

Audit Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 28 November 2023

Present:

Councillor Lanchbury - In the Chair
Councillors Curley, Kilpatrick, Noor and Simcock

Independent Co-opted member: Dr D Barker

Apologies: Dr S Downs

Also Present: Councillor Akbar (Executive Member, Finance), and Councillor Gavin White (Executive Member for Housing and Development)

AC/23/33 Minutes

Decision

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 September 2023 were approved as a correct record.

AC/23/34 Annual Audit Report and Completion Letter 2021/22

The Committee received the External Auditor's Annual Report for the Year ended March 31 2022, that provided an overview of the work undertaken by the Council's external auditor (Mazars) as well as the associated Audit Completion Letter

Alastair Newall (Mazars) confirmed that the 2021/22 External Audit had been completed. The annual report contained a summary of the audit findings and a value for money commentary. He confirmed that there were no significant recommendations or significant weaknesses in the Council's Value For Money arrangements in the indicative financial year. He advised that there was nothing to highlight in the Audit Completion letter; some amendments had been made to the accounts that had been submitted to the committee at its September meeting, and some misstatements had not been made on the basis that they were immaterial.

The Committee conveyed its thanks to Mazars and the Council's Finance team for their work in delivering completion of those accounts.

Decision

To note the report and the audit completion letter.

AC/23/35 External Audit Update - Annual Accounts 2022/23

The Committee received an oral report from the External Auditor (Mazars) regarding the progress of the 2022/23 annual accounts. The Committee welcomed Amelia Salford (Mazars) who had taken over as senior audit manager for those accounts. She confirmed that planning work had commenced some weeks prior and that the

audit strategy memorandum would be submitted to the next meeting of the committee.

Decision

To note the update.

AC/23/36 Annual Accounts update

The Committee received the update report from the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer about the completion of the remaining annual accounts. The report stated that the Council's 2021/22 accounts had been finalised and an unqualified Audit Opinion had been issued by the external auditors. The update included a planned timeline for the 2022/23 audit and the 2023/24 accounts consolidation. It made reference to the draft Annual Accounts for 2021/22 having been reported to the Audit Committee on 27 September 2022 and that information concerning amendments to those accounts by the Council's external auditors had been submitted to the previous meeting of the Committee (September 2023) where it was reported that the Audit Opinion would remain unchanged subject to the amendments that had been outlined and which had been subsequently resolved. The Mazars unqualified audit opinion stated that the Council's financial statements:

- gave a true and fair view of the financial position of the Council and the Group as at 31st March 2022 and of the Council's and the Group's expenditure and income for the year then ended; and
- had been properly prepared in accordance with the CIPFA/LASAAC Code of Practice on Local Authority Accounting in the United Kingdom 2021/22 as amended by the Code Update:

Mindful that all of the material elements had been covered in the previous two items of business, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer conveyed her thanks to the Council's Finance team and to the wider team at Mazars. Particular reference was given to this being Alastair Newall's last attendance at the Committee. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer thanked Mr Newall for all of his hard work and support over the past few years and for his and Mazar's proactive collaboration in the shared mission to complete the outstanding audit of accounts in the context of the wider national challenge.

With regard to the 2022/23 update, a number of matters that were outstanding at September 2023 were summarised within the report. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer added that there was a current lack of clarity about the cut off date for the 2022/23 audit completion and that consequently all involved were proactively seeking to deliver completion within the current financial year.

Decision

The Committee:

1. Noted that the Council's 2021/22 audit is fully complete, and an unqualified audit opinion has been issued.

2. Noted the timeline for 2022/23 audit and 2023/24 consolidation
3. Noted the corrections to the 2022/23 Accounts, as itemised in paragraph 2.2 of the report.

AC/23/37 Governance and Management of Complaints 2022/23

The Committee received its annual report from the Assistant Chief Executive and the City Solicitor setting out the Council's annual performance for 2022/23 in the management of corporate and social care complaints, Councillor and MP enquiries, and information requests.

The Assistant Chief Executive reported an increase in the number of complaints in comparison to the previous year. He reported positive progress during 2022/23 to respond to more complaints and enquiries in a timely manner, despite significant increases in the overall numbers of complaints and enquiries that had been received. The timeliness of responses was reported as having markedly improved overall during 2022/23 and whilst some targets still had not been met, overall performance was much closer to the target than in previous years. This was in spite of significant challenges in terms of increased numbers of complaints and capacity. A key factor had been the embedding of the Council's complaints handling system during the year.

The key points for consideration were summarised as:

- An increase in the total number of stage one complaints from 3,157 in 2021/22 to 3,515 in 2022/23. These numbers are significantly higher than previous years. The proportion responded to in 10 days had improved from 77% to 81%.
- The number of Stage 2 complaints (approximately 15%) had remained steady and had reportedly been responded to in a much more timely manner.
- 85 Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman (Ombudsman) enquiries compared to 81 in 2021/22 and much lower numbers in previous years, with a slight reduction in cases upheld. Performance in dealing with the Housing Ombudsman was highlighted as an area for as this is a new area of reporting for the Council.
- An increase in Councillor / MP enquiries from 1,835 to 2,007 overall – noting the work undertaken to improve reporting of cases following discussion at Audit Committee last year – and an improvement in timeliness of response from 76% to 84%.
- A significant reduction in the number of social care cases from 377 to 262, and an improvement in the proportion responded to in 20 days from 59% to 84%.
- Both General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and Freedom of Information (FOI) request numbers remained largely steady.

- There had been over 300 instances of praise across the Council

Learning Action Points were also appended to the report in line with a previous recommendation by this Committee.

There was a discussion about the established route for councillor and MP inquiries to ensure that they are not inadvertently underreported. The Complaints Manager referred to recently circulated guidance to members on the correct process. Where an element of dissatisfaction was detected in a given inquiry, as opposed to a routine request for service, there was an expectation that officers would record the matter on the councils complaints handling system to enable appropriate reporting. In response to a request from a member of the committee, the Complaints Manager agreed to explore the extent to which the complaints handling system was able to extract the number of complaints that had been recorded by the service involved.

