

Audit Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 26 July 2022

Present:

Councillor Lanchbury - In the Chair
Councillors Curley and Russell
Independent Co-opted member: Dr S Downs

Apologies:

Councillors Flanagan, Good, Simcock and Wheeler
Independent Co-opted member: Dr D Barker

Also Present:

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Finance and Resources
Alistair Newall, Mazars (External Auditor)
Karen Murray, Mazars (External Auditor)

AC/22/21 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 14 June 2022 as a correct record.

AC/22/22 Updated Draft Statement of Annual Accounts 2020/21

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided an update of the revised 2020/21 accounts containing the amendments detailed in the report.

The report advised that these accounts were updated from those reported to the 27 July 2021 meeting of the Committee and took account of any changes that had arisen since that time, including the findings of external audit.

The Committee were informed that before the audit could be concluded further changes may be required to these accounts due to a national accounting issue relating to the approach to the valuation of highways infrastructure, which has affected all Councils.

Officers clarified points raised by the Committee in relation to the purchasing of Personal Protective Equipment during the pandemic; the valuation of assets; and the assessment of infrastructure holdings for accounting purposes.

Officers also responded to questions raised in relation to the systems established for Looked After Children Accounts, including the audit control and assurance of these accounts, adding that the issue raised by a Member on General Data Protection Regulations considerations and paper bank account statements would be taken into account during the planned audit of these arrangements.

Decision

The Committee:

1. Note the amendments made to the annual accounts since they were reported to the Audit Committee in July 2021.
2. Approve the revised annual accounts including the accounting policies contained within them subject to the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer working with finance staff, external auditors and the Executive Member for Finance to finalise any amendments as a result of the highways infrastructure issue and to report the annual accounts back to Audit Committee highlighting the changes made.
3. Agree to not amend the annual accounts in relation to investment property valuations as detailed in paragraph 2.20.
4. Agree to not amend the annual accounts in relation to the consolidation adjustment in the group accounts for leases as detailed in paragraph 2.46.

AC/22/23 Draft Audit Completion report (2020/21)

The Committee considered the report of the External Auditors (Mazars) which presented the Draft Audit Completion report.

The report set out a narrative around:

- Providing an Executive Summary;
- Reporting the status of the audit;
- Information in relation to the audit approach;
- Internal control recommendations;
- A summary of misstatements; and
- Value for Money arrangements.

The Committee noted that this item had been considered and discussed in conjunction with the previous agenda item.

Decision

The Committee note the report.

AC/22/24 Treasury Management Outturn report 2021/22

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that updated the Members on the Treasury Management activities of the Council during the financial year 2021-22. Noting that Treasury Management in this context was defined as:

‘The management of the organisation’s investments and cash flows, its banking, money market and capital market transactions; the effective control of the risks associated with those activities; and the pursuit of optimum performance consistent with those risks’.

The report set out a narrative around:

- Introduction and Background;
- Portfolio Position as at 31 March 2022;
- Review of Economic Conditions 2021-22;
- Treasury Borrowing in 2021-22;
- Compliance with Prudential Indicators and Treasury Limits;
- Investment Strategy for 2021-22;
- Temporary Borrowing and Investment for 2021-22;
- Current Market Conditions and Forward Fixing; and
- Conclusions.

Officers clarified points raised by the Committee in relation to Temporary Borrowing and Investment for 2021-22 and the reported benchmarking; and the approach and rationale to long-term borrowing to fund capital projects.

Decision

The Committee note the report.

AC/22/25 Internal Audit Assurance (Q1)

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management.

The report set out a narrative around:

- An update of progress on the agreed audit plan 2022/23; and
- Additional work assigned to the audit service and copies of the audit opinions issued in the period April 2022 to June 2022.

The Committee noted that a progress update on the period prior to this had been included in the Annual Assurance Report presented to Committee in April 2022.

Members requested that the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management provide Committee with the Executive Summaries produced in relation to Adults Services described in Appendix One to the report.

