforce policies about the organisational stance on race discrimination

Noting this, the committee agreed the recommendation.

Decision

To approve the new and revised policies, as detailed in the report submitted, relating to:

- Third Party Abuse and Harassment Policy;
- The revised Disciplinary Policy; and
- Employee Dispute Resolution Policy.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 21 October 2021

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

Councillors: S Ali, Andrews, Baker-Smith, Y Dar, Kamal, Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat, Richards and Stogia

Apologies:

Councillors Davies, Hutchinson and Kirkpatrick

Also present:

Councillors Hilal, Judge, Leech and Wright

PH/21/72 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 124234/FO/2019, 128916/FO/2020 & 131163/MO/2021.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/21/73 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 23 September 2021 as a correct record.

PH/21/74 124234/FO/2019 & 124453/LO/2019 - The Lodge, Rear Of Old Town Hall, Lapwing Lane, Manchester, M20 2NR - Didsbury West Ward

The Planning and Highways Committee deferred consideration of this application on 23 September 2021 to enable a site visit to take place to better understand the proposal for car parking on the site.

The Chair confirmed that both applications (for the proposed demolition of the existing building and erection of a new build) would be considered together.

124234/FO/2019

The applicant is proposing to demolish the single storey Lodge and replace it with a 2-storey building that would provide meeting and storage facilities for the existing solicitors' office that operates out of the Old Town Hall.

124453/LO/2019

The applicant is seeking Listed Building Consent to demolish the Lodge in order to facilitate the erection of a 2 storey building to form ancillary meeting and storage

space for the solicitors' office operating out of the Old Town Hall.

The applications relate to The Lodge, a single storey detached building located at the rear of the former Withington Town Hall (now referred to as the Old Town Hall) on Lapwing Lane. The Old Town Hall is a Grade II listed building. The Lodge is located within the Albert Park Conservation Area. The Lodge is currently used as a store, in association with the office uses within the Old Town Hall, but it is believed to have originally been the gate lodge to the Corporation Yard that existed where there is now residential properties. The Lodge is accessed directly off Raleigh Close, a short cul-de sac off Lapwing Lane.

This application was placed before the Committee on 2 September 2021 but determination was deferred at the request of the applicant in order to allow for ownership issues to be resolved. The applicants have amended the site edged red location plan so that it only includes land in their ownership.

The Planning Officer addressed Committee and made reference to the site visit undertaken and also clarified that the Core Strategy car parking guidance referred to on Page 29 of the printed report should state that these are maximum number of guideline car parking spaces and not minimum.

An objector spoke against the application stating that they had spoken with other local residents who felt that their town houses were not reflected in the design of this development and added that the town houses living rooms are located on the 1st floor, meaning that the houses would be overlooked. The objector stated that parking has always been an issue on the area and noted a recent marked improvement which he felt was directly linked to the Committee's site visit and referred to photographs showing double parking and spoke of the cul-de-sac being completely blocked off at times. The objector noted that refuse trucks would use the Lapwing Lane entrance and requested that all other commercial vehicles do the same in the event of emergency services requiring access to Raleigh Close.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Hilal (Ward Councillor) attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application. The Committee was informed that Cllr Hilal was objecting to the increase in potential on street parking, noting that parking was already an issue and confirming Raleigh Close as a private road whose residents shouldn't have to provide private parking for any overflow from The Lodge. Cllr Hilal requested that the Committee refuse this application.

Councillor Leech (Ward Councillor) attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application. The Committee was informed that Cllr Leech wished for Local Ward Councillors to be able to join the site visits, adding that the lack of parking was his main concern, agreeing with the objector's submission and referred to the street scene visible on Google Maps as being a true representation regarding car parking. Cllr Leech stated that the car parking plans were unrealistic in their layout and felt that there should be no parking at the front section of the proposed layout. Cllr Leech agreed that the development would overlook town houses on Raleigh Close and stated that the travel plan proposals for bicycle use was

unrealistic and had not been conducted by an independent survey. Cllr Leech also expressed concerns over whether the development could be restricted to non-office use, stating that this was not an enforceable condition.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee to state that the large south facing window at the proposed development would have a brise soleil, that 15 parking spaces were to be provided, bike storage and shower facilities were included within the travel plan and that the use of the development as non-office space was enforceable.

