

## **Audit Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 19 January 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 and Watson

Independent Co-opted members: Dr Barker and Dr S Downs

#### **Also Present:**

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

### **AC/21/01 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 26 November 2020 as a correct record.

### **AC/21/02 External Audit Update**

The Committee considered the report of Council's external auditors (Mazars) that provided the Committee with an update on audit work carried out. The Committee was reminded that the external audit of the Council's 2019/20 financial statements and value for money conclusion in November 2020 and the signing the audit report on 30 November 2020. An updated Audit Completion Report with the completed audit findings had been circulated to all members of the Audit Committee. The external auditors are currently waiting to receive the Council's Whole of Government Accounts (WGA) submission. This work will be carried out to instructions issued by the National Audit Office (NAO) and a report will be submitted to the NAO on the conclusions. Any significant findings from this work will be reported to the Audit Committee in a subsequent Audit Update Report. The process of audit planning for the 2020/21 audit will start in January/February 2021 and the Audit Strategy Memorandum will be submitted at the March meeting of the Committee.

Reference was made to the National Audit Office updated Code of Audit Practice that has now been applied from 2020/21. The new Code changes the work that auditors will be required to do, and the related reporting, on Councils arrangements to deliver value for money in their use of resources. The changes to the reporting requirements

will mean that from 2020/21 a value for money conclusion will not be included within the Financial Statements Audit Report. A commentary on the Council's arrangements to deliver value for money will now be included in a new Auditor's Annual Report (which replaces the Annual Audit Letter). The NAO Code requires that where auditors identify weaknesses in Council arrangements they should report recommendations to the Council promptly throughout the year.

The Chair invited questions from members of the Committee.

A member referred to point 8 of the report and requested further explanation of the five themes outlined in the MHCLG's response to Sir Tony Redmond's independent review.

It was reported that the themes had been produced in order to provide more central co-ordination by bringing together the various strands of government. The Committee was informed that it would be unlikely that a single regulator would be established and new more simplified process would be introduced to help local authority accounts to be more accessible. Other recommendations included the importance of appointing independent members to audit committees, member training and the processes used by auditors and the meeting of the responsible council officers at least once a year.

A member referred to the Value for Money opinion provided by the external auditor and asked what the arrangements will now require.

It was reported that the new arrangements would require greater engagement with the Council on the arrangements to deliver value for money rather than to present an opinion. A longer narrative report will be submitted to provide a balanced assessment of the arrangements and processes to highlight changes, to promote good practice or actions needed for improvement.

The City Treasurer reported that the impact of Covid19 would be addressed in the opinion provided by the Council's Internal Audit. The recommendations of the Redmond report were welcomed and work on those had already started in respect budget preparations, value for money opinion and the Council's financial resilience.

A member referred to the issues reported on by the external auditor including the valuation of property, pensions and other group audits and asked whether this is a common theme with other local authority audit work. Reference was also made to demise of the Audit Commission and the use of private audit companies providing services for the public sector and the challenge for companies to access this very specialist market. Reference was also made the deadline for annual accounts and if this may be amended and if so what would the likely outcome be to producing final accounts on time.

It was reported that this work was common to local authorities and auditors were addressing the work to find means to make improvements in those organisations. The public sector is reliant on the use of private external audit firms, however the PSA did provide a level of independence and controlled the appointment of auditors through a tendering process. The tendering process had drove down fees which was

helpful for local authorities but in doing so may have made the market for that work less attractive to private companies. The deadline for the completion of final accounts is something the external auditor works toward and the pressure to complete local authority/health service audits is considerable due to capacity issues. There were concerns that the pressure for external auditors to meet current deadlines is unreasonable and the issue of extending the deadline for completing audits had been raised. The Committee was advised that accounts will not be signed off until the external auditor is satisfied that the audit has been properly completed but work would be ongoing to ensure that deadlines are achieved.

### **Decision**

The report was noted

### **AC/21/03 Internal Audit Assurance Report 2020/21**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management that provided an update of progress on the agreed audit plan 2020/21, additional work assigned to the audit service and copies of the audit opinions issued in the period August to December 2020. The Committee was advised that audit work had been impacted during the year due to additional work taken on by Internal Audit. This included the provision of key support for the covid19 grant schemes to provide ongoing support to local businesses and the winter support for children and vulnerable families. The availability of resources has also affected the service and a 'reach out' had been undertaken to provide three additional posts and the subsequent recruitment to permanent posts following completion of a service and savings review. Members were informed that even with additional resources it will remain a challenge to complete all planned audit work by year end as a consequence of client availability due to the continued focus on the covid response and recovery which is acute across all areas of the Council and particularly within front line services in adults, health and care, children's services and schools.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to ask questions.

