

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held in Denbigh Town Hall, Denbigh on Wednesday, 15 March 2017 at 9.30 am.

PRESENT

Councillors Brian Blakeley, Joan Butterfield, Jeanette Chamberlain-Jones, Bill Cowie (Vice-Chair), Meirick Davies, Stuart Davies, Huw Hilditch-Roberts, Rhys Hughes, Alan James, Alice Jones, Pat Jones, Barry Mellor, Bob Murray, Dewi Owens, Merfyn Parry, Pete Prendergast, Arwel Roberts, Anton Sampson, Gareth Sandilands, David Simmons, Julian Thompson-Hill, Joe Welch (Chair), Cefyn Williams, Cheryl Williams, Huw Williams and Mark Young

Observers – Councillors Ann Davies, Hugh Evans, Colin Hughes, Gwyneth Kensler and Win Mullen-James

Councillor David Smith, Lead Member for Public Realm attended for agenda item 12 – 14

ALSO PRESENT

Head of Planning and Public Protection (GB); Team Leader – Places Team (SC); Development Manager (PM); Development Control Officer (PG); Senior Engineer – Highways (MP); Strategic Planning and Housing Manager (AL); Senior Planning Officer (LG); Planning Policy Officer (LD), and Committee Administrator (KEJ)

POINT OF NOTICE

The Chair explained it had not been possible to hold the meeting in Ruthin Council Chamber as usual due to works being carried out which also meant that the meeting could not be webcast and the electronic voting equipment could not be used. The minutes would provide a formal record of the meeting and the vote would be taken by show of hands.

1 APOLOGIES

Councillors Peter Evans, Hugh Irving and Bill Tasker
Councillors Rhys Hughes and Dewi Owens would be arriving late for the meeting.

2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Joe Welch – Personal Interest – Agenda Item 5
Councillor Arwel Roberts – Personal Interest – Agenda Items 5 & 11
Councillor Ann Davies – Personal Interest – Agenda Item 11

3 URGENT MATTERS AS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

No urgent matters had been raised.

4 MINUTES

The minutes of the Planning Committee's meeting held on 8 February 2017 were submitted.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 8 February 2017 be approved as a correct record.

APPLICATIONS FOR PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT (ITEMS 5 - 11) -

Applications received requiring determination by the committee were submitted together with associated documentation. Reference was also made to late supplementary information received since publication of the agenda which related to particular applications. In order to accommodate public speaking requests it was agreed to vary the agenda order of applications accordingly.

5 APPLICATION NO. 01/2016/0374/PF - LAND AT CAE TOPYN, OFF OLD RUTHIN ROAD, Ffordd Eglwyswen, Denbigh

[Councillor Joe Welch declared a personal interest because the owner of the field subject of the applicant was a friend. Councillor Arwel Roberts declared a personal interest in this item in so far as it related to the Chapel where he often preaches.]

An application had been submitted for erection of 75 no. dwellings, together with associated roads, open space and related works at land at Cae Topyn, off Old Ruthin Road, Ffordd Eglwyswen, Denbigh.

Public Speakers –

Dr. H. Watkin (**Against**) – referred to documentation he had sent to members the previous day regarding his opposition to the development and highlighted particular areas of concern relating to pedestrian access; open space; highways and parking; flooding, and impacts on the Welsh language and biodiversity.

Mr. M. Gilbert (**For**) – stressed that the site had been allocated for residential development within the LDP and therefore argued that objections to the location and distance to facilities were irrelevant points. He reported upon requirements imposed through the application procedures and responded to issues raised regarding traffic generation and parking, flooding, biodiversity and education.

General Debate – The Development Manager introduced the item advising that the site formed part of a larger land allocation for housing in the LDP. He drew attention to the large shortfall in housing completions over the LDP period advising that the development would provide 75 houses and a range of dwellings (with just over the 10% minimum for affordable housing), open space and a commuted sum payment of £31,993. In order to guide potential developers a Site Development Brief (SDB) had been adopted, and whilst not policy, this SDB provided guidance and was a material planning consideration in this case. The main planning considerations had been set out in the report and the SDB had also been considered in relation to the proposals as part of that process. No objections had

been raised by specialist consultees and appropriate documentation had been provided in relation to the relevant assessments and strategies required. Finally members were reminded that the material planning considerations related to the impact of the proposal as opposed to the principle of the development.

