

Audit Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 15 June 2021

Present:

Councillor Ahmed Ali - In the Chair
Councillors Clay, Lanchbury and Russell

Independent Co-opted member: Dr S Downs

Also Present:

Councillor Craig (Deputy Leader)
Karen Murray (Mazars) - External Auditor

Apologies:

Dr D Barker (Independent Co-opted Member)

AC/21/10 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 16 March 2021 as a correct record.

AC/21/11 Draft Annual Governance Statement

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which set out the draft 2020/21 Annual Governance Statement (AGS), which had been produced following completion of the annual review of the Council's governance arrangements and systems of internal control.

For 2020/21, a desktop review of the AGS process had been carried out to identify improvements and efficiencies. A review of good practice had also been undertaken, including comparison with peer authorities. As a result improvements had been identified and implemented with the use of a more concise document template now being used to enable a clearer focus on a high-level summary of the strategic oversight of improvements. The report re-emphasised the Council's commitment to improve transparency of its governance arrangements by ensuring that both the Statement itself and the explanation of the arrangements within it were clear, concise and written in plain, clear language in order to make it as accessible as possible for the lay reader.

The processes that had been followed to produce the draft Statement were outlined in the report and the Committee was asked to note the findings of the 2020/21 AGS as well as the actions proposed to further develop or strengthen elements of the Council's governance arrangements during 2021/22.

The Committee welcomed the draft with particular emphasis to the clear and concise nature of the explanations, which were deemed very helpful.

Decision

To note the draft Annual Governance Statement. .

AC/21/12 Head of Audit and Risk Management Annual Opinion

In accordance with Public Sector Internal Audit Standard 2450, the Committee considered the report of the Head of Audit and Risk Management which presented the annual internal audit opinion on adequacy, effectiveness and delivery of the programme of audit work designed to raise standards of governance, risk management and internal control across the Council over the last year. This included a summary outturn of the work of the Internal Audit Section for the 12 months April 2020 to March 2021.

The report outlined a discussion within the sector regarding the ability within the sector to undertake sufficient internal audit work and produce a reliable independent assurance assessment under current circumstances. As a result, revised guidance had been issued by Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) on the form the opinion may take. The report explained that whilst an opinion on the adequacy and effectiveness of the organisation's framework of governance, risk management and control had been issued for 2020/21, the impact of the Covid19 pandemic on public services over this period had been considerable and had resulted in significant change to planned priorities in order to focus resources on those critical activities essential to the pandemic response and recovery. As a result, the Head of Audit and Risk Management's approach had been to obtain sufficient assurance to support the annual opinion, considering both internal audit work and other sources of assurance which were outlined in the report.

The Head of Audit and Risk Management provided an opinion of reasonable assurance that the Council's governance, risk and control framework was generally sound and operated reasonably consistently in the year. This was an equivalent opinion to that issued in the previous four years and reflected that overall governance, financial management arrangements and core systems and processes within the Council remained effective despite the myriad of challenges presented by the pandemic. The strength of core governance, risk and control systems and the capability, commitment and agility of the workforce and leadership had been a key factor in enabling deviation from standard ways of working and in providing an effective response and recovery approach during the year. However, risks and issues remained in light of the ongoing pandemic and financial challenges to planned delivery of organisational priorities and strategies as well as backlogs in some core business processes. Those risks would be recognised in recovery and transformation priorities including the Future Shape Programme; as well as in budgets and business plans.

The Chair invited questions and comments from members of the Committee.

The Committee welcomed the issue of an opinion in the current climate. A Member commented that it was good to see that emergency contingency planning had been effective and asked whether any of those revised working practices would be carried forward to influence future practice. The Head of Audit and Risk Management spoke about the strong foundation of work done in previous years and the pace, speed and

agility required to work within the principles of good governance and the legal framework. This, he explained, had been reflected on as an organisation and had led to a changed focus on delivery involving greater collaboration across directorate and partnership working. He also said that use of virtual technology had been an important factor in maintaining the pace of delivery outcomes.

A Member sought assurance on the delivery of post payments of additional government grants and support schemes to businesses (including audit assurance). The Head of Audit and Risk Management expressed confidence in this due to the significant amount upfront activity that had taken place as part of mandatory requirements which lowered the error rate in the validation of payments.

With regard to the placement of Looked After Children, a Member welcomed the ongoing improvements towards greater efficiency and streamlining of core processes for Children's Placement Findings.

Turning to outstanding audit recommendations in respect of Transitions and Mental Health Casework, a Member sought assurance that progress had been made in these areas. It was reported that this matter was in hand and would soon be reported back to a future meeting of the committee.

A Member asked about the current impact and future implications of recent events on audit activity. The Head of Audit and Risk Management said that approximately 25% of formal audit days had been completed with the remainder spent on business grants and other pieces of assurance work. He said that there had been a year end evaluation of what had not been delivered together with an assessment of the associated risk /priority with some refocused activity rolled forward for completion this municipal year.

A Member asked for information on the establishment, composition and remit of the Commercial Board. Officers agreed to bring detailed information on delegations and lines of accountability to a future meeting of the committee.

With regard to the Civic Quarter Heat Network (CQHN) project and the forthcoming completion of the construction phase, a Member noted that recommendations for improvements in governance arrangements had been shared with the Commercial Board and asked if those recommendations could be shared with the Committee. The Head of Audit and Risk Management agreed to this.

Decisions

1. To note the issue of the Head of Audit and Risk Management Annual Assurance Opinion in challenging circumstances.
2. To request that an overview of the function, role and remit of the Commercial Board (Procurement, Contracts and Commissioning) is circulated to Audit Committee members for information.

AC/21/13 Risk and Resilience Strategy and Risk Register

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Head of Audit and Risk Management which presented information on organisational risk management arrangements. The Committee had received its annual update in relation to delivery of Risk and Resilience strategic priorities in October 2020. The report therefore presented a short update on risk management arrangements since the last report as well as an overview of cross-cutting and strategic risks currently being monitored and managed by the Senior Management Team.

The Chair invited Members of the Committee ask questions and comment on the report.

Members noted the overall picture that ten risks had reduced in score and none had increased but were also mindful that the timing of the refresh did not reflect the current COVID infection rate in the city and its associated impact on delivery.

There was a discussion about the reported reduction in risk associated with medium term financial resources. A Member noted that concern about the Council's financial status had previously been reported by the external auditors and sought assurances around the reduction in risk. The External Auditor explained that that opinion had been issued in November 2020 when there was greater uncertainty around funding settlements as notifications from central government are issued at different points of the municipal year. She confirmed that following budget setting there was now increased confidence about the Council's ability to meet its financial commitments and acknowledged the organisation's strong track record of identifying and addressing challenges due to its robust governance arrangements.

As a point of clarification the Committee was invited to note that the identified risk associated with the loss of access to ICT had reduced its rating from 12 to 8 (medium).

Decision

To note the report

AC/21/14 Annual Audit Letter – Year Ending 31 March 2020 Council External Auditor

The Committee considered the Annual Audit letter for the year ended 31 March 2020 which summarise the work undertaken as the external auditor for Manchester City Council (the Council).

In line with the Local Audit and Accountability Act (2014) and the Code of Audit Practice issued by the National Audit Office (NAO), the Audit Letter set out key findings arising from audit activity in the following areas:

- Audit of Financial Statements
- Other information published alongside by the audited Financial Statements

- Value for Money Conclusion
- Reporting to the Group Auditor; and
- Statutory Reporting

The Letter also provided information on the increased fees for additional work undertaken as the Council Auditor around valuations and pensions liability and outlined the implications of recent changes to the Code of Audit Practice (April 2020) in relation to the Value for Money arrangements for the 2020/21 municipal year. It also made reference to the impact of the recent Redmond Review.