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

A member requested further information on what local residents on Raleigh Close could do to resolve any parking issues.

The Planning Officer stated that this would be a civil matter due to Raleigh Close being a private road.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for application 124234/FO/2019. Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

Councillor Lovecy moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for application 124453/LO/2019, stating that the reduced size of the proposal would not be a competitor for the listed building, therefore she felt there were no grounds to refuse. Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the applications for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the reports submitted.

(Councillor Kamal took no part in the considerations or the decisions made on the applications.)

PH/21/75 128916/FO/2020 - The Moss Nook at the corner of Trenchard Drive and Ringway Road, Manchester, M22 5NA - Woodhouse Park Ward

The Planning and Highways Committee deferred consideration of this application on 23 September 2021 to enable a site visit to take place to better understand the proposal for car parking on the site and the potential impact on local residents.

The applicant is proposing the erection of a part two/part three storey hotel on the site of a now vacant restaurant. The Moss Nook is a part single/part two storey building with living accommodation in the roofspace. It sits on the north-eastern corner of the Trenchard Drive/Ringway Road junction and, while currently vacant, it was last used as a restaurant with living accommodation above. The applicant is proposing to demolish the existing property and erect a part two/part three storey 30 bed hotel. At the rear of the proposed building the applicant is proposing a 24 space car park accessed off Ringway Road, along with a cycle and bin store. Access to the car park would be via an

Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) controlled barrier. Two of the car parking spaces would be fitted with vehicle charging points; two would be designated disabled bays and three would be designated as *night spaces*, i.e. to be used for guests arriving late at night. To facilitate the development, 10 of the 12 trees within the site would be felled. To compensate for their loss the applicant is proposing to plant 10 replacement trees.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the site visit had taken place and the context and character of the application site was looked at as well as the relationship to neighbouring buildings and also confirmed that the agent was unable to attend but summarised points which the agent had requested be shared with Committee ; The Committee was informed that the scheme had been reduced in height, mitigation was in place to tackle noise and disturbance, vehicle registration recognition was to be installed and the rooftop garden had been omitted. The Planning Officer informed the Committee that wording for condition 20 would need rewording regarding non-opening windows if the application was approved.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

No applicant attended the meeting.

Councillor Judge (Ward Councillor) attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application. The Committee was informed that Cllr Judge objected to the scheme on the grounds that it was proposed for a small residential area and that she had already fought for residents' parking due to the overspill from the airport. The Committee was informed that 24 car parking spaces would not sufficiently service the 30 beds at the hotel and stated that the site was not nearby to any tram or bus routes and questioned whether anyone using the hotel would utilise cycling facilities. Cllr Judge further stated that the car park was likely to be permanently full of guests and staff and felt that the building design was out of keeping with the village feel of the area. In conclusion, Cllr Judge stated that she supported local businesses but asserted that this was not the best site for a proposal of this size and asked the Committee to refuse the application.

The Planning Officer stated that the scheme had been reduced in height, that there was a travel and management plan, that this was a sustainable site and of contemporary design.

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

Councillor Stogia expressed concerns regarding overdevelopment of the application site overdevelopment of the site with consequential impacts on residents due to more intensive use, shortfall in car parking leading to increased pressures on nearby residential roads and potential impacts on residential amenity with the travel plan being unrealistic in adequately dealing with the lack of car parking spaces and no assurance where any overspill car parking will take place design being inappropriate with impact on character of the area, street scene in general and visual amenity and lack of landscaped setting/amenity area for the new build , adding that the new build would not sit well with the village feel. Councillor Stogia moved a recommendation to refuse for the reasons outlined.

Councillor Lovecy seconded the refusal, adding that the site visit was helpful in guiding her understanding of car parking issues and lack of public transport links.

The Planning Officer noted that there were clear concerns outlined in the reasons for a refusal and stated that they would take these concerns on board.

