

Audit Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 23 July 2024

Present:

Councillor Simcock

Councillors Curley, Kilpatrick, Ogunbambo

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

Apologies:

Councillor Akbar, Executive Member for Finance and Resources

Also Present:

Suresh Patel, Engagement Partner, Forvis Mazars

Amelia Salford, Senior Manager, Forvis Mazars

AC/24/16 Minutes

Decision

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 April 2024 were approved as a correct record.

AC/24/17 Forvis Mazars Audit Completion Report 2022/23

The Committee considered the report of the External Auditors, Forvis Mazars which described their audit progress report on the Council's statement of accounts for the year ending 31 March 2023. The report summarised the progress of the audit to date, challenges encountered and provided an early indication of matters that are likely to be reported during completion of the audit.

Section 1 of the report detailed the progress of the financial audit work to date since this was presented in the Audit Completion Report to the committee in April 2024, this section also detailed the misstatements identified to date. The report further confirmed that there were no changes to the audit approach and there had been no new audit risks identified. Also provided was an update on the audit fees for 2021/22 and 2022/23.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/24/18 Final Statement of Accounts 2022/23

The Committee considered the report of the City Treasurer that provided the updated 2022/23 accounts and explained the key audit adjustments since the previous update to the Committee at the meeting of 23 April 2024.

The 2022/23 draft accounts were presented to this committee on 25 July 2023 and published for public inspection on 14 August 2023. At the April 2024 meeting of this committee, an update was provided outlining the audit adjustments agreed and

reflected as part of the audit process. At that point, the audit was substantially complete subject to a number of outstanding matters, as outlined in the audit completion report, also presented to the committee.

The most significant issue related to the consolidation of the Manchester Airport Group accounts into the Councils group accounts, which was an extremely technical part of the account's preparation process and unique to a small number of Councils. This report summarised the final position following this review. Further details could also be found in the External Auditor's report elsewhere on this agenda.

Subject to the satisfactory conclusion of the outstanding work, an unqualified opinion on the single entity and group accounts was expected to be issued.

Appended to the report were the Final Annual Accounts 2022/23. This was expected to be the final position for 2022/23. The external auditors were yet to conclude their review of the changes to the group approach and their final review of the full accounts document. It was recommended that any final, non-material changes were delegated to the City Treasurer for approval in consultation with the Chair of the Audit Committee. The auditor's annual report would then be brought to the September 2023 meeting of this committee.

Decision

The Committee agreed to:

1. Note the amendments made to the annual accounts since the last update reported to the committee in April 2024.
2. Approve the revised annual accounts including the accounting policies contained within them. Delegate authority to the City Treasurer and Chair of Audit Committee to approve any final nonmaterial changes.
3. Agree not to amend the annual accounts in relation to PFI Lifecycle and adjust 2023/4 accounts to take account of cumulative lifecycle costs.

AC/24/19 Draft Statement of Accounts for 2023/24

The Committee considered the report of the City Treasurer that provided Members with the draft Statement of Accounts for the 2023/24 financial year, which were presented for audit by the Council's appointed external auditors Forvis Mazars. The Council is required to prepare a Statement of Accounts for each financial year. The accounts must be prepared in accordance with statutory timelines and accounting practices. These accounts will be published by the 31 July 2024 following the meeting of the Audit Committee and a final quality assurance review of the extensive document.

Decision

To note the unaudited 2023/24 Annual Accounts including the narrative report, signed by the City Treasurer.

AC/24/20 Treasury Management Outturn 2023/24

The Committee considered the report of the City Treasurer that described Treasury Management activities of the Council during the financial year 2023-24. The report provided:

- An introduction and Background;
- The Portfolio Position as at 31st March 2024;
- A Review of Economic Conditions 2023-24;
- Treasury Borrowing in 2023-24;
- Compliance with Prudential Indicators and Treasury Limits;
- Investment Strategy for 2023-24;
- Temporary Borrowing and Investment for 2023-24;
- Implications of Rising Interest Rates; and
- Conclusion.

In response to a discussion relating to interest rates, the Commercial Finance Lead said that the assumption was that interest rates would fall, however the question remained as to when this would occur and how many times a year. He said this was a complex area and subject to many economic factors, both nationally and globally. He informed the Committee that Capital Budgets and Treasury Budgets were managed under the same Team, and the current strategy would fund the current programme of capital schemes. He said that all alternatives to income generation were considered to reduce the need for borrowing in future years for future schemes.

The Commercial Finance Lead addressed the emerging risk regarding lender option borrower option (LOBO) loans that the Council held, noting that this has not occurred to date. He explained that should any options be exercised by any of the lenders, the decision to agree to a revised rate or repay would be based on achieving value for money over the long term.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/24/21 Internal Audit Update - Quarter 1 2024/25

The Committee considered the report of the Assistant Director (Assurance & Risk) that provided an update of progress on the agreed audit plan and details of assurances from the Internal Audit Service for quarter one 2024/25 to the end of June 2024 and confirmed progress in the delivery of the annual audit plan; and key assurances, risks and issues arising from audit work, assessment of other sources of assurance and actions taken to address internal audit recommendations.

In response to a discussion in relation to schools and school finance standards, he said that schools had undertaken their own self assessments that had provided a reasonable assurance. Further updates and assurance from these audits would be shared with the relevant Executive Member and with the next Audit Committee as part of the agreed assurance reporting arrangements. The Committee discussed the need to share good practice amongst schools in relation to financial governance

arrangements to which the Assistant Director (Assurance & Risk) confirmed that guidance is provided to schools, regardless of their structure and relation to the Local Authority. In response to a discussion that arose regarding the importance of having Local Authority representatives on School Boards, he advised that records of Board membership would be maintained. He also addressed comments raised in relation to cyber security by suggesting that a detailed confidential report could be submitted to the Committee for consideration at an appropriate time.

Decision

To note the report.

AC/24/22 Outstanding Audit Recommendations - Q1 2024/25

The Committee considered the report of the Assistant Director (Assurance & Risk) that described that in accordance with Public Sector Internal Audit Standards, the Assistant Director (Assurance & Risk) 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.

This report summarised the implementation position at the end of June 2024. This report also included an update on progress made by school to address recommendations from school audit reports.

The Committee recommended that the appropriate Director attend the September meeting of Audit Committee to provide an update as to why any recommendation remained outstanding after 12 months. Noting the comments made by the Assistant Director (Assurance & Risk) which explained that significant work was ongoing in relation to these recommendations, it was determined that it would be useful to provide Members with additional context for the reasons for the delay, and to highlight current challenges to implementation.

Decision

1. To note the report.
2. To agreed that the appropriate Director attends the September 2024 meeting of the Audit Committee to provide an update on why any recommendations remained outstanding for a period of 12 months and highlight current challenges to implementation.

AC/24/23 Register of Significant Partnerships - Annual Assurance Review 2023

The Committee considered the report of the City Treasurer that provided an overview and outcome of the assurance process which had taken place as part of the annual

review of the Register of Significant Partnerships(RSP) for 2023.

The purpose of the RSP annual review was to assess whether the partnership arrangements that the Council is a party to were performing well, delivering value for money, have strong and effective governance structures, effectively mitigating risk and realising the benefits that they were established to achieve.

The detail contained in the report focused on a number of key areas:

- Any new partnerships which have been added to the register;
- Entries recommended to be removed;
- Any partnerships where the assurance rating has increased to 'Substantial' since the last review; and
- Any partnerships now classed as 'Reasonable' or 'Limited' strength following completion of the latest self-assessment.

All partnerships not currently rated as 'Substantial' assurance would be subject to a six-month reassessment. This would take place in September 2024. The outcome of the six-month review would be reported to Audit Committee in November 2024.