Councillor Mark Young (Local Member) highlighted the huge amount of work in developing the SDB for the Brookhouse Sites which formed the basis for the determination of planning applications on the site, and he considered that many aspects of the proposed development did not conform to those requirements. That view was shared by fellow Denbigh Councillors Colin Hughes and Gwyneth Kensler who provided some history to the site within the current context of the planning application and the allocation of the sites by the Planning Inspectorate. Denbigh residents had opposed the site allocation in the LDP and were not being best served by the current development proposals. Councillor David Smith also advocated the strict use of SDBs when considering planning applications and was disappointed that more weight had not been attached to the SDB on this occasion. The general consensus was that, given that the SDB had been tailored specifically to the Brookhouse Sites, and despite assurances that SDBs would be robustly complied with, it had not happened in this case. Questions were also raised at this point regarding the transport assessment and measures of addressing flooding concerns together with drainage problems. Concerns were also raised regarding the robustness of the legal agreements proposed given that many had been contested and subsequently overturned in the past.

Officers responded to members concerns and questions as follows –

- clarified the terminology around SDBs confirming that the SDB was not policy as a matter of law but it was guidance and a material planning consideration and was an important part of the assessment
- stressed that the SDB had not been ignored in this case and officers made it clear that there were policies in the LDP supported by guidance and a clear assessment of the application had taken place having consideration to the SDB
- for clarity members were asked to specify those areas of the SDB which they considered the application did not comply with
- with regard to questions around education and drainage/flooding, members were referred to the additional information in the supplementary papers (blue sheets) which clarified those issues
- whilst it was appreciated that there were concerns around highway issues the data produced as part of the Transport Assessment was considered robust and the assessment of the impact on the local highway network had been detailed within the report – it was concluded that the level of traffic could be accommodated by the existing highway network and there was confidence it could cope with the additional traffic.

During the course of debate members considered the relevant policies and guidance, including the SDB and the material planning considerations as set out within the report. In addition to the wealth of concerns raised via representations received members also raised their own concerns regarding the development –

- Highways (including accessibility and parking) – concerns regarding the adequacy of the Transport Assessment and calculation methods given that previous developments approved on that basis had subsequently given rise to traffic problems; parking problems at Old Ruthin Road; positioning of the access near the Chapel and need for extra parking at peak times, and concerns over safe routes to school
- Education – there was a requirement in the SDB for an education contribution and concerns were expressed regarding the decision to waive that requirement, particularly given parental preference with a number of schools being full to capacity, including Ysgol Glan Clwyd, together with the strain on the current school infrastructure in the form of mobile classrooms. The importance of the education environment to both existing and potential pupils was highlighted
- Welsh Language – it was submitted that Denbigh had one of the highest number of Welsh speakers in the county which would be threatened by the development and be at odds with strategies to increase the number of Welsh speakers both in the county and across Wales
- Affordable Housing – the developer had stated his intention to provide 8 affordable housing dwellings on site which would need to be subject of a S.106 agreement to deliver. However some members were not persuaded that a legal agreement could be relied upon to secure delivery of those dwellings
- Open Space – there were calls for the full allocation to be provided
- Drainage (including flooding) – it was considered that this element should have been dealt with at the pre-application stage as specified within the SDB and whilst some information had been provided regarding the management of surface water flooding and drainage members did not consider there to be sufficient detail to satisfy them in that regard, particularly given that the existing infrastructure was not coping and it was considered that the development and proposed means of addressing the issue would likely result in additional flooding. There was also some concern regarding the location of the pumping station next to the Chapel
- Loss of Hedgerows – the proposal included the removal of hedgerows and reference had been made in the SDB that the existing hedgerow abutting the A525 and on both sides of Old Ruthin Road and the established hedgerow abutting Whitchurch Road should be retained highlighting their importance for visual screening and as habitats for local wildlife
- Scale, Density and Character of the Housing Development – concerns that the development was out of scale and character with the surrounding area and was contrary to the SDB in that a lower density was warranted in this case.

