

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE
25 MAY 2016

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning & Development Control Committee of Flintshire County Council held at Council Chamber, County Hall, Mold on Wednesday, 25th May 2016

PRESENT: Councillor David Wisinger (Chairman)

Councillors: Marion Bateman, David Cox, Ian Dunbar, Ray Hughes, Christine Jones, Richard Jones, Richard Lloyd, Mike Lowe, Nancy Matthews, Mike Peers, Neville Phillips, Gareth Roberts, David Roney and Owen Thomas

SUBSTITUTIONS:

Councillor Paul Shotton for Chris Bithell, Ron Hampson for Derek Butler, Jim Falshaw for Alison Halford and Mike Reece for Billy Mullin

ALSO PRESENT:

The following Councillors attended as local Members:-

Councillor Dave Mackie for agenda item 8.1 and Councillor Haydn Bateman for agenda item 8.2

APOLOGY:

Councillor Carol Ellis

IN ATTENDANCE:

Chief Officer (Planning and Environment), Development Manager, Service Manager Strategy, Senior Engineer – Highways Development Control, Senior Planners, Planning Support Officer, Housing & Planning Solicitor and Committee Officer

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN

The Housing & Planning Solicitor advised that this item had been included in the agenda in error as the appointment of Councillor Wisinger as Chairman of the Committee had been made at the Council's Annual Meeting (AGM). He also read out a list of the Members on the Committee as this was the first meeting of the Committee since the AGM.

RESOLVED:

That the appointment of Councillor David Wisinger as Chairman of the Committee be noted.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR

The Chairman sought nominations for the appointment of Vice-Chair and Councillor Ray Hughes nominated Councillor Ian Dunbar. The nomination was duly seconded and on being put to the vote, was CARRIED. Councillor Dunbar thanked the Committee for their nomination.

RESOLVED:

That Councillor Ian Dunbar be appointed Vice-Chair of the Committee.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Dave Mackie declared an interest indicating that he had predetermined his stance on the following application and would therefore be speaking on application for up to three minutes and would then leave the Chamber:-

Agenda item 8.1 – Full application – Proposed individual vehicular access points for plots 2, 3 and 4 of previously consented Gypsy site at Magazine Lane, Ewloe (054322)

Councillor Carolyn Thomas indicated that she had a prejudicial interest in the following application as she was a school governor and would leave the chamber following addressing the Committee:-

Agenda item 8.2 – Outline application for the erection of 8 No. dwellings at Conway Street, Mold (054670)

4. LATE OBSERVATIONS

The Chairman allowed Members an opportunity to read the late observations which had been circulated at the meeting.

5. MINUTES

The draft minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 20th April 2016 had been circulated to Members with the agenda.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

6. ITEMS TO BE DEFERRED

The Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) advised that none of the items on the agenda were recommended for deferral by officers.

Councillor Mike Peers referred to agenda item 8.1 (Full application – Proposed individual vehicular access points for plots 2, 3 and 4 of previously consented Gypsy site at Magazine Lane, Ewloe – 054322) and indicated at the site visit, it had been felt that consideration of the application should be deferred as an appeal on another application for Plot 5 on the Magazine Lane site was pending. It was felt that the comments of the Appeal Inspector on that application should be considered in determining this application. The proposal to defer was duly seconded.

The Development Manager indicated that the application was recommended for approval and advised that the officer and the third party representatives should be allowed to speak and then if it was still felt that deferment was appropriate, it could be proposed at that point. Councillor Peers accepted the advice provided.

7. **FULL APPLICATION – PROPOSED VEHICULAR ACCESS POINTS FOR PLOTS 2, 3 & 4 OF PREVIOUSLY CONSENTED GYPSY SITE AT MAGAZINE LANE, EWLOE (054322)**

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) in respect of this application which had been the subject of a site visit on 23rd May 2016. The usual consultations had been undertaken and the responses received detailed in the report.

The officer detailed the background to the report and explained that this was an application for a new vehicular access for plots 2, 3 and 4. If permitted it would mean that there were four points of access to the site. The day rooms would remain in the same positions but the static caravan on plot 2 would need to be re-sited if the application was approved. The owner of plot 5 had submitted an appeal following refusal of an application in February 2016 for an access to that plot only and the reasons for refusal were reported in paragraph 7.06. Approval of the application for accesses for plots 2, 3 and 4 would require the removal of two sections of hedge both nine metres in width and the insertion of two pairs of wooden gates and a close boarded fence would be erected behind the existing roadside hedgerow within the site. A condition would also be imposed to ensure that the remaining hedge was enhanced to screen the boundary fencing. The officer advised that there were no objections from Highways colleagues subject to conditions reported at paragraph 3.01 and therefore the application was recommended for approval.

Mr. J. Golledge spoke against the application. He indicated that he was a member of Northop Hall Community Council but that the comments he was making today reflected his own views. He objected to the application on the grounds that it did not comply with the recommendations and conditions of two separate planning appeals. The application for the site had been approved by the appeal Inspector despite it being recognised by the Inspector that the site would have an impact on the green barrier and an urbanising effect on the open countryside. However, the report failed to acknowledge the fact that at the appeal hearing, the Inspector had stated that all trees and hedgerow should be retained in the course of construction and the applicant had committed to improve the screening. Mr. Golledge said that maintenance of the natural screening was important to local residents and failure to recognise this in the report to the Committee was a serious omission. The Inspectors at both hearings had required the retention of the hedgerow and natural screening and any breach of the natural screening therefore contravened this. He felt that had these accesses been required they should have been taken into account when considering the application for the site on appeal and Mr. Golledge felt that they would have a harmful impact on the rural environment.

Mr. M. Nickson, Landscape Architect for the applicant, spoke in support of the application. He indicated that the five plot site under construction already had

planning permission and would be built so it was effectively part of the community. This application would provide secondary access points and would mean the removal of two sections of hedgerow and the addition of access drives and timber gates. He commented on the countryside views to the north which would be unaffected by the application and spoke of what could be seen to the south of the site and it was therefore felt that this application would not interfere with the open countryside character of the area. The proposal had been sympathetically designed in materials already approved as part of the boundary treatment which would not alter if this application was approved. The accesses had been grouped together to reduce their impact and to mitigate the removal of two sections of hedgerow, a landscape scheme would be produced and would assist in improving the habitat for local wildlife. On the issue of safety and nuisance, Mr. Nickson said that there was currently only one access in and out of the site and therefore secondary accesses would reduce the risks to residents of the site in cases of emergency. It would also reduce the nuisance from headlights of vehicles returning to the site during unsociable hours and would improve the access to the site by emergency vehicles if the original access was blocked. He implored the Committee to consider the safety of the residents in their deliberations on the application.

The Local Member, Councillor Dave Mackie, spoke against the application. He said that this was an exception site in the green barrier and reiterated the earlier comments by Mr. Golledge that the inspector had included a condition to retain the trees and hedgerow during construction as he had indicated that screening of the site was important. Councillor Mackie said that creating the new openings would damage the screening and suggested that the previously approved plans showed fences around each plot which mitigated the headlight issue referred to by Mr. Nickson. He also added that most residential homes did not have a secondary access and therefore as the proposals conflicted with the Inspector's condition to retain the trees, he suggested that the application should be refused. Having earlier declared an interest, Councillor Mackie left the chamber prior to the discussion.

Councillor Ian Dunbar proposed the recommendation for approval which was duly seconded. He stated that at the site visit it had been pointed out to Members where the accesses would be and it was reported that the remaining hedge would be enhanced to screen the boundary fencing. He felt that the extra access was necessary to assist in access by any emergency vehicles. Councillor Dunbar referred to the criteria that was set by Welsh Government on the provision of Gypsy sites and suggested that it was important to consider the site, which was away from other properties, in a sensible way.

In referring to the appeal decision that was awaited for the access to plot 5 and the remarks of the Inspector which he felt were a material consideration, Councillor Gareth Roberts said that he was bemused by the recommendation to grant the application. He commented on the reason of secondary access but spoke of many residential developments that only had one access in and out. He also expressed concern that it was commented by Mr. Nickson that the removal of the hedge would not have an effect on the landscape. Councillor Roberts said that the site was in the green barrier and he could therefore see no reason to support approval of the application.

