

Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the **ONCHAN DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS** held in the Boardroom, Hawthorn Villa, 79 Main Road, Onchan, on Monday 7th September 2026 at 7:00 pm.

Present:	Mr A Allen	(Chairman)
	Mr S Wilson	(Vice Chairman and Lead Member for Housing)
	Mr A Gibson	(Lead Member for Environmental and Technical Services)
	Mr O Lockwood	(Lead Member for Finance and General Purposes)
	Miss G Corkish	
	Mr D Quirk	
	Mr R Turton	
In attendance:	Mr R Phillips	(Chief Executive/Clerk)
	Mrs S Johnson	(Chief Finance Officer)
	Mr R Forgie	(District Surveyor)
	Miss A Crellin	(Executive Officer/Assistant)

C26/09/01/01

TO CHOOSE A PERSON TO PRESIDE IF THE CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN BE ABSENT

Not applicable.

C26/09/01/02

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS OF MEMBERS AND OFFICERS (in accordance with Standing Order 18.3)

Mr Allen asked the Board Members and Officers if they wished to declare any pecuniary or non-pecuniary interests in relation to any agenda items due to be considered this evening.

Mr Allen reminded the Board Members and Officers that declarations of interests can be recorded now or when the agenda item is due to be considered during the meeting.

C26/09/01/03

BUSINESS REQUIRED TO BE DEALT WITH BY STATUTE BEFORE ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None.

C26/09/01/04

MINUTES

1. Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on Monday 24th August 2026

The minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on Monday 24th August 2026, copies of which having previously been circulated, were considered.

Mr Lockwood requested the following amendments:

Page 3 - **Planning Communications - PA 26/00330/B – 26 Furman Close**

Replace “the Planning Committee” with “the Department of Environment, Food and Agriculture”.

Page 4 - **Climate Change Report – Year Ended March 2025**

Fourth bullet point replace “1st August 2024” with the 1st April 2024”.

Mr Quirk requested the following amendment:

Page 3 - Planning Application 26/00615/B – 6 Seaview Road

Amend “no comments received from neighbouring properties” to “comments have been received from a neighbouring property”.

Subject to the above amendments, it was proposed by Mr Lockwood and seconded by Miss Corkish and unanimously **RESOLVED that the minutes of the Ordinary Board Meeting held on Monday 24th August 2026 be agreed as a correct record of the proceedings and be signed by the Chairman.**

Mr Gibson did not cast a vote as he was not present at the meeting.

C26/09/01/05

TO DISPOSE OF ANY BUSINESS ARISING FROM SUCH MINUTES

1. Page 12 – Any Other Business – Street Lighting

Mr Turton commented that cost estimates arising from the non-destructive testing survey have not been included within the District Surveyor's report.

Mr Allen asked Mr Turton to clarify whether he was referring to the Minutes of the Ordinary Board Meeting held on 24th August 2026 or the District Surveyor's report that is included on the agenda for consideration later during the meeting.

Mr Turton confirmed that he was referring to the minutes of the previous meeting.

The District Surveyor advised that cost estimates had not been included within his report as he was still awaiting design information and pricing from suppliers in respect of all streets affected by the recent street lighting failures. However, the report noted that these details would follow, and he anticipated that the necessary costings would be available for the Board's consideration at the Ordinary Board Meeting scheduled for 21st September 2026.

Mr Allen noted that the District Surveyor would endeavour to provide the cost information in time for consideration by the Board at its next Ordinary Meeting.

2. Page 7 – Amendment to Public Sector Housing (General Needs) Housing Income Thresholds – Tynwald Approval

Mr Quirk referred to the twelfth bullet point on page 7 concerning the Ballacurn Trust properties in Second Avenue. He commented that the wording could be interpreted as meaning that the Authority had been unsuccessful in its efforts to purchase the properties and that the matter had concluded. He therefore enquired whether there had been any further developments.

The Chief Executive/Clerk advised the Board that he had intended to provide a further update at the end of August; however, this had not been possible as he was still awaiting a response from the Department of Infrastructure. Notwithstanding this, he confirmed that the Authority's expression of interest and offer to purchase the properties remained under consideration and that no indication had been received that the proposal had been rejected.

Mr Allen asked Mr Quirk what outcome he expected in relation to the matter.

