

NORTHUMBERLAND COUNTY COUNCIL

CRAMLINGTON, BEDLINGTON AND SEATON VALLEY LOCAL AREA COUNCIL

At a meeting of the **Cramlington, Bedlington and Seaton Valley Local Area Council** held in Netherton Social Club, 1a Netherton Lane, Bedlington, NE22 6DP on Wednesday, 18 July 2018 at 4:30 p.m.

PRESENT

Councillor C Dunbar (Chair in the Chair)

MEMBERS

W Crosby
S E Dungworth
B M Flux
A Hepple

M E Richards
M Robinson
I C F Swithenbank
R Wallace

OFFICERS

M Bulman
D Lalley
T Gribbins

J Murphy
K Norris
M Payne
J Sanderson

L Sinnamon
R Soulsby
K Westerby

Solicitor
Chief Executive
Neighbourhood Services Area
Manager
Principal Planning Officer
Democratic Services Officer
Consultant Highways Engineer
Senior Planning Manager - Planning
Policy
Senior Planning Manager
Planning Officer
Highways Delivery Manager

ALSO PRESENT

Press: 1
Public: 60

12. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Daley, Pidcock and Swinburn.

13. MINUTES

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Cramlington, Bedlington and Seaton Valley Local Area Council held on Wednesday, 23 May, as circulated, be confirmed as a true record and signed by the Chair.

14. DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The report requested Members to decide the planning applications attached to the report using the powers delegated to it. Members were reminded of the principles which should govern their consideration of the applications, the procedure for handling representations, the requirement of conditions and the need for justifiable reasons for the granting of permission or refusal of planning applications. The procedure at Planning Committees was appended for information.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

15. **18/00649/FUL - Retrospective Planning Permission for the erection of a lean to addition to the main building including its change of use to equestrian and incorporating additional stabling, the erection and siting of a single stable block, the erection and siting of a double stable block, the erection and siting of a hen house, the erection of a bale and materials store and the siting of a storage container in association with the existing equestrian centre - Equestrian Livery Stables, Mare Close, Seghill, NE23 7ED**

Ryan Soulsby, Planning Officer, summarised the above application with the aid of a slide presentation. He advised that a further seven letters of support had been received since the report was published but no additional issues had been raised.

The Planning Officer pointed out that the buildings seeking consent, included within the application, totalled 826 sqm which was below the 1000 sqm limit for applications to be referred to the Secretary of State. The other stable block at the site had consent under a previous application and would therefore not be calculated.

Councillor Dungworth entered the meeting at 4:36 pm.

Colin Lawson, objector, addressed the committee and his comments included the following points:

- If this application was approved, the site would increase and there would be more horses which would create a worse problem around Mares Close.
- There were already heaps of manure around the access road to the site.
- If approved, further development in the Green Belt would be encouraged.
- Objections had been made by residents and by the Parish Council. Thirty letters of support had been submitted after the consultation had closed and were from the family and customers of the applicant.
- The applicant had not adhered to previous planning consents and the cheapest option for the Council to address the failure of enforcement was to recommend this application for approval.

- Residents were fed up of their 'backyards' being used as a playground. Customers seemed to think they had a right to play on someone else's doorstep.
- This was not a personal vendetta, the Green Belt was being compromised and a 6 ft high fence had been erected.
- Too many Planning Officers had been given the 'short straw' to deal with this site over the years.
- Only two residents had been informed about the application, himself and the vicar. He had informed the other residents who had raised objections.
- Original consent for the paddock area was a delegated decision when it should have been a committee decision due to the number of objections received.
- Consideration was being asked for an area of 10,080 sq m, therefore, it did not comply with the law and should have been referred to the Secretary of State like other applications which consisted of more than 10,000 sqm floor space.
- He had written to the Secretary of State and received a letter back saying he had not been informed and it was for the Planning Authority to refer matters to the Secretary of State.