Councillor Mike Peers highlighted the recommendation where it was reported that the proposed additional accesses and the proposed gates were not considered to have any significant harm to the impact of the site on the green barrier; he disagreed with this statement. He welcomed the comments of the Local Member, Councillor Mackie, particularly on the conditions referred to by the Inspector for the retention of the hedgerow. In drawing Members' attention to paragraph 7.06 where the refusal reason for plot 5 at the 24th February 2016 meeting of the Committee was reported, he said that it was a similar application to what was before Members today. He expressed significant concern at the removal of 18 metres of hedgerow and highlighted the comments in paragraph 7.11 that a condition could be imposed to ensure that the remaining hedge was enhanced to screen the boundary fencing. Councillor Peers referred to, and expressed concern about, the provision of the close boarded fences and the gates. He did not feel that the requirement for secondary accesses because of the nuisance caused by headlights was a planning consideration and he also spoke of developments in his ward with one access in and out. He suggested that the requirement for access by emergency services was not plausible and said that one access had been approved by the Inspector with the inclusion of a condition to enhance the remaining hedging. He added that he could not support approval of the application.

Councillor Richard Jones said that he had considered the remarks of the Inspector that the site was well screened and therefore views into the site were limited. He said that the Inspector had carefully determined the weight attached to his decision and the inclusion of conditions when considering how the site was viewed from the road and Councillor Jones felt that any changes to that could have a detrimental impact on the area and may have changed the appeal decision if they had been put forward at the time. He spoke of the piecemeal way that the decision of the Inspector was being changed which he felt was wrong and added that, in his opinion, the application should be refused.

Councillor Owen Thomas referred to the first of many visits to the site and the fact that at that time, the A55 could not be seen because of the amount of vegetation in place. However, on the visit earlier in the week, the A55 could clearly be seen due to removal of a large amount of hedging. He felt that the provision of wooden fences did not constitute a hedge and suggested that the site would never blend into the countryside. Councillor Thomas indicated that at least one caravan on the site was being lived in and queried whether this was being considered by the Enforcement Team. He concurred that consideration of the application should be deferred until the appeal had been determined and the decision known.

On the issue of deferment, the officer advised that there was a duty to consider the application in a reasonable time and that not considering it would allow the applicant to appeal on the grounds of non-determination. The Development Manager concurred and said that a report would need to be submitted to this Committee to establish the stance to be taken at any such appeal. In urging the Members to make a decision on the proposals, he said that it was the view of officers that there was no reason to defer the application. The Service Manager Strategy said that Members needed to determine the application before them and that they needed to take account of what harm the proposals would have on the area. On

the references to the green barrier, the Inspector had recognised that there would be an impact but the need for more Gypsy and Traveller sites outweighed that harm.

In summing up, Councillor Dunbar concurred that a non-determination appeal was an option for the applicant if the decision was deferred. He added that issues such as drainage and the provision of enhancing the hedgerow had been addressed.

On being put to the vote, the proposal to approve the application was LOST. In response to a request from officers for a reason for refusal, Councillor Roberts said that the outcome of the appeal for the access to plot 5 was not yet known and that was a material consideration for the determination of this application. The Service Manager Strategy said that the refusal must be based on sound planning reasons which identified the planning harm that approving the application would cause. Councillor Peers suggested that it should be refused as 'the creation of new access points consisting of the erection of wooden gates and the loss of 18 metres of mature hedgerow would have a detrimental effect upon the character of the open countryside and the green barrier in this location contrary to policies GEN3 and GEN4'.

On being put to the vote, the reason for refusal was CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused as the creation of new access points consisting of the erection of wooden gates and the loss of 18 metres of mature hedgerow would have a detrimental effect upon the character of the open countryside and the green barrier in this location contrary to policies GEN3 and GEN4.

After the vote had been taken, Councillor Mackie did not return to the Chamber.

8. OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF 8 NO. DWELLINGS AT CONWAY STREET, MOLD (054670)

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) in respect of this application which had been the subject of a site visit on 23rd May 2016. The usual consultations had been undertaken and the responses received detailed in the report. Additional comments received since the preparation of the report were circulated at the meeting.

The officer detailed the background to the report and he explained that the site was in a flood risk area and the applicant had submitted a Flood Consequences Assessment which had been considered; no objections had been raised. There was an error in paragraph 7.07 and the officer explained that the words 'not only for vehicles emerging from the site' should be replaced with 'not only for vehicles entering the site'. When considering the design and amenity of the site, the design and access statement provided indications of the parameters of scale of the proposed dwellings but all detailed design issues, except access, were reserved for future approval. The officer provided details of the Section 106 obligations attached

to an approval of the application and the compliance with Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) regulations was reported. The main issues were access and highways impact. The Senior Engineer – Highways Development Control confirmed that there were no objections from Highways, subject to conditions. She added that Conway Street was part of the adopted highway and the layout of the road was adequate for simultaneous passing of two vehicles. It had been noted on the site visit that there was parking by residents of the terraced properties on the opposite side of Conway Street. A question had also been asked about the number of buses to the school that accessed the street and the Senior Engineer confirmed that this was nine in total. The site was not dissimilar to any other site in close proximity to a school in that there were peak times in the morning and afternoon but generally the area was quiet outside of these times.

Councillor Carolyn Thomas declared that she was Chair of the Buildings Committee and a School Governor at Ysgol Maes Garmon. She said that many of the Governors would be pleased that the site was to be developed but strongly opposed this application on access and highway safety grounds. Conway Street was narrow and the traffic could only move in one direction because of parked vehicles and there were no pull-ins or turning points. She said that school buses often had to mount the pavement to make the turn from Wrexham Road into Conway Street because of the narrow junction. There was no traffic or pedestrian management system in place and Councillor Thomas raised concern for the safety of the students who walked along Conway Street to access the school or the sports centre. She spoke of the eight coaches, taxis and a minibus that accessed the area in the afternoon to collect pupils from the school and she commented on the staff cars that also needed to access and leave the school site at these peak times along with service and delivery vehicles in the area throughout the day. There were concerns for pupils crossing Conway Street where it joined with Wrexham Road particularly at the start and end of the school day. All of the issues highlighted meant that pupils on foot were already at risk once they left the school gate and the provision of eight dwellings would exacerbate the situation as vehicles would be obliged to cross the pavement that was currently the safest access route to the school for pedestrians. Councillor Thomas indicated that the site had previously been granted planning permission but a condition had been imposed that access was to be onto Brooke Street, not Conway Street. Having earlier declared an interest in the application, Councillor Thomas left the Chamber prior to its discussion.

Mr. D. Jennings, the agent for the applicant, acknowledged some of the concerns raised but did not feel that the proposal would worsen the situation. He explained that the application would not result in any additional parking on Conway Street as parking standards had been complied with and parking was within the site boundary. He added that even though the street was busy at peak school times, it was quieter during the rest of the day and suggested that vehicles parked on Conway Street acted as a traffic management system. Conway Street was not long and there was a break in the parking where two properties had created accesses for off street parking. It acted as a useful passing place and this proposal would create an additional passing place. Mr. Jennings said that in the 55 years that the school had existed, there had not been one reported accident. There was no turning point in Conway Street but Mr. Jennings said that the access to his property was

used by vehicles to turn so a significant benefit of the scheme was that the new access point for this development would act as a virtual turning head. He added that three existing access points to the land would be replaced by one and the traffic generated by the additional eight dwellings would be small and the traffic generated by the school was also low in number and was predictable at peak school times. Mr. Jennings said that at weekends, in the evenings and during school holidays there was very little traffic in the street. He added that another benefit of the scheme was that it would provide eight homes for local people and was in a sustainable location in Mold.

Councillor Marion Bateman proposed refusal of the application, against officer recommendation, which was duly seconded. She felt that the concerns of the School Governors should be taken into account when determining the application. She raised concern that the report did not take account of the chaos that occurred twice a day in the area apart from the last sentence of paragraph 7.07 where it was reported 'that the visibility took account of the inter visibility between pedestrians and vehicles and the officer was satisfied that adequate provision could be made to ensure no detriment to highway or pedestrian safety'. She sought clarification on the evidence that the officer had on this issue and on a condition in a previous application on the site that access could not be onto Conway Street. Councillor M. Bateman said that Members had been advised on the previous application on the agenda that they should consider what harm an application would create and therefore because of the risks to safety to school children and residents that this application would cause, she reiterated her proposal of refusal.

In seconding the refusal, Councillor Dave Cox said that it was obvious as the site visit that there were apparent dangers on Conway Street and it did not matter whether it was only busy for a short amount of time. He felt that the problem could be solved by widening Conway Street and that this could be easily achieved.

The Local Member, Councillor Haydn Bateman spoke against the application. He said that Conway Street was narrow and was the only street that led to the entrance to Ysgol Maes Garmon. On the site visit, the narrowness had been noted and the street was reduced to a single lane because of on-street parking and this allowed damage to some cars by buses accessing the school. He expressed significant concern for the safety of the pupils and other pedestrians and he highlighted the condition imposed on application 045711 for the site that no access should be onto Conway Street because of safety concerns. The entrance would have been onto Brooke Street and those residents had no objections to the proposed dwellings but objected strongly to the entrance onto Conway Street. Councillor Bateman asked the Committee to refuse the application on the grounds recommended by the officers on application 045711 to safeguard the amenity of nearby residents by not permitting any vehicular access onto Conway Street.

Councillor Gareth Roberts said that he did not feel that there were any reasons to refuse the application and added that the width of the road met the standards in the Council's policies. The road was straight and did not restrict visibility and he agreed with the agent that the proposal could improve the issue of road safety as the access could be used as a turning or passing point. He felt that if the application was refused, then the applicant could appeal and the decision

would be overturned and costs awarded against the Council as there were no grounds to refuse it.

In seeking clarity, Councillor Mike Peers asked why this recommendation had not included a condition for no vehicular access onto Conway Street. Councillor Owen Thomas felt that the original application with an access onto Brooke Street was more appropriate.

In response to the comments made, the officer said that the evidence for the conclusion on visibility was from comments during discussions with Highways colleagues and it had been agreed that the proposal would not cause any harm. The suggestion to widen Conway Street was not before the Committee in this application and the officer explained that this site was now much smaller than the proposal for an access only onto Brooke Street and was now constrained by the application for a convenience store on a nearby site. He reminded Members that they needed to consider the application before them but added that the access onto Brooke Street had been suggested for the previous site because it was for more dwellings and it was felt that there was an increased risk of harm than from the eight dwellings currently proposed.

Councillor M. Bateman, in summing up, felt that the suggestion by the agent that the access to the site could be used as a turning or passing point could not be considered. She also spoke of the perceived harm and the exacerbated risk to pupils and other pedestrians and said that she was proposing refusal in the interests of safeguarding the amenity of existing residents by not permitting any vehicular access onto Conway Street.

The Service Manager Strategy said that the new access would give road users a choice of how they used the public highway and the Planning Officer confirmed that the access would be provided to an adoptable standard. The Service Manager Strategy sought clarification on the reason for refusal and said that the predominant debate had been on highway safety and asked whether Councillor M. Bateman was including the impact on the safety of the pupils too; Councillor Bateman confirmed that she was.

On being put to the vote, the proposal to refuse the application was LOST and therefore the officer recommendation of approval with a Section 106 agreement was CARRIED.

RESOLVED:

That planning permission be granted subject to conditions detailed in the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) and subject to the applicant entering either into a Section 106 agreement, providing a unilateral undertaking or the making of an advance payment which provided for the following:-

1. Ensure the payment of a commuted sum equivalent to £1100 per dwelling in lieu of on site play and recreation provisions. Such sum to be paid to be used as a contribution towards the upgrade of play facilities at the existing children play

area at Llys Pont y Garreg, Mold. Such sum to be paid upon occupation of 50% of the approved dwellings.

2. Ensure the payment of a commuted sum of £24,514 as a contribution to the provision of additional external areas for the teaching of physical education as part of the national curriculum at Glanrafon C.P. School. Such sum to be payable before the commencement of development.

After the vote had been taken, Councillor Carolyn Thomas returned to the meeting.

