

## **Audit Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 28 July 2020**

**This Audit Committee 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 Ahmed Ali - In the Chair  
Councillors Clay, Lanchbury, Russell, Stanton and Watson  
Independent Co-opted member: Dr S Downs

#### **Also Present:**

Karen Murray, Mazars (External Auditor)  
Alastair Newall, Mazars (External Auditor)

**Apologies:** Dr Barker, Independent Co-opted member

#### **AC/20/12     Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2020 as a correct record.

#### **AC/20/13     Audit Progress Report**

The Committee considered the report of the Council's external auditors Mazars that provided an update on progress in delivering its responsibilities to the Council.

The Committee was informed that changes had been implemented since the start of the Covid19 pandemic with the introduction of remote working for both council audit staff and external audit staff. In addition the MHCLG had introduced changes to the timetable to complete the audit for 2019/20 by the end of November 2020. The audit of the draft accounts was commencing. The report also provided information on the progress of the audit and made reference to National Publications that may be of interest to the Committee relating to its governance role.

The Committee was informed on matters relating to impact of the pandemic on valuation of financial pension fund assets and uncertainty around the valuation of the Council's Property, Plant and Equipment, particularly where that valuation is based on market conditions. It was highlighted that the Council's valuer has reported that they did consider that there will be a material impact on the valuations for 2019/20. From the list of National Publications in the report the Committee was informed that a report would be submitted to a future meeting to reflect the impact of the changes resulting from the new National Audit Office Code of Practice.

It was reported that the audit of accounts would be completed before the November 2020 deadline.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member referred to the impact of Covid19 on the deadline for the audit and other areas such as the value of property, plant and equipment. The Committee was informed that Covid19 had delayed the deadline for the audit and it was anticipated that there would be an impact on future valuations.

## **Decisions**

The Committee noted the report and comments made.

### **AC/20/14 Treasury Management Outturn Report 2019-20**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer providing details of Treasury Management activities of the Council during 2019-20. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer introduced the report and provided an update regarding:

- Housing Investment Fund and the transfer to the GMCA;
- The Council's limited borrowing activities during the year;
- The Council's use of internal borrowing and holding short term cash and achieving a good rate;
- Short term borrowing in view of the current climate;
- The Council's submission as part of a consultation on the Public Works Loan Board (PWLB).

Thanks were given to the Treasury Management Team for its continued good work in view of the impact of the Covid19 pandemic.

## **Decision**

The Committee noted the report.

### **AC/20/15 Annual Accounts 2019/20**

The report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer was submitted 2019/20 Annual Accounts, which have been signed by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer.

The City Treasurer introduced the report and informed the meeting that the accounts were in a relatively strong financial position with a small overspend identified, strong balance sheet and reserves. Following Covid19 and the lockdown, work had been undertaken by staff remotely to produce the accounts and their work in producing the accounts in such challenging circumstances was recognised. The group accounts had been delayed and circulated prior to the meeting.

The Committee received a presentation from the Deputy City Treasurer which provided:

- An accounts timetable which included public inspection until 10 September and audited accounts to the and the completion of the audit of the accounts by the end of November 2020.
- A Narrative Report providing details on the performance of the Council's strategic objectives.
- Net Revenue Budget 2019/20 – net revenue budget compared to outturn and key reasons for variations
- General Fund Revenue Outturn 2019/20
- Capital Outturn 2019/20 compared to budget, details of spend for key projects and summary of how capital expenditure was funded
- 2019/20 Key Variations on the budget
- Housing Revenue Account Outturn 2019/20
- Capital Outturn 2019/20
- Capital Spend and Financing 2019/20
- Effects of COVID 19 on 2019/20 Accounts
- Comprehensive Income and Expenditure Statement

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member referred to the capital outturn and requested that this not be presented in presentations with the revised budget but instead with the original budget report to provide a more accurate picture of how the budget has performed. Officers were asked to explain the Council's debt position, what plan there is to use the capital reserves, and the position on loans to maturity and the interest paid per year.

The City Treasurer noted the point regarding the capital outturn and revised budget and explained that changes can take place regarding budget allocations. The point was also made that the interest rates on current loans are at a fixed rate. It was reported that the long term debt book relates to loans taken from 1991 onwards, with the majority of the debt being long term, and of this c. 90% is 10 years or more until maturity. Debt of c. £6m will mature by the end of the 2021/22 financial year and the majority of the remaining debt running until 2050 onwards. The rate of interest for individual debts is set at the market rate at the time of the loan and would have been considered the best value for money at that time.

A member referred to Notional Accounting Adjustments and asked officers to explain what this related to and the re-measurement of pensions referred to in the accounts. It was reported that Note 12 in the accounts provided an explanation of the adjustments which included such items as depreciation. The re-measurement of the pension figure is a notional adjustments and is based on actuarial assumptions including projections for life expectancy which for the first time in recent years had reduced.

A member referred to the use of the term 'vulnerable' and requested officers instead refer to 'vulnerable people' in future reports. Reference was also made to the strength of Manchester Communities in helping themselves and those part of the community that experience digital exclusion and the importance of engaging with

them.

The Committee was informed that the wording within the accounts would be examined to pick up the point raised regarding the strength of communities in relation to the work ongoing with the Our Manchester approach and digital inclusion.

A member stated that the Committee was aware and understood the difficulties in producing the annual accounts in view of the COVID 19 impact and the economic challenge to the City and the time that has taken to complete them.

A member referred to the Group Accounts and in particular the Manchester Airport Group (MAG) going concern note and the waivers in financial covenants. There was concern re the potential impact of the downturn in travel with different scenarios including a possible second peak. It was reported that MAG and the Council had carried out extensive due diligence and scenario planning and at the time of the meeting current position does not relate to the worst case scenario. As the covenants included a measure of debt to EBITDA it was inevitable the covenant would be breached but a lot of work has been carried out with the bondholders and other debtors. As with all businesses there remains a financial risk if there is a significant second spike in infections but MAG would not be alone in being severely impacted.

## **Decisions**

1. To note the unaudited 2019/20 Annual Account, signed by the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer, including the narrative report.
2. To acknowledge the work of staff involved in the production of the Annual Accounts, in particular the circumstances under which they have had to work and that they be thanked on behalf of the Committee.

## **AC/20/16 Internal Audit Plan 2020/21**

The report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer / Head of Audit and Risk Management was submitted. The Committee was advised that the Audit Plan had been developed to be represented with a greater level of assurance over plans to address gaps in staffing resources. It was reported the impact of Covid19 on the work of the Council had resulted in Internal Audit standing down the planned audit activity in order to minimise impact on services and personnel involved in the response. Work had then focussed on audit resource on advice and guidance for the management of urgent changes required to systems and processes and to help deliver new services required as part of the crisis response. Work postponed included actions to progress the service restructure, as management were required to focus fully on the response to the crisis. Other matters arising from the impact of Covid19 related to the procurement of PPE and the logistics of ensuring distribution and work on business rates and grants to help support businesses in Manchester. Other audit work has focused on cores services such as Adults and Children” Service and the impact on the Council’s budget position and reductions over the next year.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer acknowledged the work of officers in

the Internal Audit and Risk Management Team and the additional time spent in supporting the Council's work in addressing the impact of Covid19. Reference was made to the Council's budget and the current process of budget scenarios and budget planning in view of the uncertainty of the future budget position.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member referred to the government's furlough scheme and asked what potential there was for fraud to be committed on support provided by the Council and how this would be identified and addressed. Reference was also made to re-instating safeguards in view of the pace of changes made at the start of Covid19 to ensure that staff are protected in particular through the use of IT systems.

It was reported that changes had been introduced to the process with additional controls put in place to identify fraud and audit officers were involved in consultation during the introduction of the support scheme. This included national reporting on patterns of fraud with monthly reporting to central government. In addition checks are made on spending decisions. Regular updates are also made to the Senior Management Team to highlight the risk of fraud across services. It was reported that safeguards are still in place and reference was made to the IT packages in place such as Microsoft 365 and additional cyber security measures.

A member referred to staffing levels and resources within the Internal Audit Team and the recruitment to the current structure to ensure audit work continues. Reference was also made to the passing of skills/knowledge to other non-audit staff regarding PPE in the event of a further outbreak to allow audit staff to focus on audit work. Officers were asked for a response on the updating the Audit Plan to ensure this and other actions would take place. Officers were also asked for an updated Risk Register to be submitted to the Committee to address risk within Children's Services and Adult Services.

It was reported the current staff resource position is a key priority and will be taken forward in consultation with Human Resources. Meetings would be taking place to examine the reallocation of responsibility to other non-audit staff in respect of PPE. Recruitment of additional audit staff would take place during the year and the Audit plan will be updated during August and submitted to the Audit Committee. It was reported that the Risk Register would be realigned to identify risks in core services (Children's Services and Adult Services).

A member referred to achieving best value and asked officers how plans will be amended in areas such as procurement, contract management and capital expenditure in view of future resource constraints for projects such as the Town Hall improvement scheme and the Waste Management Services Contract. The point was made that the financial stability of care homes is an additional risk to consider and what measures are in place.

It was reported that large contracts such as areas of health and social care is key focus and would be factored into planning, contract management and procurement. Other large schemes included the New Civic Quarter and the Northern Gateway would be included in the future planning. Assurance mapping would also be involved

in consideration of providers and the transition arrangements for exiting from the EU. With reference to care home stability it was reported that daily calls were made during the Covid19 crisis with those providers.

A member expressed concern on the inspections made on the properties provided for homeless adults and children. It was reported that assurances would be sought from the Director of Homelessness on the Council's statutory provision for the inspection of properties.

### **Decision**

To approve the Annual Internal Audit Plan for 2020/21 subject to the comments received.

### **AC/20/17     Head of Audit and Risk Management Annual Assurance Opinion and Report**

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Audit and Risk Management which provided the Head of Audit and Risk Management's annual assurance opinion and report on the Council's system of governance, risk management and internal control. The annual opinion of the Head of Audit and Risk Management's with a summary outturn of the work of the Internal Audit Section for the 12 months April 2019 to March 2020. Quarterly updates on progress, including assurance opinions and executive summaries of reports, have been provided to Audit Committee during the year.

The audit opinion focused on the year to March 2020 however, the events of the evident last six weeks of the year indicate that that there would be likely significant implications for the UK in relation to the Coronavirus (Covid19) outbreak.

The Head of Audit and Risk Management provided a moderate assurance that the Council's governance, risk and control framework is generally sound and operated reasonably consistently in the year.

The Chair invited questions for the Committee.

Reference was made to paragraph 2.28 of the report and the Head of Risk Management was that in view of the number of limited and no assurance opinions listed on the table, what level of assurance would be given to Adult Services.

The Committee was advised that reporting on a directorate basis Adult Services could have a limited assurance on the basis of the audits carried out. It should be noted however, that the department had been open on the areas of concern identified and there had been a lot of subsequent work carried out to address these through new processes and procedures and through the resetting of the improvement plan work as the service moves forward through the past three months during the Covid outbreak.

A member referred to Adult Services and sought assurance that reports listed on the Audit Plan scheduled for the year would be completed and not lost during the year.

It was reported that officers would continue to follow up on all limited assurance opinions with work already taking place to address risk. This would be addressed in the Audit Monitoring Report.

A member referred to Executive Summaries and when members of the Committee would receive them. It was reported that the outstanding summaries would be circulated in time for the September meeting of the Committee as part of the Quarterly Assurance Update report.

A member referred to the way in which Adult Services had reacted to the Covid crisis and made the point that the process of planning by central government during this time could have been better. The reaction of the NHS and Local Authority to the crisis had been commendable and it would be difficult to reflect the individual efforts of staff within an audit opinion. It was therefore important to consider how much of a reactive service the Council should be.

