

Minutes

Meeting name	Planning Committee
Date	Thursday, 11 January 2018
Start time	6.00 pm
Venue	Parkside, Station Approach, Burton Street, Melton Mowbray, Leicestershire, LE13 1GH

Present:

Chair Councillor J. Illingworth (Chair)

Councillors P. Posnett (Vice-Chair) P. Baguley
G. Botterill P. Chandler
P. Cumbers P. Faulkner
M. Glancy T. Greenow
E. Holmes J. Wyatt

Observers

Officers Solicitor To The Council (SP)
Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services
Planning Officer (GBA)
Planning Officer (JL)
Applications And Advice Manager (LP)
Administrative Assistant (MF)

Minute No.	Minute
PL69	<p>Apologies for Absence None.</p>
PL70	<p>Declarations of Interest Cllr Baguley declared a personal and pecuniary interest in application 17/00507/COU – The John Dory, Barkestone Le Vale.</p> <p>Cllr Greenow declared a personal and pecuniary interest in application 17/01320/FUL – Land South of Hill Top Farm, Melton Mowbray and application 17/01044/FUL – Cattle Market, Melton Mowbray.</p>
PL71	<p>Schedule of Applications</p>
PL71.1	<p>17/00507/COU Applicant: Mike Timson Location: The John Dory, 2 Rutland Square, Barkestone Le Vale Proposal: Conversion of former public house/restaurant/living accommodation into two dwellings</p> <p>Cllr Baguley left the room for the duration of this application at 18:04</p> <p>The Planning Officer (JL) provided a detailed update on information provided by both the owner and the prospective purchasers regarding progress towards the sale of the property to the 'BHG' group, explaining the terms being discussed and the progress towards agreement</p> <p>She also reported that The BHG have made reference to a recent appeal decision in Thorpe Satchville. This relates to the Fox Inn, which was dismissed, however in this case the Inspector was not satisfied that there had been sufficient marketing carried out (they did also note that the loss of the pub would result in the loss of a community facility and would not demonstrate sustainable development. There is also an outstanding ACV nomination on the property. This is yet to be determined, however the report does provide the previous history on this process, which has included three rejected ACV nominations in the past.</p> <p>A Cllr sought clarification on the current state of affairs with regards to the sale of the pub to the local residents group.</p> <p>The Planning Officer responded that a purchase price had been agreed and heads of terms had been agreed.</p> <p>A Cllr sought legal advice on the current situation.</p> <p>The Solicitor to the Council responded that even if heads of terms have been</p>

agreed, there is no legal agreement between the two parties for a deal to go ahead.

The Chair invited a deferral from the floor.

Cllr Chandler proposed to defer the application to allow greater time for the details of the sale to be concluded.

Cllr Wyatt seconded the motion to defer the application.

A Cllr queried whether both sides had agreed to the heads of terms.

The Planning Officer responded that the purchaser had not yet agreed to the heads of terms.

A Vote was taken on the motion to defer.

7 Members supported the motion
2 Members voted against the motion
1 Member abstained from the vote

DETERMINATION: DEFER, to allow more time for negotiations regarding the sale of the property to be concluded.

PL71.2

17/00982/OUT

Applicant: Mr Gamble

Location: Sunny Cottage, 2 Pinfold Lane, Bottesford

Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling house and garage. Replacement development of residential units to include four dwelling houses (C3 use) (amended proposal for four dwellings not five as previously submitted.)

Cllr Baguley returned to the meeting at 18:19

The Planning Officer (GBA) introduced the report and advised:

The application is for four new dwellings outline all matters reserved involving the demolition of one already on site.

Three more representations have been received which object on grounds of safety, important corner removing openness and report matters

Site visit will have informed the Committee's appreciation for density in Bottesford – it is difficult to estimate and varies in different parts of the village but around the 8 dwellings per hectare.

He apologised that the site is referred to as Greenfield in the report but not the case.

The site is considered acceptable in terms of highway safety and improvement through Reserved matters. LCC Highways have been scrutinised over findings and are satisfied with their recommendation.

Development proposes two dwellings with good amenities to all and reflect local need with ample parking Features to integrate the site into the location will be brought about through a successful Reserved Matters scheme.