The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management responded to comments raised in relation to the arrangements regarding the School Financial Value Standard. He made reference to new arrangements for reporting related party transactions and that there was some assurance from this process given that only one transaction reported to audit did not pass this probity test. He further clarified the arrangements in relation to related party transactions and Academy schools, noting that these arrangements were external to the Council. The Committee were advised of the separate and distinct arrangements for the audit of Academies, noting that any issues arising would be reported and managed nationally by the Education and Skills Funding Agency, a Department for Education executive agency.

The Chair sought an assurance that the pace at which the Internal Audit Team had

started the year would be able to be sustained throughout the year. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated that resources were being recruited permanently to continue this work.

Decision

The Committee note the report.

AC/22/26 Outstanding Audit Recommendations (Q1)

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management that described that in accordance with Public Sector Internal Audit Standards, the Head of Audit and Risk Management must “establish and maintain a system to monitor the disposition of results communicated to management; and a follow-up process to monitor and ensure that management actions have been effectively implemented or that senior management has accepted the risk of not taking action”.

The report explained that for Manchester City Council this system included reporting to Directors and their management teams, Strategic Management Team, Executive Members and Audit Committee.

The report further summarised the current implementation position and arrangements for monitoring and reporting internal and external audit recommendations.

Members discussed the potential need to review the outstanding long-term recommendations, noting that the original risk identified may have changed significantly over time as a result of changes in circumstances and legislation. The Head of Audit and Risk Management noted the issues raised by a Member regarding the outstanding mental health recommendation, adding that it maybe timely to re audit this area of work.

Decision

The Committee note the report.

AC/22/27 Prudential Framework Changes

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that provided information on the revised CIPFA Prudential and Treasury Management Codes of Practice.

The Committee were informed that the revised codes were published in late 2021 and contained a number of significant changes which the Council would need to implement in time for the Treasury Management Strategy Statement for 2023/24, and which would therefore form part of the budget presented to members in early 2023.

The report described the main changes in the code and the implications for the Council, including the governance and assurance arrangements.

The Committee welcomed the inclusion of members of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee to be included in the proposed training for Members. The Chair suggested that all Scrutiny Committee Chairs should be invited to this training as this would assist with the scrutiny of the Council's budget later in the year.

The Chair stated that she supported the proposed changes to the Council's Constitution in relation responsibility to monitor the performance of the Treasury Management function, detailed at section 7 of the report.

Decision

The Committee note the report.

AC/22/28 Risk Review Schools Assurance

The Committee considered the report of the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management that described that in accordance with Public Sector Internal Audit Standards, the Head of Audit and Risk Management must "establish and maintain a system to monitor the disposition of results communicated to management; and a follow-up process to monitor and ensure that management actions have been effectively implemented or that senior management has accepted the risk of not taking action".

For Manchester City Council this system included reporting to directors and their management teams, Strategic Management Team, Executive Members and Audit Committee. The report noted that the Audit Committee had requested an update on school assurance in response to recent audit reviews and issues reported through the annual Audit Opinion for 2021/22.

Following questions and comments from Members the Head of Audit and Risk Management stated that the need to report recent audit reviews and progress against issues identified to the Committee was understood. He described that the process for following up audit recommendations was best achieved by visiting the schools and meeting with the Business Manager or Headteacher. He stated that if issues needed to be escalated this was done through the Chair of Governors. He clarified that the recommendations arising from school audits were shared with both the relevant Business Manager, Headteacher and Chair of Governors.

In terms of support to schools, recognising the challenges described by members, particularly those experienced by smaller schools, the Head of Audit and Risk Management described that Budget Support Officers were available to provide advice. He further advised that schools were encouraged to work in clusters to support this activity and provide support, particularly linking smaller schools with larger ones.

The Director of Education provided examples of where the cluster approach described had delivered positive outcomes for schools and referenced the benefits achieved through economies of scale when purchasing. She further advised that the Department for Education provided a resource to schools to obtain advice and

support in relation to procurement. She further commented that issues arising through the school's assurance process were addressed through regular briefings with Business Managers, Heads and Chairs of Governors.

Decision

The Committee note the governance arrangements and oversight for schools and note the progress update on school audit recommendations.

AC/22/29 Work Programme and Recommendations Monitor

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which set out its future Work Programme for the forthcoming municipal year.