It was noted that the response by the services for adult services and adult social care to the challenges of Covid19 on Manchester had been amazing. The point was made that a holistic review of services was required. It was noted that from the comments received three main themes had been picked up that areas relating to procurement, social care and homelessness will be included within the Audit Plan.

The Committee was advised that the Annual Accounts would be submitted to the October meeting of the Committee.

## **Decisions**

1. To note the report and the comments received.
2. To note and acknowledge the work of Council Adult Care and Adult Service staff and NHS staff in responding to the challenge of Covid19 for their dedication in ensuring services continued to be maintained.



## **Audit Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 15 September 2020**

**This Audit Committee 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 Ahmed Ali - In the Chair  
Councillors Clay, Lanchbury, Russell, Stanton and Watson  
Independent Co-opted member: Dr S Downs  
Independent Co-opted member: Dr D Barker,

#### **Also Present:**

Karen Murray, Mazars (External Auditor)

### **AC/20/18 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 28 July 2020 as a correct record.

### **AC/20/19 Internal Audit Assurance Report - Quarter 2**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer / Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management. The report provided the Committee with a summary of the [work](#) of the Internal Audit Section since April 2020. The publication of quarter four 2019/20 executive summaries was delayed due to Covid19 and cancellation of Audit Committee meetings in April and June. The report included the executive summaries and assurance opinions from completed audits finalised between February 2020 and July 2020.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member referred to audits that had taken place within schools where it appeared that similar issues had been identified relating to financial procedures and policy. Officers were asked if guidance could be provided to schools and school governors to address the issues raised to improve school's financial governance arrangements. The comment was also made that in view of the audits that had raised issues within areas of Council services there are also a number of the audits that had taken place on Council services which had produced many examples of good practice.

It was reported that following the completion of the audits in schools, a consolidated themed report is produced for the Director of One Education. A common themed report is also circulated to all of the schools in Manchester highlighting common

themes and lessons learned. This process could be explored further with One Education to consider other routes to pass on guidance and support on financial governance for schools.

A member asked officers why an updated position of the Audit Plan Status had not been included in the report in view of significant problems with audit completions. Officers were also asked to explain the proposed arrangements to resource the PPE hub and business grants beyond quarter two and if any resources had been provided from Central Government to fund this.

The Committee was informed that the report had been prepared in respect of audits taking place up to the end of July 2020, although some audits may have not been completed at that point. Some additional audit reports would be submitted to a later committee. With reference to the PPE hub, it was reported that three full-time audit staff posts had been provided to deal with PPE, this had been reduced to a half full-time post until the end of March 2021, at the latest. The staff member concerned had been kept in the half post to ensure a level of continuity is maintained and it was anticipated that the other half of the post would be filled. A more structured process was now in place to deal with PPE with additional staff resources to be provided for the PPE hub. The meeting was informed that resources had been brought in from across the council to help address the ongoing incident management and prepare for business as usual and recovery planning. It was important to properly resource such areas as business rates grants with audit staff to ensure guidelines are followed as well as spot instances of fraud. It was reported that £225,000 was received from the Government as part of a New Burdens payment.

A member referred to issues relating to the audit of schools and the issues arising from those in particular financial management guidance for schools and what the position for this is and the school's development plan. Officers were asked what follow up action had been taken regarding hospitality and other issues.

It was reported that schools are provided with guidance and the findings from audits are made into formal recommendations to the schools and followed up by the auditors. School development planning is an area where the recommendation is that planning takes place three years ahead. Follow up actions on audits had been delayed due to Covid and closure of schools. Other follow up checks would be completed and reported. The issue of hospitality raised in an audit it was reported this would be checked and reported to the Committee.

A member referred to concerns raised on the use and performance of Liquid Logic and the bedding in of the system. Officers were also asked to comment on the point raised within the report that suggested a 'cultural norm' in Adult Services by social workers' approach to recording information and the concerns this raises for adult safeguarding. Members were concerned on the limited assurances given and the lack of progress being made by the service.

It was reported the audits had identified issues within adult services and children's services such as changes in business practice following the introduction of Liquid Logic. Work is ongoing to address those issues concerning Liquid Logic involving the City Treasurer, Internal Audit and Children's Services and Adult Services DMTs. The

comment made on a 'cultural norm' had been identified as an historic challenge to install business change within the service and achieve compliance through training of social work staff. Further checks would be made to ensure compliance is being achieved. With reference to concerns raised on recording safeguarding issues it was reported that the changes made to case management on Liquid Logic that children's services is a few weeks away from business of usual. Adult Services would take longer in view of the more complex nature of the care finance packages. The Director of Adult Services would be contacted on the issues raised and reported back to the Committee.

A member referred to Mental Health - Adults Services and concerns on lack of management input on decisions on mental health case work and the lack of management overview on those decisions and delays on referrals made. Reference was also made to the use of the Paris System and how it operated/ compared to Liquid Logic. The Committee also identified other issues to consider including processing between the Liquid Logic and Paris systems, management oversight on processes on recording and decision making on safeguarding recording and logging and the efficiency of communication between the two systems.

It was reported that the Paris system was used by the Mental Health Trust and not the Council. Some of the actions to be taken by the Mental Health Trust were still outstanding. It was noted that assurance is needed on how things are processed through Liquid Logic and it was expected that Liquid Logic would provide a greater level of reporting. The points made were noted and would be discussed with the Audit Team.

A member referred to the Disability Supported Accommodation Service and the limited assurance the audit had produced and drew attention to the likely changes in the support needs of the users of the service over time. Attention was also drawn to the management of the budget which did not meet the demands of the service.

Officers reported that the service had received an audit in view of concerns over budget overspends and to understand the service activity to be able to set a more accurate budget and introduce measures to better control this. It was noted that the use of agency staff was not the best use of resources and officers were now building on the recommendations of the audit.

## **Decision**

The Committee noted the report and comments made.

(Councillor Ahmed Ali declared a personal interest for the reason that he is a Council appointed representative to: Adoption Counts.)

## **AC/20/20 Outstanding Audit Recommendations – ICT Licensing**

The Committee considered the report of the of the Director of ICT which provided an update on the actions taken to address issues highlighted previously to reduce risk, barriers to full implementation and management rationale for accepting the current,

reduced level of risk. The Director addressed the Committee and explained that the audit had taken place in 2018 to look at licensing in place across the Councils IT systems and the work that has taken place since the completion of the audit.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member questioned the audit of licences and asked if this work had reduced the overall cost to the Council. Also, would officers be looking to save on the cost of licences going forward.

It was reported that figures were not available on the cost implications to the council, although it was now possible to check on the status of licences and if one was required. The cost of Microsoft rental would be based on usage and would be assessed on whether it is the most efficient model based on projections.

A member asked how centralised decision making is undertaken in respect software asset management for smaller specialised systems used by the Council.

The Committee was informed that the management of the decision making process is combined between both centrally and within the departments concerned. ICT work with departments where checks are made on the appropriateness of software and to ensure that similar software is not already available within the organisation.

## **Decision**

The Committee noted the report and the actions taken in response to the Internal Audit of software licensing and the decision of management to accept a much reduced level of residual risk.

## **AC/20/21 Outstanding Audit Recommendations - Quarter 2**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer / Head of Audit and Risk Management report which provided a summary of the current implementation position and arrangements for monitoring and reporting internal and external audit recommendations. The Head of Audit and Risk Management introduced the report. The Committee's attention was brought to Section 3.5 of the report set out those recommendations outstanding overdue by nine months:

- Adults: Transition to Adult Services (3 of which 2 partially implemented)
- Adults: Disability Supported Accommodation Services: Quality Assurance Framework (2 partially implemented)
- Adults: Management Oversight and Supervision (1)
- Adults: Mental Health Casework Compliance (6 of which 3 partially implemented)
- Core: ICT Software Licensing (3 of which 2 partially implemented)
- Core: Purchase Cards (1)
- Childrens Services: Assessed and Supported Year in Employment (2 partially implemented)

- Children Services: Management Oversight and Supervision (1)

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member referred to outstanding recommendations and confirmations from departments and the follow up work undertaken to address this and was informed that those outstanding recommendations would be addressed from meeting with management of the services concerned and reported to a future meeting.

A member referred to outstanding recommendations in respect of Adult Services and the importance of concentrating on addressing those areas of outstanding concern.

The City Treasurer welcomed the comments of the Committee in respect of Adult Services and referred to the work ongoing and undertook to consider and discuss with the Chair and the Head of Audit and Risk Management on the best way of approaching the areas of concern raised.

### **Decision**

The Committee noted the current process and position in respect of high priority Internal Audit recommendations.

### **AC/20/22 Risk Management Strategy and Risk Register**

The Committee received a presentation from the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer / Head of Audit and Risk Management providing an update and background and progress on the Corporate Risk Register. The Committee was informed that a report on the Corporate Risk Register could not be submitted for the reason that report had not been presented to the Senior Management Team.

The Committee was informed that the standard process for the Corporate Risk Register (CRR) was suspended during Covid19 crisis in favour of dynamic incident management approach with high frequency of risk and issue reporting. A formal review process has restarted and this is due to confirm the Corporate Risk Register in November 2020.

The areas of risk that have been impacted by Covid19 are as follows:

- Organisational capacity, resilience and business continuity
- Finance and Funding: 2020/21, 2021+ and capital programme
- Health and Care integration and adult social care improvement
- Responding to climate change
- ICT programmes, resilience and security
- Information risk management and data security
- Health and safety of staff and residents
- Adaptation to new ways of working
- Affordable housing and Northwards
- Post EU Exit and supply chain resilience
- Disruption to education and learning
- Safeguarding vulnerable adults and children

- Equality and inclusion

A Corporate Risk Register report would be submitted to the October or November meeting of the Committee.

A member commented that it was important to have a Risk Register presented to the Committee before February 2021 in view of the length of time since the last report (March 2019).

Officers were asked if more could be done to include the agile, real time reporting approach that has been used since the impact of Covid. The Committee was informed that it was anticipated that this would be included because it is responsive and is easy to produce.

A member asked officers if the March 2020 Risk Register could be circulated to members of the Committee in advance of the updated Risk Register report.

### **Decision**

To note the presentation and the comments made.

### **AC/20/23 Annual Work Programme - draft**

The Members considered the Committee's work programme.

### **Decisions**

1. To note the Annual Work Programme.
2. To agree that a meeting of the Committee will take place on 13 October 2020.

### **AC/20/24 Exclusion of Public**

#### **Decision**

To exclude the public during consideration of the following item 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.

### **AC/20/25 Annual Counter Fraud Report**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer / Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management which provided a summary of the anti-fraud arrangements and investigation work undertaken during 2019/20, with particular focus on the work delivered by Internal Audit.

The Committee agreed that it was satisfied with the assurance provided by the actions outlined within the report submitted.

.

### **Decisions**

To note the report.



## **Health and Wellbeing Board**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 26 August 2020**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adult Health and Wellbeing (Chair)  
Dr Ruth Bromley, Chair Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
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:**

Councillor Richard Leese, Leader of the Council  
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children's Services and Schools  
Vicky Szulist, Chair, Healthwatch  
Dr Tracey Vell, Primary Care representative - Local Medical Committee

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

Councillor Nigel Murphy, Deputy Leader  
James Binks, Director of Policy, Performance and Reform, MCC

### **HWB/20/16 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 July 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 8 July 2020.

### **HWB/20/17 Manchester's 10 Point COVID-19 Action Plan - August 2020**

At their meeting of 8 July 2020 the Board had given consideration to the report of the Director of Population Health that presented the detailed COVID-19 Manchester Prevention and Response Plan. At the beginning of this month the Director of Public Health, working with key partners, produced the attached action plan for the month of August.

In addition to the report the Director of Public Health delivered a presentation that included the latest available comparative data and intelligence. He stated that the positive cases of COVID-19 identified were predominantly amongst younger people and these had not resulted in a corresponding increase in hospital admissions, however this situation would continue to be monitored.