Les Bowman, Seaton Valley Parish Council, also spoke against the application and his comments included the following:

- The application dated back to 2015, the original permission was for 10 stables and 11 were built but nothing was done about it.
- Continuing on from that, the stables were meant to be for private use, not for commercial use - Application 14/03790FUL had received permission for personal use and not for commercial livery use.
- These stables were advertised on Facebook and the company accounts were published for the public to see.
- The cut off date for the consultation was 6 June but the letters of support were submitted after that date and should be disregarded. These were from customers, traders, family and only one resident who used the centre. All other residents objected to the traffic, noise and constant movements to and from the stables.
- Highways Officers had not taken into account that this was a very small country lane which also served the church.
- Waste disposal was an issue of concern, 50 tonnes of bedding and manure were produced from the site.
- There was no record of what would be done with the urine produced. Horses produced 2 ½ gallons a day, where would that go?
- The applicant had ignored all planning procedures and breached all conditions and it was time this was brought to a halt.
- With regard to the barn, regulations stated that wood was not a suitable material to store hay because it could not hold back fire for a safe evacuation of animals.

Craig Ross then spoke in support of the application and his comments included the following points:

- The applicant couldn't be in attendance but he was speaking as his agent and was a Chartered Town Planner.

- The applicant would like to thank members who attended the site visit and the Planning Officer for his comprehensive report which recommended approval of the application.
- The stables were tucked away on the site and were well used and loved.
- Five hundred trees had been planted around the perimeter to enclose the site.
- The hen enclosure, bale store and all other elements were moveable and temporary.
- The Enforcement Team had asked for another application to be submitted so that had been done.
- No objections had been received from the Highways team or Public Protection.
- Objections had been received from the Parish Council and 14 others but were outweighed by support for the application.
- The stables were well used and successful and it was a quiet and enjoyable place to spend time.
- It was not until reading the report they realised the Planning Officer had been to the site four times. On all occasions the Planning Officer confirmed there did not appear to be any significant noise or footfall to affect residential amenity.
- The site was well used, well run and well loved.
- It was in accordance with relevant planning policies and was recommended for approval.
- He therefore respectfully requested that the application be approved in line with officer recommendation and conditions.

In response to questions from Members of the Committee the following information was provided:-

- The site was considered as open countryside land and it was in the Green Belt so both must be given weight.
- Buildings included in the application totalled 826 sqm, any other development was not taken into consideration for this application.
- With regard to the previous application, the main consent was for an agricultural building so the additions were not brought in until the request for equestrian use.
- It was confirmed that the current application should be considered on its own merits.
- The applicant would only be in breach of permission granted if commercial livery was taking place at the site.
- The Planning Officer confirmed that he had not attended the site on a Sunday morning during the time of a church service or when a funeral was taking place.
- The amount of permitted animals per acre of land would fall under different regulations, planning permission was requested for the buildings only and these complied with planning policy.
- The number of horses on the site was not a material planning consideration.
- Any rumours of further development or perceived change of use could not be taken into consideration, members could only look at the application before them that day.
- If permission was granted, condition 02 regarding the storage container would be included.

Councillor Robinson moved approval of the application in line with officer recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Flux.

Members then debated the application and the following comments were made:

- The application should be treated as a stand alone application, like any other planning application.
- It was over-development.
- If the additions to the site were so essential (as stated in paragraph 7.16 of the report) why was permission not requested in the original application?
- At the site visit, the site looked to be very tidy and well run. It did not seem detrimental to the area and there was no reason for it not to be commercial in the future.

In response to a request for clarification from the Chair, the Planning Officer stated that chapter 9 of the NPPF referred to the Green Belt and paragraph 87 stated that “inappropriate development should not be approved except in very special circumstances”. He referred to paragraph 7.10 of the report which stated the reasons why the application could be considered as an exception. The Senior Planning Manager added that officers did not consider that the application would impact on the openness of the Green Belt.

Upon being put to the vote 5 members voted for the motion and 3 against. It was therefore:

RESOLVED that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the conditions, with reasons, set out in the report.

16. 18/00904/FUL - Change of use to caravan storage including erection of boundary fence and access roads, land between A189 and B1505 Cramlington, Northumberland

Judith Murphy, Principal Planning Officer, summarised the above application with the aid of a slide presentation. She advised that since the report was written, 7 more objections had been received but no new issues had been raised. She also reported that she had been handed a further 15 signatures that evening, to add to the objections previously received.

