



Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning Committee** held in Committee Rooms, East Pallant House on Wednesday 7 July 2021 at 9.30 am

Members Present: Mrs C Purnell (Chairman), Rev J H Bowden (Vice-Chairman), Mr G Barrett, Mr R Briscoe, Mrs J Fowler, Mrs D Johnson, Mr G McAra, Mr S Oakley, Mr R Plowman, Mr H Potter, Mr D Rodgers, Mrs S Sharp and Mr P Wilding

Members not present:

In attendance by invitation:

Officers present: Miss N Golding (Principal Solicitor), Mrs F Stevens (Development Manager (Applications)), Mr T Whitty (Divisional Manager for Development Management), Mrs S Archer (Enforcement Manager), Miss J Bell (Development Manager (Majors and Business)), Mr O Broadway (Principal Conservation and Design Officer), Mr D Price (Principal Planning Officer), Ms J Thatcher (Senior Planning Officer, Majors and Business) and Ms A Stevens (Divisional Manager for Environmental Protection) and Mrs F Baker (Democratic Services Officer)

72 **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman welcomed everyone present to the meeting and read out the emergency evacuation procedure.

The Chairman read out a statement prepared by Mr Nicholas Bennett, Monitoring Officer, which explained the physical measures put in place to comply with current legal requirements, including screens and the use of masks.

Apologies were received from Cllr Barrett and Cllr Fowler in advance of their late arrival

73 **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of 9 June 2021 were agreed as a true and accurate record.

74 **Urgent Items**

The Chairman announced that a late item had been received and that it would be dealt with under agenda item 14 on the agenda. She explained that the Committee

would receive a Part II update relating to Planning Appeal
APP/L3815/W/21/3274502 – Land adjoining A27 Scant Road West, Hambrook,

The press and public would be excluded for this item.

75 **Declarations of Interests**

Rev. Bowden declared a prejudicial interest in respect of CC/20/02907/FUL

Mrs Johnson declared a personal interest in respect of;

- CC/20/01164/REM as a member of West Sussex County Council
- CC/20/01897/FUL as a member of West Sussex County Council
- CC/20/02907/FUL as a member of West Sussex County Council
- CC/21/01391/FUL as a member of West Sussex County Council

Mr Oakley declared a personal interest in respect of;

- CC/20/01164/REM as a member of West Sussex County Council
- CC/20/01897/FUL as a member of West Sussex County Council
- CC/20/02907/FUL as a member of West Sussex County Council
- CC/21/01391/FUL as a member of West Sussex County Council

Mr Plowman declared a personal interest in respect of;

- CC/20/01164/REM as a member of Chichester City Council
- CC/20/01897/FUL as a member of Chichester City Council
- CC/20/02907/FUL as a member of Chichester City Council
- CC/21/01391/FUL as a member of Chichester City Council

Mr Potter declared a personal interest in respect of;

- SDNP/21/01391/FUL & SDNP/21/01968/LIS as the Chichester District Council external representative to the South Downs National Park
- SDNP/20/04510/FUL & SDNP/21/04511/LIS as the Chichester District Council external representative to the South Downs National Park

Mrs Sharp declared a personal interest in respect of;

- CC/20/01164/REM as a member of Chichester City Council and as a member of West Sussex County Council
- CC/20/01897/FUL as a member of Chichester City Council and as a member of West Sussex County Council
- CC/20/02907/FUL as a member of Chichester City Council and as a member of West Sussex County Council
- CC/21/01391/FUL as a member of Chichester City Council and as a member of West Sussex County Council

76 **CC/20/01164/REM Warrendell Adjacent To Centurion Way Off Plainwood Close Chichester West Sussex (approximate start time 9.35am)**

Ms Thatcher presented the report to the Committee. She drew attention to the Agenda Update which included; a correction to the report, further representations, and amendments to both the plans and proposed conditions.

Ms Thatcher explained that an application for 21 dwellings on the site had been approved in 1998. However, due to the passage of time and the failure to complete the S106 agreement the permission had lapsed. Negotiations on the S106 had continued and in order to resolve the situation the application was altered from 'Full' to 'Outline' with all matters reserved. The Outline application had been approved at Committee in 2018; the Reserved Matters had been received in 2020 and was within the agreed time limits.

