Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of the **ONCHAN DISTRICT COMMISSIONERS** held in the Boardroom, Hawthorn Villa, 79 Main Road, Onchan, on Monday 13th July 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	
Apologies:	Miss A Goldsmith	(Deputy Clerk)
In attendance:	Mr R Phillips	(Chief Executive/Clerk)
	Mr R Forgie	(District Surveyor)
	Mrs S Johnson	(Chief Finance Officer)
	Miss A Crellin	(Executive Officer/Assistant)

C26/07/01/01
TO CHOOSE A PERSON TO PRESIDE IF THE CHAIRMAN AND VICE-CHAIRMAN BE ABSENT

Not applicable.

C26/07/01/02
DECLARATION OF INTERESTS OF MEMBERS AND OFFICERS (in accordance with Standing Order 18.3)

The Chairman 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.

The Chairman 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.

Mr Quirk declared a non-pecuniary interest in agenda item 8.1(a) relating to planning application 26/00396/B for 27A Birch Hill Avenue as he is a neighbouring property owner.

C26/07/01/03
BUSINESS REQUIRED TO BE DEALT WITH BY STATUTE BEFORE ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None.

C26/07/01/04
MINUTES

1. **Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on Monday 29th June 2026**

   The minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on Monday 29th June 2026, copies of which having previously been circulated, were considered.

   Mr Lockwood requested the following amendments:

   Page 8 - **Unit A Willow House – Vacant Commercial Property**

   10th paragraph – second bullet point replace “Manx Library Centre” with “Manx Family Centre”.

Page 12 - **Quarter 4 Management Accounts**

Third bullet point – replace "how reliable and indicative the financial position of the Authority and the management accounts are" with "how reliable an indication of the financial position of the Authority the management accounts are".

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 29th June 2026 be agreed as a correct record of the proceedings and be signed by the Chairman.**

C26/07/01/05
TO DISPOSE OF ANY BUSINESS ARISING FROM SUCH MINUTES

1. **Civic Reception**

Mr Quirk requested that the Board to consider hosting a civic reception for the Captain of the Parish, Peter Kelly MBE, to celebrate his recent Tynwald Honour.

Following a discussion, it was proposed by Mr Quirk and seconded by Mr Wilson and unanimously **RESOLVED that the Authority will approach Mr Peter Kelly MBE regarding the Authority hosting a civic reception to acknowledge his Tynwald Honour.**

Mr Quirk suggested that Mr Callum Gawne also be included within the civic reception to celebrate his recent winning of the 2026 parish walk.

Mr Allen asked the Chief Executive/Clerk to approach Mr Gawne regarding the matter.

C26/07/01/06
TO DISPOSE OF ANY BUSINESS ADJOURNED FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING

None.

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

None.

C26/07/01/08
PLANNING DECISIONS/COMMUNICATIONS FROM THE ISLE OF MAN GOVERNMENT PLANNING COMMITTEE

(i) PA 26/00396/B Mr J Bond – 27A Birch Hill Avenue

The Board Members were advised that the planning application is for the erection of a single extension to the southeast elevation of the existing dwellinghouse with associated alterations to doors and replacement of roof, extension of hardstanding with formation of additional off-street vehicular parking.

In answer to questions, the Chief Executive/Clerk advised that:

- Comments had been received from a neighbouring property.
- The return date for the application is the 10th July 2026; and

- It is noted that highway services have commented that there is no significant impact upon highway safety, network functionality and/or parking as two off-street parking spaces are retained for the proposals.

Following a discussion, it was proposed by Mr Gibson, seconded by Miss Corkish, and **RESOLVED that planning application 26/00396/B – 27A Birch Hill Avenue be recommended for approval subject to fencing being installed.**

Mr Quirk declared a non-pecuniary interest and did not cast a vote.

2. **Planning Communications – Planning Applications 26/00719/B and 26/00575/D**

The District Surveyor advised the Board that the Authority has submitted the above-mentioned planning applications in relation to Keynons Youth Café, and as the Authority is the applicant, it is recommended that the Authority does not comment on the applications.

