

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, 23rd May 2018 at Retford Town Hall

Present:

Councillor D G Pidwell (Chair)
Councillors D Brett, G Clarkson, S Fielding, G Freeman, K H Isard, G A N Oxby, M W Quigley,
S Scotthorne and T Taylor.

Officers in attendance: D Askwith, A Broadhead (Application No.18/00022/OUT), K France,
C Hopkinson, M Joyce and B Pinkney.

(Meeting commenced at 6.30pm.)

(The Chair welcomed all to the meeting and read out the Fire Evacuation Procedure. He also enquired as to whether any member of the public wished to film the meeting or any part thereof; this was not taken up.)

The Chair congratulated Members for getting reappointed to the Committee. He welcomed Councillor S Fielding as the new Vice-Chair of the Committee and acknowledged Councillor A Smith for her contribution as Vice-Chairman over the past three years. Councillor A Smith's commitment was commendable, she has attended 140/150 Planning Consultation Groups in her time as Vice-Chair.

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors H Burton and A Smith.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

(a) Members

Councillor G Freeman declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in Application No. 17/01462/OUT. She left the meeting during the Item after she had spoken as ward Member.

Councillor M Quigley declared a non-pecuniary interest in Application No. 17/01104/OUT, he remained in the meeting.

(b) Officers

There were no declarations of interest by officers.

3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 28TH MARCH 2018

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting held on 28th March 2018 be approved.

4. MINUTES OF PLANNING CONSULTATION GROUP MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN 19TH MARCH AND 30TH APRIL 2018

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Consultation Group meetings held between 19th March and 30th April 2018 be received.

5. OUTSTANDING MINUTES LIST

In relation to Minute No. 74(b) Members were advised that a report would be presented to the Committee in due course.

RESOLVED that the Outstanding Minutes be received.

SECTION A – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PUBLIC

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

6. REPORT(S) OF THE DIRECTOR OF REGENERATION AND NEIGHBOURHOODS

(a) Public Interest Test

The Head of Regeneration had deemed that all Items on the Agenda were of a non-confidential nature.

(b) Appeal Decisions Received

Members were presented with seven appeal decisions.

The Development Team Manager commented on the Appeal Decision for 48 Town Street, Lound, which was allowed at appeal. The Inspector failed to properly consider the reasons for refusal and the Council have lodged an application for a judicial review. If the review is successful the decision would be quashed and the application would return to the Planning Inspector for reconsideration.

RESOLVED that the appeal decisions be received.

(c) Planning Applications and Associated Items

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
18/00186/OUT	Walker & Son (Hauliers) Ltd	Outline planning application for up to 42 dwellings plus 2 replacement dwellings, public open space, landscaping, drainage infrastructure and access, The Paddocks, 35 Station Road, Sutton cum Lound

The application sought outline planning permission for up to 42 dwellings, 2 replacement dwellings, public open space, landscaping, drainage, infrastructure and access. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

The site is located outside of the Sutton-cum-Lound development boundary and in the Neighbourhood Plan designated area. The eastern half of the site is located within an Area of Archaeological Interest. The East Coast Main Line is located approximately 160m to the west of the site.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given. Details of relevant planning policy and the sites planning history was contained within the report. A petition, 97 letters of objection from local residents, and a letter of objection from the Parish Council have been received.

The District Council's Archaeological Consultant has raised concerns that the development is likely to have a permanent impact on the significance of any archaeological interest at the site.

Notwithstanding the Council's shortfall in five year housing land supply, it is considered that the development would conflict with policies of the Bassetlaw Local Development Framework, the National Planning Policy Framework and the Sutton Neighbourhood Plan.

