

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Thursday, 24 June 2021 at 6.00pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor J S Back

Councillors: R S Walkden  
M Bates  
D G Beaney  
E A Biggs  
T A Bond  
D G Cronk  
P D Jull  
O C de R Richardson  
C F Woodgate

Officers: Principal Planner  
Principal Planner  
Principal Planner  
Senior Planner  
Planning Consultant  
Planning Solicitor  
Democratic Services Officer

The following persons were also present and spoke in relation to the following applications:

<u>Application No</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>
DOV/21/00500	-----	Ms Margherita Bennetts
DOV/20/01447	Mr Reece Lemon	Mr Peter Breen
DOV/20/00589	Mr Mark Hall	Mr Chris Saville
DOV/21/00284 & DOV/21/00567	-----	Mrs Claire Owen Mr Gerald Irvine Councillor M Bates

13 APOLOGIES

It was noted that there were no apologies for absence.

14 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

There were no substitute members appointed.

15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor P D Jull made a Voluntary Announcement of Other Interests in relation to Agenda Item 8 (Application No DOV/20/00589 - The Old Rectory, Mongeham Church Close, Great Mongeham) by reason that he, like the applicant, was a member of Deal and Walmer Chamber of Trade. He also stated that he knew some of the objectors. However, he was of the view that none of these persons was an 'Associated Person' for the purposes of the Kent Model Code of Conduct.

Councillor M Bates advised that he had been representing residents in relation to Agenda Item 9 (Application Nos DOV/21/00284 & DOV/21/00567 – Larkspur, 36-38 The Droveaway, St Margaret's Bay, Dover). He had registered to speak against the application under the public speaking arrangements, and would absent himself from the Chamber after doing so on the grounds of predetermination.

16 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 27 May 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

17 ITEMS DEFERRED

The Chairman advised that the deferred items would be coming forward in due course.

18 APPLICATION NO DOV/21/0500 - UNITED REFORMED CHURCH, THE STREET, ASH

The Committee was shown drawings, plans and photographs of the application site which was situated within The Street, Ash Conservation Area. The Planning Consultant advised that the application sought to vary conditions imposed on a planning permission granted in 2020 for the change of use of two church buildings to dwellings, along with external alterations. The variations sought changes to the roof of the church hall building by altering the design and location of the approved rooflights, the introduction of new rooflights and the relocation of an approved flue. The variation to the church building sought to change stained glass to clear glass in six windows on the ground floor. As a correction to the report, he advised that the heading below paragraph 2.19 should read planning balance.

The Committee was advised that the request to replace the stained-glass windows with clear glass was considered a reasonable one given that they mainly served the living area which would benefit from the improved outlook. The principal and most key stained-glass windows, nine in total, which were more visible from public vantage points, would be retained. Whilst there would be some loss to the historic significance of the church building, this was considered to cause less than substantial harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The changes and additions to the rooflights in the church hall building were considered to be acceptable overall, albeit they had not been installed flush with the roof slope. Through this application it was proposed to impose a condition that would ensure that the rooflights to be installed in the church building would be set flush with the roof slope which would be an improvement to the extant planning permission. Securing the optimum, residential use of the building, the retention of the remaining stained-glass windows and the installation of rooflights in the church building that would be flush with the roof slope were considered to be public benefits which outweighed the less than substantial harm identified, and approval was therefore recommended.

Councillor D G Cronk queried the planning benefit of clear windows and what would happen to the old windows. He also asked whether it was possible to put a restriction on removing more stained-glass windows. The Planning Consultant confirmed that a condition would ensure that the remaining stained-glass windows were left in situ. Clear windows would give the occupiers an outlook which was a benefit in terms of making the optimum use of the building as a dwelling. Councillor M Bates asked whether the heritage value of the windows had been taken into

account when coming to a recommendation to approve their removal. He commented that he was not entirely comfortable with recommending their removal given their age and heritage value. Councillor T A Bond expressed concerns about the windows and rooflights, arguing that conditions had been attached for a reason. The buildings made a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and removing the windows would therefore have an impact. Councillor O C de R Richardson agreed, commenting that the loss of the windows was problematic for him and, until the Heritage Officer had given her views, he was not convinced that their removal would not cause significant historical harm. He suggested that the application be deferred pending further information from the Heritage Officer and the Head of Museums and Tourism.

