

Public Document Pack

Minutes of the meeting of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** held at the Council Offices, Whitfield on Thursday, 21 April 2022 at 6.00 pm.

Present:

Chairman: Councillor R S Walkden (Vice-Chairman in the Chair)

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

Officers: Planning and Development Manager
Team Leader (Development Management) - Strategic Sites
Team Leader (Development Management) - South Team
Planning Officer
Planning Officer
Planning Consultant
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/21/00255	Mr Alister Hume	Mr Richard Styles
DOV/21/01736	Ms Carol van den End	Mr Ray Luckhurst
DOV/21/01459	-----	-----
DOV/21/01402	Mr Alister Hume	Councillor O C de R Richardson Mr Brendan Wells
DOV/21/01438	Ms Valerie Owen	-----

139 APOLOGIES

It was noted that an apology for absence had been received from Councillor J S Back.

140 APPOINTMENT OF SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS

There were no substitute members appointed.

141 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor M Bates declared an Other Significant Interest in Agenda Item 6 (Application No DOV/21/01736 – Land at West View, Chapel Hill, Eythorne) by reason that he was closely associated with the applicant and a member of the public who was speaking against the application.

142 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 24 March 2022 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

143 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENT

The Chairman advised that Application No DOV/21/01935 (Chapel Farm, Chapel Hill, Ashley) had been withdrawn from the agenda and would not be considered at the meeting.

144 APPLICATION NO DOV/21/00255 - LAND OPPOSITE 423 TO 459 DOVER ROAD, WALMER

The Committee was shown drawings and photographs of the application site which was adjacent to the southern edge of the settlement boundary of Walmer. The Planning Consultant advised that the application was for reserved matters for the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping for a development of 85 dwellings approved in outline in 2018. As an update to the report, Members were advised that two additional letters of objection had been received, raising concerns about the appearance of the proposed dwellings, traffic along Dover Road, disturbance during construction, etc. The applicant had also now submitted an ecology survey of the western boundary wall. The Council's Ecology Officer was content, subject to a condition being added that required parts of the existing wall to be dismantled by hand and the replacement of the boundary wall.

Members were advised that the land currently consisted of trees and scrub to the south and east, with a topography that was essentially flat with a slight rise to the south. The northern boundary of the site was most sensitive, with the closest property being 28 Thistledown. There would be a new frontage along Dover Road, with the boundary wall replaced in order to accommodate a single vehicular access and a new footpath. The development would provide an equipped children's play area and 30% affordable housing. Each dwelling would have designated parking spaces with additional visitor spaces provided across the site. The proposed layout and landscaping were considered suitable and of good quality.

In response to Councillor M Bates, the Planning Consultant advised that the distance between 28 Thistledown and the new dwellings would be 19.45 metres. Councillor D G Cronk expressed concerns about highway safety, commenting that the road was very narrow and had been subject to a number of accidents. The Planning Consultant reminded Members that the principal access had been considered in detail and approved at outline stage in 2018. Furthermore, it was not for this application to consider issues around parking along Dover Road. In response to Councillor P D Jull, the Planning Consultant clarified that the 'First Homes' policy, the newest form of affordable housing, had not applied in 2018 when the affordable housing element of the application had been approved. The applicant had submitted a plan which indicated that all of the loop road, the central area of open space and a central spur leading to the southern boundary of the site would be adopted, leaving just two spurs along the frontage of the site unadopted. The Planning Consultant advised that the new footpath extended along the front of the site and up to the bus-stop, but was unable to confirm whether it connected to the existing pavement.

Councillors E A Biggs and T A Bond raised concerns about residents being burdened with the cost of maintaining open space through private management

companies. Councillor Biggs noted the inclusion of tandem parking and lamented a missed opportunity to build energy efficient housing. The Planning Consultant advised that a private company would manage the open space and sustainable underground drainage system, but the central open space would be transferred to the Highways Authority. Whilst there was some tandem parking, this was because it was considered more efficient and took up less road frontage. Moreover, Officers had not considered it a problem due to the fact it was located in a cul de sac. Most of the larger dwellings would have independently accessible spaces. The developer would be required to comply with the energy efficiency requirements of Building Regulations so the opportunity for energy saving measures had not been missed.