9. GENERAL MATTERS – CHANGE OF USE OF VACANT POLICE HOUSE (FORMERLY A DWELLING) INTO A 9 BEDROOM HMO AND ASSOCIATED ACCESS IMPROVEMENTS AT 63 HIGH STREET, SALTNEY (054886)

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) in respect of this application.

The officer explained that the report had been submitted to the Committee to clarify the reasons for refusal which were reported in paragraph 6.03 and 6.04.

Councillor Richard Lloyd proposed the recommendation in the report but asked that an additional reason for refusal be added due to the problems that could be caused to pedestrian safety by the recycling and waste collections.

In referring to paragraph 6.02 where it was reported that there were no specific policies relating to Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMO), Councillor Mike Peers asked if this issue could be considered by the Planning Strategy Group to provide some guidelines or policy. The Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) confirmed that HMOs could be considered by the Planning Strategy Group.

Councillor Gareth Roberts supported the recommendation for two refusal reasons as it was felt that to add any additional reasons that may not be as strong, could weaken the Council's argument at appeal. The Service Manager Planning Strategy concurred and said that the refusal reasons had been drafted as it was felt that they were defensible at appeal. Councillor Richard Lloyd accepted the advice and withdrew his request for an extra reason for refusal.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused for the reasons reported in paragraphs 6.03 and 6.04 of the report.

Agenda items 10 to 12 were reported to Members for information.

10. GENERAL MATTERS – PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT FOR THE ERECTION OF 12 NO. DWELLINGS INCLUDING DEMOLITION OF EXISTING OUTBUILDINGS AND CREATION OF NEW ACCESS AT BANK FARM, LOWER MOUNTAIN ROAD, PENYFFORDD (052377)

The Committee considered the report of the Chief Officer (Planning and Environment) in respect of this application.

The Chief Officer explained that the report informed Members of the First Minister's decision in relation to the called-in decision of the Planning and Development Control Committee of 17 December 2014 where planning permission was approved. The application was called in by the First Minister and an informal appeal hearing took place on 7 October 2015 where the Inspector recommended that planning permission be granted. However, the First Minister disagreed and concluded the planning permission should be refused. The main issues that had been considered were:-

- The effect on the open countryside
- Development Plan Policy
- Previously developed land
- Proximity to the settlement
- Changes since the previous Call-in decision

In the conclusion at paragraph 6.12, it was reported that the First Minister reached a different decision to the Inspector on the issue of sustainability and it was suggested that as they had reached different views, the decision was finely balanced. It was felt that the First Minister had not acted unreasonably and therefore there was little prospect of a successful challenge of the decision and the period to request a judicial review had also passed.

Councillor Owen Thomas said that the professional opinion of the Appeal Inspector had been to approve the application and he expressed significant concern about the involvement of the First Minister for a site for 12 dwellings which he felt were much needed. Councillor Richard Jones said that he thought he knew what was classed as sustainable applications but this decision had made him doubt what he knew. He referred to the application at Warren Hall and sought clarification on why there were differences in the determination of approval for that application and refusal for this site.

In taking a different view, Councillor Gareth Roberts said that he was encouraged that the First Minister had looked at this application in detail and on balance had determined that it should be refused. He commented on some decisions made recently by the Planning Inspectors and welcomed the opportunity to be able to challenge the decisions made by Appeal Inspectors.

Councillor Mike Peers highlighted paragraph 6.07 on previously developed land and in referring to the Meadowslea site, queried whether the First Minister would have made the same statement on the application.

11. **APPEAL BY MR. A. EVANS AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE AMENDED APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF AN AGRICULTURAL STORAGE BUILDING (PART RETROSPECTIVE) AT FRON HAUL, BRYNSANNAN, BRNFORD (053690)**

12. **APPEAL BY MR. T. CLARKE AGAINST THE DECISION OF FLINTSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL TO REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE ERECTION OF INDUSTRIAL UNITS AT PISTYLL FARM, NERCWYS (053238)**

13. **MEMBERS OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC IN ATTENDANCE**

There were 7 members of the public in attendance.

(The meeting started at 1.00 pm and ended at 2.33 pm.)

.....
Chairman