In response to questions from the Board regarding measures to protect children returning to education the Director of Public Health stated that consideration was being given to keeping school 'bubbles' as small as practically possible to minimise the impact if pupils were required to self-isolate, adding that he recognised the challenge this represented to larger schools. He stated that positive existing relationships already existed between Public Health and local schools and contingency planning was underway to minimise the potential disruption to a young person's education.

The Director of Public Health stated that work was progressing across Greater Manchester, in line with all relevant medical and public health guidance to ensure a consistent approach was adopted and capacity was available to support schools in the event of an outbreak, including mobilising mobile testing units and home testing if required.

The Chair acknowledged the concerns regarding the return to schools and advised that it was important to build confidence amongst parents and support them with appropriate communications that would be delivered around this message, noting that the wider benefits to children attending school was recognised.

A member of the Board suggested that GPs should be able to refer people for COVID-19 testing, similar to the way they would refer a patient for other routine testing, especially noting that the winter flu season was approaching. The Director of Public Health acknowledged these comments and informed the Board that discussions around this issue were ongoing.

The Chair welcomed the 10 Point COVID-19 Action Plan, noting that it presented a framework to enable the monitoring of progress and that this item would continue to be reviewed as a regular agenda item for the Board. She further thanked all those who had contributed to the production of the Plan.

## **Decision**

The Board note the report.

## **HWB/20/18 The Our Manchester Strategy Reset**

The Board considered the report of the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform that provided an overview of the Our Manchester Strategy reset and invited the Board to comment on how health and wellbeing priorities should be reflected within the Strategy reset.

The Chair stated that it was important when considering the reset to have regard for the individual rather than systems and process, adding that it was essential that the appropriate language was used when engaging with residents on this issue. She further commented that it was important to recognise that the Our Manchester Strategy was not a Council policy but rather a strategy that belonged to the whole of the city and this work would complement the refresh of the Locality Plan.

Members of the Board discussed the need to recognise and address the wider determinants of health, including employment opportunities; environmental factors and the use of decision making to influence change, such as planning powers to promote greener environments and air quality. In addition, it was essential to acknowledge and address inequalities in all forms, with an emphasis on prevention work and the commissioning of services having an emphasis on 'whole life story' work to deliver improved health outcomes for residents.

Members acknowledged the scale of this challenge, noting that a redesign of services would be required with due consideration given to the allocation of resources.

The Director of Policy, Performance and Reform acknowledged the comments raised and stated that an update report would be submitted for consideration by the Board at an appropriate time. He further commented that if Partners would welcome further discussions and engagement on this subject sessions could be organised if they contacted him directly.

### **Decision**

The Board note the report.



## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 30 July 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, Flanagan, Hitchen, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat, Watson and White

#### **PH/20/30 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications (126669/FO/2020, 126668/FO/2020, 125655/FO/2019, 126648/FO/2020, 125573/FO/2019 and 125635/FO/2019), since the agenda was issued, was circulated.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/20/31 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 12 March 2020 as a correct record.

#### **PH/20/32 126669/FO/2020 - Land Bound by Old Mill Street and Great Ancoats Street, Manchester, M4 6EE - Ancoats and Beswick Ward**

The application relates to the erection of a Part 16/ Part 11 storey building to form 106 no. apartments (C3 Use Class) together with ground floor commercial uses (Use Class A1, A2 A3 and/or B1), with associated ancillary space, surface car parking, landscaping and associated works.

The proposals would be in the form of a stepped development with the 16 storey element being sited at the junction of Great Ancoats Street/ Old Mill Street and the 11 storey element being sited on the northern corner of the site facing towards Old Mill Street and the recently completed Phase 3 building which rises to 10 storeys closest to the application site.

Residents would access the building on foot via the main foyer located on the Old Mill Street frontage or via a level access ramp from the car parking area, a separate access for the ground floor commercial unit is also provided from Old Mill Street. A bike store providing 106 spaces would be sited on the ground floor accessed directly from an entrance on Old Mill Street.

Surface car parking for 19 cars including 4 disabled access spaces, together with 9 electric vehicle charging points which would be sited to the rear and side of the building adjacent to the Islington Wharf Phase 1 building accessed via a secure gate from the existing access road leading from Old Mill Street. This unadopted access road also provides access to the car parking associated with the Phase 1 development together with access to the Phase 3 development. Waste collections takes place from this road which would remain unaltered as part of these application proposals.

The ground floor also provides a bin store for the apartments accessed internally via the foyer and a commercial bin store located to the rear of the building.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members raised concerns regarding the non-inclusion of affordable housing as part of the development

The planning officer reported that there was no requirement for affordable housing as part of the proposal for the reason that the proposal is exempt under the Council policy. It was reported that there is an overage agreement in place where the Council may receive a sum from profits made from the development that could be used on affordable housing.

A member referred to the arrangements for water drainage and flood management of the site and whether the proposed condition was sufficient to address this.

It was reported that Flood Risk Management Team had been consulted and were satisfied that the proposed scheme would deal with water run-off from the site.

A member made reference to public realm provision on the site and that the trees would be sited within large planters and making the point that the life span of trees planted in this way was much shorter than trees planted in the ground. Officers were asked if it was possible to add a further condition to ensure trees are planted in the ground where possible and to avoid underground services.

The Planning Officer suggested that an additional condition be added to request officers to explore the possibility of planting trees in the ground where appropriate to avoid underground services and to delegate planting approval to the Director of Planning in consultation with Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee.

A councillor proposed the approval of the application and the Committee gave this their support.

## Decision

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted and subject to the addition of a further condition for the determination of the location for tree planting to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee.

### **PH/20/33      126668/FO/2020 - Land Bound by Silvercroft Street, Crown Street and the Mancunian Way, Manchester, M15 4AX - Deansgate Ward**

The application relates to a proposal for:

- 855 homes with 33 per cent one bedroom, 60 per cent two bedroom, 6 per cent three bedroom and 1 per cent duplexes;
- 244 residents' car parking spaces, with 24 accessible spaces and 24 spaces with electric vehicle charging points (EVCs) (10% provision);
- A public car park with 389 spaces in a three level basement, including 19 accessible spaces (5%) and future proofing for EVCs should the demand arise;
- 855 cycle storage spaces;
- A 0.5ha (hectare) public park;
- Two retail units facing into the public park;
- Ancillary residential amenity space including a private roof terrace and gym;
- A single form entry primary school. Outline planning permission is sought for this part of the development;
- A soft landscape zone to the west of the development;
- A wide lawn and tree planting area located to the south of the development;
- A pedestrian link along Silvercroft Street leading to Great Jackson Street and beyond;
- A shared pedestrian and cycling route along the eastern edge of the public park;
- Infrastructure improvements, such as raised tables, to promote pedestrian connectivity the Crown Street Phase 1 development;
- A servicing road that would run around the perimeter of the site.

The application is a phased hybrid application seeking full planning permission and outline planning permission. Full planning permission comprises three phases:

Phase A: a 52 storey building (building C4), comprising 414 homes, a perimeter servicing and access route, public realm, including partial delivery of a public park and landscaping, and a private residential basement car park.

Phase B: a 52 storey building (building C5), comprising 441 homes, a perimeter servicing and access route, public realm, including delivery of the remaining area of public park and landscaping, and a private residential basement car park.

Phase D: A three storey, publically accessible, basement car park.

Outline planning permission with all matters reserved is sought for:  
Phase C: A 3 storey single entry primary school with outdoor play facilities on the roof, between these buildings and Crown Street Phase 1.

The towers would be linked by a two storey podium that would be situated on the south eastern part of the site. The buildings would look out onto the public park on the north western part of the site. The podium would accommodate double height concierge spaces for each tower, with access from the park, with a lounge and amenity space, including a gym and sauna. The podium would accommodate two double height retail units fronting the park. The towers would begin at second floor with a residents' garden on the roof space of the podium between them. There would be amenity space comprising flexible spaces, such as meeting rooms and private dining areas, looking out on to and with access to the residents' garden. The top two levels of each tower would each accommodate four three-bed duplexes. The roof top of each tower would have a building maintenance unit screened by the same elevational treatment as the floors below.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members of the Committee welcomed the proposal, in particular the inclusion of a park, medical facility and a school building which would help to promote and support sustainable living for residents living in the city centre.

A member referred to the construction management plan and asked officers if the plan is sufficiently robust to protect the quality of life of residents in neighbouring areas in Hulme and Castlefield.

The Committee were advised that the scale of the construction site is large enough to include a concrete production site which would mean that there will be no vehicles carrying concrete to the site. The developer involved has been constructing buildings within the city centre over a number of years and uses a tried and tested management plan which had so far resulted in no complaints being received.

A councillor proposed the approval of the application and the Committee gave this their support.

## **Decision**

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.

**PH/20/34      125655/FO/2019 - Water Street, Manchester, M3 4JQ -  
Deansgate Ward**

The application relates to a planning permission previously granted for the demolition of all buildings and structures and the erection of a 32 storey residential building

comprising 350 homes (Class C3) with retail uses at ground floor (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4); an 8 storey mixed use building comprising workspace (B1), with retail uses (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4) and residential live/work uses; and, the creation of new public realm, landscaping, car and cycle parking, access and other associated works.

The application would supersede the Tower 1 element of the previous permission with a 32 storey building comprising 390 Co-Living Apartments with 210no. 2-, 3- and 4-bed shared apartments and 180no. studios with 870 Bedspaces. There would be ancillary amenity space on four floors consisting of residents' amenity space, a gym, commercial space, and self-storage. There would be 152 cycle spaces in the building and 40 Sheffield stands in the public realm.

80% of the 870 bedspaces would be within the Duo, Trio or Quad units which would all be single occupancy. The Duo, Trio and Quad (2, 3 and 4 bed) units could be a primary residence and would only be available on tenancies from 6-months upwards. When single occupancy is taken into account, each of the shared units meets or exceeds NDSS, without taking into account access to shared amenity. Bedroom areas would provide as much useable floorspace as possible. Each apartment will have a shared communal kitchen and lounge.

The studios would be available solely on short-term lets, up to 6 months in length, so would not be a primary residence. This would be controlled via the Section 106 Agreement and subject to action if there is a breach of the agreement. The one bedroom units in development are targeted at those requiring a short term base in the city centre.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members expressed concern at the small size of the one bedroom units and referred to the mitigation that the tenancy agreement for the units is limited to six months only. The point was made that the units' limited space could impact on the quality of life of residents living there. Co-living is a new concept and untested in Manchester and there were concerns that this may not be an appropriate development for the city and should be tested on a smaller scale first. Concern was expressed that the proposal would conflict with policies on space standards and sustainable communities and the cluster. Reference was made to the limited number of mobility adaptable units (25) and the absence of on-site disabled parking for the development. Reference was made to the meeting of the Executive – Minute number Exe/20/75 Co-living in Manchester and the conflicting nature of the planning proposal to the terms for co-living set out the Executive report.

It was proposed that the committee be minded to refuse the application on the basis of the scale of the development and number and size of co-living units and the lack of disabled parking bays proposed are in conflict with current space standard and community sustainability policies and the terms set out within the 'Co-living in Manchester' report to the Executive (3 July 2020). That was put to the vote and carried.

## Decision

Minded to refuse on the basis of the scale of the development and number and size of co-living units and the lack of disabled parking bays proposed are in conflict with current space standard and the terms set out within the Co-living in Manchester report to the Executive (3 July 2020).

The application was deferred and the Director of Planning asked to bring a report back which addresses the concerns raised and whether there are reasons for refusal that could be sustained.

