

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Thursday, 17 November 2022 at 6.07 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor J S Back

Councillors: R S Walkden  
M Bates  
D G Beaney  
T A Bond  
D G Cronk  
D A Hawkes  
P D Jull  
H M Williams  
C F Woodgate

Officers: Planning and Development Manager  
Team Leader (Development Management) - Strategic Sites  
Principal Planner  
Senior Planner  
Planning Officer  
Planning Officer  
Planning Consultant  
Planning Solicitor  
Democratic Services Officer

The following persons were also present and spoke in connection with the applications indicated:

| <u>Application No</u> | <u>For</u>          | <u>Against</u>                               |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--|
| DOV/22/00668          | Mrs Glynis Farthing | Mr Chris Shaw                                |
| DOV/22/00818          | Ms Jane Norris      | -----  |
| DOV/22/00820          | Mr Paul Betts       | Mr George Knott                              |
| DOV/22/00759          | Mr Daniel Couzens   | Ms Florence Brocklesby                       |
| DOV/22/00754          | Ms Francesca Hulme  | -----  |
| DOV/22/00837          | -----               | Mr Daniel Couzens<br>Councillor H M Williams |

75 APOLOGIES

It was noted that an apology for absence had been received from Councillor E A Biggs.

76 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

It was noted that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4, Councillor H M Williams had been appointed as a substitute member for Councillor E A Biggs.

77 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor D G Beaney declared an Other Significant Interest in Agenda Items 5 (Application No DOV/21/00731 – Land north of Eastling Down Farm Cottages and

East of Sandwich Road, Waldershare) and 6 (Application No DOV/22/00668 – Land north of Guston and The Lane, Guston Court Farm, Guston) by reason that he knew the landowners of both sites.

78 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 13 October 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

79 APPLICATION NO DOV/21/00731 - LAND NORTH OF EASTLING DOWN FARM COTTAGES AND EAST OF SANDWICH ROAD, WALDERSHARE

The Committee was shown an aerial view, drawings, plans and photographs of the application site. The Planning Consultant advised that the part retrospective application sought planning permission for a change of use to a gypsy/traveller site with 8 pitches comprising one static caravan, one touring caravan, two parking spaces and a dayroom per pitch. As an update, he informed Members that Tilmanstone Parish Council had submitted a further objection in support of Sutton-by-Dover Parish Council. Three corrections to the report were required, namely that there were three and not two static caravans on site, details of hard surfacing should be added to condition ix) and, finally, the reference to paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) should be paragraph 174.

The Committee was advised that personal circumstances could be a material consideration when determining applications for gypsy/traveller sites. If Members wished to discuss the personal circumstances of this case during the meeting, members of the press and public would need to be excluded for the duration of the discussions.

Members were informed that the scheme had been subject to amendments since originally submitted. The pitches would be located primarily along the eastern boundary of the site, and the top of the caravans would be visible when driving along the road. The existing access would be used, with visibility splays and a gate set back from the highway being a requirement of Kent County Council (KCC) Highways. Along the front of the site was a 1.8-metre fence which, being set back from the highway, had probably not required planning permission in its own right.

Councillor D G Cronk raised concerns about light pollution, waste bins and requested that any hard surfacing be permeable such as grass matting. The Planning Consultant advised that condition xvii) addressed lighting and Officers would be looking for something low-level. The applicants were proposing to use pavers for the hard surfacing which were of a type that were permeable. He confirmed that a condition on refuse storage would be added.

Councillor P D Jull reported that he had received several adverse comments about the development from Deal residents. This was a balanced decision and, in his view, considerable weight should be given to the unsustainability and adverse impact of the proposal. One or two families occupying the site would be acceptable, but eight families appeared to him to be taking advantage of the planning system. In response to Councillor M Bates, the Planning Consultant agreed that condition xv) should be amended to reflect the suggestion made by the Gardens Trust that the fencing should be removed within ten years or when the vegetation had become established. He also agreed that trees of a decent standard should be required as part of the landscaping scheme, and that electric vehicle charging could be added.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/21/00731 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Approval of drawings submitted;
- (ii) The site shall not be occupied by any persons other than gypsies;
- (iii) The static caravans hereby permitted shall be stationed on the land in the location shown on the Approved Drawing;
- (iv) The form, size and appearance and use of materials of the dayroom and static caravans hereby permitted shall be as shown on the Approved Drawing and submission;
- (v) No more than 8 static caravans and no more than 8 touring caravans. Only the static caravans hereby approved on the site shall be occupied residentially;
- (vi) Approval of details for foul and surface water drainage;
- (vii) Measures to identify and protect archaeology during excavation;
- (viii) Set back of gate on the access and provision of visibility splays;
- (ix) Additional landscaping/tree planting and hard surfacing details (the latter to be permeable);
- (x) The area of undeveloped land shown as grass on the Approved Drawing shall be retained as a grassed amenity space for the site;
- (xi) No additional boundary enclosures or hardstanding areas to be provided;
- (xii) Provision and retention of buffer zone as shown on Approved Drawing;
- (xiii) Provision of precautionary measures to protect ecology;
- (xiv) Biodiversity enhancements;
- (xv) Removal of front boundary fence within 10 years or when planting established;
- (xvi) Details of refuse storage to be submitted;
- (xvii) No commercial activity or storage of materials or other commercial equipment shall take place or be stored on the site;

- (xviii) No external lighting other than motion-activated lighting on the buildings or caravans;
- (xix) Electric vehicle charging.

(Councillor D G Beaney left the meeting during consideration of this item.)

80

APPLICATION NO DOV/22/00668 - LAND NORTH OF GUSTON AND THE LANE, GUSTON COURT FARM, GUSTON

Members viewed a map, drawings, plans and photographs of the application site which was outside settlement confines. The Senior Planner advised that planning permission was sought for the erection of a solar farm and associated infrastructure.

She advised that the site largely comprised Best and Most Versatile agricultural land (BMV) and was close to, and visible from, an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). There were also a number of heritage assets in close proximity to the site, as referred to in paragraphs 2.20 to 2.24 of the report. Whilst the proposal was, in principle, contrary to Core Strategy Policies DM1 and DM11, it could not be accommodated within settlement boundaries and functionally required a rural location and, as such, met the exceptions of both policies. It was also considered that, subject to conditions securing the proposed landscaping, the proposal would not conflict with Policy DM16 which sought to protect the character of the landscape. Due to its proximity to the AONB, additional planting was proposed, in line with comments received from the Kent Downs AONB Unit, in order to minimise any visual impact. Matters relating to the use of BMV agricultural land were covered in paragraphs 2.35 to 2.39 of the report. Whilst the proposal would remove the land from arable production for up to 40 years, the land could be used during the 40-year period for the agricultural use of keeping sheep and, as stated by the applicant, could potentially benefit from a long period of lying fallow. Subject to the imposition of the suggested conditions, the impact on the countryside and AONB was considered acceptable, as were matters relating to residential amenity, flooding, drainage, highways and archaeology. Furthermore, although the proposal would cause less than substantial harm to nearby heritage assets, this was considered to be outweighed by the public benefits of the proposal, set out at paragraphs 2.20 to 2.24 of the report. Although the 'tilted balance' approach of paragraph 11 of the NPPF was engaged due to Policy DM1 being considered out-of-date, on balance, Officers were of the view that the benefits of the proposal significantly and demonstrably outweighed any harm that would be caused, and approval was therefore recommended.

Councillor Jull queried why no Section 106 monies had been made available as had been the case with a nearby solar farm development. The Team Leader Development Management – Strategic Sites (TLDM) advised that financial contributions had to meet the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) tests relating to making a development acceptable in planning terms. Contributions had not been necessary to make this development acceptable. In response to Councillor Bates, he confirmed that the use of the land was temporary, and that the land would revert to its agricultural classification once the forty-year period had expired. Councillor T A Bond voiced concerns about building on agricultural land, but welcomed the reassurances given about its visibility.

The TLDM acknowledged that the solar farm would be seen from various points. However, the applicant had worked hard on landscaping matters during the

application process, and additional planting had been proposed in line with the comments from the Kent Downs AONB Unit, secured and maintained for the 40-year period by condition. Whilst the panels would be visible in the short to medium-term, this should be weighed against the emerging policies of the draft Local Plan that supported such developments. The fact that the farm would generate sufficient energy to power approximately 7,000 homes weighed heavily in the proposal's favour. It was for Members to determine whether the impact on the landscape would be so severe that it outweighed the benefits of the development.

In response to Councillor R S Walkden, the Senior Planner clarified that a previous application for a nearby site had been refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal based on the loss of BMV agricultural land. Another factor in the refusal had been the applicant's failure to demonstrate that other sites had been considered and discounted. Councillor Walkden commented that solar energy was considered more important now than it had been at the time of that application. He proposed that the application should be approved.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/22/00668 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Time limit;
- (ii) Plans;
- (iii) Solar panels shall be matt finish and non-reflective;
- (iv) Details of colour finish of fencing and other structures;
- (v) Submission of a construction management plan prior to commencement of development (including details of how the operators of the site will advise construction and delivery vehicles of routing to/from site; parking and turning areas for construction and delivery vehicles and site personnel; timing of deliveries; provision of wheel-washing facilities; temporary traffic management/signage; condition surveys);
- (vi) Provision and maintenance of visibility splays prior to commencement of development with no obstructions over 1.05 metres above carriageway level within the splays;
- (vii) Use of a bound surface for the first 5 metres of the access from the edge of the highway;
- (viii) Plans demonstrating the detailed design of the proposed construction access to be submitted prior to the commencement of works;
- (ix) Landscaping (boundary treatments, planting plans – species, schedules, sizes and timescale and replacement of any dead/damaged planting for the lifetime of the development – 40 years);

- (x) Biodiversity method statement- (protection of biodiversity during construction);
- (xi) Ecological design and management plan;
- (xii) Bat-sensitive lighting strategy;
- (xiii) No further external lighting other than that approved as part of the bat-sensitive lighting strategy;
- (xiv) Submission of a programme of archaeological work including an intrusive field evaluation survey prior to the commencement of development;
- (xv) Submission of details of the design of the solar panel foundation piles and all other excavations, together with details of alternative measures to secure solar panels, cabling and other infrastructure, to be used across the site. These details shall have regard to the results of the intrusive field evaluation survey, prior to the commencement of development;
- (xvi) Submission of a detailed sustainable surface water drainage scheme based upon submitted Drainage Statement prior to the development being begun;
- (xvii) Submission of a verification report pertaining to surface water drainage system prior to first use;
- (xviii) Restricting infiltration to manage surface water to the parts of the site where information is submitted to demonstrate there is no resultant unacceptable risk to controlled waters and/or ground stability;
- (xix) Arrays and all associated structures other than soft landscaping to be removed after 40 years;
- (xx) Submission of decommissioning plan prior to removal of structures;
- (xxi) Biodiversity method statement – decommissioning.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

(Councillor D G Beaney left the meeting during consideration of this item.)

81 APPLICATION NO DOV/22/00818 - RIPPLEVALE SCHOOL, CHAPEL LANE, RIPPLE

The Committee was shown drawings, plans and photographs of the application site which was located outside the settlement confines of Walmer/Deal and partly within the Chapel Lane Conservation Area. The Principal Planner advised that planning

permission was sought for the erection of a temporary modular classroom building, alterations to parking layout and ancillary hard and soft landscaping. As an update, she advised that additional conditions regarding cycling and parking provision and traffic management were required.

Members were advised that the proposal related to a school that catered for boys with special educational needs, demand for which was on the rise. The principle of the proposal was positively supported by paragraph 95 of the NPPF which encouraged local authorities to give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools. The main building of the school was Grade II-listed and another listed building known as The Cottage was approximately 76 metres south-west of the site. Two public rights of way, EE439 and EE438, ran adjacent to the school playing fields and adjacent to the northern boundary of the school field respectively. The temporary building would be seen in the context of the existing buildings and its visual impact was therefore considered acceptable, particularly as additional planting was proposed. Whilst concerns had been raised about drainage, the slight increase in wastewater arising from the school's expansion would not exceed the capacity of the two septic tanks that served the site. Finally, written confirmation had been received from KCC Highways that the proposal would not result in a severe impact on the highway network.

Councillor Jull proposed that the application should be approved in accordance with the report recommendation and updated conditions, subject to the removal of the condition on cycling provision.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/22/00818 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Time limit (temporary permission);
- (ii) Plans;
- (iii) Landscaping;
- (iv) Parking provision;
- (v) Traffic management.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

## 82 APPLICATION NO DOV/22/00820 - 37 THE MARINA, DEAL

The Committee viewed a plan, drawings and photographs of the application site which was within the settlement confines of Deal. The Planning Officer advised that planning permission was sought for the erection of front and rear dormer roof extensions, front balconies to first and second floors, replacement windows and the installation of glazing to the gable end of the dwelling. As an update to the report, Members were advised that a petition had been received from eight residents of The Marina raising objections to the proposal.

The Planning Officer advised that the proposed front and rear dormers would create significant bulk to the roof slope of the dwelling and were therefore considered

unacceptable. Furthermore, the impact on the roof slope would negatively affect the character and appearance of the street scene and the symmetry of the row of cottages. She clarified that the rear dormer added to the property next door had been built under permitted development rights.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/22/00820 be REFUSED on the grounds that the proposed front dormer, to the eastern roof slope, and rear dormer, to the western roof slope, by virtue of their size, design and location would create dominant and discordant features on the roof slope which would be prominent in views from The Marina and Sandown Road respectively. The dormers would consequently not be sympathetic to the local character and would fail to add to the overall quality of the area, contrary to paragraphs 126 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to settle any necessary wording in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

83 APPLICATION NO DOV/22/00759 - BLUEBELL COTTAGE, CLIFFE ROAD, KINGSDOWN

Members viewed drawings and photographs of the application site which was located within the settlement confines of Kingsdown and within the Kingsdown Conservation Area. The Planning Officer advised that planning permission was sought for the erection of two-storey side and single storey rear extensions, replacement windows, fencing and gates and the relocation of a side gate and steps, amongst other things. Two existing outbuildings, a conservatory and single storey side extension would be demolished.

Members were advised that the application related to a semi-detached property adjoined with Violet Cottage. Bluebell Cottage was in a conservation area which was also the subject of an Article 4 Direction. Along with Violet Cottage, the property was noted in the Kingsdown Conservation Area Character Appraisal as being of historic interest and was recorded as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset. It was recognised that the pair of dwellings made an important contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area and views towards the beach and sea from Upper Street. These matters were explored further in paragraphs 2.3 to 2.8 of the report. It was noted that the Kingsdown Conservation Area Character Appraisal had been produced after planning permission for alterations to Violet Cottage had been granted.

Third parties had raised particular concerns regarding the demolition of the existing side extension, the roof slope of which objectors regarded as being a fundamental part of the historic form and character of the cottage. Whilst objectors' views had been fully considered, Officers were of the opinion that the roof form of the extension was not of such significant importance that its loss would have a negative impact on the character of the property or the conservation area. Overall, the proposals were considered to be in keeping with the character of the cottage, and views towards the sea and beach would not be adversely affected. The application was therefore recommended for approval.

Councillor Beaney commented that the proposals would mirror alterations made to Violet Cottage next door and proposed that the application should be approved.



Councillor Bates queried whether the outbuildings that were to be demolished, which looked to be original and in reasonable condition, had been assessed. He also sought clarification as to whether the existing extension with the catslide roof had formed part of the original structure. He noted that the two cottages had appeared symmetrical in 2011 before Violet Cottage had received planning permission for alterations to that property. It appeared that the proposals under consideration, if approved, would double the size of the area currently occupied by the outbuildings, side extension and conservatory. The existing building seemingly occupied two thirds of the plot whereas the proposed extensions would occupy almost all of the plot. This would result in a much larger building that would then become an overly prominent feature in the street scene. His view was that the existing building was in harmony with the street scene and this would be lost if the proposals were approved. He indicated that he would be voting against the proposals.

Councillor H M Williams challenged the purpose of a conservation area if it was considered acceptable to knock down part of a building that had been there since at least 1841. This particular cottage had been a feature of the area for nearly two centuries and had been built before the cottages in North and South Roads. She referred to the draft Regulation 19 Local Plan and policies that sought to ensure that alterations to buildings in conservation areas respected the historic character and appearance of the area. In her view the roof and outlook of this cottage was hugely important and there was no point in having a conservation area if proposals like this were capable of being approved.

The Planning Officer advised that the existing outbuildings had not been physically inspected by herself or the Heritage Officer but were believed to be more modern constructions, of a similar age to the side gate and its roof. Although the cottage was recorded as a Non-Designated Heritage Asset, the side extension and roof slope were not original and therefore not considered to be a significant part of it. She stressed that the Heritage Officer was of the view that they were of no significant historic merit to warrant retention.

The TLDM explained that Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990 imposed a duty on decision-makers when assessing planning applications for development in conservation areas. Members were required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the area, and should consider whether the development would lead to substantial or less than substantial harm. It was possible for individuals to attach different weight when considering this matter in the planning balance. The Heritage Officer's considered view was that there would be limited harm.

Councillor Jull raised concerns about the proposals, citing the impact on views from the seaside towards Kingsdown, the loss of the existing roofscape, the incongruity of the rear extension and the fact that Bluebell Cottage would no longer be symmetrical with the adjoining property. In response to Councillor Bond, the Planning Officer clarified that the proposed rear extension would be equivalent in depth to the existing conservatory. Councillor Beaney commented that the proposals would not change the existing footprint of the building. In his view the proposed extensions would stand out no more than the existing. Councillor Williams added that it was not about trying to match Bluebell Cottage to Violet Cottage which was not in its original form in any case. Third parties were trying to conserve a building which was in its original shape and design. Councillor C F

Woodgate expressed concerns about demolishing part of a 200-year-old building in a conservation area.

It was moved by Councillor D G Beaney and duly seconded that Application No DOV/22/00759 be APPROVED in accordance with the report recommendation.

On being put to the vote, the motion failed to attract a majority of votes and was therefore LOST. That being the case, another vote was required in order to determine the application.

It was moved by Councillor M Bates and duly seconded that Application No DOV/22/00759 be REFUSED.

On being put to the vote, the motion failed to attract a majority of votes and was therefore LOST. That being the case, another vote was required in order to determine the application.

It was moved by Councillor D G Beaney and duly seconded that a site visit be held. However, before going to the vote, Councillor Beaney changed his mind and withdrew his motion.

It was moved by Councillor D G Beaney and duly seconded that Application No DOV/22/00759 be APPROVED in accordance with the report recommendation.

On being put to the vote, the motion attracted a majority of votes and was CARRIED.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/22/00759 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) 3-year time limit for commencement;
- (ii) Compliance with the approved plans;
- (iii) Sample or specific detail of roof tiles to be submitted;
- (iv) Render to match existing;
- (v) Joinery details to be submitted;
- (vi) Flood mitigation measures detailed in the submitted Flood Risk Assessment to be implemented.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to settle any necessary issues in line with the matters set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

84 APPLICATION NO DOV/22/00754 - REDWOOD, THE FORSTAL, PRESTON

Members were shown drawings and photographs of the application site which was within the village confines of Preston. The Planning Officer advised that planning permission was sought for the erection of a building for use as a holiday let, with the existing outbuildings to be demolished. As an update to the report, it was confirmed that there was an existing building on the site that was currently used as

a holiday let. It was clarified that there were no restrictions on the number of holiday lets permitted on a site. The proposal was considered to be a sustainable form of development and approval was recommended.

Councillor Beaney praised the proposal as a good use of space. Councillor Bates referred to comments made in the report about the existing annexe being used for family and friends which was incorrect as it was now known that it was being used as Airbnb accommodation. If planning permission were granted for a second holiday let, the site could generate a high number of visitors and he queried whether it should therefore be considered as a commercial operation. The TLDM clarified that paragraphs 84 and 85 of the NPPF supported a prosperous rural economy, considering the commercial benefits to the local community, including staff employed by the business and the tourism benefit to local shops, etc.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/22/00754 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Time limit;
- (ii) Plans;
- (iii) Material samples;
- (iv) No windows in west elevation at ground floor level or within roof slope;
- (v) Holiday let conditions;
- (vi) Details of additional off-street parking provision;
- (vii) Retention of vegetation/trees/hedges on western boundary.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

85 APPLICATION NO DOV/22/00837 - 1 NORTH ROAD, KINGSDOWN

The Committee was shown a map, plans and photographs of the application site which was situated within the settlement confines of Kingsdown and the Kingsdown Conservation Area. The Planning Officer advised that planning permission was sought for the installation of two rooflights to the rear roof slope and one side window to facilitate a loft conversion, together with the installation of one rooflight to the rear projection, a door to the western side elevation and alterations to windows on the rear elevation. The application had been substantially amended since first submitted. The proposed works were modest in scale and were not considered to be harmful. Whilst the dwelling was used as an Airbnb, it was still classified as a family dwelling and there was therefore no limit on how many cars the property could generate. He clarified that the purpose of conservation areas was not to keep areas as they were in perpetuity but rather to allow local authorities to manage them. Changes to properties within a conservation area did not necessarily equate to harm. The Council's Heritage Officer had confirmed that, in this case, the proposals would cause no harm to the conservation area.

Councillor Walkden stated that the dwelling's use as an Airbnb was not a planning consideration. Councillor Jull commented that he disliked the proposed size of the windows at the rear, particularly at first-floor level. He also questioned why it was not proposed to attach holiday let conditions. The TLDM clarified that the application was not seeking a change of use for the building, and the only matters under consideration were the installation of rooflights, etc. The application previously considered at the meeting had sought permission to erect a building as a holiday let and holiday accommodation was subject to different size limits, etc. If Members did not like the proposals before them, they should refuse the application. Councillor Bates raised concerns about the installation of a door in the side elevation of the building as it would generate traffic in the street and affect the street scene. Councillor D A Hawkes agreed, arguing that it would have a visual impact and be incongruent with the street scene, as well as being a safety issue for people stepping out into a narrow road.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/22/00837 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Time limit;
- (ii) Plans;
- (iii) Joinery details of all new windows, doors and rooflights;
- (iv) Window in west-facing gable end at second-floor level to be obscure glazed and fixed shut;
- (v) Rooflights in rear (south-facing) roof slope to have cill height of 1.7 metres internally.

(b) That powers be delegated to the Head of Planning and Development to settle any necessary planning conditions in line with the issues set out in the recommendation and as resolved by the Planning Committee.

(There being an equality of votes, the Chairman used his casting vote.)

(Councillor H M Williams left the meeting during consideration of this item having giving notice prior to the meeting that she had predetermined the application and would be speaking against it.)

## 86 PLANNING FEES AND CHARGES 2023/24

The Planning and Development Manager presented the report which set out the levels of Planning fees and charges for the financial year 2023/24 for Members' information.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

## 87 APPEALS AND INFORMAL HEARINGS

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

88 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 8.44 pm.