



MEETING OF THE
PLANNING COMMITTEE

Civic Suite, Parkside

27 August 2015

PRESENT:

J Illingworth (Chair), J Simpson (Vice Chair), P Baguley,
G Botterill, P Cumbers, P Faulkner, M Glancy,
E Holmes, P Posnett, J Wyatt

AS SUBSTITUTE:

Cllr L Higgins for Cllr P Chandler

Solicitor to the Council (HG), Head of Regulatory Services,
Applications and Advice Manager (KM), Administrative Assistant (AS)

D26. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr P Chandler

D27. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

D28. MINUTES

Minutes of the meeting 6 August 2015

Approval of the Minutes was proposed by Cllr Holmes and seconded by Cllr Posnett.
Five Members agreed that the Chair sign them as a true record.

D29. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

- (1) **Reference:** 14/00995/OUT
Applicant: Westleigh Partnerships Ltd

Location: Land West Of Bowling Green, Leicester Road, Melton Mowbray

Proposal: Residential development comprising the construction of around 54 dwellings and circa 1360sqm (GEA) of B1 (a) Office space together with associated infrastructure, car parking provision, open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage

- (a) The Applications and Advice Manager stated that: Outline Planning permission is sought for the construction of around 54 dwellings and circa 1360sqm of B1 Office Space on land within the town envelope for Melton Mowbray. The application seeks consent for access only with all other matters reserved for later approval. A separate application has also been submitted for the small parcel of land to the north to be used as public open space in connection with the development which is also due for consideration.

There are a couple of issues to update since publication of the report.

Firstly there is a correction with regards to the commentary on noise on page 14 of the report. The 5th paragraph refers to 45 db within bedrooms. However Environmental Health have confirmed that this is a sound level to be achieved outside the façade of the proposed dwellings. Within the bedroom a level of 35db during the daytime and 30db at night is specified in BS8233 and WHO guidelines as being the indoor ambient noise criteria for residential accommodation. The wording of condition 24 therefore needs to be re-visited along with any other noise conditions considered necessary.

Secondly with regard to Odour. Since publication of the report we have received various challenges to the odour modelling that has taken place in support of the application. There is concern that its results vary considerably from the experience of our Environmental Health Officers of the on going issues at the adjacent Treatment Plant. The study has been undertaken based on an assumption of a typical treatment works, but it is our understanding that the Plant is far from typical and in addition suffers from various problems that result in significant odours on a regular basis.

There is therefore concern that the study does not show a true reflection of the odour environment in the area and the levels of odour to which the new residential properties will be exposed to. The applicant has therefore been requested to provide additional analysis of this aspect taking account of the 'real life' situation.

It is therefore for Members to decide whether you wish to continue debating this application and leave this issue outstanding, delegating it to officers to conclude the outstanding matter, or whether you wish to defer the application pending consideration of the whole package at a later date.

If the former, we would amend the recommendation to incorporate:

- a) Any determination being subject to the satisfactory conclusion of the odour issue, i.e. the receipt of an adequate report and incorporation of any mitigation measures and;
- b) Delegated authority to amend the wording of condition no 24

These measures will hopefully not delay the applicant because additional work is required to produce the s106 and these points can be addressed

alongside.

In all other respects the application is considered to be acceptable. Whilst disappointing to see the loss of a site for employment, there is convincing evidence that it was very unlikely to be developed and of course this scheme brings forward the implementation of some office space as the balance of the application. Perhaps more fundamental, the site is highly sustainable against almost all criteria for residential under the NPPF and, with its ambition to boost housing supply, it is not considered could be resisted for this purpose.

Cllr Holmes proposed deferral so Members could consider the whole package at a later date.

Cllr Cumbers seconded the proposal and expressed her concerns regarding odour. She felt the application shouldn't be considered until all information is present.

Cllr Simpson raised concerns regarding odour, noise and flooding.

Cllr Botterill commented that the site has traditionally had odour problems which need to be addressed before coming to committee.

Cllr Cumbers clarified that they were only deferring due to the odour issue and not any of the other issues mentioned.

Cllr Simpson commented that they should also be considering the site and access.

The Chair commented that the report is flawed which is why officers have suggested deferral.

Cllr Higgins commented that he knows someone who has moved away from the area solely due to odour.

A vote was taken and the Members voted unanimously to defer.

DETERMINATION: DEFFERED to allow additional information on the incidence and impact of odours affecting the site.

(2)	Reference:	14/00996/OUT
	Applicant:	Westleigh Partnerships Ltd
	Location:	Land West Of Bowling Green, Leicester Road, Melton Mowbray
	Proposal:	Public Open Space

(a) The Applications And Advice Manager stated that: This application seeks outline planning permission for the small parcel of land to the north to be used as public open space in connection with the previous development.

Since publication of the report comments have been received from Network Rail stating that the development as proposed appears to be partly located on an area of land still in the ownership of Network Rail. They have therefore requested that the applicant re-submit the redline plan showing the correct boundary or contact Network Rail to discuss the boundary issue and reach agreement.

In response to this the applicants have produced a title plan from land registry which clearly shows the red line of their ownership along the railway boundary. This is therefore a legal issue between the 2 parties which requires resolving. It is therefore requested that Members give delegated authority to officers to resolve this outstanding issue as well as imposing necessary conditions requested by Network Rail to protect the safety of the railway boundary.

(b) Matthew Moore, the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that: he would decline to speak as he wanted to speak regarding the odour issue but it had now been deferred.

Cllr Cumbers asked if the open space would have a play area.

The Applications And Advice Manager advised that it would be an equipped play area and that the conditions would deal with this under reserved matters.

Cllr Holmes raised concerns regarding the dangers of the play area being next to a very busy rail line.

The Advice And Applications Manager advised that Network Rail aren't objecting to the proposal in principal. They are aware it is not uncommon for play areas to be next to rail lines, however they have asked for conditions such as adequate protective fencing.

Cllr Holmes proposed to defer the application and requested that both applications come back together.

Cllr Faulkner seconded the deferral and shared concerns regarding the location of the play area.

The Chair reminded Members that it is an outline application so concerns could be dealt with under conditions.

Cllr Wyatt asked for a condition not to allow the play area to be passed in ownership to a third party to maintain.

Cllr Higgins commented that there was enough information to consider the application.

Cllr Cumbers commented that condition 8 stated that play area would be maintained

in perpetuity.

A vote was taken. 3 Members voted in favour of deferral and 7 voted against. There was 1 abstention.

Cllr Higgins proposed approval of the application as it is good that developers provide an open space.

Cllr Cumbers seconded the proposal subject to safety conditions.

The Advice And Applications Manager confirmed that Network Rail have already requested safety conditions.

Cllr Posnett commented that the open space was great as long as developers maintain the play areas.

A vote was taken. 9 Members voted in favour of approval and 2 voted against.

DETERMINATION: Approved, subject to the conditions in the report and the following additional conditions addressing railway safety issues:

All operations, including the use of cranes or other mechanical plant working adjacent to Network Rail s property, must at all times be carried out in a fail safe manner such that in the event of mishandling, collapse or failure, no materials or plant are capable of falling within 3.0m of the nearest rail of the adjacent railway line, or where the railway is electrified, within 3.0m of overhead electrical equipment or supports.

Security of the railway boundary will need to be maintained at all times. If the works require temporary or permanent alterations to the mutual boundary the applicant must contact Network Rail s Asset Protection Project Manager.

The Developer must provide a suitable trespass proof fence adjacent to Network Rail s boundary (minimum approx. 1.8m high) and make provision for its future maintenance and renewal. Network Rail s existing fencing / wall must not be removed or damaged.

Where trees/shrubs are to be planted adjacent to the railway boundary these shrubs should be positioned at a minimum distance greater than their predicted mature height from the boundary. Certain broad leaf deciduous species should not be planted adjacent to the railway boundary.

-
- (3) **Reference:** 15/00369/FUL
 Applicant: K S Mayfield And Co
 Location: Elm Farm Cottages, Gaddesby Lane, Frisby On The Wreake

Proposal: Installation of 1 no. Endurance E-4660 wind turbine with a tip height of 48.4m and associated infrastructure including control kiosk and crane pad.

- (a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that: Proposal for a 48m turbine. Members will be aware from their visit of another nearby and for comparison purposes, that is similar – 46m.
- The application engages all of the issues we have become accustomed with regarding such proposals, and each has been examined in detail.
- In this case, it is our view that the turbine location is particularly advantaged by the lie of the land with ridges and plantations obstructing many view points across the mindscape and separating it from the settings of listed buildings and other heritage assets such that it does not interfere with their settings. These are explained in detail On pages 3-5 (landscape) and 9-11 (heritage assets)
- The application presents the issues of cumulative impact more profoundly than others due to the proximity of the one nearby. Clearly both will be seen together but our view is that the landscape can absorb them in this location. In the wider context – intervisibility and the proliferation of such structures, again we consider that it would be sufficiently separate from other examples both in distance and by features in the landscape, that turbines collectively would be features of the landscape (along with pylons and farm buildings for example), but by no means dominant and certainly not defining.
- However, this proposal does differ from others because it is the first we have had to determine since the new guidance in June. This is rehearsed in full on page 3 (in bold) – identification in a development plan and the backing of the affected community through consultation.
- These factors have been cited in representations received and we have spent considerable time examining the background of the application in these terms. Firstly, despite claims to the contrary, we are certain the proposal does not fall within the development plan test because it benefits from the Governments transitional provisions, which means applications already in the system do not need to be subject to that test.
- Secondly, on claims of community opposition:
- The applicant notified 15 properties, posted 3 site notices and consulted 3 Parish Councils and received only one objection (from Gaddesby PC)
- Gaddesby and Kirby Bellars PC have confirmed that their comments involved no input from the public, in the case of the former explaining that they object to such proposals as a matter of routine. It also has to be questioned whether Gaddesby is truly the affected community given location and distance.
- The Civic Society have cited only the Gaddesby PC objection as grounds of local opposition
- There was only 1 other letter of objection.
- However since writing the report 6 more letters of objection and one of support have been received. These address the core issues of Cumulative impact – pointing this will be the 10th Turbine in the area if Hall farm, Park Farm and Great Dalby get passed , the Impact upon Heritage, specifically citing the setting of Borough Hill and the new issues of development plan status and community support.

These issues were already addressed in report at 8-11. Burrough Hill specifically is over 3km away and we cannot find any viewpoint of it that the proposal will interfere with.

Finally on the question of the support of the affected community, we have plotted the source of objections (display map). Our view is that there are only 3 representations that could be said to be the affected community (others too distant) which is too few to be considered to be representative and insufficient evidence to demonstrate any widespread concerns that have not presented themselves.

The Chair advised Members that a Member of Frisby Parish Council wished to speak but had not registered in accordance with the committee procedures. **Cllr Holmes proposed to allow** them to speak and **Cllr Cumbers seconded** the proposal. A vote was taken which was unanimous.

(b) Nick Farrow, on behalf of Frisby Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that :

- Adverse effect on the appearance of the landscape.
- Would reduce attraction as a tourist destination.
- Cumulative impact.
- Local plan not in place.
- Renewable energy should have the backing of the local community and this is of no benefit to local community.
- Consultation process is flawed as the vast majority haven't been involved in the process.
- Parish Council is representing the wider community.

Cllr Higgins commented that the Parish Council were offered a consultation with the developer but declined. He asked why they declined this opportunity.

Mr Farrow responded that the appointment was for 3 days after the Parish elections so there wasn't the time frame.

The Head of Regulatory Services asked how the Parish Council knew the residents views if they hadn't asked them.

Mr Farrow confirmed there had been a meeting in relation to a different application for a turbine which was attended by a number of people from the local community. They had taken a vote at the meeting and 85% were against the turbine and 7% were for.

(c) Mr Beal, agent for the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- 85 kw of energy would be generated for the farm which would support the running costs.
- Contribution to farm efficiencies.

- Sustainable energy supporting the environment.
- Supporting the rural economy and viability of the business in it.
- Views of turbine will be limited with a low to moderate impact however outweighed by the benefits.
- Technically sound.
- No objections from consultees.
- Reduce carbon emissions.
- In accordance with DC policies.
- Applicant will comply with conditions.

The Head of Regulatory Services advised that they were following the requirements of the legislation. He confirmed that 15 individual properties had been notified, 3 site notices had been put up in the area and that 3 Parish Councils had been notified.

Cllr Higgins commented that he was disappointed the public hadn't been informed and that the Parish Council had declined their opportunity to deal with the developer. He also had concerns regarding the amount of wind turbines in the vicinity and the cumulative impact.

Cllr Cumbers proposed approval and commented that there a number pylons in that area which she felt were more intrusive than turbines. The good outweighs the possible harm.

Cllr Botterill seconded the proposal and felt it was an ideal application. The size of the turbine is appropriate for area and the farm can make its own energy.

Cllr Simpson commented that she couldn't support approval. It is an unacceptable cumulative impact and is in close proximity to another turbine. A beautiful area is being made more commercial. Solar panels on the roof of the agricultural buildings would be better. It would create harm to the landscape. Concerned regarding the lack of notifications and objections.

The Head of Regulatory Services commented that the six further objections had come after the initial report was produced.

Cllr Simpson commented that Rushcliffe and South Kestevan Councils had been consulted. The character of the area is affected.

Cllr Holmes commented that the turbine should be next to the farmyard and blend in with the buildings. This area was beautiful and it won't look the same in winter. Can't support this application.

Cllr Cumbers noted that 6 or 7 objectors was a low percentage compared to the number of people living in the area.

A vote was taken. 6 Members voted in favour of approval and 5 Members

against.

DETERMINATION: Permit, subject to the conditions in the report, for the following reasons:

The proposal is considered to be supported in terms of principle by national policy in the NPPF as contributing to the wider aims of encouraging renewable energy and decarbonising the economy. It is also considered that the proposal will not adversely affect the character and appearance of the area to an extent that it is regarded as unacceptable within national guidance. In terms of the landscape, guidance in the NPPF puts the emphasis on protecting international and nationally designated sites such as National Parks. It is considered that whilst there is the need for a balance between the interests of renewable forms of energy and landscape issues, in this instance the impact would be limited in extent on the landscape, although the landscape is relatively unspoilt it is not one that attracts protection through its designation, in the manner explained in the NPPF. Accordingly, the balance of these issues is considered to favour the installation of a single wind turbine. It is not considered that there would be detrimental cumulative impacts being sited close to an existing operational turbine and the arrangement is acceptable in this location. The site is considered to have adequate access arrangements and to pose no risk to highway users.

7.01PM Meeting Adjourned

7.04PM Meeting Reconvened

- (4) **Reference:** 14/00954/OUT
 Applicant: Mrs S Grey
 Location: Land Adjacent The Woodlands, Off Station Road, Old Dalby
 Proposal: Development for up to 15 dwellings

- (a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that: Members will recall an application in close proximity to this at the 16th July meeting which was debated at length before refusing on sustainability grounds. This is obviously similar in terms of its locational characteristics and we have made similar comments regarding the strength of its sustainability credentials and the benefits it would bring – i.e. it has merit but is far from perfect, and has benefits in terms of housing and affordable housing in particular. However, the application differs from that in July in that it is detached from the settlement (the previous physically abutted Queensway) and because of its smaller scale, the benefits are lesser. We consider these applications to be finely balanced and these factors to be sufficient to ‘tip the balance’ towards refusal of this application

No updates to report.

(b) Cllr Bennett, on behalf of Nether Broughton and Old Dalby Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that: they had received complaints from the public regarding the footpath from Queensway to Old Dalby, due to passing traffic and particularly lorries which cause wind which creates danger. The applicant has proposed bollards to safeguard and lower the speed of traffic, however the bollard at the Old Dalby end is on a bend near a railway crossing. Having taken measurements the school bus, lorries and tractors wouldn't be able to pass. The Parish Council supports building of organic, small and sustainable developments. It is out of village and not welcome as it creates a nucleus.

Cllr Holmes enquired about the distance to old Dalby school from the development.

Cllr Bennett responded that he believed it was over 400 metres and that pedestrians must cross the road to get to the school.

(c) Colin Wilkinson, Agent for the applicant, was invited to speak and stated that:

- It is a brownfield site with few objections.
- Located near facilities and services.
- Job opportunities.
- Surrounded on 3 sides by existing developments.
- Help tidy up and improve general area.
- Reduce traffic speeds, prevent overtaking and provide a safe crossing point.
- 15 houses is appropriate to the area.
- Help meet the shortage of houses.
- No harm to the rural landscape.

Cllr Simpson asked if the improved road safety would address the Parish Councils concerns.

Colin Wilkinson responded that road widening is part of the suggested scheme with 2 pedestrian refuges.

Cllr Botterill asked if the school was able to cope with extra children.

Colin Wilkinson responded that there is plenty of capacity at the existing school.

(d) Cllr Orson, Ward Cllr for Old Dalby, was invited to speak and stated that: he declared a personal interest and left the Council Chamber at 7.18pm.

Cllr Holmes proposed to permit the application and commented that it is not too far to walk to school. We need more houses in villages.

Cllr Botterill seconded the proposal. It is a derelict site and a waste of land. There

are jobs in the vicinity and the area should be utilised.

Cllr Baguley commented that she supported the proposal but had a concern regarding contamination.

Cllr Higgins commented that highways don't consider it a sustainable site. There are no amenities in Queensway. He asked for classification of Queensway.

The Head of Regulatory Services confirmed that Queensway has its own village envelope. The core strategy in 2013 had classified it as a sustainable settlement.

Cllr Higgins commented that if they approved it they would be making another hamlet.

Cllr Faulkner commented that it used to be housing and would be happy to see this reinstated. He asked for clarification regarding contamination.

Cllr Wyatt commented that it was suggested luminous paint from military vehicles had raised concerns years ago but was considered insignificant.

The Head of Regulatory Services asked if Members wished to conditions.

Cllr Holmes responded that it is a sustainable area, however she would delegate to officers to impose the conditions including highways measure and to address the contamination concerns.

Cllr Botterill as seconder agreed.

A vote was taken. 8 Members votes in favour to permit and 3 voted against. Cllr Higgins requested that his vote against be recorded.

DETERMINATION: Approve, subject to the following conditions and for the following reasons:

The Borough is deficient in terms of housing land supply more generally and this would be partly addressed by the application, Affordable housing provision remains one of the Council's key priorities. This application presents affordable housing that helps to meet identified local needs. Accordingly, the application presents a vehicle for the delivery of affordable housing of the appropriate quantity, in proportion with the development and of a type to support the local market housing needs. Queensway is considered to be a reasonably sustainable location with close links to Old Dalby where primary education and other services can be accessed.

There are a number of other positive benefits of the scheme which include biodiversity enhancement, surface water management in the form of a sustainable drainage, developer contributions to mitigate impacts upon local services and the local employment opportunities a development of this size would provide.

Though by no means 'optimum', the site is considered to perform reasonably well in terms of access to facilities and transport links; those in the immediate vicinity and the added benefit of a modest range of additional services in Old Dalby and Nether Broughton nearby.

It is considered that balanced against the positive elements are the site specific concerns raised in representations, particularly the development of the site with an isolated location (i.e. not adjoining an existing settlement).

In conclusion it is considered that, on the balance of the issues, there are significant benefits accruing from the proposal when assessed as required under the guidance in the NPPF in terms of housing supply and affordable housing in particular. The balancing issues – development of a separate site and sustainability – are considered to be of limited harm. Applying the 'test' required by the NPPF that permission should be granted unless the impacts would "significantly and demonstrably" outweigh the benefits; it is considered that permission can be granted.

-
- (5) **Reference:** 15/00531/OUT
Applicant: Mr And Mrs K Tudor
Location: Land Adjacent 54 Barkers Farm, Church Lane, Long Clawson
Proposal: Outline application for the formation of a courtyard development of 4 new barn style dwellings with extension and alteration to existing access road.

- (a) The Head of Regulatory Services stated that: Update: 5 more objections (4 separate households) received since publication of report. These reiterate points made by other representations that are addressed in the report, namely:

Highway safety

- Dangerous corner for an access
- Several road accidents on this corner
- Increase in traffic
- 5 drives already exiting on to this corner
- Parking inadequate
- Over development – 1 or 2 dwellings would be more appropriate – high increase in traffic
- Delivery Vehicles travel at speed into the site – pedestrian safety
- 13 new houses have been granted consent on this stretch of road increasing traffic

We have consulted the Highway authority on this matter and they have confirmed there is no record of accidents in the locations describe in the last 5 years. Moreover, we fail to understand why the small no of vehicles this development would add would cause accidents to start happening. The proposals would use an existing drive and would remove agricultural traffic.

Ecology

- GCN are regularly seen and recorded at number 54 (neighbouring dwelling)
- There bats in the vicinity – seen coming out of the barn
- Ecology report plays down the significance of GCN on the site

Provision has been made within the application to ensure any newts are removed from the site and will be left unharmed

Character of the area

- Too dense and presents a ring of houses stuffed with cars
- Outside of the village envelope which should be greenbelt and has been cynically changed in classification to make it easier to gain planning permission for more lucrative housing
- Village envelopes should be protected
- Green spaces have been shown to be very important to health and wellbeing.
- Clawson has had far too much development in the last decade and needs time to redevelop its community. Melton has already very much let us down on this matter

This is of course subjective but our view is that the site is already a farm yard containing unattractive buildings, and this proposal will not stretch out into green fields, it is limited to the confines of the farmyard. It would be a recessed pocket of houses not linear as pointed out, but this would be barely discernable from within the village and such arrangements are not alien to LC

Other Considerations

- If granted gravel drives should not be permitted – noisy at night
- The barn is asbestos cement and needs specialised license to dispose of it
- Long Clawson has more than fulfilled its obligation for new housing
- The school is full – (with children from other villages)
- LCC have confirmed that the school is oversubscribed it has a capacity of 105 – currently has 111 pupils set to rise to 115 next two years – It will be possible to increase capacity to extend the school by a maximum of 30 places. However, it would not be possible to prove that a development of this size will make an unacceptable impact – i.e. the no children anticipated would be very low (1), nothing to say they would be of primary school age and nothing to say they would want access to LC Primary School. The Council's lack of a Plan has left Long Clawson open to exploitation by ruthless developers looking for cheap green field sites rather than responsibly using previously used sites. Legal action against the Council by residents would probably be justified

It is clear from numerous Government decisions that our village envelopes are regarded as out of date for the purposes of housing supply and cannot be relied upon. Therefore proposals like this have to be considered under the NPPF content and criteria.

Cllr Baguley proposed to permit and commented that it is classified as brownfield and looks a nice development.

Cllr Simpson seconded the proposal and commented that it is a compact development on a previously built on site. She asked if there is enough parking on site so cars don't encroach anywhere else.

The Head of Regulatory Services responded that each dwelling has at least 2 parking spaces and with the courtyard as overspill it shouldn't affect other areas.

Cllr Posnett raised concerns regarding the village school with traffic blocking the road at drop off and pick up times. She also commented that the number of school places needed to be considered as many schools can't be extended.

The Head of Regulatory Services responded that the Education Authority have advised that the school is already oversubscribed but they have advised they can reconfigure the school to provide 30 extra spaces.

Cllr Baguley commented regarding condition 13 and hoped a heavy fence wouldn't be left after completion.

The Head of Regulatory Services advised that it is a temporary fence to keep the newts out whilst digging takes place.

The Chair noted that enforcement would make sure the fence was not made permanent.

A vote was taken and the Members voted unanimously to permit the application.

DETERMINATION: approved subject to the conditions in the report, for the following reasons:

The application presents a redevelopment opportunity on brownfield land adjacent to the village of Long Clawson. Whilst the site lies outside of the defined village envelope it is close to existing residential properties and will provide a continuation of the built form in this part of the village. It is not considered to present an intrusive development upon the open countryside beyond the confines of the site. The proposal provides 4 no. dwellings of which three support the local housing needs for the Borough, being suitable for downsizing and starter homes. The site is no longer required for its agricultural use and the redevelopment would seek to preserve and enhance the setting of the Conservation Area through removal of the large redundant barns.

It is considered that, on the balance of the issues, there are significant benefits accruing from the proposal when assessed as required under the guidance in the NPPF in terms of housing supply and going some way to meeting the identified local need, with adequate access and parking arrangements. The balancing issues – development of a site outside of the village envelope – are considered to be of limited harm in this location due to the unique characteristic of the site and potential for sympathetic design and careful landscaping, and the severe limitations of relying on the village envelope

policy. Applying the ‘test’ required by the NPPF that permission should be granted unless the impacts would “significantly and demonstrably” outweigh the benefits; it is considered that permission can be granted.

D30. URGENT BUSINESS

The Members wished Kirsty McMahon, The Applications And Advice Manager, the best on her forthcoming maternity leave.

The meeting commenced at 6.00 pm and closed at 7.42pm