Councillor J Gough spoke in objection on behalf of Sutton Parish Council. He advised that:

- The Parish Council strongly object.
- The development conflicts with Policy CS8 and the adopted Neighbourhood Plan.
- The proposal relates poorly to the built village.
- The site was the least preferred, with the most objections in the Neighbourhood Plan consultation.
- There has been letters of objection from local residents and a petition.
- The National Planning Policy Framework enables local people to shape decisions.
- The Neighbourhood Plan has full weight as the Council can demonstrate a 3 year housing land supply.
- The Neighbourhood Plan is a clear reason why the application should be refused.
- The application is ill conceived and contrary to planning policy.
- The application is not supported by the community or Neighbourhood Plan.
- The development would have a lasting impact on the village.
- If approved all other Parish Councils should be advised to abandon their neighbourhood plans as they are not worth the paper they are written on.

Mr N Johnson spoke in objection to the application. He advised that he is representing the Neighbourhood Plan Group. The Plan was made after a referendum in February and immediately became part of Bassetlaw Policy. The turnout at the referendum was 58.19% with 94.6% voting in favour of the plan. The community has embraced neighbourhood planning. The Inspector recently allowed an appeal – local people are appalled as the Neighbourhood Plan is proving worthless. Another appeal was refused but the Neighbourhood Plan was only included marginally. The Council are able to demonstrate a 3 year housing land supply therefore the Neighbourhood Plan has full weight. The village already has permission that would deliver 88 homes, that is just under 30% increase in the village. This application proposes a further 42 homes on the most unpopular site in the village.

Mr D Tuner spoke as agent for the application. He commented that:

- The development would support existing services and provide a range of homes.
- The Neighbourhood Plan does not propose a ceiling on housing delivery or prevent sites from coming forward
- The site was given five greens, scoring equally with the preferred site. The only difference being community support.
- The development is not contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan.
- The proposal would sustain services and the vitality of the village.
- The Inspector has made decisions with the Neighbourhood Plan and concluded that the benefits of development was substantive.
- The NPPF states that the Neighbourhood Plan must not promote less growth than the Council local plan.
- The site is achievable and deliverable.

Elected Members raised comments in relation to:

- The made Neighbourhood Plan and its weight.
- The Neighbourhood Plan identifies sites to come forward and would not have been successful if it precluded development.
- The site is outside of the development boundary.
- The impact on the character of the village.

- The Council's Local Plan has not been agreed or adopted, it is a starting document for debate, the Neighbourhood Plan has full value.
- The application disregards the views of the local residents.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Refuse for the reasons as circulated.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse for the reasons as circulated.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
17/01104/OUT	Mrs Natalie Sarah Holmes	Outline application with some matters reserved (approval being sought for access) for 15 self-build plots and adopted shared residential access ways, land south of Station Road, Beckingham

Members were advised that the application sought outline planning permission, with some matters reserved for 15 self-build plots with access from Station Road to serve the development. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

The site is located outside of the development boundary. The site is level, almost circular in shape and lies to the south of the village. There is an existing hedge on the road side boundary for the majority of the road frontage. The site is bounded by the A631 bypass to the west, the roundabout to the south, Station Road to the east and Willow Lane to the north.

The site has a total area of 0.95 hectares and lies to the southeast of Southfields, a large two storey dwelling. The 5 self-build plots would be served by a single point of access from Station Road.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given. The relevant planning policies and the sites planning history was set out within the report.

Members were advised that Beckingham is identified as a rural service centre and the site would be located in a sustainable location. It is not considered that the development would appear unduly discordant with the landscape and character of the area and conditions regarding landscaping are proposed. In relation to visual amenity the proposal is not considered to have a significant residential impact. Highways have raised no objection subject to conditions. Given that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of land for housing, the application would help to address the shortfall.

Mr Gough spoke in objection, he commented that:

- He lives on the plot of land at Southfields and this has been going on for five years, first for six house, then 12 and now 15.
- At the last Committee Members said that their hands were tied.
- He is appealing against the fact that the dwellings are self builds as there are no time limits.
- The Council need houses to be built now.
- His family would have to endure the development for many years to come.
- Beckingham was trying to put a neighbourhood plan together.
- There are 200 houses being built around the corner on a dangerous road.
- Self builds will not help targets quickly.