In response to Councillor Bond who queried whether the 2018 planning permission had lapsed, the Planning Consultant clarified that the applicant had been given three years to submit an application from April 2018. They had submitted an application in 2021 which had then been amended and subsequently taken a year to come to Committee. Should planning permission be granted, they would be obliged to commence development within two years of approval. In terms of highways, he advised that, whilst Kent County Council (KCC) Highways had raised objections to the original scheme, they had raised no such objections to the amended reserved matters scheme. All matters related to the access had been considered and deemed acceptable by the Planning Inspector at outline stage. He cautioned Members against raising doubts about access at this point as it was not a defensible nor robust position to take. The Planning and Development Manager stressed that the 2018 planning permission had not expired and that access was not a matter for discussion at this point. He added that Members needed to be satisfied that the details of the reserved matters adhered to any conditions that had been attached to the outline planning permission.

The Planning Consultant clarified that there was a pre-commencement condition regarding foul sewage which meant that the applicant would have to satisfy Southern Water that suitable foul water drainage could be provided before any development started. Referring to comments made by Kent Police about designing out crime, he clarified that Officers were satisfied that the scheme complied with good practice.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/21/00255 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Approved plans;
- (ii) Details and samples of materials – external surfaces of the dwellings;
- (iii) Details and samples of materials – hard surfacing;
- (iv) Revised planting details (with native species) – to be submitted;
- (v) Implementation of landscaping before occupation;
- (vi) Boundary treatment – to be carried out;
- (vii) Updated reptile survey;
- (viii) Provision of electric vehicle charging points;

- (ix) Provision of car parking before occupation of respective dwellings;
- (x) Provision of cycle parking before occupation of respective dwellings;
- (xi) External lighting of public realm areas;
- (xii) Ecology;
- (xiii) Boundary wall to be dismantled by hand.

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

145 APPLICATION NO DOV/21/01736 - LAND AT WEST VIEW, CHAPEL HILL, EYTHORNE

Members viewed drawings, a plan and photographs of the application site which was a rectangular shaped plot situated between a dwelling known as Praslin and a garage within the village confines of Eythorne. The Planning Consultant advised that planning permission was sought for the erection of a detached dwelling which was simple in design and directed by the shape and size of the plot. As an update to the report, he advised that some of the objections had centred around the displacement of two parking spaces. KCC Highways had been re-consulted and had advised that the surrounding roads could adequately accommodate two additional cars given that there were no parking restrictions in place. He advised that an additional condition was required to deal with materials.

Members were advised that the proposed dwelling would be at a lower level to neighbouring properties which helped to mitigate its impact. There was a mixed pattern of development in the area, and the dwelling was in a sustainable location and close to facilities. Whilst it could be considered that the development would look cramped within the street scene, concerns were not sufficient to warrant a refusal. It was a balanced decision but, all matters considered, approval was recommended.

Councillor Biggs expressed concerns about what he regarded as a backland development and squeezing a dwelling into such a narrow plot. The Planning Consultant clarified that backland developments did not normally have a frontage onto the highway and this proposal was not therefore regarded as a backland development. The parking spaces that were attributed to no. 18 Sandwich Road had already been displaced elsewhere. KCC Highways had raised no objections to the proposal because the proposed dwelling would provide two parking spaces, the same number as had historically been accommodated on the site. Whilst there would be some impact on the conservatory and rooflights of Praslin, this impact was not considered sufficiently harmful to warrant a refusal.