### **PH/20/35      126648/FO/2020 - Water Street, Manchester, M3 4JQ - Deansgate Ward**

This application relates to planning permission previously been granted for the demolition of existing structures and the erection of a 36-storey residential building (Class C3) with retail uses at lower levels (Classes A1, A2, A3 or A4); new public realm and landscaping, including the first phase of a new riverside park and walkway, provision of external seating areas, car and cycle parking, access arrangements and highways works, rooftop plant and other associated works". (ref:114723/FO/16).

The proposal would supersede the Tower 2 element of (114723/FO/16). Given the changes to the baseline context since the original permission was approved, a fresh standalone EIA has been undertaken in support of the planning application.

This proposal would supersede the Tower 2 element of the previous permission with a 36 storey building comprising Co-Living Apartments with 188 no. 2-, 3- and 4-bed shared apartments and 186 studios with 806 Bedspaces. There would be ancillary amenity space on four floors consisting of residents' amenity space, a gym, commercial space, and self-storage. There would be 412 cycle spaces in the building and 12 Sheffield stands in the public realm.

77% of the bedspaces would be in the Trio or Quad units which would all be single occupancy. The Trio and Quad (2, 3 and 4 bed) units could be a primary residence and would only be available on tenancies from 6-months upwards. When single occupancy is taken into account, each of the shared units meets or exceeds NDSS, without taking into account access to shared amenity. Bedroom areas would provide as much useable floorspace as possible. Each apartment will have a shared communal kitchen and lounge.

The studios would be available solely on short-term lets, up to 6 months in length, so would not be a primary residence. This would be controlled via the Section 106 Agreement and subject to action if there is a breach of the agreement. The one bedroom units in development are targeted at those requiring a short term base in the city centre.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members in considering the application indicated that the application be minded for refusal on the basis that the application is not consistent with Core Strategy Policies: CC3, CC6, CC9 (impact on St Johns Conservation Area) and CC10 current Space Standards and the terms of the Executive report 'Co-living in Manchester' (3 July 2020) and the inadequacy of the Section 106 agreement which seeks to correct the conflict with the council's Space Standards, scale of the development and detrimental impact on the surrounding area. Reference was also made to the limited number of disabled parking places for the development.

It was proposed that the committee be minded to refuse the application on the basis of the scale of the development and number and size of co-living units and the lack of disabled parking bays proposed are in conflict with current space standard and community sustainability policies and the terms set out within the 'Co-living in Manchester' report to the Executive (3 July 2020). The vote on the proposal to be minded to refuse was lost and Committee then voted on the substantive recommendation to approve, and that was carried.

## **Decision**

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.

### **PH/20/36      125573/FO/2019 - Plot 11 First Street Comprising Land Bound by Hulme Street to the North, Wilmott Street to the East, the Unite Parkway Gate Development and Mancunian Way to the South and Medlock Street to the West, Manchester - Deansgate Ward**

This application relates to the erection of four buildings ranging from 10 to 45 storeys linked by areas of public realm and private amenity space. 2 of the buildings would sit on a podium. The gas main on Newcastle Street has informed the layout and distribution of the buildings. Block A would be 10 storeys at the corner of Hulme Street and Wilmott Street and step up to 18 storeys and then 22 storeys along Hulme Street. (70.6m high). Block B would step from 18 storeys to 22 storeys and then to 26 at the corner of Chester Street and Wilmott Street (82.3m high). Block C would be 17 storeys fronting Mancunian Way and step down to 13 and then 10 storeys into the heart of the site (52.3m high). Block D would be a 45 storey tower (138.9m high).

The development would contain 1349 units with 609 apartments (284 one bed, 112 two bed, 89 three bed, 46 four bed, 78 five bed) and 875 studios. The studios would include 30 super, 23 deluxe, 240 premium, 309 standard and 273 compact units (2224 bed spaces total). Communal amenity facilities would include a cinema, co-working space, health and well-being facilities, café, a communal kitchen and dining area and a resident's lounge. The development would be run as a single operation

but each building would have a separate entrance with a reception & management offices.

Blocks A and B would contain a café, double height health and wellbeing space, bike store, plant, bin store, substation, laundry and management suite; Ground and First floor shared amenity areas (lounge/ kitchen/ dining) ( 5,562 sq.m and external private terrace and garden areas (2,470m<sup>2</sup>).

Block C would have amenity space, bike store, plant, substation, bin store and management suite; Ground and First floor shared amenity areas (1,157 sq.m) (lounge/ kitchen/ dining).

Block D would have a bike store, plant, substation, car park, management suite and bin store; first floor and 'sky lounge' (44<sup>th</sup> floor) amenity areas (lounge/ kitchen/ dining) (3,146 (GEA) sq.m) and external first floor and external private terrace and garden areas (1636m<sup>2</sup>).

The applicants consider that shared amenity space in centralised zones would encourage more social interaction than space on individual floors. It would also interact with the external green spaces.

For the purposes of this Report a 'unit' is a room within an apartment and a 'studio' is a self-contained single occupancy unit. Just over 10% (149 units) of the shared-living rooms / studios would be fully accessible or adaptable. The proposed wide range of accommodation types would provide a range of options that people could move around in according to their current life circumstances.

All accommodation would be fully furnished and bills would be with all-inclusive and cover rent, resident relations, concierge, superfast internet, all utilities and taxes, daily events and gym membership in one monthly payment' Unlike mainstream residential accommodation, large deposits would not be required. All residents would have access to the communal facilities and external amenity spaces and have a private bathroom and cooking facilities within their own accommodation.

The applicants have stated that Co-living accommodation aims to provide accommodation at a lower price point than more established models such as Private Rental Sector (PRS). The rent for around a quarter of the units would equate to median salary figures for those who obtained first degree qualifications and entered full-time paid work. The price point would be accessible to a range of incomes and deliver cost-effective living options which could be attractive to key workers. The all-inclusive bills should represent a saving over comparable rental accommodation. The reduction or removal of travel costs due to the accessible city centre location should further reduce overall outgoings.

1349 bedspaces would be in accommodation which would comply with the closest applicable National Described Space Standards and Manchester Space Standards. 396 apartments/508 bedspaces would be a mix of 1 and 2 bedroom units some with ensuite bathrooms. 213 apartments/841 bedspaces would be 3 to 5 bed units each with en-suite rooms and shared lounge spaces and kitchens.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

It was proposed that there be a site visit for the reason that it would be helpful for the Committee to see the site and adjacent areas and the impact on listed buildings at Cambridge Mill and MacIntosh Mill. That was voted upon and carried.

### **Decision**

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

(Councillor Riasat left the meeting.)

### **PH/20/37 125635/FO/2019 - Tatton Arms, Boat Lane, Northenden, Manchester, M22 4HR - Northenden Ward**

This application relates to the conversion of the former Tatton Arms public house to create 7 new residential (C3) apartments and development of a further 21 new apartments (C3) to the rear following partial demolition of existing extensions together with associated access, parking and landscaping. The applicant is seeking planning permission for the partial demolition of existing extensions and conversion of former Tatton Arms public house to create 7 new residential (C3) apartments and development of a further 21 new apartments to the rear, with associated access, parking and landscaping. There would be 28 apartments in total, 8 one bed, 18 two bed and 2 three bed.

The development would also involve a detailed landscaping scheme to include tree planting, the formalisation of the Trans Pennine Trail, the creation of a footpath to the north of Boat Lane, car parking for the development and for the neighbouring Boathouse cottages, bin storage, bin storage for the neighbouring Boathouse cottages and cycle parking.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

It was proposed that the committee approve application and the committee gave this their support.

### **Decision**

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.



## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 27 August 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, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Hitchen, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeline Monaghan, and White

**Also Present:**

Councillors O'Neill (written submission), Wheeler, Johns

#### **PH/20/38      Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications (126435/FO/2020, 126608/FO/2020 and 125871/LL/2020), since the agenda was issued, was circulated.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/20/39 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2020 as a correct record.

#### **PH/20/40      126435/FO/2020 - 27 Trenchard Drive Manchester M22 5LZ - Woodhouse Park Ward**

The application relates to the conversion of the existing dwelling to create two three bedroom dwellings; and the erection of two four bedroom dwellings with associated car parking and landscaping.

The application site measures 1.421m<sup>2</sup> in size and is located on the western side of Trenchard Drive. It is irregular in shape and consists of nos. 25 and 27/29 Trenchard Drive. No. 25 Trenchard Drive was a former garage that was converted into a dwellinghouse, without the benefit of planning permission, while nos. 27/29 Trenchard Drive, was originally a pair of semi-detached dwellings that was last used as a single residence (now vacant following a fire).

To the north of the site lies the landscaped buffer associated with a Manchester Airport operated long stay car park and to the west is an enclosed grass paddock associated with The Tatton Arms Public House which is located further south at the junction of Trenchard Drive and Ringway Road. To the south of the site stands a pair of semidetached dwellings. To the east of the site, on the opposite side of Trenchard Drive, there is a cleared plot of land (nos. 30-40 Trenchard Drive) which benefits from a planning permission for 15 dwellings (ref. 118924/JO/2018). The neighbourhood consists predominantly of two storey semi and terraced dwellings, though several commercial properties are located close to the junction of Trenchard Drive and Ringway Road, namely The Tatton Arms Public House, the Moss Nook Restaurant (currently vacant) and a detached two storey office premises called Moss Nook House.

The applicant is proposing the conversion of nos. 27/29 Trenchard Drive into a pair of 3 bed semi-detached dwellings, the erection of a rear dormer extension to nos. 27/29 Trenchard Drive, the erection of a 3 storey pair of 4 bed semi-detached dwellings to the side of nos. 27/29 Trenchard Drive, provision of 8 car parking spaces, 2 per dwelling and to facilitate the proposal the existing conservatory and no. 25 Trenchard Drive (the converted garage) would be demolished.

The Chair confirmed that Local Ward Councillor O'Neill had requested that the Committee consider a site visit and would have spoken on the Item but had problems accessing the virtual committee meeting.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to present the Item.

A Planning Officer requested that the Committee draw their attention to the supplementary information provided for broader context on the plans for this development.

The Chair invited an objector to speak.

The objector also requested that the Committee make a site visit and the Chair confirmed that that request had been received via a Local Ward Councillor and would be addressed within the meeting.

The Chair invited the agent for the applicant to speak and the applicant's agent addressed the Committee with information about the application.

The Chair invited a Planning Officer to speak.

The Planning Officer referred to the reduction of dwellings explaining that this was due to concerns over the visual aspect and issues regarding car parking and stated that the reduction will add to the space available on the site making more green space and availability for two car parking spaces for each property. The Planning Officer stated that the design was in keeping with other properties along Trenchard Drive with a similar gable end feature. The Planning Officer explained that there were no concerns from Highways regarding traffic.

The Chair invited the members of the committee to speak

Councillor Lyons raised concerns of over-development and construction plans of the proposal due to its location within a small community and proposed a site visit to achieve a better understanding of the development and its potential impact on the local community in terms of road use by construction vehicles.

Councillor Lovecy seconded the proposal for a site visit to address any concerns, mentioning that the dwelling spaces will double from two to four, but welcomed the reduction in the development from five to four properties.

A Planning Officer then addressed the issue of construction management stating that there had been a condition for a full construction management plan to be agreed which requests evidence that residents have been consulted.

The Committee voted and gave its support for a site visit.

### **Decision**

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

### **PH/20/41      125655/FO/2019 - Water Street, Manchester M3 4JQ - Deansgate Ward**

The application relates to a site, known as T1, is 0.32 hectares and bounded by Water Street, Manchester Goods Yard, and Grape Street. It is accessed from Water Street and is in use as a construction site for Manchester Goods Yard. The original planning permission (114385/FO/2016) approved the Manchester Goods Yard offices and a residential 'Tower (T1). Manchester Goods Yard is under construction and this proposal would replace the 'T1' element of that permission. The site is in the Castlefield Conservation Area and is part of a Masterplan and Strategic Regeneration Framework.