In response to a comment about the steady rise in complaints in relation to children and education services over the last two years, the Committee was advised that these were predominantly in relation to dissatisfaction with school admissions processes, school access sufficiency, special educational needs and school transport access. Children's social care complaints however had reduced significantly. Discussion then moved to the extent to which complaints were associated with a recent policy change and/or budget restrictions. The Assistant Chief Executive agreed to explore the extent to which this could be reported on in future.

There was a discussion about the trend in Local Government Ombudsman referrals. A step change was described in relation to the growth in the number of cases over the last two years and the Assistant Chief Executive described the process for the management of Ombudsman cases as robust and effective and which ensured effective learning points for the service area involved. In respect of Housing Ombudsman cases (where emphasis was given that this had been reported separately this year). He described a significant pressure that was linked with a government-led campaign to sign post social housing tenants where concerns lay in respect of housing quality. It was therefore anticipated that this trend would likely continue and the Complaints team would continue to work with services to ensure that those Ombudsman cases were appropriately managed. The Committee acknowledged the influence of targeted raising awareness campaigns and the association with long term behaviour change amongst residents. They noted the Assistant Chief Executive's comments around the positive role of residents' feedback on service development and policy change.

The Chair suggested, in terms of possible next steps, that consideration should be given to the involvement of the Members Development Group to underpin guidance for councillors on the established route for complaints and which includes information on the nuance between service requests, complaints and the role of partners. It was also suggested that a session on this could be targeted to newly appointed Councillors as part of the Member Induction programme.

The Executive Member for Finance thanked officers for the detailed report and highlighted the impact of staffing pressures that had arisen from significantly reduced local government funding since 2010 coupled with the impact of a growing city

resulting in additional demand for services. He also referred to ICT infrastructural changes that were soon to be implemented which would promote the use of user-friendly platforms to enable residents with greater ease of access to services.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/38 Treasury Management Update

The Committee received the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which set out Treasury Management activities of the Council during the first six months of 2023/24.

A challenging financial market with increasing interest rates was described. The Council had taken on additional debt during that period to fund the Capital Programme seeking loans of short to medium term length to limit the long-term impact of higher interest rates, in light of market expectations that rates would fall back. A further borrowing requirement was anticipated in the latter half of the year. The borrowing position reflected the Council's strong balance sheet which enabled net interest costs to be minimised and reduced credit risk by making temporary use of internal borrowing (reserves, provisions, positive cash flows, etc). The Council's policy remained to keep cash as low as possible and not to borrow in advance of need for capital purposes. However, the report asserted that a strong balance sheet position is not without risk, and with interest rates set to remain at current levels or increase in the future, the timing and structure of future debt financing would be important in sustaining this position. Higher rates would also act as a constraint on future borrowing, and therefore capital financing capacity, would require due consideration as part of the Council's Capital Strategy. Proactive treasury management during the year had sought to minimise borrowing costs for the Council and maximise returns on investment. The Treasury team would therefore continue to evaluate financial markets to look for opportunities and risks within the context of the agreed Treasury Management Strategy.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer reiterated the challenging environment the Council was operating within with regard to interest rates and the need to borrow to fund the Capital Programme resulting in borrowing being relatively high in comparison with other Local Authorities. A new section in the report had therefore been included which discussed the role of the newly constituted Office for Local Government (OfLOG) who would be scrutinising levels of borrowing and other council activities as part of their Early Warnings work. She gave assurance that funding for the programme was affordable and that provision had been made including within the capital financing reserves to ensure that costs would be met. The Capital Strategy itself would be considered by the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee as part of the budget process and would contain more detail on this. The cost of carry for any cash balances remained challenging.

The Commercial Finance Lead responded to questions about temporary borrowing arrangements, including financial returns and measures to ensure that the Council was operating within the financing capacity available to it. The Deputy Chief

Executive and City Treasurer asked the Committee to note that the Council's ability to borrow for future capital projects was far more constrained than in the past and that the upcoming Capital Strategy report to be considered as part of budget arrangements would restate the principles around where the Council would or would not borrow.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/39 Internal Audit Assurance (Quarter 2)

The Committee received the report of The Head of Audit and Risk Management which discussed progress on the agreed audit plan and details of assurances from the Internal Audit Service for Quarter 2 in 2023/24.

The report provided information about:

- Audit Plan Progress and Delivery
- Audit Assurance, Risks and Issues in Housing Services, Commercial and Contracts and Safer Recruitment in schools

Appended to the report was :

- A summary of Audit Work and other sources of assurance in Children and Education Services, Schools, Adults and Public Health, Corporate Services and the Chief Executive's directorate, Growth and Development directorate and Neighbourhood Services
- Executive Summaries of Audit reports for the Our Town Hall project, Foster Care payments, Imprest Accounts, Vendor creation and amendment, and safer recruitment follow up findings for a number of Manchester schools.

The Head of Audit and Risk Management responded to questions about the upcoming recruitment to vacant posts in the Service and the remit of the Audit Service in respect of schools audit activity.

Having duly considered the information the Committee noted the report.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/40 Outstanding Audit Recommendations (Quarter 2)

The Committee received the report of The Head of Audit and Risk Management which discussed the implementation position at September 2023 of outstanding high priority audit recommendations in line with Public Sector Internal Audit Standards. The report summarised information about:

- Overdue Audit recommendations over 12 months old; in respect of Avro

- Hollows Tenants Management Organisation (TMO) and Privacy Notices
- Overdue Audit recommendations 6 – 12 months old; in respect Vendor Creation and amendment, and Social Value monitoring
- Overdue Audit recommendations 1 – 6 months old; in respect of the Adaptations Review, Adult Social Care: Contracts Governance, Contracts Risk Management, Review of Fire Risk Assessment Process (Residential Properties), Adults Care Package Payments

The Head of Audit and Risk Management responded to a comment about the length of time taken to implement some of the longer-standing recommendations and gave emphasis to the positive impact of requiring Directors and Executive Members to committee in particular circumstances to explain the reasons for delay.

