

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Monday 1 December 2014

Present:

Councillor Bialyk (Chair)
Councillors Spackman, Denham, Edwards, Lyons, Mitchell, Raybould, Sutton, Williams and Winterbottom

Apologies:

Councillors Choules, Mottram and Newby

Also Present:

Assistant Director City Development, Forward Planning Officer (FP) and Democratic Services Officer (Committees) (HB)

105

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest were made by Members.

106

PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 14/1714/02 - LAND AT SANDROCK, PINN LANE, EXETER

The Chair reported that the objector who would be speaking against the application had requested permission to record the debate on this item. Permission had been granted and a separate recording would also be undertaken on behalf of the City Council.

The Assistant Director City Development presented the application for the erection of 57 dwellings, vehicular access from Pinn Lane, associated roads, parking and provision of public open space.

Members were circulated with an update sheet - attached to minutes.

The Assistant Director City Development advised that the issue of closing Pinn Lane was not part of the application. It was to be used for access purposes in the short term and, in the long term, access could be off the Tithebarn Link Road as part of the Monkerton Farm development, enabling a further closure of Pinn Lane to the south.

He further advised that representations had been received regarding a restrictive covenant on land adjoining the application site which prevented a pedestrian, cycle or vehicular link from the Link Road to Sandrock Nursery.

The recommendation was for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

Ms Carleton spoke against the application. She presented a petition of 156 signatures opposing the closure of Pinn Lane together with the following documents:-

- statement;
- objection from the hotel;

- document outlining grievances against Exeter City Council and Devon County Council;
- minute annexe – Devon County Council comments at Planning Committee meeting of 24 February 2014;
- photograph of delivery vehicle on Gypsy Hill Lane;
- page 24 of the officer's report regarding access for Sandrock site;
- access re Monkerton Farm Application;
- eight page document showing conflicts of the application with local and NPPF plans; and
- plan of Pinn Lane showing diversion route.

In summarising and in response to Members questions she referred to the following points:-

- closure of Pinn Lane would severely affect the business of the Gypsy Hill Hotel;
- the impact on the hotel was referred to in the application covering the Tithebarn Link Road but not referred to in this application;
- the closure of Pinn Lane from the south conflicts with the Local Transport Plan - extra vehicles will use the road and take away the only bus service on Pinn Lane and hotel visitors will be required to travel extra miles;
- closure of Pinn Lane will affect the material amenities of the community;
- officers have been inconsistent in the various planning applications, recommending approval to close access to Pinn Lane from the south in one application and then recommending access onto Pinn Lane on the same stretch of road in the current application;
- the Pinn Lane crossing point with the Gypsy Hill Lane/Hollow Lane route forms a strategic cycle corridor and a safe route to school and this junction should be as free of traffic as possible on safety and sustainability grounds;
- the proposed closure of the passing place on Gypsy Hill Lane will be detrimental to road safety and cause difficulties for Hotel visitors and guests;
- the closure of Pinn Lane from the south conflicts with policies in the Strategic Core Strategy;
- closure of Pinn Lane does not meet the criteria of sustainable development and the City Council has not taken into account the many conflicts with the NPPF, Government legislation and other local policies that the closure of Pinn Lane will produce. This is contrary to the NPPF which says that these policies must be taken into account.

Mr Collier spoke in support of the application. He raised the following points:-

- the applicant has responded positively to local authority officers, statutory consultees and neighbours, working with the former to ensure the proactive response to technical issues including infrastructure layout relating to the Tithebarn Green Link Road;
- there had been no objections to proposal from statutory consultees and there is no conflict with existing policies;
- an area of open space had been provided to create a Ridgeline Park;
- passing space has been retained along Gypsy Hill Lane; and
- 25% affordable housing has been integrated throughout the site in accordance with the recommendation of housing officers.

He responded as follows to Members' queries:-

- linkage with the District Heating System is provided for within the Section 106 Agreement and negotiations are continuing between Linden Homes and Eon regarding availability and timing;

- footway to the boundary will enable a potential link to the neighbouring development at some point and this has been confirmed by the County Council as the link is desirable although not essential; and
- provision for solar panels and photo voltaic panels is provided for to meet planning conditions.

The Highway Development Management Officer confirmed that the potential closure of Pinn Lane was not part of the application. A public transport route was proposed from the city centre, through the Masterplan area out to Cranbrook and other proposed growth areas to the east of the city. A number of interchanges/stops were proposed within the Masterplan area to allow quick and easy public transport links into the city and other key destinations and the bridge over the Motorway was to facilitate this linkage from Monkerton and Cranbrook into the City. Long term, the aim was to move traffic off Gypsy Hill Lane. This could not be achieved immediately and would require the following:-

- closure of the northern part of Pinn Lane at the Tithebarn Green Link Road;
- access from the west into Pinn Lane and on to the Link Road; and
- closure of Pinn Lane to create a traffic free area for most of the lane through to the Gypsy Hill Hotel, access then to be from Grenadier Road and Cumberland Way. It would then not be possible to drive north to Pinhoe.

The Chair reported the following statement handed to him by Grace Carleton:-

“Gypsy Hill Lane can not be closed because there would be no vehicular access therefore Exeter City Council are giving wrong information. Monkerton Farm decision is not decided and could be subject to Judicial Review”

RESOLVED that planning permission for the erection of 57 dwellings, vehicular access from Pinn Lane, associated roads, parking and provision of public open space be **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions:-

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall not be carried out otherwise than in strict accordance with the submitted details received by the Local Planning Authority on 10th October 2014 as modified by other conditions of this consent.
- 2) All conditions imposed on notice of outline approval (ref no. 12/0854/01) are hereby reiterated in as much as they relate to the development and have yet to be discharged in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To safeguard the rights of control by the Local Planning Authority in respect of the reserved matters.
- 3) Prior to occupation of any dwelling hereby permitted, secure cycle parking shall be provided for that dwelling in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the cycle parking shall be maintained at all times thereafter.
Reason: To ensure that cycle parking is provided, in accordance with Local Plan Policy T3, to encourage travel by sustainable means.
- 4) No more than 50% of the dwellings hereby approved shall be occupied until the shared use pedestrian/cycle connections in the south east corner to Gypsy Hill Lane and south onto Gipsy Hill Lane (as indicated on the Planning Site Layout (Drawing Number AL(0)03 Revision K) have been provided and made available for public use in accordance with details to be approved by the Local Planning Authority and maintained for this purpose at all times.

Reason: To provide adequate facilities to promote the use of sustainable modes, in accordance with Section 4 of the NPPF.

- 5) No dwellings in the development hereby approved shall be occupied until the vehicular access and footway onto Pinn Lane have been provided in accordance with Drawing 1105-Rev R1 and retained for that purpose at all times.

Reason: To ensure a safe and suitable access to the site for vehicles, in accordance with Paragraph 32 of the NPPF

107

PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 14/2007/01 - BRICKNELLS BUNGALOW, OLD RYDON LANE, EXETER

The Principal Project Manager (Strategic Infrastructure) presented the application for outline planning permission for the construction of up to 63 dwellings (including affordable) on land to the rear of Bricknells Bungalow.

He reported an email received from Councillor Newby stating that previous reasons for refusing 50 dwellings on the site had not subsided.

Members were circulated with an update sheet - attached to minutes.

The recommendation was for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

Mr Bishop spoke against the application. He raised the following points:-

- residents are not against the 63 homes, solely the safety issues surrounding the access. The report discards access route safety objections by many parties;
- the traffic assessment was based on 50 homes not 63. The Bricknells junction onto Old Rydon Lane does not consider increased through traffic from the Pratt Development and the potential for 455 homes to access Old Rydon Lane via Bricknells. The lane is, at most 4.5 metres wide here, and is less than 100 metres from a blind bend with a designated foot and cycle path crossing from Old Rydon Close on the blind side of the road. This junction does not have the same design safety criteria as the approved junction 200 metres down the Lane;
- Old Rydon Lane will cease to be a quiet country lane and become a rat run for a large development. Do not want another child being hit as happened on Newcourt Way on 28 November;
- no recommendations made to enforce a lower speed or any other safety improvements;
- a Traffic Management Plan is not workable;
- the proposed access road and junction can not be delivered by the applicant due to third party ownership of part of the land; and
- the original Master Plan should be adhered to with access via the Pratt spine road and the proposed access route should be refused.