Decision

The Committee was minded to refuse the application and requested that officers bring back a report addressing the concerns raised with potential reasons for refusal.

(Councillor Baker-Smith declared a prejudicial interest and left the meeting and took no part in the consideration or the decision made on the application.)

PH/21/76 130030/FO/2021 - 25-33 Central Road, Manchester, M20 4YE - Old Moat Ward

The application site comprises 3 large semi-detached Villas, namely nos. 25 to 27 Central Road, nos. 29 to 31 Central Road and 33 Central Road. The properties, which are shown below, were converted into a total of 20 flats (ground to second floor level) under planning permission 019106 approved in April 1983.

The applicant is applying retrospectively to convert the basements of the three properties into five two- bedroom flats. Lights wells to the front, side and rear are also proposed.

Seventeen letters of objection have been received from local residents, along with one from Councillor White. Objections have been raised in respect of the standard of accommodation proposed, waste storage and the impact on residential amenity but the main concern is that insufficient parking spaces have been provided and as a result the proposal would lead to an increase in cars parking on-street on Central Road.

The Planning Officer stated that the applicant's agent had not provided details of the electric charging points or of the number of cycles that can be accommodated within the bike store and therefore conditions 7 and 8 would need to be re-worded for these details to be agreed and then implemented. if the application was approved by the Committee.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

No applicant attended the meeting.

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

A member stated that the scheme in its current format indicated a lack of respect for the planning process and considered this proposal to be "overdevelopment by stealth." The member further stated that this scheme would put pressure on local areas to such extremes that they may feel unliveable and indicated that this style of

application was not part of the Council's strategy. The member stated they would refuse but understood that this would not be possible given the circumstances of the case.

The Director of Planning agreed with the members concerns in relation to works taking place without planning permission.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application. Councillor Y Dar seconded the proposal.

A member gave mention of comments on p81 regarding the initially proposed 20 dwellings and expressed concern that an extra 5 had been added.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there had been an agreement for 20 dwellings in the 1980s and that in 2017 permission had been granted for five additional one bed apartments within the basement areas. The Planning Officer confirmed that the applicant had commenced works without planning permission for five two bedroom apartments and that this was a clear cause for concern.

Councillor Richards moved a recommendation for deferral to allow the submission of information which was referred to by officers but had not been provided by the agent prior to Committee and for this information to be properly considered.

Councillor Lovecy seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed to defer the application for the reasons outlined.

PH/21/77 131163/MO/2021 - Land Bounded by Dinton Street, Cornbrook Road, Chester Road and Trentham Street, Manchester, M15 4FX – Hulme Ward

This Reserved Matters Application sought approval of appearance, layout, scale and landscaping, following the approval of Outline permission referenced 118625/FO/2017 for the erection of a part 11, part 15 building to form a 154 bed hotel and 88 bed apart-hotel building (Use Class C1) with associated public realm, car parking, and other associated works following demolition of existing buildings

The Planning Officer stated that there would be no Chester Road entrance near to the Metrolink station as this was deemed unsafe for commuters. The Planning Officer stated that this application was part of the Cornbrook Hub Strategic Regeneration Framework, a joint document between Manchester City Council and Trafford Metropolitan Borough Council and would add improvements to the area.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

No applicant attended the meeting.

Councillor Wright (Ward Councillor and speaking on behalf of Ward Councillor Bayunu) attended the meeting and addressed the Committee on the application. The Committee was informed that Cllr Wright noted that the scheme was agreed in 2018 but was not elected at this time and would have opposed. Cllr Wright commented that this area is not a gateway to the city centre, adding that residents were scared of gentrification and had not had any opportunity to speak to the developers. There were concerns of the impact of construction vehicles on and around the estate and stated that an arrangement was required to manage this. Councillor Wright also felt that jobs arising from the development would not be solely for local people.

