

PLANNING COMMITTEE

21st February 2019

Present: Councillor Chris Mitchell in the Chair

Councillors Agar (Vice-Chairman), A. Amos, B. Amos, Berry, Cawthorne, Denlegh-Maxwell, Hodges, Johnson, J. Squires (in place of Councillor Denham) and Stephen

Also in Attendance:
Councillor Knight

Apologies: Councillor Denham

144 Declarations of Interest

None.

145 Minutes of Previous Planning Committee

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 24th January 2019 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

Matters Arising:

Minute 130 – Public Participation – It was asked if a written response had been sent to Mr Andy Taylor, Warndon Parish Councillor. The Chairman agreed to check that this had been done.

146 Site Visits

There were no site visits.

147 Public Participation

None.

148 Public Representation

None.

149 Application P18L0453 - 30 Norton Road

Introduction

The Committee considered an application for the proposed erection of a 2 bed detached dormer bungalow at 30 Norton Road.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application was reported to planning committee on the 24th January 2018 at which it was deferred, minded to refuse, on grounds that the proposed dwelling would cause harm to the residential amenity of the neighbouring residents by virtue of an overbearing impact on neighbouring residents amenities and would be an over-development of the site in comparison with the previously approved scheme (P17L0363), contrary to the aims and interests of policy SWDP 21 and paragraph 127 of the NPPF (2018).

The original report was attached as appendix 1.

Site Visit

The application had not been the subject of a site visit.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the comments of the Deputy Director – Economic Development and Planning with regard to the concerns expressed by Members related to the siting and scale of the proposed development in relation to the neighbouring properties, scale of the development, consequences of the changes in the design of the schemes and the overbearing impact.

Officer Presentation

The Development Management Services Team Leader drew the Committee's attention to paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 of the report which identified the change to the eaves height.

The Development Management Services Team Leader continued to recommend the application for approval but if Members resolved that they were minded to refuse the application then a suggested reason for refusal was given at paragraph 3.21 of the Officers report, although it remained his opinion that the reason was not sufficiently robust.

Public Representations

There had been no one registered to speak on the application.

Key Points of Debate

- The local Ward Member, Councillor Knight, in addressing the Committee stated that the neighbours concerns were of mass and scale and whilst the ridge had been lowered the eaves height was causing concern.
- Members agreed that a good debate had taken place at the last meeting and that nothing had changed, although the eaves height was now referred to in this report. It was asked whether this would be to add an extra room. The Development Management Services Team Leader stated that the roof space would continue to provide bedroom accommodation but the proposals sought to provide greater head room in comparison with the approved scheme.

- Some Members agreed that the increase in the eaves height would result in an increase in the mass of brickwork and understood why but it did not make it acceptable.
- Other Members felt that there was no planning reason to refuse the application and agreed with the Officer's opinion that it would not stand up in an appeal. Although there was no objection principle to development on the site, as there was an existing scheme, the objection was one of the increased mass of the development.
- The Development Management Services Team Leader proposed an amendment to his suggested reason for refusal at paragraph 3.21 of the report to include the increase in the mass of brickwork arising from the eaves height if Members were to refuse contrary to Officer's recommendation.

On being proposed and seconded and put to the vote the application was refused. The grounds for refusal were as outlined by the Development Management Services Team Leader, as amended.

Contrary to Officer's recommendation it was:

RESOLVED: That the Committee refuse planning permission for the following reason:

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed dwelling would introduce a dwelling within a site which, by virtue of the limited space and arrangement and the increase in the mass of brickwork to the rear elevation arising from the increase in the height of the eaves and proximity of the dwelling to the rear boundary of the site and garden of the neighbouring property, would generate harm to the adjoining residents by virtue of being overbearing in scale and size. The occupation of the site and ensuing facilities required are contrived to the point of being occupied intensely and in a way that is contrary to the surrounding development.

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, this would be contrary to the aims and interests of policy SWDP 21 and paragraphs 127, 128 and 130 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018, which seek to promote inclusive design, social interaction, and the provision and use of shared spaces.

150 Application P18G0322 - Site at DEFRA, Whittington Road

Introduction

The Committee considered an application for the proposed erection of 64 dwellings, 71 extra-care living apartments with associated ancillary facilities (Use Class C3), access, car parking, landscaping and associated works, DEFRA site, Whittington Road.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application had been referred to Planning Committee as it did not fall under the scheme of delegation and was a departure from the Development Plan.

Site Visit

The application had not been the subject of a site visit.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the background to the proposal, the site and surrounding area, the proposal itself, relevant planning policies, planning history and representations and consultations where applicable. The draft Heads of Terms were attached as appendix 1 to the report.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the late papers which related to the following:

- amendment to the recommendation in the report - the reference to the referral to the National Planning Casework Unit has been removed as an application of this nature does not need to be referred as set down in Circular 02/09: The Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009;
- additional comments received from the Highway Authority providing an update with regard to the site wide housing parking provisions;
- additional condition related to the installation of electric vehicle charging points at plots 45 and 46; and
- comments from the City Council's Economic Development and Planning Policy teams following receipt and assessment of the viability information

Officer Presentation

The information in the report was presented as set out by the Deputy Director – Economic Development and Planning.

Public Representations

There had been no one registered to speak on the application.

Key Points of Debate

- Members were disappointed that the site was not going to be used for employment as originally approved and questioned whether the site should have been earmarked as employment land in the South Worcestershire Development Plan originally. The Case Officer confirmed that viability was now being assessed at the allocation stage of the development plan review and that moving forward this should mean that sites are only allocated once it is demonstrated that they would be viable for that use.

- Members asked about the details of cycle storage as they could not be seen on the plan. The Principal Planning Officer confirmed they were not shown on the plan but were conditioned and sufficient detail had been provided to determine the application.
- The Worcestershire County Council Transport Planning and Development Management Team Leader acknowledged Members comments related to this issue and informed them that this will be requested for future applications.
- The Principal Planning Officer stated the application was supported by a detailed viability assessment which demonstrated that the development of the site for Class B1 office use would be unviable.
- Members agreed however that it was important to have extra care facilities and were also pleased that 30% affordable units would be provided. Overall it was seen as a good use of open space. Members also saw the electric vehicle charging points and the financial contributions as a positive to the proposal.

On being proposed and seconded and put to the vote the proposal was agreed.

RESOLVED: That the Committee is minded to grant planning permission, subject to the applicant and all persons having an interest in the land entering into an Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in accordance with the agreed Heads of Terms, and subject to the Deputy Director – Governance being satisfied with the nature of such an Agreement delegate to the Deputy Director – Economic Development and Planning to grant the necessary planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the plans list.

151 Application P18K0410 - Former Homebase Store, Tybridge Street

Introduction

The Committee considered an application for the proposed removal of condition 2 of planning application P85C0477 to allow occupation/trading by another occupant, former 'Homebase' Store, Hylton Road.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application had been referred to the Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Udall on the grounds of impact on the St John's retail area.

Site Visit

The application had not been the subject of a site visit.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the background to the proposal, the site and surrounding area, the proposal itself, relevant planning policies, planning history and representations and consultations where applicable.

There were no late papers circulated.

Officer Presentation

The information in the report was presented as set out by the Deputy Director – Economic Development and Planning.

Public Representations

There had been no one registered to speak on the application.

Key Points of Debate

Members were aware that this condition attached to application P85C0447 was purely for the benefit of Homebase Limited and that the removal of the condition would allow occupation/.trading by another occupant and was seen as acceptable.

On being proposed and seconded and put to the vote the proposal was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the Committee grant permission to remove condition 2 of planning application P85C0447.

152 Application P18K0411 - Former Homebase Store, Tybridge Street

Introduction

The Committee considered an application for the proposed variation of condition 2 of application P01A0240 (restriction of retail sale categories), former 'Homebase' Ltd, Hylton Road.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application had been referred to the Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Udall on the grounds of impact on the St John's retail area.

Site Visit

The application had not been the subject of a site visit.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the background to the proposal, the site and surrounding area, the proposal itself, relevant planning policies, planning history and representations and consultations where applicable.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the late paper which related to correspondence in support of the application.

Officer Presentation

The information in the report was presented as set out by the Deputy Director – Economic Development and Planning.

Public Representations

There had been no one registered to speak on the application.

Key Points of Debate

- Members supported the proposal which provided employment opportunities which was welcomed. It also maintained the vibrancy of the area.
- It was asked what effect the proposal would have on the St John's shopping area. The Principal Planning Officer explained that because of the small scale floor space it did not need to be supported by a retail impact assessment. This type of business would not trade in a City Centre and it was the Officer's opinion that it would not have an unacceptable effect.
- In referring to the sale of goods the post office services was queried. Members were concerned that this would have an effect on the post office in St John's. The Principal Planning Officer said she would ask them to specify exactly what this was.

On being proposed and seconded and put to the vote the proposal was agreed, subject to clarification of the nature of the 'post office services' referred to and confirmation that this would not comprise a Royal Mail post office.

RESOLVED: That the Committee grant permission to vary condition 2 of planning application P01A0240 to the following:

1. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, the units shall only be used for sale of carpets, furniture, furnishings, electrical goods, automotive and cycle products, DIY maintenance and improvement products for the house and garden, pets and pet products, and office equipment and accessories (including blank cassettes and compact discs relating to computers and computer products).

The sale of goods within the following categories shall be permitted from a maximum of 925 square metres of the store only:

- (i) Food and drink;**
- (ii) Clothing including children's clothing and sports wear;**
- (iii) Stationary items and post office services;**
- (iv) Shoes;**
- (v) Toys and sports goods;**
- (vi) Fashion accessories including handbags and luggage;**
- (vii) Watches and jewellery;**
- (viii) Perfume and toiletries;**
- (ix) Pharmaceutical items;**
- (x) Books; and**
- (xi) Music, records, CD's, pre-recorded videos and audio tapes**

The retail sale of goods shall not be permitted other than as detailed above and the store shall be used for no other purpose (including any other purpose in Class A of the schedule to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987, or in any provision equivalent to that Class in any statutory instrument revoking and re-enacting that order with or without modification) without prior written agreement with the local planning authority.

For the following reason:

To safeguard the vitality and viability of the City Centre and St Johns District Centre in accordance with the aims and objectives of SWDP10.

2. Approve the variation of the Section 52 Agreement dated 21st April 1986 as amended by previous Deeds of Variation dated 24th July 2001 and 19th November 2015 respectively.

153 Application P18D0480 - Central Park, Great Western Avenue

Introduction

The Committee considered an application for the proposed development of 1,392sq.m of floor space for Use Classes B1 (C1) and D1 (Non Residential/Institution/Training Centre) with associated infrastructure at Central Park, Great Western Avenue.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application had been referred to the Planning Committee as it did not fall under the scheme of delegation. Previous applications for the site had also been determined by Planning Committee.

Site Visit

The application had not been the subject of a site visit.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the background to the proposal, the site and surrounding area, the proposal itself, relevant planning policies, planning history and representations and consultations where applicable.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the late papers which related to the following:

- following the completion of the Unilateral Undertaking associated with application P18D0210, the Unilateral Undertaking was no longer required and the recommendation was to be amended accordingly; and
- consultee response from Worcestershire County Council Highway Authority having no objection, subject to conditions.

Officer Presentation

The information in the report was presented as set out by the Deputy Director – Economic Development and Planning.

The Principal Planning Officer informed the Committee that as this building had not been constructed and the approved use implemented a change of use application could not be used to consider the proposed change in the use of the unit and therefore a fresh application was required.

Public Representations

There had been no one registered to speak on the application.

Key Points of Debate

- The Legal Team Manager responded to a point of clarification on a Unilateral Agreement.
- Members noted that the Lead Local Flood Authority had not yet been provided with a drainage strategy or sustainable drainage system proposal as requested but this had been covered by a condition in the plans list.
- Members welcomed the proposal and the units intended use.

On being proposed and seconded and put to the vote the proposal was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the Committee grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the plans list.

154 Application P18J0541 - Former YMCA Building, Henwick Road

Introduction

The Committee considered an application for the proposed variation of condition 2 of planning consent P17J0577 to allow enlargement of plant room and repositioning of cycle store at the former YMCA Building, Henwick Road.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application was deferred for decision at the meeting of the Planning Committee on 24th January 2019 on grounds of concern raised by Councillor Udall on behalf of the neighbouring residents regarding notification of the application.

A review of the planning file confirmed that the requisite statutory consultation was carried out. The residents of 2, 4, 6 Westbourne Close, 30 and 32 Comer Avenue were notified of the application on 19th December 2018 as the closest properties affected by the proposals. A site notice was also posted on the same day.

However, following the meeting of the Planning Committee, residents were re-consulted on 5th February 2019 and were provided with a copy of the relevant plans, with a request for any comments to be received by 15th February 2019

Site Visit

The application had not been the subject of a site visit.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the background to the proposal, the site and surrounding area, the proposal itself, relevant planning policies, planning history and representations and consultations where applicable.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the late papers which related to the following:

- amendment to condition1;
- additional neighbour consultation details and officer's response to their comments made; and
- further neighbour objections and the Officer's response to the comments made.

Officer Presentation

The information in the report was presented as set out by the Deputy Director – Economic Development and Planning.

Consideration of applications under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 was explained to Members for clarification.

Members were shown the difference between the approved and proposed scheme in the form of a powerpoint presentation.

Public Representations

There had been no one registered to speak on the application.

Key Points of Debate

- Members acknowledged that the proposal was necessary because the existing boilers needed to be replaced but could not be moved or replaced without extensive demolition of part of the listed building. It was agreed that the proposal was the best solution.
- Members thanked Officer's for checking and carrying out a re-consultation process again with residents.

On being proposed and seconded and put to the vote the proposal was unanimously agreed.

RESOLVED: That the Committee grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the plans list.

155 Land at Wyevale Garden Centre, Droitwich Road

The Committee considered a report by the Deputy Director - Governance to vary a Section 106 Agreement relating to planning application P89C0570, land forming part of Wyevale Garden Centre, Droitwich Road.

The majority of the site, the subject of the S106 Agreement, is situated on the west side of Droitwich Road but also included a piece of land on the east side of Droitwich Road, shown edged red on the plan ('the Red Land') as identified in the late paper and as highlighted to Members in the powerpoint presentation.

The 'Red Land' was not used by the applicant in connection with its business and was occupied by an agricultural tenant who farmed the land.

The applicant had requested a Deed of Variation to the Section 106 Agreement to allow them to sell the 'Red Land' separately from the remainder of the site. This would allow for flexibility in the future use of the 'Red Land' subject to the submission and approval of a planning application for development of the land accordingly.

RESOLVED: That the Committee approve the variation of the Section 106 Agreement dated 7th June 1991.

156 Application P18K0466 - 23 Bozward Street**Introduction**

The Committee considered an application for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension to an existing 5 bed House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) to form a 6 bed HMO Use Class C4, 23 Bozward Street.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application was referred to Planning Committee on 24th January 2019 whereby the Committee deferred the application, minded to refuse, on grounds that the proposal would result in an increase in demand for roadside parking on Bozward Street and adjacent streets that currently experience problems of congestion and would lead to inconvenience for local residents and exacerbate the difficulties they faced in parking their vehicles.

The original report was attached as Appendix 1.

Site Visit

The application was not the subject of a site visit.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the comments of the Deputy Director – Economic Development and Planning with regard to the concerns expressed by Members related to car parking. The parking standards for HMOs were set out in the adopted Houses in Multiple Occupation Supplementary Planning Document (October 2014).

In this regard the site is located within Zone 2 wherein a total of two parking spaces would be required for both 5 and 6 bedroom HMO's.

The Worcestershire County Council Streetscape Design Guide was also a material planning consideration and requires both 5 and 6 bedroom HMO's to provide a total of 3 parking spaces and six cycle spaces.

There were no late papers circulated.

Officer Presentation

The Development Management Services Team Leader drew the Committee's attention to paragraphs 3.9 to 3.11 of the report with regard to the 'fall back' position, which meant that the applicant could exercise permitted development rights to construct the extension to provide the additional accommodation if the application was refused.

The Development Management Services Team Leader continued to recommend the application for approval but if Members resolved that they were minded to refuse the application then a suggested reason for refusal was given at paragraph 3.17 of the Officers report, although it remained his opinion that the reason was not sufficiently robust.

Public Representations

There had been no one registered to speak on the application.

Key Points of Debate

- Members asked what relevant policy was referred to when this property became an HMO in terms of highway matters. The Development Management Services Team Leader stated that prior to the Article 4 Direction conversion of the property to a HMO was permitted development. Reference was made to the Development Plan and the Streetscape Design Guide and LTP4 which were material considerations for parking.
- In this case, as a permitted HMO the proposed extension would be subject to Prior Approval consultation. In the absence of objections from neighbours the Local Planning Authority has to approve the Prior Approval. Under this process there was strict criteria which were different to a planning application. Members were referred to paragraph 3.12 of the report that related to these permitted development rights.
- Members asked if planning permission was given was there any condition that could be attached to make car parking better. The Development Management Services Team Leader stated that whilst he was aware of some reported instances where it had been sought to restrict car ownership by residents of HMO's, nevertheless he did not consider that such a condition would satisfy the relevant tests in itself and because the use of the property as a HMO was its permitted use. The Legal Team Manager also confirmed that such a condition would not be recommended and stated that there was an opportunity to remove permitted development rights for future extensions on this application.

- Concerns had been raised that there could potentially be more people living in the property than allowed. The Development Management Services Team Leader stated that use of the property as a Class C4 HMO was limited to occupation by no more than 6 residents. However, if there were any concerns regarding the number of occupants then these should be raised with the Local Planning Authority and Housing Department.
- Some Members were of the opinion to approve the application and remove permitted development rights. Other Members still objected to the proposal.

A proposal was made to refuse the application, this was seconded, and on being put to the vote the application was refused as set out in paragraph 3.17 of the Officer's report.

Contrary to Officer's recommendation it was:-

RESOLVED: That the Committee refuse planning permission for the following reason:

The site comprises a two storey terraced dwelling within an established residential area that is characterised by predominantly two storey Victorian terraced houses that are broadly similar in original design, layout and appearance. A common characteristic of these properties is also the high incidence of roadside parking throughout the day and evening hours on Bozward Street and the surrounding streets, where the high density of development limits the opportunity for off-road parking. Consequently, the streets are dominated by parked cars.

Policy SWDP 21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan 2016 requires all development, inter alia, to have regard to the amenities of neighbouring residents in terms of traffic generation and the provision of car parking facilities. This is reflected in the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document - Houses in Multiple Occupation (2014) which includes parking standards for HMO's to ensure that adequate provision for off street parking is made available in the interests of the amenity of nearby properties. Whilst the HMO SPD recognises that there may be circumstances in which on-street parking may be permissible, nevertheless this may not be the case in circumstances where there is insufficient capacity to accommodate on-site car parking in an acceptable manner on streets that already incur problems with on-street parking.

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposal would lead to increased pressure for roadside parking on Bozward Street and adjacent streets that currently experience problems of congestion and would lead to inconvenience for local residents and exacerbate the difficulties they face in parking their vehicles throughout the day and evening hours. The proposal would thereby also be contrary to the aims and interests that Policy SWDP 21 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan 2016 and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document - Houses in Multiple Occupation (2014) seek to protect and promote in this regard.