Karen Murray (Mazars) introduced the Letter explaining that, under usual circumstances, the findings would conclude the audit work undertaken for the 2019/20 municipal year however this had been delayed. Mazars had yet to conclude their work on the Council's Whole of Government Accounts return due to difficulties with the system that had recently been implemented. As a consequence, the Council had not yet been able to finalise its return due to a number of queries and was awaiting a response from the Treasury. However, Mazars were generally satisfied that proper arrangements were in place.

The Chair invited Members of the Committee ask questions / comment on the Letter.

On seeking assurances around the Council being unable to finalise Whole of Government accounts on time, Ms Murray indicated that the likelihood of penalties was very low since a number of Local Authorities had reported technical difficulties of a similar nature with the new system. She added that Mazars had confidence in the Authority's position such that the return would be ready for sign off as soon as those technical difficulties were resolved. She explained that the report was largely a repeat of the Audit Completion report that was submitted to the Committee's November 2020 meeting in respect of issuing the Audit Opinion and the Value for Money Conclusion.

The Committee asked about the implications of the recent changes to the Code of Audit Practice. Ms Murray explained that in essence it represented a shift from the binary conclusion to determine whether or not proper arrangements had been put in place. She summarised the change in the Code as meaning that the external auditor will no longer provide a Value for Money conclusion and would instead provide a commentary which sets out all of the work undertaken over the course of the year provides a view on overall arrangements for delivering value for money. From the 2020/21 municipal year onwards, where a significant weakness in value for money arrangements had been identified, auditors would be required to quickly notify Local Authorities of those weaknesses and provide a series of actions to address those weaknesses. Ms Murray confirmed that Mazars remained generally satisfied that proper arrangements are in place based on the work done so far but that this was continuously under review.

There was a discussion about the implications of the Redmond Review and reference to the proposal to create the Office of Local Audit and Regulation (OLAR), which was subsequently rejected by MHCLG. Ms Murray explained that the intention behind OLAR would have been to coordinate and regulate audit practices and achieve better coordination of what is expected, when and by whom to meet the

challenges within the sector. The Committee noted that the matter was currently under consultation for another body as wider government reforms of the audit market.

Decisions

To note the report.

AC/21/15 Audit Strategy Memorandum – Year Ending 31 March 2021

The Committee considered the Council's External Auditors (Mazars) Audit Strategy Memorandum for the year ended 31 March 2021.

The document provided information on

- The audit scope (including group audit), approach and timeline
- Significant risks and key judgement areas
- The extended auditors report; and
- Value for Money

The document discussed national timescales for 2020/21 requiring the Council to produce their draft Group accounts by the end of July 2021 and for the audit to be completed by the end of September 2021, effectively two months earlier than the deadlines agreed for 2019/20.

Mazar's asserted that this timescale would be extremely challenging, particularly given the complexity of the Council's financial statements, the related complexity of their own external audit processes, and the pressure this placed on the Council's finance team to deliver draft financial statements and supporting working papers within the allocated timeframe. On that basis, Mazar's had resolved to complete the Council's audit by November 2021 therefore allowing the Council two additional months to produce the draft Group financial statements and supporting working papers to enable completion of the audit in a well managed and deliverable manner.

The main challenges to meeting the September 2021 timetable were described as:

- The size, number and complexity of the valuations of Council and Group land & buildings and investment properties – this was an area of significant difficulty in 2019/20, and the audit work requires significant information, and assistance, from the Council's three external valuers. The previous year's completion report recommended improvements in the audit trail from the Council's valuers to support the valuations. As a result, Mazar's planned to commence detailed audit activity in that area in July, in advance of the rest of the audit work in order to mitigate the risk of delays in completing the work.
- Completion of audit work by the auditor of GM Pension Fund – Mazar's obtained assurances from the auditor of GMPF on several areas relating to the Council's pension asset and liability. The GMPF audit is planned to be completed by the end of July and at this stage we do not anticipate any delays impacting on the Council's audit completion.

- The timetable does require the Council's draft accounts and working papers to be available for the start of our audit. We have planned our main audit work to commence at the start of September to ensure that sufficient contingency is inbuilt.

Ms Murray said that the Committee would receive a further report in November 2021 which would explain the work that had taken place.

The Committee sought assurances concerning the risk of penalties in not keeping to the national timetable. Ms Murray confirmed that Mazar's were not aware of any sanctions that would apply for the submission of a late Audit opinion. She explained that the new deadline had been set by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) following a consultation in which there had been unanimous supplier concern about the ability to attain a managed position in bringing the timescale forward. She added that in issuing a late opinion she was both confident of achieving a managed situation and the ability to issue in November 2021. Mazar's would work with the Council's Finance team to explain to MHCLG that the opinion was underway but not yet complete and that the complexity of the Council's finances was at the heart of the issue and stressed the importance of doing the right work at the right time for the avoidance of risk.

Decision

1. To note the report and in doing so, note that the external audit opinion will be submitted in November 2021.
2. To note that a further report on audit activity undertaken by Mazar's will be submitted to the Committee's November 2021 meeting.

AC/21/16 Register of Significant Partnerships

The Committee considered a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which provided an overview of the Register of Significant Partnerships in 2020. The report outlined the review and assurance process which had been conducted as part of the annual review. The report focused on the following key areas:

- Any new partnerships which have been added to the Register
- entries recommended for removal
- where the governance strength rating has changed following the introduction of the new four level ratings system
- any partnerships now classed as 'Reasonable' or 'Limited' strength following completion of the latest self-assessment.

The report stated that no new entries had been proposed for 2020; three however were proposed for removal due to either inactivity or in the process of being closed.

Members noted that the majority of partnership were ranked as 'substantial' or 'reasonable and welcomed this. There was a discussion about the ratings for health and social care partnerships which were determined as 'reasonable'. A Member

stressed the importance of ensuring that despite the reasonable rating, such partnerships were kept at the forefront of audit and monitoring activity due to the nature of their work. Officers acknowledged this and confirmed that these would form part of internal audit actions to provide continued assurance to members and health colleagues.

A Member sought more information about the potential insolvency of National Car Parks Manchester Limited and suggested that the partnership should not be removed from the Register until work around consolidation of the account had been finalised. The Head of PMO: Commercial Governance & Directorate Support agreed to circulate additional information on financial aspects outside of the meeting and assured the Committee there were no potential implications for the Council. Officers agreed to keep the item on the Register until all had been finalised.

There was a discussion about the proposed removal of Northwards from the Register. A Member suggested that this partnership should not be removed until all aspects, including the transfer of staff and assurances around service provision for tenants had been finalised. Officers agreed to this.

A Member expressed surprise that no new partnerships being added for the year. The Head of PMO: Commercial Governance & Directorate Support confirmed that nothing had been brought forward for inclusion by the Senior Management Team. However, she also said that there was potential for some further partnerships to be added in a 6 month review. She added that under usual circumstances the review focussed on reasonable or limited partnerships, but this could be extended to include new partnerships as well as updates on those proposed for removal.

There was a discussion about the Manchester International Festival and The Factory and whether this could become a future partnership. Officers acknowledged the interdependencies and the overarching governance arrangements which encompassed both entities. They agreed to bring provide a comprehensive update to the Committee in November 2021.

Noting that a number of recommendations had been made by the Committee in today's meeting, a Member suggested the introduction of a monitor that sits alongside the Committees Work Programme to track the progress /implementation of it decisions. The Head of Audit and Risk Management agreed to collaborate with the Committee Officer to progress this.