The Planning Consultant advised that the view of Officers was that the removal of the windows would cause less than substantial harm. He emphasised that amendments were not being sought to the rooflights in the church building. That said, those proposals would now benefit from a condition being added to ensure they were installed flush to the roof plane. He stressed that the stained-glass windows of most note would remain. He suggested that a condition could be imposed to ensure that the windows were not destroyed after removal. He noted that planning permission had been granted in 2019 for the church hall building to be demolished so to refuse additional rooflights might appear unnecessarily draconian given that the building had been saved. Whilst the Heritage Officer had not been asked to comment on the application, Officers were confident that she would not have come to a different conclusion. Whilst the condition requiring retention of the windows had been imposed for a reason, that did not prevent the applicant from changing their mind and applying for variations. It was a balanced decision, and the Committee would need to weigh up the public benefits against the limited harm that would arise from the windows' removal.

In response to Councillor E A Biggs, the Planning Consultant clarified that some works to the hall building had already commenced without permission. He explained that, whilst a non-designated heritage asset was one that was not listed, it was considered to be of historical interest. Whilst such assets could not be protected statutorily, they had a value which meant that their alteration or demolition would be subject to scrutiny. The Principal Planner advised that the Head of Museums and Tourism would not normally be consulted on such a matter. However, she agreed that the Heritage Officer could confer with him when preparing her comments for the Committee.

RESOLVED: That, notwithstanding the Officer's recommendation, Application No DOV/21/00500 be DEFERRED pending advice on the stained-glass windows from the Council's Heritage Officer (to include conferral with the Head of Museums and Tourism).

19 APPLICATION NO DOV/20/01447 - LAND AT NORTH POULDERS, ASH ROAD, SANDWICH

Members viewed drawings, plans and photographs of the site which lay to the east of the Sandwich by-pass and north of Ash Road. The Principal Planner advised that the site, which covered around seven hectares, was largely flat and currently used for intermittent grazing. Planning permission was sought to use the site for water-based recreation, including the creation of a shallow lake for wakeboarding and an aqua park. The excavated material would be used to create low bunds around the lake and up to the existing bypass embankment. Areas in the northern and eastern parts of the site would be set aside as enhanced habitats for wildlife,

including a wildlife meadow, ditches and scrubland. The proposed built development would be limited to two single storey buildings at the southern end of the site.

He went on to advise that the site was well connected to the strategic road network. Moreover, the proposal would be a significant addition to the range of leisure and sporting facilities in the district, and had strong support from the Council's Inward Investment team. The site was relatively self-contained in visual terms, with the bypass embankment providing a visual barrier that separated it from the wider countryside to the north and west. Most of the site was in flood zone 3, but the Environment Agency and Kent County Council (KCC) were content that, subject to conditions, the development would not cause additional problems in terms of flooding. Whilst there had been a lot of concern locally about the potential for noise, the noise assessment indicated that noise levels would be well below background noise levels.

In response to concerns expressed by a public speaker about health and safety, the Principal Planner advised that, whilst important, they were not material planning considerations. Restrictions on the number of visitors had been raised by KCC in the context of car parking and traffic flow. If numbers were a concern for Members, a condition could be attached requiring the applicant to submit details of a scheme to limit visitors.

In response to points made by Councillor D G Beaney, the Principal Planner advised that larger tree species could be required for planting on the bunds to ensure the site was well screened and to encourage wildlife. In response to a concern raised by Councillor Richardson about the vagueness of the condition citing dusk as the hour of closure, he advised that there was no intention to operate the site after dark as this would require significant lighting and lead to light pollution. Rather than dusk, he suggested that the condition could be amended to refer to closing half an hour before sunset or something similar. In terms of health and safety, the applicant would need a licence from the national wakeboarding federation and be expected to comply with any standards set by them.

Councillor Bond commented that the depth of the water, number of visitors and health and safety were operational matters and not a planning concern. The Planning Solicitor agreed that the health and safety of customers was not a material planning consideration. Such matters were covered by separate legislation and it was for the operator to take steps to comply with that legislation. The only consideration for the Committee was whether the proposal was an acceptable use of the land in planning terms. The Principal Planner clarified that the applicant had stated that the park would be closed to other customers when there were competitions in order to keep numbers down and control traffic.