Gerry Killen, objector, addressed the committee to speak against the application and his comments included the following points:

- The original application was refused for a number of reasons, a reduction in the number of caravans was no reason to approve the application.
- Emergency vehicles - any possible delays to these vehicles by cars and caravans turning into the site could be life threatening.
- There were already traffic problems at the nearby school and these would be exacerbated if the application was approved.
- Additional traffic would cause congestion on the B1505, there was already a new housing development nearby and a possible future housing development adjacent to the hospital.

- There were major parking problems on a Sunday outside of St John's Church and the Police had been in contact with the priest to say that anyone attending the church must not park with wheels on the path. An increase in traffic would increase that risk.
- The proposed flood lighting would be annoying to residents overlooking the site and sleep patterns would be disturbed.
- It was disappointing that Highways Officers had accepted the application and he did not believe the data submitted to them was true to facts.
- Surveys carried out on 14 to 20 November at Jubilee Industrial Estate, Ashington were not representative of traffic on the B1505, it was not a main thoroughfare and was conducted in winter when traffic movements were lower.
- A survey carried out at allotments was not relative as allotments had no relationship to a caravan park.
- As there would be a large amount of gas bottles stored, had there been any consultation with the Fire and Rescue Service?
- Another major concern was delays caused by cars towing caravans at the roundabout off the Moor Farm roundabout onto the B1505.
- A caravan park would be out of keeping with the residential area and would have a detrimental effect on house prices in the area.
- Cramlington already had an industrial estate, why could caravan storage not be there?
- Where was democracy when, at meetings, residents, who elected Council members, were not allowed to speak?

Councillor Allan Hepple then spoke against the application:

- He was the elected representative for the residents and was pleased they had come out to voice their opinions. He thanked Gerry Killen for the concerns he had raised.
- The reasons for refusal of the original application remained valid.
- 755 caravans was over development, which was the same as last time.
- Caravans were all different shapes and sizes.
- There was a fire risk with the gas bottles - no risk assessment was apparent.
- The traffic survey at Jubilee Industrial Estate was not relevant, it was nowhere near residences.
- The number of caravans was not relevant, objections were about the location of the caravan park in a residential area near a large primary school and private nursery which was open until 6 pm.
- The road was used frequently for blue light ambulances.
- He asked members to listen to the concerns of residents.

John Collins, Cramlington Town Council, also spoke against the application:

- He echoed everything that had been said by the other objectors.
- He had attended St John's Church for many years. Both of his daughters had been married there and, when there was any kind of occasion, it was pandemonium so it would be very dangerous if this was approved.
- Cramlington was a garden town, there were places for things, this was the gateway to Cramlington and was the wrong place for caravan storage.
- He agreed with points made about emergency vehicles.

- It was a 'B' road but 200 metres further down it became an 'A' road.
- It terrified him that caravans would be turning in, it was a step too far and he asked members to reject the application.

Sean Hedley addressed the committee, speaking in support of the application, and his comments included the following:-

- He was the planning director of Hedley Planning Services and was speaking on behalf of the applicant.
- The objectors views differed from officers of the Council and statutory consultees who considered the application to be acceptable.
- There were two reasons for refusal last time and they had worked very closely with officers to address these.
- The applicant had reduced the number of caravans to 750 which was less than the estimated maximum figure.
- There was a drainage report, internal road layout, turning facility and space between caravans. It would not be over-development.
- Residential properties to the west were 40 metres from the site boundary and the site access was 60 metres from the nearest house.
- Most houses had fencing around and views referred to were from upstairs bedroom windows. Loss of view had been cited by residents but unfortunately there was no right to a view under the planning system.
- With regard to the potential impact on the road network, proposals did not warrant a transport assessment but surveys were instructed.
- He referred to paragraph 7.31 of the report which stated that it had been sufficiently demonstrated by the applicant that the proposal would not result in a significant increase in traffic movements across the Moor Farm roundabout and the adjacent smaller roundabout to the north west.
- Highways England had removed their holding objection and were satisfied that development generated traffic would equate to 10 additional traffic movements during peak times.
- Highways England did not consider there would be any adverse impact on the Local Road Network or Strategic Road Network.
- He respectfully requested members to support the officers recommendations and approve the application.