The Chair invited the Executive Director of Adult Social Services to address the Committee in relation to Greater Manchester Mental Health Trust (GMMH). She advised that NHS England had commissioned an Independent Review of mental health services provided by GMMH. The Review was chaired by Professor Oliver Shanley and the findings of this review and subsequent improvement plan had been reported to the Health Scrutiny Committee at their meeting of 26 June 2024. The new Chief Executive had attended that meeting and addressed questions raised by Members. She added that additional resources had been deployed to support the Trust and stated that staff recruitment and retention, in addition to an increasing demand on services continued to present a challenge to the Trust. She gave assurance that herself and the Executive Member for Healthy Manchester and Adult Social Care remained fully briefed on the situation at GMMH.

The Assistant Director (Assurance & Risk) addressed the issues raised by Committee Members in relation to the AVRO Hollows Tenant Management Organisation (AHTMO). He provided an historical context to the organisation and described the challenges that surrounded this. He said that a Special Review of the AHTMO has been undertaken by an Independent Reviewer who had made a total of 77 recommendations for the TMO and the Council. The TMO had received the report, and a meeting was planned with the Board to discuss the Improvement Plan during late June/early July. He stated that the Council had a duty of care to both the tenants of these properties and to the physical assets (i.e. the buildings, including the fire risk assessment and any remedial work of the external cladding). He said support and guidance was offered to the Board and both he and the Assistant Director of Housing met with the Board monthly with a view to progressing the required improvements in the required timeframes. He added that the Board were subject to an annual ballot of the residents, and any tenant could put themselves forward to sit on the Board at the Annual General Meeting, however concerns remained regarding the Board's understanding of their legal duties. He said that ultimately there was a legal route that the Council could instigate to bring management back into Council

control. He also confirmed that local ward Councillors were informed of relevant discussions in relation to these properties, referring to improvements to rendering and the significant capital investment that had been delivered to improve the properties.

The Chair recommended that a report on GMMH and AVRO Hollows Tenant Management Organisation be submitted to the November meeting of Audit Committee. The Committee agreed to this.

In response to a question raised by the Chair in relation to the National Football Museum and repairs, the Head of Commercial Governance, Assurance and Initiatives stated that the report referred to the organisational effectiveness of entities that formed part of the Register of Significant Partnerships and that the issue of maintenance did not form part of this reporting.

In relation to Victoria North (Northern Gateway Operations) and the issues raised by a Member in relation to the internal governance structure of FEC (Far East Consortium), the Housing Investment Manager, Major Regeneration acknowledged the reported historical issues and the steps taken to address these. He said that it was envisaged that once the action plan had been implemented the entry will return to 'substantial' assurance on the Register. He gave assurance that a number of documents and reports had been provided to the Internal Audit Team which showed that the actions were already underway, and that progress was being made in a number of areas. FEC had also confirmed their support in implementing the action plan. In view of its remit, it was noted that an update on those matters would be reported to a meeting of the Resources and Governance Scrutiny Committee at an appropriate time.

Decision

1. To note the report.
2. To agree that further updates on matters pertaining to the Greater Manchester Mental Health Trust and the AVRO Hollows Tenant Management Organisation be submitted to the November meeting of Audit Committee.

[Dr Downs declared a personal interest in this item of business as his partner is an employee of Greater Manchester Mental Health Trust]

AC/24/24 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 2024/25 municipal year.

The Chair advised that the report on the Corporate Risk Register would be considered at the September meeting.

Decision

To note the report and approve the work programme, subject to the amendments made in the previous agenda items.

This page is intentionally blank

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 28 June 2024

Present: Councillor Lyons - In the Chair

Councillors: S. Ali, L. Bell, Curley, Davies, Gartside, Hassan, Hewitson, Hughes, Kamal, Kilpatrick and Lovecy.

Also present: Councillors Flanagan and Grimshaw.

PH/24/32 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 139133/FO/2024 and 137769/FO/2023.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/24/33 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 30 May 2024 as a correct record.

PH/24/34 138910/FO/2023 - Henesy House, 4 Nobby Stiles Drive, Manchester, M4 4FA - Miles Platting and Newton Heath Ward

This proposal was considered by the Planning and Highway Committee on 30 May 2024 when Members deferred consideration in order to undertake a site visit and for further information and clarification on how the accommodation would be commissioned and managed, and how it would relate to other similar uses in the ward.

A site visit took place on the morning of the meeting.

The accommodation would be occupied only on a referral basis in conjunction with the City Council's Homeless Team and residents would need to meet eligibility criteria to live there. Residents would be risk assessed relevant to their needs. Anyone who is considered to pose a risk of committing anti-social behaviour in the local area would not be accepted.

The accommodation would be staffed on a 24 hour basis. Staff would be working and on duty overnight. Residents would not be allowed visits and management arrangements would prevent residents from congregating outside of the building either within the grounds or on the public highway. Staff members would disperse any residents who are congregating outside and failure to comply with this could result their agreement being terminated. The applicant would make their contact

number available to surrounding residents and other users including the school, who can contact them directly and staff can immediately take appropriate action.

Residents would be encouraged to meet with their families in the family home or with friends at local day centres or other social/leisure facilities. It is recommended that the operational management, in condition 12, is modified in order to reflect these arrangements.

The City Council's Homeless Team and Support Housing Team support the proposal and do not believe that it would result in an over concentration of this type of use in the ward. The existing uses are low key in nature, housing a limited number of residents, and were dispersed across the ward avoiding a concentration in one location. As a percentage of the total population of the ward, these uses represented a small proportion of the total number of residents and would meet the needs of the most vulnerable.

The applicant stated that the proposal would help the council avoid the use of costly bed and breakfast accommodation. The applicant had worked with the city council and the scheme has the support of the Housing Team. It would accommodate low risk people who needed help. There would be a 24 hour staff rota and no sleeping quarters. People with a criminal record would be assessed on their individual case and any anti-social behaviour would not be tolerated. Clients would be contracted to a behaviour policy as part of their terms and conditions and anyone not adhering could be forcibly removed. Visitors would not be allowed on-site and there would be full control over who was in the building. Residents would be expected to meet family and friends at their premises or out in other social settings. GMP support the scheme and the applicant had engaged with Local Ward Councillors, redesigning the scheme from high to low risk clients. They had engaged with the local primary schools and met with Headteachers at an engagement event. The Diocese of Salford had provided the building free of charge for this purpose. Funding is available for additional security measures, such as CCTV and this scheme would enable low risk homeless males to build their lives back up towards a self-sustaining lifestyle and would reduce homelessness in Manchester.

Councillor Flanagan stated that it was a sad day for Ward Councillors and residents who had had to object to this scheme. They look for a compromise to any application, rather than object, adding that he had worked with and met the applicant as they have been involved in other homeless accommodation projects. He is not against homelessness accommodation sites but Miles Platting and Newton Heath Ward has a higher than average amount. It is not NIMBY-ism but the higher than average amount was an indicator of there being too many already. A senior Officer had advised him that the Ward is full to capacity and could provide a copy of the email. The Officer felt the proposal should not be supported when it could remain as an end of life and dementia care centre. The site could be considered for other uses and he was shocked to hear that money was the driving force behind this application. He stated that there is talk of relocating Abbott Primary School as it may be in jeopardy and closed by confirming that he was keen to continue working with the applicant.