Mr Evans spoke in support of the application. He raised the following points:-

- the application is a modest but important part of the Newcourt Strategic Allocation and the applicant has responded to the previous refusal by increasing the number of dwellings intended and responding positively on design issues and highway and access detail;

- the applicant has confirmed that there are no land ownership issues concerning the proposed junction and the highway works to the east and west are all within the confines of the adopted highway. Nevertheless, if adjoining neighbours would prefer the indicated access road footway to the eastern side then this can be done within the confines of the site;
- there will be a flexible approach to the Section 106 planning obligation requirements and planning conditions and there have been positive discussion with officers. These discussion have included infrastructure triggers and the potential connection of the body of the site to the Pratt group land to the east and west. While the access proposed is acceptable, this alternative access may be supported by the applicant. This would be consistent with the approach to delivery of the Strategic allocation adopted by the Council; and
- the application is a key component in the delivery of the strategic allocation and contributions to infrastructure and housing.

Members noted the highway concerns raised by the objector and the potential for an alternative (already approved) access to that being put forward by the applicant. As the alternative access required negotiations with the adjoining landowner who was also seeking to bring forward housing development. It was considered that the application be deferred both for a site inspection and to allow further opportunity for developers to seek a common solution to access issues.

RESOLVED that the application be deferred for a site inspection and for further discussions between landowners.

108

PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 14/1482/03 - 62 HAVEN ROAD, EXETER

The Assistant Director City Development presented the application for a new building to provide boat and equipment storage space and club facilities including changing rooms, gym, classroom, office and social areas.

Members were circulated with an update sheet - attached to minutes.

The recommendation was for approval subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

Mr Miller tabled photographs of the area showing parked vehicles and spoke against the application. He raised the following points:-

- residents do not object to the regeneration of the site and the provision of the new centre for the Exe Water Sports Association but feel that the scale and impact is excessive;
- responses from statutory consultees are incomplete;
- parking problems on this narrow road will increase and, as the centre grows, it will attract further vehicles including minibuses from a wider area;
- the comments of the highway authority not backed by a survey;
- English Heritage believe that the elevations are too high and will impact adversely on the character and appearance of the conservation area;
- departs from supplementary planning guidance; and
- although a public exhibition was held there was no consultation.

Mr Grainge spoke in support of the application. He raised the following points:-

- the existing Club facilities are inadequate to meet current demand, and future growth. The proposed building is simple and sensitive to its location and will enhance the Conservation Area and the waterfront;

- the location has supported water sports activity and is both close to the City and readily accessible. It is the best location for a much needed local, City wide and regional amenity;
- proposed buildings are purposeful and unique, designed to adapt to changing patterns of boat storage and use. The building form clearly reflects its purpose, as the historic industrial buildings that surround the Basin did when they were built;
- will enhance the Conservation Area and the waterfront;
- the design has been reviewed in light of the consultation responses;
- the design has been amended to incorporate brick walls and granite paving. The brick proposed for the walls, will closely match a number of nearby historic buildings with brick facades. Areas of perforated brickwork and additional windows on the Haven Road façade further articulate the building and break up its mass;
- English Heritage advised that the scale of the building is appropriate in its setting but requested a review of Building A's mono-pitched roof and consider a more traditional duo-pitch. After careful consideration, it was concluded that it should remain as designed;
- English Heritage also suggested that the bridge links between the two buildings are removed. They are considered necessary for operational, safety, security and access reasons and also add interest and activity to the alley between the buildings, without blocking views of the Basin and the River beyond;
- detailed responses have been given to a wide range of operational, traffic and parking concerns. Following discussion with Devon County Highways, the amended proposals include a controlled zone for vehicle loading and unloading along the Haven Road frontage. There are also a number of coordinated strategies to minimize car use;
- as this site cannot accommodate parking it is reasonable to expect Club members requiring parking to use the existing, well-placed public car parks;
- It is understandable that some local residents will try to protect the views they currently enjoy. Building on the opposite side of the street will inevitably create change. The Canal Basin Master Plan proposes redevelopment of this site for water sports use; and
- the Clubs serve and support a diverse population of all ages in active sport and leisure.