At its meeting on 30 July 2020 the Committee resolved that it was 'minded to refuse' the application on the grounds that the number of units proposed was too large and it did not provide sufficient parking for disabled people. They requested officers to bring a report to the next meeting which addresses these concerns.

This proposal would supersede the Tower 1 element of the previous permission with a 32 storey building comprising 390 Co-Living Apartments with 210no. 2-, 3- and 4-bed shared apartments and 180no. studios with 870 Bedspaces. There would be ancillary amenity space on four floors consisting of residents' amenity space, a gym, commercial space, and self storage. There would be 152 cycle spaces in the building and 40 sheffield stands in the public realm.

80% of the 870 bedspaces would be within the Duo, Trio or Quad units which would all be single occupancy. The Duo, Trio and Quad (2, 3 and 4 bed) units could be a primary residence and would only be available on tenancies from 6-months upwards. When single occupancy is taken into account, each of the shared units meets or

exceeds NDSS, without taking into account access to shared amenity. Bedroom areas would provide as much useable floorspace as possible. Each apartment will have a shared communal kitchen and lounge. The studios would be available solely on short-term lets, up to 6 months in length, so would not be a primary residence. This would be controlled via the Section 106 Agreement.

The Chair invited a Planning Officer to make comment on the application.

A Planning Officer stated that they had looked at addressing the Committee's concerns following the previous Committee meeting on 30 July 2020, stating that the applicant had secured 35 car parking spaces in an adjacent building for the sole use of disabled parking for both buildings, namely T1 (minded to refuse at the previous committee meeting) and T2 (approved at the previous committee meeting). The Planning Officer confirmed that if T1 were not approved then the disabled parking spaces would not be available for T2. The Planning Officer informed the Committee that the scheme was in keeping with the Executive resolution and that if the Co-living scheme were to be subject to a more dispersed approach it would use up more land and have a broader consequence on other requirements for commercial space in the St John's area and create a larger challenge in managing a series of smaller schemes compared to the single purpose building presented in this application.

The Planning Officer then confirmed that the scheme approved by the Committee (T2) accommodated a larger number of occupants than the scheme being considered here (T1). The Planning Officer then addressed previous concerns of the Committee around the longevity of the project and any future plans for the building should the Co-living scheme not deliver and stated that the applicant had provided a conversion plan, to a mainstream living purpose, which would be put in place in the event that the initial purpose was not successful. The Planning Officer then informed the Committee that the more affordable accommodation in the building was set within units comprising of larger spaced dwellings and that the studios were to be the more costly. The Planning Officer's final comment was that, due to the approval of the linked scheme at T2, Planning Officers did not feel that a refusal from the Committee could be substantiated.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

A Member of the Committee sought clarity on what tenants options would be when they were ready to co-habit with a partner, for instance, and the Planning Officer responded to the Member that the dwellings in this scheme were all for the purpose of single occupancy.

Members expressed concerns over whether the Manchester spatial standards were being met, the proposals of ensuring short term tenancies of six months maximum were maintained and that the proposal is untested.

Councillor Lyons proposed the application be minded to refuse on grounds of inadequate living space and that it is counterintuitive to the cautious approach set out in the Executive report.

Councillor Lovecy seconded the proposal stating that there was a further consideration to take into account regarding Coronavirus when dealing with shared dwelling spaces, stating that it would require several tenants to self-isolate in the event of one occupant contracting the virus.

The Planning Officer addressed the concerns stating that the space requirements were met within the dwellings with potential to be permanent and that only the dwellings with a maximum six month tenancy did not meet the standards. The Planning Officer referred to concerns around Coronavirus stating that the accommodation may not be available commercially for four years.

The Director of Planning made comment on the Committee's previous minded to refuse decision stating that that decision had been made on the basis of the lack of disabled car parking and that the matter had now been addressed and it was now felt that there was no reason for refusal which could be substantiated.

The Committee voted and gave support to the decision to minded to refuse.

### **Decision**

Minded to refuse on the basis that the number and size of co-living units are in conflict with current space standard and the terms set out within the Co-living in Manchester report to the Executive (3 July 2020).

The application was deferred and the Director of Planning asked to bring a report back which addresses the concerns raised and whether there are reasons for refusal that could be sustained.

**PH/20/42      125573/FO/2019 - Plot 11 First Street, Deansgate Ward Comprising Land Bound by Hulme Street to the North, Wilmott Street to the East, the Unite Parkway Gate Development and Mancunian Way to the South and Medlock Street to the West, Manchester - Deansgate Ward**

This application is for the construction of four buildings of heights varying from 10 storeys to 45 storeys together comprising Co-living bedspaces (use class Sui Generis) and associated amenity facilities, with ground floor commercial units (Use classes A3 (Café / Restaurant and D2 (Gym)), private amenity space and public realm comprising hard and soft landscaping, car parking and cycle facilities and other associated works.

Consideration of this application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 30 July 2020 to enable a site visit to take place to allow Members to assess the impact that the proposed development would have on nearby listed buildings. The site visit was undertaken on the morning of 27 August 2020.

A Planning Officer addressed the Committee with information about the application.

The applicant's agent attended the meeting and addressed the Committee.

A Local Ward Councillor gave objection to the proposal on the grounds of the height of the buildings with the tallest being two storeys shorter than the Beetham Tower which the Local Ward Councillor felt was not in keeping with this area, stating that First Street was comprised of mid-rise towers of public realm usage. The Local Ward Councillor further stated that the development would overshadow areas of Deansgate and Hulme and sit uneasily with the immediately local aspects of Manchester's industrial history. The Local Ward Councillor made comment that the Co-living aspect is in conflict with current space standard and felt concerned around the impact of the Coronavirus restrictions when applied to living in such dwellings. Further comment was made about the large increase of population in this Local Ward from this development alone and how that would present with more traffic and round the clock disturbances from food deliveries and taxis. In conclusion the Local Ward Councillor stated that whilst the open green space proposed as part of the development was welcomed, it was outweighed by the harm that allowing this application would present on the local surrounding area.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to address the concerns of the Local Ward Councillor.

The Planning Officer questioned the comment that the building was too tall by stating that the site was situated at the main gateway entrance to the City Centre from the Airport and South Manchester motorway network and that this would be a prime location for such a development, being built on open land and away from the more historic aspects of the City Centre. The Planning Officer requested that the Committee take note of the inclusion of a park on the site and that the site in its current state was overdue for development.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

A Member raised concerns around the close proximity of this development to listed buildings at Mackintosh Mill and Cambridge Street Mill, the loss of residential amenities in the north side of Hulme, the potential for a conversion plan if the Co-living scheme was not successful, if short term tenancies for Co-living (i.e. 2 weeks) were to be considered and any arrangements concerning the access and egress of vehicles to and from the site.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to address the Member's concerns.

The Planning Officer stated that the closest aspect of the proposed development to the listed buildings is lower than the previous proposal for this site and lower than other consented similar schemes. Addressing the issue of a conversion plan the Planning Officer confirmed that this had been taken into account and would not require any structural work. On the subject of short term lettings the Planning Officer confirmed that this type of arrangement is already occurring in the City Centre in serviced apartments and hotels and that the Co-living method of living addressed the needs of this style of living arrangement. In conclusion the Planning Officer confirmed that there is an access strategy for the First Street site as a whole.

Further concerns were raised by a Member on the previous proposal for this site having provision for a Primary School and a medical practice which was not included in this proposal, having a public green space instead. The Member questioned the lack of residential community facilities.

The Planning Officer responded to address the concerns and state that a development nearby would house a Primary School and that previously the implied demand for public use amenities was underused and led to empty commercial units finally adding that the inclusion of green, open space would be easily accessible from Hulme.

Councillor Davies proposed the committee be minded to refuse the application and this was seconded by Councillor Lyons.

The Committee voted and gave their support to the decision of minded to refuse.

(Councillor Monaghan abstained from vote due to a poor internet connection which did not allow her to take part in the full consideration of the application).

### **Decision**

Minded to refuse on the basis of the impact on neighbouring residential areas in Hulme and also the development is in conflict with policies on current space standard and previous reports from the Executive.

The application was deferred and the Director of Planning asked to bring a report back which addresses the concerns raised and whether there are reasons for refusal that could be sustained.

(Councillor N Ali left the meeting at this point and did not return).

### **PH/20/43      126608/FO/2020 - Land to the South of Store Street, Manchester, M1 2NE - Piccadilly Ward**

This application is regarding the erection of part 4, part 11 storey residential (Class C3) development (with roof top plant room) comprising 66 (Class C3) residential units (3 x 2 bed town houses, 46 x two bed apartments and 17 x one bed apartments) together with associated car parking (10 spaces including 5 Electric Vehicle Charging spaces), cycle parking (66 spaces) communal roof terrace (level 6), landscaping and ancillary infrastructure including rooftop PV solar panels, alterations to access onto Store Street

The site is 0.1 hectares and bounded by Store Street, the Ashton Canal, the 3 storey William Jessop Court, a retaining wall and the junction of Millbank Street and Store Street. The elevated Ashton canal passes the southern boundary and crosses Store Street on an aqueduct, which is grade II\* listed. The site is 200 m North West of Piccadilly Station and is close to all sustainable transport options. The site is in Flood Risk Zone 1 (low risk) and is within a critical drainage area.

The application proposes the erection of part 4, part 11 storey building comprising 66 shared ownership homes (100% affordable) delivered through a joint venture with a registered provider. It would include 3 two bed town houses, 46 two bed apartments and 17 one bed apartments.

20% of the affordable homes would be secured through a S106 Agreement and the remaining 80% as a condition of grant funding from Homes England. The shared ownership housing model requires that the homes would be available for purchase at between 25% and 75% of market value. Occupiers who have entered into a Shared Ownership Lease would be allowed to 'staircase' to full ownership.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee with information about the application.

The Chair invited a Local Ward Councillor to speak on the application.

A Ward Councillor gave support to the application giving mention to it being a proposal of 100 percent affordable housing by Government definition and 20 percent genuinely affordable by the Manchester definition. The Ward Councillor welcomed the addition of City Centre premises that were classed as affordable and the two to one provision on tree planting whereby any one tree removed to develop the site would be replaced with two.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Councillor Lyons confirmed that he had declared an interest on the Item and was speaking as a Local Ward Councillor, not as a Member of the Committee. Councillor Lyons stated that this was the result of Local Ward Councillors putting their values and principles in action and thanked the applicants for working together with them to realise this vision of affordable housing in the City Centre. Councillor Lyons then left the meeting and took no part in the debate or vote on this item.

The Chair again invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

A Member spoke in support of the application on the basis of affordable housing on a shared ownership scheme and the two to one provision on tree planting.

A Member asked if there was any provision in place to halt any property developers purchasing any of the dwellings to sell for a profit.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the S106 scheme would prevent multiple acquisitions of any of the properties.

Councillor Y Dar made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor Kamal.

The Committee took a vote and gave their support to the decision to agree the recommendation

## **Decision**

Minded to approve the application, subject to a legal agreement in respect of securing the provision of 20% on site affordable housing (shared ownership – aligned with Manchester’s average income level) and subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.

**PH/20/44      125871/LL/2020 - 42 - 46 Thomas Street (including 41-45 Back Turner Street) Manchester M4 1ER - Piccadilly Ward**

This application is in regard to the demolition of 42, 44 and 46 Thomas Street (including 41, 43 and 45 Back Turner Street) to facilitate redevelopment of the wider site under extant planning permission and listed building consent ref: 113475/FO/2016 and 113476/LO/2016

Planning permission and listed building consent were granted in August 2017 to develop a site bounded by Thomas Street, Kelvin Street and Back Turner Street. The scheme incorporated 7 Kelvin Street, a grade II listed building, but removed the 3 storey former weaver’s cottages known as 42-46 Thomas Street (including 41, 43 and 45 Back Turner Street). 7 Kelvin Street is on the City Council’s local Buildings at Risk list.