Decision

To agree the Committee's Work programme.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 28 July 2022

Present: Councillor Curley - In the Chair

Councillors: S Ali, Andrews, Davies, Flanagan, Hewitson, Kamal, Leech, J Lovecy, Lyons, Riasat and Richards

Apologies: Councillors Baker-Smith, Y Dar and Stogia

Also present: Councillor Good, Robinson and Wilson

PH/22/39 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 133746/FO/2022, 132489/FO/2021 and 130922/FO/2021.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/22/40 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 30 June 2022 as a correct record.

PH/22/41 133746/FO/2022 - Land at Junction of Parrs Wood Lane, Manchester, M20 5AA - Didsbury East Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described that this proposal related to the erection of a 6 storey building to form 75 no. residential apartments, and associated car and cycle parking, landscaping and highway works.

The application site currently formed part of the existing car parking area to the south of the associated Tesco Store located off Parrs Wood Lane located within the Didsbury East ward. As well as hardstanding associated with the car parking area the site also contained associated landscaping and trees.

The proposals were subject to notification by way of 272 letters to nearby addresses, site notice posted at the site and advertisement in the Manchester Evening News. In response 235 comments were received, 228 of these were objecting to the proposals. Didsbury East Councillors Foley, Simcock and Wilson have submitted comments objecting to the proposals.

Amongst other matters that were set out within the main body of the report it was considered that the principle of high density residential development in this part of

South Manchester did not accord with the adopted planning policies in place in Manchester; that the proposals did not provide for an adequate level of on-site car parking to serve the development; and, the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the proposals would not give rise to unacceptable impacts on the highway network in the vicinity of the site.

The Planning Officer had nothing further to add to the printed published report, noting the receipt of the late representations.

An objector, representing residents, addressed the Committee on the application. He stated that the proposed high-density development was inappropriate for the location and if permission was granted would adversely contribute to the traffic congestion already experienced in the area. He also raised the issue of road safety in the area. He stated that the number of car parking spaces proposed in the scheme would detrimentally impact on local on-street car parking. He concluded by supporting the officer recommendation to refuse the application.

The agent addressed the Committee on the application.

Councillor Wilson, Member for Didsbury East Ward addressed the Committee. He stated that he and his fellow ward councillors supported the officer recommendation to refuse. He reiterated the issues raised regarding the impact on local traffic congestion and on-street parking, with little or no mitigation measures proposed in the application. He further stated that the consultation exercise undertaken by the applicant had been disappointing.

Councillor Flanagan moved the recommendation to Refuse the application.
Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Refuse the application for the reasons given in the report.

PH/22/42 133055/FO/2022 & 132890/LO/2022 - The Stables, Wilmslow Road, Manchester, M20 5PG - Didsbury East Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described that the applicant had applied to install 7 no. external air handling units within the roof valley on the west end (unit 3) of the grade II listed stable block to provide air conditioning for the office(s) within. The works would include a steel deck, attached to the roof trusses below, which would run the length of the roof valley and support the air handling equipment, along with 1 no. rooflight to provide access for maintenance.

No objections had been received from local residents or businesses. The proposal, however, had been assessed against its impact on a listed building and it was considered the units, due to their siting and associated works, would be to the detriment of the Stables causing less than substantial harm to the designed heritage asset.

Members were advised to note that the City Council had been notified of an appeal against non-determination. Members cannot now determine the application, but a resolution is required as to what decision the Committee would have made if Members were able to make a decision.

The Planning Officer had nothing further to add to the printed published report.

No objectors attended the meeting to address the Committee on the application.

The applicant or agent did not attend the meeting to address the Committee on the application.

Councillor Flanagan moved the recommendation to Minded to Refuse the application. Councillor Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved that it was Minded to Refuse the application for the reasons given in the report.

PH/22/43 132489/FO/2021 - Port Street, Manchester, M1 2EQ - Piccadilly Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described that the Planning and Highways Committee were 'minded to refuse' this proposal on 30 June 2022 on the basis that it would be one storey taller than set out in the Piccadilly Basin Strategic Regeneration Framework (SRF).

The proposal was for 481 homes with two commercial units in a part-33, part-11, part 9 part 7 storey building with hard and soft landscaping. 211 letters of objection had been received from 2 rounds of notification and 34 letters of support. Many did not object to the principle of the site being developed, supporting the creation of more housing with appropriate facilities and were keen to see it brought back to life but objected to the form of development.