He responded as follows to Members' queries:-

- the reason for retaining the mono pitch roof was that, if changed, flats opposite would have unattractive views through roof windows into utility areas. Changing the roof would also result in a weaker building form that would not sit comfortably opposite the five-storey block of flats and the road junction;
- seven different organisations also use area and therefore contribute to parking in the area;
- with a larger facility, more club members will leave canoes, kit etc. on site which will reduce the need to travel to the clubs by car as well as bringing trailers. There will also be bike storage facilities on site;

Members supported the bridge linkage between the buildings but felt that the alternative to the mono pitch for the roof was preferable.

RESOLVED that, subject to the design incorporating a dual pitch roof and the receipt of amended elevation plans in respect of this roof design, further information regarding a traffic management strategy and a financial contribution of £5,000 towards traffic regulation orders in the vicinity of the site, to be secured by an

appropriate agreement, planning permission for a new building to provide boat and equipment storage space and club facilities including changing rooms, gym, classroom, office and social areas be **APPROVED** subject to delegated authority being given to the Assistant Director City Development, subject to prior consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, to agree a condition setting out the hours of use of the terrace, and subject also to the following conditions:-

- 1) C05 – Time Limit - Commencement
- 2) C15 – Compliance with Drawings
- 3) C17 – Submission of Materials
- 4) No part of the development hereby approved shall be commenced until adequate areas shall have been made available within the site to accommodate operatives' vehicles, materials and construction plant in accordance with details that shall previously have been submitted to, agreed and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: To minimise obstruction of and damage to the adjacent highway, in the interest of public safety.
- 5) No part of the development shall commence until a construction traffic management plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The statement should include details of access arrangements and timings and management of arrivals and departures of vehicles. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period. Prior to commencement it is recommended that the developer consults and if necessary meets with the Local Highway Authority to establish a safe means of progress.
Reason: To minimise impacts from construction related traffic on the environment, the amenity of local residents/businesses and safety on the public highway.
- 6) Construction work shall not take place outside the following times; 8am to 6pm (Mondays to Fridays); 8am to 1pm (Saturdays); nor at any time on Sundays, Bank or Public Holidays.
Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.
- 7) C70 - Contaminated Land
- 8) C57 - Archaeological Recording
- 9) Notwithstanding condition no. 2, no work shall commence on this site under this permission until full details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the following shall thereafter be provided in accordance with such details:
 - (a) windows to include materials, means of opening, reveals, cills and headers;
 - (b) external doors;
 - (c) rainwater goods;
 - (d) external lighting and
 - (e) refuse storage.**Reason:** Insufficient information has been submitted with the application and in the interests of visual amenity.