Officers responded to those concerns and subsequent questions as follows –

Highways (including accessibility and parking) –

- although the requested software had not been used in the Transport Assessment officers were satisfied that the calculations provided were robust
- the guidelines specified within the Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance on Parking had been met
- it was considered that the development would not significantly increase traffic in the location of Old Ruthin Road and Whitchurch Road junction and would likely generate an increase of one car per minute on the highway

- there was an existing problem associated with parking on Old Ruthin Road (brow of slope) and each access onto the road met visibility standards
- ideally 10 spaces for the Chapel would be provided and the developer proposed parking for the Chapel in the form of a layby for 4 spaces – more spaces may be provided as part of the application for the development of the other site
- having regard to the information submitted the Highways Officer did not consider there were sufficient grounds to refuse the application on highway matters and conditions had been suggested to deal with particular points as necessary.

Drainage – no objections had been received from Natural Resources Wales and the County Land Drainage Engineer regarding the proposed means of dealing with surface water drainage and officers believed sufficient information had been submitted to show that foul and surface water could be effectively managed subject to appropriate conditions. The impact on the Chapel when locating the pumping station had been considered and discussed with Environmental Health who considered there to be no issues of noise or odour and therefore no impact.

Archaeology – the County Archaeologist and Clwyd Powys Archaeological Trust had been consulted and had concluded limited impact on the site.

Education – given the latest information available and calculation of school places generated by the new development Education officers were of the view that there was sufficient capacity within the nearest primary and secondary schools and therefore a financial contribution would not be required – in terms of community infrastructure contributions must be reasonable and linked to the development.

Affordable Housing – officers advised that the use of S.106 agreements was standard practice to ensure developers were held to account and was not a strong ground to refuse an application.

In light of the concerns raised regarding the development Councillor Mark Young proposed, seconded by Councillor Merfyn Parry, that the application be refused, and further discussion focused on the specific planning grounds for refusal. Officers advised that if the application was refused, contrary to officer recommendation, a report would be submitted to the next committee meeting in accordance with usual practice in order for officers to respond to the issues raised and further advise as to the appropriateness of the planning grounds for refusal.

Proposal – Councillor Mark Young proposed, seconded by Councillor Merfyn Parry, that the application be refused, contrary to officer recommendation on the grounds of unacceptable impact on Welsh language; impact on traffic safety and safe routes to school; inadequate information submitted regarding drainage and concerns over flooding; lack of financial contributions towards education resulting in negative educational impacts; inadequate on-site open space provision; loss of hedgerows; scale, density and character of the housing development, and detrimental impact on the nearby church by the proposed pumping station.

VOTE:

GRANT – 1

REFUSE – 24

ABSTAIN – 0

RESOLVED that permission be **REFUSED**, contrary to officer recommendation, on grounds of unacceptable impact on Welsh language; impact on traffic safety and safe routes to school; inadequate information submitted regarding drainage and concerns over flooding; lack of financial contributions towards education resulting in negative educational impacts; inadequate on-site open space provision; loss of hedgerows; scale density and character of the housing development, and detrimental impact on the nearby church by the proposed pumping station.

At this point (11.30 a.m.) the meeting adjourned for a refreshment break.

6 APPLICATION NO. 01/2016/1241/PF - SITE OF FORMER DENBIGH TECHNOLOGY AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION CENTRE, MIDDLE LANE, DENBIGH

An application was submitted for demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment of land by the erection of 70 extra care apartments, community living unit, construction of new vehicular and pedestrian accesses, alteration of existing vehicular access and hard and soft landscaping at site of former Denbigh Technology and Vocational Education Centre, Middle Lane, Denbigh.

Public Speaker –

Mr. R. Dafis (Applicant/Grwp Cynefin) (**For**) – highlighted the close working between Grwp Cynefin and the Council to develop the proposal and provide much needed housing for the benefit of older people in the area in a prime location close to the town. Also reported upon works to mitigate traffic flow with a detailed Traffic Plan being in place for the construction period.

General Debate – Councillor Gwyneth Kensler (Local Member) supported the application which would provide a much needed purpose built facility for local residents by conversion of a long standing derelict site. She acknowledged concerns regarding highway issues which she would discuss further with the Highways Officer but urged members to grant the application. Councillor Barry Mellor welcomed the development and praised Grwp Cynefin for the work they had undertaken with similar schemes. Councillor Meirick Davies was keen for some stones from the old school building to be preserved in the new build and officers advised that the use of materials could be covered in the planning conditions.

Proposal – Councillor Barry Mellor proposed the officer recommendations to grant the application, seconded by Councillor Arwel Roberts.

VOTE:

GRANT – 25

REFUSE – 0

ABSTAIN – 0

RESOLVED that permission be **GRANTED** in accordance with officer recommendations as stipulated within the report.

7 APPLICATION NO. 20/2016/0164/PO - LAND AT TY COCH FARM, GRAIGFECHAN, RUTHIN

An application was submitted for development of 0.1 ha of land by the erection of 2 no. local needs affordable dwellings (outline application – all matters reserved) at land at Ty Coch Farm, Graigfechan, Ruthin.

Public Speaker –

Mr. H. Evans (**For**) – argued that the development would help meet affordable housing need in the area but the stringent tests applied made it extremely difficult to provide them. The site sat comfortably in the area and would be seen as part of the current development. In reality it would become part of the settlement boundary.

General Debate – Councillor Hugh Evans (Local Member) clarified that the local member referred to in the report was the local community councillor. Councillor Evans supported the application advising that the housing was intended for a fourth generation local family, well respected in the community, and presented their only option to live in the area they were brought up. He submitted that the application was in the spirit of other council aspirations including sustainability of the Welsh language, more vibrant and rural communities, providing opportunities for young people to live in Denbighshire, provision of affordable housing, and resilience and sustainability in communities. There had been no objection to the application.

Members considered the merits of the application and were keen to support local families in such cases where they wished to live within their communities but there was a lack of affordable housing. The intention of the family to gift the land for the development was noted and there was family support to ensure the housing was affordable to the other family members. It was also noted that the family had accepted that local need affordable houses must be available in perpetuity and any permission would be subject to a S.106 agreement to ensure the dwellings remained affordable whilst the need existed. Members also considered the close proximity of the proposed dwellings to the boundary of the village. Officers reiterated the reasoning behind the recommendation for refusal given that the site was outside of any village boundary and did not form part of a hamlet as recognised in the LDP; and key policy tests for affordable housing development had not been met. Councillor Rhys Hughes asked that the policy on affordable housing be revisited as part of the forthcoming review of the LDP in order to make it easier for local people to build affordable homes within their communities.

Proposal – Councillor Stuart Davies proposed, seconded by Councillor Huw Hilditch-Roberts that the application be granted, subject to a S.106 agreement and planning conditions agreed with the Local Member, on the grounds that the need for affordable housing outweighed any other planning consideration in this case and given the site's close proximity to the village boundary.

VOTE:

GRANT – 20

REFUSE – 2

ABSTAIN – 0

RESOLVED that permission be **GRANTED**, contrary to officer recommendation, subject to a S.106 agreement and planning conditions agreed with the Local Member, on the grounds that the need for affordable housing outweighed any other planning considerations in this case and given the site's close proximity to the village boundary.

At this juncture (12.25 p.m.) the meeting adjourned for a short refreshment break.

8 APPLICATION NO. 44/2017/0055/PF - LAND AT 31 PRINCES PARK, RHUDDLAN, RHYL

An application was submitted for erection of detached dwelling at land at 31 Princes Park, Rhuddlan, Rhyl.

Public Speaker –

Mr. B. Robinson (**For**) – argued that a precedent for such development in the area had been set and referred to a number of examples to illustrate that point. Advised that every effort had been made to minimise overlooking of those properties with screening which could also be addressed further via conditions.

General Debate – Councillor Arwel Roberts (Local Member) spoke in favour of the application advising that the family had lived in Rhuddlan for generations and there was a housing need in the area. He reported that the applicant was willing to provide appropriate screening to address the issue of overlooking and ensure no adverse effect on visual amenity. Councillor David Simmons also supported the application given that there were similar developments overlooking other properties in the area and he believed that a precedent had been set in that regard. Councillor Ann Davies (Local Member) sought clarification regarding ownership of the access lane to the proposed dwelling.

The Development Manager clarified that the application had not been made for local needs affordable housing. He elaborated upon the reasoning behind the officer recommendation to refuse the application given the short distances between properties and detrimental effect in terms of visual and residential amenity. Officers did not consider the proposed screening measures would adequately address the issues. Objections had also been received from Rhuddlan Town Council and neighbours. In response to questions officers drew attention to the close proximity between properties as detailed on the plans submitted. With regard to ownership of the access to the property officers advised that the area did not form part of the application site and therefore was not a material consideration in this case.

Proposal – Councillor Huw Williams proposed, seconded by Councillor Cheryl Williams, that the application be refused in accordance with officer recommendation. Councillor Arwel Roberts proposed, seconded by Councillor David Simmons, that the application be granted subject to visual screening conditions to address overlooking concerns.

VOTE:

GRANT – 9

REFUSE – 13

ABSTAIN – 0

RESOLVED that permission be **REFUSED** in accordance with officer recommendations as stipulated within the report.

9 APPLICATION NO. 01/2016/1243/CA - SITE OF FORMER DENBIGH TECHNOLOGY AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION CENTRE, MIDDLE LANE, DENBIGH

An application was submitted for demolition of former school buildings at site of former Denbigh Technology and Vocational Education Centre, Middle Lane, Denbigh.

Proposal – Councillor Barry Mellor proposed the officer recommendations to grant the application, seconded by Councillor Julian Thompson-Hill.

VOTE:

GRANT – 21

REFUSE – 0

ABSTAIN – 0

RESOLVED to advise Welsh Government that if the County Council was empowered to determine the application, it would **GRANT CONSERVATION AREA CONSENT**.

10 APPLICATION NO. 15/2016/0842/PF - TY ISA, PANT DU ROAD, ERYRYS, MOLD

An application was submitted for continuation of use of land as extension to residential curtilage at Ty Isa, Pant Du Road, Eryrys, Mold.

Proposal – Councillor Joan Butterfield proposed the officer recommendation to grant the application, seconded by Councillor Stuart Davies.

VOTE:

GRANT – 20

REFUSE – 0

ABSTAIN – 1

RESOLVED that permission be **GRANTED**, in accordance with officer recommendation as detailed within the report.

11 APPLICATION NO. 44/2017/0072/PF - LAND ADJACENT TO CASTLE HILL, HYLAS LANE, RHUDDLAN, RHYL

[Councillor Ann Davies (Local Member) declared a personal interest in this item because she lived near to the application site. Councillor Arwel Roberts declared a

personal interest because he was a Governor at Ysgol y Castell which was situated close to the application site.]

An application was submitted for erection of 1 no. dwelling with detached garage and construction of a new vehicular access at land adjacent to Castle Hill, Hylas Lane, Rhuddlan.

Councillor Ann Davies (Local Member) asked that the application be deferred pending further information regarding the height of the development, any archaeological interest and the access point. Officers clarified that planning consent for the exact same development had lapsed the previous month and believed there was no justification for deferment given that the same issues had been considered previously.

Proposal – Councillor Brian Blakeley proposed, seconded by Councillor Julian Thompson-Hill that the application be deferred pending clarification regarding the height of the development, any archaeological interest and the access point.

VOTE:

FOR DEFERRAL – 9

AGAINST DEFERRAL – 11

ABSTAIN – 0

RESOLVED *not to defer the application.*

General Debate – Councillor Ann Davies (Local Member) highlighted her concerns over the height of the development which she felt would be overbearing given it was in a conservation area and create a blot on the landscape with little consideration given to the historic nature and significance of the surrounding area. She also raised concerns regarding the creation of a new access point onto the road, which involved removing a wall which had historical significance, and raised highway concerns including poor visibility near a school which was busy at peak times. Councillor Arwel Roberts (Local Member) agreed highlighting the historic significance of the area and his concerns over highway safety with the creation of an additional access point which he believed would exacerbate the existing traffic problems and congestion at peak times.

The Development Manager drew members' attention to the planning history which was a key consideration advising that planning permission had been granted for a dwelling on the plot on appeal and as recently as 2012 and there had been no significant change in policy since then or discernible difference in the proposed development. In response to questions officers advised that the proposal was to remove part of the wall to create a 3 metre access and the remainder of the wall would be retained. The vehicular access would be assessed by Highway officers. Planning officers had proposed the same conditions as imposed on the previous consent which covered the materials to be used including natural stone and slate to match that used on the adjoining dwelling.

Proposal – Councillor Arwel Roberts proposed that the application be refused on highway safety grounds, seconded by Councillor Dewi Owens.

VOTE:

GRANT – 10

ABSTAIN – 10

REFUSE – 0

There being an equal number of votes for and against the Chair used his casting vote in favour of granting the application. Consequently it was –

RESOLVED that permission be **GRANTED** in accordance with officer recommendations as detailed within the report and supplementary papers.

12 SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE NOTE: RECREATIONAL PUBLIC OPEN SPACE - DOCUMENT FOR ADOPTION

Councillor David Smith, Lead Member for Public Realm submitted a report recommending adoption of the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Recreational Public Open Space. He reminded members of the different stages in the process before final adoption of SPG documents by the Planning Committee.

Following a nine week consultation period a number of amendments had been proposed in response to representations received which had been highlighted in the final document and detailed in the Consultation Report. There was currently no adopted SPG on recreational public open space and the document would provide guidance on the provision and design of open space in new developments.

Proposal – Councillor Stuart Davies proposed the officer recommendation to approve the draft SPG for adoption, seconded by Councillor Bill Cowie.

Upon being put to the vote it was –

RESOLVED that members approve the Supplementary Planning Guidance document on Recreational Public Open Space (attached as Appendix II to the report) for the use in the determination of planning applications.

13 SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE: ' PLANNING FOR COMMUNITY SAFETY' - ADOPTION OF FINAL DOCUMENT

Councillor David Smith, Lead Member for Public Realm submitted a report recommending adoption of the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Planning for Community Safety.

Following an eight week consultation period a number of amendments had been proposed in response to representations received which had been highlighted in the final document and detailed in the Consultation Report. The document provided guidance on how improving community safety and decreasing the fear of crime can be addressed through design and landscaping.

Proposal – Councillor Stuart Davies proposed the officer recommendation to approve the draft SPG for adoption, seconded by Councillor Julian Thompson-Hill.

Upon being put to the vote it was –

RESOLVED that members adopt the Supplementary Planning Guidance on Planning for Community Safety attached as Appendix 2 to the report for use in the determination of planning applications and planning appeals.

14 SITE DEVELOPMENT BRIEF: LAND ADJACENT TO YSGOL PENDREF AND LODGE FARM, UPPER DENBIGH - ADOPTION OF FINAL DOCUMENT

Councillor David Smith, Lead Member for Public Realm submitted a report recommending adoption of the proposed Site Development Brief (SDB) for land adjacent to Ysgol Pendref and Lodge Farm, Upper Denbigh, with recommended changes, for the determination of planning applications and planning appeals. The SDB had been through the same process as the Supplementary Planning Guidance documents before being submitted to the Planning Committee for final adoption.

The report detailed the results of the nine week public consultation on the draft SDB and proposed a number of changes to the SDB in response to representations received which had been highlighted within the final document and detailed in the consultation report. If approved the SDB would be used to assist in the determination of any planning applications on the sites. Councillor Colin Hughes (Local Member) commended the consultation exercise, the results of which had been taken into account in the final document, and reiterated the need to take full account of the SDB when considering future planning applications on this site.

Proposal – Councillor Stuart Davies proposed the officer recommendation to adopt the revised Site Development Brief, seconded by Councillor Huw Williams.

Upon being put to the vote it was unanimously –

RESOLVED that members adopt the proposed Site Development Brief for land adjacent to Ysgol Pendref and Lodge Farm, Upper Denbigh attached as Appendix 2 to the report, with recommended changes, for the determination of planning applications and planning appeals.

At this point Councillor David Smith took the opportunity to thank members of the LDP Steering Group for their valuable contribution over the last five years and also commended the work of the officers involved within that process.

15 INFORMATION REPORT: PLANNING APPEAL DECISIONS

An information report was submitted outlining the recent decisions issued by the Planning Inspectorate on appeals lodged against determinations on planning applications by the County Council. Members were encouraged to contact the relevant officers directly outside of the meeting if they required more detailed information on particular cases.

RESOLVED that the information report be received.

The meeting concluded at 1.25 p.m.