A discussion in relation to the following took place:

- Mr Quirk stated that if the Authority remained in contention to purchase the units, it would need to make appropriate budget provision for any acquisition.
- Mr Allen questioned whether a civil servant would be in a position to confirm that the Authority remained under consideration whilst a Minister is not in office due to the upcoming General Election.
- Mr Quirk noted that the Minister for Health and Social Care remained in office and therefore should be able to make a decision regarding the matter.
- Mr Quirk further commented that the Authority remained unaware of the potential purchase price and questioned how a local authority could effectively plan when the units were reportedly available for sale, but no indicative valuation or asking price had been provided.
- Mr Quirk added that Central Government should provide local authorities with greater notice and engage more proactively on matters of this nature.
- Mr Allen enquired whether there would be merit in writing again to the Trustees of the Ballacurn Trust seeking an update.
- Mr Quirk requested that the Chief Minister be copied into any such correspondence.
- Mr Wilson commented that the Chief Executive/Clerk previously advised the Board that the Isle of Man Government departments were seeking to develop a single shared estate strategy and suggested that it was unlikely the matter would progress further until after the formation of a new administration; and
- Mr Quirk reiterated that the Authority wished to purchase the units and that the Department of Health and Social Care wished to dispose of them. He expressed the view that the Department should not delay a decision pending the appointment of a new administration and should engage constructively with the Authority regarding the proposed sale.

The Chief Executive/Clerk confirmed that he would write again to the relevant parties and seek a further update on the current position.

3. Page 10 - Board Member Conduct Independent Investigation – Terms of Reference

Mr Allen requested that the Chief Executive/Clerk provide an update on the matter.

The Chief Executive/Clerk advised that the matter had been considered during the In Committee sessions of previous Ordinary Board Meetings, having regard to the nature of the issue and the advice received from the Authority's legal advisors. Accordingly, it remained the recommendation that any further consideration of the matter should continue to take place during the In Committee session.

Mr Allen suggested that, given the presence of members of the public in the public gallery, both they and Board Members would benefit from an update on the current position.

The Chief Executive/Clerk confirmed that no further information had been received from the Isle of Man Constabulary and that the position remained unchanged since it was last reported to the Board.

C26/09/01/06

TO DISPOSE OF ANY BUSINESS ADJOURNED FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING

None.

C26/09/01/07**TO DEAL WITH ANY BUSINESS EXPRESSLY REQUIRED BY STATUTE TO BE DONE**

None.

C26/09/01/08**PLANNING DECISIONS/COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE ISLE OF MAN GOVERNMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE****(i) PA 26/00569/B Mr J Evans – 78 Summerhill Road**

The Board Members were advised that the planning application is for the widening of the existing vehicular access and associated driveway to the front curtilage of the existing dwelling house.

In answer to questions, the District Surveyor advised that:

- No comments have been received from neighbouring properties;
- The return date for the application is the 11th September 2026; and
- Highway Services have commented that there is no significant negative impact upon the highway network in terms of highway safety.

Following a discussion, it was proposed by Mr Gibson, and seconded by Mr Wilson, and unanimously **RESOLVED that planning application 26/00569B – 78 Summerhill Road be recommended for approval.**

(ii) PA 26/00665/B Mrs K Duncan – 38 Howe Road

The Board Members were advised that the planning application is for the demolition of the existing conservatory and erection of a replacement sunroom extension, re-rendering of all external elevations, and alteration to reduce a window aperture.

The District Surveyor advised that correspondence received today from Planning confirms that the application is due for further consultation due to amendments to the application being received and asked if the Board wishes to defer the application to the next meeting.

Following a discussion, it was agreed that planning application 26/00665/B – 38 Howe Road be deferred to the Ordinary Board Meeting to be held on Monday 21st September 2026.

(iii) PA26/00672/B Mr A Fleet – 121 King Edward Road

The Board Members were advised that the planning application is for the removal of two chimney stacks and installation of replacement roof tiles.

In answer to questions, the District Surveyor advised that:

- No comments have been received from neighbouring properties; and
- The return date for the application is 25th September 2026.

Following a discussion, it was proposed by Mr Gibson and seconded by Mr Quirk and unanimously **RESOLVED that planning application 26/00672/B – 121 King Edward Road be recommended for approval.**

1. Planning Communications

PA 26/00615/B – 6 Seaview Road

The District Surveyor provided the Board with the following overview:

- The application had previously been considered at the Ordinary Board Meeting held on 24th August 2026. Due to concerns regarding inaccuracies contained within the application documentation, including an incorrect site location plan and incorrect property address, as well as missing details relating to decking and render, the Board resolved to defer consideration of the application pending the matter being reported to Planning.
- The identified inaccuracies were subsequently brought to the attention of Planning. However, to date, no acknowledgement has been received, nor do any amendments appear to have been made to the application documentation published on the Planning Portal.
- It is noted that the Authority's correspondence regarding the application now appears on the Planning Portal; and
- As previously reported, the consultation period for the application expired on 3rd September 2026. As a result, there was a possibility that any comments submitted, or resolution passed by the Board at this stage, might not be taken into account by Planning as part of the formal determination process.