Due to the particular circumstances of the matter a site visit had been arranged for members which took place in the morning prior to the committee meeting.

The meeting was informed that the Weavers Cottages referred to were not then listed but they were considered to be non-designated heritage assets. The impact of their loss was properly considered in the context of national and local planning policies. They have been heavily altered internally and much original fabric and character has been lost.

The application approved the erection of a 4/5 storey building that retained and incorporated the Grade II Listed 7 Kelvin Street, to provide 20 dwellings, with active ground floor uses, following the demolition of numbers 42 to 46 Thomas Street (113475).

A related application for listed building consent approved alterations and repair and change of use of 7 Kelvin Street to 3 apartments as part of a 4/5 storey residential development (113476).

In July 2018, following the acquisition of the site, the Weavers cottages were designated as Grade II Listed. As such all remaining buildings on-site are now grade-II listed. Applications to discharge pre-commencement conditions on the site have been submitted and are currently under consideration

The Chair invited a Planning Officer to introduce the Item.

The Planning Officer requested the Committee take note of a minor amendment in the supplementary agenda.

The Chair then invited the applicant to speak and the applicant addressed the Committee with information about the application.

A Ward Councillor spoke in objection to the proposed demolition and redevelopment of the site, stating that the grade-II listed buildings in question consist of three mill workers cottages and are survivors of Manchester's industrial and working class heritage. The Ward Councillor gave mention to Historic England having submitted a representation which detailed why they felt the demolition should not be allowed and that Historic England believed there was still a viable use for the buildings in their current state. The Ward Councillor requested the Committee consider a decision of minded to refuse to facilitate further investigations on how the buildings could be developed without losing their heritage character, giving further mention of Heritage England's alleged intention of appealing any proposed demolition and redevelopment.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Councillor Lyons confirmed that he had declared an interest on the Item and was speaking as a Ward Councillor, not as a Member of the Committee. Councillor Lyons made comment that the application was not for renovation but for demolition of a grade-II listed building, stating that the site was structurally sound and inferred that the redevelopment application was for a larger net gain. Councillor Lyons stated that the objection received from Heritage England was one of the strongest he had known in his time as a Ward Councillor. Councillor Lyons requested a motion of minded to refuse and stated that, if achieved, he and other Ward Councillors would work with the developers to facilitate the renovation of these grade-II listed buildings. Councillor Lyons then left the meeting and took no part in the debate or vote on this item.

The Chair invited a Planning Officer to speak on the application.

The Planning Officer gave mention to Heritage England having stated that the loss of the grade-II listed buildings would be considered as substantial harm and that the scheme would be viable if the buildings were kept. The Planning Officer informed the Committee that if they were in approval of the proposal the decision could only be as minded to approve as the matter would then need to be referred to the Secretary of State. The Planning Officer then stated that the situation was unique in that the plot had been purchased and planning permission approved prior to the buildings receiving their heritage status.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members spoke of the useful site visit they had attended and expressed their concern over the proposed demolition of what is now listed as part of Manchester's industrial and working class heritage.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to make a comment.

The Planning Officer stated that the listed building status was confirmed two years ago and that no other scheme had presented itself prior to this application further

stating that there had been a notable volume of objections received in the run up to the committee meeting.

Councillor Lovecy proposed the Committee be minded to refuse and this was seconded by Councillor S Ali.

### **Decision**

Minded to refuse on the basis that demolition would be contrary to policies on the conservation of historic assets in the city which represent Manchester's working class heritage.

The application was deferred and the Director of Planning asked to bring a report back which addresses the concerns raised and whether there are reasons for refusal that could be sustained.

### **PH/20/45      127142/FO/2020 - Land to the East of the Fairway Manchester M40 3WS - Moston Ward**

The application site relates to an open piece of land situated along The Fairway within a predominantly residential area of Moston in North Manchester. The site is bounded by residential to the north, east and the west, with Moston Brook Recreational Space to the east. The site is accessed via The Fairway.

The proposal site is irregular in shape with the frontage being narrower than the remainder of the site which opens up as it goes further rearward. It is immediately bounded to the north east of the application site by a sub-station and a detached property identified as no. 51 The Fairway. Moston Brook Recreational Space lies immediately to the south of the site, and to the east residential properties on West Avenue and opposite the site and to the east are residential properties relating to The Fairway.

Currently the frontage of the site is bounded by low timber rail fencing erected by the applicant and connects to the dry stone wall that returns partially along the eastern boundary with the pathway running through to Moston Brook Recreational Space. There is no formal vehicular access to the site with the main access being pedestrianised.

The submitted application proposes the erection of one 2 storey dwellinghouse (Class C3) with associated parking, landscaping and boundary treatment.

The Chair invited the applicant to speak and the applicant addressed the Committee with information about the application.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment and ask questions.

Members welcomed the proposal and the zero loss of trees on the site.

Councillor Lyons moved the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor S Ali.

**Decision**

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

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 24 September 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, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Hitchen, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeline Monaghan, and White

**Also Present:**

Councillors M Dar, O'Neill and Wheeler

#### **PH/20/46      Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications (126431/FO/2020, 125596/FO/2019, 127053/FO/2020 and 126435/FO/2020), since the agenda was issued, was circulated.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/20/47 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 30 July 2020 as a correct record subject to the inclusion of Councillors Riasat and Watson in the list of apologies given at the meeting.

#### **PH/20/48      126431/FO/2020 - Site South of Sportcity Way, East of Joe Mercer Way, West of Alan Turing Way And North of the Ashton Canal at the Etihad Campus Manchester - Ancoats and Beswick Ward**

The application proposes a multi-use arena comprising 68,608 sqm of floorspace with ancillary retail, food and beverage uses.

This 4.46 hectare site is used as a 500 space overspill car park for events at the Etihad stadium. The site is secured with a mesh fence on all sides and contains a number of self-seeded trees and shrubs. Its topography is relatively flat with a gentle slope from south to north before the site drops steeply down to the Ashton Canal.

The site is bounded by Joe Mercer Way (an elevated pedestrian walkway connecting to the Etihad Stadium) which separates the site from the Manchester Tennis and Football Centre located further west, Alan Turing Way, a four lane road with segregated cycle lanes is to the east with the Ashton Canal and the Etihad Metrolink stop to the south.

The applicant's aim is to develop the best arena in Europe in Manchester that would attract the world's top events and shows. They aim to set new standards in terms of arena design and environmental sustainability.

The design would be unique and enable the main auditorium to operate in a variety of different seating modes and host different entertainment and leisure events including music, sport, performances, awards ceremonies and other live entertainment. Its capacity would normally be 20,000 but could be extended to 23,500 for events where a centre stage configuration is used.

The arena would host events on scheduled days throughout the week and year. The operational strategy could occasionally result in events taking place at the same time or same day as football events at the Etihad Stadium. The associated impacts of this are considered in detail in the report.

The auditorium would be custom designed for a much more compact, flexible and intimate configuration compared to comparable capacity venues. The lower tier of the seating bowl would have retractable seating that could be configured in a variety of ways in maximise the spectator experience. The upper tier would project and be lower to the heart of the auditorium to enable a more intimate spectator experience.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to present the Item.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that additional information had been provided within the 'Supplementary Information on Applications' document, previously circulated. Reference was made to representations received from the Manchester Arena and Printworks to have the application referred to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to decide whether the application should be called in for determination, if the Committee was minded to Approve. The Planning Officer reported that all aspects of the scheme had been addressed and this was detailed within the planning report. Reference was made to a representation received from the Executive Vice President of ASM Global (operating company of Manchester Arena), regarding the impact of the development on the Manchester Arena, and which requested the Committee to consider the impact of the application in line with the concerns of other city centre stakeholders. In addition it was reported that the £100million investment planned for the Manchester Arena by ASM Global, may not be justified if the application was approved.

A further representation from ASM Global had suggested that the Market Assessment had not been properly considered by the Council's independent advisor. The planning Officer confirmed that the Council's independent advisors had reviewed the additional work and had confirmed in writing that it did not fundamentally alter their advice that there is robust evidence to support the proposal.

The Committee was advised that if the Committee was Minded to Approve the application, the approval notice would not be issued until the Secretary of State had considered the application.

The Chair invited an objector to speak.

The objector spokesperson addressed the Committee on behalf of ASM Global and other interested stakeholders. Concern was expressed on the impact of the application on the sustainability and vitality of the city centre economy. In addition, concern was expressed on the matters not included within the planning report that were raised in the late representation that had been left unanswered relating to growth in the market and the split from the city centre. The point was made that the forecasts produced in the application had yet to be tested and needed to be fully understood before a decision could be made. Other issues raised related to the impact of the application on the Manchester Arena and the planned investment of £100million by ASM Global. In addition, reference was made to policy C9 which seeks to protect the city centre and the East Manchester Regeneration Framework which was produced to complement the city centre offer. The Committee was advised that the Manchester Arena had the capacity to meet expansion and growth in the market. The application did not provide links to the city centre similar to the Manchester Arena and took potential trade away from city centre businesses.

The Chair invited the applicant's agent to speak on the application. In response to the points raised in the representations it was stated that there is sustainable growth in the market for two city arenas. Other cities have recognised growth in these markets and this would be sustained in Manchester through the increase of the population over the next fifteen years. The evidence produced has been robustly tested independently and this has indicated that the visitor spend generated by a second arena would benefit the city centre economy. It was hoped that a new arena will help spur the operators of the Manchester Arena to invest in the facility and provide the city with two high quality entertainment venues.

A ward councillor addressed the Committee and reported that other ward councillor and local residents in surrounding wards have welcomed the application and supportive recognising the benefits this will bring to the surrounding ward areas such as job creation and apprenticeships.

A ward councillor welcomed the application and referred to the importance of maintaining balance between the two arenas and businesses in the city centre. Reference was made to the positives which the development would bring to East Manchester in the form of jobs during and after construction and the potential of attracting further investment to the area. It was hoped that Manchester Arena could continue to be a world class venue and a second arena could complement this.

A ward councillor referred to parking arrangements for local residents and sought an assurance that there would be no cost to residents or the Council. In welcoming the application and the positive benefit it provides for local residents through jobs and training opportunities, the councillor considered it reasonable that the city could accommodate two arenas. Officers were asked for clarification regarding the overlap of events being held at the new arena and football matches arranged for the Etihad

Stadium and the traffic plan to deal with the large numbers of attendees and vehicles this would attract.

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

A member in welcoming the application and the benefits it would bring to the area and local economy also asked officers to explain the arrangements in place to deal with events at both the arena and the Etihad Stadium.

The Planning Officer responded by explaining that the evidence that has been presented to the Committee had been analysed and the conclusion from this suggests that two arenas could operate successfully in the city. Officers are currently working with the operators of the Manchester Arena regarding their investment proposals which will take a phased approach. The residents parking zone intended for the area around the application site will be set up and operated at no cost to the Council and is subject to a Section 106 agreement. With reference to events clashing on the same day at the arena and the Etihad Stadium, it was reported that special measures would be introduced such as to stagger the start and finish times at each venue. Attendees would also be advised that limited parking would be available and sustainable transport options would be encouraged as well as improvements being made to the three existing walking routes from the city centre.

Officers were asked for clarification on the operation of a travel plan and in view of location of the site of the proposal being on the former Bradford coal mine, could an assurance be given on the safety of the development and impact on surrounding residential homes. With regard to the public realm works in the application would the trees planted be mature trees.

It was reported that the travel plan would be reviewed annually by the Council and the venue operators. The Coal Authority had been consulted on the proposal and was satisfied that the issues raised can be addressed within the application. The Committee was informed that details of the public realm works had yet to be finalised but it was expected that the trees to be planted would be mature/semi mature.

