



Minutes of the meeting of the **Cabinet** held in The Assembly Room - The Council House (Chichester City Council), North Street, Chichester on Tuesday 3 December 2019 at 9.30 am

Members Present Mrs E Lintill (Chairman), Mrs S Taylor (Vice-Chairman), Mr M Bell, Mr R Briscoe, Mrs N Graves, Mrs P Plant and Mr P Wilding

Members Absent

In attendance by invitation

Officers Present Mr T Ayling (Divisional Manager for Planning Policy), Mr N Bennett (Divisional Manager for Democratic Services), Mr K Carter (Divisional Manager, CCS), Mr A Frost (Director of Planning and Environment), Miss L Higenbottam (Democratic Services Manager), Mrs J Hotchkiss (Director of Growth and Place), Mr P Jobson (Taxation Manager), Mrs V McKay (Divisional Manager for Growth), Mr J Mildred (Divisional Manager for Corporate Services), Mr P E Over (Executive Director & Deputy Chief Executive), Mrs E Reed (Environmental Housing Manager), Mrs L Rudziak (Director of Housing and Communities), Mrs D Shepherd (Chief Executive) and Mr J Ward (Director of Corporate Services)

71 **Chairman's Announcements**

Mrs Lintill greeted Chichester District Council (CDC) members and officers and the two representatives who were present for this meeting.

The emergency evacuation procedure for Chichester City Council was read out.

There were no apologies for absence.

72 **Approval of Minutes**

The Cabinet received the minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2019 which had been circulated with the agenda.

There were no proposed changes to the minutes.

RESOLVED

That the minutes of the Cabinet meeting held on 5 November 2019 be approved.

73 Declarations of Interests

There were no declarations of interest.

74 Public Question Time

The following public questions were received. The responses are indicated in italics below.

Mr Dicker asked the following questions:

1. Under issues raised no comment is made about the quality of the consultation document and in particular the different standards for assessing land suitability for the development including proximity to SDNP and Harbour boundaries how many comments were made and what are the council doing to address these valid concerns.

2. In light of the changes to national planning and policy how will the changes be reflected in the plan prior to the next round of consultation and specifically:

“This guidance, along with other Government initiatives such as the emerging National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England will need to be reflected as appropriate in the ongoing technical work for the Local Plan Review.”

3. Can the council please explain why the housing numbers have increased in line with this comment?

The first new option (Option 1B) was developed from the Preferred Approach Option 1A, but sought to maximise numbers at the locations East of Chichester and South West of Chichester. With a small increase in the Parish numbers, this leads to an increase in housing provision from 4,900 to 5,625 (c.700 dpa).

4. Why is there no identifiable option that looks at land around Goodwood for both employment and residential space? Yet later in the document it states that further investigation is required around employment space near Goodwood.

5. When will this council make a decision on the unmet housing need from the SDNP?

6. The Peter Brett Report is very detailed. From a scanned reading prior to the submission of questions I can see no mention of the modelling and policy excluding the link road that Councillor Taylor stated would be undertaken. Where is this in the PB report or when will it be conducted if it is not in the report.

Mrs Taylor provided the following responses:

Thank you for your questions. Answering each in turn –

- 1. The list in section 8 of the report, of significant issues is not intended to be exhaustive and members are asked to consider the full range of responses. Section 5 of the report outlines the consultation process, and section 6 of the report reflects on the consultation process and how it may be improved. With regards to the assessment of the suitability of land for development, the covering report highlights that further consideration will be given to landscape capacity and proximity to the sensitive environment of the AONB and confirms that the availability of suitable sites will be reviewed in an update of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment.*
- 2. Any changes in government policy will be reflected upon and where necessary the plan updated. The government has stated that the National Flood and Coastal Erosion Risk Management Strategy for England will be published in 2020 and members will be updated accordingly.*
- 3. In line with national planning policy, the plan should be informed by the consideration of options and alternatives through the sustainability appraisal process. The outcomes of that testing is set out in Appendix 4 to the Local Plan way forward report. However the total number of dwellings referred to is the sum of all the potential locations for development which are included in that option – it does not represent the target for development in the emerging plan. Ultimately the next iteration of the plan will set out a new housing target justified with reference to the evidence of need, infrastructure and environmental constraints and ensuring the certainty of delivery.*
- 4. The refresh of the Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment, which is referred to in sections 11 and 12 of the report will be considering all available land including that around Goodwood.*
- 5. The unmet need from the South Downs National Park will be considered next year as this council finalises its proposed submission draft plan. That consideration will need to be based on factors including - confirmation of the position of the national park authority; the availability of sites within the Chichester Plan area; environmental and infrastructure constraints; and sustainability and habitats regulations assessment.*
- 6. Further work to consider the transport implications of a mitigation strategy which excludes the Stockbridge Link Road is underway and the initial results are being discussed with West Sussex County Council as Highway Authority and Highways England. The outcomes of this work will inform the Plan and the results reported back to Members and interested parties in due course.*