A discussion in relation to the following took place:

- Mr Quirk requested that the District Surveyor write to the Minister for Environment, Food and Agriculture to highlight concerns that the views of the Authority were not being adequately considered as part of the planning process. He further expressed concern that neighbouring properties may not have been afforded a proper opportunity to comment on the application owing to the inaccuracies contained within the application documentation, including the incorrect property address.
- Mr Quirk noted that a number of members of the public present in the public gallery were directly affected by the application. He further stated that other neighbouring residents were unaware of the proposal and had therefore not been afforded the opportunity to submit representations during the consultation period.
- Mr Turton stated that, in his opinion, the application should be strongly opposed by the Board. He further questioned how the application could be properly determined when the submitted documentation identified the incorrect property; and
- Mr Wilson expressed the view that Planning was not following its own procedures, nor the relevant legislative requirements, in its handling of the application.

Mr Gibson then read a prepared statement setting out the grounds upon which he and the District Surveyor had intended to recommend refusal of the application at the previous Ordinary Board Meeting. However, consideration of the application had been deferred by the Board at that meeting pending clarification of the issues identified within the application documentation.

Mr Allen asked Mr Gibson whether he wished to formally move the prepared statement as a proposal recommending refusal of the application.

Following further discussion, it was proposed by Mr Gibson, seconded by Miss Corkish, and **RESOLVED** that planning application 26/00615/B – 6 Sea View Road be recommended for refusal on the following grounds:

- The proposed raised decking is considered unacceptable by reason of its height, elevated position and close proximity to the southern and eastern site boundaries. The development would facilitate direct and intrusive overlooking of the private garden areas and principal living spaces serving No. 8 Sea View Road and Nos. 9, 11 and 13 Governors Road, resulting in a significant loss of privacy and residential amenity for neighbouring occupiers.
- Furthermore, the proposed timber balustrade, positioned in close proximity to the eastern boundary with No. 8 Sea View Road, would appear unduly dominant and overbearing when viewed from the neighbouring garden, adversely affecting the outlook enjoyed by residents. The elevated nature of the decking, combined with its proximity to adjoining properties, would create an increased perception of overlooking and enclosure, causing unacceptable harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers.
- In addition, the overall design, layout, visual appearance and choice of external finishing materials, including the proposed smooth render finish, would be out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area and would fail to integrate satisfactorily with the established pattern of development.
- The proposal therefore gives rise to material planning concerns relating to building design, layout, visual appearance, external finishing materials, overlooking and loss of privacy.
- For these reasons, the proposed development would result in significant harm to the residential amenity of occupiers at No. 8 Sea View Road and Nos. 9, 11 and 13 Governors Road, contrary to General Policy 2(g) of the Isle of Man Strategic Plan and the guidance contained within the Residential Design Guide 2021.
- Furthermore, concerns remain regarding the accuracy of the application documentation. Onchan District Commissioners requested that the application be re-advertised due to discrepancies identified within the site location plan and the description of the proposed development. Such inaccuracies have the potential to prejudice the public consultation process and should therefore be given appropriate consideration, including re-advertisement and an extended consultation period.

For: *Mr Allen, Mr Wilson, Mr Lockwood, Miss Corkish, Mr Turton and Mr Gibson*

Against: *Mr Quirk*

Mr Quirk asked for it to be recorded that he voted against the proposal as he believes the application should be withdrawn by Planning.

C26/09/01/09

FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES

None.

C26/07/01/10**CONSIDERATION OF ANY REPORTS FROM THE CLERK AND OTHER OFFICERS****1. Motion 77 – Three Month Review of Provision of Allowing Members of the Public to Ask Questions of the Board**

The report of the Chief Executive/Clerk dated 7th September 2026, copies of which having previously been circulated was considered.

The Chief Executive/Clerk provided the Board with the following overview:

- At the Ordinary Meeting held on Monday 27th April 2026, the Board resolved that the Authority introduce a structured opportunity for ratepayers of the District to ask prepared questions of the Chairman or relevant Commissioners.
- The purpose of this initiative was to enhance transparency, accessibility, and public engagement in the Authority's decision making process.
- The arrangement was approved on a trial basis for a period of 3 months, subject to the Authority's Standing Orders being amended to make the necessary procedural provision.
- The amendments to the Standing Orders required to facilitate this change were subsequently approved by the Board at the Ordinary Board Meeting held on the 1st June 2026.
- To date, no question have been submitted for consideration; and
- The three month trial period has now concluded. The Board is therefore requested to consider the outcome of the trial and determine whether the structured opportunity for ratepayers to ask prepared questions of the Chairman or relevant Commissioners should be:
 - Adopted as a permanent arrangement.
 - Adopted subject to further review or amendment; or
 - Discontinued.