A member referred to the consideration of market assessments as part of the application and asked officers for guidance on this.

It was reported that the application presents a large proposal and market assessment is a material consideration. The applicants have provided a detailed assessment and so had the objectors and the Council had engaged an independent consultant to provide advice. The advice received was there is a market available for two arena venues. The proposed venue would look to facilitate more diverse formats and layouts than the existing arena to open Manchester to different types of event and in doing so would attract a wider regional/national audience and provide a balance to the national economy.

A member referred to a community fund for the three local wards affected by the proposal and asked how this would be monitored. The Committee was informed that this was included in the draft S106 agreement but it was not a material planning consideration and members of the Committee should not consider it in their decision.

Councillor S Ali made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor Y Dar.

The Committee took a vote and gave their support to the decision to agree the recommendation.

## Decision

**Minded to Approve** subject to:-

- i) the signing of a section 106 agreement with regards to the review and expansion of the existing Residents Parking Zone (RPZ), an operational event management strategy, walking route improvement works, local labour commitments and waste management arrangements.
- ii) confirmation that the Secretary of State does not intend to call the application in for his own determination.
- iii) Revision to condition 15 as follows:

*15) Prior to the first use of the arena hereby approved, a strategy for use of the ancillary spaces throughout the arena building, including kiosks to the canal (as shown on drawing BRA-POP-ZZ-01-DR-A-0613 Rev 00 stamped as received by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority, on the 6 March 2020), on non-arena event days shall be submitted for approval in writing by the City Council, as Local Planning Authority.*

*For the avoidance of doubt, this shall include details of the nature of the uses which would take place within the ancillary spaces including which facilities/spaces would be made available, the amount of floorspace to be utilised, operating hours and any management arrangements to ensure authorised access to the arena building only.*

*The use of the ancillary spaces on non-arena event days shall be carried out in accordance with this strategy for as long as the arena is in use.*

*Reason – To facilitate the use of the ancillary spaces on non-arena event days for community use and other appropriate purposes including kiosks to the canal which would support natural surveillance and activity at the arena and Etihad Campus as part of supporting the vitality of the campus and community access to the building pursuant to policies SP1, EC7 and DM1 of the Manchester Core Strategy (2012).*

(Councillor Flanagan declared a personal and pecuniary interest in the application and spoke as a Ward Councillor and took no part in the consideration of the application.)

(Councillor Hitchen declared a personal and pecuniary interest in the application and spoke as a Ward Councillor and took no part in the consideration of the application.)

(Councillor Monaghan did not take part in the consideration of the application or vote.)

**PH/20/49 126944/FO/2020 - Land Bound by Dantzic Street, Gould Street, Williamson Street and Bromley Street (Known As Victoria Riverside) Manchester – Cheetham Ward**

This application is for a proposal comprising 3 residential tower buildings of 37, 18 and 26 storeys above two 6 storey podiums on Dantzic Street to form 634 homes. 611 would be apartments with 13 townhouses and 10 maisonettes. 35% would be one bedroom, 55% two bedroom and 10% 3 bedroom offering a range of choice and accommodation would be attractive to families as well as smaller households.

The tower A, at 37 storeys, is at the junction of Gould Street and Dantzic Street followed by the tower B at 18 storey tower and the tower C at 26 storey tower. The distances between the towers has been maximised for privacy and to maximise views. A lower level block, 6 storey block on Dantzic Street and Bromley Street would include townhouses, maisonettes and commercial uses creating front doors onto the street.

Shared indoor and outdoor amenity spaces would be created on two podiums with private and semi-private amenity space and balconies. Podium A is the south of Bromley Street adjacent to Tower A. Podium B is located to the east of Bromley Street between towers B and C.

This 0.97 hectares vacant site is bounded by Dantzic Street, Gould Street, a railway viaduct and a warehouse unit. It is bisected by Bromley Street which lies in a northwest-southeast orientation. Bromley Street is closed.

The Planning Officer had nothing further to add to the application.

No objector was present at the meeting.

The applicant's representative spoke to the Committee on the application.

The Chair invited member of the Committee to comment on the application.

Members referred to the design of the proposal and officers were asked if the design was age friendly to enable residents to age in place and officers were asked if the proposal would include a local labour agreement to provide employment opportunities for local people.

The Committee was informed that there are a number of types and styles of accommodation proposed including houses and apartments gardens which would be suitable for all age groups. In addition, the Committee was informed that the S106 agreement did include a local labour agreement.

In welcoming the application the Chair noted that the development would include 20% affordable housing across the development.

Councillor S Ali made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor M Watson.

The Committee supported the recommendation.

### **Decision**

Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement in relation to affordable housing and the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted.

#### **PH/20/50      125596/FO/2019 - Land Bounded by Hulme Hall Lane, Varley Street, Iron Street, Coleshill Street and Rochdale Canal Manchester M40 8HH - Miles Platting & Newton Heath Ward**

This application relates to a housing-led mixed use development. It involves 410 new dwellings (Class C3) and 744sq.m of commercial floorspace comprising Class A1 (retail), Class A3 (restaurant/cafe) Class B1 (business/office use), together with recreation open space and landscaping, infrastructure provision and car parking. Following recent changes to planning legislation, the Class A1, A3 and B1 uses now fall within use Class E and the title of the application has been changed accordingly.

There would be a variety of house types ranging in size and design (2 bedroom 4 person, three bedroom 4 person, three bedroom five person and three bedroom six person houses) along with 107 apartments. All would meet the Council's approved space standards.

The development would include two blocks of apartments located along the south western boundary of the site adjacent to Varley Street, close to the junction with Holland Street, with a further two blocks fronting onto Hulme Hall Lane in proximity to Coleshill Street. The apartment blocks would be part four, part five, and five storeys in height. The rest of the site would then include the dwellinghouses, which would be either 2 or 3 storeys in height.

The layout would be in the form of a gird iron pattern of buildings with the majority of houses facing onto the street (some terraces facing the canal would face onto pedestrian routes which link to the proposed highways). Each would have a small rear garden and access to larger shared courtyard areas which would include some off street parking provision. These areas would be secured, On street parking controlled by the use of permits is also proposed.

A range of different tenures are included, build to rent and affordable housing being delivered through a registered provider (One Manchester). Overall there would be 36 Shared Ownership, 34 Affordable Rent, 44 rent to buy and 296 Build to Rent

The proposed commercial floorspace would primarily be located at ground floor level within the apartment block fronting onto Hulme Hall, the café element of the scheme would be located at ground level facing onto the canal with a flat above.

As noted there would be a new highway network into and around the site, which would connect Hulme Hall Lane in an east west direction to Varley Street. Car parking has been provided at a provision of 310 parking spaces, 438 cycle spaces and 22 parking spaces for disabled users which are all included within the proposed development. Parking for the most part is in the form of on street bays and would be managed through a residents permit scheme.

Associated landscaping, boundary treatments, new highways with street trees, and significant site remediation is also proposed. The layout of the site incorporates seven key areas of open space each with its own distinct character but which would create a chain of practical and useable space for future and existing residents.

The scheme would also necessitate the provision of a number of substations within the overall site.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to present the Item.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that additional information had been provided within the 'Supplementary Information on Applications' document, previously circulated. The Committee was informed that an objection had been received from a ward councillor regarding the loss of football pitches and recreational land. As a result of concerns raised an amendment was recommended to be made to the legal agreement to include a payment for the provision of recreational /sports facilities, with the current green space to remain in use until any new or upgraded facility becomes available. In recognising the potential for a 'rat run' through the development it is proposed that a further condition is added with the condition wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning in consultation with the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee. In addition, Condition 7 of the application, referencing offsite highways works on Traffic Regulation Orders would need to be amended to reflect the additional condition. Significant alterations to the canal frontage have been proposed by the applicant and agreed by the Canals and Waterways Trust including the removal of railings and the addition of new access points and these would be subject to an amendment to the existing proposed conditions to ensure full details of accessible access points to the canal are first agreed. A number of remediation works were also proposed and contained within the supplementary information. The recommendation to the Committee remained Minded to Approve subject to the amendment to the legal agreement and the inclusion of further condition and changes to the existing conditions as outlined.

No objector attended the meeting.

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

The Chair invited the Committee to make comments on the application.

A member welcomed the proposal and the opportunity that it would bring to the area but expressed concern on the lack of consultation with local councillors by officers. In addition, concern was expressed regarding a potential rat run through the development which had not been identified in the report. An assurance was sought for a physical barrier would be installed to reduce vehicle speed to protect

pedestrians and better access to the Rochdale Canal for the public. The Committee was informed that there are three pitches as part of the green space and no contact had been made with Sport England on the proposal to remove the pitches. It was requested that any financial agreement be in consultation with local councillors and would benefit local residents. The proposal was welcomed for the reasons that it will provide affordable good quality housing and use a brown field site requiring significant remediation works.

The planning Officer gave an assurance that the additional condition would address the concern of a 'rat run' and the legal agreement would be robustly worded to address the loss of green space and provision of a new or upgraded facility.

A member referred to the use of parking permits as part of the proposal and expressed concern that this may push parking onto existing residential areas and needed to be addressed to prevent it. Reference was also made on the lack of timely consultation with ward councillors on the application. Officers were asked to include ward councillors in the consideration of the additional highways condition.

The Planning Officer reported that the adopted roads within the controlled parking zone would subject to the existing wider controlled parking zone. Private roads would be subject to parking management measures on match days.

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

Director of Planning noted the concerns of members regarding consultations and offered to bring together officers from the service areas concerned to meet with local councillors to work through and address the concerns that had been raised.

A member took issue with the statement from the applicant's agent that local councillors had been consulted and stated that this was not the case. The Chair was requested to write to the Chief Executive to highlight the issues on consultation and involvement of local councillors arising from the application to ensure they are not repeated in future applications.

Councillor G White made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor J Flanagan.

The Committee supported the recommendation.

## **Decision**

1. **Minded to Approve** – subject to a section 106 legal agreement and amendment as outlined relating to a payment towards improved /new facilities to replace the green space to be lost, a clause relating to the timing of delivery of these facilities, a mechanism to re-test the viability of the development in relation to the delivery of affordable housing, should there be a delay in the implementation of the planning permission, together with a further review prior to the occupation of the development, and to finance the future administration, enforcement and maintenance of the residents permit parking scheme. An additional condition to address the creation of a 'rat run' within the development and also rewording of

existing proposed conditions in order that details of accessible access points to the canal are agreed, with the wording to be delegated to the Director of Planning and the Chair of the Planning and Highways Committee a subject to the additional conditions outlined in the supplementary information document.

2. That the Director of Planning facilitate a meeting with local ward councillors and officers involved in the areas of service concerned to address issues that have been identified relating to traffic calming measures arrangements to maintain access to green and recreational space and public access to the Rochdale Canal.

**PH/20/51      127053/FO/2020 - Vacant Land on the corner of Victory Street and Claremont Road Manchester M14 5AE - Moss Side Ward**

This application relates to the erection of four two storey houses with associated car parking and landscaping. The application site comprises vacant land (previously used to accommodate residential housing until between 1961 and 1979) measuring 923m<sup>2</sup> in size.

The land is currently in an unkempt condition, it currently features a number of trees and a significant area of dense vegetation undergrowth, it is located on the west side of Victory Street near to its junction with Claremont Road. The site is located in Moss Side Ward.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to introduce the application. The Planning Officer informed the Committee that additional information had been provided within the 'Supplementary Information on Applications' document, previously circulated. There was no further information to present on the application.

There was no objector to the application and the applicant did not attend the meeting.

Councillor M Watson made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor J Flanagan.

**Decision**

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.