157 Application P18K0467 - 21 Bozward Street**Introduction**

The Committee considered an application for the proposed erection of a single storey rear and side extension to an existing 6 bed House in Multiple Occupation (Use Class C4), 21 Bozward Street.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application was referred to Planning Committee on 24th January 2019 whereby the Committee deferred the application, pending the decision on application P18K0466 at number 23 Bozward Street, and to clarify implications on the ability to implement the proposed extension in accordance with recommended condition 4.

The original report was attached as Appendix 1.

Site Visit

The application was not the subject of a site visit.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the comments of the Deputy Director – Economic Development and Planning with regard to the impact that the proposed extension would have on neighbouring residents if the application for 23 Bozward Street was refused. Following assessment it was considered that the proposed extension would not have a detrimental impact with regards to loss of light on the occupiers of 23 Bozward Street.

There were no late papers circulated.

Officer Presentation

The Development Management Services Team Leader drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 4.2 of the report which stated that should planning permission be granted for this application it was recommending that condition 4 be deleted.

Public Representations

There had been no one registered to speak on the application.

Key Points of Debate

- It was commented that the same argument relating to car parking on the previous application applied to this proposal. The Development Management Services Team Leader stated that the proposal meant that the number of bedrooms remained the same. The change was internal re-configuration.

- It was asked that a condition relating to the removal of permitted development rights be applied. This was agreed.

On being proposed and seconded and put to the vote the proposal was agreed, subject to the removal of condition 4 and the additional condition relating to the removal of permitted development rights.

RESOLVED: That the Committee grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the plans list, the omission of condition of 4 and an additional condition for the removal of permitted development rights.

158 Application P18E0484 - Land adjacent to 1 Lavender Road

Introduction

The Committee considered an application for the proposed erection of a 3 bedroom dwelling on land adjacent to 1 Lavender Road.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application had been referred to Planning Committee as it was contrary to policy SWDP 38 – Green Space of the South Worcestershire Development Plan 2016.

Site Visit

The application had not been the subject of a site visit.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the background to the proposal, the site and surrounding area, the proposal itself, relevant planning policies, planning history and representations and consultations where applicable.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the late paper which related to the following:

- neighbour objections and support of the application; and
- consultee response from Worcestershire County Council Highway Authority having no objection, subject to conditions.

Officer Presentation

The information in the report was presented as set out by the Deputy Director – Economic Development and Planning.

The Development Management Services Team Leader drew the Committee's attention to the planning history of the site at paragraph 6.1 of the report confirming that the site already had extant permission for a dwellinghouse. However, this would generate harm to the existing trees on the boundary of the park and therefore a scheme to be alternatively sited was sought.

Members were shown the approved plans and the proposed scheme.

Public Representations

There had been no one registered to speak on the application.

Key Points of Debate

- On a point of clarification the Chairman asked that as the site lies within an area designated as Green Space and the application was approved, would this set a precedent. The Development Management Services Team Leader stated that each application is determined on its own merits and referred Members to paragraphs 8.16-8.20 related to the impact on Green Space.
- Members generally agreed there was no objection to the contemporary design of the building which was seen as an improvement to the previous scheme. It was also noted that the mature Sequoia was to be protected. Some Members, however, did object to the style, scale and impact the proposal would have on the green space.
- If approved Members were concerned over deliveries to the site and asked that a condition be included regarding times of access. The Development Management Team Leader stated that the hours of construction/deliveries were a condition already but there was not a condition for a Construction Environmental Management Plan and would include this if Members wished. This was agreed.

On being proposed and seconded and put to the vote the proposal was agreed, subject to the additional condition of a Construction Environmental Management Plan.

RESOLVED: That the Committee grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in the plans list and to the additional condition for a Construction Environmental Management Plan.

159 Any Other Business

Members referred to the 'Minded to Refuse' decisions of the Committee and asked whether it would be possible to open up the discussion of the procedure again, which was voted for by Committee last year.

After discussion it was agreed that there was no reason why this could not be considered but the Chairman and Vice- Chairman felt that it would be more appropriate to wait until the procedure had been in place for 12 months before a review took place.

Duration of the meeting: 1.30pm to 4.10pm

Chairman at the meeting on
21st March 2019