**RESOLVED:** (a) That Application No DOV/20/01447 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (a) Standard commencement condition;
- (b) List of approved plans;
- (c) Submission of details of appearance of masts;
- (d) Implementation of landscaping scheme (to include the use of larger species, and enhanced planting on the bund closest to the road);

- (e) Provision of car parking (including submission of surfacing material);
- (f) Provision of new access, vehicular crossing and sight lines, before occupation;
- (g) Existing access to be closed;
- (h) Limitation on use of retained access – emergency only;
- (i) Buildings to be constructed at the agreed slab level;
- (j) Provision of cycle parking;
- (k) Submission of a detailed drainage scheme regarding the diversion of the watercourse;
- (l) Submission of verification report regarding the above;
- (m) Development to be carried out in accordance with recommendations of the FRA;
- (n) Observance of Environment Agency by-law margin;
- (o) Submission of details of foul water package treatment plant;
- (p) Submission of, and adherence to, Construction Management Plan;
- (q) Walkover inspection of site for water voles and other animals prior to construction commencing;
- (r) Submission of, and adherence to, detailed ecological enhancement and management plan;
- (s) Submission and approval of external lighting;
- (t) Archaeological investigation;
- (u) No competition or similar events to be staged unless and until an event management plan has been approved, and thereafter to conform to the approved plan;
- (v) No external public address system to be installed unless details have first been approved;
- (w) Control over opening hours (including to close before darkness falls – a precise time to be defined in relation to sunset);
- (x) Implementation of Travel Plan;

(y) Submission of details to demonstrate compliance with principles of Secured by Design.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions, in line with the issues set out in the report and as resolved by the Planning Committee, and to draft and issue a Statement of Reasons.

20

APPLICATION NO DOV/20/00589 - THE OLD RECTORY, MONGEHAM CHURCH CLOSE, GREAT MONGEHAM

The Committee was shown an aerial view, drawings, a plan and photographs of the application site which was situated within the settlement confines of Great Mongeham and within a conservation area. The Senior Planner advised that planning permission was sought for a change of use of land as a wedding and events venue, with the erection of a marquee and works to an outbuilding to facilitate its conversion to a toilet block. As an update to the report, she advised that further objections had been received which raised no new matters for consideration. Comments had also been received from KCC's Public Rights of Way (PROW) team in response to re-consultation. Its objection by reason that there would be a significant increase in traffic using Mongeham Church Close which was also a PROW had now been lifted.

Members were advised that the main dwelling on the site, the Old Rectory, was a Grade II-listed building whose walled garden would be used for civil ceremonies. The number of weddings or events would be restricted to 30 per year, with a maximum number of 50 guests. There would be 17 parking spaces without the need for double parking. Noise levels would be controlled by the use of a noise limiter. Whilst the proposal would cause a short-term increase in traffic and competition for on-street parking during events, the public benefits of the scheme were considered to outweigh these negative aspects, the benefits being the bringing back into use of a disused listed outbuilding and the promotion of expenditure within the local economy which would contribute towards the social viability of the area. Furthermore, it was considered that the proposal would not cause harm to the rural character and appearance of the surrounding area, nor would it cause harm to the living conditions of neighbouring occupants or to wildlife habitats.

In response to Members' queries and concerns, the Senior Planner advised that a disabled car parking space could be included, and that the toilet block would be accessible by wheelchair. She explained that the improved visibility splays at Mongeham Church Close and Northbourne Road were required because of the intensification in the use of the access (currently limited to residential use) that would arise from the proposal. KCC Highways had recommended the provision of a bus-stop clearway in Northbourne Road to prevent undesirable parking across the bus-stop. The Principal Planner clarified that the requirement to provide a minimum number of parking spaces rather than a maximum had followed from advice given by KCC Highways.

Councillor Bates questioned why KCC's PROW team had withdrawn its objection. Whilst 30 weddings a year did not appear to be many, the majority of them were likely to take place between May and August which meant an average of at least one wedding a week. 17 parking spaces for 50 guests was not sufficient in his view. Guests would almost certainly park in Northbourne Road and in Mongeham Church Close, causing congestion and inconvenience for local residents. Furthermore, the frequency of these events during the summer months would impede local residents'

enjoyment of their gardens. Councillor Richardson agreed, commenting that traffic congestion would be a weekly occurrence during the summer months. He expressed concerns about noise levels and questioned why the proposed visibility splays did not conform with the current guidance.

The Senior Planner advised that the applicant had initially proposed 60 events per year with a maximum number of 200 guests per wedding. The application had been 'live' for a year and there had been a good deal of consultation during that time with KCC Highways which had withdrawn its objection on the grounds that the highways impact would not be severe. A minibus service for guests would help to reduce the number of cars, and the submission of a travel management plan had been attached as a condition, the latter requiring approval by KCC Highways. In respect of noise issues, the Principal Planner advised that advice had been sought from the Environmental Health team which had carried out tests at the site. The recommendation was based on their expert advice. The installation of a noise limiter would be required by condition. The Chairman clarified that a noise limiter would automatically cut off the music if it exceeded a certain number of decibels.

Councillor Bond queried where catering and other support staff would park. He was sceptical about plans to bus guests in from Deal given the pressure of parking in that town. Whilst a travel management plan was well intended, it was his view that a significant number of guests would do whatever was most convenient for themselves, including parking where they liked. He expressed concerns about the impact on the church, particularly if it was holding weddings at the same time as the application site. In his view parking and traffic had not been properly addressed and would have a significant impact on local residents and the church. He commented that condition 15, as currently worded, would probably enable the applicant to keep the marquee up all through the summer months given the probable frequency of weddings and other events. Whilst the proposal ticked some boxes, it was in the wrong area.

The Senior Planner stressed that, unless the travel management plan was found to be satisfactory by KCC Highways, the condition could not be discharged and the applicant would be in breach of conditions. She clarified that the condition relating to the marquee was there because the dates of events were unknown and it would ensure that it was not left up for the entire year. The background to the visibility splays was set out in paragraphs 2.18 and 2.19 of the report. As a result of discrepancies between the visibility splays shown in legal documents and those physically evident, KCC Highways had recommended that a topographical survey should be undertaken. The survey had been reviewed by KCC Highways and, whilst the splays were not in accordance with current guidance, they would be an improvement on the current situation once vegetation had been cut back by the highway authority.

In response to a suggestion by Councillor Beaney, the Principal Planner advised that conditions could be strengthened to require that parking on site was to be used only for guests. In addition, the minibus service could be designated for both guests and staff. She advised Members that they had the option to grant temporary planning permission which would allow the applicants to test their travel management plan. The Senior Planner clarified that the applicants had stated that they would not park on site when events were on and this could be conditioned. Councillor Beaney stated that he was in favour of supporting a local business if conditions could be strengthened in the ways suggested, including a reduction in the number of events to 25. It was not a large wedding venue and he believed that many people would travel together by car.

It was moved by Councillor D G Beaney and duly seconded that Application No DOV/20/00589 be APPROVED as per the report recommendation subject to amendments/additions to conditions as follows: (a) 3-year temporary permission; (b) Number of weddings/events being reduced to a maximum of 25 per year and number of heads to 50 per event; (c) Removal of the bus-stop clearway at the stop in Northbourne Road; (d) Provision of a minimum of 17 car parking spaces as shown on the plans, to include a disabled parking space; (e) Provision of a guest and staff minibus service between the venue and locations in Deal; and (f) Provision of a Travel Management Plan to encourage sustainable travel including measures regarding staff parking and owners parking off-site during events.

On being put to the vote, the motion FAILED.

It was moved by Councillor T A Bond and duly seconded that Application No DOV/20/00589 be DEFERRED to allow the applicants to explore the possibility of providing additional on-site parking and for further details of the traffic management plan.

On being put to the vote, the motion was CARRIED.

RESOLVED: That, notwithstanding the Officer's recommendation, Application No DOV/20/00589 be DEFERRED pending further details of the traffic management plan and to enable the applicants to explore options for additional on-site parking.

## 21 ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING

The meeting was adjourned at 8.51pm for a short break and reconvened at 8.55pm.