The objections related to design and scale, heritage and townscape, affordable housing / need and viability, privacy and living conditions of adjacent residents, provision of public realm, traffic, highways and parking, climate change / embodied carbon, compliance with Planning Policy, precedent and the consultation process.

The Planning and Highways Committee were 'minded to refuse' this proposal on 30 June 2022 on the basis that it would be one storey taller than set out in the Piccadilly Basin SRF. They requested officers to present a further report with a potential reason for refusal.

The applicant had subsequently revised the scheme and had reduced the height to 33 storeys in order to fully comply with the Piccadilly Basin SRF. In light of this, officers could not present a potential reason for refusal.

The scheme would be consistent with the height indicated in the Piccadilly Basin SRF. The manner in which it complied with approved planning policies was clearly set out and addressed in the report. It was these policies that must form the basis of decisions made by the Local Planning Authority, including the Planning and Highways Committee. Planning law required that applications for planning permission are determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicated otherwise.

The report concluded that Officers considered that the scheme was acceptable and should be approved.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee by making reference to the late representations, one of which had been received at noon on the day of the meeting.

The Chair stated that there were to be no more late representations to be considered where they were received with 48 hours of the Planning and Highway Committee meeting.

An objector, representing local residents, addressed the Committee on the application. She stated that residents had welcomed the Committee's previous decisions to be 'minded to refuse' and supported the challenge provided by Members to Officer recommendations. She stated that it remained the opinion of residents that the proposal was inconsistent with the Piccadilly Strategic Regeneration Framework, the Ancoats and New Islington Neighbourhood Development Framework and the ambitions for the Northern Quarter. She stated that it was her opinion that precedent had been set to refuse this application when other applications had been refused in the locality due to the size of the proposed development. She stated that the need to develop the site appropriately and sympathetically was recognised however the application proposed was contrary and incompatible with the Strategic Regeneration Framework. She further referred to the detrimental impact the proposal would have on sunlight, particularly on the local school, the detrimental impact on the historic nature of the area, parking and highways and the inadequate provision of public realm. She concluded by asking the Committee to refuse the application.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee by acknowledging the comments expressed by both the objector and agent. He said that the issues raised by both had previously been articulated and discussed at previous meetings when this application had been considered by the Committee. He reiterated that the sole reason the Committee had given to refuse at the meeting in June was on height, that is the higher building was one storey higher than in the SRF, and this had been addressed by the applicant.

A member spoke on the application and stated that the scale of the development would compromise various schemes and conservation sites in the local area and added that the reduction in height by 1 floor did not provide any reason for them to approve the application.

The Planning Officer stated that there was also a requirement to assess the public benefits of the scheme and noted that the report addressed this balance.

Councillor Flanagan stated that the previous concern was about exceeding the recommended height as set out by the Piccadilly SRF; going by the evidence provided and recommendations deemed appropriate in the SRF, he felt that the proposal was now suitable and agreed the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve.

Another member stated that they felt that they could not support this amended proposal and expressed that the reduction by 1 storey would not make a huge difference. The member felt that there was still an issue with affordable housing at the site and noted that the Committee did not feel that the £1m contribution towards affordable housing across the city was acceptable at the first application hearing in May 2022, stating that the profits made from the scheme could in fact support affordable housing on-site.

The Planning Officer stated that there had been 'no minded to refuse' at previous meetings based on affordable housing, adding that the profit margin would now be lower due to the reduction of the scheme and that it could be difficult to defend a reason for refusal on this ground should the matter go to an appeal.

Councillor Andrews stated that he had supported a Minded to Refuse decision in June 2022 due to the excessive height under the Piccadilly SRF policy but explained that he now supported Councillor Flanagan's move to Approve the application and Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved that it is Minded to Approve the application, subject to the signing of a section 106 agreement in relation to an initial off site affordable housing contribution, with a future review of the affordable housing position.