Councillor C F Woodgate commented that it would be a small home. Coupled with the lack of parking in the area, he was inclined to be guided by the views of Eythorne Parish Council which had raised objections. Councillor Bond agreed that

the proposed dwelling would look cramped and he was not a fan of the design. However, the mixture of properties in the area, some of which were also narrow, persuaded him that there was no reason to refuse the proposal. In response to Councillor D A Hawkes, the Planning Consultant advised that the loss of light to Praslin was a matter of judgement as no scientific information was available. Taking into account the orientation, height and separation distance between the proposed dwelling and Praslin, together with the fact that the new dwelling would be set back slightly, it was Officers' view that a refusal would not be justified.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/21/01736 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Standard three-year period for implementation;
- (ii) Drawings that have been submitted;
- (iii) Details of materials;
- (iv) Details for the disposal of foul and surface water to be submitted for approval;
- (v) Details of the finished site levels and threshold levels of the building to be submitted for approval;
- (vi) The provision and retention of car parking spaces (of a minimum length of 4.8 metres), including the provision of an electric vehicle charging point, access to the site and secure cycle;
- (vii) Removal of permitted development rights to install windows within the north facing roof slope;
- (viii) Removal of permitted development rights to extend the building;
- (ix) Provision of landscaping details including retaining structures and boundary enclosures and a timetable for their implementation to be submitted for approval;
- (x) Details of refuse storage.

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

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

(Councillor M Bates left the meeting during consideration of this item.)

146 APPLICATION NO DOV/21/01459 - LAND NORTH-WEST OF PEGASUS, LONDON ROAD, SHOLDEN

The Committee was shown drawings, plans and photographs of the application site. The Development Management Team Leader (South) advised that the application was for reserved matters for the approval of appearance, landscaping, layout and

scale, following the grant of outline planning permission for the erection of 42 residential dwellings at a site at London Road, Sholden. The site was outside the settlement boundaries of Deal but adjoined it on the southern and eastern boundaries.

As an update to the report, Members were advised that an amended plan had been received relating to additional planting and speed humps. In addition, KCC Highways had clarified its views, and the Council's Housing Manager had recommended that there should be a change to the mix of affordable housing. The primary issue for Members to consider was the level of landscaping which had been increased significantly since the original plans were submitted, particularly along the frontage of the site. As a result, the parking layout had been constrained and the number of spaces reduced in order to accommodate more trees and shrubs. The development would include 13 affordable homes in accordance with the Council's 30% affordable housing requirement. A condition was recommended to remove permitted development rights for roof extensions and dormers.

Councillor D G Beaney stated that he felt uncomfortable with the amount of landscaping now proposed, and questioned how much weight should be given to the proposals. He suggested that the number of houses should be reduced in order to retain more parking on site. Councillor Jull referred to statements made at the time of the outline application that there would be 200 trees planted on the site, along with 100% affordable housing. He was certain that these factors would have persuaded members of the Planning Committee to vote in favour of approval. Whilst KCC Highways had provided additional comments, it was not clear from the report whether it was content with the proposed parking arrangements. He raised concerns about the treatment of the London Road frontage which did not mirror the frontage of the Sholden Fields development on the opposite side of the road, the location of parking spaces alongside the road being of particular concern.

The Team Leader clarified that planting had been increased by about a third since the original submission, with a particular focus on increasing planting to the frontage of the scheme to reduce the impact on London Road. She added that some on-street planting had also been secured. She stressed that the outline application had never proposed 100% affordable housing and the proposal had always been for an open market housing scheme with an element of affordable housing. Whilst KCC Highways had reiterated some earlier concerns, it had raised no objections to the scheme.

Councillor Bates referred to the correspondence from KCC Highways dated 7 April which, even at such a late stage, had raised questions about additional visitor spaces and their accessibility, as well as access for refuse vehicles and fire tenders. The Team Leader advised that tracking details for refuse vehicles had been submitted and confirmed as acceptable by KCC Highways. She clarified that the additional visitor parking spaces were located along the frontage of the development. Whilst bordered by a footway and vegetation, there was no reason to believe that the additional spaces would not be usable.

Councillor Beaney referred to a statement made by the public speaker in connection with the outline application in which it had been mentioned that 100% affordable housing would be provided and numerous trees planted. The Team Leader emphasised that the scheme as submitted in the outline application, and as detailed in the committee report and presentation, had not proposed 100% affordable housing. The Planning Solicitor acknowledged Members' concerns and recalled the speaker having mentioned that the scheme would provide 100% affordable housing.

However, the application had not been presented to the Planning Committee nor determined on that basis, and it was not possible to revisit the issue now with a view to refusing the reserved matters application.

Councillor Bond raised concerns about flooding and queried what was meant by the condition relating to foul drainage capacity. The Team Leader advised that the condition was the same as those imposed on other schemes in Deal and required applicants to enter into agreements with Southern Water to carry out work needed to increase capacity in the sewage network if this was found to be necessary. The Planning and Development Manager reminded Members of other occasions when a Grampian-style condition had been imposed to the effect that no development could commence until confirmation had been received from Southern Water that there was sufficient capacity in the network to accommodate the proposed development. He read out the wording of the full condition which prohibited any dwelling being occupied until this confirmation had been received.

Councillor Beaney repeated concerns about a statement made at the time of the outline application by the public speaker that there would be 100% affordable housing. As a new member of the Planning Committee at that time he had taken the statement at face value. He stated that he would not be voting in favour of the reserved matters application.

The Planning Solicitor referred to the minutes of the meeting at which the outline application had been determined. He reiterated that the Committee had determined the application based on the committee report and presentation given to it at that meeting. The minutes indicated that, whilst the speaker may have mentioned the provision of 100% affordable housing, and Councillor Oliver Richardson had queried this at the time, the Officer had confirmed that the scheme was as set out in the report and would not provide 100% affordable housing. In any case, the provision of 100% affordable housing was not in accordance with the relevant development plan policy and, as such, was not something that could have been required by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). The promise of 100% affordable housing had been something of a red herring and had not formed part of the application proposal or the resolution taken by the Committee. The minutes were conclusive as to the basis upon which the Committee had determined the application and Members were not able to re-open the issue at this stage.

In response to Councillor Hawkes, the Team Leader clarified that KCC Highways had raised no concerns that the proposed parking spaces would be too narrow, only about their accessibility given that they were situated close to hedges and trees. It was undoubtedly the case that there was sufficient space for parking to be accommodated on site.

Councillor Jull proposed that the application should be refused on three grounds. The indicative site plan submitted at outline application stage had indicated that the layout could be achieved without excessive tandem parking. However, the proposed layout was substandard, resulting in a requirement for additional visitors' parking. Secondly, the proposed frontage onto London Road was entirely different to the frontage of Sholden Fields and would therefore appear incongruous in the street scene. Finally, whilst the emerging draft Local Plan carried limited weight at the present time, it required this and the adjacent site to be developed in coordination in terms of access and landscaping. This application, if approved, would not allow that requirement to be progressed.

The Team Leader referred to KCC Highways' comments set out in the report which acknowledged that the number of visitor and unallocated parking spaces had been increased. The 20% parking provision set out in the policy had been met, and only due to the number of tandem parking spaces proposed had KCC Highways requested a further increase in visitor parking.

(The meeting was adjourned for a short break at 8.06pm and reconvened at 8.17pm.)

In respect of the draft Local Plan, the Team Leader reminded Members that it was at an early stage and consequently carried very limited weight. This and the adjacent site had been granted outline planning permission, with the form of the access confirmed and agreed for both sites. In effect, the ship had sailed on coordinating the development of the two sites. She cautioned against refusing the application on the basis of a policy included in the draft Local Plan. Considering the second ground proposed for refusal, she advised that there was a wide mix of development along London Road, including dwellings that fronted directly onto the footpath. A refusal on this ground was not, therefore, recommended.

The Development Management Team Leader (Strategic Sites and Place) advised Members that Policy DM13 required the provision of an additional 0.2 visitor spaces per dwelling where tandem parking was proposed. This had been achieved, with amendments made to the scheme following comments received from KCC Highways. Whilst there was generally a preference for developments not to use tandem parking, their use did not make this application unacceptable in planning terms. It was a fact that KCC Highways had raised no objections to the use of tandem parking in relation to this scheme. Paragraph 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) referred to cumulative severe harm being caused in relation to parking, a threshold that had not been reached in relation to this application.

The Planning and Development Manager urged Members to be mindful of how a refusal on parking would appear at appeal when KCC Highways had raised no objections. A refusal on the grounds of parking and the draft Local Plan would be weak, difficult to defend at appeal and carry a high risk of costs being awarded against the Council. Whilst there was a degree of subjectivity in respect of the impact on the London Road frontage, the road frontage in the general area was in fact not uniform with a mix of frontage treatments. Furthermore, although the proposed frontage of the scheme was not precisely like that of Sholden Fields opposite, there were echoes of it. In Officers' view there would be no harm caused that would warrant a refusal.

Councillor Bond stated that there was insufficient visitor parking for a site where there was no alternative parking available off site. He was of the view that the site had been over-developed which had led to a poor layout and pressure on parking spaces. Councillor Jull agreed that the key concern for him was the poor design and layout of the site.

The Planning and Development Manager stressed that the number of units included in the outline planning permission - approved and deemed acceptable at that time - had not changed. The Team Leader had worked hard on achieving an acceptable landscaping scheme and Officers were confident it would enhance the development. The Team Leader added that the number of visitor spaces provided would be in excess of those required by the policy, albeit slightly fewer than considered appropriate by KCC Highways.

In relation to the draft Local Plan, the Planning Solicitor advised that the Plan had gone out to consultation under Regulation 18 and the LPA was now considering what form the Plan to be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate would take. He emphasised that the courts had stated that LPAs should not derogate from planning permission granted at the outline application stage when determining a reserved matters application. In this case, it had been determined that the site could be developed independently of the adjacent plot of land when the outline planning permission was granted without any such condition or limitation in relation to the adjacent land. Whilst the emerging Local Plan was a material consideration, it carried very limited weight as it was still at an early stage of the process and, even if it were more advanced, the principle of not derogating from a grant of planning permission still applied so as to mean that a refusal on this basis would be indefensible at appeal.

Councillor Woodgate commented that outline planning permission for the same number of units had been granted in 2019. At that time the access and frontage were not regarded as being a problem. It was not possible to go back to the drawing board and he believed there was no case for raising objections to the development at such a late stage.

Councillor Jull agreed to amend his motion to focus on site layout and parking as the sole ground for refusal. As seconder, Councillor Bates supported the amended motion.

The Planning and Development Manager urged Members to consider a deferral of the application to explore whether the applicant would be open to amending the scheme to accommodate a different treatment of the layout/parking arrangements. In response to Councillor Beaney who expressed his wish to refuse the application, the Planning and Development Manager advised that Members would need to articulate their concerns around layout and scale in more detail. He suggested that it would be more appropriate to defer the application and work with the applicant, in line with NPPF guidance.

Following the advice of Officers, Councillor Jull agreed to withdraw his amended motion (with the support of Councillor Bates as seconder).

Councillor T A Bond proposed and it was duly seconded that Application No DOV/21/01459 be DEFERRED to address issues around parking and parking layout, with the final wording for deferral delegated to Officers.

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

RESOLVED: (a) That, notwithstanding the Officer's recommendation, Application No DOV/21/01459 be DEFERRED to allow Officers to explore amendments to the scheme to address concerns raised by the Planning Committee about parking and parking layout.

(b) That the final wording of the reasons for deferral be delegated to the Planning and Development Manager.

147 APPLICATION NO DOV/21/01402 - THE EDGE, BAY HILL, ST MARGARET'S BAY

The Committee viewed an aerial view, drawings, plans and photographs of the application site which was outside, but in close proximity to, the settlement confines

of St Margaret's Bay and in a conservation area. The Senior Planner advised that the application sought planning permission for the erection of a detached dwelling and the demolition of an existing dwelling. As an update to the report, she informed Members that St Margaret's-at-Cliffe Parish Council had submitted a further response, confirming its objections and raising concerns about amended plans. An additional public representation had been received, raising concerns about overlooking to properties on the opposite side of Bay Hill and properties to the west.