Councillor Grimshaw stated that he did not completely agree with how the meeting had gone between Local Ward Councillors and the applicant. He noted that St

Patrick's RC Primary School were part of the Diocese so would clearly support the application. There had been no letter of support from Abbott Primary School and there is a lack of infrastructure to provide daytime meeting places in the Ward, with the library not being able to open full-time. Families and children would also use these places and it was posed whether these low-risk clients would make residents feel unsafe in their own communal areas. It was likely that the clients would meet their friends on street corners and make the area feel less safe. He stated that with some clients potentially coming from prison made him feel that the bigger picture remained unseen and expressed his disappointment with the application.

The Planning Officer stated that all formal responses to the application were contained within the report, adding that there may have been other conversations but Officers can only respond to what comes back to them. He confirmed that the Director of Homelessness is supportive and noted that there was not any over-concentration of these facilities in this Ward.

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

Councillor Kilpatrick noted the 1.69% concentration of similar homelessness projects in the Miles Platting and Newton Heath Ward but asked what the city average was.

Councillor Curley noted the Planning Officer's comments regarding comments sent to the Planning Team being all that could be recorded for the report and expressed that the applicant was a good organisation. He raised concern about vulnerable people and wished for them to be supported properly by their families and friends. There is a possible contradiction between there being a high need and the low risk nature of the potential tenants, adding that there were many who needed this kind of help due to mental health issues. He addressed Councillor Flanagan's comment around the issue of money by stating that this was a basic requirement for any project but would be concerned if this aspect was prioritised over health and wellbeing. Placing the scheme close to schools may not be best for either the project or the schools.

The Planning Officer stated that the scheme, if approved, would make 1.69% of dwellings for homeless families in the Ward and that the city average was 0.95%. The management plan would be a condition.

The Chair added that the site visit was useful in determining where the entrance would be located in relation to that of Abbott Primary School and that extra screening could be added if approved by the Committee today.

The Director of Planning confirmed this, noting that the Planning Team would work with the applicant for a suitable solution for screening between the school and the homeless unit if approved today.

Councillor Kilpatrick questioned the multiple entrances to the proposed scheme, one of which was directly opposite the foundation year's entrance, asking if there could be a condition placed on the application to restrict the use of these other entrances, where permissible for health and safety reasons.

The Planning Officer stated that the main entrance would be opposite the car park entrance and the other entrance was for staff use only, would be locked when not in use and there would be a condition to control this.

Councillor Davies concurred that the site visit had been useful, noting that the pedestrian gate entrance to the school would need to be open for emergencies but may be better if closed. She enquired on whether staff could prevent issues such as clients congregating outside of the building as an all-male presence would be intimidating. Further questions were raised on the issue of smoking and whether this was allowed in the individual residencies and also on control of drug use as this was another concern for passers-by and school children. If these behaviours were not considered anti-social but they could still be intimidating and threatening to others. Concern was raised around the potential for visitors to the clients being exploited in some cases.

The Planning Officer stated that the gateway would be locked 24/7 unless required for access or egress and referred the Committee to page 17, paragraph 4, regarding visits or congregating outside the unit or on the public highway, adding that this could lead to residents of the project having their residency terminated.

Councillor Hewitson questioned why this was not a scheme for Female clients, noting that that it had been refused for this purpose previously.

Councillor L Bell noted comments regarding clients meeting visitors at local day centres but considered that there was a lack of such provision in the Ward and had concerns about where the residents of the unit would congregate. He also raised concern around the amount of school children passing by the unit and asked what the overnight arrangements were for staff on-site, whether it would be staffed by 5 persons over a 24 hour period and how clients being "low risk" was assessed.

Councillor Lovecy noted that there was a need to determine the detail within the operations management plan. She noted that there was a similar scheme within her Ward which did have some issues previously but was now running well so noted how schemes like this can be successful and would want this to work as well. Councillor Lovecy stated that her concern was for this project to have arrangements for zero problems and an effective team. She questioned what these males would be doing in the daytime as the Ward didn't appear to offer much daytime provision. She noted that the Early Years centre also had an entrance on Nobby Stiles Drive. Councillor Lovecy requested for the Committee to have the assurances they needed to approve this application, noting specifically any contract with the Homelessness Service of the city council and issues of public concern. She supported the scheme in principle but had outstanding concerns.

The Planning Officer stated that the Committee could only deal with the application in front of them today, which was for 19 homeless low risk males. He referred to Councillor Bell's and Lovecy's comments, stating that the Homelessness Service were satisfied with arrangements for staff, managements and selective process of clients. Others support the scheme and all staffing and management operations.

The Director of Planning noted that there was a condition regarding how tenants would be assessed and that this had been worked over thoroughly with the Homelessness Service.

Councillor Davies expressed that she needed more information, adding that the Homelessness Service may be experts but would not address concerns of residents and were serving their clients. Councillor Davies asked for information on local day centres and leisure centres and on how tenants would be evicted if not complying with house rules, further enquiring about the legal process around this.

Councillor S Ali noted that his only concern was on the location of the proposal being next to schools, asking about the level of low risk and whether this may include drug users as he would consider them to be high risk.

The Director of Planning stated that any legal process around eviction is outside the remit of Planning, and any issues arising would be dealt with by a separate legal process. The assessment of client's risk and criteria was for the service to ascertain and promote, with assistance from city council colleagues.

Councillor Kilpatrick stated that it was disappointing to have asked for the concentration of similar schemes across the city on 21 June and be told today that it is higher than the city average and doesn't include travellers. There was a need for accommodation for homeless males but he asked how this scheme would impact on the local amenity and whether the school could deal with its operations. Councillor Kilpatrick inferred that it was difficult to make a decision as, on balance, there was general support for this type of provision but he felt that the application was lacking information on the overall concentration across the city and impact on the school. He directly enquired on what the operational impact would be to the school.

Councillor Davies enquired about the security of clients and why information regarding the potential termination of contracts was in the report if it was not something for the Committee's consideration. She noted the Condition 12 comment stating that the Operational Management Statement shall be submitted for approval and questioned how this was being applied, considering there was another step to follow.

The Director of Planning confirmed that the legal agreement was a separate process, not for the Committee to consider and that the tenancy details were not for the Committee to consider. There was an operational management plan, as per other Planning Committee applications with some level of detail and additional conversations will take place between the city council and the applicant, such as the issue of smoking on the site.

The Planning Officer addressed Councillor Kilpatrick's concern, stating that there would be no impact to the school, noting that the entrances to both the unit and the school were not opposite each other, there would be no outside gatherings allowed and children would be escorted to and from school as they were primary age.

The Chair passed back to the Committee to make a determination.

Councillor Lovecy still had concerns about Condition 12 and enquired about further assurances on an operational management plan. She noted that the school had not objected to the scheme and stated that this may add some weight in favour of the application and moved the officer's recommendation of Approve for the application.

The Chair asked Councillor Lovecy if her motion was to include additional conditions around screening.

Councillor Lovecy confirmed this to the Chair.

Councillor Gartside seconded the motion, adding that the applicant was present and would be able to take away the Committee's concerns and comments to address them with the Planning Team.

The Committee voted not to support the motion and the Director of Planning explained that the Committee would need to provide a reason to be resolved to a decision of Minded to Refuse.

Councillor Curley asked if the various concerns of the Committee could be consolidated into one reason by a member.

The Director of Planning stated that one reason was required from one member.

Councillor Curley motioned that the application be deferred due to a Minded to Refuse decision as the Committee resolved that they had concerns regarding – impact on community and school, the management of clients outside the premises, potential access issues to the premises and school, legal issues relating to the tenancy termination plans, provision of day care centres in the locality, concentration of similar projects in this Ward and that the scheme was considered the right application in the wrong location.

The Committee agreed that Councillor Curley's reasons addressed their concerns.

The Director of Planning noted that some of the comments in Councillor Curley's reasons were not relevant but noted that they would be taken away and the application would return for consideration.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Refuse due to the high concentration of similar schemes in the Ward, proximity of the scheme to primary schools, assurances around the operational management plan, tenancy termination concerns and lack of provision of local day centres.