Mr Dicker was permitted to ask a supplementary question:

How many comments have been made and what is the council doing to address the concerns on the quality of consultation documents.

I was assured that the council would be making a decision on the unmet housing need from the South Downs National Park this month.

Mrs Taylor replied as follows:

I recall explaining that the South Downs National Park decision would be made next year.

Mr Frost replied as follows:

The number of responses is set out in the tables in the report. Further details on the specific point raised will be sent to Mr Dicker outside of the meeting.

Cllr Charlotte Pexton (Bosham Parish Council) asked the following question:

The Initial Council Response in respect of AL10 Chidham and Hambrook states (p112):

“In March 2019 the Revised Landscape Capacity Study was produced which confirmed the assessment in the November 2018 study regarding the capacity for landscape change in the east-west corridor. The Preferred Approach Plan notes the potential landscape sensitivities, including protecting views to the South Downs National Park and Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and their settings.

Therefore further consideration will need to be given to the capacity of this service village area to accommodate development, particularly with regards to landscape capacity and proximity to the sensitive environment of the AONB.”

Bosham Parish Council considers that the same consideration must be given to AL7 Highgrove Farm, Bosham. Bosham Parish Council is concerned that the wording of the Councils “Initial Response” implies a more stringent assessment and appraisal of the landscape setting relating to the AL10 allocation than is the case with Policy AL7.

Bosham Parish Council therefore requests Chichester District Council to confirm that there will be no less stringent assessment and appraisal of AL7 than of any other potential allocation along the A259 corridor?

Mrs Taylor provided the following response:

Thank you for the question. I can confirm that all sites are and will be subject to the same stringent assessment and appraisal. The proposed allocation of 500 homes at AL10 - Chidham and Hambrook – is considered to be a significant number for a service village and that is why it is recognised in the report – however, these considerations are acknowledged to affect other parishes and will be taken into account.

Cllr Pexton was permitted a supplementary question as follows:

The council's landscape study demonstrated that the area around Bosham has the same landscape sensitivity as Chidham so needs to be taken into account.

The comment was noted.

Mr Marson asked the following question:

QUESTION ON S12 INFRASTRUCTURE PROVISION (p39 of Agenda Pack)

The narrative of the officer statement as documented is not a true reflection of either the Strategic Transport Meeting 15/11/17, nor the CDC Transport Consultancy Brief (sections 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5).

Is it not about time our Cabinet took a position that the Local Plan stated a dependency on adequate A27 funding from Government. In taking that stance, push back the onus on the CDC Director of the Environment and Planning to demonstrate that he, and his officers, deliver balanced narratives that enable our elected councillors to make informed decisions.

A balanced narrative for Infrastructure that would assist our councillors, and one which the public could readily accept, should contain integrated statements that take account of impact to Air Quality/Public Health from housing/transport numbers. The implications from the Court of Appeal judgement 12th Sept in Kent, where the refusal to grant planning approval for housing on the grounds of impact to Air Quality should not be underestimated given the current, and likely future AQMAs in Chichester.

My question is therefore...(a) Is this Cabinet prepared to declare a red line dependency for A27 Highways England funding to support our Local Plan? (b) will this Cabinet reject the S12 narrative as written and request Officers to provide a balanced narrative for our elected councillors to consider.