PH/22/44 132574/FO/2021 - Land South of Stables Car Park, Paradise Wharf, Ducie Street, Manchester, M1 2JN - Piccadilly Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described the application was for 4, three-bedroom townhouses adjacent to the canal towpath. They would be part 4, part 5 storeys with integral garages for cars and bikes. Vehicle and pedestrian access would be via an existing vehicle access adjacent to The Stables.

The dwellings would mainly be red brick with the fourth floor set back from the main elevations and finished in a glazed ceramic cladding. Roof terraces are formed in the remaining area.

The upper levels of the southern elevation have Juliette balconies, recessed balconies, and the main roof terrace. At the ground floor, adjacent to the towpath,

feature brick work and arched windows would provide interest and create defensible space.

One of the 4 trees on site would be removed. Servicing would be from Ducie Street and each household would have an internal bin store with space for 4 bins.

The Planning Officer addressed the Committee by making reference to the late representation received from Councillor Wheeler.

No objectors to the application attended the meeting or addressed the Committee on the application.

A representative from the construction arm of the developer attending on behalf of the applicant and addressed the Committee.

A member stated that they were happy to support the proposal but asked if the garages were big enough to drive into and then exit/enter the vehicle and if there could be internal depictions in the reports.

The Planning Officer responded by advising that the size of the proposed garages was appropriate for vehicles and that additional design documents could be accessed via the planning portal.

A Member welcomed the inclusion of electric vehicle charging points in the proposal.

Councillor Flanagan proposed a recommendation to approve with an additional condition that stipulated that at least one parking space outside of the Stables should be designated as a disabled parking space and that this should space be serviced with the provision of an electric vehicle charging point. Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application, subject to the inclusion of the additional condition proposed by the Committee.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 1 September 2022

Present: Councillor Curley - In the Chair

Councillors: Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Baker-Smith, Davies, Flanagan, Hewitson, Kamal, Leech, J Lovecy, Riasat, Richards

Apologies: Councillors Y Dar, Lyons and Stogia

PH/22/45 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding application 133858/FO/2022.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/22/46 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 28 July 2022 as a correct record with the additional noting of a new Committee protocol for submitting late representations, which would now have to be received 48 hours before the meeting to be considered for inclusion. This was due to a Councillor having presented late representations on two occasions, one during the Committee meeting and another at noon on the day of the Committee meeting.

PH/22/47 134154/VO/2022 - Land to the West of Rodney Street Manchester Item No M4 6JJ - Ancoats & Beswick Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described that the proposal would create 128 homes in two apartment buildings and 10 townhouses. The apartment buildings are 8 and 5 storeys and the townhouses 3 storey. Parking, public realm and landscaping would be provided. The proposal is the first project the City Council's 'This City' housing company which seeks to develop high quality, low carbon housing for all Mancunians as part of boosting the City's housing supply which includes providing affordable housing.

The Planning Officer had nothing further to add to the printed published report.

The agent addressed the Committee on the application, stating that this development represented high quality homes for all with a low carbon impact for Manchester residents. This was a new venture looking at building 500 homes per year, self-finance with all profits going towards affordable housing. Rates would be

capped for the unwaged and low waged and protected in perpetuity. There would be a premiere service for all tenures. All dwelling to be adaptable for disabled and older people and will meet national space requirements. The development would be of a sensitive building design with landscaped public realm and sustainable water, carbon, pollution, waste and recycling features. The scheme would be fitted out with electric cycle and car charging facilities and create many jobs in the development phase with Manchester residents having priority. The scheme would create more Council Tax revenue and much needed affordable homes in Manchester.

The Planning Officer had nothing further to add.

A member stated that this was a much needed development in this area but would like to discuss issues around parking. The report had mentioned that there would be no impact on local parking arising from the scheme. The member felt that this was disingenuous and also raised the distribution of disabled parking within the scheme whilst noting that the Ancoats Parking Policy could be considered for this site, as the scope was extended by The Leader of the Council. The member asked the Planning Officer to raise the issue of the 38 rented dwellings being included in the aforementioned parking scheme.

The Planning Officer stated that this could be picked up within the scope of the residents' parking scheme to address their needs.

A member asked if the townhouses were part of the affordable housing stock in the site and the Planning Officer confirmed this to be the case.