In response to questions from Members, the following information was provided:

- The height of the galvanised fence had not changed from the previous application but landscaping proposals had been improved. Screening would be provided by Hawthorn Hedgerow and existing vegetation would be retained on the western boundary. If Members wished, a stipulation that trees should be evergreen could be added to the conditions.
- Hedges would be taller than the fence to screen it.
- The traffic surveys were undertaken at Jubilee Industrial Estate Caravan Park in Ashington then results were analysed and factored to the proposed development.
- Allotment surveys were carried out because of existing permission for allotments.
- Northumbria Healthcare was consulted but no response was received.

- Officers did not consider it necessary to consult the Ambulance Service or the Police. Ambulances ran 24/7 and drivers on the highway would usually respect blue lights, however, it was not a planning consideration if drivers chose not to do so.
- The first application included a galvanised fence, the current application stated a wooden fence.
- The first application was currently at appeal. If this application was refused and the appeal was approved, it would be for 1500 caravans and a galvanised fence.
- If the application was approved tonight the applicant could still revert to the original plans if the appeal was allowed.

Councillor Flux proposed that the application be refused on similar grounds to the previous application. He did not consider that a wooden fence or hedges would make any difference to the visual impact and the highways issues stated previously were still relevant. There was not enough material difference in the application. Councillor Swithenbank seconded the motion.

The Senior Planning Manager said there would need to be more clarification regarding the reasons for refusal.

The Consultant Highways Engineer referred to the evidence presented in the surveys. He acknowledged that they had been undertaken in November, which could result in lower levels of traffic movements than the peak summer period, however, even if the level of traffic was three times as much as was surveyed it would not change the conclusions drawn. In terms of Moor Farm roundabout, Highways England had carried out assessments at peak periods and assumed that all traffic from the site would go there but no evidence was found to show there would be a severe cumulative impact under NPPF.

Members commented as follows:

- The caravan park at Jubilee Industrial Estate was very close to a roundabout and was on a significantly slower road.
- There was already a significant element of blue light traffic close to the application site and on 1 June a planning application had been submitted to extend the size of the emergency care hospital.
- The applicant had addressed both reasons for refusal of the previous application.
- There were empty units on Cramlington Industrial Estate, why could such a proposal not be considered there away from the curtilage of residents?
- Concerns about looking left and right out of Wreay Walk.
- The application should be refused and members should not be guided or scared by the threat of appeal.

Upon being put to the vote 7 members voted for the motion and 1 member abstained. It was therefore:

RESOLVED that the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. The development has the potential to generate a significant increase in traffic movements across the Moor Farm roundabout and the adjacent smaller roundabout to the north west and the wider road network. As such, the proposal has the potential to give rise to severe impacts on the highway network to the detriment of road users and general highway safety contrary to Policy DC1 of the Blyth Valley Development Control Policies DPD (2007), Policy A1 of the Blyth Valley Core Strategy (2007), and paragraph 32 of the NPPF.
2. The proposed development in this location would constitute overdevelopment of the site due to the number of caravans, up to 755, that could be stored at any one time. This would be out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area and represent a significant visual intrusion to the detriment of the amenity of the area. As such, the proposal would be contrary to Policy DC1 of the Blyth Valley Development Control Policies DPD (2007) and the provisions of the NPPF.

17. APPEAL UPDATE

Members received information on the progress of planning appeals. (Report enclosed with the official minutes on page 37 of Appendix A.)

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

(The meeting then adjourned and reconvened at 6.00 pm.)

18. COMMUNITY CHEST AWARDS

Following presentations in February 2018, a second round of presenting certificates to recipients of Community Chest funding had been arranged. The Chair welcomed the recipients and, on behalf of members of the Cramlington, Bedlington and Seaton Valley Local Area Council, thanked them for their contributions to the community.

Councillor Robinson then presented certificates to representatives of the following organisations who were congratulated and photographs were taken:

- Seghill Colliery Institute
- Bedlington Creatives
- Bedlington Brass Community Trust
- Seaton Sluice Community Association

19. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Keith Dalton, Bedlington referred to the pavilion at Gallagher Park, Bedlington in which toilets were meant to be provided for the public. He said these toilets were closed all of the time and he had addressed this several times with the officer in charge who said there was nobody to look after them. It had originally been said that users of the park would be able to access the toilets and they would be opened and closed by an

out of hours operative. Tony Gribbin, Neighbourhood Services Area Manager, said he would follow this up and provide a written reply to Mr Dalton.

Mr Dalton then referred to car parking and asked why, after the administration had introduced free parking, suddenly parking charges had been re-introduced at Plessey Woods? Some discussion took place about the charges being introduced by the Countryside Commission and it was stated that a written reply would be sought and provided to Mr Dalton.

Adam Hogg, Bedlington referred to his question at the last meeting about the 'wonky' roundabout at Broadoaks in Bedlington. He had received a written reply but disagreed with what Highways officers had said. The Chair stated that under new public question time legislation, it would not be allowed to raise the same question at subsequent meetings. Mr Hogg said the roundabout was an embarrassment to NCC Highways Department and queried how he could take this further if he was not allowed to raise it again? In response Daljit Lally, the Chief Executive, asked Mr Hogg to share his question/comments with her and she would take the matter forward.

20. PETITIONS

- (a) No new petitions had been received.
- (b) There were no reports to consider.
- (c) With regard to the petition put forward by Ms Isabel Easson requesting speed cameras and traffic calming measures in Rothesay Terrace and Victoria Terrace, Bedlington, the local member reported that speed signs were now in place and Ms Easson had requested that her thanks be conveyed to members, particularly to Councillor Dungworth, who she felt had been very supportive. Councillor Dungworth praised Ms Easson for her commitment to this under very difficult circumstances but felt that, following the death of Ms Easson's daughter, the Council should have done this as a matter of course. She said there were lessons to be learned about highways and safety which appeared to be more in favour of the motorist.

21. LOCAL SERVICES ISSUES

Kris Westerby, Highways Delivery Manager, introduced himself to the committee stating that he had been in post since April. He provided a verbal update about key recent, ongoing and/or future planned Local Services work taking place in the Cramlington, Bedlington and Seaton Valley area as follows:

- Completed resurfacing works;
- Large structural patching works;
- Potholes;
- Drainage works in Cramlington;
- 20 mph scheme - Hillcrest, Cramlington.

In response to a question Mr Westerby stated that, for skid resistance, gritters put dust on roads to soak up bitumen. It was noted that fresh bitumen could sometimes increase the growing speed of weeds.

Councillor Hepple praised the Highways Team for the microsurfacing work carried out and queried if water cooling on main roads caused problems. In response it was stated that the porous texture of roads acted like a sponge and microsurfacing sealed it. If water stood more than 2 hours on a road it was classed as a defect.

Councillors felt it would be beneficial for information to be passed on to them so that they were aware of problems on major routes.

The Chair requested that the prominent speed humps at Alderley Way in Cramlington be looked at.

A member queried if there was something more modern which could be used instead of speed humps to encourage traffic to slow down. It was noted that sets, which could be stuck onto the road surface, were used in 20 mph areas.

Tony Gribbin, Neighbourhood Services Area Manager, also provided a verbal update as follows:

- Current weather conditions had affected some services, namely grass cutting which had been suspended due to grass not growing so quickly. Staff had been redeployed to other duties such as path edging.
- All summer bedding had been planted and the county was looking fantastic. A numbers of areas had been inspected for green flag status including Dr Pitt Park and Astley Park.
- Judging for Northumbria in Bloom and Britain in Bloom competitions was taking place.
- Weed treatments across the area had been completed, members should let officers know of any more problem areas.
- Winter maintenance would be looked at in conjunction with colleagues in Highways to ensure there was a continued co-ordinated approach.
- From a grounds maintenance point of view any comments were welcome about areas which members felt needed more attention.
- There would be another litter pick up/weed/grass cut on the spine road.

Following requests from Members, it was agreed that officers would look at the following:

- A189 near the TA Centre - there seemed to be a lot of grass in the area.
- Klondyke to High Pit road.
- The Avenue between Seaton Delaval and Seaton Sluice - overhanging trees blocking signage to New Hartley.

A member said the use of blue dye had alarmed some members of the public and it would have been helpful if communications had been put out to explain why it was

being used. It was suggested that information be published in Parish/Town Council magazines for those who could not access the NCC website.

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

22. NORTHUMBERLAND LOCAL PLAN - REGULATION 18 DRAFT PLAN

Members received a report which provided an update on the Northumberland Local Plan and details of the Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation. (Report attached to the official minutes as Appendix B.)

Joan Sanderson, Senior Planning Manager - Planning Policy, provided a presentation (copy attached to Appendix B with the official minutes). She said Members had already been provided with a written update report on the Local Plan which included details of the Regulation 18 Local Plan consultation and this presentation would cover: progress to date on preparation of Northumberland Local Plan; Regulation 18 Local Plan Consultation and the Next Steps.

Following withdrawal of the Core Strategy, the Council was preparing a new Local Plan with full plan coverage and the plan period would run to 2036. A number of updates to existing evidence base studies had been undertaken and work had been carried out with internal and external partners. Over 700 responses had been received to the Spring 2018 Local Plan consultation and results had been fed into the draft plan. There had been a threat of Government intervention but no further action would be taken so long as the Council accelerated its plan preparation programme by up to 3 months and provided greater clarity in its LDS, which had been done.

Details of the new Local Plan were provided and the draft vision set out what the plan intended to achieve over the plan period. It covered the whole of Northumberland except for the National Park and, once adopted, would replace all local plans. The vision and objectives had not changed dramatically to that of the withdrawn core strategy, except for an increased emphasis on the health and wellbeing agenda and ensuring high quality design in new developments.

In order to deliver the vision the plan would need to define level and distribution of development and include specific policies, details of which were provided along with the strategy for the economy; housing; connectivity; managing natural resources; natural and built environment; water environment; contaminated and unstable land, pollution and soil quality and infrastructure provision.

Details of settlement boundaries, Green Belt boundaries and information was provided for the:

- main towns - Bedlington/Bedlington Station and Cramlington
- service centre - Seaton Delaval,
- service villages - New Hartley & Seghill, Seaton Sluice/Old Hartey
- smaller settlements - Holywell, Harford Bridge and Netherton.

Reference was made to the consultation timescales and next steps. All responses received would be fed into the Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan and people were being encouraged to submit responses online. The policies map could be accessed via the Local Plan page on the Council's website along with a Frequently asked Questions page.

The Regulation 19 Draft Local Plan would be consulted upon in January 2019 and other key milestone dates were provided with adoption of the Local Plan taking place in March 2020.

In response to questions the following information was provided:

- The consultants had used the Government's new housing requirement methodology as the starting point, which had resulted in 717 units. A policy uplift had then been applied in relation to meeting the requirements of the NELEP's Strategic Economic Plan (SEP). One set of consultants had been employed to undertake the economic and housing growth options scenario work, which made it easier to understand. In terms of distribution, in the new Local Plan it appeared the South East of the county was getting a lot of new development but the level of distribution was aligned to the population level.
- A minimum requirement for 20% affordable housing and 50/50 owned/rented accommodation split had come from the updated Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) work. The updated SHMA had also looked at general needs housing and a need for smaller accommodation and bungalows had been identified. There was also the need to look at accessibility standards and future proofing homes in order to meet the needs of the elderly population.
- Officers had worked hard to protect affordable housing contributions and were now performing well on delivery.
- The base date of the Plan was 1st April 2016, the Plan had to run for 20 years as it could take 3 years or more to put in place. When the Plan was adopted it must have 15 years looking forward.
- Section 106 agreements - the policy on planning obligations in the emerging local plan referred to the fact that planning obligations would only be sought where it was necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
- Design - a supplementary planning document on design would also be prepared and would look at various design issues, including sustainable construction.
- Officers had been asked to change the name of the Ashington, Blyth, Tyne Railway line and it was thought this was linked to the North of Tyne Devolution deal.

RESOLVED that the report and presentation be noted.

ITEMS FOR INFORMATION

23. MEMBERS' LOCAL IMPROVEMENTS SCHEMES

Members received a progress report as of July 2018. (Attached to the official minutes as Appendix C.)

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

24. LOCAL AREA COUNCIL WORK PROGRAMME

Members were asked to note the latest version of agreed items for future Local Area Council meetings. (Attached to the official minutes as Appendix D.)

RESOLVED that the information be noted.

25. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

It was noted that the next meeting would take place on Wednesday, 22 August 2018, venue and time to be confirmed.

The meeting closed at 7:25 pm.

CHAIR _____

DATE _____