Mr Quirk queried the dimensions of the proposed signage application.

The District Surveyor provided Mr Quirk with an overview of the dimensions shown on the planning application elevation plan.

Mr Quirk stated that, when the matter was previously brought to the Board for consideration, it had been requested that Keynons Youth Café apply to the Manx Lottery Trust for grant funding to assist with completion of the project.

The Chief Executive/Clerk advised that the first stage of the process was the submission of the planning application, following which an application will be made to the Manx Lottery Trust should the planning application be approved.

C26/07/01/09
FINANCE AND GENERAL PURPOSES

None.

26/07/01/10

CONSIDERATION OF ANY REPORTS FROM THE CLERK AND OTHER OFFICERS

1. **Ballacurn Trust, Meadow View Properties – Update**

The Chief Executive/Clerk provided the Board Members with the following update:

- On 7th July 2026, he received an update from the Department of Infrastructure advising that the Department of Health and Social Care intends to dispose of the Meadow View properties directly, rather than disposing of them via an estate agent.
- The Government Valuer is due to conduct a valuation of the properties in late July 2026, following which the Department will approach the Authority regarding purchasing the properties.
- It is expected that a further update will be available for the Board in August 2026; and
- It is highlighted that purchasing the properties will most likely not be a quick process as the Authority will need to submit a petition to the Department of Infrastructure and the Treasury for permission to obtain borrowings to fund the purchase.

Mr Wilson noted that following the upcoming General Election and the appointment of a potential new Minister for the Department of Health and Social Care, there could be a possibility that the properties are not sold to the Authority if priorities are changed within the Department.

Mr Turton agreed with Mr Wilson's concerns, as well as providing an overview of the current use of the adjoining properties that he assumes are managed by Manx Care to provide services to those with disabilities.

Mr Wilson asked for clarification regarding what would be included within the sale.

The Chief Executive/Clerk advised the Board that following earlier requests for information, no details have been provided in relation to the communal areas, such as the car park, the grassed areas, or the street lighting, and it was therefore unclear whether these would be included in the sale.

Mr Turton requested that the Minutes record that the process relating to the potential purchase of the properties had been significantly delayed by the Department of Infrastructure and the Department of Health and Social Care, and that the Authority has endeavoured to progress the purchase of the underutilised properties to provide social housing to those on the Authority's waiting lists.

Mr Allen agreed with Mr Turton's comments and agreed that they would be recorded within the Minutes.

2. <u>Department of Infrastructure – Weed Spraying</u>

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

- In 2015 the Authority entered into a Service Agreement with the Department of Infrastructure to undertake weed spraying and other responsibilities to publicly adopted highways throughout the district, except for Main Road, Whitebridge Road, Governors Road, and the Mountain Road.
- This year the Authority has received complaints about Main Road and Governors Road in relation to weeds;
- The Department has been contacted to address the complaints, but at present no response or information has been received as to when these roads will be treated; and
- To resolve the matter, the Board is asked to consider approaching the Department to request that they permit the Authority to formally adopt the responsibility for weed spraying on the above-mentioned roads.

A discussion in relation to the following took place:

- Mr Gibson noted that the weed spraying of these roads cannot be left any longer as it negatively reflects upon the Authority, even though the responsibility lies with the Department.
- Mr Gibson suggested that if the Department does not address the matter, then the Authority should undertake the work for 2026 and recharge the Department to cover the Authority's expenditure.
- Mr Quirk agreed with Mr Gibson's comments and highlighted that he has previously raised that the 2015 Service Agreement has not been reviewed since its inception.
- Mr Quirk stated that the Department continues to underperform in relation to many of its responsibilities, and that ratepayers should not be paying for a service that is already funded from taxes.
- Mr Turton requested that ratepayers of Onchan are made aware that the Department are not performing its duties concerning weed spraying of these roads and that it is not an issue for the Authority to resolve by expending ratepayers' money.