- 10) The development shall not be used until the works to be carried out in association with the adopted Canal Basin Public Realm Plan have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority and implemented in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: To accord with the requirements of the Public Realm Plan and in the interests of visual amenity.
- 11) No amplified music, voice or tannoy system shall become operational unless routed through a suitable noise limiter that has been installed, operated and maintained to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority in accordance with details to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.
- 12) No development shall take place unless and until details of bat and swift boxes have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the development shall be carried out entirely in accordance with the approved plan.
Reason: To ensure that the wildlife opportunities associated with the site are maximised in the interests of biodiversity.
- 13) No buildings, plant or machinery shall be erected on the roof of the building hereby approved unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interests of visual amenity.
- 14) No development shall commence until details of the windows fronting Haven Road, which shall be obscurely glazed and non-opening, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and maintain in accordance with the agreed details thereafter unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interest of residential amenity.
- 15) No development shall commence until a noise impact assessment has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority to consider the impact of noise from the building's plant and equipment. Any recommendations of this report for noise mitigation measures shall be implemented prior to and throughout the occupation of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.
- 16) No development shall commence until full details of the kitchen extraction system including siting size and design of any external extraction/ventilation flue, a noise assessment and odour control measures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in accordance with the approved details.
Reason: In the interests of visual and residential amenity and to comply with the guidance contained within annex B DEFRA document 'Guidance on the Control of Odour and Noise from Commercial Kitchen Exhaust Systems.
- 17) The buildings shall only be available for the unloading and unloading of boats between the hours of 0730hrs and 2200hrs and at no other times unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
Reason: In the interests of residential amenity.

- 18) The bar/clubhouse area of the building hereby approved shall not be used other than between the hours of 0800 hrs and 2400 hrs.

Reason: So as not to detract from the amenities of the nearby residential property.

109

PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 14/1615/01 - LAND WEST OF FITZROY ROAD AND NORTH OF HONITON ROAD, EXETER

The Principal Project Manger (Strategic Infrastructure) presented the application for a mixed use development to provide a District Centre comprising uses within some or all of Classes (A1) with associated Garden Centre, A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A3 (Restaurants and Cafes), A5 (Hot Food Takeaway), D1 (Non-residential institutions), D2 (Leisure), associated means of access, access road, car parking, infrastructure works, public realm and landscaping.

Members were circulated with an update sheet - attached to minutes.

The recommendation was for refusal for the reasons as set out in the report.

It was reported that further correspondence relating to the application had been received including a letter in support of the application that was subsequently withdrawn because of a conflict of interest, interest in further retail development in the area and an objection from John Lewis. Information had been provided by the applicant including an assessment that the scheme would not overlap with the Bus and Coach Station proposals. It was not considered that other comments raised new issues.

Mr Green spoke against the application. He raised the following points:-

- asset manager of the Guildhall Centre on behalf of Aviva who are making a significant investment in the re-development of the Centre which is likely to be undermined by a retail and restaurant development on the outskirts of the City;
- the Honiton Road development is contrary to existing planning policies which only supports local centres;
- there is no policy allocation for this floor space at Honiton Road and it fails both the sequential and impact tests. Sequentially, the applicant has not provided a test to assess the suitability of City Centre sites and, because of the complexity and size of the site, the applicant has also failed to properly complete an impact assessment on all centres, especially the City Centre which is exacerbated by the absence of any clear indication of likely occupiers. There is therefore no scope to confirm future impact; and
- remodelling of the Guildhall commences in January 2015 with, hopefully, a finish by Christmas 2015.

Mr Rocke spoke in support of the application. He raised the following points:-

- the scheme will strengthen the position of Exeter as a retail and leisure destination and provide much needed, high quality facilities for the local residential and business communities on the east side of Exeter;
- the benefits of the proposals include £45 million investment, at least 345 permanent jobs, up to 150 construction jobs, a £1.4 million CIL receipt, provision of essential facilities for residents and employees whose support for the proposals has been expressed through the representations of their Residents' Association and business leaders;
- the few dissenting voices are from those who neither live nor work in the East Exeter Community, and who are seeking to protect their commercial interests;

- perceived by the local community to be a significant benefit. The level of support, and absence of legitimate objection, for retail proposals of this nature is unprecedented;
- the retail strategy of the development plan supports the delivery of a new town centre as part of the Monkerton and Hill Barton urban extension and is supported by the local community;
- the Bus Station site is neither 'suitable' nor 'available'. It is unsuitable since it is in the wrong location to provide accessible local facilities for those who live and work in the Monkerton and Hill Barton/Sowton areas. The site is not 'available' to develop a retail scheme of the nature proposed;
- the negligible level of impact projected in the Retail Impact Assessment accompanying the application does not amount to 'significant adverse' harm. There is no evidence of any alternative, more severe impact and therefore no case against the proposals on retail impact grounds. The Council's own consultants have been unable to identify any higher impact figure;
- further monitoring of existing traffic conditions on the local network indicate that highway solutions can overcome initial objections;
- the 'balance' of considerations is in favour of approval. The proposals are in accordance with the retail strategy of the Development Plan, and supported by local residential and business communities alike. They are also essential to support the future residential community at Monkerton and Hill Barton;
- there is no evidence to outweigh the benefits of the proposals; and
- the evidence is therefore overwhelmingly that planning permission should be granted.