She explained that the Committee were being asked to consider the Reserved Matters of layout, scale, appearance, access and layout in respect of the 21 dwellings approved through the Outline planning permission.

Ms Thatcher highlighted the site location to the Committee and the proposed layout and elevations. She explained that the affordable homes would be located in plots 20 and 21. She confirmed that the entire location was located within Flood Zone 1.

The Committee received the following representations;
Mrs Linda Bye – Objector (statement read by Mrs Fiona Baker)

Officers responded to Members' comments and questions as follows;

For the purpose of clarity Mr Whitty reiterated the site history and explained that an application had been submitted 23 years previously; however, the S106 agreement had never been signed, and the application not determined. Two years ago the applicant changed the application to an Outline planning application for 21 dwellings which had been considered and approved by the Planning Committee. What the Committee were being asked to decide on was the Reserved Matters (REM) of layout, appearance, scale and access for the approved Outline application.

On the matter of the Centurion Way link Mr Whitty confirmed that this would be open to public access.

On the matter of noise disturbance, particularly on Bank Holidays and Sundays; Ms Thatcher confirmed that the site working hours were included under Condition 25 of the Outline planning permission, which restricts the hours of construction from 7.30am – 6pm Mondays to Fridays; 8am – 1pm on Saturdays and no working on Sundays or Public Holidays. In addition, Ms Thatcher explained the difference between the condition included within the Outline application and the REM application. She informed the Committee that the condition attached to the Outline application related to construction hours on site, whereas condition 8 in the REM application referred specifically to protect against noise from development. She

confirmed that the condition set out in the Outline application would take precedent over the condition included within the REM application.

With regards to the Construction and Environmental Management Plan, Ms Thatcher confirmed that this was included within the Outline application.

With regards to the proximity of the site to a scheduled ancient monument, Ms Thatcher explained that there was a monument located to the south of the site, but this was far enough away for it not to be impacted by the development.

With regards to archaeological constraints; Ms Thatcher confirmed that this was included within the conditions attached to the Outline permission.

In response to concerns raised regarding earthworks and site levels, Ms Thatcher, acknowledged that the site was a challenging engineering project; however, it was for the developer to demonstrate how they proposed to manage and undertake this work in line with the proposed conditions.

With regards to concerns raised regarding newts and biodiversity; Ms Thatcher informed the Committee that there was a biodiversity plan; Condition 2 in the report requires that an ecological watching brief is completed before any development commences, further biodiversity conditions are also attached to the Outline permission. In addition, she confirmed that no trees are proposed to be removed as part of the development.

With regards to nitrate mitigation; Mr Whitty acknowledged concerns regarding potential impact to the Chichester Harbour, however, due to the Outline application being granted permission prior to the Nitrate Mitigation Policy being implemented it could not be applied to this Reserved Matters application.

With regards to recycling storage facilities; Mr Whitty confirmed that this was included within the conditions.

With regards to the future management of the site; Mr Whitty informed the Committee that there was no condition relating to the future management of the site. He explained that it was his understanding the future management of the site had been secured through S106, but agreed that he was happy for a condition to be included if, following officer investigation this is not the case.

With regards to site levels and the matter of overlooking; Ms Thatcher explained that strategic planting was proposed along the southern border, including new trees and native hedging. She highlighted that the flank elevation on number 15 had been left blank to prevent any direct views to Balboa.

On the matter of ground stability; Mr Whitty clarified that structural stability and potential slippage was a matter that would be considered by building regulations where it related to buildings.

On the matter of the Highways England contribution; Mr Whitty explained that had this been required, it would have been secured at the Outline application and was not relevant to this Reserved Matters application.

On the matter of the pond; Mr Whitty confirmed that the pond was addressed through the site drainage strategy and secured through conditions. Officer preference was that the pond is not lined due to the disruption it would cause to the established wildlife, but this would be determined through further investigation work.

Mr Whitty agreed that a condition could be included to ensure the carriageway was capable of taking the weight of refuse vehicles and HGV.

On the matter of Condition 17 and 18 including the word cycleway; Mr Whitty agreed that phrasing in both conditions 17 and 18 could be amended from just 'footway' to 'footway and cycleway'. He informed the Committee that the phrasing in the S106 agreement did refer to a footway and cycleway.

On the matter of unauthorised vehicular access; Mr Whitty acknowledged concerns, but informed the Committee that it was officer opinion that due to the varying site levels this was very unlikely. However, he agreed that if the Committee did want to safeguard against such access a condition could be included.