- Miss Corkish supported Mr Gibson and Mr Qiuirk's comments and suggested that the Department be charged for the works if the Authority has to undertake the work on its behalf.
- Mr Lockwood supported Mr Turton's suggestion regarding publicity to make ratepayers aware of whose responsibility it is to resolve the matter.
- Mr Lockwood advised the Board Members that the Authority may encounter difficulty trying to recover any expenditure from the Department, so it would be preferable for the Department to undertake the work; and
- Mr Wilson supported the other Board Members' comments in relation to raising awareness of the matter being a responsibility for the Department to resolve.

Mr Allen concluded that he agrees that the Authority should make a public statement clarifying that weed spraying on these roads is the responsibility of the Department, and not the Authority, and that if the Department cannot provide the service promptly then the Chief Executive/Clerk is to instruct the Authority's staff to complete the works and charge the Department so that the matter does not negatively impact the expenditure of the Authority and the ratepayers.

C26/07/01/11
CONSIDERATION OF ANY CORRESPONDENCE

1. **City of Douglas Civic Service**

   A copy of the invitation received from the Chief Executive of Douglas City Council dated 2nd July 2026, advising that the City of Douglas Civic Sunday Church Service will take place on the 27th September 2026 at 10:30 am at St Matthew's Church, copies of which having previously been circulated was noted.

C26/07/01/12
TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS ASKED UNDER STANDING ORDER 25

None.

C26/07/01/13
TO CONSIDER ANY MOTIONS

None.

C26/07/01/14
ENVIRONMENTAL & TECHNICAL SERVICES

1. **Lead Member Report – Quarter 1**

   Mr Gibson asked the Board Members if they were in favour of taking the report as read unless there are any queries they wish to raise.

   Mr Lockwood stated that the report is useful for updating the Board about ongoing projects. In this regard, as in the previous quarter, the progression of the drainage works at the stadium in Onchan Pleasure Park is queried.

   The District Surveyor advised that the Authority's officers are liaising with a contractor to negotiate the costs as the initial quotation received was in excess of the budget provision made by the Board from the Authority's General Reserves.

   Mr Quirk highlighted that the football pitch at the stadium has not been spiked to assist with aeration for two years, and the disabled parking bays in the car park nearest the boating lake have still not been repainted.

The District Surveyor confirmed that the Authority is awaiting a contractor to repaint the disabled parking spaces, following the matter previously being raised by Mr Quirk. He also advised that he would liaise with a representative of Onchan Association Football Club and provide an update regarding maintenance plans for the football pitch during the forthcoming year.

Mr Quirk reported that a vehicle parked on Belgravia Road would shortly have an expired vehicle tax disc.

The Chief Executive/Clerk advised Mr Quirk to report the matter to either the Isle of Man Constabulary or the Department of Infrastructure, as the Authority has no enforcement powers in relation to vehicles parked on publicly adopted highways. Alternatively, Mr Quirk could provide the vehicle details to the Authority, and the Chief Executive/Clerk would forward the information on his behalf.

The Chief Executive/Clerk further advised that the Isle of Man Constabulary's Eastern Neighbourhood Policing Team representative, who regularly attends the Authority's offices on Tuesday mornings, is expected to resume those sessions shortly. It is intended that these meetings will be used to discuss vehicles that have been parked on Belgravia Road for extended periods and, where appropriate, request inspections by the Vehicle Test Centre to determine whether any vehicles can be removed.

Mr Quirk stated that vehicles are frequently parked on both sides of Belgravia Road for prolonged periods, preventing the Authority's road sweeper from cleaning the road and kerb line.

The District Surveyor advised that a temporary road traffic order suspending parking on the road could be applied for to facilitate road sweeping if the vehicles cannot be removed by other means.

Mr Allen reminded the Board Members that the item under consideration was the Lead Member for Environmental and Technical Services' Quarterly Report and noted that the discussion had drifted onto matters outside the scope of the agenda item.