Members were advised that the existing house's valuable contribution to the conservation area was recognised. The application sought to demolish the house and replace it with a five-bedroomed dwelling which was considered to be of an attractive design and sympathetic to the character of the area. The size of the dwelling's dormer windows had been reduced since the original application and re-advertised accordingly. She underlined that the most important policies for determining the application, particularly Policy DM1 which sought to resist development outside the settlement confines, were considered to be out-of-date and the 'tilted balance' approach set out in paragraph 11 of the NPPF was therefore engaged. Whilst it was a balanced case, Officers considered that the demolition of the existing house and its replacement with the proposed dwelling were unlikely to cause harm to the conservation area or residential amenity. Since the benefits of the development were considered to outweigh the disadvantages, approval was recommended.

Councillor Jull stated that he did not agree that there would be no harm to the conservation area, nor that the benefits of the development outweighed the disadvantages. Accordingly, he would not be voting in favour of the application. Councillor Bates commented that the role of a conservation area was to ensure that its most attractive features were protected and conserved. Whilst he understood why the applicant might want to erect a new dwelling, the proposed design was not attractive, particularly the substantial balustrade overlooking the cliff top. The St Margaret's Conservation Area was one of the most iconic in the district and was worthy of protection. The existing building blended in well, especially in views from the shoreline. Other recent constructions, such as Pine Edge which was the subject of a planning enforcement investigation, were already making a difference to the conservation area. He agreed with the principle of a replacement building, but was of the view that it should replicate the size and dimensions of the existing house. Councillor Hawkes pointed out that there would be 5 metres of decking which would look like a helipad sticking out over the bay. He was of the view that the dwelling was oversized and would look incongruous within the surrounding area.

Councillor Bond expressed a different view, arguing that the existing house was not listed and made a limited contribution to the conservation area. The proposed dwelling was only slightly larger and was unlikely to have an impact on neighbouring properties. Taking into account the presumption of the NPPF that development in sustainable locations should be granted unless the disadvantages outweighed the benefits, he could identify no planning reasons to refuse the application. Councillor Woodgate agreed, adding that, whilst he had taken into account the views of residents, he was struggling to find sound reasons to refuse the application.

RESOLVED: (a) That, subject to no new material considerations being raised by Natural England, Application No DOV/21/01402 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) Standard time conditions;

- (ii) List of approved plans;
- (iii) Samples of materials;
- (iv) Construction management plan;
- (v) Details of surface water disposal;
- (vi) Existing and proposed ground, eaves and ridge levels;
- (vii) Details of build contract prior to demolition of existing dwelling;
- (viii) Recording of building prior to demolition;
- (ix) Provision and retention of vehicle parking;
- (x) Electric vehicle charging points;
- (xi) Cycle parking;
- (xii) Details of MHVR and heat pump systems.

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

148 APPLICATION NO DOV/21/01438 - 12 THE STRAND AND COACH HOUSE FRONTING YORK ROAD, WALMER

Members were shown an aerial view, drawings, a plan and photographs of the application site which was within the settlement confines of Walmer and in a conservation area. The Planning Officer advised that the application sought planning permission for the erection of two-storey front and side extensions, a single storey rear extension and dormer roof extensions to the front and rear of an existing dwelling. In addition, permission was sought to erect two-storey side and rear extensions and roof extensions to facilitate the conversion of a coach house to the rear of the main dwelling-house to an annexe. The existing rear extension to the main dwelling would be demolished. The property was in a poor state of repair and detracted from the conservation area. The proposed extensions would neaten the property's appearance and make it more uniform. Approval of the application was therefore recommended.

RESOLVED: (a) That Application No DOV/21/01438 be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

- (i) 3-year time limit for commencement;
- (ii) Compliance with approved plans;
- (iii) Archaeology safeguarding;
- (iv) Coach House to remain ancillary.

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

149 APPEALS AND INFORMAL HEARINGS

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

150 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 9.26 pm.