Members referred to work being done on fraud checks on business grants and the impact the involvement of audit staff in this work has had on the audit team for the reason that staff are running the checks rather than providing a consultancy and facilitating role. Also, what arrangements will there be if the grants system is extended past financial year end as it is likely that the pandemic would continue. Reference was made to resources available to the Audit team and the involvement of Salford Council to undertake audit work on the Council's ICT function in view of potential deletion of vacancies from the team structure. The Head of Risk and Internal Audit was asked to comment on the comparison of work undertaken in the previous year to this year and was it mandatory to provide an opinion if a sufficient amount of work had not been completed.

It was reported that there is not a mandatory requirement to provide an audit opinion, however there is a requirement under the current procedures to provide an opinion to those charged with responsibility for governance such as the Audit Committee. The

Committee was advised that heads of audit across the country were using outcomes from planned audits and other sources of assurance to inform the production of an opinion. Head of Internal Audit stated that other forms of assurance will include his own role and engagement in various governance and recovery groups. In providing the opinion it was important for the Audit Committee and stakeholders that there is clarity on the basis in which the opinion is taken. The CIPFA guidance would be used to inform the opinion on potential limitations and/or qualifications required and referenced. In noting that the amount of audit work had reduced it was reported that audit staff would still be obtaining assurances from planned audits and other work such as emergency grants and business recovery work undertaken during the year. The issue of using another authority to examine the Council's ICT work is a routine arrangement that is done as a matter of course to involve an outside authority to undertake a review. This work was not as a result of the availability of resources. The process of appointing staff from the outreach process would begin next week to help address the current resource shortfall within the Audit Team for the final quarter and into the following year. It was reported that due to the current working arrangements, there may be challenges in working with clients during audits in Adults and Children's Services and a degree of flexibility would be required to work with those clients to obtain assurances. The new improvement plan would help to obtain those assurances following discussions with the areas of services concerned. In response to the question on fraud checks it was reported that from the checks being undertaken, the majority of the work on business grants is system and process based and it was considered the work is valuable in gaining assurance for that area. The resource allocated to grant work will not be at the same level as it was previously because of confidence in the systems in place and the introduction of a post payment assurance plan and the provision of regular updates on their delivery. Further discussions will take place on the investigation of potential largescale fraud through the business grant scheme and this may impact on the fraud team's resources. Discussions would be held with the Committee on the way forward to priorities work. It was reported that in view of the current circumstances the Council faces, it will be necessary to decide on priorities for audit work to be undertaken and identifying other sources of information.

Members referred to the pressures on the Audit Team in particular, the additional responsibilities as a result of Covid19 and the importance of prioritising work to ensure that the audit of Children's and Adults Services and Mental Health Services were maintained. Officers were asked for an update on the PSN and what strategy is in place to prioritise what audit work will take place and what the issues are in accessing clients and if there were other means in obtaining information. Members also asked what the Committee could do to support the service to ensure work is completed in view that audit work is still a necessary and important function within the Council.

The City Treasurer responded and advised the Committee that the peak of the pandemic is now being faced by health and social care services and all non-essential work must stop to allow resources to be focused on maintaining hospital capacity and discharges. This relates, in particular to the point made on the capacity of clients to take part in audits of their service. In addition, it is necessary to maintain a working balance for the requirements of the Government, in order to avoid come back, in areas such as counter fraud assurance. Balance has also been maintained on

business grant work and this has been supported by the Business Support Team to process claims in a timely manner. With regard to Council finance it was reported that the monthly returns provided to the CLG has been essential for the Council to achieve a better financial settlement and the additional funding from the Government was on the basis of strong evidence-based work. It was reported that these examples demonstrate that there is a very fine line on the decisions taken on what priorities to pursue. The pandemic has provided a good demonstration of the strengths within the Council services. Reference was also made the administering of the school voucher scheme for school children in Manchester and the benefit and level of assurance this has provided which will be reflected in the opinion to be submitted to the Committee.

The Committee was informed that issue of capacity also related to auditor's ability to physically access documents to complete a sign off and the priorities of officers on more pressing issues such as vaccination work and testing. Officers were working to obtain information through other sources within the organisation. Discussion will take place on the priorities to focus on areas such as Mental Health Casework and Homelessness these will be based on the level of urgency and current arrangements to provide access to individuals and information.

The Committee was advised that to best support officers it should continue to discharge its function in obtaining assurances and ensuring that audit work is completed. It was reported that senior officers are aware of the need to complete audit work to maintain and improve the work of the Council services and that the findings will be submitted to the Audit Committee.

A member referred to outstanding audit work and asked if it was possible to collaborate with other officer colleagues to work smart to complete the work and if this was good practice.

It was reported that as an example of collaborative working, work in Adult Services would be monitored by audit staff and would involve sitting in on meetings rather than just receiving copies of minutes and be at a higher level to take part in checking and testing to gain assurance.