(Councillor Kamal arrived during this item and took no part in the discussion or voting on the application).

PH/24/35 139133/FO/2024 - Land at Cornbrook Road, Manchester - Hulme Ward

The Committee considered the report for the erection of a 24-storey mixed use building incorporating 224 residential apartments (Use Class C3a), 87 apart-hotel studios (Use Class C1), amenity space, flexible commercial space (Use Class E), and cafe (Use Class E(b)), together with infrastructure, landscaping, and other associated works.

The public realm would be improved including street tree planting, raingardens and high quality hard landscaping. There had been 3 letters of support and 9 objections.

The Planning Officer did not add anything to the printed report.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee and stated that they represented the company and referred to their track record across the city centre and Salford with projects in Hulme, Ordsall and Ancoats. The developer wished to contribute to the city centre and this was a landmark development. The site in its current state was unattractive and subject to crime and the fear of crime. The application was a quality design of red brick with a sawtooth roof, harking back to the industrial heritage of the city. This development would provide much needed hospitality and access, adding public realm space to make the area feel safer whilst minimising impacts and improving economic growth. This was a good use of a brownfield site and the agent requested that the Committee approve the application.

The Planning Officer stated that the Cornbrook Metrolink stop was in dire need of improvement and this scheme would address that as part of the development and make the area much safer.

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

Councillor L Bell stated that his only concern was the lack of affordable housing within the scheme and hoped for some offer or support in this regard.

Councillor Kilpatrick noted that the height of the development had played a part in the objections received and stated that he made attempts to check the Strategic Regeneration Framework and questioned whether the increased height of the proposal was in line with this framework, as suggested in one of the objections. Councillor Kilpatrick moved onto a query around the light impact assessment and noted that the footprint of the scheme was the same as the previous application for this site. He raised concern over the impact to the Vox building and questioned why the development was compared to a theoretical building within the report. If the previously planned development was recommended for approval based on light assessments, then other factors should also be considered for this development, such as viability now that it was proposing a bigger building on the site. He noted that there appeared to be a different assessment as the Committee were being asked to approve a bigger building but lose the Section 106 agreement.

The Planning Officer stated that where affordable housing was concerned, the policy allows for a viability assessment to be undertaken. This is tested independently and then assessed in-house for consistency. It has been accepted that the profitability is way below the allowance for affordable housing to be considered on this scheme. This via a benchmark land value which shows that affordable housing could not be

sustainable for this proposal. However, it was noted that this could change and so a recommendation for a later stage assessment could be made when the development was 80% complete. The test would then be re-run and the possibility for the city council to arrange for a Section 106 contribution. With regards to the day/sunlight assessment, this was very technical and the Planning Officer stated that they had made best attempts to put this into plain language in the report. The BRE guidelines on day/sunlight are not subject to Planning Policy but could be used in court cases and is an accepted methodology of accepting readings. Regarding the mirror image of the development, it was practice for any application in the development stages to have a theoretical mirror image building also assessed for any high impact. There was agreement for a landmark building on this site as per a city centre situation. The day/sunlight assessment allowed for a higher build but this proposal was lesser than previously agreed. This information had been tested via appeal and court cases.

Councillor Lovecy enquired about the landscaping, asking if it was possible to add a condition to add a play area for children.

Councillor Curley addressed the issue around viability, noting that some city centre projects saw the developers unable to keep to promises, leading to project being kept on hold. Addressing the issue of the Section 106 agreements, he stated that Manchester would never get enough affordable housing, but stated that it always helps but felt that it was notable that the scheme would offer benefits to the broader area in tidying up a grim area of high use due to the Metrolink station. Councillor Curley expressed that the scheme should be welcomed for this improvement.

The Planning Officer referred to Councillor Lovecy's request, stating that it could be difficult to provide but the idea of a play area/apparatus would be investigated. He agreed with Councillor Curley's comments, stating that the application had been tested line by line and every value considered by three different services.

Councillor S Ali moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve.

Councillor Curley seconded the motion.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve for the application, subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement to secure a late stage review of the viability to determine if there is any uplift in conditions to warrant a contribution towards affordable housing.

PH/24/36 137769/FO/2023 - 190 Burton Road Manchester, M20 1LH - Didsbury West Ward

The Committee considered a proposal regarding the erection of a single-storey rear and side extension to create additional retail space, internal bin store and WC and installation of new shop front and associated balustrading to forecourt.

The applicant proposed the erection of a single-storey rear and side extension to create additional retail space, internal bin store and WC, along with a new shop front

and balustrading to forecourt. Two letters of objections had been received from local residents and objections had been received from Ward Members. The main concerns raised included impact on residential amenity, the character of the Conservation Area and pedestrian/highway safety.

The Planning Officer did not add anything to the printed report.

Councillor Kilpatrick addressed the Committee as Local Ward Councillor, confirming that he had made representations prior to joining the Planning and Highways Committee. He stated that this was the only premises without infill to the rear in this location and expressed disappointment with the report for this application. The premises was for Class E use, café/restaurant and was temporarily operating as a yoga studio but should still be considered as Class E. He noted the potential impact on neighbours as the project was situated very close to local residents. Councillor Kilpatrick addressed his concerns regarding the use and movement of 1,000L waste bins and noted that he had spoken with the applicant who agreed to store these waste bins inside. Regarding the frontage, this premises was within the conservation area therefore restrictions apply on the frontage. Regrettably, many premises had required retroactive planning applications for work already done. Councillor Kilpatrick also noted the curtilage to the frontage of many premises in the area, noting that lots of shop frontages should not be there to obstruct the public highway. He urged the Committee to consider the Class E usage of the premises, not to consider what it was currently operating as, and consider the impact this would have on local residents. Councillor Kilpatrick concluded by stating that there were already notable impacts with bins regarding associated noise and waste issues and asked the Committee to reject the application.

Councillor Kilpatrick left the chamber after making his comments.

The Planning Officer addressed the concerns by stating that the applicant had altered plans for waste and Class E use. The planned internal bin was satisfactory for a restaurant and could be placed, but not stored at the rear of the building. Late representations gave greater control over acoustic insulation and front and back door opening being restricted and were addressed in the report. The front area would be allowed later hours for the bi-folding door usage. There was also an additional condition to reinforce that the premises would not be staying open to 01:00 hours, as was previously proposed.

Councillor S Ali moved the officer's recommendation of Minded to Approve.

Councillor Kamal seconded the motion.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application subject to conditions set out within the report.

This page is intentionally blank

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 25 July 2024

Present: Councillor Lyons - In the Chair

Councillors: S. Ali, Chohan, Collins, Davies, Gartside, Hassan, Hewitson, Hughes, Kamal, Kilpatrick and Riasat

Apologies:

Councillors L. Bell, Curley and Lovecy

Also present:

Councillor Flanagan, Miles Platting and Newton Heath Ward

PH/24/37 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 138662/FO/2023 and 139751/FO/2024.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/24/38 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 28 June 2024 as a correct record.

PH/24/39 138910/FO/2023 - Henesy House, 4 Nobby Stiles Drive, Manchester, M4 4FA - Miles Platting and Newton Heath Ward

The Committee considered the report that reminded Members that this application was initially considered by the Planning and Highway Committee on 30 May 2024, where it was deferred in order to undertake a site visit and to allow further information and clarification to be provided on how the accommodation would be managed, and about other similar uses in the ward. The site visit took place on the morning of 28 June and was later considered by the Committee. At the May Committee Members were minded to refuse the item, with a decision being deferred to allow officers to address the concerns raised as follows:

- How resident's contracts would be terminated in the event of a breach of their agreement, and if/how the operator could move residents on.
- The signposting and provision of access to daycentres for residents to meet friends and families, and the general management of and support given to residents outside of the facility.
- The impact on the neighbouring school's accesses, and the impact on the local community and operation of the school.

- The overconcentration of uses of this nature in Miles Platting and Newton Heath and their subsequent wider effect on the ward.

In reporting back to Committee, officers advised that these concerns could not form the basis of defensible planning reasons to refuse the application, on the basis that:

The termination of a resident's license and the protocol for moving residents on would be addressed through the management and operation of the facility. The Management Plan could be controlled via a planning condition (See condition 12). It has been confirmed that residents would occupy on a license agreement, which could be terminated without notice if they breach the terms of the agreement. No notice is required and there are no legal rights of appeal. Causing anti-social behaviour, congregating outside the site or on local streets would be in breach of the license agreement and could lead to immediate eviction. Effective management of residents outside of the facility would be achieved through the deterrent of the termination of their license agreement.

Residents would be encouraged and signposted to attend other sites in the local area to meet friends and family. These measures would be included in the Management Plan. The site is on the boundary of Piccadilly ward and the facilities that residents would be signposted to are in neighbouring areas. These include day centres, educational, volunteering and training services and other leisure facilities. Examples include the Booth Centre, Barnabus, Lifeshare and Caritas facilities. Other examples include Mustard Tree and Back on Track. Other leisure facilities include Central Library, Aquatics Centre, The art gallery and MOSI.

All residents would be registered at the Urban Village Medical Practice under their homeless person contract ensuring services would not be taken away from local people. The practice is fully supportive of this scheme.

Residents would access the facility through the main entrance at the southern end of the site. The vehicular access to the car park and the pedestrian gate at the northern end of the site would be used only by staff, with the latter being locked and used in the event of an emergency. These measures would be secured by condition 12. The only entrance for residents would be as far away as possible from the school's access.

Policy H10 states that housing for people with additional support needs will not be supported in areas where there is a high concentration of similar uses. However, there is no threshold in the policy and demonstrable evidence to support impact due to an alleged over concentration is required. The ward has only a marginally higher number of such uses than other neighbouring areas, and for the reasons set out above there is no basis to refuse permission as the management plan, license agreement, controlled access points and the spread of facilities for residents in a wider area would not cause adverse impact or cause disproportionate stress on local infrastructure and facilities.

The applicant stated the proposed scheme would accommodate 19 single males who had been assessed as low risk and with low need. She reiterated the difference between a license to occupy as opposed to a tenancy agreement, and the associated

license conditions relating to congregating and antisocial behaviour. She said occupants would be permitted to smoke in their bedrooms and the communal courtyard. She said that the management and operation plans had been fully endorsed by the Council's Homelessness Service. She further reiterated the use of the main entrance as the primary access route and that discussions had been undertaken with Abbott Primary School, including options for additional screening between the site and the school. She added that no formal letter of objection had been submitted by the school to the proposed development. She stated that dialogue with both the school and local residents would continue. She said that training and educational sessions would be delivered to the occupants on site, in addition to occupants being signposted to relevant support services outside of the ward, but within a mile walking distance. She said that Urban Village Medical Practice were fully supportive of the scheme. She concluded that by stating that the applicant had a proven record of delivering quality, well managed support services.

Councillor Flanagan stated that the area in which the scheme was proposed already had proliferation of services and schemes designed to support vulnerable residents, including drug and alcohol services; a bail hostel (Approved Premises); homelessness services; in addition to the high levels of temporary accommodation. He commented that the area experienced high levels of deprivation and there was a lack of shops in the vicinity that had resulted in a food desert. He reiterated that he was not anti-homeless services and that he had met and spoke with the applicant to discuss concerns previously discussed at Committee. He stated that an absolute redline would be the site being used for the 'A Bed Every Night' scheme, for the reasons that those individuals referred could not be adequately risk assessed. He proposed that the Committee, if minded to approve should consider including a condition that excluded the site from being used as part of the 'A Bed Every Night' scheme or reject the application.

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

Councillor Davies stated that the Council was committed to supporting rough sleeping and those experiencing homelessness, however appropriate consideration needed to be given to where services were located and the impact these could have on the local community. She noted that the 'A Bed Every Night' scheme had been very important in the support offered to rough sleepers and questioned if the Operational Management Statement could be modified to include a condition to exclude the site from accepting referrals from the 'A Bed Every Night' scheme.

Councillor Kilpatrick referred to the minutes of the previous meeting where he had asked for a condition regarding restrictions on the use of other entrances and noting the discussions at this meeting regarding the use of the main entrance. He requested that a condition be agreed in relation to this. He further questioned what controls the operator could reasonably have once an occupant had left the premises.

Councillor S. Ali asked how an individual would be assessed as being low risk before being accommodated at this site.

The Planning Officer stated that a condition could be included that addressed the discussion regarding the use of the main entrance and the installation of appropriate screening with the school.

The Legal Officer said that the test for any condition would be if it was enforceable and therefore this would have an impact on a specific condition regarding 'A bed for Every Night'.

The Director of Planning stated that the proposed operational and management plans were robust and this set out how the premises would be occupied. In response to a comment made regarding the funding of the scheme, she said that this was not a material planning consideration. With reference to the 'A Bed Every Night' scheme she said that it would be very difficult to categorically rule out excluding this site from ever being used and said that if the Committee were minded, she could discuss this with the applicant to agree a suitable condition in consultation with the Chair about reinforcing the content of the Management Plan.

Councillor S. Ali, noting the discussion and views of the Committee moved the recommendation to approve the application, subject to a conditions being agreed by the Director of Planning and the applicant, in consultation with the Chair, to be included in the management plan in regard to the relationship of the site and the 'A Bed Every Night' scheme; the use of the main entrance by occupants and the establishment of additional screening between the site and school.

Councillor Gartside seconded this motion.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the application subject to the inclusion of conditions that were to be agreed by the Director of Planning and the applicant, in consultation with the Chair in regard, to be included in the management plan in regard to the relationship of the site and the 'A Bed Every Night' scheme; the use of the main entrance by occupants and the establishment of additional screening between the site and school.

PH/24/40 138662/FO/2023 - 98 Wilmslow Road Manchester M14 5AL - Moss Side Ward

The Committee considered the report that described the proposal for the erection of a 4 storey building to form 42 no. residential units (Use Class C3) with ground floor commercial restaurant / cafe and retail units (Use Class E and sui generis), car parking, cycle parking and associated infrastructure following the demolition of the existing building on site.

Following the notification process of the application proposals 13 responses were received 11 of these raising concerns and objections and 2 indicating support.

The key issues were:

- The scale and massing of the proposals.

- Impact on residential amenity and neighbouring properties.
- Highway impacts arising from the development.
- Demolition and construction impacts.

The agent for the applicant attended the hearing and addressed the Committee on the application, stating that they had worked closely with the Planning Department to address the issues relating to the previous decision to refuse and submit an amended application. These amendments included an alteration to the northern elevation facing the adjacent 'Jobs Centre Plus building' to improve the window relationship of proposed residential units to that site and also alterations to the internal layout including relocation of the entrances to the retail units so these reflect the more commercial frontages on Wilmslow Road and Grandale Street opposite the site. These amendments were subject to further notification of residents and consultees. He said that the height and footprint of the proposal had been reduced and the architecture was sympathetic to the local area, and an increase in onsite car parking and the provision of 100% secure cycle storage. He said that occupants of these high quality residential properties would not be able to access the local residents parking zone in the area, noting that the site was well accessed by sustainable modes of transport and there had been no objections to the amended proposal by Highways. The agent concluded by stating that he was confident that sufficient measures and controls had been proposed to address any concerns and requested the Committee endorse the Planning Officers recommendation to approve the application.