Councillor J Sanger spoke in objection as Ward Member for Beckingham. She advised that for future residents on the site it will be like living on a second roundabout with heavy traffic to the west, the south and the east of the development. The site is on Low Street and not Station Road as stated in the application, it was changed to Low Street in 2012. The serious worry of residents is the entrance to the site. Heavy articulated lorries constantly travel down to the wharf near the River Trent, plus much village traffic, does anyone realise how busy this piece of Low Street is all day and evening? It is horrendous and traffic leaving the roundabout already keeps to the speed limit. The entrance to the site is past the two houses on the left leaving the village, almost opposite the entrance to the Village Hall with approximately 30 more vehicles accessing the road from the site – it is a serious accident waiting to happen. 15 dwellings are proposed on the site as individual plots, is this not overshadowing and loss of privacy for the house in the west corner of the site? Can the layout of the site be looked at to take the house into account? There are 17 windows in this house built to enjoy the field and wildlife at the time. Can extra conditions be added? There are currently 17 but it must be correct to the existing family. She asked that the application be refused.

Elected Members raised comments/ asked questions in relation to:

- It could be some time before the self-build plots are built and contribute to the five year housing land supply.
- How the Section 106 Agreement can be enforced on self-build plots.
- Affordable housing on site.
- The sites planning history.
- The responsibility for the shared access way.
- The adverse outcomes outweigh any benefits.

In response to questions raised the Solicitor advised of the draft Section 106 trigger points. The agreement would be between the Council and whoever the landowner is. When the plots are sold the S106 would be negotiated in the conveyance process when the land is purchased. The obligations would move with the land ownership.

Members discussed the enforceability of the S106 Agreement on the applicant rather than the purchasers.

RESOLVED that the application be deferred to a future meeting of the Committee for clarification regarding the Section 106 Agreement.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
18/00088/OUT	Mr Anthony Bamford	Outline application with all matters reserved for residential development of 10 dwellings, land at The Croft, West Moor Road, Walkeringham

Members were advised that the application sought outline planning permission, with all matters reserved for 10 dwellings. Slides were used to show the site location, an indicative layout and photographs of the site. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

The Development Team Manager presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given. Letters of objection have been received from 13 local residents and the ward Member. The relevant planning policies and the sites planning history was set out within the report. Member's attention was drawn to the amendments and revised reasons for refusal circulated prior to the meeting.

The site is considered to be in an unsustainable location and would have a significant impact on the landscape and character of village. The application lacks a flood risk assessment and SUDs and insufficient information has been provided regarding highway safety.

Mr P Ferry spoke in objection to the application. He advised that he lives in Honeysuckle House in front of the development and the proposed access would be on the gable end of the house. Emphasis has not been put on the flooding issues. He commented that when they bought their house it was given an amber warning for flooding, after light rainfall the garden is saturated and the field collects surface water, after heavy rainfall the field is like a lake. Using a soakaway system would intensify the problem. The properties would be built on clay and that us the basis for serous concerns. The other issue is he proposed driveway on the bend with heavy traffic.

Councillor J Sanger spoke as ward Member. She advised that:

- The application is not popular with residents.
- Residents would be grateful and relieved if the Committee see fit to agree with officers and refuse the application.
- The application does not enhance the open rural character of the landscape, it is encroaching the countryside.
- The proposal is not sustainable, there is no shop, no post office, the school is full with no plans for extension, the doctors practice is overstretched, the local church may be closing and the local transport facilities are poor. The nearest bus stop is quite a walk from the site.
- The site was not in the Neighbourhood Plan's call for sites.
- It is not a linear development which is the main characteristic of the village layout.
- The area is likely to flood after heavy rainfall; nearby residents have photographs of their gardens as proof.
- If permitted the application would be contrary to the objectives of the Local Development Framework and the National Planning Policy Framework that is no safe access it the site can be achievable.

Mr D Cooney spoke as the Agent for the application. He commented on the reason to refuse due to sustainable drainage, in one of the other applications on the Agenda SUDs is part of the Section 106 Agreement prior to commencement of the development. He asked for consistency in the applications. The proposal is a small development for ten houses; in Councillor Sanger's newsletter she states that smaller developments are more acceptable. A design and access statement has been submitted and tree planting provides a strong boundary. The site is no in a flood risk zone. He asked Members to fully consider the development.

Elected Members raised comments/ asked questions in relation to:

- Water management and drainage.
- Flooding issues.
- Highways.
- The proposal would encroach into the open landscape and is not linear in character.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Refuse for the amended reasons as circulated.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Refuse for the amended as reasons as follows:

1. The site is located in Walkeringham, but outside the development boundary and therefore in the Countryside. Walkeringham is identified as a Rural Service Centre of northeast Bassetlaw. Policy CS1 of the Bassetlaw Local Development Framework states that development will be restricted to areas within defined Development Boundaries. The development, if permitted, would therefore be contrary to the policies outlined above and would conflict with the objectives of the Local Development Framework.

Whilst the District Council is unable to demonstrate a deliverable 5-year land supply for housing, and the above policy is considered out of date it is considered that the benefits of additional housing to the proposal in increasing housing supply are significantly and

demonstrably be outweighed by its adverse impacts, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, contrary to Paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

2. The site in question is identified in the Bassetlaw Landscape Character Assessment as Mid-Nottinghamshire Farmlands Policy Zone 02: Walkeringham. As part of its aims to create and enhance the open rural character of the landscape, it recommends that new development should be of an appropriate design and scale. Historically this area of the village of Walkeringham has formed around an open area of undeveloped agricultural land, known as 'The Moor' and taken the form of linear development. The Bassetlaw Local Development Framework contains policy DM4, which states that new development should respect its wider surroundings in relation to historic development patterns and landscape character.

Similar advice is contained in policy DM9 states that that new development proposals in and adjoining the countryside will be expected to be designed so as to be sensitive to their landscape setting and expected to enhance the distinctive qualities of the landscape character policy zone in which they would be situated. Part 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework Conserving and Enhancing the natural environment states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes.

The application site currently forms part of a much larger arable field which is largely flat and which affords views over the surrounding area. Being in a relatively prominent and visually isolated location it is considered that the proposed development is backland development to the rear of the properties West Moor Road which would pay little regard to the rural character and appearance of this part of the village. The proposed erection of 10 dwellings would introduce an unduly prominent and obtrusive element into the landscape to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area.

If permitted, the development would result in a significant incursion into the open landscape and would seriously detract from the character and appearance of the village and would fail to respect the historic development patterns of the village, contrary to Policies DM4 and DM9 of the Local Development Framework and the National Planning Framework

3. Policy DM12 B of the Core Strategy Bassetlaw Development Framework states that proposals for new development in Walkeringham will only be supported where it is demonstrated to the council's satisfaction that the proposed development will not exacerbate existing land drainage and sewerage problems.

The application does not include any proposals for SuDS or details that the existing drainage and sewerage problems in the village will not be exacerbated. If permitted, the development could potentially lead to and exacerbate existing land drainage problems within the village and the surrounding area. As insufficient evidence has been submitted with the application, the development, if permitted would be contrary to the objectives of the Local Development Framework and the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The Bassetlaw Local Development Framework contains policy DM4, which states that permission will only be granted for residential development that is of no detriment to highway safety. The proposed scheme has failed to demonstrate that a safe access to the development site can be achieved. Similar advice is contained in the National Planning Policy Framework. The development, if permitted, would be contrary to this policy and would conflict with the objectives of the Local Development Framework and the NPPF.

The required additional information was not submitted and as such insufficient information has been received with regard to Highway safety. As such the proposal is considered to be contrary to Policy DM4 and the NPPF.

(Councillor G Freeman left the meeting)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
17/01462/OUT	Mr and Mrs Neave	Outline planning application with some matters reserved (approval being sought for access) for residential development of up to 165 dwellings, land east of Doncaster Road, Langold

Members were advised that the application sought outline planning permission, with some matters reserved for residential development of up to 165 dwellings. Details of access were included for consideration. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

The site is located outside of, but adjacent to, the Langold development boundary. The site is located to the north of Langold, to the east of Doncaster Road and is 7.56 hectares in area, currently the land use is agricultural. The site is bounded to the west by Doncaster Road, residential development to the south and agricultural land to north and east. The site is generally flat and there are trees and hedges along the road frontage. The site is located in Flood Zone 1, which has a low probability of river flooding.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given. Letters of objection had been received from the Parish Council and 13 local residents. The relevant planning policies and the sites planning history was set out within the report.

Given that the Council is unable to demonstrate a five year supply of land for housing, the application would help to address the shortfall. The site located in sustainable location and is not considered to have a detrimental impact on character and appearance of the area, residential amenity or highway safety.

Mr M Caley spoke in objection to the application. He advised that:

- The site is outside of the development boundary.
- The site was not included in the Development Plan in 2011.
- The proposal is contrary to policies CS1 and CS5.
- The enabling of planning permission on site in advance of the emerging Bassetlaw Local Plan is premature.
- In terms of highways not all issues have been addressed in relation to the junction.
- The proposal is contrary to policy DM13.
- There are heritage constraints; to the north is Hodsock Park and Oldcotes Conservation Area.
- The application is in conflict with advice in the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DM8 of the adopted plan.
- The development does not compliment the character or landscape of the area.
- The Archeology report submitted is inadequate. The report is only desktop and a more thorough report could have a different conclusion.
- There are concerns over schooling and the question of funding for schools on another site is not resolved.
- Residents are concerned as a gas main runs across the site.

Councillor G Freeman spoke as ward Member for Langold. She advised that Langold was constructed in the 1920's to provide much needed housing for the colliery. The village was constructed like a model village with features of architectural and historical interest. She asked if the same recommendation would be given if the Council had a five year housing land supply. The site is in the designated neighbourhood plan area and it is possible that there are archaeological remains on the site that have not been explored. She commented that there would be an impact on wildlife and there is a concern the development would become a separate village.

Ms J Hodson spoke as the Agent for the application. She advised that the application was subject to pre-application discussion from October 2016 and the application was progressed based on advice given. The application has included additional works, a geographical survey and the access has been moved. The application was worked up and submitted with layout plans. All trees, except at the access, will be maintained. There are facilities and services in the area of the site and bus provision. The applicant has written to the Local Authority to agree the S106 Agreement and understands CIL and S106 contributions.

Elected Members raised comments/ asked questions in relation to:

- Education contributions.
- Affordable housing.
- The gas line that runs across the site.

In response to questions raised Members were advised that the Education Authority initially sought a contribution for primary school provision however the figures have been recalculated and they are subsequently no longer requesting a contribution. To request a contribution that Education Authority has to prove there is a lack of capacity.

The Case Officer commented that an Archaeological Statement has been submitted and the Conservation Officer is comfortable in terms of heritage impacts and has no concerns. The applicant has been aware of the gas line and this would be a site constrain that would form part of the reserved matters application.

(The meeting was adjourned for legal advice to be sought)

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant planning permission subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement and the conditions as circulated.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant planning permission subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement and the conditions as circulated.

(Councillor G Freeman re-joined the meeting and Councillor M W Quigley MBE left the meeting)

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
17/01239/RSB	Sundown Adventureland	Proposed 49 holiday lodges, 32 touring caravan pitches, 14 glamping pods, reception area with manages accommodations, store and play areas, parking and associated infrastructure (resubmission of 16/01363/FUL) land at Elmwood Lodge, Sundown Adventureland, Rampton Road, Treswell

The application was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
17/00517/FUL	Mr Alexander Mills	Erect 17 one bedroom apartments following demolition of existing dwelling and construct new access , 125 Scrooby Road, Bircotes

Members were advised that the application sought to erect 17 one bedroom apartments following the demolition of the existing dwelling. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

The site lies within the Harworth and Bircotes Development Boundary, to the east of and adjacent the Local Centre Boundary. The site is located within a mixed residential and commercial town centre location. The site is currently occupied by a large single dwelling which is unoccupied.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given. The relevant planning policies and the sites planning history was set out within the report.

Members were advised that the developer has submitted a viability assessment which has demonstrated that it would not be financially viable to develop the site should the Section 106 Contributions be required. The findings of the viability assessment have been accepted and the developer has agreed to accept an 'overage clause' to ensure that, should the financial situation improve, the Council would be in a clawback position.

Given the Council's lack of a five year supply of housing the site would help to address the shortfall. The site is located in a sustainable location and it is considered not to have significant detrimental impact therefore it is considered that the benefits of the proposed development to the site and community are significant and complies with planning policies.

An elected Member asked a question regarding the Town Councils concerns in relation to overspill parking on Shrewsbury Road. The Case Officer advised that the proposed parking is sufficient for the development.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant planning permission subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement and the conditions as circulated.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant planning permission subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement and the conditions as circulated.

<u>Application No</u>	<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Proposal</u>
18/00022/OUT	Mr J Smith	Outline application for planning permission (all matters reserved) for ten dwellings, land south of pumping station fronting Bawtry Road, Blyth, Worksop

Members were advised that the application sought to erect ten dwellings with all matters reserved. Slides were used to show the site location. The site had been the subject of a site visit prior to the meeting.

The site is located outside of any development boundary. The land comprises of 0.67 hectares of a large arable field. The site is north of the A1 (M) and adjacent to the A614. Immediately to the south is an area of woodland, then the A1 services and to the north there is a sewage pumping station.

The Case Officer presented the proposals and a summary of responses from statutory consultees was given. One letter of support has been received from a local resident, one letter from a resident stating they have no objection and one letter making observations. Blyth Parish Council have no objection in principle. The relevant planning policies and the sites planning history was set out within the report.

RECOMMENDATION OF THE HEAD OF REGENERATION – Grant planning permission subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement and the conditions as circulated.

COMMITTEE DECISION – Grant planning permission subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement and the conditions as circulated.

(d) Proposed Minor Alterations to Pre-Application Protocol

Members were presented with a report which detailed the need for the Pre-application Protocol in line with changes to the Council's Charges and Schedules for 2018-19. The report sought approval for minor changes to the Protocol.

The updated protocol encourages applicants to enter into a Planning Performance Agreement Protocol or bespoke charging schedule/ programme of work agreement. The changes to the Protocol were outlined within the report. The current and proposed Protocol were appended to the report.

RESOLVED that:

1. The need for an amended Pre-application Protocol and its contents be noted.
2. The amendments to the Pre-application Protocol, as set out in the report, be agreed.

(e) Development Management Performance Report 2017/18 Full Year

Members were presented with a performance report for the Development Management function for the whole year and the final quarter of 2017/2018, for the period 1st April 2017 to 31st March 2018. The previous year's figures were included for comparison.

Members were given a summary of the report. The measures of performance outcomes and current position for determining 'major', 'minor' and 'other' applications were given.

The outcome of appeals against refused applications allowed was also given along with planning enforcement caseload statistics.

Members commented on the positive report and thanked planning officers for their hard work and also the Enforcement Officer for his commitment.

The Chair also thanked Members of the Committee for decisions that have been robustly upheld.

RESOLVED that the report be received and the current performance data be noted.

SECTION B – ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION IN PRIVATE

Key Decisions

None.

Other Decisions

None.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH THE CHAIR CONSIDERS TO BE URGENT

As there was no other urgent business to be considered, the Chair closed the meeting.

(Meeting closed at 9.06pm.)