A member referred to changes within the staffing structure and what processes are in place to ensure that the level of senior management support for the City Treasurer will be in place.

It was reported that a suitably qualified member of staff is currently in place for the Deputy Treasurer position and interviews would be taking place for the permanent replacement in the following week. It should be noted that the corporate core would have a reduced function, however work would continue to ensure the best use of existing resources. This will enable the City Treasurer to maintain an overview of the work of the department.

## **Decision**

The Committee noted the report and the comments received.

## **AC/21/04 Outstanding Audit Recommendations**

Consideration was given to a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Head of Audit and Risk Management that provided a summary the current implementation position and arrangements for monitoring and reporting internal and external audit recommendations.

The Chair invited members of the Committee to ask questions.

A member referred to the Disability Supported Accommodation Services: Quality Assurance Framework and expressed concern that the recommendation from February 2018, for a register of all details including residents; staff and properties to be sent to Performance, Research and Intelligence team was yet to be implemented and the no further action was now required. The point was made that it is important that detailed records are produced and maintained to better protect vulnerable individuals the Council has responsibility for.

It was reported that the recommendation had been implemented from an audit perspective that quality assurance checks were in place, however a more accurate update on the keeping of accurate registers within properties would be provided to members of the Committee.

### **Decisions**

1. The Committee noted the report.
2. To request a report be submitted to provide a review of resources within Internal Audit.

## **Health and Wellbeing Board**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 27 January 2021**

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

#### **Present:**

Councillor Richard Leese, Leader of the Council (Chair)  
Vicky Szulist, Chair, Healthwatch  
Dr Tracey Vell, Primary Care representative - Local Medical Committee  
Dr Murugesan Raja, GP Member (North) MHCC  
Dr Vish Mehra, Central Primary Care Manchester  
David Regan, Director of Public Health  
Dr Denis Colligan, GP Member (North) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
Rupert Nichols, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust  
Dr Ruth Bromley, Chair Manchester Health and Care Commissioning  
Paul Marshall, Strategic Director of Children's Services

#### **Apologies:**

Councillor Craig, Executive Member for Adults Health and Wellbeing  
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust  
Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services  
Mike Wild, Voluntary and Community Sector representative

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

Dr Manisha Kumar, Medical Director, MHCC

### **HWB/21/01 Urgent Business**

The Chair agreed to the submission of an item of urgent business from the Director of Public Health relating to information regarding a Census.

### **HWB/21/02 Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 December 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 9 December 2020.

### **HWB/21/03 COVID-19 Update - Presentation**

The Director of Public Health and Dr Manisha Kumar, Medical Director MHCC, co-presented the latest COVID-19 Update.

The Director of Public Health referred to points in the presentation covering updates, data and intelligence specific to Manchester which showed how the various rates in confirmed cases, over 60s cases and detection had reduced consistently in the mid-January period. The Director of Public Health referred to five new testing sites across the city and a forthcoming test site due to open in February at the Rates Hall in the Town Hall Extension.

Dr Manisha Kumar referred to points in the presentation covering the vaccination programme stating that the first vaccination centre was set up in Wythenshawe two weeks following the approval of the Pfizer vaccine. Dr Kumar explained that a further seven sites have since been established covering South, Central and North Manchester. Dr Kumar confirmed that the programme had met the target of administering vaccinations in all 56 elderly care homes across the city by 24 January 2021. Supported accommodation and care homes for younger persons were confirmed as being the next target for the vaccination programme. Information was displayed on the ten age group cohorts and amounts of doses for each (approximately 500,000 first doses doubling to 1 million with the supply of a second dose). Dr Kumar confirmed that cohort four was undergoing current operations. Information was provided on the amount of vaccinations required to prevent one death for each cohort which had fed into certain age groups being targeted in the first instance and the ongoing likelihood of a yearly vaccination programme similar to the flu jab. Vaccination Delivery Models were displayed and referred to with comment on covering delivery to the housebound, vulnerable and rough sleepers as well as the care sector, including staff. An update was displayed on vaccinations completed from the previous week and mention given to a good amount of vaccinations being delivered for the coming week. A graph was referred to which displayed areas of the city having greatly increased their rates of first doses to patients aged 80+. The next phase was referred to in terms of second doses to be administered and moving down the ten cohorts to cover other age groups. A current update was displayed and referred to, which confirmed that over 51,000 vaccinations had now been administered, showing high percentages for both 80+ and 75-79 cohorts and the uptake of delivery in the 70 to 74 cohort. To close the presentation the Director of Public Health gave praise to the work being done by staff across Manchester's hospitals.

The Chair invited comments and questions.