Decisions

1. To note the report
2. To agree to the development of a decisions monitor that sits alongside the committee's work programme to track the progress of decisions made and their associated outcomes.

Health and Wellbeing Board

Minutes of the meeting held on 9 June 2021

Present:

Councillor Richard Leese, Leader of the Council (Chair)
Councillor Midgley, Executive Member for Adults Health and Wellbeing
Vicky Szulist, Chair, Healthwatch
David Regan, Director of Public Health
Rupert Nichols, Chair, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust
Dr Ruth Bromley, Chair Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Kathy Cowell, Chair, Manchester University NHS Foundation Trust
Dr Geeta Wadhwa, GP Member (South) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Bernadette Enright, Director of Adult Social Services
Paul Marshall, Strategic Director of Children's Services
Michael Luger, Chair of the Northern Care Alliance

Apologies:

Dr Murugesan Raja, GP Member (North) MHCC
Katy Calvin-Thomas, Manchester Local Care Organisation
Councillor Bridges, Executive Member for Children's Services
Dr Denis Colligan, GP Member (North) Manchester Health and Care Commissioning
Dr Tracey Vell, Primary Care representative - Local Medical Committee

Also in attendance:

Dr Manisha Kumar, Medical Director, MHCC

HWB/21/12 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 March 2021 were submitted for approval.

Decision

To agree as a correct record, the minutes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 24 March 2021.

HWB/21/13 COVID-19 Update and Vaccination Programme Update

The Director of Public Health and Medical Director, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning gave a presentation on the latest data and intelligence relating to COVID-19, with a particular focus on Variants of Concern (VOC). The Medical Director, Manchester Health and Care Commissioning, provided the Board with a progress report on the ongoing roll out of the Vaccination Programme.

The Board was reminded that Greater Manchester had been designated as an enhanced response area. The data provided had been validated up to 4 June 2021. In view of the increase in the number of infections the message continued to be the importance of vaccination. Reference was made to the number of people being admitted to hospital and the circumstances relating to this, in particular other

underlying medical issues. The North West is dealing with a fourth wave in view of the rising number of infections being recorded.

The current dominant variant is the Delta Variant and is 40% more transmissible than the Alpha Variant. The current rate of infection is 216.7 per 100000 population. A breakdown of cases per ward was provided with the number of deaths of Manchester residents recorded between week 13 to week 20. To increase the rates of vaccination a focused vaccination approach had been introduced into the top eight wards of the City with the highest rates of Variants of Concerns cases. The growth in vaccination had resulted in a reduction of deaths. The Manchester Action Plan had proved successful in

- Targeted communications and engagement
- Enhanced community testing and contact tracing
- Support to self-isolate (GM Pathfinder)
- Settings based outbreak management and advice
- Track data on a daily basis (e.g. over 60s rate and hospitalisations)
- Targeted Vaccination Drive

Additional vaccines supplies were expected to help with the push on vaccinations.

The Executive Director for Children Services provided an update on the advice and approach for schools. This included the continued wearing of masks, testing and advice on maintaining a safe space and hand washing. Planning was also in place for children transitioning to high school and planning for recovery.

Dr Manisha Kumar, Medical Director, MHCC addressed the meeting on the Covid 19 Vaccination Programme.

The Board was informed that the latest first dose vaccinated number in the City is 290763, although though the actual number is higher, due to those not living within the City or registered with a Manchester GP not included in the total. The figure for those receiving a second vaccination dose is 173813. Work was ongoing to focus on the wards within the central areas of the City and to target hotspots where the take up of the vaccine is lower. In addition, there are almost 250,000 residents to invite for a vaccine for the 10-12 cohorts. Reference was made to the approach and engagement with all cohorts to increase access for the take up of the vaccine. Communication is an essential factor in reaching all areas with work through local groups and community leaders, social media and door knocking to directly contact and engage with residents. It was reported that there are (approx.) 3700 volunteers helping to run vaccination centres currently who's help has been invaluable.

The Chair thanked the officers for the presentation. Reference was made to the importance of staying strong in the work of ensuring the take up of the vaccine regardless of community or location. Residents have a personal responsibility to take the vaccine and not doing so places them, other residents and the NHS at risk and increases the chances of other domestic variants developing which may be more resistant to the current vaccines.

The Chair also reported on the Surge Vaccination Programme planned for Greater Manchester for a 3 week period. Manchester will utilise the whole of the period to provide vaccinations, due to the high number of residents involved. For the over 40 age group there is a good level of supply of the Astrazeneca vaccine to provide first and second doses and increase levels of protection. For the under 40 age group the important factor would be the accessing of sufficient doses of the Pfizer and Moderna vaccines for the surge vaccination period.

The Chair responded to a question raised regarding the potential impact of taking vaccine from area to use in another and stated that by using the vaccine to contain the spread of infection in a high prevalence area, it would in turn reduce the risk of spread in other areas.

In noting the point raised regarding Patient Practices, the Chair endorsed the importance of working with neighbouring authorities, in particular instances where communities are located across two local authorities such as the Jewish community where Manchester residents were receiving a vaccination in Salford.

The Chair referred to infection prevalence figures which indicated a high rate for the 19-65years population. The figures produced by GMCA provided additional detail and identified the 16-29years age group as the highest prevalence cohort. It was also noted that this age group were less likely to have received a higher level of vaccination. This provided a correlation of prevalence of infection and non-vaccination to further justify to importance of getting vaccinated as soon as possible.

The Executive Director of Adult Services referred to partnership working and expressed thanks to Manchester Foundation Trust for the collaborative approach since the start of the pandemic on testing on release from hospital before national guidance was issued, vaccination work in the care sector and opening up the Pfizer vaccination to the under 40's age group.

The Chair referred to concerns raised regarding the Enhanced Response Area guidance and stated that a common-sense approach was needed in applying the guidance. No rules or restrictions apply to Greater Manchester that don't also apply to the rest of the country. Local lockdown measures did not work and the national lockdown was most effective to reduce the spread of infection.

Decision

The Board received the presentation and noted the plan update and thanked everyone involved in the vaccination programme for their massive effort.

HWB/21/14 Review of the Health and Wellbeing Board

The Board considered the report of the Director of Public Health regarding the membership of the Health and Wellbeing Board. The membership was last reviewed in 2018. In view of the scale of organisational and system change over the next year a refresh of the membership from July 2021 was proposed to support the work of the Board for the remainder of the municipal year. It is envisaged that once the Greater

Manchester Integrated Care System and place-based arrangements are clearer and then a more formal review of the Board can take place before April 2022.

The revised Membership of the Health and Wellbeing Board proposed that the following members will remain on the Board for the duration of 2021/22 and in line with the guidance the three statutory officers of the Council will continue to be Board members:

- Leader of the Council (Chair)
- Executive Member Health and Care (Deputy Chair)
- Deputy Leader of the Council
- Executive Member for Children's Services
- Chair Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC)
- Chair Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (MFT)
- Chair Greater Manchester Mental Health Foundation Trust (GMMHT)
- Chair Healthwatch
- VCS nominated representative
- Director of Public Health
- Director of Adult Social Services
- Director of Children's Services

In addition:

The Local Care Organisation will be requested to nominate a representative to sit on the Board.

The new Manchester GP Forum have been requested to identify three GP Board members.

The nominations will go to the Constitutional and Nomination Committee on 14 July 2021.

Further discussions will take place on representation from committees relating to Primary Care in Manchester (i.e. Local Medical Committee, Local Pharmaceutical Committee, Local Dental Committee, Local Optometry Committee).