The Chair invited the Committee to ask questions or make comments

Councillor Gartside stated that she recognised the benefits of developing this site and welcomed the application. She enquired about the implications of the amendments to parking bays on Grandale Road.

Councillor Kilpatrick welcomed the provision of 100% secure and covered cycle parking provision within the ground floor of the development. He commented that the development would deliver 15 on-site car parking spaces and questioned whether this would be sufficient for the number of units. He further sought an opinion as to whether it would be lawful to exclude residents from this development from having access to the Resident Parking Zone scheme.

The Planning Officer stated that the loss of the parking bay was on the North side of Grandale Street and was not one that was part of the Resident Parking Zone scheme, adding that the bay to the South side would not be lost. He said that the option proposed by the applicant to the removal of the northern parking bays and conversion of the southern bays from '3-hour maximum stay' bays to '1-hour maximum stay' bays is accepted in principle. He said that any costs associated with any amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order would be met by the applicant.

Councillor Davies said that Condition 9 provided no assurances in relation to the management and operation of internal risers to manage fumes, vapours and odours that were discharged from the retail units. She said that issues such as noise nuisance and fire risks could result from such installations.

The Planning Officer stated that the ongoing maintenance of the internal ducts would be required through the details to be submitted as part of the discharge of that condition. and would be agreed in consultation with the Planning Department and the Environmental Health Department.

Councillor S. Ali moved the recommendation to be Minded to Approve for the application.

Councillor Riasat seconded this motion.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be Minded to Approve subject to the signing of a Section 106 Agreement to secure a late stage review of the viability to determine if there is any uplift in conditions to warrant a contribution towards affordable housing; and, provision of car club membership for 2 years and not permitting residents of the development applying for resident parking permits.

PH/24/41 139751/FO/2024 - Fallowfield Shopping Centre Birchfields Road Manchester M14 6FS - Rusholme Ward

The Committee considered the report for the erection of a new foodstore (Use Class E) and 1no. retail unit (Use Class E) and 1no. hot food delivery unit (sui generis) with associated car parking and landscaping.

Planning permission was granted in May 2022 for a new foodstore, following the demolition of existing retail units on this site.

The current application also proposes the erection of a new foodstore (Use Class E) to be operated by Lidl, with associated car parking and 2no. new sub-let units, within Fallowfield Shopping Centre.

The main changes between the two applications relates to an increase to the proposed building footprint, alterations to the car parking arrangement, the addition of a further sub-let retail unit and the loss of the existing medical centre.

Following notification of the application, one representation has been received, objecting to the proposal, on the grounds undue operational and construction.

The key issues were:

- *Regeneration and sustainable location within an established shopping centre.* The application site relates to accessible, brownfield land and would offer favourable regeneration to provide appropriately scaled economic development which would create a range of local employment opportunities.
- *Loss of the existing medical centre.* The site currently accommodates a medical centre to be demolished and not re-provided. This issue is covered in detail in the body of the report.

- *Environmental.* The proposed redevelopment has the potential to bring about significant environmental and visual improvements, offering the redevelopment of an underutilised brownfield site to deliver a modern foodstore development. Such development would improve the appearance of a prominent site adjacent to a key arterial route.

- *Impact to residential amenity.* Given the context of the proposal within an out-of-town retail park, the levels of activity would not be untypical.

- *Impact to the operation of the highway.* The application has been considered by both TfGM and Highways Services. Subject to necessary off-site highway works to be secured by an attached planning condition, no significant issues are raised.

The agent for the applicant attended the hearing and addressed the Committee on the application, stating that the application reflected the Lidl operating model. He commented that the provision of car parking had been increased from 94 to 102 and the proposal would deliver 40 new jobs and the subletting of two retail units. He commented that there had been no objections from statutory consultees. He said that the NHS were of the opinion that the current medical centre building was not fit for purpose, and it was understood that the NHS who operated the medical centre were presently exploring options for its relocation nearby and they had been granted an additional 12 months to secure an alternative site.

Councillor Kilpatrick asked if approval had been agreed with HS2 to develop the site, noting that the northern part of a site currently used for wider car parking provision and was previously earmarked for a HS2 ventilation shaft. This area was still subject to a safeguarding direction.

Councillor Hewitson noted that the medical centre was very well used by residents and welcomed the agreement reached to allow the NHS 12 months to secure an alternative site.

The Planning Officer stated that HS2 had given their approval for the site to be developed subject to appropriate conditions.

Councillor Kamal moved the recommendation to approve the application.

Councillor Hughes seconded this motion.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application.

**PH/24/42 139537/FO/2024 - Clever Clowns Day Nursery Greenbrow Road
Manchester M23 2UH - Baguley Ward**

The Committee considered the report for the erection of a three-storey apartment block comprising 20 apartments following demolition of existing building, supported by access, parking, landscaping, drainage, and other associated works.

The proposals related to the development of a site that currently contains a two-storey vacant building last used as a day nursery and prior to that a public house. The building is proposed to be demolished with the site redeveloped to provide 20 affordable residential apartments in a three-storey building with associated car parking area to the rear of the site.

Following notification of the application 7 representations were received objecting to the proposals.

The key issues were:

- Scale and height of the proposed building.
- Impact on adjacent existing residential properties.

The agent for the applicant attended the hearing and addressed the Committee on the application, stating that the proposal would realise the redevelopment of a vacant building for the provision of 20 affordable residential units within a sustainable location. The units would comprise of 1 and 2 bedroom apartments that would be of a high-quality design providing good size accommodation. These would support older residents to right size. She commented that the proposal would not impact on local amenities as the proposed height and depth of the development had reduced so as not to be detrimental to neighbouring properties. Further she commented that the car parking proposal were considered to be acceptable by the Planning Department and the proposal was in a location accessible by public transport and the proposal would provide 20 internal cycle parking spaces.

Councillor Gartside welcomed the proposal and the delivery of affordable housing. She also welcomed the opportunity this proposal presented for people to right size.

Councillor Hughes moved the recommendation to approve the application.

Councillor Kamal seconded this motion.

Decision

The Committee resolved to Approve the application.

Planning and Highways Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on 29 August 2024

Present: Councillor Lyons - In the Chair

Councillors: S. Ali, L. Bell, Chohan, Collins, Curley, Davies, Gartside, Hassan, Hughes, Kamal, Kilpatrick, Lovecy, Riasat

Apologies: Councillor Hewitson

Also present: Councillor Reid

PH/24/43 Urgent Business

The Director of Planning provided a verbal update regarding the government consultation on a new draft National Planning Policy Framework. It was believed to have limited weight but still a material consideration on decision-making. The Director of Planning considered that the recommendations within the reports were in accord with the Council's adopted Development Plan, Places for Everyone and with the existing and emerging NPPF.

PH/24/44 Interests

Councillor Hughes declared a prejudicial interest in Item 9 - 139693/FO/2024 - Abbey Hey Clinic Constable Street Manchester M18 8GD. Councillor Hughes spoke on the item as a Ward Councillor, subsequently leaving the room and taking no part in further discussion or the vote on this item.

PH/24/45 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered

A copy of the late representations received had been circulated in advance of the meeting regarding applications 137226/FO/2023, 137227/FO/2023, 137794/FO/2023 & 137795/LO/2023, and 139693/FO/2024.

Decision

To receive and note the late representations.

PH/24/46 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 25 July 2024 as a correct record.

PH/24/47 137226/FO/2023 - Part Of Plot C And Plot E Great Jackson Street Manchester M15 4NP

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding an application for full planning permission for the demolition of

existing structures and the phased construction of four residential buildings (two at 47 storeys and two at 51 storeys) to provide 1,746 homes (Use Class C3), flexible commercial, leisure, food and drink uses (all Use Class E) and / or drinking establishment (Sui Generis), basement car parking, cycle parking, landscaping and public realm, servicing and access arrangements, highways alterations and associated works.

There were 56 representations, 3 in support and 53 objections.

The Planning Officer noted that the late representations had been circulated that included two further objections, and corrected some of the drafting of the original report. An objection considered the proposal to not comply with policy EN2 regarding delivery and viability of tall buildings. Their concerns related to the lack of a guarantee of a funding partner for funding to be available for a scheme that is unviable. The Planning Officer noted that the Committee are aware that the applicant has delivered schemes in this area, and elsewhere, in similar challenging financial circumstances, with Officers of the belief that this highlights that the scheme does comply with policy EN2 and would comply with the development plan when read as a whole.

The applicant's agent noted that the applicant had a long-term commitment to transform the area, having already delivered over 3,000 homes alongside other supporting infrastructure. They addressed the objectors concerns regarding a funding partner, noting it was rare for this type of application to have a funding partner without the necessary Planning Permission. The application could deliver a large green space that would be publicly accessible by removing a large tower originally proposed. The application was forecast to create a number of jobs, both during and after construction. The proposals are energy efficient.

Members raised concerns regarding the lack of Affordable Housing within the proposal. A member did note that the viability assessment regarding this had been done as would be expected, but the outcome was still disappointing.

The Planning Officer acknowledged the importance of Affordable Housing but accepted that the conclusion had been that it was currently not viable, and this had been tested independently. They did inform the Committee that the viability would be retested when a significant part of the scheme was completed, usually around 80%. If this showed Affordable Housing to be viable at this stage, Officer's would work to achieve the maximum amount of affordable housing possible.

Members then raised concerns about the limited provision for children within the scheme and queried if the employment opportunities would include apprenticeships.

The Planning Officer noted that whilst there was no specific provision for children within the application, that had been provided in previous schemes. The Committee could add a condition for this to be looked at further. In terms of employment, it was noted that a Local Labour Agreement would be required to be delivered, and it was expected that apprenticeships would form part of that.

A member raised concerns regarding the impact on light for nearby buildings, but noted they were pleased with the positive response regarding children's spaces.

The Planning Officer accepted that the figures did look challenging regarding light due to being a clear site, but this is an area where tall, high-density buildings were expected. They acknowledged that there were impacts but they were within acceptable levels.

A member raised again their concerns regarding the lack of Affordable Housing yet noted that the report stated the application would go towards targets. They also sought clarity on if there were any height limits on developments in this area.

The Planning Officer noted that the report clearly set out that the scheme could not deliver Affordable Housing. They stated that there was an indicative framework for the areas development and the proposals were broadly in line with that.

Councillor Curley moved the Officer's recommendations with an additional condition for the applicant to consider children's play spaces.

Councillor S. Ali seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be minded to approve subject to a legal agreement for a review mechanism for a financial contribution towards off site affordable housing and for off-site bio-diversity mitigation, with an additional condition for the applicant to re-consider children's play spaces within the application.

PH/24/46 137227/FO/2023 - Plot D Great Jackson Street Manchester M15 4NP

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding an application for full planning permission for the demolition of existing structures and the erection of one residential building to a height of 71 storeys comprising 642 homes (Use Class C3) with food and drink uses (Use Class E) and / or drinking establishment (Sui Generis); and one office building (Use Class E); with basement car parking, cycle parking, landscaping and public realm, servicing and access arrangements, highways alterations and associated works.

There were 18 representations, one in support, 16 objections and 1 representation.

The Planning Officer referenced the two additional objections circulated within the late representations, which also corrected some drafting of the original report. A similar issue had been raised as in the first item regarding the application not being compliant with policy EN2. The Planning Officer noted again that the Committee are aware that the applicant has delivered schemes in this area, and elsewhere, in similar challenging financial circumstances, with Officers of the belief that this highlights that the scheme does comply with policy EN2 and would comply with the development plan when read as a whole.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee, noting that this application proposed the tallest residential building across the development. The applicant had engaged in a rigorous design process in consultation with others, which had resulted in some changes from the 2018 masterplan. Changes included reducing the number of tall buildings from two to one, increasing the height of the one building, and introducing a stand-alone 3-storey office building. They noted that the overall impacts of the development were acceptable and identified appropriate mitigation where necessary.

A member queried if a similar condition regarding children's play spaces, as added to the previous application, would be possible for this scheme. Members also raised concerns regarding the lack of Affordable Housing contained within the proposals and how this would go towards meeting the 10,000 affordable homes target.

The Planning Officer noted that the podium takes up virtually all the ground floor of the site and therefore felt it may not be possible to deliver play facilities as part of the scheme. However, they noted that this application was next door to the previous item where that condition had been added, alongside other developments in the area that are delivering green spaces. The Planning Officer accepted that part of the housing targets included 26,000 new homes at normal market sales, which this application does go towards. At this stage, it did not contribute to the 10,000 affordable homes target but that would be re-assessed at a later point during construction. If this showed Affordable Housing to be viable at that stage, Officer's would work to achieve the maximum amount of affordable housing possible.

Councillor S. Ali moved the Officer's recommendations.

Councillor Hughes seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to be minded to approve subject to a legal agreement for a review mechanism for a financial contribution towards off site affordable housing, off-site tree planting and for off-site bio-diversity mitigation.

PH/24/47 137794/FO/2023 & 137795/LO/2023 - 12 And 14 - 16 Piccadilly Manchester M1 3AN

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the erection of a 34 storey building (land at no. 14-16 Piccadilly) and conversion of adjacent building (no.12 Piccadilly) (basement to fourth floor) to create an aparthotel, including a ground floor cafe (Use Class E (b)), first floor exhibition hall (Use Class F1) and a rooftop bar and restaurant (Use Class E (b)), and associated works. The report also contained an application for Listed Building Consent for the external and internal alteration and refurbishment of no 12. Piccadilly to form aparthotel in association with the erection of a 34 storey building (land at no. 14-16 Piccadilly), including ground floor cafe (Use Class E (b)), first floor exhibition hall (Use Class F1) and a rooftop bar and restaurant (Use Class E (b)), and associated works.

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

A local resident addressed the Committee, noting that they welcomed the development but felt there was an opportunity to be more creative in the design of the application. They acknowledged that the application would reduce the view of nearby residents. Servicing at nearby premises is not done in the service yards provided and is done from outside of the housing association block. The resident had concerns that there were no further plans for servicing within this plan. They felt that the street was already at full capacity. They accepted the scheme could work but felt that more needed to be done.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee, noting that the site had been vacant for more than 20 years. The listed building at the site was integrated into the proposals. Within the application, there would be publicly accessible facilities, alongside the hotel. The principle of a tall building on the site has previously been accepted with two planning permissions granted previously. The scheme would provide jobs both during and post-construction. The scheme would also provide heritage benefits by bringing a Grade II listed building back into use after being vacant for more than 20 years. They noted that the applicant had a strong track record of delivery.

The Planning Officer noted that this was a relatively small site, next to a listed building. It was a key objective of the proposal to save and restore the listed building. The building would be high-quality precast concrete. In terms of servicing, the officer noted that the best fit had to be looked at nothing would be perfect. The Highways Team were satisfied with the servicing condition put forward. The Planning Officer noted that colleagues can look at enforcement where conditions of other nearby premises were not being met.