Members of the Board also expressed their gratitude and shared praise of all staff involved in the ongoing care and roll out of the vaccination programme.

A question was raised concerning any declined vaccinations and the Chair invited Dr Kumar to comment.

Dr Kumar stated that there had been approximately 1000 people who had not opted in and that there was need establish reasons as to why people were declining the vaccine offer.

A Board member raised a question regarding the sharing of the information on the City Council website so that residents could take access local data.



The Chair stated that Health and Wellbeing Board meeting was helpful in this respect as the presentation was now in the public domain and could be accessed on the Council website.

Board members expressed concerns on contacting patients and those who are unregistered and further concerns on inequalities, in that the population being served across Manchester has a high ethnic mix and that this cohort isn't being matched by the turn out attending for vaccinations. Further comment was made on the spreading of disinformation across social media platforms and other methods.

The Chair invited Dr Kumar to comment.

Dr Kumar stated that there was a drive to have trusted figures involved in communicating on the safety and efficacy of the vaccine to all Manchester residents and that health centres would have to use a clear booking system that was easy for all to understand.

The Chair responded regarding anti-vaccination movements and COVID19 deniers who are active in spreading their beliefs and expressed that GPs are seen to be highly trusted among the population, adding that their credibility should be harnessed in this regard.

The Chair then commented on the targeting of current cohorts stating that these were being targeted early as it was the best method of saving the most lives. The Chair stated that the number of people opting out of having the vaccine would increase as the younger cohorts were targeted and that there would be individuals with occupational risks to consider, more so within other, younger cohorts. The Chair also referred to figures in the North West showing some abuse of the system with individuals effectively pushing in to get their vaccines earlier than in the current vaccine protocol and stated that that, any time this happens, a person in a higher priority category is put at further risk. The Chair commented on the increased non-compliance to the test and trace system and isolating under lockdown, stating that the recent national death statistics should convey the importance of these practices in should be adhered to take pressure off the NHS and save lives.

The Director of Public Health informed the Board that there would soon strong data and communications available to convey how Manchester is progressing with the pandemic and added that work is ongoing with key faith leaders and health professionals across Greater Manchester to establish key messages for the public. There would also be a drive to commit to all faiths and ethnic backgrounds as the programme progressed through the other cohorts.

The Chair stated that he was keen to receive the vaccine as soon as it was available to him and welcomed the scale and pace of the operation.

## **Decision**

The Board note the report.

### **HWB/21/04 Census update**

The Director of Public Health stated that he would send information to Board members and confirmed that the Census is going ahead and would be conducted digitally. The Director of Public Health stated that there was a great need for participation in this matter as City Council and NHS funding would be adversely affected if the figures were not accurate.

The Chair agreed with the drive for accuracy stating that this has a knock-on effect for funding, planning and many other aspects of the City Council's services.

The Chair thanked all participants for their time and the hard work undertaken in their response to the pandemic.

### **Decision**

To note the update.

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 21 January 2021**

**This Planning and Highways meeting was a meeting 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, Kamal, Leech, Lovecy, Lyons, Madeline Monaghan, Riasat, Watson and White

**Apologies:**

Councillor Hitchen:

**Also Present:**

Councillors Jeavons (ward Councillor) and Wheeler (ward Councillor)

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

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications (128189/FO/2020 and 121252/FO/2018), since the agenda was issued.

**Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

### **PH/21/01 Minutes**

**Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 17 December 2020 as a correct record.

### **PH/21/02 128189/FO/2020 - 39 Daisy Bank Road, Manchester, M14 5GP**

This application relates to a change of use to a residential care home providing accommodation for up to 6 people (Class C2). The application relates to a relatively large vacant 2-storey, semi-detached dwelling house with an existing two storey side and rear extension. The application property is unoccupied but has a current licence for use as an 8 person house in multiple occupation (HMO); a use that appears to have first commenced in 1997. The proposed development would relate to the care of up

to 6 adults with mental health needs or learning difficulties requiring 24-hour support over short and longer-term periods.

The Planning Officer provided an update including drawing Members attention to the late representation report. The update referred to the submission of a staff travel plan that has been assessed by Highways officers. Further details are required in relation to implementation and future monitoring however, the submission gives assurance that the details of the recommended staff travel plan condition are capable of being delivered as part of the development. The Committee was informed that if the application is agreed there would be an amendment made to Condition 3 regarding the Permitted Management Plan on the number of residents who could be cared for at the residence.

The applicant or agent did not address the Committee on the proposal.

There was no objector present at the meeting.

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

A member noted that objections had been submitted by local residents on the possible loss of amenity but considered that the proposed application will provide much needed residential care provision and welcomed the application.

Councillor Lovecy moved the recommendation to approve the application, subject to an amendment to Condition 3 to amend the Permitted Management Plan to limit the number of residents who can be cared for at the residence at one time. Councillor Watson seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

The Committee approved the application subject to the Conditions detailed in the report submitted and subject to the amendment of Condition 3 to amend the Permitted Management Plan to limit the number of residents who can be cared for at the residence at one time.,

### **PH/21/03      121252/FO/2018 - Great Marlborough Street Car Park, Great Marlborough Street, Manchester, M1 5NJ**

This application is for the partial reconfiguration of existing Multi-Storey Car Park (MSCP), including temporary access off Great Marlborough Street, construction of 5 storey external ramps, closure of vehicular access to top level; and construction of new facade; and partial demolition of the surplus part of existing MSCP and erection of a part 55, part 11 storey, part 4 storey mixed-use building comprising 853 Purpose Built Student Accommodation units (sui generis), ancillary amenity space and support facilities, and 786sqm (GIA) SME incubator workspace (Use Class B1), including public realm improvements and other associated work.

The Planning Officer provided an update including drawing Members attention to the late representation report. The update referred to further comments received from

the Macintosh Village Residents Company and the responses to the comments from the Director of Planning as follows:

- The objection to the third notification was on behalf of 425 individual objectors;
- Members should receive a copy of their legal advice, and a more professional and accurate record of the impact for the developer, given residents would be successful in injunction (the possibility must be understood by Members);
- A 6-year construction plan has been communicated to residents. The 3 years within the report was a fictional plan and is misleading
- The price point was issued in the consultation documents stating £275 per week so it needs to be in the document and link to profitability and a more transparent S106. The committee report suggests the applicant is borrowing £150 million but is yet to land on a business model or price point?
- A legal offer was made during the second consultation of a direct payment to Macintosh Village Residents after sharing street crime CCTV footage and the acknowledgement that anti-social behaviour will increase pro rata with the increase from student caste V1 before they sold it;
- The statement regarding the track record of the applicant is biased. They no longer own student castle and a balanced report would inform members know of their track record of selling every 3 years;
- There are deliverability challenges and highways have said no access nor use of Hulme Street for cranes. The applicant says they will not use a tower crane as HSE would not allow residents to use the car park. So where is the crane shown on the construction plan during residents' consultation 2 and 3 going to go?
- A miscalculation with the UNITE scheme regarding access for the crane and site was made and the whole road was closed for the duration. You cannot close Great Marlborough Street for the duration nor use or access Hulme Street so where is the evidence of deliverability?
- The report does not reference the previous planning refusals in the area for over dominance of a tall building not on a podium;
- The report does not reference the Manchester Residential Design Guide;
- The report does not reference Part L of the Building Regulations that does not allow the use of an energy tariff to pass sustainability.

Responses for the Director of Planning:

Whilst the proposal would create 853 units, the size of the units means that some could be shared and up to 934 students could live there. The applicant intends to offer room to single occupants with the larger studios reserved for those with disabilities. However, for the purposes of considering the impact of the development, the planning submission, including the Environmental Statement, has considered the maximum capacity of the building. The report notes that room sizes are larger than other nearby student accommodation. 97% of the studios exceed 18 sqm.

The response of the Macintosh Village Residents Company (third notification) was supported by 425 individual objectors. The third notification was subject to a 30-day consultation, and publicised in the form of a press notice, due to information being

received under the EIA Regulations. In addition, this information was the subject of a 21 days re-notification was undertaken with local residents.

The construction period is expected to be 5 years with the build lasting 3 and half years and the remainder for fit out.

The constrained nature of the site and the need to ensure that the MSCP remains operational throughout, creates construction and highway management challenges together with disruption to the surrounding residential area from noise, dust and traffic. The specific logistical requirements are still being considered with Highway Services and indicative details are provided in the report. The final location of the tower crane(s) has yet to be agreed, but Hulme Street would not be used for its erection or dismantling. A tower crane strategy would be required and condition 11 should be amended to make this more explicit.

Access to the MSCP would be managed when the crane is erected/dismantled in the interest of safety and access would be restricted/supervised during this time. The users of the car park would be given prior notification of any restrictions. In any instance where access is required without prior notice, or in the event of an emergency, the car park areas would be made safe in order to facilitate the request for access at the earliest opportunity. It is envisaged that this will be for short periods of time only during the lifting operations.

Once the crane has been erected, general construction exclusions zones would only apply to specific construction areas of the MSCP which include the roof of the car park. As detailed within the report, the car park would remain in use with appropriate protection measures in place to ensure segregation from the construction site. Use of the lifts and main stair core would remain accessible. Any changes to access routes will be communicated in advance and clearly sign posted.

The applicant's contractor has developed management measures to minimise localise impacts on residents and the local highway network. This includes air quality monitoring measures and Just In Time (JIT) delivery systems which ensures that waggons do not idle on the surrounding road network.

The construction impacts of this development can be managed and mitigated so that amenity or highway impacts would not warrant refusal. Condition 11 would ensure that construction impacts are mitigated and agreed to maintain the operational effectiveness of the highway network and pedestrian safety and minimise impact on residential amenity.

Officers are in receipt of a legal opinion obtained by Macintosh Village Residents Company with regards to the impact of the redevelopment of the site on the leaseholders car parking spaces within the MSCP. It notes that the Residents Company oppose the redevelopment of the car park and that the purpose of the legal opinion is to determine whether the redevelopment of the car park is allowed within the confines of the leases and whether the redevelopment would result in an actionable interference with the rights of leaseholders.

The legal opinion states that the redevelopment of the car park, insofar as it would

reduce the number of spaces available, is not permissible by the lease in or of itself and that the development of the car park (both during the 6 year construction phase and upon the completion) would likely result in actional interference with the rights of tenants with the benefit of the right of way and the right to park. The legal opinion concludes that the tenants with the benefits of the rights would be able to seek restrain such interference by injunction.

Members are advised that there are private third-party property rights relating to the right to park in the MSCP. Such rights are protected and enforced through other legislation and are not material planning considerations.

It is noted that Macintosh Village Residents Company disagree with this position and state that the presence of such rights effect the deliverability of the scheme which they believe is material to the planning decision.

Increasing the supply of purpose-built student accommodation would help to relieve pressure on existing homes in the city centre which drives up rents and are Council Tax exempt. There are also known issues, particularly at Manchester Metropolitan University, who is unable to offer all first-year students' accommodation in purpose built student accommodation.

The scheme on New Wakefield Street was promptly delivered upon the grant of planning permission and is now ready for occupation.

The applicant has a track record of delivering student accommodation schemes. It is not material to the determination of this planning application whether the applicant chooses to then sell their interest in a site and all obligations are attached to the land and not the applicant.

This planning application has to be determined on its merits. The scale, height appearance is considered in detail in the report particularly the impacts on the wider townscape and heritage. The images within the report, including cumulative impacts (shown in wire lines) comprehensively considers the local and wider impact on the City scape and concludes, that in most cases, the impacts are beneficial or commensurate with other nearby developments.

Where harm does arise, particularly to the setting of the conservation area and nearby listed buildings, this harm is suitability mitigated by the significant public benefits which would arise from a project of this nature. The proposal therefore accords with paragraphs 193, 194 and 196 of the NPPF and section 72 of the of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Localised impacts on the wind environment and impacts on daylight, sunlight and loss of privacy are also considered likely and the effects are outlined in some detail in the report. Such impacts are not unusual in a city centre context and would therefore not warrant refusal of this planning application.

The report does reference the Residential Quality Guide a summary of which is included in the policy section of the report.

The correspondence relating to a legal offer etc is not part of this planning application and is not a relevant planning consideration. Designing out crime is a key planning consideration and the application has been reviewed by Design for Security at GMP with recommendations in the Crime Impact Statement. The recommendations in their report have each been included in the design including increased CCTV.

The development exceeds relevant planning policies and those outlined within Part L of the Building Regulations without a specific energy tariff. Commitment to a zerocarbon energy tariff is one additional means, beyond Part L, that forms part of the low carbon strategy.

The objector's representative addressed the Committee and outlined the reasons for the objections submitted.

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

Councillor Jeavons (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to object to the application due to the potential impact on the surrounding area and the Mackintosh Village and requested the Committee undertake a site visit. The Committee was informed that the development would negatively impact the residential community and unbalance the area through influx of such a large number of students.

The Planning Officer reported that the points raised had been extensively covered in the planning report.

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

A member raised five points in respect of the application and welcomed the proposal for a site visit. The points raised were:

- Is the development deliverable if it is open to legal challenge.
- The cumulative negative impact of the area with the increase in students living in the development.
- The lack of affordable accommodation within the development.
- The details on the infrastructure improvements and the importance of agreeing them before the application could be approved.
- The unacceptable visual appearance of the development.

Members of the Committee supported the request for a site visit

Councillor White moved the proposal for the Committee to undertake a site for the reasons of the size/massing of the proposed building and its potential impact on the surrounding area. Councillor Flanagan seconded the proposal.

## **Decision**

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



(Councillor Nasrin Ali did not take part in the vote on the decision due to technical issues.)

**PH/21/04 126328/FO/2020 - Speakers House, 39 Deansgate Manchester, M3 2BA**

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

The Planning Officer provided an update on the application. The Committee was advised that two reasons for minded to refusal had been included in the planning report. The Committee was informed that officers did not consider the first reason regarding a loss of amenity to be sufficient to refuse the application. The second reason referred to points raised by Historic England relating to the impact of the building on town houses located nearby but did consider the impact to result in less than substantial harm. The view taken by planning officers is that the benefit of the development to the area will outweigh negative impact.

The objector's representative addressed the Committee and recapped on the reasons for objection.

- The Height and mass and the development;
- Loss of amenity to local residents (loss of privacy and light, overlooking);
- Impact on heritage assets;
- Over development of the site.

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

Councillor Jeavons (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to object to the application. The committee was advised that the application does not work for the local area or that area of the city centre in terms of height and mass. The impact on local heritage assets is considerable and unacceptable in a city centre concept.

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

The Planning Officer referred to the detailed responses within the planning report to the objections received and the application of planning policies and guidance. Reference was also made to the impact of the scheme which is not considered to be a substantial harm on the surrounding area.

Councillor Lyons moved the proposal for the Committee to refuse the application. Councillor Leech seconded the proposal.

Members of the committee considered that the issues relating to the negative and substantial impact of the proposal had not changed with the loss of amenity and impact on heritage assets and considered that the negative impact of the

development would not outweigh the potential public benefits and agreed that the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would be unacceptable due to the resultant loss of amenity for the residents of No. 1 Deansgate and therefore contrary to guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework and inconsistent with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.
2. The proposed development would represent overdevelopment of the site and would be unacceptable due to the negative impact on the heritage assets of St. Anns's Church, the Royal Exchange and the St. Ann's Square Conservation Area. Furthermore, the negative impact of the development on surrounding heritage assets would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to guidance with the National Planning Policy Framework and inconsistent with policies SP1, EN3, CC9 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved policies DC18.1 and DC19.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

## **Decision**

The Committee refused the application for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would be unacceptable due to the resultant loss of amenity for the residents of No. 1 Deansgate and therefore contrary to guidance within the National Planning Policy Framework and inconsistent with policies SP1 and DM1 of the Core Strategy.
2. The proposed development would represent overdevelopment of the site and would be unacceptable due to the negative impact on the heritage assets of St. Anns's Church, the Royal Exchange and the St. Ann's Square Conservation Area. Furthermore, the negative impact of the development on surrounding heritage assets would not be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to guidance with the National Planning Policy Framework and inconsistent with policies SP1, EN3, CC9 and DM1 of the Core Strategy and saved policies DC18.1 and DC19.1 of the Unitary Development Plan for the City of Manchester.

**PH/21/05      128002/FO/2020 - One City Road, 1 City Road East, Manchester, M15 4PN**

This application relates to a full Planning Application for demolition of existing structures on site, erection of one 11-storey plus basement office building (Use Class E) and one 14-storey plus basement office building with ground floor commercial unit (Use Class E), landscaping, highways works, and associated works. The application includes 519 cycle parking spaces and on-street parking bays would be re-arranged to include two on-street parking bays for disabled people and a car club space.

The Committee undertook a site visit prior to the meeting.

The Planning Officer did not any further comments of the planning application submitted.

The objector's representative addressed the Committee and referred to the reasons for objection relating to:

- Amendment to the proximity of the development to City South residents;
- Loss of privacy
- Shadowing on City South;
- Loss of natural light;
- Noise concerns.
- Access to City South on Shawcross Street;
- Putting back the development date to 2024;
- Impact on selling of properties at City South development;
- Increase in pollution;
- Construction work impacts;
- Environmental pollution, litter during construction;
- Car parking for the office space;
- Increase in traffic;
- Loss of trees and green space
- Loss of visual amenity.

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

Councillor Jeavons (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to object to the application. Reference was made to the loss of amenity to the residents of City South as detailed in the planning report.

The Planning Officer reported that it was important that development continues in this area of the city centre to provide homes and places of work and a balance was needed to address resident's tensions with new developments in order to move forward. Officers considered that the design of the development provided an acceptable balance.

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

A member referred to the reference 'bounce back' and made the point that many office workers are working from home and this may continue resulting in another office block becoming unnecessary. Reference was also made to the permeability of the site to pedestrians and the appearance of the access which looked like an entrance to the proposed building.

The Planning Officer reported that there is a belief by developers that there is a requirement for Grade A office accommodation within the city centre and this development would help meet that requirement. The new accessible walkway proposed would be similar to the walkway currently used as a public access between

the Town Hall Extension and the Central Library on Library Walk between St Peter's Square and Mount Street.

Members referred to the assessments made to determine acceptable levels of natural light for new buildings and the issue of noise for the properties with no alternative rooms to move to. The point was made that it is important to assess the impact of new developments on people in their homes. Reference was made to the construction management plan and the importance of the involvement and consultation with residents in process when producing the plan.

The Planning Officer reported that consultation with residents and contractors is at the forefront of any development and consultation on the construction management plan would be raised with the developer. Officers would also look at providing a new format for the presentation of information relating to the impact new development on light levels for residents.

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

### **Decision**

The Committee approved the application subject to the Conditions detailed in the report submitted.

(Councillor Flanagan left the meeting took no part in the vote on the application or the remainder of the meeting.)

### **PH/21/06 127881/FO/2020 and 127882/LO/2020 - 109 -127 Market Street, Manchester, M60 1TA**

This application relates to development comprising erection of four storey roof-top extension (for use within Class E (Commercial, Business and Service Uses); for use of floors 1-7 for use within Class E (Commercial, Business and Service Uses) and change of use of the basement and ground floor to permit Use Class E (Commercial, Business and Service Uses) and Drinking Establishments and Hot Food Takeaway (Sui Generis) use, external works associated with the formation of new ground floor entrances, sub-division of the ground floor into 9 units; works to windows including replacements, creation of winter gardens on the 6th floor; creation of external roof top amenity spaces; installation of new rooftop plant; the provision of secure cycle parking (255 spaces) in sub-basement and other associated works.

There is also an application for Listed Building Consent: Internal and external alterations to include: the erection of four storey roof-top extension; partial demolition of the floor structure to create the atrium; installation of a lightwell; external alterations to form new entrances on the ground floor; sub-division of the ground floor into smaller units the refurbishment; works to windows including replacements; demolition of a staircase; partial demolition of kitchen and plant structure on Floor 7; creation of winter gardens on the 6th floor; creation of external roof top amenity spaces; installation of new rooftop plant; refurbishment of the interiors and other associated works.

The Planning Officer provided an update the application and reported that following discussions with the application regarding concerns raised by local residents on the issue of privacy and overlooking. Agreement had been reached that a dense frit would be added to the bottom level of each window to head height to increase privacy of the residential properties adjacent.

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

Councillor Wheeler (ward Councillor) addressed the Committee to comment on the proposal. Reference was made to the extension planned on the top of the current building. Reference was also made on the loss of light to local properties adjacent to the building and impact this may have on the health and wellbeing of residents affected. Reference was made to the planning report that access to light in adjacent buildings it is unrealistic and asked if this could be addressed.

The Planning Officer reported that the planning report provided detailed responses to the points raised.

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

A member referred to the roof top and extension and why the structure is hidden from view and designed in an out of touch manner and the lack of light for residents.

The Planning Officer reported that the building is iconic within the city centre and had come to the end of its useful life in its current use. The applicant has looked at potential uses and has produced a sustainable use for the building that protects its historical integrity and an office building is considered the best future use. The roof top extension was added and is the smallest financially, commercially viable structure and design for the building. This has been assessed independently on its impact and is considered acceptable.

Councillor Shaukat Ali moved the proposal for the Committee to approve the application. Councillor Riasat seconded the proposal.

## **Decisions**

1. The Committee approved the planning application 127881/FO/2020, subject to the Conditions detailed in the report submitted.
2. The Committee approved the application for List Building Consent 127882/LO/2020as detailed in the report submitted.

(Councillors Y Dar, Monaghan and Nasrin Ali left the meeting and did not take part in the vote on the application.)

**PH/21/07      128045/VO/2020 - Manchester Cathedral, Victoria Street.  
Manchester**

This is for a City Council Development - Public realm works to create a new public amenity space (Phases 1A, 1B and 1C) comprising the creation of a memorial feature to the Manchester Arena Attack, new entrance square in front of Manchester Cathedral (with potential use as events space), areas of new paving, amenity planting, raised lawns, tree planting, street furniture and lighting.

The proposals would create a public amenity space in 3 phases including the creation of a memorial feature to the Manchester Arena Attack (Phase 1A), new entrance square in front of Manchester Cathedral, paving, amenity planting, raised lawns, tree planting, street furniture and lighting.

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

There was no objector present at the meeting.

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

A member asked officers if the area proposed would be classed as a public park and how many trees would be included in the design, what alternative arrangements would be made for cyclists to avoid using the area for access. Also, did the GMP Safety by Design team have any concerns on the design of the area.

The Planning Officer reported that the area is for the creation of a public realm, and there will be sixty-four trees included in the design. Alternative access arrangements for cyclists routes would be considered because the space would be for pedestrian access only and cyclists would be required to dismount. The GMP concerns had been addressed and the final design would require a Safety by Design accreditation before it could be proceeded with.

A member asked if the area would be fully accessible for people with mobility issues.

The Committee was informed that the area would be full accessible to the public and further negotiations would continue to with access groups to address concerns and ensure full accessibility.

Councillor Lyons moved the proposal for the Committee to approve the application.  
Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

### **Decision**

The Committee approved the planning application, subject to the Conditions detailed in the report submitted.