The member went on to say that this was very welcome and atypical for Planning applications in general. He added that there may be a design issue with flat rooves, stating that this has created problems in his own ward. The member also questioned whether residents of the townhouses could receive parking permits, in line with the previous member's request for other residents in affordable housing on the site and whether those not in affordable housing have access to parking permits, some clarification on the mobility hub charges.

The Planning Officer stated that residents' parking was a separate process and cannot be linked to a Planning application but confirmed that parking issues hadn't yet been fully prepared. The affordable housing stock could be included in the parking policy and this would be reported back for consultation. Regarding the mobility hub, there was no current operator confirmed and no pricing strategy. For parking and travel, the current scheme had 47 spaces linked to 128 homes which is consistent with MCC policy and this was how the scheme should be measured for making a determination.

A member stated that she was supportive of the scheme but asked if the disabled car parking spaces could be spread out instead of being allocated all at the same building.

The Planning Officer stated that he would modify/add a condition to address this.

Councillor S Ali moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application with the additional condition to distribute disabled parking bays around the site.

Councillor Flanagan seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application subject to the addition of the aforementioned condition.

(Councillor Richards declared an interest and took no part in the hearing or decision making process).

PH/22/48 132708/FO/2022 Car Park to the Rear of Chorlton Irish Club, Cross Road, Manchester, M21 9DJ - Chorlton Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described that the proposal related to the erection of a part three, part four storey development to provide 29 (10 x one and 18 x two bed and 1 x studio) residential units with associated vehicular and cycle parking, refuse store and landscaping.

The application site currently forms part of the existing Chorlton Irish Club car parking area to the south located within the Chorlton Ward, the opposite side of Cross Road lies within Chorlton Park Ward. The proposals were subject to notification by way of 273 letters to nearby addresses, site notice posted at the site and advertisement in the Manchester Evening News.

In response to the revised scheme objections were received from 21 residents at 16 separate addresses and three neutral comments were made. Amongst other matters that are set out within the body of the report it is considered that the principle of apartment led residential development in this part of South Manchester is appropriate as it will add to the stock of affordable housing. The scheme will also bring forward high quality development on a brownfield site in a sustainable location that will not give rise to unacceptable impacts on the highway network or cause undue harm to the amenity of surrounding property.

The Planning Officer stated that a full tree protection order for the duration of construction would be put in place if the Committee approved the application.

An objector, representing local residents, addressed the Committee on the application. He stated that he has lived on Cross Road for 50 years and that there has never been any previous threat to the character of the road. He stated that residents were in support in principle but saw the scheme as overdevelopment, being too tall and extensive, with other local groups stating that it is an obstruction in the locality. The objector claimed that these views had been ignored by the Planning Team and developer, adding that Council policy had not been adhered to. The scheme would present Cross Road with a 264% increase in residents if approved. The Victorian era drainage system on Cross Road was already failing and the addition of further dwellings would exacerbate this problem. The developer had

addressed the issue of overlooking dwellings on Thornbridge Avenue but nothing had been considered for Cross Road and was in breach of policies. The objector had hoped for a smaller scale development, more in keeping with the area, and asked the Committee to consider a site visit to make a more informed decision and understand the intrusion to local residents.

The agent addressed the Committee on the application, stating that the site was acquired by Southway Housing Trust in early 2021, having beaten competition from private developers. They had made an agreement to leave parking spaces to allow the Irish Club to have spaces for clients when they re-opened. Prices to buy houses in Chorlton had been known to be expensive. The pre-application process had been to hold consultations, events and have an online portal and the recommendation for approval reflected the consultation process. Realising the impact to the street scene, the developers had included textured brickwork to compliment the area and an overall high quality design. This was a 100% affordable housing scheme with parking and cycle spaces, electric charging facilities, delivery area to minimise the impact to local residents with landscaping and additional trees.

The Planning Officer stated that the elevation had been designed to be in scale with the top floor, adding that there was a narrow frontage to Cross Road, that the scheme was set away from Beech Road park with additional landscaping and traffic calming measures.

A member noted that obscured glazing had been added to properties overlooking Thornbridge Avenue and asked whether this could be an added condition for properties overlooking Cross Road.

The Planning Officer stated that this could be included.