Sequential test queries

The flooding advisors maintain the EA guidelines and have been followed. LLFA comments suggest that the development will have features to mitigate against impacts of flooding.

a) Bob Bayman, on behalf of the Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Parish Council objects to this application.
- There is a large residential area nearby that gains access through Pinfold Lane.
- The proposed access is at the narrowest point on Pinfold Lane.
- There are another two junctions nearby and this will make the highways issue worse.
- This site is near the entrance to the village, and this will damage the village feel.
- It is a poor design and not in keeping with the street scene.

A Cllr queried whether access had already been decided.

Mr Bayman responded that access is likely to be at the proposed site entrance on the illustrative plans.

A Cllr asked whether they had been any serious accidents on the road here.

Mr Bayman responded that there are constant near misses, and that you shouldn't be waiting for a bad accident before anything is done about it.

b) Kevin Stones, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:

- His rear garden backs onto this site.
- It is not large enough for the proposed dwellings.
- There are significant objections to this proposal within the village.
- This will cause a lot of on street parking.
- There are highways issues in the area, and a lot of schoolchildren use the nearby footpaths.
- There are daily near misses in the area.
- The highways issues here have been known to residents for years, and this proposal will make the site worse.
- This is contrary to the NPPF as it will damage the village feel.
- It will cause a loss of privacy for neighbours.
- The form and character of the village will be ruined.

A Cllr queried where his property was on the map.

Mr Stones pointed out his property on the map, as it backs onto the site.

The Planning Officer (GBA) responded that LCC Highways have no issues with the

development.

A Cllr sought clarification on what houses and house types would go on the site. The Case Officer (GBA) responded that this could be decided by the Council at a later date through the conditions. The application is 'outline' only with a minimal level of information and though less than ideal, this is permissible.

A Cllr commented that there are highways issues on this site, as was demonstrated by the site visit. Also, this site is a sensitive area, and is next to the High Street Conservation Area. This proposal would lead to over intensification and overdevelopment of the site, as it will be at 43 houses per hectare. Also support the request for more flooding tests on the site.

A Cllr commented that there are known highways issues in this area, and the roads around there are dangerous. We cannot wait for somebody to be killed before anything is done with the road issues. This would lead to over intensification on the site.

The Case Officer (GBA) queried whether this site, with the addition of only a few houses, would affect the highways situation too much.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services commented that LCC Highways have to look at how much the new development will affect the current situation, and whether it makes the road safety "severe", following NPPF requirements. The approach to Highways road safety assessment was changed in 2012 by the NPPF, evidently to make it more favourable to development.

A Cllr commented that it is a matter of judgement how bad the current road safety situation is, and how much the new houses will affect it.

A Cllr queried whether the site was included in either the Local Plan or the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services responded that the site is too small to be allocated in the Local Plan, and the Neighbourhood Plan for the area has not yet been published.

A Cllr questioned whether this is already significant allocations for the area in the Local Plan.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services responded that the area already has enough sites allocated in the Local Plan.

A Cllr commented that they cannot support until the access has been decided.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services commented that the current plans are only indicative and can change later on.

A Cllr commented that they have concerns with regards to the sequential test and over intensification on the site, and it is difficult to agree with the Planning Officer.

A Cllr commented that a sequential test was needed to establish flood risk, and this site is a Zone 2 flood area.

Cllr Holmes proposed a motion to refuse the application on grounds of the absence of a sequential test, over intensification of the site, poor design and site layout, and highways issues in the area.

Cllr Chandler seconded the motion to refuse.

A Cllr sought clarification as for the reasons for refusal.
The reasons for refusal were reiterated by Cllr Holmes.

A Vote was taken on the motion to refuse.

10 Members supported the motion.
0 Members voted against the motion.
1 Member abstained from the vote.

DETERMINATION: REFUSED, for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development is in a location vulnerable to flooding and it has not been demonstrated, through the application of a 'Sequential Test' that there are no preferable sites available (in terms of a lower level of flood risk), therefore, the development is contrary to the advice in the NPPF at paragraphs 100, 101 & 103.

2. The development proposed is considered to have an adverse impact on the form and character of this part of the village of Bottesford. The proposed development on this site fails to respect the open nature of the local area. It is therefore contrary to policies BE1 of the Melton Local Plan 1999 and Paragraphs 17, 61 and 64 of the NPPF.