## 22 APPLICATION NOS DOV/21/00284 & DOV/21/00567 - LARKSPUR, 36-38 THE DROVEWAY, ST MARGARET'S BAY, DOVER

Members viewed an aerial view, drawings, plans and photographs of the application site. The Principal Planner advised that, since the report was published, the applicant had made representations. Essentially, the applicant disagreed with the committee report. He contested the distance of the dwellings from other houses, and stated that the relocation of the access steps to the middle had been done on the advice of the Council's Building Control team. Moreover, he disputed the height of the garages and contested that the retaining wall had been built to the permitted height. He had advised that the grass bank would be reinstated after completion, and that overshadowing would be less not more. Finally, the applicant had advised that he would appeal if conditions were imposed on any planning permission granted.

The Principal Planner advised Members that planning permission had been granted for the site under DOV/17/01137 for the erection of two detached dwellings and detached garages, with the existing dwelling to be demolished. An application had subsequently been made in 2019 to vary conditions 2 and 3 of this permission and it had been granted (DOV/19/01130). An application made in 2020 (DOV/20/01316) seeking variations to DOV/17/01137 had been refused. There had been other refusals and these were set out in section d) of the report. There were now two further applications for the Committee to consider: DOV/21/00284 which was similar to the previously refused application, and DOV/21/00567 which sought to make amendments to the scheme approved under DOV/17/01137.



If approved as recommended, DOV/21/00284 would see the removal of the retaining wall and the reinstatement of the grass bank originally proposed; a reduction in the height of the garages by half a metre and no green roof; amendments to the front elevation windows and proposed cladding to lessen the appearance of height; the removal of proposed chimneys; and the addition of kitchen windows at ground floor level. DOV/21/00567 sought amendments such that the retaining wall and chimneys would be retained; there would be no reduction in garage heights, the cladding would be as originally proposed and there would be no attempt to reduce the vertical emphasis of the buildings. It was recommended that the latter application, which would 'undo' the positive aspects of DOV/21/00284, should be refused.

The Principal Planner acknowledged that the site, which was thought to be an ancient burial mound, was a problematic one to develop due to its raised level. The concept behind Officers' decisions relating to the site was to prevent harm to the amenity of neighbours and to retain the soft green character of the road at this point. The dwellings as originally approved had been designed to minimise overlooking and overbearing on neighbours. Whilst DOV/21/00284 was considered acceptable, application DOV/21/00567 sought to bring back all the elements of the dwellings that Officers had previously sought to tone down.

Addressing some of the key issues that had arisen during the application history of the site, the Principal Planner advised that the applicant had expressed concerns about the measurements quoted in the refusal of DOV/20/01316. However, following a site visit and new on-site measurements being taken, it had become apparent that the measurements submitted with the application had been incorrect. As a result, the dwellings were approximately the same distance from neighbouring properties as had been approved under DOV/17/01137 and DOV/19/01130. Concerns about the overbearing impact on adjacent properties were therefore no longer of such concern, notwithstanding that the height of the dwellings would be increased. The occupiers of 38a The Drove had received engineering advice about overshadowing and had requested that a study be conducted. The applicant had declined to produce a study. However, following further consideration, and by using the daylight study produced for DOV/17/01337, Officers had concluded that, on balance, the increase in eaves height proposed under the applications was unlikely to cause significant, increased harm in respect of overshadowing or loss of light.

In response to Councillor Bond, the Principal Planner clarified that the current proposals would be no higher than the original dwelling that had been demolished. Halfway through the application process it had come to light that the topographical information provided for the previous applications had been incorrect. He confirmed that DOV/21/00284 was now based on the correct topographical information. Councillor Bond commented that, whilst he was not concerned about the parking and garages, he was uncomfortable with the increase in building heights. Councillor Beaney pointed out that the only reason for increasing the height between the window and the soffit board would be to fit an extra room in the roof. This would make the front gable a lot heavier and constituted a big change to the design of the building. The Principal Planner clarified that one of the reasons for the refusal of the 2016 application had been due to the increase in height between the soffit and the window. He had worked with the architect to move the window up slightly, and on amendments to the design of the cladding to lessen the vertical emphasis.