A member suggested that a close eye be kept on the upcoming Adaptations reviews, in light of recent comments made by members of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/41 Housing Services Update

The Committee considered a report of the Strategic Director Neighbourhoods which provided information about building safety compliance in Housing Services in light of the issue of a Limited Assurance opinion concerning fire safety processes in July 2023.

The Director of Housing Services introduced the report with emphasis that safety remained at the heart of the Council's vision and practise for social housing and, as such, prior to the transfer of former Northwards housing stock (the Arms Length Management Organisation (ALMO) back to the Local Authority, an audit of systems and procedures in connection with fire risk assessment safety had been undertaken. The findings had resulted in the issue of a Limited Assurance opinion and a number of agreed actions which were set out in the report for ease of reference. The majority of those actions had been completed, with just two remaining actions not yet fully implemented. New roles and systems had been implemented. The matter was under review of the Housing Board and the Housing Advisory Body and performance information on building safety compliance had been published on the Council's website

Discussions touched on recent events in Bristol where approximately 400 residents in a Local Authority maintained tower block were decanted from their homes at extremely short notice requiring temporary accommodation due to concerns over building safety. The Director of Housing Services gave assurance that the circumstances surrounding the Bristol decant were markedly different to the issues raised in the assurance opinion. Tried and tested policies and procedures were in place, including the availability of front line staff to support and accommodate residents should safety concerns arise. Furthermore, a review of the Council's approach to building safety in view of recent legislative changes was underway. This

would include the approach taken in relation to damp and mould and asbestos exposure and any further areas of improvement that had been identified. He also gave emphasis to a majority of capital programme spending in Housing Services being ring-fenced to building safety and decent homes.

A member of the committee welcomed the progress and sought clarification on the underlying reasons for the delay with the remaining two action points yet to be finalised. A degree of complexity around particular Private Finance Initiative (PFI) housing stock was described as the cause, as well as an assessment of best practice examples from other organisations prior to ratification by the Housing Board. With regard to the access strategy, he advised that further engagement with residents was needed in view of a number of complexities however good progress had been made.

In response to a question about Reinforced Autoclaved Aerated Concrete (RAAC), the Committee noted that full structural surveys had been undertaken of high rise stock which identified no RAAC. A recent detailed desktop exercise undertaken by Strategic Housing had identified a small number (circa 35) of assets (communal and high rise configuration of buildings) requiring further investigation. For residential assets, a further study was underway of approximately 1500 properties with a potential structural element containing RAAC. However initial onset investigations indicated that this was not the case, though further sampling would be undertaken. It was asserted that colleagues were in a strong position to act quickly should any remediation be necessary.

In response to a question about next steps where residents refused access to properties to enable remediation, the Committee was informed that risk based assessments, including vulnerability assessments were undertaken in view of the nature of work being refused. Enforcement, where indicated, of tenancy agreements and other legal routes would also be considered subject to being proportionate, reasonable and compliant with the relevant legislation because of the impact not only to the resident but to neighbouring properties.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development agreed that issues around refusal of access were an important consideration that had been duly considered at that Housing Advisory Board. An education piece had subsequently been implemented to support better engagement with residents to explain the importance of this type of work and the benefits conferred on residents in term of theirs and their neighbours/ health and safety. Due to the time taken to complete such an exercise, the matter would be overseen by the Housing Advisory Committee. The extent to which local ward members could facilitate the process would also be explored.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/42 Register of Significant Partnerships

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer which provided an update on the partnerships where a 'Reasonable' or 'Limited' rating was recorded, following the 2022 annual assessment, and presented to the

Audit Committee in June 2023.

The report provided:

- An overview of partnership governance arrangements with a Reasonable Strength Rating, namely; Manchester Safeguarding Partnership
- An overview of partnership governance arrangements with a Limited Strength Rating, namely, Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust (GMMH), AVRO Hollows Tenant Management Organisation (TMO), and SHOUT Tenant Management Organisation (TMO)

In respect of Greater Manchester Mental Health NHS Foundation Trust (GMMH), the Committee was informed that a number of actions were in place with clearly defined timelines for delivery.

In respect of SHOUT Tenant Management Organisation (TMO), the Head of Strategic Housing provided an outline of the number of properties managed by the TMO highlighting that the Council undertakes most of the repairs and maintenance work. In terms of its governance arrangements, a Board had recently been appointed and a meeting to establish how the board was progressing was due in December 2023. He gave assurance that there was less concern about the operation of this particular TMO.

In respect of AVRO Hollows Tenant Management Organisation (TMO), the Head of Strategic Housing outlined the legal basis for TMOs and the modular agreement that is in place nationally in terms of how they operate. The Committee noted that there were concerns about the TMO's retention of staff and board members which could impact on governance arrangements. Additionally, Avro Hollows had elected to employ its own repairs contractor (which it is legally entitled to do) and that those repairs were carried out by a small to medium enterprise, however this was described as a concern in its own right. In terms of assurance, however, a formal assessment of works undertaken on a recently remediated long term empty property (known as a 'void' property) had found no breaches of any fire safety work and no concerns about the quality of work that had been undertaken. In respect of the TMO's responsibility for the management of four tower blocks as part of its housing stock, the Head of Strategic Housing gave assurance that the Council retained responsibility for major health and safety related works such as fire risk assessment, lift maintenance and legionella testing. In view of there being no rights to 'step in' with the regard to the operation of the TMO, next steps were outlined as well as interim arrangements to ensure that the Council was well-sighted on a range of matters as they develop. The Committee noted the procedural basis that would lead to the cessation of the TMO subject to certain findings.

The Executive Member for Housing and Development thanked officers for their continued support and oversight of the relationship with the TMO and its overall operation.

The Committee resolved to request that an update on progress of the TMO is submitted to the Committee in approximately 6 months and asked officers to give

consideration to a communications outreach to tenants around what actions the Council was planning to undertake and the reasons why.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/23/42 Work Programme

The Committee considered a report of the Governance and Scrutiny Support Unit which set out its future Work Programme for the remainder of 2023/24 municipal year.

Decision

To note the report and approve the work programme.