**PH/20/52      126435/FO/2020 - 27 Trenchard Drive Manchester M22 5LZ  
Woodhouse Park**

The application site relates to the conversion of the existing dwelling to create 2 no. three bedroom dwellings; and the erection of 2 x 4 bedroom dwellings with associated car parking and landscaping.

This application was placed before the Planning and Highways Committee on 27 August 2020 and at that meeting the committee deferred deliberation in order to allow Members to undertake a site visit due to concerns about overdevelopment and the impact on the community from construction vehicles.

The application site measures 1,421m<sup>2</sup> in size and is located on the western side of Trenchard Drive. It is irregular in shape and consists of nos. 25 and 27/29 Trenchard Drive. No. 25 Trenchard Drive was a former garage that was converted into a dwellinghouse, albeit without the benefit of planning permission, while nos. 27/29 Trenchard Drive, was originally a pair of semi-detached dwellings that was last used as a single residence (now vacant following a fire).

The Committee had undertaken a site visit to view the development site and surrounding area.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that additional information had been provided within the 'Supplementary Information on Applications' document, previously circulated.

An objector to the application addressed the Committee.

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

A Ward Councillor addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

The Planning Officer advised the Committee that in response to the objections raised regarding overdevelopment it was necessary to show significant harm the development would cause. The size of the development had been reduced and the properties would have larger gardens with tree planting and eight parking spaces.

The Chair invited the Committee to comment on the application.

Members referred to the site visit and opportunity to view the application site and in doing so supported the application, in view of the changes made by the applicant following consultation with planning officers.

Councillor Y Dar made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor S Ali.

### **Decision**

To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted and the Late Representations submitted.

**PH/20/53      125871/LL/2020 - 42 - 46 Thomas Street (including 41-45 Back Turner Street) Manchester M4 1ER - Piccadilly Ward**

This application relates to the demolition of 42, 44 and 46 Thomas Street (including 41, 43 and 45 Back Turner Street) to facilitate redevelopment of the wider site under extant planning permission and listed building consent ref: 113475/FO/2016 and 113476/LO/2016.

At its meeting on 27 August 2020 the Committee resolved that it was 'minded to refuse' this application on the basis that the demolition would be contrary to policies on the conservation of historic assets in the city which represent Manchester's working class heritage. They requested officers to bring a report to the next meeting to address their concerns.

Officers believe that the case setting out why these buildings cannot be retained was clearly set out in the previous report and on that basis they do not believe that a reason for refusal can be substantiated. However, there are policies that seek to protect the historic environment and if Members remain sufficiently concerned about the validity of the case to support the demolition the following reason for refusal is suggested:

The demolition of 42-46 Thomas Street would fail to preserve or enhance the Grade II designated heritage asset causing irreversible harm through the total loss of the buildings which would not meet the tests set out in section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) as a clear and convincing justification for the loss has not been provided and it has not been demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. It is therefore considered to be contrary to Government Guidance contained in Sections 16(2) of (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and The Core Strategy for the City of Manchester, in particular Policy EN3 (Heritage) CC9 (Design and Heritage) and saved policy DC19.1 (Listed Buildings) of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

Notwithstanding the suggested reason for refusal, for the reasons set out in the remainder of the report, the recommendation of officers is that this application be approved subject referral to the Secretary of State in accordance with the Arrangements for handling heritage applications – notification to Historic England and National Amenity Societies and the Secretary of State (England) Direction 2015

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to introduce the report. The Committee was advised that the recommendation of planning officers was that the application should be approved, however if it was the Committee's decision to refuse the application the report provided reasons to support the decision.

No objector attended the meeting.

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

A ward councillor addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

The Planning Officer responded to the issues raised and stated that the buildings were currently in a poor state of repair and it was unlikely that sufficient funds would be available to rescue the buildings and further decline was inevitable. In the current state the buildings had no commercial value.

The invited the Committee to comment on the application.

Members in commenting on the application referred to the heritage value of the buildings and the historical importance they hold in terms of Manchester's textile history. It was considered that the historic value of the building outweighed the value provided by the development and for that reason the application should be refused.

Councillor White made a request to move refuse and this was seconded by Councillor J Hitchen.

### **Decision**

Refuse - the demolition of 42-46 Thomas Street would fail to preserve or enhance the Grade II designated heritage asset causing irreversible harm through the total loss of the buildings which would not meet the tests set out in section 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment) as a clear and convincing justification for the loss has not been provided and it has not been demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss. It is therefore considered to be contrary to Government Guidance contained in Sections 16(2) of (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and The Core Strategy for the City of Manchester, in particular Policy EN3 (Heritage) CC9 (Design and Heritage) and saved policy DC19.1 (Listed Buildings) of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

### **PH/20/54 125655/FO/2019 - Water Street Manchester M3 4JQ - Deansgate Ward**

Consideration of this application was deferred at Committee on 27 August 2020.

At its meeting on 30 July 2020 the Committee resolved that it was 'minded to refuse' the application on the grounds that the number of units proposed was too large and it did not provide sufficient parking for disabled people. They requested officers to bring a report to the next meeting to address these concerns.

The site, known as T1, is 0.32 ha and bounded by Water Street, Manchester Goods Yard, and Grape Street. It is accessed from Water Street and is in use as a construction site for Manchester Goods Yard. The original planning permission (114385/FO/2016) approved the Manchester Goods Yard offices and a residential 'Tower (T1). Manchester Goods Yard is under construction and this proposal would replace the 'T1' element of that permission.

This application would supersede the Tower 1 element of the previous permission with a 32 storey building comprising 390 Co-Living Apartments with 210no. 2-, 3-

and 4-bed shared apartments and 180 studios with 870 Bedspaces. There would be ancillary amenity space on four floors consisting of residents' amenity space, a gym, commercial space, and self-storage. There would be 152 cycle spaces in the building and 40 sheffield stands in the public realm.

Planning Permission has previously been granted for the demolition of all buildings and structures and the erection of a 32 storey residential building comprising 350 homes (Class C3) with retail uses at ground floor (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4); an 8 storey mixed use building comprising workspace (B1), with retail uses (Classes A1/A2/A3/A4) and residential live/work uses; and, the creation of new public realm, landscaping, car and cycle parking, access and other associated works.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to introduce the application.

No objector was present at the meeting.

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

The Chair invited the Committee to comment on the application.

Members of the Committee referred to the issues previously raised by the Committee regarding the scale of the development and the untested concept of co-living in Manchester and the space provided. Reference was also made to the provision of disabled parking and the necessity of ensuring provision is available for residents and visitors without charging at a prohibited level.

The Planning Officer noted the comments made and explained that the units within the development that could be permanent homes do meet space standards. Issues relating to additional parking would be included in the S106 agreement and conditions attached to the approval notice to the applicant.

Councillor S Ali made a request to move the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor N Ali.

## **Decision**

Approve subject to:

- a s.106 covering occupancy, long-term management, payment of Council Tax, reduced rental provision and waste management.
- Inclusion in the s106 agreement of 35 disabled parking spaces for residents and visitors that are not charged at a prohibited level.

(Councillor Monaghan did not take part in the consideration of the application.)

**PH/20/55      125573/FO/2019 - Plot 11 First Street Comprising Land Bound by Hulme Street to the North, Wilmott Street to the East, the Unite Parkway Gate Development and Mancunian Way to the South and Medlock Street to the West Manchester - Deansgate Ward**

This application relates to the construction of four buildings of heights varying from 10 storeys to 45 storeys together comprising Co-living bedspaces (use class sui generis) and associated amenity facilities, with ground floor commercial units (Use classes A3 (Café / Restaurant and D2 (Gym)), private amenity space and public realm comprising hard and soft landscaping, car parking and cycle facilities and other associated works.

Plot 11 First Street Comprising Land Bound By Hulme Street To The North, Wilmott Street To The East, The Unite Parkway Gate Development And Mancunian Way To The South, And Medlock Street To The West, Manchester

At its meeting on 27 August 2020 the Committee resolved that it was 'minded to refuse' the application on the grounds of the impact on neighbouring residential areas in Hulme and the development is in conflict with policies on current space standard and previous reports from the Executive. They requested officers to bring a report to the next meeting to address these concerns.

The site is an integral part of First Street and is clearly within the City Centre. It is part of a broad sweep of land to the north of the Mancunian Way which has been identified for high density development for over 20 years and includes Great Jackson Street, First Street, Circle Square, UMIST/IQ/ID and Mayfield. It is one of the few remaining areas in the City where the Councils commercial and growth ambitions can be delivered. The committee has previously approved schemes within these areas of a similar overall density and what is proposed here is not unusual.

The southern boundary of the site is adjacent to the Mancunian Way which is an interface with Hulme, This stretch of the Mancunian way is 18m in width and includes an elevated section which clearly separates this part of the City Centre from Hulme. The closest part of the development to any residential property in Hulme is 67m. The impacts of the scheme in terms of amenity are clearly set out in the main body of the report and these are all considered to be acceptable. On this basis officers do not believe that a reason for refusal on these grounds could be substantiated.

The Chair invited the Planning Officer to introduce the application.

The Planning Officer made reference to economic information contained within the application which provided an outline of potential benefits of the proposal for:

- employment creation of direct and in direct jobs and apprenticeships;
- inclusion of a local labour agreement;
- the overall benefit the city economy and workforce.

There was no objector present at the meeting.

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

The Chair invited the Committee to comment on the application.

A member referred to size standards of the studio accommodation which had been considered as unacceptable by the Committee. The point was made that during the Committee's site visit it was noted that the residents of Hulme had a view of the

Mancunian Way and this was not shielded in any way. Officers were asked if an agreement could include help with landscaping to improve the view and reduce road noise for Hulme residents.

The Planning Officer explained that the planning response to issues raised on the space standards of the development had not changed. In response to the point raised on the impact of the development on residents of Hulme it was reported this was not mitigation to support refusal of the application.

Members of the Committee raised a concern that applications that have been previously agreed could result in a new altered application which could make refusing difficult for the Committee. The point was made that co-living could result in residents paying more and living in smaller substandard accommodation. Officers were reminded that the Executive report on co-living had recommended caution in the development of proposals and this should be observed in consideration of the application.

The Planning Officer reported that there is no incentive for people to stay in smaller space accommodation for the reason that it is more expensive. The Council's Executive had agreed to use three locations to test the concept of co-living. The Committee was asked to note the development will help to provide choice of different styles of accommodation to meet demand and the management of the development when completed will be of a very high standard. The Committee was advised that the three locations identified for co-living developments were St John's, Piccadilly/ Northern Quarter and the Southern Corridor. The developments proposed would provide around four thousand five hundred units and it was not proposed to bring further developments of this scale at this time. A cautious approach had been taken with the size and scale of the developments as recommended by the Council's Executive. It was projected that users of the short term tenancy arrangement would vary in length and would provide an alternative to staying in an aparthotel.

A member indicated that they would oppose the application for the reasons that the scale and massing of the development would have a detrimental impact on listed building within the vicinity and loss of amenity for Hulme residents.

The Planning Officer stated that the assessment of the impact of the development of listed buildings had been provided in the planning report and was less than the impact of the previously agreed application for the site. On that basis there were no policy based reason to refuse the application.

A member referred to disabled parking arrangements and proposed that an additional forty four spaces be made available for disabled residents and visitors either on site or off site and that this be included in the s106 agreement.

The recommendation for approval of the application subject to the inclusion of forty four additional disabled parking spaces for residents and visitors either on site or off site to be included in the s106 agreement was proposed by Councillor Flanagan and seconded by Councillor S Ali.

## **Decision**

Minded to approve, subject to a legal agreement in respect of the Heads of Term and the inclusion of forty four additional disabled parking spaces for residents and visitors, either on site or off site, to be included in the s106 agreement.

(Councillors N Ali and Monaghan did not take part in the consideration of the application.)