Councillor Richardson expressed frustration at the number of applications and variations submitted in respect of the development. In his view the applicant should adhere to the original planning permission granted in 2017. In response to Councillor Cronk, the Principal Planner confirmed that if both applications were refused, the extant permissions of 2017 and 2019 would apply (including the addition of rooflights and a rear dormer window).

In response to Councillor Biggs, the Principal Planner confirmed that the base of the dwellings had already been poured. They were similar to the measurements shown in the approved plans for the dwellings that had already been granted planning permission. Councillor Bond noted that the height of the proposed dwellings would be similar to the height of the pre-existing house. He also noted that overshadowing would be minimal, and he was therefore of the view that there were no significant planning reasons to support a refusal of DOV/21/00284. The Principal Planner advised that if Members felt that DOV/21/00284 had overcome the previous reasons for refusal, they could grant planning permission. He clarified that the applicant would be able to continue building on the basis of the extant permissions if the foundations had been poured to the approved footprint and at the correct level. If this was not the case, the Council's Planning Enforcement team would need to advise.

In response to a query from Councillor Cronk, the Planning Solicitor recommended that Members should not focus on hypothetical situations such as what might happen if they refused both applications. The only consideration for the Committee was whether the proposals were acceptable in planning terms. It was not for Members to speculate about the works that had already been carried out since these were not germane to the Committee's decision but rather matters for the Planning Enforcement team to investigate.

Councillor P D Jull questioned whether the applicant could be required to reinstate the 2019 design which incorporated a room in the roof, an improvement in his opinion. He suggested that DOV/21/00284 should be approved subject to the removal of conditions 2 and 3 and the reinstatement of the window in the eaves. The Principal Planner advised that the window was not included in the application before the Committee and could not therefore be considered. It was stressed that Officers were trying to bring this matter to a conclusion. It was likely that the applicant would appeal should both applications be refused. Granting one application might resolve some of the matters and avoid two appeals. She emphasised that the dwellings recommended for approval would be only 33 centimetres higher than those already granted planning permission.

It was moved by Councillor E A Biggs and duly seconded that Application No DOV/21/00567 be REFUSED as per the Officer's recommendation.

On being put to the vote, the motion was CARRIED.

Councillor D G Cronk moved and it was duly seconded that Application No DOV/21/00284 be approved as per the Officer's recommendation with the addition of a requirement to provide cabling for electric vehicle charging points.

On being put to the vote, the motion was CARRIED.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/21/00284 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Drawings;
- (ii) Reversion of retaining wall to bank;
- (iii) Lowering of height of garages;
- (iv) Materials and elevational treatment;
- (v) Windows;
- (vi) Hard and soft landscaping – in accordance with approved details;
- (vii) Refuse and recycling – in accordance with approved details;
- (viii) Vehicle parking;
- (ix) No access to garage roofs except for maintenance or emergency;
- (x) Bicycle parking;
- (xi) Bound surface;
- (xii) No surface water on highway;
- (xiii) Visibility strip;
- (xiv) Ground levels – in accordance with approved details;
- (xv) Earthworks – in accordance with approved details;
- (xvi) Permitted development removal A, B;
- (xvii) Archaeology;
- (xviii) Construction management plan – in accordance with approved details;
- (xix) Cabling for electric vehicle charging points.

((b) That Application No DOV/21/00567 be REFUSED on the grounds that the proposed development, if permitted, would, by virtue of its dimensions combined with its design details and siting, including increased base height to the dwellings, increased height to the dwellings and garages, proposed elevational finish, fenestration details, increased use of engineered materials and proposed retaining wall, result in an obtrusive and incongruous form of development out of context with, and causing harm to, the street scene which, taken in combination, represents poor design, contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraphs 8, 11, 127 and 130 in particular.

(c) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning, Regeneration and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions and/or reasons for refusal in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

(The Chairman advised the Committee that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9, it was required to pass a resolution to continue the meeting beyond 10.00pm.

RESOLVED: That, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9, the Committee proceeds with the business remaining on the agenda.)

23     APPEALS AND INFORMAL HEARINGS

The Committee noted that there was no information to receive regarding appeals and informal hearings.

24     ACTION TAKEN IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE ORDINARY DECISIONS (COUNCIL BUSINESS) URGENCY PROCEDURE

The Committee noted that no action had been taken.

The meeting ended at 10.17pm.