With regards to specifying what mitigation should be used to prevent unauthorised access, Mr Whitty agreed that the condition could be worded to ensure that appropriate measures are taken to ensure access to all permitted users, such as bollards.

On the matter of cycle parking; Mr Whitty confirmed that this was included as part of the Outline application.

On the matter of trees located around the site and safeguarding them for future applications to have them removed; Mr Whitty explained that the dwelling located to the north of the site was closest in proximity to trees, which were located approximately 10m from the dwelling. Officers felt that there was enough room between developments and the trees to safeguard against any future applications for felling or lopping.

Mr Whitty confirmed that the trees on the western boundary were covered by a group TPO.

With regards to concerns over surface water drainage; Ms Thatcher informed the Committee that condition 23 of the Outline application and the S106 agreement secured the SUDs on the site.

With regards to estate roads being adopted by the highway authority; Mr Whitty informed the Committee that it was unlikely that the roads would be adopted and it would be the responsibility of residents to ensure future maintenance.

With regards to requesting that the development of the cyclepath is brought forward, i.e. before the 12th house has been completed; Mr Whitty explained that it was not

possible as this had already been agreed and secured as part of the S106 agreement. In a vote the Committee agree the recommendation to **permit**.

Recommendation, **PERMIT** subject to the conditions and informatives listed in the report; and additional and amended conditions and informatives agreed by the committee.

Additional or Amended conditions;

Additional Condition - To include a condition for the Estate Management (if this has is not secured through the S106 agreement)

Additional Condition – To include a condition requiring details of road construction

Additional Condition – To prevent unauthorised motor access via the link onto the Centurion Way, but to ensure that measures taken do not hinder cycle movements.

Amendment to conditions 17 & 18 – to include the word cycleway

77 **CC/20/01897/FUL 22A And Land To The Rear Of 24 Lavant Road Chichester West Sussex PO19 5RG (approximate start time 10.45am)**

Ms Stevens presented the report to the Committee. She drew the Committee's attention to the Agenda Update sheet which included an amendment to the recommendation and additional consultation responses.

Ms Stevens explained that the recommendation had been amended to 'Defer for S106 and then permit', as the S106 had not been completed.

The application had originally been presented at Committee in April 2021, at that time the Committee voted to defer the application for further information. Ms Stevens highlighted the additional information which had been requested by the Committee including; the use of nitrate mitigation, amendments to the landscaping scheme (including the retention of an apple tree at the rear of the site) consideration to the housing mix, further advice on fire risk due to the buildings being timber framed and also a consultation with Southern Water.

Ms Stevens informed the Committee that three of the objections received have subsequently been removed following further discussions regarding landscaping at the rear of the site.

The Committee received the following representations;
Mr Paul White – Agent

Officers responded to Members' comments and questions as follows;

With regards to the inclusion of a condition to control the numbers of vehicles on site; Ms Stevens drew the Committee's attention to condition 3 of the report, which required that no development could commence until a Construction and Environmental Management Plan had been approved. She agreed that an

informative could be included asking the developer to be mindful of the way site workers parked along Lavant Road and to be mindful of local access along the footway. In addition, Mr Whitty explained that whilst an informative could be included, Chichester District Council are not the highway authority and have no enforcement power to prevent inappropriate parking.

On the matter of a potential foul sewage pipe crossing the site, Mr Whitty explained that the response received from Southern Water was a standard response used as a safeguard; it does not mean that there is a foul sewage pipe there; however, an informative would be included to bring the potential issue to the developer's attention.

With regards to the calculations used to calculate the nitrate mitigation required, Ms Stevens confirmed that the figure of 2.4 people per dwelling was taken from Natural England's methodology policy for the mitigation of nitrates upon the Harbour. Recent cases have tested this methodology in the courts and it has held up as being correct.

On the matter of bedroom sizes, Ms Stevens explained that there were no policies within the Local Plan on space standards; however, there are National Space Standards that set out requirements for bedrooms, living rooms etc. if there is a material consideration regarding the size of a bedroom the National Space Standards would be applied to ensure that there suitable space is provided

On the matter of waste management and litter generated by site workers; Ms Stevens agreed that this could be included within condition 3 and the Construction and Environmental Management Plan.