AC/23/43 Exclusion of the Public

A recommendation was made that the public be excluded during consideration of the following items of business.

Decision

To exclude the public during consideration of the following items which involved consideration of exempt information relating to the financial or business affairs of particular persons, and public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

AC/23/42 Annual Counter Fraud (Part B)

The Committee received a report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Head of Audit and Risk Management which provided a summary of the anti-fraud arrangements and investigation work undertaken during 2022/23, with a particular focus on the work delivered by Internal Audit.

The report provided information on:

- Internal Control Arrangements
- Structure and Roles, including the role of Internal Audit and the Council's broader approach
- A summary of financial outcomes
- An outline of proactive Anti-Fraud Work
- Training and awareness
- An overview of reactive caseloads,
- Other areas of Focus
- Key Proactive Work and Plans 2023/24

- A summary of Successful Sanctions and Prosecutions was also appended to the report

The Head of Audit and Risk management responded to questions and comments arising from the report.

Decision

To note the report.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 14 December 2023

Present: Councillor Lyons - In the Chair

Councillors: Andrews, S. Ali, Curley, Gartside, Hewitson, Hughes, Johnson, Lovecy, Kamal and Riasat

Apologies: Councillor Chohan

Also present: Councillors Abdullatif, Doswell, Hilal, Ilyas, Moran and Muse

PH/23/86 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 137399/FO/2023, 137401/FO/2023, 138126/OO/2023, 137537/FO/2023, 138127/OO/2023 and 138128/OO/2023.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/23/87 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 19 October 2023 as a correct record.

PH/23/88 137399/FO/2023 - Land bounded by Upper Brook Street, Cottenham Street and Kincardine Road, Manchester, M13 9TD - Ardwick Ward & 137401/FO/2023 - Land between Upper Brook Street, Kincardine Road and Grosvenor Street Manchester - Ardwick Ward

The Committee considered the reports of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding:

137399/FO/2023 - the erection of a 6 to 9 storey building for Sci-Tech use (Use Class E (g)(ii)) and 265sqm of a cafe/bar (Use Class E (b)), and a 9 to 23 storey building for Purpose Built Student Accommodation (PBSA) (Use Sui Generis), comprising 737 bedrooms and 293sqm of community use (Use Class F2 (b)) and 80sqm of commercial floorspace (Use Class E), alongside new public realm, access, parking, and associated works following demolition of existing buildings.

114 objections (from 78 households) had been received. Councillors Muse and Abdullatif object.

And:

137401/FO/2023 - Full planning application for the demolition of existing buildings and erection of three 12/14/29 storey buildings to be used for Purpose Built Student Accommodation (Use Sui Generis), comprising 983 bedrooms in total and 506sqm of ground floor ancillary uses (café/commercial and convenience store - Use Classes E (a)/(b)/(c)), three buildings comprising 5/7/9 storeys for Science and Innovation uses (Use Class E (g)(i) & (ii)) and 834sqm ground floor community uses (retail/ cafés and medical facility (Use Classes E (a)/(b) and (e)), and the provision of new public realm, two new public squares, new access and parking, and associated works.

Manchester Metropolitan University supported the proposal.

113 (from 76 households) objections were received during the first round of notification, 97 (from 77 households) had been received. Councillors Muse and Abdullatif object.

The Planning Officer stated that they recommended additional conditions regarding a student wellbeing strategy. The Planning Officer drew attention to matters in the late representations report regarding 6 additional objections for item 6 - 137401/FO/2023 - Land between Upper Brook Street, Kincardine Road and Grosvenor Street Manchester - Ardwick Ward. The Planning Officer stated that all points raised in those late representations were addressed within the report.

An objector attended the hearing and addressed the Committee, stating that it was not the job of the Brunswick community to solve the problems faced by students with a longer commuting distance. This was an unsustainable application as there was already PBSA in the area which stretched the resources. Adding this development would have a further negative effect on the community. Air pollution would be affected and the Medlock area already had the highest record in Manchester. There were also biodiversity issues to consider. Children in the area have a right to cleaner air and a cleaner urban environment. This proposal would see people using residential car parking spaces. Claiming that there would be zero additional cars was not realistic. This development would tower over the residents and block their light. There were 2 public consultations and the objector had attended. There were no buildings of similar height and massing in the area. 5,000 extra people and associated deliveries and taxis etc. was considered as a contempt for the community. The residents of this area wanted an affordable supermarket and affordable housing. As a resident of the area for the last 10 years, there had already been lots of building work endured which had a negative effect on residents. This was an attack on working class people.

Two applicant agents attended and spoke for each of the two applications, the first stating that the developers were proud of the work they had already undertaken in Manchester. They employed great design management and had consulted with and listened to the community as well as planning officers. There was a demand for student accommodation in Manchester. The developers understood the concerns of the local residents and had reduced the size of the scheme accordingly. This was an experienced operator who had given consideration to the mental health of students who would be based there. The scheme would create 5,000 construction jobs and there was a growing demand for professionals that would be served by this

application being granted. There would be a local, affordable store, medical centre, 3 acres of public realm and sports facilities as part of the development for the use of local residents.

The second agent stated that they represented a leading developer. This application would bring people together and create a university setting to compete with London, Oxford and Cambridge. This would create a dedicated property which would connect for tailored support to tenants. 1,500 new jobs would be created once completed. There would be a research and development science centre which would link with school and create skilled jobs. This development would deliver growth and prosperity to Manchester.

Ward Councillor Abdullatif addressed the Committee and stated that she had a great number of conversations with local residents about this application and none of them were in support of this development. She was in attendance with Ward Councillor Muse to object. Councillor Abdullatif suggested the Committee undertake a site visit to understand the concerns of residents and expressed that this was a huge development. There were 1,500 residents in the local estate and students would add 13,000 more into the area daily. This was not viable. The local houses were all low rise and the development was not in keeping with these surroundings. There would be a 29-storey tower, a small road and then two storey houses. The Committee were asked to take the residents' quality of life into consideration. The additional commuter traffic for this development would add to the already considerable strain felt by this community of Ardwick. Upper Brook Street was already a very polluted road and the Brunswick area one of the worst polluted in the country. The area is committed to nature conservation, as exemplified by the model green development area, funded by GMCA and supported by Manchester University. The local action group reject the scheme as being harmful to Gartside Gardens which is at risk of over-shadowing. Children understand the concerns of what this development means to local residents and the promises made do not go far enough. In her closing statement, Councillor Abdullatif asked the Committee to think about local people and reject this application.