A discussion in relation to the following took place:

- Mr Wilson stated that his preference would be to extend the trial period. However, during the extension, the Authority should actively promote the fact that members of the public are entitled to attend the Authority's public meetings and submit questions.
- Mr Lockwood stated that it was worthwhile considering the likely reasons why the public questions process had not been utilised to date. He observed that, where a ratepayer wished to raise a matter with a Board Member, they were more likely to contact that Board Member directly rather than wait until the next Board Meeting for a response. He considered this approach to be effective provided that the volume of enquiries remained manageable.
- Mr Lockwood further stated that he would support making the public questions process permanent, given that the Standing Orders had already been amended to accommodate it. Whilst requests to receive answers in a public forum may arise, he anticipated that such instances would be relatively infrequent.
- Miss Corkish stated that she would support extending the trial period for a further three months and increasing publicity.
- Mr Turton commented that he would favour extending the trial period until the Authority's next Annual General Meeting. He noted that, with the forthcoming House of Keys General Election, the Authority could potentially lose up to three Board Members who are standing. Extending the trial until the next Annual General Meeting would allow any newly elected Board Members the opportunity to participate in the process and be asked questions, rather than waiting for a further review to be brought before the Board.
- Mr Gibson agreed that the process should be more actively publicised during any extended trial period.

- Mr Wilson stated that his preference was for the process to be adopted on a permanent basis, as it formed part of the Authority's commitment to openness and accountability. He commented that ratepayers should be made aware of the responsibilities of the local authority and that the Board should remain publicly answerable beyond a limited trial period.
- Mr Quirk noted that all Board Members have Authority email addresses and can already be contacted directly by members of the public; and
- Mr Turton suggested that greater emphasis should be placed on promoting the fact that meetings are open to the public and encouraging attendance.

The Chief Executive/Clerk confirmed that publicity could be provided through the Authority's noticeboards, the public reception counter, the Library, the Authority's website and its social media channels.

Following a further discussion, it was proposed by Mr Wilson and seconded by Miss Corkish and unanimously **RESOLVED** that:

- **The trial arrangements introduced under Motion 77 for the provision of a structured opportunity for ratepayers of the District to ask prepared questions of the Chairman or relevant Commissioners, and the provision made within the Authority's Standing Order 25, be extended until the Authority's Annual General Meeting due to be held on Tuesday 4th May 2027; and**
- **During this time, initiative is actively advertised via the Authority's noticeboards, the public reception counter, the Library, website and social media channels.**

2. The Capacity Act 2023 – Code of Practice – Public Consultation

The report of the Housing Manager dated 7th September 2026, copies of which having previously been circulated was considered.

The Chief Executive/Clerk provided the Board with the following overview:

- The Department of Health and Social Care is consulting on the draft Capacity Act 2023: Code of Practice.
- The Act aims to:
 - Support and empower people to make their own decisions wherever possible.
 - Protect the rights, wishes and feelings of people who may lack capacity.
 - Ensure that any intervention is proportionate and does not unnecessarily restrict a person's rights or freedoms.
 - Balance an individual's right to make their own decisions with the need to protect them from harm where they are unable to do so.
 - Ensure that any decision made on behalf of another person is made in their best interests.
 - Provide appropriate safeguards for individuals, carers, family members and professionals.
- The Act intends to place the individual at the centre of decision making and promotes autonomy wherever possible, supported by appropriate safeguards where a person lacks capacity; and
- The closing date for responses is the 18th September 2026, and the Board is requested to consider the proposed responses provided by officers.

Mr Wilson declared a non-pecuniary interest due to his employment with the Isle of Man Government and did not take part in the consideration of the matter.

A discussion in relation to the following took place:

- Mr Lockwood agreed that the inclusion of additional examples and case studies within the draft Code would be beneficial. He further noted that the consultation document indicated that a revised Code would be laid before Tynwald in November 2026.
- Miss Corkish stated that she agreed with the comments made by Mr Lockwood.
- The importance of considering the draft Code of Practice within the wider context of the Assisted Dying Bill was highlighted, noting that it represented a further stage in the development and implementation of the proposed legislation.
- Mr Turton expressed his appreciation to the officers involved in preparing the report and consultation responses within a limited timeframe. He commented that the responses were comprehensive.
- Mr Quirk stated that he had concerns regarding some of the comments contained within the proposed response, particularly those relating to the Assisted Dying Bill; and
- Mr Gibson stated that he was satisfied with the responses prepared and considered that they should be submitted on behalf of the Authority.