A member stated that he was in agreement with the objector's proposal of a site visit, adding that they were alarmed to read of 48 car parking spaces along Cross Road, questioning the accuracy of this information. He noted that the survey may have been carried out during a quieter period due to the pandemic, adding that there would likely be less places at weekends. The member asked if there was a waste disposal strategy to ensure that large bins would not be left on Cross Road. He also questioned the use of the Irish Club car park, noting that the capacity of the club was around 300 people when fully functioning which would surely have an impact on local roads. He concluded by stating that, whilst he was very supportive of affordable housing in this area, it was a shame that there were no affordable rental properties on the site.

The Planning Officer confirmed that there were 29 parking spaces which equated to 1 per unit, that there was an associated cycle and travel plan and that this was in a sustainable location for other travel options. He added that there was some on-street parking, that the Irish Club will open again in the future but not all parking spaces could be retained for the club to use, adding that there was no condition there to refuse the application on these grounds. However, 13 spaces were to be retained for the Irish Club, plus a taxi pick up and drop off point.

The previous member responded by stating that a similar scheme at a nearby pub had shown that taking parking spaces away to built properties had vastly increased on-street parking issues and that this did not represent a sustainable approach.

The Planning Officer expressed that the addition of affordable housing at this location would outweigh the disruption to the Irish Club, adding that the club did not own the car parking area so this could not be considered as a reason for refusal.

A member stated that the scheme was very attractive but required scrutiny. The massing and height were concerning and the illustrations may not truly convey the full impact of this development. She requested information on the tenure of each property, to check if individuals could sell the properties at a market rate for a quick profit. The member felt that people may travel from further areas to visit the club and not use sustainable methods of transport, adding to parking issues in the area and questioned whether a proposal for a club with 13 spaces would be considered for approval.

The Director of Planning stated that the application had to be considered on its own merits and dismissed any notion of considering an application for the Irish Club. She added that condition 24 in the report dealt with the issue of purchases of these properties and that Southway Housing Trust would assist on the matter.

A member added that he still had concerns over parking issues whilst noting that the report clarified that parking at the Irish Club could not be considered as a reason for refusal. He agreed with the previous member's proposal for a site visit but stated that he had a condition to add if no site visit was proposed by the Committee.

A member welcomed affordable housing in Chorlton but felt that a varied approach to tenures was necessary. She was pleased to see Southway Housing Trust working with the City Council on referrals to the scheme and hoped that social housing could be involved to get people onto the property ladder and also free up social housing spaces. She asked whether it was only drainage on the site that would be maintained or if the roadway and pavement were also included.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the car parking area would be unadopted with a long term management plan for landscaping and maintenance.

A member asked what the rationale was for a site visit, with the scheme being recommended for approval and with parking not able to be considered.

The member who proposed the site visit stated that the site visit would be to consider the overlooking aspect to Cross Road.

Councillor Flanagan moved the officer's recommendation for approval with an additional condition for frosted glazing on the first and second floor, overlooking Cross Road.

Councillor Andrews seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application subject to the addition of the aforementioned condition.

PH/22/49 133858/FO/2022 - Land Adjacent Newall Green Farm, Manchester, M23 2TX - Baguley Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing that described that the applicant is proposing to erect a two storey building on the site to form eight supported living apartments, complementing the existing supported living use that operates out of the other three buildings. One resident has objected to the proposal but did not substantiate it with any reasons. Another local resident has stated their support for the proposal but has raised concerns about potential highway issues, as well as making a number of observations about ecology and construction management.

The application was being placed before the Committee as the site is located within the Green Belt and adjacent to three Grade II listed farm buildings.

The proposal is considered to be appropriate development within the Green Belt and as such would not constitute a departure from the Core Strategy and would not need to be referred to the Secretary of State.

The Planning Officer had nothing further to add.

The applicant addressed the Committee on the application and stated that the scheme was for accommodation for adults with learning disabilities, with support, who could not live in a shared space.

The Planning Officer had nothing further to add.

Councillor Andrews stated that the Baguley Ward Councillors supported the scheme, noting some local opposition to the footpaths and moved the officers recommendation of approve for the application with an additional condition to include e-bike charging on the site.

Councillor S Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application subject to the addition of the aforementioned condition.