He responded as follows to Members' queries:-

- the applicant undertook a campaign to raise awareness of their proposal and it is likely that local businesses liaised with each other and undertook lobbying. There was no "pattern letter" circulated. Consensus was achieved amongst residents and businesses of the benefits of the scheme; and
- an encouraging meeting had been held with Devon County Council highway officers who consider that there are potential solutions to any highway difficulties at the Fitzroy Road/ Honiton Road junction.

Although recognising the need for additional services in this area, Members believed that this demand would be appropriately served by a Local Centre. They felt that insufficient evidence had been provided to support a departure from existing policies in the Core Strategy, particularly the existing strategic allocation. Much of the site was already permitted for employment development. This land was likely to be of interest to high-tec industries seeking to relocate to be close to the Met Office and the Science Park. It was also considered that the proposal would impact adversely on the City Centre. Members confirmed that it would be possible to apply planning conditions limiting such issues as floor space, the unit sizes and the types of goods available but the applicant was unwilling to negotiate conditions that would alter the character of the proposal.

RESOLVED that outline planning permission for a mixed use development to provide a District Centre comprising uses within some or all of Classes (A1) with associated Garden Centre, A2 (Financial and Professional Services), A3 (Restaurants and Cafes), A5 (Hot Food Takeaway), D1 (Non-residential institutions), D2 (Leisure), associated means of access, access road, car parking, infrastructure works, public realm and landscaping be **REFUSED** for the following reasons:-

- 1) the application site forms a significant part of the Monkerton and Hill Barton strategic allocation area. The scale and function of the proposed development would not accord with, and would be prejudicial to the achievement of, the strategic objectives for 'around 2,500 dwellings, and around 5 hectares of employment land and all associated infrastructure' at the Monkerton and Hill Barton area as set out in Policy CP19 of the Core Strategy.
- 2) the proposed development would not accord with the retail strategy focussed on mixed use development at the Bus and Coach Station in Exeter city centre and would therefore be contrary to Policy CP8 of the Exeter Core Strategy;
- 3) the application has failed to satisfy the sequential test and has not demonstrated that the Exeter Bus and Coach Station site would not be suitable for the proposed town centre uses in accordance with Policy CP8 of the Core Strategy and paragraphs 24 and 27 of the National Planning Policy Framework;
- 4) the application has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not result in a significant adverse impact on committed and planned public and private investment in centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and on town centre vitality and viability in accordance with Policy CP8 of the Core Strategy and paragraphs 26 and 27 of the National Planning Policy Framework;
- 5) the application conflicts with Core Strategy policies CP8 and CP19. In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and Paragraph 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework it should therefore be refused as other material considerations do not indicate otherwise
- 6) contrary to paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework, adequate information has not been submitted to satisfy the Local Planning Authority that the proposal is acceptable in terms of access and impact on the highway network

110

LIST OF DECISIONS MADE AND WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

The report of the Assistant Director City Development was submitted.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

111

APPEALS REPORT

The schedule of appeal decisions and appeals lodged was submitted.

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

SITE INSPECTION PARTY

RESOLVED that the next Site Inspection Party will be held on Tuesday 16 December at 9.00 a.m. The Councillors attending will be Bialyk, Edwards and Lyons. The visits will include a visit to the Bricknells Bungalow site (Min. No. 107 above refers) (arriving at approximately 9.10 am) to which all Committee Members are invited.

(The meeting commenced at 5.30 pm and closed at 8.45 pm)

Chair