Following a discussion, the Board Members confirmed that they consent to note the remaining contents of the report.

2. **Springfield Court Refurbishment Options**

To be considered In Committee.

C26/07/01/15
HOUSING MATTERS

1. **Social Housing Allocations Undertaken**

The memorandum of the Housing Manager dated 13th July 2026, copies of which having previously been circulated was considered.

The memorandum was noted.

2. **Lead Member Report – Quarter 1**

Mr Wilson asked the Board Members if they were in favour to take the report as read unless there are any queries they wish to raise.

Following a discussion, the Board Members confirmed that they consent to note the contents of the report.

3. **Pet Policy – Additional Pet Request**

   To be considered In Committee.

4. **Parking Permit Request for One Extra Space – Heywood Court Sheltered Housing Complex**

   To be considered In Committee.

5. **Parking Permit Request for Three Extra Spaces – Heywood Court Sheltered Housing Complex**

   To be considered In Committee.

C26/07/01/16
CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. **Dates for the Diary**

Date	Organisation	Event	Time
12th July 2026	The Friends of Onchan's Heritage	Heritage Service – Abbeylands Chapel	3:00 pm
13th July 2026	Onchan District Commissioners	Board Meeting	7:00 pm
14th July 2026	Onchan District Commissioners	**(P)** Ørsted Meeting	6:30 pm
27th July 2026	Onchan District Commissioners	Board Meeting	7:00 pm
4th August 2026	Onchan District Commissioners	Commissioners Surgery – Springfield Court	2:00 pm to 3:00 pm
10th August 2026	Onchan District Commissioners	Board Meeting	7:00 pm

2. **Meeting with Ørsted**

   Mr Allen reminded the Board Members that the meeting taking place the following day with Ørsted is not a public meeting, as per the developer's request.

   Mr Allen highlighted that the Authority has recently received a number of enquiries from residents regarding this meeting and the reasons why it is being held in private. It has been publicised that Ørsted has advised that its representatives will not attend a public drop-in session or public meeting while the public examination process is ongoing.

   Mr Allen advised the Board Members that the meeting is an opportunity for them to ask questions of the developer and to relay the answers back to members of the public if questioned.

   Mr Turton stated that he does not agree with the meeting being held in private and continues to argue that the developer should meet with the public to provide answers.

   Mr Turton suggested that the meeting should not take place.

   Mr Allen advised the Board Members that the offer to meet with Ørsted was a unanimous decision of the Board.

   Mr Turton suggested that the Board should continue to pressure Ørsted to host a drop-in session at the HUB, as was accommodated for the No Offshore Turbines 4 IOM group.

Mr Allen agreed with Mr Turton's comment but noted that the Board does not have the power to force Ørsted to attend and host a public drop-in session.

Mr Gibson suggested that it would be unfair of the Board to have a meeting with the No Offshore Turbines 4 IOM group and not to offer to meet with Ørsted. Mr Wilson noted that he has concerns he wishes to raise with the developer.

Mr Wilson noted that the proposed offshore wind turbine development is causing concerns within the community, and that this is being inflamed by the lack of information and transparency from the Isle of Man Government regarding the matter.

Mr Allen reminded the Board Members to provide their questions to the Chief Executive/Clerk before the meeting so that they can be circulated to all the Members to consider before the meeting commences.

C26/07/01/17
ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

1. **Onchan District Sports Day**

   Miss Corkish confirmed that she had attended the Onchan District Sports Day earlier that day and had presented the trophy to the winning school, which was Ashley Hill Primary School.

2. **Onchan Primary School – 150th Anniversary**

   Mr Turton confirmed that he had attended the Onchan Primary School 150th opening anniversary on Friday 10th July 2026.

There being no further business, the public meeting ended at 7:40 pm.

C26/07/01/18
ENVIRONMENTAL AND TECHNICAL SERVICES

1. **Springfield Court Refurbishment Options**

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

   The report of the District Surveyor dated 13th July 2026, copies of which having previously been circulated was considered.