The Planning Officer stated that this was a request for approval of reserved matters only, considering the layout, scale, landscaping and access, adding that the previous consultation in 2014 and 2018 was in line with procedures. The Planning Officer stated that local residents had been notified and gave mention to improvements to the area (which previously housed scrap yards) and the underpass. The Planning Officer stated that, as a joint document between Manchester City Council and Trafford MBC, it was perceived that Manchester had covered their requirements.

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

A member expressed their sympathy with the local residents and asked if there were any conditions available to promote the inclusion of the community.

The Planning Officer stated that this was covered on the initial plan.

A member questioned the addition of trees and waste collection.

The Planning Officer stated that there are 15 trees proposed, 4 of which were located in Trafford and that this was one application for two hotels so there could be either one or two waste strategies.

A member questioned the lack or level of communication between the developer and the community and requested that this be monitored.

The Planning Officer stated that they could reinforce these conditions.

Councillor Andrews moved the officers recommendation of approve for the application.

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the deferral of the application, in order to undertake a site visit.

(Councillor Stogia left before the close of this item and took no part in the consideration or the decision made on the application.)

PH/21/78 130912/FO/2021 - 20 Lord Street, Manchester, M4 4FP - Cheetham Ward

This proposal was for the creation of accommodation for 31 homeless men (sui generis) with an ancillary healthcare office/facility following demolition works and elevational alterations to the existing building. The site is 0.09 hectares, and bounded by Lord Street, Stock Street, Stock Street East and Mehtab House, a car garage/workshop to the north. It comprises two connected buildings and a detached building which are vacant.

The Planning Officer stated nothing further to add.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

The Planning Officer stated that the Homeless Directorate and other associated services were in support of the application.

A member stated that homelessness was a huge issue in the city and, whilst noting that local residents had concerns about the management of this facility, added that the management team had 3 years experience in the Cheetham Ward. The member confirmed that he would address residents' concerns and gave support to this proposal.

Councillor Lyons gave their support to this development and encouraged the long-term use of the facility and moved the officer's recommendation of approve for the application.

Councillor Riasat seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the applications for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the reports submitted.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 18 November 2021

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

Councillors: S Ali, Andrews, Baker-Smith, Y Dar, Davies, Kamal, Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat, Richards and Stogia

Apologies:

Councillors Hutchinson and Kirkpatrick

Also present:

PH/21/79 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 131719/FO/2021, 130030/FO/2021, 123430/FO/2019 & 131147/FO/2021.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/21/80 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 21 October 2021 as a correct record.

PH/21/81 131719/FO/2021 - Ivygreen Allotments Off Halstead Avenue Manchester M21 9FT - Chorlton Ward

This application sought to erect a small building to the west of the allotment access road, on the site of an existing summer house and shed, to house a compostable toilet for use by the allotment holders and their guests. The building would measure 2.46 metres by 1.9 metres and be a maximum of 2.33 metres in height, sloping down to 2.13 metres with its monopitch roof. It would be constructed from box profile sheet cladding and a vent pipe would project from the top of the building. A trellis screen would be erected in front of the proposed building to screen it from Halstead Avenue. Underneath the proposed building two vaults would be created to hold the solid waste while urine would be separated and sent to a soakaway in the ground. The soakaway would be located to the rear of the proposed building and beyond that another trellis screen would be installed. The proposed building would be located approximately 14 metres away from the access gates located adjacent to Halstead Avenue.

The Planning Officer made an apology for the use of the wording “elderly” in the report and stated that it should have read “older.”

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

The Planning Officer stated that this would be a sustainable solution to users of the allotment and noted the recommendation that the scheme be approved.

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

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of approve for the application.

Councillor Lyons seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the application for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the reports submitted.

(Councillor Davies took no part in the considerations or the decisions made on the applications.)

PH/21/82 130030/FO/2021 - 25-33 Central Road Manchester M20 4YE – Old Moat Ward

This application was placed before the Committee on 21 October 2021, but determination was deferred in order to allow the applicant to submit details of the vehicle charging points, cycle storage facilities and a swept path for parking space no.2. The required information had been provided and considered to be appropriate and acceptable.

The application site comprises 3 large semi-detached Villas, namely nos. 25 to 27 Central Road, nos. 29 to 31 Central Road and 33 Central Road. The properties were converted into a total of 20 flats (ground to second floor level) under planning permission 019106 approved in April 1983. The applicant is applying retrospectively to convert the basements of the three properties into five two-bedroom flats.

The Planning Officer confirmed that this application was deferred in October due to a lack of information regarding cycle storage and electric charge points. The Planning Officer then stated that this information had been received, assessed and included in the report.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

No applicant attended the meeting.

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

A member stated that they felt that this type of retrospective application was disrespectful to the planning processes and asked if there was any way to deter this

from happening in future. The member noted the incremental effect this type of scheme would have on neighbourhoods and asked that the Committee need to say no to this style of overdevelopment.

The Planning Officer stated that work had commenced on the site and that there was no legislation to penalise the developer once work had begun but that this was at the developer's risk as the application could be refused and costly enforcement action could be taken against the developer.

Councillor Baker-Smith sought clarification on whether she needed to express an interest in the item due to having a friend who lived at the site.

The Chair had confirmation from the Director of Planning that Councillor Baker-Smith would be able to take part in the hearing for this item so long as she had no discussions with this resident.

Councillor Andrews requested feedback from the Planning department on the ratio of allowed and refused outcomes for these retrospective planning applications and then moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

The Director of Planning confirmed that the requested information would be fed back to the Committee.

Councillor S Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the application for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the reports submitted.

PH/21/83 123430/FO/2019 - Clyde Court Nursing Home 22 - 24 Lapwing Lane Manchester M20 2NS - Didsbury West Ward

This application was proposing to convert a former nursing home (nos. 22/24 Lapwing Lane) into five dwellinghouses and erect a detached dwellinghouse fronting onto Clyde Road. Part two and three storey extensions are also proposed to the side and rear of nos. 22/24 Lapwing Lane and numerous unsympathetic extensions to the nursing home would be demolished to facilitate the proposal.

Eight letters of objection have been received from local residents, along with one from West Didsbury Residents Association. Objections have been raised in respect of the impact on residential amenity, existing tree coverage, the character of the Albert Park Conservation Area and the exacerbation of existing parking problems.

The Planning Officer added no further information to the reports provided.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

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

The Planning Officer added that the scheme, if approved, would secure the building for long term family use.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

Councillor Lyons seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the application for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the reports submitted.

PH/21/84 131147/FO/2021 - Manchester College Arden Centre Sale Road Manchester M23 0DD - Northenden Ward

This proposal related to the redevelopment of the Manchester College Arden Centre site located off Sale Road in the Northenden Ward of Wythenshawe. The proposals had been amended since they were first submitted and now consist of the provision of 224 no. dwellinghouses of a range of house types accessed via the existing vehicular access point to the College via Moss Hey Drive. 357 nearby residents were notified of the proposals and 10 responses were received, 7 of these objected to the proposals and 3 made neutral and other observations.

The application site contains playing pitches associated with the College use to the southern portion of the site, the replacement of these pitches is required and is necessary in order to make the proposals acceptable from a planning policy point of view. The applicants are to enter into a section 106 agreement to enable the provision of mitigation pitches at Wythenshawe Park and other pitch provision within Wythenshawe through a financial contribution to the Council.

The proposal also identified the provision of affordable housing to be provided on site as part of the development in the form of 45 no semi-detached dwellings (23 no. 2 bedroom and 22 no. 3 bedroom). The provision of these properties is to be secured via the section 106 agreement.

The Planning Officer added that the scheme had been reduced in size.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

The Planning Officer confirmed that, if approved, condition 20 (relating to acoustic treatments) would no longer be required as the pump station would now be located underground and had been fully assessed.

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

A member welcomed the scheme as providing affordable housing on the site and asked how these properties would be allocated.

The Planning Officer confirmed that they would be “pepperpotted” across the site with 5% social affordable rented housing and 15% intermediate, that the details of all housing within the scheme would be within the legal agreement and added that colleagues from MCC Housing department would be involved in the allocation process.

A member asked about the provision of car parking spaces.

The Planning Officer confirmed that each dwelling would have car parking and also electric charging points.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer’s recommendation of “Minded to Approve subject to the signing of Section 106 agreement for the provision of 20% affordable housing on site, financial contributions towards replacement pitch provision and additional sports provision; and, provision of signalised pedestrian crossing and bus shelter on Sale Road” for the application, removing condition 20.

Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the application for the reasons and subject to the conditions detailed in the reports submitted.

(Councillor Richards declared an interest in this item and took no part in the consideration or the decision made on the application.)

PH/21/85 Confirmation of The Manchester City Council (Land at car park adjacent to York Street, Didsbury) Tree Preservation Order 2021 - Didsbury West Ward

The Committee were asked to consider 1 objection made to this order relating to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) served at the above address on 1 Birch tree (T1) and 6 Callery Pear trees (T3 – T8) immediately adjacent to a car park on York Street, Didsbury, Manchester, M20 6UE.

The Planning Officer added no further information to the report provided.

No objector to the application attended the meeting.

No applicant attended the meeting.

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

Councillor Andrews moved the Head of Planning’s recommendation to instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the Tree Preservation Order in the report.

Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the recommendation to confirm the Tree Preservation Order.

Standards Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 4 November 2021

Present

Independent Co-opted Member: N Jackson – In the Chair
Councillors Andrews, Connolly, Evans, Lanchbury and Simcock

Ringway Parish Council: Councillor O'Donovan

Independent Co-opted Member: G Linnell

Also present:

Independent Person: Mr A Eastwood

ST/21/16 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held 17 June 2021 were submitted for approval.

The Chair advised the Committee that in respect of Minute number *ST/21/14 Terms of Office of the Independent Members of the Standards Committee and the Council's Independent Persons*, the Independent Co-opted Members and Independent Persons had each agreed to extend their current appointments for a further year, until 18 November 2022.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2021 as a correct record.

ST/21/17 Dispensations

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer that described the operation and efficacy of the process for granting dispensations in relation to Members' Interests. It is the Monitoring Officer's view that the requests for dispensations that have been made, have been sought in appropriate circumstances and that the level of requests for dispensations does not give rise to concern.

A member asked if councillors sponsored by a trade union should seek dispensation for the length of their four year term, rather than seeking dispensation on individual matters.

The City Solicitor advised the Committee that introducing a blanket dispensation could be problematic and it would be more appropriate to use the dispensation process on a case-by-case basis.

Decision

To note the report

ST/21/18 Planning Protocol

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that described the operation and efficacy of the Planning Protocol. Members noted that the Planning Protocol sets out a duty to promote and maintain high standards of conduct in the discharge of the Council's duty as local planning authority and it is considered to be effective in doing so.

The Committee was advised that the Planning Protocol is kept under review and amendments will be considered as circumstances may arise. Members were advised of one issue regarding late representations to Planning and Highways Committee that is currently being discussed. The process allows the receipt of late representations prior to a cut off of 4pm, two days prior to the meeting that will consider the application. A supplementary agenda is then issued the day before the meeting that includes late representations and the planning officer responses. It was reported that there have been occasions where late representations are submitted on the morning of the meeting and the lateness and detail of the submission, in some instances have resulted in only a verbal update being given that prevented the planning officer from providing a complete response and detailed advice to the Committee. The short length of time had on occasion resulted in the application being deferred to a later date. The Committee were asked if it had any comments.

A member referred to the importance of committee members having all of the information prior to a meeting that allows them to read and understand the application and the two day cut off for the submission of late representations appeared to be a sensible rule. Officers were asked if the information being presented at such a late stage of the process was due to the circumstances of a particular application or could it be due to an accepted practice that had developed over a period of time.

The Committee was advised that the planning application process allows opportunities to make submissions and it was unlikely that a very late submission would have a significant impact on the application.

A member referred to the protocol that provides the opportunity during a Planning and Highways Committee for the public to speak for four minutes and ward Councillors to speak to planning applications and made the point that this allowed further late representations to be made. Reference was also made to the use of site visits for lobbying committee members and officers were asked if ward councillors who were not a member of the Planning and Highways Committee and members of the public are allowed to attend a site visit.