In a vote the Committee agree the recommendation to **permit with S106**

Recommendation, **PERMIT with S106** subject to the conditions and informatives listed in the report, as well as the agreed additional informatives.

78 **CC/20/02907/FUL 20 Sherborne Road Chichester PO19 3AA (approximate start time 11.20am)**

Having declared a prejudicial interest Rev Bowden left the room for the duration of the item.

Ms Fjola Stevens presented the report to the Committee. Before presenting her report she provided a verbal update on the report recommendation. She informed the Committee that the recommendation as set out in the report was to refuse the planning application due to the impact of the development as a result of nitrates on the Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation.

However, the applicant has subsequently submitted a Nitrates Report and mitigation scheme which shows that the development would be nitrate neutral, therefore the recommendation has been amended to; 'Delegate to Officers.

Ms Stevens explained that the primary reason for the recommendation to 'refuse' was due to the nitrate issues, however, it is not possible to amend the decision to; 'Defer for S106 then permit', as officers require time to consider the information that has been submitted to ensure that it is acceptable; a Habitats Regulation Assessment must be undertaken and Natural England must be consulted before a formal decision can be offered.

Ms Stevens highlighted the site location to the Committee and the proposed design layout. The developments had been designed as 'lifetime' homes, with the provision of a lift and downstairs bedroom.

She informed the Committee that the proposed nitrate mitigation site was located within East Dean, whilst the mitigation does look acceptable; Ms Stevens reiterated that it still required full consideration and an HRA was required.

The Committee received the following representations;
Mr Pal – Applicant

Officers responded to Members' comments and questions as follows;

With regards to any other concerns that may cause officers to refuse the application Ms Stevens confirmed that the only reasons for refusal were as set out in the report (page 110 of the Agenda Pack), however, she did inform the Committee that whilst the application remained undetermined consideration would have to be given to any further representations.

With regards to the inclusion of recreation disturbance within the S106 agreement Mr Whitty explained that this would be picked up by officers through the recommendation.

On the matter of the chalet style building; Ms Stevens agreed that if the application is recommended for approval then a condition would be included to ensure that the chalet building remains incidental to the main house.

With regards to the amenity view; Ms Stevens explained that there was boundary treatment already in situ and did not feel that it would be reasonable to ask for further amendments at this stage.

With regards to the comments received from the Highway Authority; Ms Stevens confirmed that the Highway Authority was satisfied with the proposal.

In a vote the Committee agree the updated recommendation to **Delegate to Officers**

Recommendation, **Delegate to Officers** for the reasons listed in the report.

Ms Bell presented the report to the Committee. She drew their attention to the update sheet which set out an amended description to the development and an amendment to condition 37.

In addition, Ms Bell informed the Committee that a late update had been received from the Environment Strategy Officers; who had confirmed that they had no objections to the application, subject to the proposed conditions included in the report.

Ms Bell explained that the application is a Section 73 application and is seeking to vary condition 1 of planning permission CC/20/01914/FUL which had been approved by the Planning Committee in November 2020. The application specifically seeks to change Block 1 from one single large unit into 10 smaller units and associated works. The variation only applies to Block 1; Blocks 2, 3, 4 and 5 would remain unchanged from the previous application.

Ms Bell highlighted the proposed elevations to the Committee and explained that the proposed elevations would be lower than that which had been approved in the original application.

There were no representations.

Officers responded to Members' comments and questions as follows;

With regards to the proposed height of the development; Mr Whitty highlighted that the original building height; which had been deemed acceptable and subsequently approved by the Committee; was greater than what was being proposed, therefore it was difficult to identify what harm was being caused in lowering the height. He advised that the Committee should not seek to restrict development unless harm can be identified. In addition, Ms Bell informed the Committee that officers had spoken to the applicant regarding the proposed height of the building; they had informed them that the units had been designed for 'start-up' businesses or businesses which were looking to establish a presence in Chichester. The height of the development is important for a number of reasons including the stacking and delivery of shipments, or for the installation of a mezzanine. The applicant had also informed officers that the eaves height was comparable and in-line with other similar developments in the area.

On the matter of the north east wall; Mr Whitty explained to the Committee that this was an existing wall and as such the Committee were not able to request the applicant make any changes to it.

With regards to the appearance of the development; Mr Whitty explained that whilst the development was utilitarian in its design, it was an industrial development and in keeping with other similar developments in the surrounding area. He advised that if the Committee are concerned that the application does cause potential harm to the public realm, then they delegate to officers to allow for a potentially more attractive design to be negotiated, however, he reiterated that this was an industrial unit that was in keeping with local style and design.

With regards to the north elevation; Ms Bell acknowledged members comments regarding the appearance. She explained that the palette is considered to be of contemporary style, with a double pitch roof which does offer more variation to the design than put forward in the original application.

On the matter of traffic generation; Ms Bell drew the Committees attention to paragraph 8.11 of the report which sets out that it has been identified the proposed variation will generate a net increase of 66 trips per day, the Highway Authority have acknowledged the increase and raised no objection.

Ms Bell confirmed that there was no widening on the North East side of the development entrance.

On the matter of sustainable design; Ms Bell drew Members attention to Condition 17, which conditioned that no development shall commence above ground level until a strategy detailing the sustainable design and construction of new building has been approved. In addition, Mr Whitty explained that the roof had been orientated in the proposed way so as to cause minimum impact to neighbouring properties.

In a vote the Committee agree the recommendation to **permit**.

Recommendation, **PERMIT** subject to the conditions and informatives listed in the report.

**Cllr Plowman left the meeting at 12.50*

**Cllr Oakley left the meeting at 12.50*

80 **SDNP/21/01967/FUL & SDNP/21/01968/LIS Village Hall East Dean Lane East Dean Chichester West Sussex PO18 0JG (approximate start time 12.50pm)**

Mr Price and Mr Broadway presented the report to the Committee.

Mr Price highlighted the window to Committee and explained the reasons why officers were recommending that the application be refused.

The Committee received the following representations;
Mrs Vicky Mudford – On behalf of the applicant

Officers responded to Members' questions and comments as follows;

On the matter of why it was considered unreasonable to replace the single glazed window with the proposed double glazed wooden window; Mr Broadway explained that the replacement would have a detrimental impact on the listed building. Technology had advanced and there a number of more sympathetic options that would be more suitable and in keeping with the nature of the building, for example single glazing with a secondary glazing system.

Mr Price confirmed that the SDNPA had two primary policies for listed buildings which followed the principles set out in NPPF for safeguarding listed buildings.

Mr Price confirmed that both Mr Broadway and the case officer have had conversations with the Village Hall Management Committee to discuss the alternative options available. Mr Price explained that officers were not averse to replacing the window, but it must be considered in the context of the listed building status.

Mr Whitty reminded the Committee that they must consider the integrity of the advice that had been presented by Mr Price and Mr Broadway, if the Committee were to overturn the recommendation then they would set a precedent for future applications.

Following the discussion Cllr Potter proposed the following recommendation 'Permit, subject to conditions', this was seconded by Cllr Bowden.

In a vote the Committee agreed to overturn the recommendation and **permit** the application.

Recommendation, the application be **permitted, subject to conditions**.

81 **SDNP/20/04510/FUL & SDNP/20/04511/LIS Barn to The West of Didling Manor Farm Didling Lane Didling Treyford Midhurst West Sussex GU29 0LQ (approximate start time 1.20pm)**

Mr Price presented the report to the Committee.

He explained that whilst the building itself was not listed in its own right, it had been considered as curtilage listed due to its location and surrounding properties.

Mr Price drew attention to the agenda update sheet which set out further detail from the applicant and how the holding would be run in future.

Mr Price explained that the use of the building was ancillary to the farm business and as such did not require a change of use application.

Officers responded to Members' comments and questions as follows;

With regards to what services such as electricity being on site; Mr Price could not confirm that they were on site; however, he explained that it was most likely as there are a number of residential properties located around the building.

In a vote the Committee agreed the recommendation to **permit**.

Recommendation, that the application be **approved** for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out in paragraph 10 of the report

**Cllr Potter left the meeting at 14.17*

**Cllr Fowler left the meeting at 14.20*

82 **Chichester District Council Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy**

Matters

The Chairman drew the Committee's attention to the Agenda update sheet which included an update on Hundredsteddle Farm and Plot A, Land north of Premier Business Centre, Birdham.

On the matter of Land West of Birdham Farm; Mrs Golding confirmed that the eviction notice had expired on 30 June 2021.