   The District Surveyor provided the Board with the following overview:

   - The refurbishment at the Authority's Springfield Court social sheltered housing complex aims to address accessibility, building condition, and resident safety across the sixty-eight flats and communal areas.
   - A Stage 1 Design Development Report has been completed by Bell Burton Associates confirming the updated cost estimate for the planned refurbishment scheme of the Authority's Springfield Court sheltered social housing complex.
   - The report reflects architectural design development and incorporates structural, mechanical, and electrical information.
   - This report is subject to the Department of Infrastructure's approval under the Capital Works Procedures.
   - The Board Members have been provided with an appraisal of the two strategic options for Springfield Court following the completion of the Stage 1 Design Development Report:
     1) Proceeding with the proposed refurbishment scheme, as costed in the Stage 1 Bell Burton Associate's Report dated May 2026. This will approve the continuation of the refurbishment scheme to maintain

progress and address immediate concerns. The initial total capital cost of the refurbishment scheme was approximately three million pounds, but based on updated costings this is now estimated at approximately four and a half million pounds; or

2) Explore alternative options of full demolition and redevelopment to provide new purpose built flats and communal areas. The estimated capital cost of such a scheme is approximately eighteen and a half to twenty and a half million pounds.

- Given the significant difference in capital cost, even with the increased construction costs since the refurbishment's inception, the refurbishment scheme represents the most financially viable option and will address short term issues experienced by residents and the Authority; However, a redevelopment offers the greater long term strategic benefit, but at a higher cost.

A discussion in relation to the following took place:

- Mr Lockwood highlighted that the key question is whether anything has changed since the original decision of a previous Board to approve the refurbishment scheme that should cause this Board to revisit the decision. He does not believe increased cost estimates in isolation should cause the Board to revisit its decision, since costs have increased for all construction projects.
- Mr Lockwood suggested that if a new sheltered social housing complex were to be constructed to replace Springfield Court, then the obvious locations for it would be the former gas works site on Second Avenue, or the former Follies Cabaret site, which previously had a planning application approved for sheltered housing.
- Mr Turton stated that the Authority is behind in providing sheltered social housing and notes that providing new properties is unachievable if the Authority does not have the support from the Department of Infrastructure and the Treasury to obtain borrowings.
- Mr Turton highlighted the delays previously experienced by the Authority when trying to obtain permission to borrow for social housing projects, and he has concerns that asking for such a large sum to redevelop the complex may encounter the same delays.
- Mr Quirk commented that, from the options which are available, the only option that makes sense is that Springfield Court is refurbished rather than experiencing further delays in getting works completed.
- Mr Quirk highlighted that the tenants have waited many years for the Authority to get this project underway, and to propose more delays in relation to investigating a new redevelopment scheme rather than progressing the refurbishment scheme is unfair to the current tenants.
- Miss Corkish stated that Springfield Court is not up to today's standards and expectations of what social housing tenants expect. It is suggested that the Board takes the opportunity to undertake a full redevelopment of the complex rather than refurbishment to provide a long term solution to provide appropriate social housing properties that will address current issues as well as future-proofing the properties.
- Mr Wilson agreed with Miss Corkish's comments and stated that the complex needs to be redeveloped rather than refurbished.
- Mr Wilson highlighted that the Board needs to make a decision regarding this matter promptly rather than deferring a decision as construction costs continue to increase, as well as the need to address the needs of sheltered social housing tenants.
- Mr Gibson confirmed that he is in agreement with Miss Corkish and Mr Wilson, and he supports the redevelopment of the complex to provide a long term solution for the provision of suitable sheltered social housing.
- Mr Gibson highlighted that if the refurbishment option were to be progressed, he believes that the issues regarding difficulty in allocating the properties to housing

applicants will still exist, as all of the accessibility issues will not be addressed by a refurbishment.

- Mr Turton highlighted that he has fought with previous Boards for the provision of a new sheltered housing complex to be built within the District, but the recurring issue is the lack of land available to purchase and develop.
- Mr Turton raised his concern that if the refurbishment scheme is not progressed, the existing complex will continue to deteriorate, and the tenants deserve a better quality of accommodation now; and
- Mr Turton suggested that the Board consider an alternative option, this being that the refurbishment is progressed, and that a suitable site be found to purchase to build a new complex.

The Chief Executive/Clerk asked the Board Members if it would be beneficial if he and the District Surveyor provided an overview of the history of the scheme, as not all of the current Board Members may be aware of the details.

Mr Allen advised that this would be beneficial for the newer Board Members, as well as acting as a reminder for the other Board Members.

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

- The refurbishment scheme was agreed upon by a previous Board in 2019. The brief for the works was based upon responses provided by the then tenants following a consultation.
- At that time, development of an alternative site was considered; however, no site was identified except for the tennis courts on Belgravia Road. This site was put forward by the Authority as part of the Area Plan for the East, but the application was not successful, and the site was not designated for development for social housing.
- The Board also considered redeveloping the existing Springfield Court site to reduce the number of flats by increasing the floor areas of a flat by making two units into one unit. This option was not progressed due to the Board not wishing to reduce the number of flats, as well as the logistics and loss of income relating to tenancy management of the vacant flats.
- The Board then decided upon progressing the refurbishment option of the existing Springfield Court complex, as this appeared to be the only viable option, but it was noted that there would be limitations and not all of the issues raised by the tenants would be addressed.
- Since this time, delays have hindered the progression of the refurbishment project due to the Covid pandemic, delays within the Department of Infrastructure in relation to administration and approvals, planning permission issues, and a member of the original design team retiring.
- The Bell Burton Associates' Report was required due to the retirement of the previous design team quantity surveyor, and due to the ever increasing construction costs that are being experienced in the construction sector on the Island.

Mr Allen asked the Chief Finance Officer about the financial implications of the proposals upon the Authority's housing budgets.

The Chief Finance Officer provided the following overview:

- It is noted that the comments made by the Chief Executive/Clerk, District Surveyor, and Mr Turton regarding the difficulties and delays experienced when trying to progress projects through the Isle of Man Government's Capital Project Procedures, and trying to obtain permission to borrow funding, are matters that the Board need to consider.
- Either option, whether refurbishment or redevelopment, will most likely result in the Authority claiming deficiency payments and support from the Isle of Man

Government, as the income received from rents, and the current commitments in relation to existing borrowings, maintenance and administration costs, will be insufficient to meet the overall expenditure to provide the social housing service.
- It is highlighted that the Authority is currently one of a few local authorities not claiming deficiency support from the Isle of Man Government; and
- Concerns regarding the Department of Infrastructure's proposals to cease deficiency support need to be considered by the Board. At present the Department's plans are not finalised, but the Board has previously been made aware that one proposal from the Department is that local authorities self-fund their social housing services, and a way of doing this would be to set their own rents, which would most likely have to significantly increase to cover the expenditure of providing the service.

A discussion between Miss Corkish and Mr Quirk took place regarding their differing views on the merits and disadvantages of progressing the refurbishment scheme, and the redevelopment of the site.

Mr Allen concluded the discussion and advised the Board Members to focus on the two proposals that have been put forward for consideration, rather than drifting into other areas of debate. He concluded the discussion and requested that the Board Members now consider the proposals.

Following a discussion, it was proposed by Mr Wilson and seconded by Mr Gibson and **RESOLVED that the Board agrees to commission a feasibility study into the redevelopment rather than refurbishment of Springfield Court as a long term strategic option, including financial modelling, site capacity testing, and decanting of tenant planning.**

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

The Chief Finance Officer and District Surveyor left the meeting at 8:33 pm.

C26/07/01/19
HOUSING

1. Pet Policy – Additional Pet Request

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

The report of the Housing Manager dated 13th July 2026, copies of which having previously been circulated was considered.

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

- A social housing tenant has submitted a formal request seeking permission to keep several dogs exceeding the limit set out in the Authority's Pet Policy.
- The current policy limits the number of pets per household to help ensure that accommodation standards are maintained and to support animal welfare and wider community impact.
- The tenant had previously received approval to keep two dogs, which are now aged twelve and nine years.
- The tenant explains that they initially helped another dog owner who was experiencing difficulties. Over time, the original owners no longer want the dogs returned, and the tenant has continued to care for them; and
- The tenant is now seeking retrospective approval to retain these two additional dogs at the property.

Following a discussion, it was proposed by Mr Wilson and seconded by Mr Gibson and unanimously **RESOLVED that the tenant's request for two additional dogs to be kept**

at the property, as detailed within the Housing Manager's report dated 13th July 2026, be refused due to the household exceeding the maximum number of dogs permitted under the Authority's Pet Policy.

2. <u>Parking Permit Request for One Extra Space – Heywood Court Sheltered Housing Complex</u>

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

The report of the Housing Manager dated 13th July 2026, copies of which having previously been circulated was considered.

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

- A formal request for one additional parking permit, in addition to the permit already issued to the household, has been received by the Authority.
- The household is made up of two sheltered social housing tenants.
- The Authority's current policy limits parking provision to one permit per household.
- The car park is private and is managed by the Authority under the Onchan Off-Street Parking Place Order 2021; and
- The Board is asked to consider whether granting an exception to the Authority's policy is reasonable.

A discussion in relation to the following took place:

- Mr Wilson, Miss Corkish, and Mr Gibson noted that the details provided regarding the request are considered reasonable; therefore, they are in favour of issuing an additional permit.
- Mr Lockwood stated he does not believe the policy of allowing each tenant only one parking permit should be applied rigidly, as at any point in time, there will be tenants who have no use for a parking permit. It is also suggested that parking permits should be renewable annually as this would enable the Authority not to renew multiple permits for the same tenancy if a shortage of spaces arises.
- Mr Wilson suggested that the Authority's officers draft a revised policy to permit the issue of up to two parking permits to sheltered housing households where more than one tenant resides within the property; and
- Mr Turton stated that he is not in favour of granting a permit to allow the tenant access to an additional parking space as spaces must be available for visitors and the Authority's staff to use when required.

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

- **The sheltered housing tenant's request, as detailed in the Housing Manager's report dated 13th July 2026, for an additional parking permit to be issued for use within the Heywood Court car park be approved.**
- **Officers be instructed to draft a revised policy to permit the issue of up to two parking permits to sheltered housing households where more than one tenant resides within the property; and**
- **Officers identify any other sheltered housing households comprising more than one tenant and offer the issue of an additional parking permit, where appropriate, to ensure consistency and fairness.**

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

3. **Parking Permit Request for Three Extra Spaces – Heywood Court Sheltered Housing Complex**

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

The report of the Housing Manager dated 13th July 2026, copies of which having previously been circulated was considered.

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

- A formal request for three additional parking permits, in addition to the permit already issued to the household, has been received by the Authority.
- The household is made up of two sheltered social housing tenants.
- The Authority's current policy limits parking provision to one permit per household.
- The car park is private and is managed by the Authority under the Onchan Off-Street Parking Place Order 2021; and
- The Board is asked to consider whether granting an exception to the Authority's policy is reasonable.

A discussion in relation to the types of vehicles owned by the tenant took place, the availability of space at the complex, and the potential future impacts of setting a precedent if the Board were to allow tenants to park numerous vehicles at the site.

Following a discussion, it was proposed by Mr Wilson and seconded by Miss Corkish and unanimously **RESOLVED that the sheltered housing tenant's request, as detailed in the Housing Manager's report dated 13th July 2026, for three additional parking permits to be issued for use within the Heywood Court car park be refused.**

26/06/03/20
ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

None.

There being no further business, the meeting ended at 8:54 pm.