The Chair stated that some of the appointments to the Board may be made before the end of the Municipal Year with transitional arrangements moving ahead. The appointments would include the Chair of the ICS and NHS Board. In addition, work was needed to address gaps within the membership of the Manchester Partnership Board which will form the basis of the Locality Board.

The Chair reported that the new system being introduced would involve two layers of accountability. One layer would relate to the NHS and accountability would be directly to the Secretary of State for Health. The local level would have accountability to the Locality Board and the Health and Wellbeing Board will play an important role in that local level of accountability. The Board's involvement may require changes its role and composition with a more formal composition. The Board's role is the public face of the local accountability and this will be noted in the discussions to take place.

A member referred to the importance of recognising the diverse nature of the city's population and during a review process the aspiration should be that the membership of the Board and the new Locality Board structure reflects the diversity of the population it serves.

The Chair noted the point raised and added that reflecting Manchester's breadth of diversity may make the process difficult for the membership of appointing a Board with a limited membership.

Decision

1. The Board noted the report submitted.
2. The Board agreed the proposed revised appointments to the Health and Wellbeing Board as follows:

Revised Membership of the Health and Wellbeing Board –

The following members will remain on the Board for the duration of 2021/22 and in line with the guidance the three statutory officers of the Council will continue to be Board members:

- Leader of the Council (Chair)
- Executive Member Health and Care (Deputy Chair)
- Deputy Leader of the Council
- Executive Member for Children's Services
- Chair Manchester Health and Care Commissioning (MHCC)
- Chair Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust (MFT)
- Chair Greater Manchester Mental Health Foundation Trust (GMMHT)
- Chair Healthwatch
- VCS nominated representative
- Director of Public Health
- Director of Adult Social Services
- Director of Children's Services

In addition:

- The Local Care Organisation will be requested to nominate a representative to sit on the Board.
- The new Manchester GP Forum have been requested to identify three GP Board members.

The nominations will be submitted to the Constitutional and Nomination Committee on 14 July 2021.

Further discussions will take place on representation from committees relating to Primary Care in Manchester (i.e. Local Medical Committee, Local Pharmaceutical Committee, Local Dental Committee, Local Optometry Committee).

Licensing and Appeals Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 7 June 2021

Present: Councillor Ludford – in the Chair

Councillors: Grimshaw, Andrews, Chambers, Connolly, Evans, Flanagan, Hewitson, Hughes, Lynch, McHale and Reid

Apologies: Councillor Jeavons

LAP/21/3 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2021 were submitted for approval.

Decision

To approve as a correct record the Minutes of the Licensing Committee meeting held on 8 March 2021.

LAP/21/4 Minimum Licensing Standards – Consultation Findings

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding an update on the Minimum Licensing Standards (MLS) project, which included a summary of consultation responses from the public and taxi trade.

The Licensing Unit Manager presented information from the report outlining how the public and taxi trade had responded to various aspects of the consultation which was made across Greater Manchester's 10 local authorities.

Responding to a question from a Committee member, the Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that Members would be provided with further reports on the consultation findings, with more detail on Manchester specific responses.

Responding to questions from a Committee member, the Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that the consultation could probably have taken place sooner but for the fact that the project was linked to the Clean Air Plan as there was a crucial link on vehicles, adding that the COVID19 pandemic further delayed the matter. The Licensing Unit Manager then confirmed that a £20million fund was to be made available to support vehicle upgrades and that this is due to commence towards the close of this calendar year.

Responding to a question from a Committee member, the Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that her understanding was that the aforementioned £20million was to be delivered by way of a grant scheme, and not a loan (although those grants may then be used towards special loans that are being devised as part of the overall Clean Taxi Fund Scheme) and that concerns of licensed drivers regarding extra charges have been fed back to TfGM.

Responding to questions from a Committee member, the Licensing Unit Manager confirmed that fee setting was not yet finalised, that the target dates for the Clean Air Plan were informed by the Government and could therefore not be altered, and that there had been a low percentage of feedback from the taxi trade to the consultation.

Responding to a final question from a Committee member, the Licensing Unit Manager stated that drug and alcohol testing for licensed drivers was supported in principle in the consultation findings, adding that the detail on implementation was to be determined and would need to be cost effective.

Decision

To note the report.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 3 June 2021

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

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

Apologies:

Councillor Kirkpatrick

Also present:

Councillors Johns and Rawson

PH/21/26 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications 128864/OO/2020, 128698/FO/2020, 129251/FO/2021, 129252/LO/2021, 129406/FO/2021, 128248/FO/2020, 127241/FO/2020, 127016/FO/2020, 127017/LO/2020 and 129835/FO/2021 since the agenda was issued.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/21/27 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 March 2021 as a correct record, subject to the replacement of the words “to undertake a site visit” with “to approve the application” at paragraph 23 of minute number PH/21/22.

PH/21/28 128864/OO/2020 - Land Opposite 83-87 Vine Street, Manchester, M18 8SR - Gorton and Abbey Hey Ward

This application seeks outline planning approval for layout and access in connection with developing the site for 25 dwellinghouses. All other matters including appearance, scale and landscaping are reserved. A variety of house types are proposed, comprising a mix of 15 two-bedroom, 9 three-bedroom and 1 four-bedroom houses. All would meet the Council’s approved space standards. A parameters plan has been submitted which indicates that the proposed properties would be two storeys in height. Access would be taken from Vine Street at a location to the south of the existing access to the site, and the existing dropped cross over would be reinstated. The layout would be in the form of a spine road running east west from Vine Street through the centre of the site, which would terminate in a turning head at the western end of the site, with houses located to the north and

south of the proposed road, orientated to face onto the street. Each house would have a front and rear garden. The tenure for all the proposed houses would be affordable rent being delivered through a registered provider (Southway Housing).

The agent for the applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

The Committee was informed that there was no one present to speak in objection to the application.

The Planning Officer did not add anything further to the report and reiterated to the Committee that the application is for layout and access arrangements to the proposed development site.

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

A member referred to three trees located on the access point of the site on Vine Street and the proposed removal of one of the trees.

The planning officer reported that there would be a landscaping scheme submitted at a later stage as part of a reserved matters planning application

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation for the Committee to be Minded to Approve the application. Councillor Shaukat Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application as detailed in the report submitted, subject to the conditions included and subject to the section 106 legal agreement proposed to ensure that 20% of the properties are affordable and would remain so in perpetuity.

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

PH/21/29 128698/FO/2020 - Vacant Land bounded by Stockport Road, Swallow Street, Siddall Street and Pennington Street, Manchester - Longsight Ward

The application related to a planning application relating to a cleared area of vacant, largely grassed land bounded by Swallow Street (north), Stockport Road (east), Pennington Street (south) and Siddall Street (west). The location of the site within Longsight ward, it is located within Levenshulme District Centre. The eastern boundary to Stockport Road would relate to neighbouring retail and commercial uses that characterise Stockport Road. A three-storey building used for the supply of building materials is located to the north of the site at the junction of Swallow Street and Siddall Street. Residential uses predominantly comprising of back of pavement, 2-storey housing is located to the north, west and south of the application site. A building with a maximum height of 3 storeys is located to the south of the site and at

the junction of Stockport Road and comprises of ground floor retail and a commercial use with apartments above. The site is enclosed with fencing and has previously been affected by fly-tipping. Some self-seeded bushes are situated centrally within the site. Double yellow lines (TROs) are located adjacent to the boundaries with Stockport Road returning at the respective junctions with Swallow Street and Pennington Street. The principle of a mixed use residential and retail development was established on 21 November 2021 by planning permission ref: 117411/FO/2017 for the erection of a four storey building to form 10 retail units on the ground floor with 24 apartments Page 66 Item 6 above with associated 25 space car parking area and new vehicular access from Siddall Street.

The Committee was informed that there was no one present to speak in objection to the application.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

The planning officer informed the Committee that a previous application had been granted for a four-storey building on the Stockport Road boundary of the site. However, the proposed application is an improvement on the existing application and provides regeneration opportunities for Levenshulme District Centre.

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

In welcoming the development and the improvement it would bring to the development site and surrounding area a member of the committee made reference to the s.106 Agreement for a reconciliation re-appraisal of the development for an affordable housing contribution. Reference was also made to the enhancement of the street scene through the planting included in the scheme.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation for the Committee to be Minded to Approve the application. Councillor Riasat seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application as detailed in the report submitted, subject to the conditions and the s.106 Agreement to secure a reconciliation re-appraisal to determine if the delivered development should be related to an affordable housing contribution

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

PH/21/30 129251/FO/2021 and 129252/LO/2021 - 98-116 Deansgate and 35-47 King Street West, Manchester, M3 2GQ - Deansgate Ward

The planning application proposes the use of floors 1-9 as offices and includes elevational alterations and the erection of a three storey rooftop extension to Kendal Milne and use of the ground, lower ground and basement levels as flexible

commercial space. The Fraser Building and link bridges would be demolished and replaced with a 14 storey office building (Use Class E), including plant level, amenity space and ground and basement commercial units. The application for Listed Building Consent is for internal and external alterations to Kendal Milne building as part of proposals for change of use and three storey rooftop extension to form 9 floors of offices and commercial uses at ground, lower ground and basement levels.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that the development would support city centre growth and infrastructure and the St Mary's Parsonage Strategic Regeneration Framework and there is a demand for office accommodation post-covid. The Committee was also informed that there had been a modification made to Condition 9 and this had been included in the Supplementary Information circulated prior to the meeting.

The Agent for the applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

The Committee was informed that there was no one to speak in objection to the application.

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

A member of the Committee referred to the loss of some of the glass block windows within the building and asked officers if other solutions had been explored before this decision had been made.

The Planning Officer reported that the heritage appraisal and the options analysis had interrogated this issue and the only way to retain the glass blocks would have been a 'black box' use such as a cinema or conference facility. Such usage would have a significant impact on the building. The applicant has since agreed to retain more of the glass blocks than had originally been proposed.

A member requested the inclusion of age friendly seating within the public realm element of the scheme. It was reported that condition relating to the public realm and the seating scheme would be amended to include age friendly seating.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation to approve the application.
Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the applications as detailed in the report submitted and subject to the conditions included in the report and subject to:

- Amendment to Condition 9, as set out in the Supplementary Information report.
- Amendment to the condition relating to public realm works for the inclusion of 'age friendly' seating within the scheme.

**PH/21/31 129406/FO/2021 - Land at Deansgate South, Manchester -
Deansgate Ward**

The application proposes a 28-storey purpose built student accommodation (PBSA) building providing 534 bed spaces. There have been 28 objections and 12 in support. Deansgate Ward Councillors Marcus Johns and William Jeavons have objected to the proposal.

The Planning Officer reported that a number of issues had been raised by the applicant and were included in the Supplementary Information report. The issues raised had been addressed by officers within the report submitted. The recommended reasons for refusal had been modified as set out in the supplementary information and related to:

- Principal of use
- Design quality – inadequacy of the proposed building materials
- Urban design – impact on surrounding building and the lack of open space around the building.
- Impact on nearby Listed Buildings
- Impact on the Conservation Area
- Wind environment

The Chair invited a spokesperson representing objectors to the proposal to address the Committee.

The objector stated that the proposal would have a negative impact on the surrounding buildings and the city centre. The proposal does not fit the Great Jackson Street Framework. The proposed structure is overbearing and obtrusive and there would be a loss of day light, a loss of privacy and a loss of the view from the neighbouring residential properties. The impact of the proposal would be detrimental to the Conservation Area and Listed Buildings. In addition, the universities do not support the proposal for student accommodation for this area of the city centre.

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

Councillor Johns (Deansgate Ward) addressed the Committee in objection to the application and requested that the application be refused as recommended for the reasons outlined.

The Planning Officer reported that the applicant had been consistently advised that the use was unacceptable and the building too tall. It would not be consistent with core strategy policy H12 or the Great Jackson Street framework. There are no obvious regeneration benefits and the proposal which would have a negative impact on the surrounding area. The building materials are not of a quality required and the proposal has been recommended for refusal.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation to refuse the application. Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee refused the application for the reasons detailed in the report submitted and in the officer's presentation.

PH/21/32 128248/FO/2020 - Land bound by Gould Street, Williamson Street, Bromley Street and Bilbrook Street, Manchester, M4 4DD - Piccadilly Ward

The application proposes 1202 homes and 192 sqm of commercial space within 9 buildings ranging from 8 to 34 storeys in height with car parking, public realm and landscaping following demolition of existing structures. Neighbour notification generated seven objections together with comments from the Marble Arch Inn and Friends of Angel Meadow (FOAM).

The Planning Officer informed the Committee that an additional condition had been added and this was detailed in the Supplementary Information report which requires details of the interim treatment of all land not included in phase one to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences. All works approved in discharge of the condition to be implemented in full before the first occupation of any home in phase one.

There was no objector present at the meeting.

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

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

A member of the Committee referred to the inclusion of affordable housing and asked officers for the reason why the proposal had been set a level of 7%, which included remediation in view of the 20% policy.

The Planning Officer reported that a viability appraisal had been independently assessed on behalf of the Council which concluded that the development would only be viable with a 7% level of affordable housing. This would be reviewed at a later date to determine any changes in viability. If further affordable housing is considered appropriate it would be included within the development or as a contribution to off-site provision.

A member of the Committee noted the scale of the proposal and questioned whether social infrastructure such as nurseries and GP surgeries would be included within the development. The planning Officer was also asked whether the proposed development had been designed to promote intergenerational living and include provision for residents with a disability.

The Planning Officer reported that Victoria North is a very large-scale development that will take between 15-20 years to complete within the lower Irk Valley area. The overview and vision includes social infrastructure and that will be included within individual proposals as development proceeds. The units within the development will

include town houses and 1-3 bedroom flats to promote intergenerational living to ensure the development is successful.

A member of the Committee referred to the importance of ensuring the transporting of contaminated soil is done away from adjoining residential neighbourhoods and to conduct environmental assessments of the development land. Also, planning officers were informed that the proposed hours of work for the construction of the development appeared to be outside that of the current policy. In view of the scale and the length of time the development would take to complete and the close proximity of a residential neighbourhood, the proposal was made to include a condition for construction times to be as follows:

8.30am-6.00pm Monday to Friday

10.00am-2.00pm Saturday

No construction to take place on bank holidays or on Sunday.

The Planning Officer reported that the majority of the contaminated material had been removed. The remaining contaminated soil would be removed in a safe manner. An additional condition could be added to address concerns on the hours of operation of the site.

A member referred to the long-term vision for the development of the area and wider area of the lower Irk Valley and expressed concern that plans for this vision for the inclusion of social infrastructure planning for families needed to be forthcoming sooner rather than later.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation of Minded to Approve for the application, subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement in relation to affordable housing and to the inclusion of an additional condition requiring the hours work to be amended as proposed. Councillor Stogia seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application, subject to the conditions contained in the report and supplementary report, and to the signing of a section 106 agreement in relation to affordable housing and to the inclusion of an additional condition requiring the hours work to be amended as follows:

8.30am-6.00pm Monday to Friday

10.00am-2.00pm Saturday

No construction to take place on bank-holidays or on Sunday.

(The Committee adjourned at this point for 10 minutes.)

**PH/21/33 127241/FO/2020 - 515-521 Barlow Moor Road, Manchester, M21
8AQ - Chorlton Park Ward**

The application relates to a change of use of 515 Barlow Moor Road from ground floor retail (Use Class A1) and 1no. self-contained flat to form a single 2no. bedroom dwellinghouse (Use Class C3), elevational alterations to front and rear, landscaping,

and, conversion of no.s 517 to 521 Barlow Moor Road from ground floor retail (Use Class A1) and 6no. self-contained flats to form 11.no self-contained flats (Use Class C3) together with a three storey rear extension to no.s 517 and 519 Barlow Moor Road, 3no front dormers and 3no. rear dormers, associated elevation alterations to front and rear including creation of vehicular and pedestrian access, bicycle and bin stores and formation of 6 no. car parking spaces.

The Planning Officer reported that video footage had been received that show bats to be flying in the area around the development and a further bat survey of the area would take place to assess this.

A spokesperson representing objectors to the application addressed the Committee.

Councillor Rawson addressed the Committee to object to the application.

Councillor Andrews requested that the Committee hold a site visit to the development site to visualise the area and allow time for a bat survey to be completed and assessed. This was seconded by Councillor Richards.

Decision

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

PH/21/34 121897/FO/2018 - Unity House 42 Great Southern Street, Manchester, M14 4EZ - Moss Side Ward

The application relates to the erection of second-floor extension and infill extensions to courtyard to provide prayer hall and classrooms.

The Planning Officer did not add anything further to the report submitted.

There were no spokespersons representing objectors or the applicant present.

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

Decision

The Committee agreed the application as detailed in the report submitted and subject to the conditions included.

PH/21/35 127016/FO/2020 and 127017/LO/2020 - 363 Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M14 6XU - Withington Ward

The application relates to the erection of two storey rear extension to create 9no. self contained flats together with various other works including internal alterations, the

rebuilding of gate piers, the laying out of car parking area and the provision of a cycle store and refuse store.

The Planning Officer advised the Committee that there were two applications to consider relating to development and Listed Building Consent.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee on both of the applications.

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

Decisions

1. The Committee agreed the application for development, as detailed in the report submitted and subject to the conditions included.
2. The Committee agreed the application for Listed Building Consent.

PH/21/36 129835/JO/2021 - Untapped 67 Church Road, Manchester, M22 4WD - Northenden Ward

The application relates to Application to remove Condition numbers: 1 (time period for operation), 2 (personal consent) and 8 (External Seating Area) from planning approval 124313/FO/2019 to allow the business to operate permanently, remove the personal consent and allow the property to be operated by any operator, and to allow an external seating area, and the variation of Condition 4 (opening hours) to amend the opening hours to allow opening between 10am to Midnight 7 days a week and to allow the operation of an external seating area between the hours of 10am and 9pm. Permission is also sought to amend Condition 9 (Management Plan) to reflect changes in management relating to the external seating area.

The Planning Officer did not add anything further to the application submitted.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation to approve the application.
Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the application as detailed in the report submitted and subject to the conditions included.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 1 July 2021

Present: Councillor Curley (Chair)

Councillors: Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Hutchinson, Kamal, Lyons, Riasat, Richards and Stogia

Apologies:

Councillor Baker-Smith, Kirkpatrick and Lovecy

Also present:

Councillors Jeavons, Rawson, Shilton-Godwin and Wheeler

PH/21/37 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received in respect of applications 130166/FH/2021, 121252/FO/2018 and 129010/FO/2020 since the agenda was issued had been circulated in advance of the meeting.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/21/38 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 3 June 2021 as a correct record.

PH/21/39 11 Mardale Avenue, Manchester, M20 4TU

This application is for the erection of a part single, part two-storey side and part single-storey, part two-storey rear extension, the installation of rear dormer, front porch extension and elevational alterations to provide additional living accommodation. The property is not listed or in a conservation area and is typical of the type and style of properties within the immediate area. This application is a resubmission following an earlier refusal for a scheme consisting of larger extensions. The proposed extensions have been amended since the previous submission to reduce their scale and to reduce impacts on the appearance of the main part of the building and the neighbouring properties.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee on the application stating that the scheme had been revised and reduced in width with the roof height lowered and stated that the application was now acceptable.

The Committee was informed that there was no one present to speak in objection to the application.

The applicant was not present to address the Committee on the application.

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

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation for the Committee to Approve the application. Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the application as detailed in the report submitted and subject to the conditions included.

(Councillor Davies was not present in the meeting room and took no part in the consideration or vote on the application.)

PH/21/40 Application for 127241/FO/2020 - 515 to 521 Barlow Moor Road Manchester M21 8AQ - Chorlton Park Ward

The application relates to a change of use of 515 Barlow Moor Road from ground floor retail (Use Class A1) and 1no. self-contained flat to form a single 2no. bedroom dwellinghouse (Use Class C3), elevational alterations to front and rear, landscaping, and, conversion of no.s 517 to 521 Barlow Moor Road from ground floor retail (Use Class A1) and 6no. self-contained flats to form 11.no self-contained flats (Use Class C3) together with a three storey rear extension to no.s 517 and 519 Barlow Moor Road, 3no front dormers and 3no. rear dormers, associated elevation alterations to front and rear including creation of vehicular and pedestrian access, bicycle and bin stores and formation of 6 no. car parking spaces

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee on the application, stating that the Committee had been on a site visit that morning, prior to the meeting.

A resident made representations on behalf of residents of the building and addressed the Committee in objection to the application on the grounds that there was insufficient space for all features proposed, that the garden to the rear is a wildlife corridor, that there were concerns over the potential for adding further car parking spaces and that the current tenants would be forced to move out of their homes when the development was complete.

Councillors Rawson and Shilton-Godwin (Chorlton Park Ward) addressed the Committee in objection to the application and requested that the application be refused for the reasons outlined.

The Planning Officer reported that the concerns over car parking and the garden space had been properly assessed and no objection was raised by the ecology unit and that the agent for the applicant had confirmed that current tenants would be supported with a move from the building to alternative accommodation.

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

A member of the Committee, referring to the report, noted that the current tenants had been given a year and a half to prepare to move out of the premises.

The Planning Officer stated that the Government standard advice was that a planning permission should commence within three years of the grant of permission.

The Director of Planning confirmed the Planning Officer's comments and stated that an extension could be sought if this was seen to be agreeable to the Committee.

A member of the Committee suggested the planning permission should be extended to five years and this would give the tenants a further period of time to make any arrangements to move to new accommodation.

The Director of Planning stated that this proposal could be added as a condition.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation of Approve for the application, subject to the added condition that the planning permission should be commenced within 5 years, so as to give the existing tenants further time within which to secure new accommodation. Councillor Richards seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the application as detailed in the report submitted and subject to the condition that the planning permission should be commenced within 5 years.

PH/21/41 121252/FO/2018 - Great Marlborough Street Car Park, Great Marlborough Street, Manchester M1 5NJ - Deansgate Ward

The application relates to a partial reconfiguration of a 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 stated that there had been late representations which had been circulated to the Committee. A lengthy representation had been received on the morning of the committee which, it is understood, had been sent direct to all members of the Committee. The officer informed the Committee that the comments had not raised new issues and these had been fully set out and addressed in the printed report and the late representation. The officer responded to the comments about the Equalities Act and the Public Sector Equality Duty. These had been looked at and that officers are satisfied that the issues are adequately covered in the application and the report.

The officer also confirmed that the publishing of the report before the expiry of the (fourth) neighbour notification was in accordance with usual practice and there had been no failure to comply with due process or normal practice.

A local resident, acting as spokesperson for a resident's group, addressed the Committee in objection to the application on the grounds of the size of the development and associated carbon, waste and oxygen issues, loss of parking spaces during development, decrease in disabled parking spaces, increase to the traffic network in the immediate surrounding area and loss of amenity to neighbouring residences.

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

Councillor Jeavons (Deansgate Ward) addressed the Committee to object to the application.

The Planning Officer referred the Committee to the report, stating that all issues raised had been addressed. The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions and comment on the application.

A member of the Committee raised a question about the development's link with Manchester University and the percentage of units being affordable

The Planning Officer stated that the policy required the support of one University only, adding that Manchester Metropolitan University had provided this support and that there is no policy on providing affordable student accommodation.

A member of the Committee supported the principle of housing students and releasing HMOs back into the rental market for families but felt that the proposal was too tall at 55 storeys, feeling that 30 storeys would be more acceptable.

The Planning Officer stated that Executive had supported the provision of student accommodation in line with the Committee member's previous comments and added that the impact of buildings, once over a certain height, diminishes.

A member of the Committee raised the issue of parking for residents during and after the construction.

The Planning Officer stated that the parking spaces would be available throughout construction, other than when specific aspects of the building work were taking place.

A member of the Committee raised the issue of early publication of reports and concerns around taxis and food deliveries creating noise and disturbance in the vicinity.

The Planning Officer stated that, in this most recent round of consultation, local residents had been given 30 days to respond with comments. Some comments had been received following that round of notification. The latest comment was received on the morning of the meeting (day 37) and had been circulated to the Committee Members. Addressing the other concerns, The Planning Officer stated that there is a robust management plan for the building with regard to taxis and deliveries.

Councillor Lyons moved that the Committee refuse the application on the grounds of excessive height, loss of amenity to local residents, lack of support from Universities and

the impact of adding 853 students to a local community. Councillor Hutchinson seconded the proposal.

The Committee voted against Councillor Lyons' proposal.

Councillor Andrews moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve for the application, subject to a legal agreement. Councillor Hutchinson seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application as detailed in the report submitted, subject to the signing of a legal agreement in relation to infrastructure improvements.

(The Committee adjourned at this point for 10 minutes).

PH/21/42 130475/LO/2021 - 42, 44 and 46 Thomas Street (Including 41, 43 and 45 Back Turner Street) Thomas Street, Manchester M4 1ER - Piccadilly Ward

The planning application proposes the demolition of the Grade II Listed former Weavers Cottages 42-46 Thomas Street that were listed in 2018 following the grant of planning permission for their demolition in 2017. Approval of this proposal would enable the delivery of the wider site proposal including the retention and refurbishment of 7 Kelvin Street.

The Planning Officer informed the Committee a representation had been received from a local business stating that the proposal would be a benefit to the Northern Quarter.

A member of the Committee requested a deferral of this item until the Committee's previous decision to refuse an earlier application had been assessed by the Secretary of State.

The Director of Planning stated that this was a new application, albeit for the same proposal, and should be considered by the Committee and allow for officers to respond to any matters the committee may wish to raise before reaching a decision.

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

Councillor Wheeler (Piccadilly Ward) addressed the Committee in objection to the application and requested that the application be refused due to the loss of a historic working-class site.

Councillor Lyons (having declared an interest and speaking as Councillor for Piccadilly Ward) addressed the Committee in objection to the application and requested that the application be refused in line with Historic England's opposition to the demolition of the site.

(Councillor Lyons left the meeting for the remainder of this item and the following item).

The Planning Officer stated that there had been one earlier refusal of permission, not two as had been suggested by previous speakers. This was the second application for Listed Building Consent for these proposals. The Planning Officer advised that the current derelict site has a negative impact on the surrounding area. If the Committee made a decision to approve this application, it would need to be referred to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government who could decide to either call in the application for determination or refer it back to the City Council to issue a decision. This is different to an Appeal which are mutually exclusive processes.

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

Councillor Hutchinson moved to defer the application for a site visit. Councillor Davies seconded the proposal.

Councillor Stogia said that the site, which was known by many, is in a poor state and that a decision should not be delayed. Adding that that the redevelopment would support businesses which was much needed as a result of COVID-19 and proposed the application should be Approved, in line with the Officer recommendation. The Chair stated that the proposed deferral for a site visit would require a vote by the Committee.

The Committee voted against the deferral for a site visit.

Councillor Stogia moved the recommendation of Minded to Approve for the application. Councillor Shaukat Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee is Minded to Approve the application, subject to referral to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, 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.

PH/21/43 129010/FO/2020 - Public Car Park Accessed Via Stockport Road and Albert Road, Manchester M19 3AB - Levenshulme Ward

The application relates to the temporary use of the southern half of public car park for a 4 year period in connection with the operation of a weekly market on Saturdays (10.00 am-4.00 pm) between March and December (inclusive) and no more than 10 annual Friday night-markets (5.00 pm-9.00pm) during the same period, retention of existing storage container unit and internal generator, reconfiguration of waste / recycling storage area and installation of electric power supply cabinet (following the phased decommissioning of an existing generator)

The Planning Officer stated that the frequency of the markets operations had been proposed to be increased in frequency but the application had been revised in order to seek approval for the same times and dates that the market had operated for the last four years.

There was no objector present at the meeting.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Andrews moved the recommendation for the Committee to Approve the application. Councillor Kamal seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee agreed the application as detailed in the report submitted and subject to the conditions included.

Standards Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 17 June 2021

Present

Independent Co-opted Member: N Jackson – In the Chair

Councillors Andrews, Connolly, Lanchbury and A. Simcock

Ringway Parish Council: Councillor O'Donovan

Independent Co-opted Member: G Linnell

Apologies:

Councillor Evans

ST/21/08 Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held 18 March 2021 were submitted for approval.

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 18 March 2021 as a correct record.

ST/21/09 Draft Annual Governance Statement 2020/21

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer presenting the draft 2020/21 Annual Governance Statement (AGS). The AGS has been produced following completion of the annual review of the Council's governance arrangements and systems of internal control. The Directorate Lead - Corporate Planning and Governance introduced the report and informed the Committee that work had been undertaken to streamline the report following an exercise with peer authorities to look at examples of good practice and to adapt those to improve the layout and content of the statement. The statement has been made more concise and now focuses on important strategic information.

The Committee was reminded that the AGS is reported to both Audit Committee and Standards Committee. The Annual Report of Standards Committee informs the AGS as a source of assurance and it was proposed that for 2021/22 and subsequent years that instead of the AGS itself being brought to Standards Committee and Audit Committee, that would instead be submitted to Audit Committee only. This amendment would improve the efficiency of the process due to the timing of the usual Committee schedule which holds the meeting of the Standards Committee in March before Audit Committee. This will allow the draft version of the AGS to be in a more complete year-end position when reported to Audit Committee, therefore reducing officer resources required to update and produce the document. A recommendation would be required for the Council to consider and decide whether to amend article 9 of the Council Constitution accordingly. In addition, the Committee was requested to agree that the Code of Corporate Governance (CCG) be removed

from the remit of the Standards Committee and be considered by the Audit Committee.

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

Members of the Committee questioned the reasons for the removal of the AGS from consideration by Standards Committee in particular the reference to officer time. Members also considered the involvement of the Committee to be relevant and important. A change of date of the Standards Committee was suggested to address the matter.

The Committee was informed that a change of date to bring the report later would address the matter.

The Chair advised the Committee that the change of timings in the accounting regulations had impacted on the production of the AGS. Also, the Standards Committee had only limited terms of reference in relation to the AGS and CCG. The Committee's ability to inform the AGS is through the production of the Annual Standards Report as it provides the Standards Committee overview of how the Council is operating and provides the Council with that assurance. It would also be difficult to advise on what the Committee could add to the CCG through the limited standards related focus it has, unless changes were made by CIPFA to the key principles relating to matters of conduct.

A member questioned what compromise could be made if a change was made to the CIPFA principles to allow to allow the Committee to assess if input was required into the any new principles.

The Committee was advised that any changes to the CIPFA principles would be reported to the Committee for consideration.

Following discussion, members were in agreement that the Committee should retain its current responsibility for parts of the AGS and CCG relating to Standards matters. In addressing the issue of the scheduling of meetings, it was suggested that the Chair agree to call an additional meeting of the Standards Committee to deal with those matters as and when they arise.

The Chair noted that the Committee was aware of the need for flexibility in considering the Annual Governance Statement and preferred to retain the current responsibilities as part of its terms of reference, as detailed in the Council Constitution. To ensure the schedule for the production of the AGS is met, the Committee would meet to consider the AGS at an additional ordinary meeting at a time to complement its submission to the Audit Committee.

Decisions

1. The Committee noted the contents and the comments on the draft version of the Council's 2020/21 Annual Governance Statement (AGS).

2. The Committee agreed to retain its responsibility to consider the Annual Governance Statement and Code of Corporate Governance in relation to member standards matters.
3. The Committee agreed that an additional ordinary meeting of the Standards Committee be arranged, in consultation with the Chair, to consider the AGS, to complement the submission of the AGS to the Audit Committee if needed.

ST/21/10 Review of the Operation and Efficacy of the Arrangements for dealing with Code of Conduct complaints against Members

The Committee considered the report of City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer that provided an update on the operation and efficacy of the arrangements for dealing with Code of Conduct complaints against Members.

The report was introduced by the Head of Governance, Legal Services.

Reference was made to the suggestion that the Chief Legal Officers in Greater Manchester consider the wording of the Arrangements as part of their discussions on the new Local Government Association Model Code of Conduct for Members. The report also provided the timeframes within the Council's Arrangements for dealing with complaints. The Committee was also advised that for the period 1 February to 31 May 2021, four complaints against Members were received by the Monitoring Officer and in respect of all four complaints the timeframes were complied with.

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

A member asked when the Chief Legal Officers would consider the New Model Code.

The Committee was informed that a meeting to consider the Code would take place within the next two months and the outcome would be reported to the next meeting of the Standards Committee in November.

Decisions

1. To note the Monitoring Officer's information on the operation and efficacy of the Arrangements for dealing with Code of Conduct complaints against Members.
2. That the Chief Legal Officers in Greater Manchester be requested to discuss their respective Arrangements and that the outcome of these discussions be reported to a future meeting of this Committee.

ST/21/11 Review of the Operation and Efficacy of the Use of Resources Guidance for Members

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor that provided an update on the operation and efficacy of the Use of Resources Guidance for Members.

The Head of Governance, Legal Services introduced the report and informed the Committee that the changes made to the Guidance as part of the review of the Constitution had been agreed by Council in February 2021 and these are highlighted in the report.

Decisions

1. To note the Monitoring Officer's views on the operation and efficacy of the Use of Resources Guidance for Members.
2. To recirculate the Use of Resources Guidance for Members to all members of Council for information.

ST/21/12 Membership of the Standards (Hearing) Sub-Committee

The Committee considered the report of City Solicitor to assist the Committee in reviewing the membership of the Standards (Hearing) Sub-Committee, considering recent changes to the membership of the Standards Committee.

Decisions

1. To appoint the membership of the Standards (Hearing) Sub-Committee as follows:

Members of the Sub-Committee	Substitute Members
The Independent Member who has been appointed as Chair of the Standards Committee, who will act as Chair of the Standards (Hearing) Sub Committee – currently Nicolé Jackson	The other Independent Member of the Standards Committee, who will act as substitute Chair of the Standards (Hearing) Sub-Committee – currently Geoff Linnell
Councillor Andrew	Councillor Simcock and Councillor Connolly shall, in that order of priority and subject to availability, act as substitute elected members in the event that one or more elected members of the Standards (Hearing) Sub-Committee is unable to attend a meeting of the Sub-Committee.
Councillor Evans	
Councillor Lanchbury	

2. Where the Standards (Hearing) Sub-Committee is considering a complaint against a member of Ringway Parish Council, the Parish Member of the Standards Committee (currently Parish Councillor O'Donovan) shall also be a member of the Sub-Committee.

ST/21/13 Review of Procedure for the Hearing of Allegations of Breaches of the Council's Code of Conduct for Members

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor seeking the views of the Committee on the proposed revisions to the Procedure for the Hearing of Allegations of Breaches to the Council's Code of Conduct for Members.

Decision

The Committee noted the proposed revised Procedure for the Hearing of Allegations of Breaches of the Council's Code of Conduct for Members ('the Procedure') and approved, the revised Procedure, as detailed in the Appendix of the report submitted.

ST/21/14 Terms of Office of the Independent Members of the Standards Committee and the Council's Independent Persons

The Committee considered the report of the City Solicitor and Monitoring Officer that sought the views of the Committee in relation to the terms of office of the two independent co-opted members of the Standards Committee and the Council's two Independent Persons.

The Head of Governance, Legal Services introduced the report. Reference was made to the extension of the terms of office of the current two Independent members and the two Independent Persons for one further year. The Committee for Standards in Public Life have recommended that Independent Person appointments should be for a fixed term of 2 years, renewable once. The Government's response to the recommendations is still awaited.

It was reported that contact with each of the Independent members Persons on the Standards Committee would take place outside of the meeting to confirm whether each person wishes to continue in the role. A report would then be submitted to Constitutional and Nomination Committee before submission to Council to approve the extension of one year from November 2021 to November 2022.

The Chair invited questions from the Committee.

A member asked if there is a recruitment process in place, in the event that any of the independent persons did not wish to continue in the role. Officers were also asked if it would be possible to extend the term of office beyond November 2022 and asked that the Committee be notified of the outcome of the contact with the Independent Persons and Independent Members

The Committee was informed that a recruitment process is in place and sufficient time is available to recruit if required. The extension beyond the current proposal is possible however, the recommended term of office is four years to prevent any possibility of their independence being compromised by a long period of involvement with particular Council

Decisions

1. That Nicolé Jackson & Geoff Linnell (the two independent co-opted members of the Standards Committee) and Alan Eastwood & Sarah Beswick (the Council's two Independent Persons) be contacted to ask whether they are agreeable to the extension of their terms of their office for a period of one year from 18 November 2021.
2. That the matter then be referred to the Constitutional and Nominations Committee and Council for a decision to be taken regarding the potential extensions of their terms of office.

(The Committee was advised that following advice from the City Solicitor, the Co-opted members named within the report (Nicolé Jackson and Geoff Linnell), who were present at the meeting, would not be required to declare an interest for the reason that the report sought agreement to contact co-opted committee members to ask if they are agreeable to the extension of the terms of their office for a period of one year from 18 November 2021.)

ST/21/15 Work Programme for the Standards Committee

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

Decision

To note the report and agree the Work Programme.