A member was happy to hear about enforcement and asked the Chair to discuss this with members to ensure that problems do not continue to arise in the future. They queried the concrete; how nice it could be kept and how it would respond to rain.

The Planning Officer noted that the concrete would be factory produced and will have to meet the standards required to be used. They assured the Committee that it would be good quality and its response to rain would form part of the assessments.

Members then queried if there was anything that could be done to allow public access to the improved heritage site and the view of Officer's on the removal of part of a wall of a Grade II Listed building.

The Planning Officer noted that the application was for a hotel and public access would likely be limited. However, the application sought to integrate the building into the development, but there could be public access to amenity space if they were part of the listed building. The Planning Officer noted, regarding the wall, that the intention is always to keep as much of a listed building as possible, however that is not always possible, and a balance must be found.

Councillor Curley moved the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Riasat seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve applications 137794/FO/2023 & 137795/LO/2023.

PH/24/48 139072/FO/2024 - Particular Baptist Church Rochdale Road Manchester M4 4HT

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the temporary change of use of vacant former Baptist Church from Place of Worship (F1) to Storage & Distribution (B8) and the installation of a new roller shutter door to the side elevation.

Four objections had been received.

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

A member queried if the church would stay and be used as such.

The Planning Officer noted that the premises had not been used as a church for a while and this application sought to change the use.

Councillor S. Ali moved the Officer's recommendation.

Councillor Riasat seconded the proposal.

Decision

The Committee resolved to approve the application.

PH/24/49 139693/FO/2024 - Abbey Hey Clinic Constable Street Manchester M18 8GD

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Planning, Building Control and Licensing regarding the change of use of the existing vacant clinic to form 6 no. residential apartments (1 x one bedroom, 3 x two bedroom and 2 x three bedroom apartments) together with external elevational alterations, car and cycle parking and landscaping.

Following notification of the application, an objection was received from the Abbey Hey Residents Association, and their reasons for objecting has been supported by Ward Members.

Key issues regarding the application were:

- Sustainability of the proposed use in this location and the impact on the character of the area
- Impact on potential residential amenity
- Potential over-insensitive use of the site
- Waste management
- Impact to the operation of the highway and access.

The Planning Officer drew members attention to the late representations, which included further objections from a resident's association and ward councillors. It also included information on a prior approval process in relation to the potential change of use to residential use for the application property.

A ward Councillor addressed the Committee, noting their concerns that the application was recommended for approval. The owner of the property had 21 people living at the site illegally, not responding to Council instruction to evict the tenants. The police and fire services also gave notice that the building did not comply with health and safety legislation, with no response from the owner. The ward Councillor felt it surprising that the building only required small changes to become six apartments and felt that the owner intended to disguise the property as an HMO. They felt there was insufficient car parking for the proposals, with inadequate road and pavement infrastructure in the immediate vicinity. There was believed to be bedrooms overlooking nearby properties in the proposal, and an anticipation of significant noise from this. The ward Councillor noted that there had been noise complaints whilst the building was being used as a hostel. They felt that the scale and massing of the building was out of character with the surrounding area. The ward Councillor had concerns that extra residents in this building would put extra pressure on an already failing sewerage system. They asked the Committee, if they were not minded to refuse, to perform a site visit.

A second ward Councillor addressed the Committee, noting that they did not believe the use of the building would change if the application was approved. They asked the Committee to perform a site visit that included the inside of the building, if possible.

The Planning Officer noted that there many issues raised by Councillor Reid and these were dealt with in detail within the report before Members. Officers understood the concerns of ward Councillors and residents regarding HMO use but noted that enforcement action had been taken against the owner and there was a condition of permission recommended which would prevent use as a HMO. The Planning Officer summarised the changes to the scheme to give it a more residential appearance including garden areas, boundary treatment and landscaping. It was noted that six car parking spaces for 6 units was in accordance with the necessary policies. If the Committee resolved to complete a site visit, it could not be guaranteed that access inside the building would be possible.

Members raised concerns regarding the external impact of the proposals and the internal design. It was felt that clearer images were required, if an inside site visit was not possible, to give members a better understanding of the proposals. They felt that the floorplan gave no impression of what the site would look like and there was little detail provided.

The Planning Officer noted that they had negotiated the proposal down from eight to six apartments which meet the Council's space standards, utilising existing windows. It was noted that the grant of planning permission would provide control to the Planning department whereas a Prior Approval submission would only allow limited control from a planning point..

Members questioned if they would be permitted to enter the building on a site visit and if there would be any overlooking from the property. Members also raised concerns over the applicant's behaviour. There were also concerns raised about noise emanation and the detail regarding the sizes of the properties.

The Planning Officer noted that there would be no additional windows overlooking the neighbouring gardens, only existing windows would be used. It was noted that the proposals met the space standards required, but if deferred then Planning Officer's could provide further detail regarding this.

Councillor Curley proposed a site visit to allow for members to see the site and what is proposed, particularly regarding issues raised by the ward Councillors.

Councillor Davies seconded the proposal.

The Director of Planning did note that there was no right of access inside the building but that can be sought from the applicant. If it was not possible to get inside, Officer's would provide as much detail as possible.

A member queried if there was a possible condition to prevent the use as an HMO.

The Planning Officer noted that a condition had been recommended to prevent HMO use.

Decision

The Committee resolved to defer the application for a site visit.

(Councillors Hughes and Kamal declared a prejudicial interest in the item and remained in the room as Ward Councillors until they had spoken, subsequently leaving the room and taking no further part in the discussion or decision-making process).

Personnel Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 24 July 2024

Present: Councillor Akbar (Chair) – in the Chair

Councillors: Hacking, Igbon Johnson, Midgley, Rawlins, Reid and T Robinson

Apologies: Councillors Bridges, Craig, Moran and White

PE/24/13 Minutes

Decision

The Committee approves the minutes of the meetings held on 5 and 14 June 2024

PE/24/14 Revised HROD policy – Equal Opportunities in Employment Policy Statement

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Human Resources, Organisational Development and Transformation, which outlined a revised Equal Opportunities in Employment Policy Statement, which was to be renamed 'Workforce Equalities Statement' for the Committee's consideration. Once the statement had been approved, it would be launched to the workforce via the Council's usual communications channels.

There was unanimous support from Members in relation to the changes that had been made to improve and bolster the statement and the steps that had been taken, and would be taken, to continue to engage with staff.

Decision

The Committee approve the Workforce Equalities Statement.

Constitutional and Nomination Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 9 September 2024

Present:

Councillor Karney – in the Chair

Councillors, Curley, Flanagan, Midgley and Richards

Apologies: Councillors Bridges Craig, Green Leech and Reeves

CN/24/13 Minutes

Decision

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 10 July 2024 as a correct record.

CN/24/14 Compulsory Review of Polling Districts and Polling Places

A report from the Chief Executive was submitted that sought approval for the initiation of the compulsory review of polling districts and polling places within the city. The Electoral Administration and Registration Act 2013 requires compulsory reviews of parliamentary polling districts and polling places must take place every 5 years. The proposed review of polling districts will start on 16 September 2024 and will involve a public consultation. Following the completion of the review the proposed changes will be published a report would be required to be submitted to meeting of this committee to be held in January 2025 to seek formal approval to implement the amendments before the end of the review period on 31 January 2025.

Decisions

The Committee agreed:

1. To note the background to the review and the proposed timetable/process including the consultation arrangements.
2. To authorise the initiation of the compulsory review of polling districts and polling places within the Council's area beginning on 16 September 2024.
3. To delegate authority for undertaking the review to the Chief Executive.
4. To request that the Chief Executive reports back to the Committee upon completion of the review in January 2025 so that the Committee can make a final determination on polling districts and polling places for the city.