Following further discussion, it was proposed by Mr Lockwood and seconded by Mr Gibson and **RESOLVED that the proposed responses provided within the Housing Manager's report dated 7th September 2026 regarding the Capacity Act 2023 Code of Practice be approved and submitted through the Consultation Hub on behalf of the Authority.**

For: *Mr Allen, Mr Wilson, Mr Lockwood, Miss Corkish, Mr Turton and Mr Gibson*
Against: *Mr Quirk*

Mr Quirk requested that it be recorded that he was not opposed to the responses as drafted. However, he expressed concerns regarding the wider implications of the Assisted Dying Bill and considered that additional time should be afforded to review and consider the consultation document before a formal response was submitted on behalf of the Authority.

3. Secondary Employment and Business Interests Policy

The report of the Chief Executive/Clerk dated 7th September 2026, copies of which having previously been circulated was considered.

The Chief Executive/Clerk provided the Board with the following overview:

- The Authority recognises that it's employees may wish to undertake paid or unpaid employment, self-employment, business activities, public appointments, voluntary work or other external interests outside their employment with the Authority.
- In the interests of good governance, transparency, and the effective management of conflicts of interest, it is considered appropriate for the Authority to establish a clear framework governing the declaration and approval of secondary employment and other external interests; and
- The Board is requested to consider the circulated draft policy and determine whether it should be approved and adopted for implementation across the Authority.

Mr Turton asked the Chief Executive/Clerk whether the policy had been discussed with staff.

The Chief Executive/Clerk confirmed that it had not.

Following a discussion, it was agreed that consideration of the policy be deferred until the next Ordinary Meeting of the Authority, due to be held on 21st September 2026, to allow for consultation with staff and the submission of any comments.

C26/09/01/11

CONSIDERATION OF ANY CORRESPONDENCE

1. Telephone Box Purchase Proposal

A copy of the correspondence received offering the Authority the opportunity to purchase a 1953 model K6 telephone kiosk, copies of which having previously been circulated was considered.

A discussion in relation to the following took place:

- All Board Members expressed the view that the purchase of a telephone box by the Authority would not represent an appropriate use of ratepayers' funds.
- Mr Lockwood commented that he did not believe the Authority should expend ratepayers' money on acquiring a disused telephone box solely for its heritage value. However, he considered this an appropriate opportunity to discuss the future use of the remaining telephone boxes within Onchan.
- Mr Lockwood further advised that, to the best of his knowledge, there were four telephone boxes within the District that remained in the ownership of Manx Telecom, namely those located at the Main Road/Royal Avenue junction, Port Jack, Corkill's Roundabout, and the Hillberry Road/Lhon Vane Close junction. He suggested that the Authority should approach Manx Telecom to ascertain whether it would be willing to dispose of any of these assets.
- Mr Turton highlighted that the previous Board had held discussions with Manx Telecom regarding the future of the telephone box located on School Road, but this matter never progressed; and
- Miss Corkish requested that the Chief Executive/Clerk contact Manx Telecom and Craig's Heartstrong Foundation to make enquiries regarding the potential acquisition of the telephone box on Hillberry Road for conversion into a defibrillator housing.

Following a discussion, it was proposed by Mr Gibson, seconded by Mr Turton, and unanimously **RESOLVED that the Authority decline the opportunity to purchase the 1953 Model K6 telephone box offered for sale.**

Mr Allen requested that the Chief Executive/Clerk bring a further report to the Board regarding the feasibility of acquiring the telephone box located on Hillberry Road and the potential for its conversion into a housing unit for a public-access defibrillator.

The Chief Executive/Clerk confirmed that he would make the necessary enquiries and present further information to the Board for consideration in due course.

Mr Gibson declared a non-pecuniary interest in relation to any future matters that may come before the Board concerning agreements, contracts, or other arrangements involving his employer, Manx Telecom.

2. 35 Main Road – Commercial Tenancy Request

To be considered In Committee.

C26/09/01/12

TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS ASKED UNDER STANDING ORDER 25

None.

C26/09/01/13**TO CONSIDER ANY MOTIONS****1. Motion 83 – Submitted under Standing Order 19**

Mr Wilson tabled motion 83:

“That the Authority resolves to undertake and fund from the Authority’s Housing Reserves a feasibility study into the potential redevelopment of the Hawthorn Villa site and the land within its curtilage, to assess the feasibility, viability and deliverability of a mixed-use scheme incorporating new social housing, appropriate accommodation for the Authority’s operational requirements, and the impact on, and future provision of, existing income-generating commercial properties”.