3. The development proposed is very close to a junction which is considered very dangerous for pedestrians, motorists and other road users. The increased traffic movements which would be caused by this development is considered to also further increase the likelihood of accidents in the local area. For these reasons the development proposes a severe impact to highway safety, contrary to National Planning Policy Framework para. 32.

PL71.3

16/00352/OUT

Applicant: Mr Andy Norris
Location: Field 3957, Manor Road, Easthorpe
Proposal: Proposed residential development

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services stated that we are waiting for the results of a sequential test, as the current results are inconclusive.

The Chair invited a deferral.

Cllr Holmes proposed a deferral.

Cllr Chandler seconded the motion for a deferral.

A Cllr commented that we should be deciding the application, like the previous application, to remain consistent.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services commented that the previous application did not have a sequential test, whilst this application does and we are currently waiting for conclusive results.

A Cllr stated that this application is off Muston Lane and not Manor Road, and that we need to wait for the full results of the sequential test.

A Cllr stated that there are worse flood issues here than in the area of the previous application.

A Vote was taken on the motion to defer.

11 Members supported the motion.

0 Members opposed the motion.

0 Members abstained from the vote.

DETERMINATION: DEFER, to allow for the submission of an updated and completed Sequential Test.

PL71.4

17/00397/FUL

Applicant: Mrs Sarah Grey

Location: Land Opposite 1 and 10, Station Lane, Old Dalby

Proposal: Residential development of up to 80 dwellings, associated infrastructure and landscaping.

This application was withdrawn from the agenda.

PL71.5

17/01047/FUL

Applicant: Redmile Developments LTD

Location: Dairy Houses, 9 Langar Lane, Harby

Proposal: Erection of 5 dwellings (re-locations of Plots 7, 8 and 10 of planning permission 15/00933/FUL and erection of an additional 2 dwellings plot 11 and 12).

The Planning Officer introduced the application and advised:

- A very detailed response to the Committee report has been submitted from an objector, commenting on much of its content. This was reported in full and is summarised as follows:
 - The size and scale and mass has already been breached and now the developer seeks to further undermine that phrase with over development of the site which is not matched by other properties on Langar Lane. One large property,

recently built by the developer was given planning consent even though it is out of proportion to the plot that it sits on and dominates the future development as a whole.

- Insufficient consideration may be given to the whole situation in favour of a timed schedule to get properties built.

- The over development makes the site more urban than it is rural and does not enhance the surrounding countryside or the village atmosphere

- The development proposed is not safe for motorists, pedestrians, horses or people with disabilities. There appears to be inadequate footpaths suitable for disability scooters or wheelchairs. A roadway shared with motor vehicles into the site is not suitable for the disabled transport.

- this latest planning application is approved it will fly in the face of Good Design, and the site that is over developed and looks very urban will not integrate and will stand out like sore thumb on one of the main approach roads into Harby, and this old and historic village.

- How would the three properties he refers to be appropriate and 'would address the street scene.'? The rest of the properties on Langar Lane are better spaced, stand back from the road with greenery to the front of the properties and wide verges, with nothing built behind them (in the majority of cases) These new proposed properties are closer together, border the narrow pavements with minimal area for greenery at the front and there are no bungalows in the proposal.

- LCC Highways are said to have raised no objections on safety grounds. Why is that? The additional house will attract residents with cars. In theory the number of residents in each house could easily result in more vehicles than parking spaces on driveways allow. Where will these vehicles park? Undoubtedly on Langar Lane. This will create an added danger for drivers entering to leaving the development and for drivers negotiating parked vehicles on a busy Langar Lane. Are the Highways fully aware of the difficulties already posed on Langar Lane? Vehicles speed out of the village and into it over a humpback bridge which makes visibility difficult in the area of the entrance to this development. Large vehicles such as tractors with heavy trailers use this route and whilst the drivers will sit higher in the cabs it will not make negotiating Langar Lane easier if vehicles are parked outside 3 properties. Two new properties with more parking at the rear would be safer and more aesthetically pleasing for the area as well reducing the over development and urban appearance of the site.

- Most of the conditions were not complied with and the whole length of Langer Lane became a shambles of uncoordinated works and a safety hazard during the construction phase 1.

- It also states that the Applicant has indicated that School Lane, Dickmans Lane and Boyer's Orchard will not be used by delivery drivers. There were several 'guarantees' and 'assurances' given to resident before construction started. None were kept.

- Two, four bedroom properties has the potential for at least 4 cars per household, perhaps more. Parking space is not sufficient on two properties to accommodate 8 vehicles?

- There is an estimate of available spaces at the school which conveniently suits the figure of 4 children from the new properties. The school capacity is limited. What if there are 10 children in the new plots. These estimated figures will

then be useless and wrong. This section is not a valid argument in my opinion. Like so many things, the report takes account of the best case scenario and not the worst case and the best laid plans etc., never – or rarely – work out as expected.

- Access road width is stated as being sufficient to allow two cars to pass each other. Should any errant parking take place and then a wider vehicle – fire engine for instance, needs access;
- It is contested whether the size of the gardens proposed are adequate for the corresponding size of properties from the plans, the gardens are very minimal which will detract from the individual buildings and the site as a whole.
- ‘The application is for full planning permission and therefore it is considered that the proposal present is what will be constructed.’ This in my opinion is a naive statement. As we all know, various amendments can be made by the developer during construction – and have been in the past – and what initial planning is granted is NOT always what is eventually built.
- If previous bad practice is not recognised and dealt with (and you may pass the buck and say that this is the problem of other departments) then developments will despoil the village and ruin the heritage of the area.
- NP POLICY H7: HOUSING DESIGN: The over development does not enhance the ‘character of the area’
- The over development and bunching of properties on Langar Lane does not reflect the character or density of the surrounding area.

a) Cllr Tillyard, on behalf of the Parish Council, was invited to speak and stated that:

- Permission has already been granted on this site for 10 houses.
- There was originally planned to be 5 houses on each side of the road.
- There are concerns about the house on plot 10.
- There would be over-congestion on the site if this application were approved.
- There are Parking and safety issues on this site and the surrounding area.
- There is no independent access due to plot 10 blocking access.
- Plot 10 makes the site overcrowded.
- There have already been 139 dwellings granted permission in Harby.

Cllrs had no questions for Cllr Tillyard.

b) Phillip Goodman, an objector, was invited to speak and stated that:
• He is a former planning inspector who helped to produce the local Neighbourhood Plan.

- The site would be cramped and overcrowded.
- It reduces green space in the area.
- It would cause on street parking in the vicinity.
- There is limited space for refuse bins on the site.
- Housing needs are already met in the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan.
- The street scene would be very cramped here.
- It is contrary to the NPPF, and Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan.

A Cllr asked what the Neighbourhood Plan allocation was for the site. Mr Goodman answered that the Neighbourhood Plan allocated 10 dwellings for the site, which have already been granted.

- c) Caroline Chave, the agent, was invited to speak and stated that:
- This site is already a Brownfield site.
 - The site is within the village envelope.
 - The used to be a dairy on the site, which closed in 2012.
 - The Larger self-build units that were intended for the site have not sold, so are being redeveloped into smaller units.
 - This will make better use of the village Brownfield land.
 - The proposed buildings are of lower heights than other buildings within the village.
 - The properties are traditionally designed properties.
 - Each dwelling will have 2 parking spaces and a garage.
 - The self-build projects have central government support.

Cllrs had no questions for Ms Chave.

- d) Cllr Rhodes, the Ward Councillor, was invited to speak and stated that:
- Agree with the Parish Council and with Phillip Goodman.
 - There is not room for 5 dwellings on this site.
 - LCC Highways advice can be ignored if you disagree.
 - There is only room for 2 houses on the front of the development, not the 3 that are planned.

Cllrs had no questions for Cllr Rhodes.

The Planning Officer (JL) clarified on site parking provision by reference to the layout plan. Parking is off Langar Lane, and for plot 10, parking is to the rear of the property.

A Cllr commented that it looks like a promising development, but looks over intensive. A Neighbour has reported possible issues with drainage in the vicinity of the development.

Cllr Baguley proposed a motion for refusal on grounds that it is over intensive and out of keeping with the area and the street scene as a result.

Cllr Holmes seconded the motion for refusal. It is on a busy road and would lead to on street parking.

A Cllr commented that the development looked nice, but it would be cramped and overdeveloped. It will cause on street parking and so supports the motion to refuse.

A Cllr queried if we know the numbers and calculations for how cramped the plots would be. The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services responded that there is no specified arithmetic standard. It would be dependent upon the

Committee's judgement of the impacts of the development.

A Cllr stated that it would lead to further urbanisation within the village, and that we need to preserve village character.

A Cllr commented that there are no planning reasons for refusal of this development.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services responded that design and village character are important considerations for the Committee to judge.

A Cllr stated that it is replacing two large houses with three smaller ones, and so is in favour of permit.

A Cllr queried the current state of the Neighbourhood Plan.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services stated that the Neighbourhood Plan is currently post-examination so has significant weight.

A Cllr stated that the Neighbourhood Plan allocated 10 dwellings on this site, so it should stick to the 10 that have already been granted permission.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services responded that the NPPF would regard more houses as a benefit, and that Harby already has its NP allocation.

A Cllr commented that look and appearance of a development must be taken into account.

A Cllr commented that the site looks too cramped.

A Cllr stated that there would be an increase in on street parking if this development went ahead, irrespective of the advice of LCC Highways.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services stated that the judgement must be made on whether the increase in traffic and road safety issues would represent a hazard and whether it would be severe.

A Vote was taken on the motion to refuse.

7 Councillors supported the motion.

4 Councillors opposed the motion.

0 Councillors abstained from the vote.

DETERMINATION: REFUSED, for the following reason:

In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority, the proposed development is considered to represent the overdevelopment of the site, especially the proposed dwellings fronting Langar Lane, which would fail to respect its surroundings, reinforce local distinctiveness and have an adverse impact on the quality of the street scene. It is considered that the proposed

development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and wider village. The proposal is considered contrary to Section 7 of the NPPF 'Requiring Good Design', Policies OS1 and BE1 of the Melton Local Plan 1999 and Policy H7 of the Clawson, Hose and Harby Neighbourhood Development Plan, which seeks to ensure development is sympathetic to the site and surroundings. It is not considered that the benefits of the scheme are sufficient to outweigh these impacts.

PL71.6

17/01320/FUL

Applicant: Mr Martin Brown

Location: Land at South of Hill Top Farm, St Bartholomews Way, Melton Mowbray

Proposal: Farm shop and associated parking and landscaping.

Cllr Greenow left the meeting at 19:35.

The Planning Officer (JL) advised there was one late item to report. An amended plan has been received for the application which demonstrates the split of the development internally (with the proposed tea room). Therefore the condition relating to the drawings (no 2) will need to be amended to reflect this amendment-9th January 2018 (16/43/001)

The application seeks permission to erect a farm shop, associated with Hilltop Farm, located on Nottingham Road. It is required to be determined by the committee as approval of the application would be a departure to the 1999 Melton Local Plan. The proposed farm shop would be outside the village envelope and positioned approximately 1200m along the road from the host farm. The proposed development would require the construction of a new building. LCC Highways have not raised any highway safety concerns.

a) Maurice Fairhurst, the Agent, was invited to speak and stated that:

- There are currently no farm shops in the north of Melton.
- This is for the specific sale of farm products.
- It will sell produce made on the farm.
- It will be single storey and made of natural timber.
- It is a well landscaped design.
- It will provide a greater choice of fresh food.
- It will create more jobs.
- It has good parking on the site.
- It is supported by local residents as well as the NPPF and the Local Plan.

A Cllr questioned the proportions of the site that would be selling the produce made on site, and the proportion of the site that would be the tea room.

Mr Fairhurst responded that the tea room will take up roughly 25% of the site, and that of the space within the shop, roughly 75% will be selling goods and produce that is produced on the farm.

A Cllr queried the butchering facilities nearby.

Mr Fairhurst replied that there is a slaughterhouse in Long Clawson and another at Six Hills.

A Cllr queried the plans for both a nice view and for the screening in the plans. Mr Fairhurst replied that with the correct screening approach, both can be achieved.

A Cllr asked about the produce and how much will be done externally and how much on site.

Mr Fairhurst replied that the produce will return from the butchers and slaughterhouse as ready for sale.

A Cllr questioned the electricity arrangements.

Mr Fairhurst responded that the site does not currently have electricity, but will have it installed for the application.

A Cllr commented that this type of development is very good, and the type that we are looking for. It will produce local goods for local people, and requires no new access roads.

Cllr Posnett proposed to approve the application in accordance with the recommendation.

Cllr Baguley seconded the motion to approve the application.

A Cllr states that this is a win-win scenario and should be approved.

A Cllr questions what would happen if the business were to fail.

The Head of Strategic Planning and Regulatory Services responded that it would have to have a Change Of Use application to become anything else.

A Cllr states that they welcome this application, and that there is a huge demand for this within the borough.

A Cllr comments that this application is very welcome, and that it will be very close to the proposed bypass.

A Vote was taken on the motion to approve.

10 Councillors supported the motion.

0 Councillors opposed the motion.

0 Councillors abstained from the vote.

DETERMINATION: APPROVED, subject to the conditions as set out in the report, amended as per the Planning Officer's update, for the following reasons:

This proposed development would result in the erection of a building with associated car parking in a location that whilst not ideal for retail, is acceptable for the purpose of farm diversification, Farms and their associated ancillary elements are purposely not located close to the built form of towns and villages.

Information supplied by the agent demonstrates that whilst not currently on site, the agent is shortly to acquire additional livestock to ensure that 75% of the products sold by the farm shop will be reared at the applicants farm, with the remaining 25% of products will be brought in from elsewhere which will include seasonal vegetables from local producers. There is also a small tea room element proposed which will supply home baked bread, cakes and preservatives. As stated within the recently submitted New Melton Local Plan, Melton Mowbray is England's "Rural Capital of Food" and whilst Melton's food and drink specialism provides bespoke opportunities and a degree of local resilience, farm businesses are under pressure to respond to pricing volatility and to adapt to environmental challenges which adversely impact productivity and farm income.

It is considered that, on the balance of the issues, there are therefore significant benefits accruing from the proposal when assessed as required under the guidance in the NPPF in terms of boosting the rural economy. Applying the 'test' required by the NPPF that permission should be granted unless the impacts would "significantly and demonstrably" outweigh the benefits. Taking into account the proposed farm shop would be an ancillary use to the existing farm and provide income to support and increase the current level of farming activity at Hilltop Farm, it is considered that permission should be approved.

PL71.7

17/01044/FUL

Applicant: Melton Borough Council

Location: Cattle Market, Scalford Road, Melton Mowbray

Proposal: Use of site of former cattle market as a new temporary car park.

The Planning Officer (GBA) stated that there had been no updates to the report.

A Cllr queried the access onto the site.

The Planning Officer (GBA) stated that entrance is at the North-West of the site, and the exit is on the South-West of the site.

A Cllr queried why the application was only for a temporary car park.

The Planning Officer (GBA) responded that the site may be used differently in the future.

A Cllr stated that the exit is very close to the Nottingham Road and Asfordby Road junction, which is horrific and always has lots of traffic.

Cllr Posnett Proposed to Permit the application.

Cllr Wyatt Seconded the Motion to Permit.

A Vote was taken on the Motion to Permit.

10 Councillors supported the motion.

0 Councillors opposed the motion.

0 Councillors abstained from the vote.

DETERMINATION: PERMIT, subject to the conditions as set out in the report, for the following reasons:

The application seeks consent for a car park for a temporary period which is acceptable in the location proposed.

Cllr Greenow returned to the meeting at 19:52.

PL72

Urgent Business

Approval of the Minutes for the previous Planning Committee meeting on 30.11.2018.

A Cllr noted that the minutes did not include a declaration of interest from Cllr Illingworth for the application on Briars Well Farm.

This was the only amendment to the minutes.

A Vote was held to approve the minutes.

10 Councillors supported the motion.

0 Councillors opposed the motion.

0 Councillors abstained from the vote.

Cllr Posnett was not at the meeting so couldn't vote.

The Motion passes. The Previous minutes are approved.

No Further Business.

The meeting closed at: 8.01 pm

Chair