Ward Councillor Muse addressed the Committee and stated that he was at the meeting to represent Ardwick. He stated that he and the residents were not against buildings of any kind but this development, next to two storey family homes, needed to be realistic. This scheme contradicts the council's own policies and the transient nature of student lifestyles would be challenging for the area. Students do not pay council tax and this scheme would be a larger student dwelling area than Fallowfield. There would be refuse and sewage problems, the medical centre was already overwhelmed and children in the area already have a high rate of asthma and eczema and other respiratory problems. Nurses have voiced their concerns about these issues and a 12 year old child had written a letter to ask that the Local Ward Councillors help them so that the development would not take their natural light. This child was a symbol of the area's future. There was no supermarket servicing the area and only one medical centre. It was stated that getting an appointment at the medical centre was akin to a lottery win. Councillor Muse implored the Committee to hear his impassioned plea for the community's future.

The Planning Officer addressed the concerns and stated that these were very long reports which covered all issues raised. The objective for Manchester City Council

was to deliver life-science space over 650,000 square feet. The scheme had been tested for its viability and it was considered necessary to provide PBSA at this scale. The application had been reduced by 12 to 13 floors and the reduction represented the minimum required and had been tested independently. The resulting figures fed into the size of the life-science space and this was the amount that was required for the scheme to be viable. The scale and community had all been considered and it was understood that this was a large and imposing development, but the size of the development doesn't make it unacceptable. This would have to be tested against MCC and national policies. All implications of sunlight, noise, wind, air quality, traffic, parking and biodiversity etcetera were all set out clearly in the report.

The Chair invited Committee members to make comments or ask questions.

Councillor Johnson stated that it was important to consider the resident's point of view. She questioned how the air quality could not be worsened by the granting of this application, considering the additional traffic associated with the construction, staff and deliveries. This area already had high levels of air pollution. Car free areas should be prioritised, although cars are still required for expected online deliveries. Disabled people also rely on a certain number of parking space availability. Regarding the claim of increased biodiversity in the report, Councillor Johnson noted that tree planting was part of the scheme but it was not a particularly green plot, compared to the size of the buildings. The public realm appeared to be walkways with bushes and trees. The scheme may address the strategic framework in adding to a vibrant city but this needed to be balanced with the impact on local communities. The addition of this development, if agreed, would change the face of Ardwick for the future and potentially exclude families from living near the city centre. Councillor Johnson noted that the size of the development had been noted as not relevant and asked how this was so and agreed with the objector's call for a site visit and proposed this as a motion.

Councillor Hewitson seconded the proposal for a site visit stating that this development does not sit well in this location.

Councillor Davies sought clarity on some site plans in the report.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the site plans were covered under the second application under item 6 in the agenda.

The Planning Officer then responded to Councillor Johnson's comments on air quality by referring to page 96 and 97 where it was stated that construction could have some impact unless subject to mitigation, although these measures were set out in the report. After construction, this was to be a largely car-free scheme and colleagues in Environmental Health state that there would be zero impact, also detailed in the report. There were already two other huge car parks nearby at the Aquatic Centre and Circle Square which currently operated at around 35% capacity. There were also detailed strategies for deliveries within the report. Over the two sites there would be 3 acres of public realm. In terms of the impact of students on the community, there were large numbers of students occupying mainstream accommodation in Ardwick. Homes are being used to house students with 47% of these houses in Ardwick being built to rent. There was a need to build PBSA where

students were choosing to live as without it there was additional pressure on family accommodation and these numbers would rise.

The Director of Planning addressed Councillor Johnson's comments by stating that the permanent impacts of the scheme were all addressed within both reports, this was a brownfield site earmarked for development unless there were material considerations opposing this. There were social, economic and environmental benefits, creating much needed jobs and high quality jobs, additional to the PBSA also set out within the report.

Councillor Andrews Stated that he understood the requirement for additional PBSA in Manchester but agreed with Councillor Hewitson that a site visit was necessary to fully understand the impact to local residents.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve a motion for a site visit for both applications in order to fully understand the potential impact of the developments on the local community.

PH/23/89 138126/OO/2023 - University of Manchester Fallowfield Campus Wilmslow Road, Manchester M14 6HD - Fallowfield Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding an outline planning application (with access only in detail) for the phased demolition of existing buildings and phased development of up to 3,300 Purpose Built Student Accommodation bedrooms (Sui Generis use class) with associated facilities including waste storage, laundry and cycle storage; up to 4,500 sq m of floorspace to be used for ancillary purposes associated with the student residential use of the site within Use Class F1a, Class E(a), E(b), E(c), E(d), E(g), Sui Generis (drinking establishment and hot food takeaway); ancillary supporting staff accommodation (up to 55 bedrooms) (Sui Generis use class), and up to 1,200 sq m of ancillary residential dwellings (Use Class C3), plus associated car parking, hard and soft landscaping, open space, utilities, footpaths and roads.

The application related to the redevelopment of part of the University of Manchester student halls of residence at its Fallowfield Campus within the Fallowfield ward. Planning permission had previously been granted for its demolition and redevelopment as part of a wider scheme to provide additional bedspaces at the Campus. The application sought to update the University's proposals to modernise the campus and provide further additional capacity at the site to address the need within the City for further purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA).

The Planning Officer noted the additional objections in the late representations report from local community groups and confirmed that all matters raised were already addressed in the report.

An objector attended the hearing and addressed the Committee stating that the scheme clashed with local and national policies and legal precedents. As an outline application, the most impactful features would be reserved matters, meaning that the

Committee would not get to deliberate if they approved the proposal today. There were no particular details on the amount of bed spaces. An additional influx of wealthy students would cause harm to Fallowfield by way of 100,000 tons of carbon, in excess of legal limits in the area. Children have to walk past this area daily and also people with respiratory conditions. This scheme was contrary to the council's own air quality policies. Bat protection was questioned and 14 bat roosts were mentioned. It was a criminal offence to remove bat roosts. This was a student fortress with no mixed use, no public rights of way and contrary to the core strategy. The Planning Officer may not have been well advised on this application. The Committee were being asked to make a decision on an unknown quantity and it was expressed that this application was a Trojan horse.

The applicant's agent attended and addressed the Committee stating that this was a major investment and core part of the developer's portfolio and would provide 4,500 safe student dwellings spaces. It was mentioned that Manchester's growth had been partly due to the student population with many choosing to settle in the city and contribute. This was a globally competitive marketplace. Fallowfield played an important role in this field but the site drastically needed modernisation. There was growing demand for accommodation for overseas students which was currently not matched by growth in the provision of dedicated accommodation. There were challenges in meeting these accommodation commitments. This application presented a phased transformation of the current campus to address key points. There would be a variety of dwelling sizes and price points to allow affordable options. There would be ancillary facilities to make the campus self-sufficient. There would be 950 extra bedspaces, additional to the current offering. This was a modest increase which would allow for 2nd and 3rd year students to return to the site and lessen the use of mainstream housing stock. There would be additional tree planting and the retention of green spaces. This scheme would build on what was already a student campus and would be subject to effective management. There was a level of local concern and communications with the community had been addressed with officers to work together.

Ward Councillor Ilyas addressed the Committee stating that he understood the need for student accommodation and that the number of HMOs and PBSA in the proximity of this proposal is an issue for community cohesion. Councillor Ilyas did not agree that it was HMOs and not PBSA that caused the main problems as the impacts can be caused by the people and organisations within the community. This proposed expansion in the heart of the community put it at breaking point and would exacerbate the need for HMOs. Councillor Ilyas supported PBSA but the policy needed to take account of the community. The scheme was not in line with MCC policy and was imbalanced. The council had already spent time and resources tackling anti-social behaviour, litter and other associated issues and he questioned the legitimacy of pouring more public money into this problem which could undo years of work.

Ward Councillor Doswell addressed the Committee and stated that the regeneration of the site and the improvement of standards of student accommodation was welcomed. Councillor Doswell was in attendance to represent both residents and students and expressed that they should not pit one against the other. She felt that the application fell short of key information, most notably the number of bedspaces.

The Planning Officers have stated that there will be a “reserved matters” application to follow for determination but the Committee need to know what they are voting on today. There needed to be an indication of the number of bedspaces in order for the Committee to be able to make a clear decision. Also, there was no mention of the capacity of staff dwellings on the site. This was less a question of who but more about how many and Councillor Doswell expressed concerns about costs and lower income students. Working class students felt priced out of accommodation in the city and it was noted that 20% of the rooms should be let at an affordable rate if agreed, with the NUS definition or 20% discount on the market rate. Regarding current issues, there were mid-week complaints about noise, litter and anti-social behaviour in this area. Students tend to live in PBSA for the first year and then find a cheaper HMO. Due to this practice, this proposal would be unsustainable in 5 years time. Private developers will build more PBSA and plans are lodged every week for the Fallowfield Ward. Councillor Doswell disagreed that this proposal met with Manchester City Council policy, adding that the application relating to Oakley Villa on Wilmslow Road for 425 bedspaces was considered contrary to the core strategy. The university should seek to develop better relationships with local residents and Councillor Doswell requested that the Committee reject this application to work towards a better development.

The Planning Officer stated that there was a detailed report which covered all issues raised. The next stage of the application was reserved for future consideration with this application being before the Committee to set parameters to guide the following proposal with outline applications being wholly normal practice within the planning application process. With regard to reserved matters in a future application, it was noted that there would be 5,300 bedspaces, an extra 950 to what was currently possible on-site. The application complied with all policies and this was set out within the report. There was specific policy advice in the core strategy noting potential to intensify development at this campus. Regarding bat roosts, there would need to be a licence granted from Natural England and no work could progress until the licence was granted. In terms of the campus being a “student fortress,” the setting is the same as the site has never had a public right of way. The outer tree belt would be retained. There was a clear footprint whereby development can take place and that this will take place within 35% of the developable area. Also identified were height restrictions for certain zones. When the reserved matters application comes forward, the application will be fully tested again and brought to Committee. In the USDAW planning appeal, the inspector had stated that they felt this application was acceptable as a concept, their refusal was more concerning design, scale and mass. The inspector did not find that the increase in numbers was unacceptable, on the contrary, they stated that it would be an improvement to students living in HMOs. The last 10 years has seen a 29% drop in council tax exemption in South Manchester and a move towards the city centre and/or PBSA. In terms of affordability, the scheme was not subjected to other market pressures, plus there was not enough PBSA hence a higher cost. The matter had been discussed with the Neighbourhoods Team within the city council and it was noted that the larger impact of students was caused by them living in HMOs.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions or make comments.

Councillor Curley proposed a site visit to have a greater understanding of the proposal within its surroundings.

Councillor Johnson seconded the proposal and stated that this application was similar to the previous Ardwick applications as there was a strong community voice. She requested information on the drop in council tax exemptions and whether there was any data available to show that students choose to move home. Councillor Jonson noted that there was clearly a need for more PBSA and asked if there could be a condition to address the issue of cohesion and integration between the two communities, residents and students.

Councillor Gartside stated that she was aware and recognised the need for further PBSA in the city; an additional 950 bedspaces and asked if there was any available information on 2nd and 3rd year students dwelling choices, how many HMOs were being made available and whether this applied to 1st, 2nd and 3rd year students.

The Planning Officer stated that the council's Executive had set out that there was not enough PBSA, reporting that 10,000 rooms across the city had been set as the necessary amount, with the Planning and Highways Committee having approved 3,500 so far. It was reported that 670 homes had been made available due to the expansion of PBSA in the city and that providing an alternative was the only way to keep this trend up. The Planning Officer stated that community engagement cannot be added as a Planning Condition but noted that the applicant/agent was in the meeting and would be able to take this away. If the Committee voted for a site visit, then more information could be brought back to a later meeting.

Councillor S Ali agreed that there should be a site visit.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve a motion for a site visit in order to fully understand the potential impact of the development on the local community.

PH/23/90 136558/FO/2023 - 46 Henry Street, Manchester, M4 5DD -

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding an application for use of ground and first floor as a restaurant (Use Class E) together with elevational alterations and other associated external works.

The application related to elevational alterations, including extending and creating a first floor to the building, in association with the creation of a restaurant.

Six letters of objection had been received from two households.

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

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee and stated that they had worked with conservation officers on the planning and design process. The building would have zinc cladding and the overall design would be a vast improvement. The

application was originally to be dealt with under delegated powers, but public concerns led to revisions being made with no public access to the 1st floor and a serving hatch removed from the plans as a potential source of anti-social behaviour. The rooftop plant and odour extraction system would have no effect on neighbouring residencies. The Ancoats area and immediate surroundings were home to thriving bars and restaurants and this would be an addition with a maximum cover of 18 diners. A smoking and CCTV policy had also been put in place. All available information was in the report and the agent expressed that he was looking forward to adding to the thriving food and drink economy in the Ancoats area.

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

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

Councillor Lovecy stated that this was a welcome application with community engagement and an improvement on the current setting.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the application subject to the conditions within the report.

PH/23/91 137537/FO/2023 - Withington Community Hospital, Nell Lane, Manchester, M20 2LR - Didsbury West Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of a two-storey building comprising a Community Diagnostics Centre (use class E(e)), with associated external landscaping, patient and delivery drop off area and 6 no. accessible parking spaces.

The planning application was for the erection of a two-storey building comprising a Community Diagnostics Centre (use class E(e)), with associated external landscaping, patient and delivery drop off area and 6 no. accessible parking spaces at the site of Withington Community Hospital on Nell Lane in the Didsbury West Ward.

The key issues with this application were:

- The need and benefit of the new centre
- The impact on the local environment
- The impact on the local traffic and parking

It was acknowledged there were concerns with the proposals, particularly around car parking and the potential impact on the local area; however, as set out in the report it was considered the proposal, which would provide a valuable new Health Care facility, must be carefully balanced with the overall public benefits holding significant weight. It was also recognised that this is a sustainable location near tram stops and bus routes, and other local facilities which provides significant opportunity to assist in modal shift from the private car whilst also having access to off-street car parking for those users where alternatives are not viable.

Other matters raised by objectors were also fully addressed.

The Planning Officer referred the Committee to an additional condition in the late representations report.

The applicant's agent from the NHS Foundation Trust addressed the Committee on the application and stated that there had been a £2.3bn investment from the government. This had identified Manchester and Trafford as key beneficiaries of the scheme. Withington Hospital was already recognised as a key medical hub for the South Manchester area. This centre was well placed to measure the impact of cardio-respiratory issues on local health. The principle of this development was considered acceptable. This medical centre was located in a residential area with the design maximising the functionality of the building. Solar panels, net zero targets, low carbon and sustainable transport methods would help to meet strategic policies in the city. There would be 10 cycle spaces and 6 EV charging points all part of the travel plan for the scheme. There was also an action plan to consider short, medium and long term travel developments. There had been engagement with stakeholders and Local Ward Councillors. To assist with any potential for a rise in on-street car parking, there had been a rise from 30 to 60 mins of free parking for users of the hospital. The development complies with the local and national framework and would be a benefit to the development of a healthy population.

Ward Councillor Hilal addressed the Committee stating that she was in favour of the proposal, but had received complaints from residents about staff parking on residential streets. Councillor Hilal joined residents to observe this in the early hours of the morning and conducted research with staff members on why they were doing this. Staff of the hospital stated that they were being charged £3 per hour to park at the hospital and could not afford to do so. Charges for staff are based on wage. Councillor Hilal spoke to management at the hospital, asking if staff could have 3 hours free parking as they were having a negative effect on local residents. The management rejected this proposal. Also, cancer patients of the hospital were not aware that they were entitled to free parking and it was questioned how the hospital could feed this information to these patients in a clear way to avoid more on-street parking. There had been an agreement in the report for all users of the hospital to have 60 minutes of free parking, which was an increase from the previous 30 minutes. Also, the hospital was supportive of the use of their car park for residents between the hours of 8pm and 6am. Residents had previously rejected a parking scheme and Councillor Hilal and Jeff Smith MP had met with objectors to assist with an agreement between them and the hospital. It had been determined that the proposed unit will employ 30 additional staff and more patients were expected to visit and that would need consideration.

The Chair invited the Director of Planning to make a comment to the hospital trust on the overnight parking arrangement.

The Director of Planning stated that this was certainly an agreeable option and expressed her gratitude to all concerned and involved in the discussions. There was already a travel plan arranged for this application and the Director of Planning stated that she would write to the trust to set out terms for a potential overnight parking plan.

The Planning Officer added that the applicant was committed to the travel plan and that this was flexible to incorporate future changes.

Councillor Andrews was pleased to hear all the efforts and discussions that had taken place around this application and moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application, subject to conditions and amendments.

Councillor Gartside seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the application, subject to conditions and amendments within the reports.

PH/23/92 138127/OO/2023 - Express Solicitors, 313-315 and 317-319 Palatine Road, Manchester, M22 4HH - Northenden Ward

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding an outline planning application (with matters of access, layout and scale for approval) for demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of site for up to 34 apartments and 3 townhouses (Use Class C3).

The planning application had been submitted in outline for the redevelopment of the site following demolition of all buildings and erection of a 5 storey building to comprise 34 apartments located along the Palatine Road frontage of the site, together with 3 no. town houses to be located along the Allanson Road frontage. The application had been submitted in outline with matters relating to access, layout and scale being submitted in detail, with matters relating to the appearance and landscaping being reserved for future reserved matters applications.

The key issues with this application were:

- The scale of the building and its impact on the character and visual amenity of the area
- Potential impacts on the residential amenity of residential properties in the area
- The provision of affordable housing on the site
- The impact on the local traffic and parking
- The flood risk associated with the site

It was acknowledged there were concerns with the proposals, particularly around car parking and the potential impact on the local area; however, as set out in the report it was considered that the proposal would provide residential properties on brownfield land in a sustainable location with a policy compliant proportion of these being for affordable housing.

This application appears on the meeting agenda with another application submitted by the applicant for the redevelopment of another of their office sites located in

Northenden for residential development in close proximity to this application proposal that application is reference number 138128/00/2023.

Other matters raised by objectors are also addressed.

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

The applicant attended and addressed the Committee on the application, stating that this solicitor's firm had started out with 1 member of staff and grown to employ numerous staff, as exemplified by the use of building before the Committee today. The company had required further expansion and acquired a new site on the Sharston Estate. This had led the company into re-purposing the building as "accidental developers." The 1950s era building had been investigated for its potential to be converted into housing stock and it was considered not viable. The two items before the Committee today (items 10 Express Solicitors & 11 Transformulas House) were part of the same development and would be a useful site for housing and some affordable homes. In terms of parking, there were 40 spaces currently but this renovation would lead to less traffic and less parking due to the amount of staff being moved off-site. The townhouse each have a garage as part of the plot and the apartments had a 70% parking provision which had satisfied the Highways Officer.

Ward Councillor Moran addressed the Committee stating that she thanked the agent and welcomed new houses to the area. Parking was a concern in this Ward but the other Local Ward Councillors were not opposed to housing on this site as more housing was required. New houses would need to deliver for residents in a sustainable way. The main concern was that the houses were terraced with no driveways and this may cause parking problems due to the 24 parking spaces available for the whole development as some households will have 2 cars. Another concern was the loss of retail units on the high street. Northenden had been improving with new restaurants and cafes in recent years which residents were in favour of. Further to this was the lack of any green space or enhancement of existing green spaces for these future occupants. The environmental effects of the demolition with no option to retro fit was another concern. Councillor Moran asked the Committee to please consider these concerns when making their decision. Regarding the most contentious element being car parking, she asked if officers would work with the developer to mitigate any impacts on the community.

The Director of Planning stated that this was a very balanced report. All affordable housing is a bonus but the Planning Team were aware that parking is a big issue. The team would be working on the Section 106 agreement so further car parking arrangements could be discussed at that point.

The Planning Officer stated that this was an outline application with a reserved matters application to follow in future, going into more detail therefore landscaping could be given further inspection. There is a travel plan in place with 100% cycle parking in the district centre and less car parking required, as suggested by the applicant due to the residents being in smaller numbers than the previous staff of the unit. Currently there was no retail unit operational on the site and the current unit didn't lend itself well to this. These residential homes would also support the district centre.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions or make comments.

Councillor Andrews enquired on what an “informative” was with regard to the report.

The Planning Officer stated that it was not a condition of the planning permission, but concerning issues the developer had to be aware of that cannot be dealt with via planning process.

Councillor Andrews then moved the officer’s recommendation of Approve for the application with an understanding that there would be conversations between the planning team and the developer to address issues raised by the Ward Councillor before the reserved matters application was placed before the Committee.

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be minded to approve the application subject to conditions within the report, subject to the completion of a section 106 agreement relating to on-site provision of 20% affordable housing.

**PH/23/93 138128/OO/2023 - Transformulas House, 1A Brett Street,
Manchester, M22 4EY - Northenden Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding outline planning permission (with matters of access, layout and scale for approval) for demolition of all existing buildings and redevelopment of site for 2 townhouses (Use Class C3).

The planning application had been submitted in outline for the redevelopment of the site following demolition of all buildings and erection of 2 no three storey townhouses. The application had been submitted in outline with matters relating to access, layout and scale being submitted in detail, with matters relating to the appearance and landscaping being reserved for future reserved matters applications.

The key issues with this application were:

- The scale of the building and its impact on the character and visual amenity of the area
- Potential impacts on the residential amenity of residential properties in the area
- The impact on the local traffic and parking
- The flood risk associated with the site

This application appeared on the meeting agenda with another application submitted by the applicant for the redevelopment of another of their office sites located in Northenden for residential development in close proximity to this application proposal at 313 – 319 Palatine Road. The application number is 138127/OO/2023.

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

The applicant did not add anything by way of a statement to the Committee.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions or make comments.

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

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the application subject to conditions within the report.

PH/23/94 137172/FH/2023 - 126 Chichester Road Manchester M15 5DZ

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of a single storey rear extension to provide additional living accommodation.

This application was considered by a meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on the 16 November 2023 where Members resolved to defer consideration in order for additional images of the extension to be included within the report. This would also provide some understanding of the course of events leading to the extension being partly erected providing visual context. These images had now been included in the main body of the report. Concern was also expressed by Members that this application is retrospective. It is the case that a retrospective application is fully assessed in the same way as any other application and the extension, the subject of this application, had been fully considered on its individual merits.

The Planning Officer stated that visual aspects had now been provided to the Committee in the report.

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

Councillor Curley seconded the proposal.

Councillor Lovecy stated that the Committee had requested that some builds be taken down retroactively and asked if this application met planning policies.

The Director of Planning confirmed that this application did meet the city council's planning policies.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the application subject to conditions within the report.

**PH/23/95 138378/FH/2023 - 54 Ardern Road, Manchester, M8 4NW -
Crumpsall Ward**

The Committee considered the report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

The application sought planning permission for the erection of part single, part two storey side and rear extension to form additional living accommodation.

During the course of the application, it came to light the applicant works for Manchester City Council and for that reason it was necessary for the application to be presented to Committee for consideration. One representation from a neighbour had been received raising concern about the proposal in relation to loss of light.

Key issues related to the proposal's impact upon neighbouring occupiers with regard to loss of light and the visual appearance as well as the impact on the character of the area in general. These issues were fully considered within the main body of the report.

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

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions or make comments.

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

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the application subject to conditions within the report.