Motion 83 was proposed by Mr Wilson and seconded by Miss Corkish, and will stand adjourned without discussion until the next Ordinary Meeting of the Authority due to be held on Monday 21st September 2026.

C26/09/01/14**ENVIRONMENTAL & TECHNICAL SERVICES****1. Street Lighting NDT Testing Services**

The report of the District Surveyor dated 7th September 2026, copies of which having previously been circulated was considered.

The District Surveyor provided the Board with the following overview:

- An independent Non-Destructive Testing (NDT) survey of the Authority's street lighting stock was undertaken during July 2026.
- The survey assessed the structural integrity of the Authority's street lighting columns, including wall thickness loss, internal corrosion, foundation condition and the estimated remaining service life of each asset.
- The results identified a number of lighting columns that have been categorised as Fail/Remove, requiring immediate removal due to severe corrosion, through-wall perforations, excessive wall thickness loss and the associated risk of structural failure.
- The Board Members were emailed by the Chief Executive/Clerk at this time to make them aware that a number of columns had failed the testing and required immediate removal due to safety concerns.
- The survey also identified a number of columns which, whilst currently remaining in service, are exhibiting significant deterioration and should be prioritised within future replacement programmes.
- The following categories identified within the survey report should be treated as priorities for intervention:
 - Columns categorised as Fail/Remove.
 - Columns exhibiting critical corrosion and through-wall perforations.
 - Columns with wall thickness loss typically between 31% and 40%; and
 - Columns identified as unstable or having compromised foundations.
- The NDT inspection identified numerous lighting columns where structural deterioration had reached a level requiring immediate intervention, including:
 - Critical internal corrosion.
 - Through-wall perforations.
 - Heavy internal rusting.
 - Wall thickness losses in excess of 50%; and
 - Structural instability and compromised foundations.
- In the interests of public safety, all columns classified as Risk Category 6 have been removed from service by Officers.

- It is recommended that Officers prioritise a replacement programme based on the assessed level of risk. The areas identified as requiring immediate replacement are:
 - Hague Crescent and Strathallan Road, comprising 10 columns, of which 7 have been classified as Risk Category 4 or above.
 - Sunningdale Drive, Central Drive and Eskdale Road, comprising 25 columns, of which 21 have been classified as Risk Category 4 or above.
 - Howstrake Drive and Greeba Drive, comprising 19 columns, of which 15 have been classified as Risk Category 4 or above.
 - Royal Avenue, Royal Avenue West and Royal Drive, comprising 29 columns, of which 18 have been classified as Risk Category 4 or above; and
 - Mount View Road, comprising 12 columns, of which 5 have been classified as Risk Category 4 or above.
- Completion of the proposed programme would result in the replacement of 25 of the 35 Risk Category 6 columns and 41 of the 98 Risk Category 4 columns identified within the survey. The remaining Risk Category 6 columns would be replaced through responsive maintenance works, whilst the remaining Risk Category 4 columns would be incorporated into future planned replacement programmes; and
A further report will be presented to the Board detailing the proposed replacement programme together with the estimated financial implications for consideration.

A discussion in relation to the following took place:

- Mr Gibson stated that it should be recognised that the Authority had reached this position because previous Boards had been unwilling to commit the level of expenditure required to proactively replace ageing street lighting infrastructure. He considered that the deteriorating condition of the assets demonstrated the need for investment and that the matter should be further considered once the financial implications had been reported to the Board.
- Mr Allen clarified that, in his view, the situation had not arisen solely due to a lack of action by previous Boards. Rather, he noted that previous Boards had not been provided with the necessary information regarding the condition of the street lighting stock by former officers of the Authority, which had limited their ability to make informed decisions.
- Mr Wilson expressed his appreciation for the work undertaken in preparing the report and advised that the Board should await the detailed costing report before considering the matter further.
- Mr Lockwood commented that the most urgent locations for replacement were likely to be those where multiple consecutive lighting columns had already been removed from service. He noted that four consecutive columns had been removed on Strathallan Road, while three consecutive columns had been removed on Eskdale Road, two on ^[ODC 21/09/2026] Drive and two on ^[ODC 21/09/2026] Mount View Road.
- Miss Corkish stated that the Board should await the costing report before reaching a decision, but agreed that a replacement programme would be required, particularly as the winter months were approaching; and
- Mr Turton stated that he wished to see the street lighting network improved and was not opposed to the proposed approach. However, he considered that the Authority should prioritise restoring lighting in locations where columns had already been removed before progressing with wider street replacement schemes.