The Committee was informed that ward councillors and members of the public could attend a site visit, if it is in a public place. The Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee would use their discretion on the reasons of individuals attending and make it clear that lobbying the committee members is not allowed. The purpose of a site visit is to help provide committee members with additional information and local knowledge of the application site and the surrounding area and not an opportunity to lobby members of the committee. If committee members were being lobbied or pressured, the officers present would discourage this and advise everyone present of the planning procedure. The Committee were advised that members are reminded of

the purpose and reasons for the site visit and this is explained to members of the public in attendance.

The Committee endorsed a deadline of 4:00pm two days prior to the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee for the submission of late representations.

Decision

To note the report and note the potential amendment to the Planning Protocol.

ST/21/19 Register of Members Interests

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer that described the operation of the Register of Members' Interests. The Monitoring Officer is of the view that Register of Interests requirements are understood by Members but will, as a matter of good practice, continue to issue specific guidance to all Members regarding declaration of interests at meetings.

Decision

To note the report.

ST/21/20 Gifts and Hospitality Guidance for Members

The Committee considered the report of the operation and efficacy of the Gifts and Hospitality Guidance for Members.

Decision

To note the report.

ST/21/21 Review of the Operation and Efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that described the operation and efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol. The Monitoring Officer did not consider that any amendment of the Protocol is required at this time. However, when the Code of Conduct for Members is next subject to substantive change, the Monitoring Officer does consider that a full review of the Protocol should be undertaken to align the Protocol with the revised Code.

Decision

To note the position set out in the report submitted, regarding the operation and efficacy of the Member/Officer Relations Protocol.

ST/21/22 Local Government Association (LGA) Model Code of Conduct for Members

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that invited the Committee to consider the LGA Model Code of Conduct for Members. It is the view of the Monitoring Officer, for the reasons highlighted within the report, that Manchester should retain the current code of conduct. It was recommended that the central government response to CSPL recommendations and any legislative changes should be awaited before changing Manchester's code, noting that the Government's response is expected by the end of this year.

A member of the Committee endorsed the recommendation to defer consideration and recommendations regarding adoption of the LGA model code of conduct.

The Chair stated that it was important for the Committee to monitor the government response to the CSPL recommendations and the LGA Model Code of Conduct for Members would be placed on the Committee Work Programme for each meeting in preparation for the Government's response.

The City Solicitor reported that if any changes were made to the code of conduct, members would be briefed, and training would be provided to ensure members were made aware of what is required of them.

Decision

1. To defer consideration and recommendations regarding adoption of the LGA Model Code of Conduct, pending the receipt of central government's response the Committee on Standards in Public Life recommendations and any legislative changes.
2. To request a further report on consideration and recommendations regarding adoption of the LGA model code be submitted to the next appropriate meeting, when the Government's response is available and that the subject be added to the Committee's workplan for each meeting, until it is received.

ST/21/23 Members' Update on Ethical Governance

The members considered the report of the City Solicitor that sought the Committee's comments on and approval of the draft Members' Update on Ethical Governance for November 2021. A draft of the Members' Update for November 2021 was set out in the Appendix to the report. Members were asked to provide comments on the draft and to approve its content for circulation to all members by e-mail. A paper copy would be available on request.

Reference was also made to cyber training and it was suggested that the Members Development Committee be requested to contact members to ensure they have undertaken the training.

The City Solicitor reported that a reminder will be circulated to all members of the Council to remind them of the importance of undertaking cyber training, if they have not already done so.

Decision

To approve the content of the draft Members' Update on Ethical Governance, as set out in the Appendix of the report submitted, for circulation to all members.

ST/21/24 Work Programme for the Standards Committee

The Committee considered the report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit that invited the members of the Standards Committee to consider its work programme for future meetings and make any revisions.

Decision

To note the report and agree the Work Programme, with the inclusion of the Local Government Association (LGA) Model Code of Conduct for Members for each meeting of the Committee.