Mrs Taylor provided the following response:

Thank you for your question. In terms of part (a), a scheme of junction improvements for the A27 Chichester bypass is not at this stage funded via the Government's Roads Investment Strategy (either RIS1 or RIS2) and whilst the Council will continue to press for government funding and support, this cannot be relied upon. In order to be able to submit a sound Local Plan for independent examination next year, the Council has no option therefore but to proceed with work (in conjunction with Highways England) on the Local Plan A27 mitigation scheme, which is likely to comprise smaller-scale, at-grade improvements to ensure the junctions will continue to operate effectively and to mitigate the impacts of new development. However the work to date does suggest that public funding support will be necessary as part of that strategy.

In terms of part (b) of your question, the representations received to Policy S12 which concerns infrastructure provision cover a wide range of infrastructure matters and so are not focused solely on transport issues. Appendix 1 to the Local Plan Review report on the Cabinet agenda explains that the Council has provided a summary of the comments received and an initial response to the matters raised; unfortunately, it is not possible for the Council to provide a unique or detailed response to every representation. Nevertheless, I would wish to reassure you that matters such as the impacts on air quality and human health are key issues for the District Council, West Sussex County Council and Highways England in assessing the effects of new housing and associated traffic arising from development in both the adopted and emerging Local Plans. Ultimately, the answer to this part of your question will of course be a matter for members of the Cabinet to determine when they consider the Local Plan agenda item.

Ms Towers asked the following question:

In the Responses to the Preferred Approach Consultation and Way Forward document Policy S30 Strategic Wild life corridors there were 18 responses in support and one against. Those in support represented large organisations and councils , the one objection was a developer representing land owners.

The first line of the Council's response states "while there is a level of support, a number of objections and suggestions to amending the policy have been received". This does not reflect the fact that there is a significant level of support and only one objection. The suggestions to amend the policy are to improve the corridors. The objection seems to be because the wild life corridor proposed in Fishbourne is on land that could be developed.

Can the Council assure me that there will not be equal weighting between the many supporting submissions and the one objection and that the objection will not be on an equal footing with the many organisations who are putting the crucial conservation of wild life and bio diversity in Chichester Harbour and the National Park before development?

Mrs Taylor provided the following response:

As a matter of clarification, the report refers to the number of objections not objectors. However, I can confirm that the responses received will be considered on an equal footing with reference to the issues raised within them.

Ms Towers was permitted a supplementary question as follows:

Will you treat the objections on an equal footing with the supporters

Mr Frost replied as follows:

There were a number of issues raised which would be treated with equal weighting.

Ms Towers then asked:

What assurances can the council make that once in place wildlife corridors will be protected in perpetuity?

Mrs Lintill requested the supplementary question be submitted in writing for a written response as it did not directly link to the initial question.

Mrs Lintill then concluded public question time.

75 Extending Ultrafast Public Connectivity

Mr Wilding introduced the item. He explained that in 2017 the council signed up to a countywide Gigabit project. Part of the project was an award to West Sussex County Council (WSCC) of a government grant funded contract to create a fibre network connection for public sector sites across the county. Cityfibre won the contract and the project is now in the final stages. He explained that the council now has an opportunity to use the cool off arrangement to connect a further 50 council assets in Chichester city such as Westward House, Westgate centre and offices. The project requires new fibre infrastructure installation across the city but in turn will provide ultrafast connectivity to the council's assets and increase fibre and digital infrastructure across the city, benefitting the local community and the local economy. The cost of the project is estimated at £743,000 over seven years and is likely to be met from the West Sussex Business Rates Retention Pool.

Mr Wilding confirmed that there is also a project relating to better connectivity in the rural areas.

Mr Mildred added that the project is part of the programme of countywide projects which tie in to the national agenda for digital infrastructure. He explained that it puts the council at the forefront of the benefits on offer. A member briefing will be arranged next year.