On the matter of Hundredsteddle Farm, Mrs Golding explained that the council were challenging the PINS decision letter and costs letter both dated 25th March 202, on a matter of law. She informed the Committee that the Planning Inspector had held that they could not comment on the use of the land, however, as a matter of law they should be commenting. The proceedings were issued on 5 July 2021 and it is a matter for the court to accept the letter and consent to a review

The Committee agreed to note this item.

83 South Downs National Park Schedule of Planning Appeals, Court and Policy Matters

The Committee agreed to note this item.

84 Crouchlands Farm Enforcement Report

Mrs Archer presented the report to the Committee; Mrs Stevens, Divisional Manager, Environment Protection, was also in attendance to answer questions.

Mrs Archer informed the Committee that the purpose of the report was to update Members on the enforcement proceedings taken against Crouchlands Farm. She explained that much of the site was now in compliance with the enforcement notice; however, officers undertook a site visit after the expiry of the compliance period and confirmed that 'Lagoon 3' still remained intact with no evidence to suggest that any works of compliance had been attempted or were about to start.

Mrs Archer explained that the case had been passed to the Legal team for their consideration and advice. The next steps in a case such as this would be to move to prosecution.

The Committee received the following speakers;
Cllr Gareth Evans – CDC Ward Member

Officers responded to Members' comments and questions as follows;

With regards to the removal of the underground infrastructure, Mr Whitty informed the Committee that the authority had sought expert ecology advice; the advice received was that due to the period of time that had passed the best option was to leave the pipework in situ. Mr Whitty confirmed that all other apparatus had been removed.

With regards to providing a concise timeline detailing the next steps in the enforcement process, Mr Whitty explained that this was not possible due to the complexity of pursuing a prosecution, however, an indication of the process could be provided.

On the matter of CDC taking responsibility for the site Mr Whitty explained that at no point would CDC take responsibility for the site. He explained that there was no obligation or ability for the authority to take responsibility; as a final option CDC could take direct action, but this would not be considered until all other options (including prosecution) had been exhausted.

With regards to the distribution and spreading of the contents of Lagoon 3, Mrs Stevens advised that this would be managed by the Environment Agency as the body responsible for the agreeing the required permits.

Mr Whitty confirmed that the site owner is liable for any pollution on the land.

On the matter of any future owner being obligated to return the site to agricultural land; Mr Whitty explained that through the enforcement notice the land is required to be returned to its previous state, which in this case is agricultural land. However, it is important to note that the authority cannot force anyone to farm the land.

With regards to concerns regarding any inappropriate use of the land being permitted in return for the site being cleared, Mr Whitty confirmed that the authority would never entertain any inappropriate use of the land, and explained that there is no 'trade off' in planning terms.

On the matter of the reopening of the surrounding PROW's; Mrs Stevens confirmed that WSCC had been asked to reopen the surrounding paths; however, they had taken the decision that the paths would remain closed. This decision had been made in consultation with West Sussex Fire & Rescue (WSFRS) and the EA, whilst there was no danger to the public from Lagoon 3; it was felt prudent that the path should be kept shut.

On the issues of nitrates; Mrs Stevens explained that the EA managed this issue.

With regards to the stability of Lagoon 3; Mrs Stevens assured the Committee that the structure was very robust and the liquid was safely contained. Officers and representatives from the EA and WSFRS undertake biannual inspections to monitor the site, with interim inspections made if required. Early indications that would suggest the structure was beginning to fail in some way might include signs such as; the swelling of the bund, unpleasant odours being omitted and potentially leaks, however, these would be picked up during site inspections.

In a vote Members agreed the report recommendation to **note the contents of the report.**

Resolved;

Members of the Committee note the contents of the report.

85 **Consideration of any late items as follows:**

As announced by the Chairman a late report relating to Planning Appeal APP/L3815/W/21/3274502 – Land adjoining A27 Scant Road West, Hambrook,

The Chairman proposed that by virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 the press and public be excluded for this item. Cllr Briscoe seconded the proposal.

Following a vote the Committee resolved to exclude the press and public.

The Chairman invited Ms Bell to present her report to the Committee.

The Committee received a representation from Cllr Moss.

Officers responded to questions and comments from the Committee.

Following a vote the Committee resolved to agree the report recommendation.

86 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

The public and press had been excluded under Agenda Item 14.

There were no further Part II items.

The meeting ended at 3.30 pm

CHAIRMAN

Date: