

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the
LOWLANDS AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
held in Committee Room 1, Council Offices, Woodgreen, Witney, Oxon
at 2:00 pm on Monday 16 April 2018

PRESENT

Councillors: Mrs M J Crossland (Chairman), S J Good (Vice-Chairman), H B Eaglestone, P Emery, D S T Enright, Mrs E H N Fenton, Mr E J Fenton, J Haine, H J Howard, P D Kelland, R A Langridge and A H K Postan

Also in attendance: Mrs J C Baker

Officers in attendance: Phil Shaw, Miranda Clark and Paul Cracknell

61. MINUTES

RESOLVED: that the Minutes of the meeting of the Sub-Committee held on 12 March 2018, copies of which had been circulated, be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

62. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS

Apologies for absence were received from P J Handley and K J Mullins.

A H K Postan attended for M A Barrett

63. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mrs Crossland declared an interest in application No. 17/02058/FUL (80 – 82 Station Road, Brize Norton) as members of her family had a financial interest in the development proposals. She indicated that she would leave the meeting during consideration of the application.

Mr Eaglestone declared an interest in application No. 18/00496/HHD (10 Farmington Drive, Witney) as the applicant and indicated that he would leave the meeting during its consideration.

Mr Howard declared an interest in Agenda item No. 6 (Tree Preservation Order No. 63/84 – Application to fell one Pine tree at Lime Tree Close, Carterton) as the applicant and indicated that he would leave the meeting during its consideration.

Whilst not a disclosable interest, Mr Fenton advised that one of the objectors to application No. 18/00446/FUL (Land South of Elmside, Greenacres Lane, Aston) was a colleague.

64. APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENT

The Sub-Committee received the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing giving details of applications for development, copies of which had been circulated. A schedule outlining additional observations received following the production of the agenda was circulated at the meeting, a copy of which is included within the Minute Book.

(In order to assist members of the public, the Sub-Committee considered the applications in which those present had indicated a particular interest in the following order:-

17/04112/FUL, 17/04113/FUL, 18/00320/FUL, 18/00419/FUL, 18/00512/FUL, 18/00446/FUL, 17/02058/FUL, 18/00075/S73 and 18/00496/HHD

The results of the Sub-Committee's deliberations follow in the order in which they appeared on the printed agenda).

RESOLVED: that the decisions on the following applications be as indicated, the reasons for refusal or conditions related to a permission to be as recommended in the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing, subject to any amendments as detailed below:-

3 17/02058/FUL 80 - 82 Station Road, Brize Norton

Mrs Crossland left the meeting during consideration of the following application. The Vice-Chairman, Mr Good, took the Chair.

The Planning Officer presented her report and sought delegated authority to approve the application subject to the Council's Environmental Health Officer being satisfied with the plans for the proposed odour abatement equipment.

Mr Postan indicated that this was a vital business, supporting employment and the local economy and acknowledged that the addition of a café would improve the facilities it was able to offer customers. However, he considered that the café was to be situated in the wrong location. Whilst it utilised an existing building, customers smoking outside the café could give rise to a fire risk given the proximity to stored timber.

Mr Postan proposed that consideration of the application be deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

Mr Kelland suggested that the café was more likely to operate as a take away and did not anticipate that there would be a great deal of cooking taking place on the premises.

Mr Fenton expressed doubt that the operation would give rise to noise or air pollution and felt that it was up to the owners to identify a suitable location for the operation. He did not expect that there would be high levels of usage.

Mr Howard acknowledged Mr Postan's concerns but agreed with Mr Fenton. As to increased levels of usage, he noted that there was already a mobile catering unit operating on the site.

Mr Langridge noted that there was no objection from the Highway Authority and that concerns over the impact on residential amenities could be addressed by the conditions proposed by the Council's Environmental Health Officer. He could see no reason to require relocation of the facility and indicated his support for the Officer recommendation.

The proposition of deferral failed to attract a seconder and the Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Langridge and seconded by Mr Kelland.

Mr Postan reiterated his concerns over odour and noise. In response, the Planning Officer drew attention to the comments of the Council's Environmental Health Officer set out at paragraph 5.9 of the report and the associated conditions 3 and 6.

The Officer recommendation was then put to the vote and was carried.

Permitted subject to the Council's Environmental Health Officer being satisfied with the plans for the proposed odour abatement equipment.

(Mr Postan requested that his vote against the foregoing application be so recorded)

11 17/04112/FUL

Barn at Holwell Manor Farm, Holwell

The Planning Officer introduced this and the following application.

The applicant's representatives, Mr Neil Perry and Mr Andrew Miles, addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of their submissions is attached as Appendix A to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to questions from Mr Kelland, Mr Perry advised that locally made brick had been used elsewhere on the site. The idea of re-cladding the building had been considered and rejected and there were sufficient bricks in a non-structural dividing wall to be re-used externally. Mr Perry also advised that, whilst the internal structure suggested that the roof of the 1881 building had originally been tin, it was not possible to confirm this. It was thought that a slate would be the most appropriate roofing material but the applicants would be prepared to use tin if this was preferred.

The Planning Officer then presented her reports containing recommendations of refusal.

Mr Enright indicated that, having visited the site, he considered the proposals to be a decent scheme and did not believe that the two different uses proposed made a significant difference. The proposals would be an improvement upon the current position and Mr Enright did not consider the site to be in the open countryside. The proposals represented a good use of the existing buildings and, whilst an office use would give rise to some traffic generation, he thought either a residential or a small scale office use would be acceptable.

Mr Enright proposed that both this and the following application be approved. The proposition was seconded by Mr Postan who agreed that the site was not within the open countryside and considered the applications to represent a good use of the existing buildings.

(Mrs Baker joined the meeting at this juncture)

Mr Kelland indicated that this was a fantastic group of buildings with an existing mixed use and considered both applications to be acceptable.

The Development Manager stressed that the question to be addressed was not whether the buildings were capable of conversion but what the impact of the development would be. Whilst Officers were content with the extant planning permission on the single storey barns but considered the incorporation of the more modern structure to be inappropriate.

The extant consent envisaged that domestic paraphernalia would be contained within the footprint of the modern addition. The concern was that, by incorporating this addition within the development, domestic

clutter would be pushed into an area within the public view so as to be detrimental to the street scene.

Mr Kelland indicated that, whilst he would have preferred to see a mixed use, he did not view residential development as unacceptable.

Mr Langridge agreed with Mr Enright and expressed his support for the applications. Whilst he acknowledged the concerns expressed by Officers, he did not share them.

Mr Howard also recognised Officers' concerns but did not consider the site to be within open countryside. He considered that residential use was preferable to office use as such use would give rise to greater level of traffic generation. Mr Howard did not accept that a residential use would result in an adverse effect on residential amenity.

Mr Good expressed sympathy for the Offices' view and agreed that this was a visually sensitive area. He questioned the internal layout of the scheme and the Development Manager confirmed that it appeared to incorporate a self-contained annex element and a large lounge area.

Mr Good indicated that he would prefer to see residential development and welcomed the extension of the wall to create a pedestrian only access.

Mr Emery stated that he did not think office use was appropriate in this location but was happy to see residential development.

The Development Manager cautioned that the emerging Local Plan grouped small villages, hamlets and the open countryside together and, where re-use of existing agricultural buildings was considered appropriate, viewed a residential use as the option of last resort.

Mr Emery noted that the principle of residential development on the site had already been accepted and Mr Fenton considered that it would be preferable if the buildings were redeveloped and improved rather than lost.

Mr Postan indicated that he would have preferred to see a mixed use as the creation of an employment use would enhance the life of the community.

Mr Howard indicated that he recognised the constraints within the emerging Local Plan but did not consider that development would give rise to demonstrable harm.

Mr Good stressed that it was not good planning to permit an application simply to improve a poorly maintained site. He suggested that, if approved, the residential use should be restricted by condition to be occupied as a single residence.

Mrs Crossland considered that the site was capable of development but was not convinced that the current proposals were appropriate. Her personal preference was for new development rather than conversion of the existing buildings and Mrs Crossland indicated that she would prefer to see the current applications refused as she considered the converted buildings to be too large for a single dwelling or for use as multiple offices. Her preference was for a mixed use.

The recommendations of approval were then subject to individual votes.

Permitted subject to the following conditions:-

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.
Reason: To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004.
2. That the development be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.
Reason: For the avoidance of doubt as to what is permitted.
3. Before above ground building work commences, a schedule of materials (including samples) to be used in the elevations of the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in the approved materials.
Reason: To safeguard the character and appearance of the area.
4. The self-contained unit proposed within the conversion hereby permitted shall be used as accommodation ancillary to the proposed one dwelling resulting from the overall conversion development on the site and shall not be occupied as a separate dwelling. This self-contained unit shall remain ancillary thereafter.
Reason: A separate dwelling in this location would be contrary to the relevant housing and environmental policies of the West Oxfordshire Local Plans and the NPPF.
5. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), no development permitted under Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B, C, D, E, G and H shall be carried out other than that expressly authorised by this permission.
Reason: Control is needed to retain the visual appearance of the site and its historical features, the setting of the Listed Buildings, and to protect residential amenities.
6. No development, including any works of demolition, shall take place until a Construction Method Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Statement shall be adhered to throughout the construction period and shall provide for:
 - I The parking of vehicles for site operatives and visitors
 - II The loading and unloading of plant and materials
 - III The storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development

- IV The erection and maintenance of security hoarding including decorative displays
- V Wheel washing facilities
- VI Measures to control the emission of dust and dirt during construction
- VII A scheme for recycling/disposing of waste resulting from demolition and construction works.

Reason: To safeguard the means to ensure that the character and appearance of the area, living conditions and road safety are in place before work starts.

- 7. Bat and bird boxes shall be installed in accordance with details including phasing that have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before development commences.

Reason: To safeguard and enhance biodiversity.

- 8. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the Recommendations contained within the Windrush Ecology Report as submitted with the application. In addition revised amended elevation plans shall be first submitted to and approved in writing to show the recommended Schwegler IFQ bat boxes on the southern gable end of the southern barn and the eastern gable end of the northern barn. The measures taken (where appropriate) shall be retained as such thereafter.

Reason: To ensure that the habitats of protected species are retained.

- 9. In the event that contamination is found at any time when carrying out the approved development, it must be reported in writing immediately to the Local Planning Authority. An investigation and risk assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Environment Agency's Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11, and where remediation is necessary, a remediation scheme must be prepared to bring the site to a condition suitable for the intended use by removing unacceptable risks to human health, buildings and other property, and which is subject to the approval in writing of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the environment in the interests of the amenity.

- 10. No dwelling shall be occupied until the vehicular and cycle parking spaces and turning areas that serve that dwelling has been constructed, laid out, surfaced, lit and drained in accordance with details that have been first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of road safety.

- 11. That, prior to the commencement of development, a full surface water drainage scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include details of the size,

position and construction of the drainage scheme and results of soakage tests carried out at the site to demonstrate the infiltration rate. Three tests should be carried out for each soakage pit as per BRE 365 with the lowest infiltration rate (expressed in m/s) used for design. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure the proper provision for surface water drainage and/ or to ensure flooding is not exacerbated in the locality (The West Oxfordshire Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance).

NOTE TO APPLICANT:

1 The Surface Water Drainage scheme should, where possible, incorporate Sustainable Drainage Techniques in order to ensure compliance with;

- Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (Part 1 - Clause 27 (1))

- Code for sustainable homes - A step-change in sustainable home building practice

- Version 2.1 of Oxfordshire County Council's SUDs Design Guide (August 2013)

- The local flood risk management strategy published by Oxfordshire County Council 2015 – 2020 as per the Flood and Water Management Act 2010 (Part 1 - Clause 9 (1))

19 17/04113/FUL

Barn at Holwell Manor Farm, Holwell

The proposition of approval was put to the vote and was lost.

Having expressed concern over the potential traffic generation arising from an office use the Officer recommendation of refusal, having been duly proposed and seconded was put to the vote and was carried.

Refused

26 18/00075/S73

24 Sellwood Drive, Carterton

The Planning Officer presented her report containing a recommendation of conditional approval.

Mr Howard noted that the property to the north of the site was a bungalow and that the original property on the site had been demolished. He considered the current proposal to be a significant improvement upon the original application and believed it to represent the best outcome the Council could hope to achieve.

The Officer recommendation was proposed by Mr Howard and seconded by Mrs Crossland and on being put to the vote was carried.

Permitted

32 18/00320/FUL

Bints Yard, Chapel Lane, Northmoor

The Development Manager introduced the application.

Mr Graham Shelton addressed the meeting on behalf of Northmoor Parish Council. A summary of the points that he raised is attached as Appendix B to the original copy of these minutes.

Mr Jeremy Flawn, the applicant's representative, then addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix C to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Fenton, Mr Flawn advised that the dwellings would be served by a non-network sewerage treatment facility (Klargester units or similar) and would not discharge into the existing sewer network.

In response to a question from Mrs Crossland, Mr Flawn advised that, whilst it would be for the developer to programme the project, he anticipated an early start on site.

The Development Manager presented the report containing a recommendation of conditional approval. He acknowledged the concerns expressed by the Parish Council regarding the adequacy of the local sewerage network and suggested that condition 13 be amended to address these. He commended the Parish Council for identifying the key issue that the proposed development was not sufficient in itself to warrant the grant of planning permission but the provision of affordable housing was of sufficient benefit to justify approval. Whilst market housing would not be acceptable on this site, the provision of five of the eight units as shared equity affordable housing was sufficient to make the provision of three market dwellings acceptable.

Mr Good expressed his support for the scheme which he felt was just what the village needed. He congratulated the Council's Officers for securing a good design and the Parish Council for their insightful consideration of the scheme. Mr Good welcomed the amendment to the drainage condition, emphasising that this was an important issue, and proposed the Officer recommendation.

The proposition was seconded by Mrs Fenton who reiterated the importance of securing an independent sewerage system and questioned how it could be ensured that there was no discharge into the mains system in the future. The Development Manager advised that developers had the right to connect to mains drainage and that it fell to Thames Water to provide an adequate system.

In response to questions from Mr Postan, the Development Manager advised that condition 18 removed permitted development rights bringing matters such as the installation of roof lights under planning control. He advised that 'staircasing' on shared equity housing usually ran from 20% to 80% and Mr Postan suggested that the Council should seek to secure the lowest possible introductory level. The Development Manager also advised that the Council could not secure low interest rate mortgages.

In response to a suggestion from Mr Fenton, the Development Manager agreed that the foul drainage system should be installed prior to the commencement of development.

Mr Good suggested that the landscaping scheme should require the use of native species.

The Officer recommendation of conditional approval was then put to the vote and was carried.

Permitted subject to the applicants entering into a legal agreement to secure the provision of affordable housing and to the amendment of condition 13 to require that the foul drainage system be installed prior to the commencement of development.

50 18/00498/OUT Westbourne, Shilton

It was noted that this application had been withdrawn at the request of the applicant.

60 18/00419/FUL Land East of 135 Farmers Close, Farmers Close, Witney

The Development Manager introduced the application.

The applicant's agent, Mr Paul Slater, addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix D to the original copy of these minutes.

The Development Manager then presented the report containing a recommendation of refusal.

Mr Langridge acknowledged the Officers' concerns but disagreed with their assessment. He considered the site to be incongruous and an eyesore that had no positive impact upon the street scene. Mr Langridge stated that he had not seen the area used and noted that there was plenty of other green space in the immediate vicinity. He considered that it would be preferable to see a house in what was already an urban environment and proposed that the application be approved.

The proposition was seconded by Mr Eaglestone.

In response to a question from Mr Kelland, the Development Manager advised that it was his understanding that ownership of the land had passed to the applicant.

Mr Enright considered that the loss of any public open space for development was undesirable.

Mrs Fenton recalled that, during a previous site visit, the footpath through the site had been gated and questioned the current position. The Development Manager advised that there had been several attempts to restrict access in the past by those seeking to secure planning consent. The access was currently unrestricted and the application acknowledged the existence of a right of way. Mrs Fenton indicated that, on balance, she was in favour of the development.

Mr Howard suggested that the loose surface was dangerous and unsuitable for use as a play area. Mr Emery was disturbed at the potential loss of an area of open space and, whilst the current surface might be unsatisfactory, it could be made acceptable.

Mr Haine agreed that the proposal did not sit well with the existing pattern of development and expressed his support for the Officer recommendation of refusal. Mr Good expressed some concern over the design of the dwelling, arrangements for vehicular access and bin storage. The Development Manager agreed that the parking arrangements would rely upon good neighbourliness to operate successfully.

Mr Postan noted that not all play areas were necessarily grassed.

Mr Langridge reminded Members that there were no objections from the Highway Authority and stated that he would have supported the Officer recommendation had the land in question been used as a play area but in his experience it was not.

Mrs Crossland expressed concern at the loss of open space and agreed with Mr Good that the proposed dwelling did not sit comfortably on the site. Once the site was developed it could never be reclaimed as open space and Mrs Crossland considered the benefits it provided as such outweighed the provision of a single dwelling.

Mr Eaglestone considered the retention of the site as open space to be unnecessary as it failed to make a positive impact upon the street scene. The Town Council supported the application and the provision of lighting for the footpath.

The recommendation of approval was then put to the vote and was lost.

The Officer recommendation of refusal was proposed by Mr Haine and seconded by Mr Emery and on being put to the vote was carried.

Refused

68 18/00512/FUL 58 Newland Mill, Witney

The Planning Officer introduced the application.

Mr Keith Blois addressed the meeting in opposition to the application. A summary of his submission is attached as Appendix E to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mrs Crossland, Mr Blois advised that there had been no police involvement in the complaints which were primarily noise related.

The Planning Officer then presented her report containing a recommendation of refusal and recommended that, should the recommendation be approved, Officers be authorised to take enforcement action to require the cessation of the unauthorised use without delay and within such timescale as considered appropriate.

Mrs Fenton expressed her concern over the current use of the property and questioned whether it complied with Fire Regulations. The Planning Officer advised that there were a number of technical infringements but that no significant concerns had been expressed.

Mr Emery agreed that the current use was inappropriate and proposed the Officer recommendation. The proposition was seconded by Mr Langridge

who questioned whether the suggested use as a holiday let would be permissible.

The Development Manager advised that such a use might be permissible as permitted development if ancillary to a residential use. However, whilst the current use appeared to have ceased, there was a need for further investigation as it was possible that a new breach was taking place.

Mr Langridge suggested that Officers be authorised to take Enforcement Action against any further breach of planning control that might be identified.

Mr Good indicated that the property was over-occupied and considered that the property was not operating as a guest house or a bed and breakfast establishment. He agreed that Enforcement Action should be taken as a matter of urgency.

Mr Enright agreed that the use was inappropriate and expressed concern that such a use could become more common.

The Officer recommendation was then put to the vote and was carried.

Refused, the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing being authorised to take enforcement action to require the cessation of the current unauthorised use and any other such use as may be identified without delay and within such timescale as considered appropriate.

(Mrs Baker left the meeting at this juncture)

74 18/00446/FUL

Land South of Elmside, Greenacres Lane, Aston

The Development Manager introduced the application.

Mr Michael Gilbert, the applicant's agent and Mrs Marion Cole addressed the meeting in support of the application. A summary of their submissions is attached as Appendix F to the original copy of these minutes.

In response to a question from Mr Enright, Mrs Cole confirmed that the proposed dwelling was intended for use by a family member. In response to a question from Mr Howard she confirmed that the applicants would be happy to discuss revisions to the proposed design of the dwelling.

The Development Manager then presented the report containing a recommendation of refusal. Whilst recognising the persuasive nature of a social case, he cautioned against approval as there was no effective way of restricting occupation.

Mr Emery questioned how this application differed from that approved on a site to the north east and the Development Manager indicated that he believed that this had been for a replacement rather than a new dwelling.

Mr Good noted that the Parish Council had not raised any objections and, whilst he would have considered a speculative development in this location to be unacceptable, he had some sympathy for the applicant's wish to provide for their family.

Mr Good proposed that consideration of the application be deferred to enable Members to assess the impact of the development on the site. The proposition was seconded by Mrs Fenton.

Mr Langridge suggested that the deferral would give the applicant the opportunity to consider changes to the design.

Whilst acknowledging Members' wish to assist a local family, the Development Manager cautioned against setting a precedent for development contrary to Policy regardless of the level of local support.

The recommendation of deferral was then put to the vote and was carried.

Deferred to enable a site visit to be held.

82 18/00496/HHD 10 Farmington Drive, Witney

(Mr Eaglestone left the meeting during consideration of the following application)

The Officer recommendation of conditional approval was proposed by Mr Langridge and seconded by Mr Howard and on being put to the vote was carried.

Permitted

65. APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED POWERS AND APPEAL DECISIONS

The report giving details of applications determined by the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing under delegated powers and an appeal decision was received and noted.

66. TREE PRESERVATION ORDER NO. 63/84 – APPLICATION TO FELL ONE PINE TREE AT LIME TREE CLOSE, CARTERTON, OX18 3AD

(Mr Howard left the meeting during consideration of the following application)

The Sub-Committee received and considered the report of the Head of Planning and Strategic Housing regarding an application to fell a pine tree at Lime Tree Close, Carterton, included in Tree Preservation Order No.63/84.

In response to a question from Mr Emery, the Council's Forestry and Landscape Officer advised that the owner of the land upon which the tree was located would be responsible for any damage that might result. However, he stressed that the tree was not at the end of its life or any more dangerous than any other. He advised that there were decades of life left in the tree and indicated that there was a need to balance risk; there was no great evidence of any significant risk. If there was likelihood or a high risk of the tree causing damage he would agree that it should be felled.

Given its proximity to a public footpath and the fact that a branch had fallen from the tree, Mr Kelland considered that it represented a danger and should be felled. Mr Langridge concurred and, as he did not consider the tree to be of high amenity value, proposed that the application to fell be approved. The proposition was seconded by Mr Emery.

Mr Postan indicated that remedial work could be taken to ameliorate any danger and the Forestry and Landscape Officer advised that such action had been considered and rejected as being unnecessary. He advised that the Council may be liable to pay compensation should the tree cause any damage within 12 months of an application to fell being refused.

Mr Enright stated that the Sub-Committee should take account of the technical advice received which indicated that there was no reason to fell the tree.

Mr Haine considered the tree to be too tall in this location. It was not a native species and the crown was the wrong shape.

Mr Fenton stated that branches occasionally fell from trees and, if properly maintained, there was no significant danger. Mr Fenton considered that the Sub-Committee should follow the expert advice.

Mrs Crossland indicated that the tree was not highly visible from key roads as it was in the centre of the development and flanked by other examples. She did not consider that it made an important contribution to the landscape and noted that the applicant was prepared to plant a replacement tree.

RESOLVED: That the application to fell the pine tree at Lime Tree Close, Carterton, included in Tree Preservation Order No.63/84 be approved, the applicant be required to plant a replacement.

(Mr Enright and Mr Fenton requested that their votes against the foregoing decision be so recorded)

67. CHAIRMANS REMARKS

Mrs Crossland expressed her thanks to those Members who were not seeking re-election for their hard work and contributions to the work of the Sub-Committee. All had acted with sincerity in representing what they believed in. She wished all those seeking re-election good luck

The meeting closed at 5:10pm.

CHAIRMAN