The District Surveyor advised that undertaking replacements as part of coordinated schemes would be more cost-effective than individual reactive repairs. He explained that many of the existing columns had individual electricity supplies, requiring Manx Utilities to disconnect and remove the existing supplies before new infrastructure and connections could be installed, which is more costly than following the Authority Street

Lighting Policy to install private net works that are supplied by fewer Manx Utilities' supplies.

Mr Allen noted that it was anticipated that the Board would be in a position to consider the financial implications of the proposed replacement programme at the next Ordinary Board Meeting.

2. Flowers & Bedding Plants Contract 2027/30

The following was considered In Committee.

C26/09/01/15

HOUSING MATTERS

1. Sheltered Social Housing Commissioners Surgeries – Proposed Governance Rules and Procedures

The report of the Chief Executive/Clerk dated 7th September 2026, copies of which having previously been circulated was considered.

The Chief Executive/Clerk provided the Board with the following overview:

- Following the most recent Commissioners' Surgery held at Heywood Court, the Authority received two complaints from tenants, one written and one verbal.
- The complaints related to the manner in which the surgery was conducted, the conduct of certain tenants in attendance, and perceived shortcomings in the actions of the Authority's officers present.
- Following consideration of this matter at the Ordinary Meeting held on Monday 10th August 2026, the Board resolved to continue hosting Commissioners' Surgeries at the Authority's social housing complexes subject to the adoption of rules and procedures governing the conduct and management of such surgeries; and
- The Board are requested to review the proposed surgery governance rules and consider their implementation.

A discussion in relation to the following took place:

- Mr Wilson, Mr Lockwood, Miss Corkish and Mr Turton confirmed that they supported the implementation of the proposed rules.
- Mr Quirk queried whether tenants of the Authority's sheltered housing complexes had been consulted on the proposed rules.
- Mr Wilson stated that he did not believe consultation with tenants was necessary, as the rules simply set out the standards of behaviour and conduct expected of individuals attending Commissioners' Surgeries; and
- Mr Gibson stated that he was disappointed that it had become necessary to introduce a formal set of rules to explain the standards of behaviour expected of individuals attending Commissioners' Surgeries. However, he acknowledged the need to ensure that such meetings could be conducted in a respectful, safe and orderly manner for all involved.

Following the above discussion, it was proposed by Mr Wilson and seconded by Miss Corkish and **RESOLVED that the Commissioners' Sheltered Housing Surgery Rules and Procedures as appended to the Chief Executive/Clerk's report dated 7th September 2026, be approved and adopted with immediate effect for all future Commissioner Surgeries held at the Authority's Sheltered Housing Complexes.**

For: *Mr Allen, Mr Wilson, Mr Lockwood, Miss Corkish, Mr Turton and Mr Gibson*

Against: *Mr Quirk*

The Chief Executive/Clerk confirmed that he would arrange for the Commissioners' Surgery Rules, together with an accompanying covering letter, to be circulated to the Authority's sheltered housing tenants for their information.

C26/09/01/16

CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Dates for the Diary

Date	Organisation	Event	Time
7 th September 2026	Onchan District Commissioners	Board Meeting	7:00 pm
12 th September 2026	Onchan Horticultural Society	Annual Show – Elim Family Centre	2:00 pm
12 th September 2026	Fire Island and Chilli Festival	Fire Island and Chilli Festival – Onchan Pleasure Park	12 noon to 7:00 pm
18 th September 2026	St Peter's Church	Film, Fizz and Chips Night	7:00 pm
21 st September 2026	Onchan District Commissioners	Board Meeting	7:00 pm

C26/09/01/17

ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

1. School Road – Bus Shelter

Mr Quirk enquired as to why the bus shelter on School Road had been removed, noting that the weather was deteriorating and that members of the public currently had no shelter whilst waiting for buses.

The Chief Executive/Clerk advised that the Board had previously agreed to permit Bus Vannin to replace the existing bus shelter, with the proposed replacement requiring the use of a small area of the Authority's land. To facilitate this, a licence agreement had been entered into between the Authority and Bus Vannin.

The Chief Executive/Clerk further advised that he had been unaware that the replacement works had commenced. He confirmed that he would contact Bus Vannin to obtain an update on the progress of the works and report back to the Board.

2. Belgravia Road

Mr Quirk queried the dilapidated vehicles parked on Belgravia Road which are using parking spaces for visitors to Onchan Pleasure Park and Belgravia Road residents.^[ODC 21/09/2026]

The Chief Executive/Clerk advised that the Isle of Man Constabulary representative from the Eastern Neighbourhood Policing Team is due to attend the office tomorrow and will be asked to provide an update.^[ODC 21/09/2026]

3. Apologies

Mr Gibson confirmed that he will not be in attendance at the next Ordinary Board Meeting due to be held on 21st September 2026 and gave his apologies.

There being no further business, the public meeting ended at 8:28 pm.

The Chief Finance Officer and Executive Officer/Assistant left the meeting at 8:30 pm.

C26/06/02/18

CONSIDERATION OF ANY CORRESPONDENCE

1. 35 Main Road – Commercial Tenancy Request

The following was considered In Committee and transferred to the public domain.

A copy of the correspondence dated 19th August 2026 received from Share the Care (Hospice Shops) Isle of Man, copies of which having previously been circulated was considered.

The Chief Executive/Clerk provided the Board with the following overview:

- The commercial tenancy for 35 Main Road is due for renewal later in 2026.
- Share the Care (Hospice Shops) Isle of Man have carefully been considering their position in Onchan and whether it is sensible for them to retain the unit, as Hospice has had an extremely difficult trading year due to the renovation works which have recently been undertaken at Elm Tree House.
- Share the Care (Hospice Shops) Isle of Man are requesting a 3 year lease renewal; and
- If the renewal is granted, Share the Care (Hospice Shops) Isle of Man plan to improve the interior of the unit, and would request financial assistance from the Authority.

A discussion in relation to the following took place:

- Mr Lockwood stated that the tenant's refurbishment request appeared reasonable and noted that the proposed annual rent was lower than the current rent being paid. However, he considered that the Board should not make a decision regarding the rental figure until officers had fully reviewed the matter and provided a recommendation.
- Mr Turton commented that the rent charged for the neighbouring unit was not directly comparable and stated that he was not in favour of agreeing to a reduced rent.
- Mr Quirk advised that he agreed with the comments made by Mr Turton.
- Mr Gibson stated that he was also not supportive of any reduction in the current rent.
- Mr Turton confirmed that he was content to approve the proposed internal alterations, subject to these being appropriately reflected within the terms of the lease.
- Mr Wilson commented that the request appeared reasonable and that, whilst he would like to support the tenant, he did not believe it would be financially prudent for the Authority to provide financial assistance or accept a reduction in rental income; and
- All of the Board Members agreed that they are not in favour of supporting a reduced rent, nor providing financial support to undertake the proposed internal alterations.

Following the above discussion, it was proposed by Mr Lockwood, seconded by Mr Wilson, and unanimously **RESOLVED that Share the Care:**

- **Not be offered a reduced rent in respect of a new lease term of three years at 35 Main Road, nor receive any financial assistance from the Authority towards the cost of the proposed alterations; and**

- Be permitted to undertake the proposed internal alterations, as outlined within the correspondence dated 19th August 2026, at the tenant's own expense.

C26/09/01/19

ENVIRONMENTAL & TECHNICAL SERVICES

1. Flowers & Bedding Plants Contract 2027/30

The following was considered In Committee and transferred to the public domain.

The report of the Environmental and Technical Services Manager dated 7th September 2026, copies of which having previously been circulated was considered.

The District Surveyor provided the Board with the following overview:

- Every three years, officers of the Authority invite tenders from suitable contractors for the supply of flowers and bedding plants throughout the District.
- Following the advertisement seeking expressions of interest in relation to the Authority's retained contractor for the supply of summer and winter flowers, tender documentation was issued to two interested contractors; and
- One tender was returned by Watson's Nurseries Limited.

Following a discussion, it was proposed by Mr Gbison and seconded by Miss Corkish and unanimously **RESOLVED that the fixed tender price submitted by Watson's Nurseries Limited for the supply of summer and winter flowers and bedding plants for a period of three years commencing on the 1st April 2027 and expiring on the 31st March 2030 be and is hereby approved as per the details contained within the District Surveyor's report dated 7th September 2026.**

C26/09/01/21

ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

1. Centenary Park

Mr Wilson stated that he had recently visited the site to familiarise himself with its location and current condition. During his visit, he noted that a number of memorial trees had been planted and queried who would become responsible for the trees and associated memorial plaques should the tenant cease to occupy the site in the future.

The Chief Executive/Clerk confirmed that he was unable to provide a definitive answer at this stage but advised that he would review the original agreement entered into between the Manx Woodland Trust and a former Board to establish the respective responsibilities relating to the site, including the memorial trees and plaques.

There being no further business, the meeting ended at 9:00 pm.