Mrs Sharp was invited to ask her pre-submitted question as follows:

I understand that the Extending Ultrafast Public Connectivity report Item 5 on the agenda that this item doesn't involve 5G. However could I ask the Cabinet Members (Martyn Bell – Place and Penny Plant - Environment)

- A) If you could, if possible work with Peter Wilding (Corporate Services) to link in the digging up the road issue with the Vision project to revamp our city pavements and possibly with tree planting works
We don't yet as a County have a "Dig Once" policy but if we could work together to bring some co-benefits to Chichester residents this might make residents happier about the inconvenience of the digging works although we probably all agree on the society benefits that better connectivity can bring
- B) Could I ask Cabinet Members to share your personal views on the precautionary principle and 5G and trees

I know that you might say 5G doesn't need to be discussed under this Agenda item but this project doesn't preclude the coming of 5 G and residents' concerns are very real especially for those who have health issues linked to Wi-Fi etc so some reassurance from Cabinet members that they are looking into these issues would be a comfort.

Mr Wilding provided the following response:

With regards to the first part of your question the Council is represented on a Countywide group that is coordinating the approach to Digital Infrastructure, one key work stream of that group is developing a 'Dig Once' approach. Whilst the County Council will need to lead this as they grant the licences for digging roads we will ensure that Chichester District Council strongly encourage this approach to be developed and implemented as a matter of urgency.

Mrs Lintill then provided the following response:

With regards to the second part of your question it is not appropriate at this time to seek the personal views of members however the WSCC position on this and shared lines for communication are that the County does not have a programme to deliver 5G which is still in development by national commercial suppliers and we would expect that any future deployment of 5G in the county would be in line with the relevant government policies.

Mrs Sharp asked if the issue could be discussed by all members at a future date. Mrs Lintill confirmed that this would be the case.

Mr Potter was invited to ask a question as follows:

With reference to the last sentence of page 13 of the Cabinet papers relating to minimising disruption, how much disruption is anticipated?

Mr Mildred then provided the following response:

Wherever possible existing infrastructure will be used to minimise disruption however, it is likely to take a few years to complete in total.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolutions and recommendation below.

RESOLVED

1. That the Cabinet resolves to enter into an agreement with Cityfibre for an extension of the Council's full fibre connectivity using the West Sussex County Council's framework using the seven year revenue model.
2. That the Cabinet delegates authority to the Director of Corporate Services and the Cabinet Member for Corporate Services the final approval of sites and contract detail.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

That Cabinet recommends to Council to underwrite the cost of the contract and that any costs not met by the Business Rates Pool for 2019/20 up to a maximum of £743,000 over a seven year period starting no earlier than 2021.

76 **Local Plan Review - Responses to Preferred Approach Consultation and Way Forward**

Mrs Taylor introduced the item. She explained that a consultation of the Local Plan Review took place over an eight week period from 30 December 2018 until 2 February 2019. A total of 3200 representations were received from 729 respondents. The report sets out a summary of the representations received for Part I of the Local Plan Review Preferred Approach which relates to Strategic Policies and Allocations. A separate report to Cabinet and Council will address representations on Part II of the Plan relating to Development Management Policies. Mrs Taylor drew attention to appendix 1 to the report which contains the initial council response and paragraph 8 of the report. She explained that paragraph 9 sets out a number of new issues which require consideration including the declaration of a Climate Emergency and the discharge of nitrates into Solent and impact this has on future development. Mrs Taylor confirmed that A27 discussions remain ongoing with Highways England and WSCC regarding the nature and finance of improvement works and this uncertainty will need to be addressed within the Local Plan. She then drew attention to the Schedule as set out in appendix 3 to the report and the Sustainability Appraisal detailed in paragraph 4 of the report. She confirmed that further technical work is required.

Mrs Taylor outlined an amendment to recommendation 1c to add the words *and supplementary material* prior to its publication.

Mrs Lintill clarified that the report is considering progress only at this stage.

Mr Wilding addressed concerns relating to options in the north of the district and the implications given the current lack of infrastructure. Mr Ayling explained that the council must test all the options and consider the benefits and issues of each.

Mrs Plant commented that less than 1% of residents had made representations on the review. She explained that a Local Plan is essential in order to prevent unplanned development in the district. She referred to the need for the examiner to find the Plan sound.

Members thanked officers for their hard work to date.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the recommendations below.

RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNCIL

1. That:
 - a. the Summary of Representations included as Appendix 1 to this report is noted.
 - b. the proposed Council responses to the representations set out in that document are agreed, and
 - c. the Director of Planning and the Environment be authorised, following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Planning Services, to make minor amendments to the Summary of Representations and Responses and supplementary material prior to its publication.
 - d. That the issues raised in the Summary of Representations document and the other relevant issues summarised in section 9 of the report are noted as key considerations for the ongoing production of the Local Plan.
2. That the programme of further technical work set out in section 11 of this report is endorsed.
3. That the implications for the distribution of development set out in section 12 of this report are endorsed, subject to further technical work and testing through Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment being completed.

77 **Resurfacing, Improved Drainage and additional site enhancements at Westhampnett Depot**

Mrs Plant introduced the item. She drew attention to the details of the proposal as set out on pages 29 to 37 of the report. The project seeks to overhaul the foul drainage system at the Depot and will create a pumped connection to Stane Street. The project will also overhaul the storm water drainage storage system creating new gullies, soakaways and a fuel interceptor. The HGV parking area will be levelled and fully resurfaced and a new enclosed vehicle washdown facility installed. Mrs Plant explained that the addition of several environmental and operational improvements would result in significant additional costs if carried out separate to the main project. She outlined the additional enhancements which include:

- A new one way system for vehicles entering and exiting the site
- LED Flood lighting
- Electric vehicle charging including installation of cable stays under the surface
- A rainwater storage system
- Increased CCTV cameras
- Number plate recognition at the entrance gate

Mrs Plant confirmed that the additional enhancements total £195,000 resulting in an overall total cost of £850,000. In addition WSCC have agreed in principle to connect the gypsy and traveller transit site to the main sewer system, funded by WSCC.

Mrs Plant advised that officers had secured a window of 14 weeks to store vehicles offsite during the works. Mr Ward added that due to the critical timescale outlined in section 4.9 of the report the Chairman of the Council had agreed to take the

decision as urgent and as such the decision is not subject to call-in (please see urgent notice attached to the final minutes).

Mr Carter outlined a minor amendment to page 33 of the report which should refer to the existing budget as being £592,000 rather than £595,000.

Members noted their support to the project.

Mrs Plant requested the addition of the words *of which* to follow £850,000 in the recommendation to Council.

Mrs Lintill requested clarification on the use of storm water. Mr Carter confirmed that the size, cost, capture and use all have to be considered. He explained that a suitable volume had been agreed and the water would be used to fill road sweepers which are currently filled by hose pipe, thereby reducing mains water usage. In addition it is anticipated that the time saved filling the sweepers would be up to an hour a day.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolutions and recommendation below.

RESOLVED

1. That Cabinet approves the inclusion of environmental and operational enhancements to the scheme set out in section 5, subject to Council's approval of the additional costs.
2. That Cabinet approves the appointment of Contractor B for undertaking the resurfacing, improved drainage, environmental and operational enhancements and associated work at CCS Depot, and delegates authority to the Director of Corporate Services to conclude the detail of the contract following consultation with the Cabinet member for the Environment and Contract Services

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

That Cabinet recommends to Council to increase the budget from £592,000 to £850,000 of which £650,000 funded from reserves and £200,000 funded from the Asset Replacement Programme to enable the inclusion of additional works as set out in Section 5.

78 Determination of the Council Tax Base 2020-2021

Mr Wilding introduced the item. He explained that the determination of the Council Tax Base 2020-2021 is an estimate of the taxable capacity of the district. The figure is adjusted based on the assumed collection rate of 99%. He drew attention to Appendix 1 which details the chargeable properties by band which totals 54,133 and Appendix 2 which details the determined tax base for each parish.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolutions below.

RESOLVED

In order to comply with section 35 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

1. No item of expenditure shall be treated as 'special expenses' for the purposes of section 35 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992.
2. This resolution in (1 above) shall remain in force for the 2020-2021 financial year.
3. The calculation of the Chichester District Council's taxbase for the year 2020-2021 be approved.
4. The amounts calculated by Chichester District Council as its council taxbase be those set out in appendices 1 and 2 to this report.

