

## **Audit Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2020**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Ahmed Ali - In the Chair  
Councillors Clay, Lanchbury, Stanton and Watson  
Independent Co-opted members: Dr S Downs and Dr D Barker

#### **Also Present:**

Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member Finance and Human Resources  
Karen Murray, Mazars  
Stephen Nixon, Mazars

**Apologies:** Councillor Russell

#### **AC/20/01     Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2019 as a correct record.

#### **AC/20/02     Internal Audit Assurance Report**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management that provided a summary of the audit work undertaken and opinions issued in the period April to December 2019.

The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management introduced the key themes as set out within the report. The Chair then invited questions from the Committee.

A Member sought further information regarding the current vacancies within the Audit Department. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated that two temporary staff had been appointed to cover imminent vacancies and the intention was to have implemented a full review and restructure by the end of June 2020, following the appropriate consultations. He described that this programme of work was being delivered in conjunction with Bolton Council and he envisaged that this approach, in addition to reviewing the progression opportunities for staff would make Manchester an attractive and interesting place to work that would also help assist with the recruitment and retention of staff.

A Member enquired if staff with audit responsibilities across the schools' estate were appropriately trained and competent to discharge their responsibilities. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management commented that appropriate oversight and support for this function was promoted across all schools for this critical role and advice and guidance, including lessons learnt was provided to Head Teachers. A

Member commented that a service level agreement should be introduced regarding training for school business managers to assist them and support them in the areas of activity and themes that emerged from the audit work. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated that he would raise this with colleagues in the Education Department and the Schools Group with a view to progressing this, noting that issues seemed to arise when schools deviated from agreed purchase protocols and systems.

A Member sought clarification as to who was responsible for recommendations identified for schools and if any remained outstanding, where were these reported to and monitored. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management clarified that there existed a separate schools' recommendations tracker and that they were monitored, and if areas of concern were identified these would be reported to the Executive Member for Children and Schools and if appropriate to the Audit Committee. He further stated that clarification would be sought as to whether any outstanding recommendations relating to schools needed to be included in the regular Outstanding Audit Recommendations report that was considered by the Committee.

The Head of Internal Audit and Risk commented that there was significant work required to improve Data Protection Impact Assessments (DPIA) and said that work had been undertaken to reiterate the importance for officers to complete these in a timely manner and a programme of actions had been agreed, in consultation with the City Solicitor to improve this area of activity. A Member noted the importance of this as failure to carry out a DPIA when required or to consult the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) when necessary, could lead to the Council facing enforcement action with the maximum financial penalty of 10 million euros. A Member commented that any information and guidance issued to staff in relation to DPIA's should also be circulated to all Members.

In response to comments made regarding Section 106 money, the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated that the audit of this activity had taken place during a period of change to this system. He stated that the planned improvements and identified key actions should significantly enhance the arrangements in place to monitor s106 agreements. A Member commented upon the importance of the development of a database that would enable records and information to be consolidated and supported the inclusion of this as an identified key action and recommended that this activity was reported back to the Committee, in particular the reported delays in the spending and movement of monies and the indications that there may have been a number of unspent historical balances remaining on SAP. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated that a progress report would be submitted to the Committee at an appropriate time.

In response to a question from the Committee regarding her opinion on the completion of DPIAs by officers of the Council, the City Solicitor stated that as an organisation the Council was still learning about Key Decisions and DPIAs and she was of the opinion that they were not purposefully not completed. She stated that the importance of this was recognised corporately and a programme of staff training, including the development of a template for staff to use and communications was ongoing to officers across the organisation. She further reiterated the importance of retaining the right data and information for the right amount of time. She stated that to

support this the process required for staff completing DPIAs was appropriate and not too onerous for staff required to complete them and a user friendly guide had been produced and that this was continually reviewed, recognising the importance of the Group of officers who meet regularly to review and monitor this activity.

## **Decisions**

The Committee;

1. Note the Internal Audit Assurance Progress Report to 31 December 2019.
2. Confirm and approve the proposed changes to the Internal Audit Plan 2019/20.

## **AC/20/03 Outstanding Audit Recommendations**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer and the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management that provided a summary of the current implementation position and arrangements for monitoring and reporting internal and external audit recommendations.

The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management introduced the key themes as set out within the report. The Chair then invited questions from the Committee.

Members sought an opinion as to whether those recommendations that were reported as being over nine months would be completed or whether the relevant Executive Member and Strategic Lead would be required to attend a future meeting of the Audit Committee to explain why they remained outstanding. A Member enquired if the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management was satisfied that the system for monitoring Outstanding Audit Recommendations was working efficiently. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management commented that the Committee had heard from the relevant officers and Executive Members in regard to the outstanding recommendations over nine months and further commented that this approach had assisted in keeping a focus and accountability on this area of work, noting that this approach had been supportive and helpful to the Audit Team.

A Member commented that whilst he welcomed the list of outstanding recommendations listed by length of time they remained outstanding, what was being done to recognise, and where appropriate prioritise new entries. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management acknowledged the comment and stated that consideration would be given to the format of the reporting and the allocation of a critical score against each entry to assist with the prioritisation of each individual recommendation.

The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer informed the Committee that both herself and other Senior Management Team members did assess the critical levels of each recommendation when the reports from Audit were received. She further added that whilst the ambition was always to reduce the number of outstanding recommendations, the number of these was relatively low when compared to the number of recommendations made.

A Member sought an update on the recommendations that remained outstanding in relation to the Disability Supported Accommodation Services and Transition to Adult Services. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated that an audit opinion on Disability Supported Accommodation Services would be provided at both the March and April 2020 meetings of the Committee and this would further update Members on the implementation of these. He further commented that the report would be updated and any revised target dates for the Transition to Adult Services recommendations would be included when this information was next reported to the Committee.

The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management responded to a question asked by a Member in regard to the implementation date of the Supervisions Google Form by advising that this would be checked and updated in the report for when it was next submitted to the Committee.

In response to a question asked by a Member in relation to the outstanding recommendations reported for Social Value and the associated KPIs (key performance indicators), the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management commented that a considered and robust response was received to the recommendations and he advised the Committee that a significant amount of work had been done in respect to the issues identified and he was confident that a number of the actions had been completed.

The Executive Member Finance and Human Resources addressed the Committee and stated that there were a number of measures implemented to monitor Social Value and KPIs. He described that an annual social value event was delivered each year by CLES (Centre for Local Economic Strategies) that benchmarked the authority against a range of metrics. He further described that consideration was being given to understanding and recording the wider benefits and societal outcomes of social value, including real stories and not to simply measure this activity in terms of a monetary value. He described that Manchester was pioneering the approach to social value and it was important to capture and describe the real stories and impact this approach had on the lives of residents and communities across the city. Members agreed that whilst important, social value should not simply be measured in the number of jobs and apprenticeships delivered and recognised the wider impact this approach had. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that consideration continued to be given to the governance arrangements to promote, challenge and deliver social value via the Council's procurement arrangements.

## **Decision**

To note the report.

## **AC/20/04     Audit Strategy Memorandum**

The Committee considered the report of the Council's external auditors Mazars that summarised their audit approach, highlighted significant audit risks and areas of key judgements and provide the Committee with the details of their audit team.

Karen Murray, Mazars introduced the key themes as set out within the report. The Chair then invited questions from the Committee.

A member of the Committee enquired if the reporting deadline of 31 July was achievable. Karen Murray described that last year there had been a challenge nationally to adhere to the deadline and it was anticipated that this would be repeated this year. She described that discussions were currently ongoing with the appropriate government minister to understand if this deadline could be extended, however Mazars continued to work to the 31 July deadline, pending any ministerial decision. She said that she would continue to liaise with the City Treasurer as these discussions progressed to ensure the correct opinion was delivered.

In response to a question regarding the IFRS 16 Leases accounting standard, Karen Murray described that work was ongoing to understand the impact of this reporting requirement. She stated that to date they as the external auditor were satisfied with the approach that was being taken by Manchester City Council to comply with this requirement to disclose this information and regular meetings with the finance team would continue to monitor this significant piece of work to comply with the relevant accounting standard.

The Chair supported a comment from a Member who described that the addition of another layer of reporting made it difficult for the lay reader to fully understand the Council's accounts and noted the additional work this represented for officers. The Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that the requirements to comply with the accounting were very challenging and she paid tribute to the staff who worked within the Finance Team. She described that consideration had been given to streamlining the reporting of the accounts, however to comply with the legislation and reporting standards this was very challenging and she commented that a summary of the accounts was always provided.

### **Decision**

To note the report.

### **AC/20/05 The Committee's Work Programme**

The Members considered the Committee's work programme. A Member requested that the meeting dates for the 2020/21 municipal year be circulated.

### **Decisions**

The Committee;

1. Note the Work Programme.
2. Recommend that the Governance Officer circulate the meeting dates for the 2020/21 municipal year.

## **Audit Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on 10 March 2020**

#### **Present:**

Councillor Ahmed Ali - In the Chair  
Councillors Clay, Lanchbury, Stanton and Watson  
Independent Co-opted members: Dr S Downs

#### **Also Present:**

Karen Murray, Mazars

**Apologies:** Dr Barker, Independent Co-opted member  
Councillor Ollerhead, Executive Member Finance and Human Resources

### **AC/20/06     Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 11 February 2020 as a correct record.

### **AC/20/07     Register of Significant Partnerships**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that presented the Register of Significant Partnerships 2019. The format, and the review and assurance process associated with the register was outlined in the report. The report focused on partnerships which had been added to the Register during 2019 and those where the governance strength rating had changed, or where the rating remained 'Medium' or 'Low' strength following completion of the latest self-assessment. The full draft Register was included as an appendix to the report.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Directorate Lead, Corporate Planning and Governance stated that a review would be undertaken of how this register was produced to strengthen the reporting and value of the document. He stated that the review would allow for consideration to be given as to the frequency of the reporting, reflect upon and identify any improvements to the reporting process. He stated that consideration would also be given as to whether an additional metric of rating could be introduced to strengthen the document and that the Committee would be kept informed as this work developed.

In response to a Members question regarding plans for when the current Strategic Director Growth and Development left his post, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer stated that whilst not wishing to pre-empt any final decisions, the knowledge of all the partnerships and responsibilities was distributed across a number of officers within the Council.

In response to the reported rating of Medium for Manchester Health and

Care Commissioning (MHCC), the partnership between the Council and CCG to create a single health, social care and public health commissioning function for Manchester, the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform advised that work continued to progress in regard to this activity and commented upon the existing complex systems within the different organisations and the challenge this represented. However, he reassured the Committee that progress continued to be made. The Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management stated that a governance audit of MHCC had been undertaken approximately 12 months ago and progress continued to be made against those findings that had resulted in the Medium rating being awarded. The Directorate Lead, Corporate Planning and Governance directed Members to the section of the report that described the criteria applied to the awarding of the different ratings and described that these had been applied and that those ratings were reviewed by a moderation panel to ensure they were applied consistently and correctly.

In response to a Members comment regarding the importance of transition planning from Children Services to Adult Service, the Director of Policy, Performance and Reform advised Members that this was recognised and the respective services were actively working to improve transition pathways.

In response to a Members question regarding Northwards, the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer informed the Committee that a review of ALMO (Arm's-length management organisations) governance arrangements was currently underway to ensure the existing arrangements were satisfactory, and the findings of this review would be reported at an appropriate time.

In response to a specific question regarding the Brunswick PFI, the Head of Internal Audit and Risk Management advised the Committee that he would look into this and provide an update to the Committee at an appropriate time.

## **Decisions**

The Committee note the report.

### **AC/20/08     Accounting Concepts and Policies, Critical Accounting Judgements and Key Sources of Estimation Uncertainty**

The Committee considered the report of the Deputy Chief Executive and City Treasurer that explained the accounting concepts and policies, critical accounting judgements and key sources of estimation uncertainty that would be used in preparing the 2019/20 annual accounts. It also contained details of the new International Financial Reporting Standard (IFRS) 16 on leasing that was to be fully introduced by Local Government on 1 April 2020.

In response to a question from a member of the Committee regarding the anticipated impact on staff capacity to implement the International Financial Reporting Standard (IFRS) 16 on leasing, the Deputy City Treasurer stated that this requirement had been factored in to the teams' work planning.

Members noted the consequences of recent global events on world markets and the impact this could have on pension funds. The External Auditor acknowledged this comment and informed the Committee that consideration was being given as to how to respond to and navigate this emerging situation.

### **Decisions**

The Committee;

1. Approve the accounting concepts and policies that will be used in completing the 2019/20 annual accounts
2. Note the critical accounting judgements made and key sources of estimation uncertainty.

### **AC/20/09 Annual Internal Audit Plan 2020/21**

#### **Decision**

To defer consideration of this report to the next meeting of the Committee.

### **AC/20/10 Risk Management Strategy and Risk Register**

#### **Decision**

To defer consideration of this report to the next meeting of the Committee.

### **AC/20/11 The Committee's Work Programme**

The Members considered the Committee's work programme. A Member commented that following the decision to defer the previous two items of business to the next meeting, consideration needed to be given to the number of items of business scheduled for the next meeting. The Chair noted this comment and advised the Committee that he would discuss this with relevant officers

### **Decisions**

The Committee note the Work Programme subject to the above comments.

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 16 January 2020**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Hitchen, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeleine Monaghan Riasat, Watson and White

**Also in attendance:** Councillors Newman and Wheeler

#### **PH/20/01 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications, since the agenda was issued, was circulated.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/19/02 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 19 December 2019 as a correct record.

#### **PH/20/03 124820/FO/2019 - Land to the North East of Enterprise Way bounded by Roxholme Walk and Dentdale Walk and the Rear of Lincombe Road and Felskirk Road to the North, Manchester, M22 1PU**

The committee considered a request for a site visit in view of a question raised about the proposed use of the site in relation to job creation and potential green issues.

#### **Decision**

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

#### **PH/20/04 121099/FO/2018 - Land at Portugal Street East Manchester M1 2WX**

The application submitted relates to the construction of two residential buildings (Use Class C3) comprising Block one (29 storeys) (224 apartments (four x one bed one person, fifty two x one bed two person, sixty four x two bed three person and one hundred and four x two bed four person) 25% one bed and 75% two bed) Block two

(twenty three storeys) (264 apartments forty four x one bed one person, forty four x one bed two person, ninety two x two bed three person and eighty four x two bed four person) (33% one bed and 67% two bed) with a linked central podium, to deliver four hundred and eighty eight units, shared amenity space, twenty seven car parking spaces, four hundred and ninety two cycle spaces, landscaping (including new public park), lighting, highways and associated works following demolition of existing buildings and structures.

The application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 19 December 2019 for a site visit which, took place prior to the meeting.

The application relates to a 0.88 hectares site bounded by Adair Street, Portugal Street East, the Piccadilly – Ashton-under-Lyne Metrolink line / Fair Street, Longacre Street and warehousing situated between Longacre Street and Heyrod Street.

The planning officer did not add anything further to the report submitted.

Councillor Wheeler addressed the Committee in his capacity as ward Councillor (Piccadilly). Reference was made to the size and cost of the proposed development (488 units) which did not include affordable housing, a social housing contribution or S106 contribution. Councillor Wheeler stated that this was unacceptable and the applicant is asked to reconsider the level of contribution.

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

The Planning Officer reported with reference to affordable housing, the figures relating to this are provided in the report submitted and have been tested through an external independent organisation and verified by internal advisors and are consistent with other figures produced for the city centre. There is a clawback mechanism within the S106 agreement which will be retested at an agreed phase of the development process to check if there has been an uplift in incomes. The Committee was informed that the purchase of land to be used for public realm purposes had impacted on the profitability of the development and ability of the developer to contribute to affordable housing.

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

A member referred to the planting arrangements for trees as part of the development and asked if these would involve planting on the street or in planters and what the maintenance arrangements would be. Officers were also asked what similar scale buildings were in the vicinity of the development site.

The Planning Officer reported that any planting of trees would be in the ground and not in planters. Check would need to be made on underground services before planting to prevent damage from digging and roots. The maintenance of public realm element of the development will be under the responsibility of the Portugal Street Partnership, which the Council is a stakeholder. A resident's service charge will include the maintenance cost for the public realm area and no public funding will be

used. The Committee was informed that the Oxygen building is within the vicinity of the development and is a similar height and scale (thirty-four storeys) to the proposed development.

A member referred to the allocation of three disabled parking spaces in the development of the twenty-seven spaces and asked planning officer why the allocated number was only three in view of the potential number of residents and visitors to the development that may have a disability and require a parking space.

The planning officer reported that the development is located within the city centre and is close to other sustainable transport links. The figure of three parking spaces is proportionate to the twenty-seven spaces allocated. Additional parking needs could be met off-site. Condition 26 of the application requires a parking management strategy for residents to be approved by the Council as Local Planning Authority. An additional Condition could be added to the application to increase the number of disabled parking places that would reduce the overall number of parking spaces due to the additional space required for a disabled parking space.

A member made reference to the age friendly benches in Whalley Range and commended their use within the public realm area of the development.

## **Decision**

The Committee were Minded to Approve the application, subject to:

- A legal agreement in respect of reconciliation payment of a financial contribution towards off site affordable housing.
- The inclusion of an additional Planning Condition requiring the increase in the number of disabled parking spaces to 50% of the spaces proposed.

### **PH/20/05 121467/FO/2018 - Land Bounded by Adair Street, Portugal Street East, Longacre Street and Great Ancoats Street, Manchester M1 2WX**

The application submitted is for the phased demolition of existing buildings including those marked within Plots A to E of the report and delivery of public realm (including hard and soft landscaping, tree planting and street furniture), including a public square, highways improvements and associated works.

The application was deferred at the meeting of the Planning and Highways Committee on 19 December 2019 for a site visit which took place prior to the meeting.

The proposal relates to the land within the Portugal Street East (PSE) SRF boundary roughly bounded by Adair Street, Portugal Street East, the Piccadilly – Ashton under-Lyne Metrolink line and Longacre Street and Great Ancoats Street (0.91 hectares). The site comprises a mix of highway land and hardstanding with car parking and service areas and buildings which include a single storey building close to the junction of Norton Street and Epworth Street, a complex of buildings occupied by the GMB Group, one and two storey buildings adjacent on Heyrod Street opposite

Rammon House, Victoria Buildings on Great Ancoats Street and a two storey complex on Heyrod Street adjacent to Rammon House.

The planning officer did not add anything further to the report submitted.

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

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

A member referred to the application and asked for further explanation on the reference made to HS2 and the impact on the development site.

The planning officer reported that an area of the development land falls within a HS2 safeguarding zone and is identified as 'land potentially required during construction' and for provision of the Manchester Piccadilly High Speed Station multi-storey car park to the north of the new HS2 Station located at Travis Street.

### **Decision**

The Committee approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted.

### **PH/20/06 125552/VO/2019 & 125553/LO/2019 - Town Hall Albert Square Manchester M2 5DB**

The application was for a City Council Development restoration and refurbishment of Manchester Town Hall to facilitate its continued use as the primary civic building in Manchester, incorporating Council offices, civic spaces, Coroner's Courts and accommodation, state rooms and back-of-house support functions, together with ancillary functions, including events, visitor tours, cafe, visitor space and retail area (Sui Generis Use); works to include: revised entrance arrangements including new slopes to Albert Square and Cooper Street entrances; upgrade of catering facilities; roof works; new services, plant and equipment; installation of new building lighting; and associated works. An application for Listed Building Consent for external and internal restoration, refurbishment and alteration works to the Grade I Listed Town Hall building, together with installation of new building lighting was also submitted.

This proposal is one of two related applications that have been submitted in relation to the public realm and the Town Hall.

The works to the Town Hall is based upon eight core principles:

1. To secure the long-term future of the Town Hall, its civic role and its external setting.
2. To retain and enhance as a functioning and efficient Town Hall.
3. To restore and celebrate this significant heritage asset
4. To enhance the use of the building, as a visitor destination and increase access to Mancunians.

5. To transform users' and visitors' experiences.
6. To reduce carbon footprint and energy costs.
7. To maximise the commercial opportunities and offset costs to the public purse.
8. To deliver economic and social value for Manchester.

One of the main objectives of the Hall Project is to refurbish and restore the listed building back to its former glory and bring it back into functional civic uses.

The aim is to ensure the project has the maximum positive impact for Manchester residents and businesses and delivers a real legacy of direct and supply-chain jobs and helps those working on the project to gain skills and experience that they can build on and use throughout their careers, as well as inspiring others.

Design development has been informed by intrusive and due diligence surveys to fully understand the condition of the building and the public realm, including the condition of hard landscaping, trees and the location of utilities' routes.

The construction phase is scheduled to take place between 2019 and 2024 and would commence with works in the building and courtyard, which were granted planning permission and listed building consent in 2019.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further observations and modifications to conditions. Following this, two further representations were received. One representation referred to the closure of access to traffic and concerns about the creation of "no go" zones for lone pedestrians and cyclists in the city centre and danger to pedestrians from cyclists. The other representation referred to the Disabled Peoples Access Group concerns regarding a lack of consultation and that it only been informed recently about the proposal and would welcome an opportunity to provide views and comments on the development. In response to this the Committee was informed an access group representing various stakeholders, including disability representation and elected members, had been involved throughout the design process. The issues raised have been addressed in the application submitted.

No objectors were in attendance.

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

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

Members referred to the large amount of information contained within the late representations submission providing limited time for members to read and understand the document. Reference was made to the potential impact of the development on the surrounding residents and businesses and the planning officer was requested for an assurance that local consultation would continue as part of the Construction Management Plan. A member stated that council members felt left out

of the consultation process and would welcome the opportunity to visit the site to better visualise and understand what is proposed and question the Design Team.

The Planning Officer reported that there had been a number of revisions to the planning conditions which are very detailed and this had contributed the late circulation of the late representations document. The Construction Management Plan included regular scheduled meetings involving all stakeholders. The Planning Officer offered to arrange for members of the committee to visit and view the Town Hall building to provide an opportunity to speak to the Design Team on the proposals and ask questions.

A member referred to the late receipt of the late representations and stated that the committee must be confident that the decision taken on the application is made with all the information available and a good understanding of the proposals. In view of the scale and importance of the of the development it was proposed the approval of the application be subject to a condition for to a visit be arranged for committee Members within a month of making the decision for the committee to view the building and raise any concerns for the design team to implement. This was seconded.

The Director of Planning reported that it is not possible for the Committee to add a condition requiring the Committee's concerns raised as part of a visit to be implemented after making a decision to approve the application. The Committee's decision is based on the information contained within the report and the late representations submitted and officer input. The Director of Planning suggested that in view of the discussion, the committee could decide to make a visit and request that any comments or concerns are noted by the Director of Planning and reported to the Design Team.

The committee supported the request to arrange a visit for members of the committee to the Town Hall. Members also sought assurance that any comments would be relayed back to the Design Team and supported a proposal for the Director of Planning to be delegated authority, in consultation with the Chair, to record any concerns raised and to report them to the Design Team.

## **Decisions**

1. To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the Late Representations submitted
2. That arrangements are made for members of the Planning and Highways Committee to visit the Town Hall Building and for the Director of Planning to be delegated authority, in consultation with the Chair, to record any comments and to report them to the Design Team.

(Councillor S Ali left the meeting during consideration of the application and did not return to the meeting.)

**PH/20/07 124918/VO/2019 - Albert Square Manchester M2 4JW**

The application was for a City Council Development for the refurbishment and expansion of Albert Square public realm, including its continued use for temporary events and activities throughout the year; works to include: the installation of a new surface water drainage scheme, removal of existing trees and replacement tree planting and soft landscaping; installation of new lighting columns, wayfinding signage and street furniture; creation of new sloped access to the Town Hall entrances; highways and servicing access works, and associated works.

This proposal is one of two related applications that have been submitted in relation to the public realm and the Town Hall.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further observations and modifications to conditions. Concern had been expressed by the Disabled Peoples Access Group and residents regarding the lack of consultation and engagement with scheme and sought reconsideration of some parts of the application. It was reported that the Design Team will continue to engage with stakeholder panels as the scheme progresses.

No objectors were in attendance.

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

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

A member commended the use of age friendly public benches in the public realm area of Albert Square and the siting of female statue/monument. Reference was made to the drainage arrangements and if these would help sustain the green areas proposed. Also, would safety barriers be included in the design.

The Planning Officer stated that there were no proposals to site any statues in Albert Square but the comments made would be passed to the Design Team. The drainage system had been designed to help to sustain the green area and the provide safety features to prevent access by vehicles. Conditions for this have been included in the application.

A member referred to the sustainability of business resulting from the application, arrangements for the proposed road closure, safety of pedestrians, emergency access and relocation of the taxi rank in Albert Square to Central Street and Clarence Street.

The Committee was informed that there would be a road closure process involving a separate consultation process involved. The safety of pedestrians in Albert Square has been considered involving lighting and CCTV and it will secure accreditation through Secure by Design. The relocation of the taxi rank will be for a twelve-month interim period and will then be considered as part of the review of taxi ranks in the City Centre. This will be considered by the Licensing Committee.

A member requested that a condition be added to require arrangements to be made for a visit for members of the Planning and Highways Committee to Albert Square to

allow members to visualise the proposals either through viewing the areas concerned or through drawings or digital images and for the Director of Planning to be delegated authority, in consultation with the Chair, to record any concerns raised and to report concerns to the Design Team.

A member requested explanation of the concerns received from the Guide Dogs for the Blind Association on the application. Concern was also expressed on the design features of the proposal, in particular, the combination of existing heritage features such as statues with modern designs and if this would be appropriate. Reference was also made to the height of the lighting totems and the wider consultation process that has helped to produce the final proposal.

The Planning Officer reported that the Association had raised issues regarding the vulnerability of blind people using Albert Square regarding the layout, hazards and cyclists. The Association had been invited to consultation meetings but no representatives had attended. Conditions have been included to address the concerns that were made. The heritage statues in Albert Square are listed and removing them would involve a lengthy process. The height of the lighting totems was proposed because they provide more light over the square. The Committee was informed that there has been a lengthy and broad process of consultation which has helped to inform the proposals taking in elements from across the range of responses to ensure the features are acceptable and appropriate to reflect the importance of the location.

## Decisions

1. To approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the Late Representations submitted:
2. That arrangements be made for a visit for members of the Planning and Highways Committee to Albert Square and for the Director of Planning to be delegated authority, in consultation with the Chair, to record any comments and to report the comments to the Design Team.

### **PH/20/08 124888/FO/2019 - Land Bounded by Addington Street, Marshall Street, Cross Keys Street And Chadderton Street, Manchester M4 4RJ**

The application was for the erection of a six to nine storey residential building (Use Class C3) comprising eighty dwellings including nine townhouses and seventy-one apartments with resident's lounge, refuse, plant, new substation, cycle storage, an internal landscaped courtyard and improvements to the adjacent footways on Marshall Street, Chadderton Street, Addington Street and Cross Keys Street and other associated works following removal of existing car park.

The application was considered by the Planning and Highways Committee on 19 December 2020. The Committee was minded to refuse the application and requested officers bring back a report which addressed concerns relating to the affordable housing contribution. The application proposed a commuted sum of £220,000 towards offsite affordable housing. The detailed viability report submitted

with the application was independently tested on behalf of the City Council in order to ensure that it was robust and in line with current market conditions.

The planning officer did not add anything further to the report submitted.

Councillor Wheeler addressed the committee in his capacity as ward Councillor (Piccadilly) and stated that since the last meeting there had been no contact made with any ward councillors impacted by the proposal to discuss their concerns on the scheme. The Committee was requested to defer consideration until contact with ward councillors had taken place.

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

### **Decision**

The Committee approve the application, subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report submitted.

### **PH/20/09 125615/FO/2019 - Belle Vue Greyhound Stadium, Kirkmanshulme Lane, Manchester, M18 7BD**

The application was for the renewal of previous planning permission 110616/FO/2015/N2 for the continuance of stock car racing for a maximum of eleven meetings per season between 1 March to 31 December (annually) for a temporary period of 4 years.

The Committee had previously approved application 62940/FU/NORTH2/01 in March 2002 for a temporary two-year period for Five Formula one and seven Regular stock car meetings to operate for two seasons subject to a number of conditions. In February 2004 a further temporary approval was granted by committee for the variation of conditions 1 and 3 of permission 062940/FU/NORTH2/01 to allow 8 stock car meetings per year including 4 Formula One events up to 31 October 2007. In February 2008, a temporary approval was granted by committee for the continuance of stock car racing for a maximum of eight meetings per season during a period from 1 March to 30 November for a temporary period of 4 years (ref: 085126/FO/2007/N2). Planning permission 097958/FO/2011/N1 related to the continuance of stock car racing for a maximum of eleven meetings per season during a period from 1 March to 31 December for a temporary period of 4 years; this application was given a temporary planning permission which expired on 1 March 2016.

A further application for the renewal of previous planning permission 097958/FO/2011/N2 for the continuance of stock car racing for a maximum of eleven meetings per season between 1 March to 31 December (annually) for a temporary period of 4 years (ref:110616/FO/2015/N2) was approved on 4 February 2016 for 4 years and will expire on 4 February 2020.

The Committee on 19 December 2019 was minded to approve residential development on this site, subject to a legal agreement for affordable housing (ref: 122160/FO/2018).

The Planning Officer reported a correction in Condition 4 that changed the closing time from 7.30pm to 9.30pm and changed the date for the May Bank Holiday from Monday 4 May 2020 to Friday 8 May 2020.

### **Decision**

The Committee approve the application, subject to the conditions as corrected (Condition 4, below) and reasons set out in the report and the Late Representations submitted.

(Condition 4 - closing time change 7.30pm to 9.30pm and change the date of the May Bank Holiday from Monday 4 May 2020 to Friday 8 May 2020.)

### **PH/20/10 Confirmation of The Manchester City Council (Churchgate, Ford Lane) - Tree Preservation Order 2019**

The application was for a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on 10 October 2020 and to recommend the confirmation of the Tree Preservation Order.

### **Decision**

To instruct the City Solicitor to confirm the Tree Preservation Order at Churchgate, Ford Lane, Manchester M22 4NQ, under Section 199 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and that the Order should cover the trees as plotted on the plan attached to the report submitted.

## **Planning and Highways Committee**

### **Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 13 February 2020**

**Present:** Councillor Curley (Chair)

**Councillors:** Nasrin Ali, Shaukat Ali, Andrews, Y Dar, Davies, Flanagan, Hitchen, Kamal, J Lovecy, Lyons, Madeleine Monaghan, Watson and White

**Also in attendance:** Councillors Akbar, A Ali, Kilpatrick, Newman, O'Neil and Wright

#### **PH/20/11 Supplementary Information on Applications Being Considered**

A copy of the late representations that were received in respect of applications, since the agenda was issued, was circulated.

#### **Decision**

To receive and note the late representations.

#### **PH/19/12 Minutes**

#### **Decision**

To approve the minutes of the meeting held on 19 December 2019 as a correct record.

#### **PH/20/13 124820/FO/2019 - Land to the North East of Enterprise Way bounded by Roxholme Walk and Dentdale Walk and the Rear of Lincombe Road and Felskirk Road to the North, Manchester, M22 1PU - Woodhouse Park Ward**

(Councillors Andrews and Flanagan both declared prejudicial interests in this item of business and left the meeting before it was considered)

The application related to the construction of a temporary 729 space car park, with associated access arrangements onto Enterprise Way, for a temporary period of five years. The application was deferred at the meeting of the Committee on 16 January 2020 for a site visit to be undertaken to allow members of the committee to view the site of the proposed development and surrounding area that were not available on the drawings and images included in the planning report submitted; due to the loss of employment land and the greenness of the site. The Committee undertook a site visit prior to the meeting.

The proposals are for car parking to be brought forward as an early phase of development to support the applicant's growth at existing office space at the Airport and in advance of their Headquarter offices being developed. The proposals would not result in the loss of employment land but would bring forward the site as an

earlier phase of development that is associated with a scheme granted planning permission by Committee at its meeting held in December 2018. It was explained that the proposal was not related to the operation of the airport but to the growth of a business located near to the airport.

The meeting was addressed by an objector who referred to the Climate Emergency that the Council has declared. He argued that the demand for ever more car parking capacity had to stop if there was to be a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions in the city. This application was an opportunity for the Council to show how travel to work needed to be reconsidered in the future. The application should be rejected and green travel options relied upon.

The meeting was then addressed by a representative of the applicant. He spoke of the applicant's investment in creating new jobs in Manchester and how the growth of the business was a boon to the city's economy and the economic wellbeing of the area.

Councillor O'Neil addressed the meeting as a ward councillor for the Woodhouse Park ward. He felt that the traffic generated from the operation of the airport was already adding to the pollution and carbon dioxide that were directly affecting the local communities, and that this application would only exacerbate that undesirable situation. He called on the committee to reject the application.

Councillor Newman also addressed the meeting as a ward councillor for the Woodhouse Park ward. He spoke of the levels of pollution that local residents face from the airport operations and the traffic generated by air passengers going to and from by the airport. This application would add to pollution and traffic in the area. The employment opportunities generated by the growth of the business were welcome but he sought an assurance that the jobs created would be taken up by local residents so that they did not result in more traffic.

The planning officer confirmed that the principle of a large car park at this site had been approved in a 2018 planning approval that had also dealt with the building of new offices for the company. This application was bringing forward the timing of the implementation of a part of that earlier consent. The applicant had provided a Green Travel Plan as part of the application to help reduce the level of additional traffic the expansion of the car park would generate, as the number of spaces available would still be fewer than the number of employees who were to be working at the site.

The Chair referred to investment into community and social infrastructure by the company to support community initiatives in the Woodhouse Park ward.

Given the relationship of the proposed car park to the delivery of the consent granted in 2018, it was proposed that approval of this application should be time-limited as the future of the whole site needed to be in accordance with the earlier consent. The long-term operation of the car park should not be independent of the proposed office development. The recommendation had approval for five years only. The Committee felt that two years would be more appropriate. It was proposed and agreed that a temporary consent of two years should be given.

## Decision

To grant temporary consent for a period of two years subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the Planning Officer's report.

### **PH/20/14 125474/FO/2019 - Land Adjacent to Mayton Street, Manchester, M11 2AN - Clayton and Openshaw Ward**

(Councillor Andrews re-joined the meeting for consideration of this application. Councillor Hitchen had to leave the meeting for part of this item and so took no part in the decision making)

The application submitted related to the erection of twenty three two storey dwelling houses with associated car parking, hard and soft landscaping and boundary treatments.

The application site comprises of land previously developed for housing that has been maintained as open green space. It is intersected by a network of footpaths with incidental mature tree planting and surrounded highways along Beede Street, Mayton Street, Herne Street, Newtown Close and Thames Close, which also provide access to neighbouring housing and communal on street car parking bays. The surrounding area mainly comprises of two storey pitched roof terraced housing with semi-detached houses located to the north of the site along Mayton Street and Beede Street. A mix of single, two and three storey houses and apartments are located to the south of the site.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further information on representations made and proposed further conditions that should be applied to any consent.

The meeting was addressed by a representative of the applicant. She said that the development would bring 23 much-needed high quality affordable family houses to Openshaw, with 17 for social rent and 6 for shared-ownership. The number of homes being proposed had been reduced from 39 to 23 so as to retain an area of open space as a community resource, preserving something that the community has been enjoying for some years.

The Committee welcomed the scheme and the contribution it was going to make to the provision of affordable homes in the city.

## Decision

Minded to approve subject the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the further conditions and reasons proposed in the Late Representations, and also subject to entering into a Section 106 Agreement to secure a retained contribution of affordable housing as part of the authorised development, the Environment Agency being satisfied with the additional flood risk information and no adverse comments being received from the Coal Authority.

**PH/20/15 124972/FO/2019 and 125248/FO/2019 - Land bounded by Mayfield Depot Building, Hoyle Street, Mancunian Way (A635), Baring Street, Buxton Street and Berry Street (inclusive) and McDonald Hotel along with associated roads and junctions and land adjacent to Mancunian Way (Former Mayfield Goods Yard), Baring Street Office 2, Manchester, M1 2AD - Piccadilly Ward**

(Councillor Flanagan re-joined the meeting for consideration of this application)

The application 124972/FO/2019 was for the phased creation of around 2.4 ha (6 acres) of public park, including hard and soft landscaping and new bridges across the River Medlock; erection of 9 storey office development above basement with mezzanine and plant level (Class B1) with ground floor Class A1 (Shop), A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A3 (Café and Restaurant), A4 (Drinking Establishment) B1 (Office) uses, rooftop amenity spaces and terrace levels, associated public realm and riverside walkway; erection of an eleven storey Multi-Storey Car Park to provide 581 car parking spaces with associated landscaping; highways and infrastructure works including the creation of new junction from London Road to provide access to the multi-storey car park (MSCP) (Use Class Sui Generis); works to Baring Street, stopping up of Bond Street and Nether Street (alongside associated Traffic Regulation Orders to manage unrestricted parking to Buxton Street, Berry Street and Travis Street (to be delivered and implemented prior to the MSCP becoming operational)) alongside enabling works comprising phased demolition and site clearance, earthworks including re-profiling and construction of retaining walls for the land bounded by the Mancunian Way to the south, Mayfield Depot to the north, Baring Street to the west and Hoyle Street to the east. The site is located on Land bounded by Mayfield Depot Building, Hoyle Street, Mancunian Way (A635), Baring Street, Buxton Street & Berry Street (inclusive) and McDonald Hotel Along with associated Roads and Junctions, Manchester, M1 2AD.

The application 125248/FO/2019 was for the Erection of a thirteen storey building (including ground and mezzanine) comprising office space (Use Class B1) above flexible uses at ground and mezzanine levels (Class A1 (Shop), A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A3 (Café and Restaurant), A4 (Drinking Establishment), /D1 (Art Gallery, Museum and Conference & Training Centre)/D2 (Cinema)/ Theatre (Sui Generis)) with rooftop amenity spaces and external terrace levels, internal ancillary storage spaces for waste, cycles, rooftop plant, back of house functions and associated landscaping works. The site is located on land adjacent to Mancunian Way (former Mayfield Goods Yard), Baring Street Office 2, Manchester, M1 2AD.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted for application 124972/FO/2019 which provided further information on representations made.

The meeting was addressed by a representative of the applicant. He explained that at the heart of this application was the creation of a new public park in Manchester, with a river running through it. The park was felt to be an essential element of the application that would see the world-class regeneration of the mostly derelict Mayfield site, in accordance with the Mayfield Strategic Regeneration Framework. This new district would create a community in the city with a mix of employment,

shopping, leisure and homes. It would result in up to 10,000 new jobs. The historic depot at Mayfield was to be retained and restored as part of the scheme.

The committee welcomed the application for the redevelopment of this important area at the edge of the city centre, and the transformation that it would bring about. They discussed the objections that had been made and the extent of the car parking that was being proposed.

### **Decision**

To approve both applications subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report.

#### **PH/20/16      124302/FO/2019 - Land bounded by Chester Road, Hulme Hall Road and Ellesmere Street, Manchester, M15 4JY - Hulme Ward**

The application was for the demolition of the existing building on site and the erection of a residential-led mixed use development within two build blocks ranging from eight to eighteen storeys in height. The development consists of three hundred and sixty-six residential units (C3); two hundred and seventeen square metres of commercial floor space (Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, B1 or D2); associated car and cycle parking within a basement level; public realm and landscaping; access and servicing arrangements and other associated works.

The site is located on the north east side of the junction of Chester Road and Hulme Hall Road, and is within the St Georges area of Hulme. It is bounded by Hulme Hall Road, Chester Road and Ellesmere Street. It adjoins Sky Gardens, a new build residential scheme on Chester Road and Phoenix House, a 1960s industrial building on Ellesmere Street. The site is rectangular in shape and 0.38 hectares. There is a vacant light industrial unit on part of the site with the remainder used as a temporary site office and car parking and is bounded by a security fence.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further information on representations made. Additional photographic images of the development site were circulated. A representation had been made that the Committee undertake a site visit.

### **Decisions**

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

#### **PH/20/17      125654/FO/2019 - Former Church Inn, 84 Cambridge Street, Manchester, M15 6BP - Hulme Ward**

The application was for the erection of a nine-storey purpose built student accommodation building comprising sixty-two units and associated landscape and highway works, following demolition of existing structures.

The site is located on the west side of Cambridge Street, Hulme, just north of the junction with Cavendish Street and to the south of the Mancunian Way. The site is viewed in the context of the Mancunian Way and Manchester City Centre when approaching Manchester from the south. The site measures 0.3 hectares comprises a vacant public house known as the Church Inn, the public house closed in March 2016. The site is bounded by student accommodation blocks immediately to the north (Cambridge House) and south (Manchester House), Cambridge Street to the east with Manchester Metropolitan University student accommodation and facilities on the opposite side of the street. To the west lies a housing estate managed by One Manchester, the site immediately adjoins the turning head to Bristle Street and lies in close proximity to property on Elmdale Walk and Dalesman Walk.

The Committee had on 14 March 2019 resolved to defer determination of an application in order to undertake a site visit before making a decision. The site visit took place on 11 April 2019, and the Committee were minded to refuse the application due to concerns expressed regarding the negative impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties resulting in a loss of amenity, overlooking and reduction in daylight. The application was deferred and the Director of Planning asked to bring a report which addresses the concerns raised and potential reasons for refusal. The applicant reviewed the scheme to address the concerns expressed by the Planning and Highways Committee and revised plans had been submitted in June 2019.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further information on representations and objections made. It also proposed a further condition that should be attached to a consent. Objections received referred to the negative impact of the development on residential amenity and the loss of green space. The applicant's late representations included copies of correspondence with two local councillors saying that those councillors no longer opposed the application.

A local resident spoke at the meeting to object to the application. He referred to the guidelines relating to loss of daylight and sunlight and asserted that the report showed there would be 152 transgressions of those guidelines if the scheme was built. He referred to the extent that the glazing of the building would result in the potential overlooking of the windows and gardens of adjacent properties, some at short distances. The development would also require access over land that was in other ownership, and permission for that had not been sought. Providing that access would result in the loss of an amenity space enjoyed by the existing residents of neighbouring properties. The access to the site was constrained and unable to deal with the likely traffic volumes or provide sufficient access for emergency vehicles.

The meeting was addressed by a representative of the applicant. He explained that this application was the developer's first scheme of student accommodation in Manchester, although they had much experience from other universities across the UK. Their approach is to work in partnership with universities, local council and other

local community stakeholders to ensure that their student accommodation developments are rooted in the communities. He explained how the proposals had been changed since they were considered in 2019 so as to address the concerns that the committee had raised at that time. The scale of the development had been reduced, bringing about improvements in the daylight and sunlight available to occupants. The development was supported by the university and two of the ward councillors.

The meeting was next addressed by Councillor Wright, a ward councillor for the Hulme ward. She said that the building was still too big for the proposed location, out of keeping with the neighbouring properties and would result in significant detriment to the residents of the neighbouring properties. She referred to the extent of the objections to the scheme from local people. She spoke of the unsatisfactory proposals for access and for the servicing and removal of waste, and where the bins for the building were to be sited. He asked the Committee to reject the application.

The Planning Officer confirmed that the applicant was negotiating with the other land owner to secure the necessary access to the rear of the building, but that the right of access over the land was primarily a legal matter for the applicant. Good access to the building and the servicing of the bins were to be addressed by the conditions being proposed. He confirmed that in planning terms the loss of daylight within this building, and to one of the adjacent buildings, was considered to be acceptable as the guidelines were intended to be used in a flexible manner.

The Committee referred to the size and massing of the proposed development and the impact it would have on the amenity of the neighbouring properties, as well as the concerns about how access to the rear was to be arranged, together with the proposals for waste management at the rear of the building. Members were also concerned by the suggestion that students did not need to enjoy the same levels of daylight as residents in other types of properties. Members also felt that there could be significant traffic generated at certain times of the day, if the experiences from other buildings in the city centre were replicated here.

## **Decisions**

Minded to refuse for the reasons due to the negative impact of the proposed development on the character of the area by virtue of the height of the development proposal, the impact upon residential amenity with regards to the development proposals having an overbearing impact that would result in a loss of light to neighbouring property and with regards to the impact of deliveries, servicing and noise disturbance having an impact upon residential amenity.

**PH/20/18      117960/FO/2017 - High Elms, Upper Park Road, Manchester,  
M14 5RU - Rusholme Ward**

The Committee was informed that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

**PH/20/19 117961/LO/2017 - High Elms, Upper Park Road, Manchester, M14 5RU - Rusholme Ward**

The Committee was informed that the application had been withdrawn by the applicant.

**PH/20/11 123188/FO/2019 - Xaverian College Lower Park Road Manchester M14 5RB - Rusholme Ward**

(Having been out of the room at the start of this item of business Councillor N Ali took no part in the decision making, Councillor M Monaghan was also not present for this item of business)

The application was for the Installation of fencing and gates to campus boundaries between 2.4 m and 2.7 metres in height. The application proposals relate to the boundary walls around the Xaverian College campus which is located in the Rusholme ward of Manchester. The College occupies a mix of new and converted buildings focused around an open area green space, however the Campus is spread over two distinct areas to the east and west of Lower Park Road. Many of the older buildings on the Campus are former residential villas which have been converted and extended to accommodate educational use. The campus is located within Victoria Park Conservation Area and contains the Grade II listed buildings known as Ward Hall, Marylands and Firwood which have all been converted for educational use in the past.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further information on representations made. A further eleven objections had been received including from the Manchester Civic, Society relating to the height and design of gates and railings, preservation of trees, loss of visual amenity.

The meeting was addressed by a representative of Rusholme and Fallowfield Civic Society who spoke about the possible impact the development would have on the Conservation Area. She spoke of the college's strategy to use high fences to help safeguard the learners, to give the college more time to respond to any risks to the students. She felt that as the strategy was untested, with no proof that all the measures the college was seeking were actually necessary. It was likely that the fencing would not need to be as high as that which is being proposed, making reference to the boundary walls that have been at the site. The proposed heights were excessive in the Conservation Area and a better design could actually enhance the area and not harm it.

Councillor Ali, a ward councillor for Rusholme ward, addressed the meeting. He spoke of the importance of the college and its heritage buildings to the character of the Conservation Area and the Victoria Park neighbourhood. He urged the college to consider using railings of 2.1m high rather than 2.4m in the more prominent parts of the boundary.

A representative of the applicant spoke next. He referred to the desire to maintain the aesthetic qualities of the college and the desire to avoid proposals that would

harm the college's estate and the wider Conservation Area. Nevertheless, the college was trying to adhere to the Department of Education advised minimum height of 2.4m on the site boundary.

The department's advisory minimum height was confirmed by the Planning Officer.

Members of the committee welcomed the way that the college had been working with the local community and the Civic Society to try to avoid harming the amenity of the area and expressed their desire that the cooperative approach continued into the future. The members accepted the college's desire to comply with the Department of Education's advisory height and welcomed the quality of the design that the college was proposing to use.

### **Decision**

To approve both applications subject to the conditions and reasons set out in the report.

#### **PH/20/11      125186/FO/2019 - Riverside Lodge, 208 Palatine Road, Manchester, M20 2WF - Didsbury West Ward**

(Councillor S Ali left the meeting part way through this item of business and took no part in the decision on this or the later item)

The application was for Rooftop extension to Block A to form 4 x 2 bedroom apartments and provision of an additional 5 car parking spaces. Riverside Lodge is residential complex on Palatine Road consisting of 34 flats split into two blocks. Block A is 4 storeys in height (flat nos. 1 to 16), while block B is a part 4/part 5 storey building housing flat nos. 17-34. The ground floor levels of both buildings are elevated as they sit on top of undercroft parking facilities for 34 cars. To the front of the blocks is a hard surfaced area used for servicing and parking, while at the rear there is a communal lawned area.

To the west of the site is a wooded area and beyond that stands the Green Belt. To the east of the site, on the opposite side of Palatine Road, stands a modern residential development set behind a Site of Biological Interest. To the north of Block B is another strip of woodland, beyond which stands three detached dwelling houses. Riverside Court, a 3 storey residential complex of 24 flats lies to the south of Block A. The row of trees along the rear boundary of the site are protected by a Tree Preservation Order and the site is located within Flood Zone 3.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representation that had been submitted which provided further information and further objections that had been received from the local MP and local residents, and a further condition that was being recommended to any approval.

A local resident spoke as a representative of the owners of properties in Riverside Lodge. The application was a resubmission of a scheme that had been approved in 2014 but had lapsed before it had been commenced. However, the policy issues now raised by the application had changed since the prior approval had been given.

She commented on the lack of provisions for cycle storage, and also to the loss of daylight and sunlight to some of the residents in the blocks within the overall scheme. There would also be a loss of green space and a likelihood that local parking problems would be exacerbated.

Councillor Kilpatrick, a ward councillor for the Didsbury West ward addressed the meeting. He felt that the original consent should never had been given. He explained the setting of Riverside Lodge as an established site of two blocks close to the River Mersey. He described the loss of amenity that the approval would result in to the residents of Riverside Court and Riverside Lodge, highlighting the parking problems that will arise in the neighbourhood. He added that some of the proposed new parking was in an area that is at risk of flooding. He explained why he felt that application was contrary to the Council's policy on housing development outside of district centres. He asked the committee to reject the application.

The Planning Officer explained that the loss of daylight and sunlight had been considered and the development would result in only one of the neighbouring dwellings being below the guideline levels.

The members of the committee considered the merits of the application and were concerned about the potential harm to the character of the area due to the proposed car parking. They weighed up the extent of change in the scheme, and the guidance that might be relevant since the approval had been given in 2014. There were also concerns about the impact on residents during the construction period including the loss of the existing lift for a period of time.

### **Decision**

Minded to refuse due to the harm the development would cause to the amenity of existing residents, the loss of green space in order to provide additional car parking, and the disruption to existing residents during the construction period, including the loss of the lift in the building for a period of time.

### **PH/20/11      125299/FO/2019 - Hologic (Warehouse Building), Crewe Road, Manchester, M23 9HZ - Brooklands Ward**

The application relates to the erection of a 3 storey extension to provide new loading bay and storage area, with ancillary office accommodation on a mezzanine level with associated vehicle turning area. The proposed site on Crewe Road consists of two buildings: a two storey office and research facility and a packaging/ warehouse and office facility. The applicant also utilises an element of the building located on the opposite side of Crewe Road for storage. The application proposes to plant a landscaping screen, including 13 semi-mature trees, along the boundary with nos. 271 and 271a Wythenshawe Road.

The Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to the late representations that had been submitted by the applicant which provided further information and a further condition that was being recommended to any approval.

A representative of the applicant addressed the committee. The application was for a warehouse on an industrial estate. This would result in the creation of local employment and help reduce carbon emissions by bring manufacture and distribution of the company's product into one location instead of being spread across England. He spoke of the mitigations that were part of the application to address concerns about noise and visual impact.

The committee welcomed and supported the application and the contribution it will make to employment and reducing carbon dioxide emissions.

### **Decision**

To approve, subject the conditions and reasons set out in the report and the further condition and reasons proposed in the Late Representations