79 Disabled Facilities Grants - Staff Resources

Mrs Graves introduced the item. She explained that the report relates to the Disabled Facilities grants which seek to enable independent living for people with disabilities. The grants are funded from the Better Care Fund and can be used for a number of projects including changes required to a property to enable earlier discharge from hospital. In 2018/19 a total of 180 grant related cases were facilitated compared to 126 in 2017/18. The facilitation of this increase in cases has only been possible via the use of contractors. Mrs Graves explained that the volume of cases is set to increase further and therefore additional staffing is required to ensure that the council has a robust system in place to provide the level of support needed. She confirmed that the staffing costs would be funded by the Better Care Fund.

Mrs Reed added that the complexity of the cases had increased significantly.

Mrs Taylor requested clarification on whether current vacancies were an indication that recruiting to the new posts would be difficult. Mrs Reed explained that although there had been vacancies the new posts would be more specialist.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolution below.

RESOLVED

That a Senior Environmental Health Officer (DFG Specialist) and two Specialist Housing Standards Officers are appointed to deliver the West Sussex Disabled Facilities Grants Policy 2020-24 within Chichester District to be funded from the Council's annual Disabled Facilities Grant funding.

80 **Late Items**

There were no late items.

81 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

Mrs Lintill read the part II resolution in relation to agenda items 12 and 13 which was seconded by Mrs Taylor.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to go into part II.

RESOLVED

That with regard to agenda items 12 and 13 the public including the press should be excluded from the meeting on the grounds of exemption in Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972 namely Paragraph 3 (Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)) and because, in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

The Cabinet then took a five minute break.

82 **Southern Gateway**

Mr Bell introduced the item.

Mr Over then provided additional information. He also drew member's attention to amendments to the recommendation:

- Resolution 4 to delete the word authorised from the first line.
- Resolution 5 to delete the words and county officers from the first line.

The Cabinet then discussed the report.

Mr Moss requested that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee (OSC) recommendations be referred to in making recommendations to the Council. Mrs Lintill clarified that the recommendations from OSC and the Chichester District Growth Board had been noted.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolutions and recommendation below.

RESOLVED

On the assumption that Council approve the selection of Developer A that Cabinet:

1. Delegates authority to the Deputy Chief Executive or the Director of Growth and Place, after consultation with the Strategic Leadership Team, the Leader and Cabinet Member for Growth, Place and Regeneration, (and the Growth Lead at WSCC assuming WSCC are a party to the agreement) to approve and execute the Development Agreement based on Heads of Terms.
2. Approves the appointment of Jones Lang LeSalle and Browne Jacobson LLP to support the Council in the implementation of the project, funded from the cost undertaking to be entered into by the appointed development partner and/or the balance of One Public Estate (OPE) funding.
3. Subject to the appointment of a development partner that the land owned by the District Council be formally declared surplus to requirements and be offered up to support the regeneration on the terms set out in paragraph 6 and to remove the land from the Councils parking order at the appropriate time.
4. Notes that officers will investigate a “Land equalisation” proposal and bring forward options to a future Cabinet.
5. That the District Council requests WSCC to agree a scheme of delegation that enables District Council officers as project lead to grant consents required on behalf of WSCC provided there is no financial detriment to WSCC.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

Following “standstill” and dealing with any issues arising, and confirmation that WSCC have cleared their own governance processes, including call-in, that the Council select Developer A on Heads of Terms shown in Appendix 1 to deliver the Southern Gateway Masterplan regeneration project pursuant to the outcome of the Evaluation Report at Appendix 2 once matters of detail are finalised with the bidder.

83 St James Industrial Estate Chichester

Mr Bell introduced the item.

Mr Oakley and Mrs Sharp were invited to the table as they had requested to speak.

Mrs McKay and Mrs Hotchkiss responded to the points raised.

Decision

The Cabinet then voted unanimously to make the resolution below.

RESOLVED

Following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Growth, Place and Regeneration, the Director of Growth & Place be authorised to agree terms for a pre-let space at St James Industrial Estate in accordance with the proposal set out in section 5 of the report.

The meeting ended at 11.28 am

CHAIRMAN

Date: