

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

10 DECEMBER 2015

Present: Councillor R Martins (Chair)
Councillor G Derbyshire (Vice-Chair)
Councillors S Bashir, N Bell, S Johnson, I Sharpe, M Turmaine,
M Whitman and T Williams

Also present: Councillor K Collett and T Rogers (Minutes 43 to 47)

Officers: Fiona Dunning
Senior Planning Officer
Planning Officer
Committee and Scrutiny Support Officer (AG)

43 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

There were no apologies for absence.

44 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS (IF ANY)

There were no disclosures of interests.

45 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 19 November 2015 were submitted and signed.

46 15/01447/FUL 81 CECIL STREET

The Committee received the report of the Senior Planning Officer, including the relevant planning history of the site.

The Senior Planning Officer introduced the item, explaining that full planning permission was sought for the removal of the existing side extension and garage and the construction of a new one bedroom property. The application followed two previous applications which sought permission for the creation of a new two story dwelling; both refused planning permission given the impact the development would have on the amount of natural light entering the neighbouring property to the east of the site (79 Cecil Street). The current scheme differed from those previously submitted in that it proposed a single story building rather than a two story structure. As a result, the reduced mass of the building allowed a greater amount of natural light to enter the neighbouring

property as demonstrated by the Daylight and Sunlight Study that accompanied the application. It was considered that the current scheme would have no detrimental impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of the neighbouring property; and that in this respect the current proposal had addressed the reasons for refusal that were applied to the previous two applications. He then went on to read the remainder of the 'summary' in the application contained on Page 6 of the report.

The Chair invited Robbie Laird, present on behalf of local residents, to speak to the Committee in objection to the proposed development.

Mr Laird explained that he would be opposing the application from a policy view point. Firstly, it was considered that parking facilities had not been properly taken in to account. He made reference to the Watford District Plan 2000, commenting that Policy T22 and the map on page seven, Zone Three had not been adequately considered. He suggested that cognisance needed to be taken of the implications for parking in relation to people getting to work arising from the new Croxley and the proposed High Speed Two rail links.

He made reference to the spacing and sunlight relating to the proposed development asking why a 25 degree line had been used and referring to the Resident Design Guidance 2004; suggesting that as the entrance to the property was on the side of the house, a 45 degree line would have been more appropriate. As a result, the light would be reduced.

Mr Laird asserted that Policy HS3 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31 had not been taken in to account; in that non affordable housing did not seem to have been considered despite the development being of less than ten dwellings. He concluded by saying that whilst he was pro-development, he was opposed to this current proposal that, in his view, was 'piecemeal' and not at all satisfactory.

The Chair asked the Senior Planning Officer to respond to the questions raised by Mr Laird.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that with regard to:

- Policy HS3 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31; this only applied if there were ten or more properties under development.
- Policy T22 of the Watford District Plan 2000 and parking; the proposed development was in a sustainable area and near to Watford Junction train station and to shops, bus stops for example and the town centre. He explained that such objections had been lost at appeal in relation to similar applications.
- Daylight; this was why the applications had been refused previously. He was satisfied that the new smaller scale building would allow suitable daylight in to the adjoining property and was in compliance with building research guidance.
- The 45 degree line; this would only apply in relation to the rear of a property. A 25 degree line was the first test in respect of this application. In fact, a 45 degree line would potentially result in a larger building.

The Chair thanked Mr Laird for his contribution.

The Chair opened the debate to Committee Members.

Councillor Bashir said that he agreed with many of Mr Laird's concerns making reference to the two previous applications that were refused due to the light issues. He suggested that it would be more appropriate that the new development resulted in an improved lighting situation and not simply be worse than at present; as discussed in the Daylight and Sunlight Study. He outlined his principle objection that there would be over development of the area. He made reference to Page 8, Item 2 in the report commenting that having a building just about meeting the internal square footage requirements and reducing the garden space to less than that permitted was inappropriate and would not look satisfactory. He suggested that members should treat the application with scepticism and that the proposal was an over development of the site and not in keeping with the area.

Councillor Sharpe agreed in spirit with Mr Laird's and Councillor Bashir's comments. He considered the situation in Callowland Ward to be close to intolerable. He said that whilst it may be typical having small gardens; that minimum standards should be applied. He considered that whilst some people may want smaller gardens; this was a symptom of cramming in an undesirable form. He would be interested in officer's views on this point.

The Chair asked the Senior Planning Officer to comment on the issue

The Senior Planning Officer explained that the application had to be looked at in relation to the context of the area; with 'garden space' an issue discussed in the Residential Design Guide. This advised that a minimum garden area of 50 square metres be provided for a one bedroom house and a minimum of 65 square metres be provided for a three bedroom house. The proposed development would result in a 45 square metre garden for the new one bedroom property and a 38 square metre garden for the existing three bedroom dwelling. However, many other gardens in the area of Cecil Street measured only 37 square metres.

Councillor Williams agreed with Councillor Bashir's comments with regard to the garden sizes - and that reducing the present 65 square metre garden to the three bedroom property to only 38 square metres would seem to represent demonstratable harm. Councillor Derbyshire considered the small size of the proposed gardens to be strong grounds to refuse the application in that these did not meet the standards set in policy.

Councillor Bell agreed with Members on the points raised commenting that the Cecil Road development provided evidence of cramming. He suggested that the Committee should make a stand about the size of the gardens which clearly indicated an over development of the site.

Drawing discussions to a conclusion, the Chair commented that Members appeared to be widely critical of the apparent over development aspects of the application. He invited Councillor Bashir to move his motion to refuse planning permission. Councillor Bashir moved refusal on the grounds that it would result in an overdevelopment of the site and because the garden space did not meet the required criteria. The Chair endorsed Councillor Bashir's concerns about the proposed amenity space and put the proposal to the vote.

RESOLVED –

that planning permission be refused on the grounds that the shortfall of private outdoor amenity space is an indication that the proposal is an overdevelopment of the site creating a detrimental impact on the future occupants of the development and the amenity of adjoining neighbours, contrary to the provisions of the Residential Design Guide (RDG) and Policy SS1 of the Watford Local Plan Core Strategy 2006-31.

47

15/01068/FULM NORTH WATFORD POLICE STATION

The Committee received the report of the Planning Officer, including the relevant planning history of the site and details of responses to the application.

The Planning Officer introduced the item, explaining that full planning permission was sought for the erection of 12 no. three bed semi-detached houses, 16 no. two bed flats and associated car parking and landscaping. All existing buildings on the site were to be demolished. The houses were to be erected along the southwest and northwest boundaries with the rear elevations addressing Leveret Close. The apartment building (four storeys plus roof accommodation and undercroft parking) was to be cited on the eastern corner of the site (adjacent to Kingsway). Access would be as existing and no direct access to Leveret Close was proposed. Bin and cycle stores were also incorporated within the parking area. A total of 34 parking bays were proposed.

The Committee had received a petition submitted by the Chair of Governors at the Leavesden Green School. However, following legal advice, the 'petition', as submitted, could not be considered by Members to be a material consideration in the determination of the application as it did not give actual signatures (only names) and addresses were incomplete. Furthermore, the petition did not state what it was about and it appeared to have been commenced prior to the North Watford Police Station application being submitted to the Council thereby precluding reconsideration of the application following amendments.

The Chair invited Laura Creed, Chair of Governors, Leavesden Green School, to speak to the Committee in objection to the proposed development.

Ms Creed made reference to the petition that had been prepared in July. She explained that the main concern in relation to the application was the height of the proposed block of flats; this being of five storeys and overlooking the school. The block was adjacent to the school fields, with these used daily and with

outdoor learning for vulnerable children on a Friday. She reiterated that there was concern about the height of the fourth and fifth storeys overlooking the school and emphasised that they were keen to keep children safe. She explained that there were six windows overlooking the school together with balcony's overlooking the school fields. She stressed that there was real concern about the proximity of the flats to the school fields. She concluded by saying that steps should be taken to ensure the flats did not overlook the school fields so as to protect the children.

The Chair invited Gareth Lewis, Watford Community Housing Trust, to speak to the Committee in support of the application.

Mr Lewis explained that the application was in response to the Watford housing crisis. The site had been acquired by the Trust on the open market. All 28 units would be 'affordable' housing and the submitted scheme was for three bedroom houses and two bedroom flats. He suggested that the proposed scheme made best use of the topography of the location. All properties would meet lifetime standards. The Trust had an extended commitment to the needs of the community and the local authority. As a result, amendments had been made to the application including removing cycle access, removing the garden space roof and one level of the block and also improving privacy. There had been a reduction in homes to 28 from the original 30 proposed. He suggested that the development would add to the Borough housing stock. Improvements had also been made to vehicular access for reasons of safety in light of comments from Hertfordshire County Council Highways Department; including preventing vehicles crossing the main highway. Homes would be let at 70 percent of the market rate and to people with links to the Borough. He concluded by saying that the development would help address the chronic housing shortage; with the Trust providing 100 percent affordable homes as opposed to 35 percent if it was in the private sector.

The Chair thanked both speakers for their contributions and noted that two ward councillors, Councillor Rogers and Councillor Collett had registered to speak on these proposals. He invited Councillor Rogers, Woodside Ward Councillor, to speak to the Committee.

Councillor Rogers explained that on the face of it the planning application had a great deal to recommend it. The site had been neglected for a number of years and there was concern locally as to what was going to happen to it. It was an ideal brown field site favoured by the government for redevelopment and could supply much needed local housing if developed carefully. He described the geography of the location in some detail. He explained he had conducted research to understand resident's feelings on the proposals and that there were two main concerns of parking and of over development. With regard to parking; he suggested that with the number of people living on the site there would be a need for at least 60 parking spaces – almost double what was proposed. He outlined the fears of residents in Leveret Close with reference to possible parking problems resulting from the development. With regard to density, he explained that the consensus of local residents was that three stories in the block of flats should be a maximum. This would enable the Leavesden Green School to

screen the apparent intrusion to the children's privacy by growing a line of conifers. The proposed five floors would be a serious invasion of privacy. He suggested that to resolve this issue, the proposed ground floor should become a basement and that landscaping would afford adequate light to its windows. Therefore, by losing the accommodation in the roof and having only three floors visible, he felt that this would be acceptable and it would also go some way to easing the apparent parking problem.

The Chair invited Councillor Collett, Woodside Ward Councillor, to speak to the Committee.

Councillor Collett outlined the history of the site suggesting that it was always destined to be sold off with potential risks if bought by private developers or by a business for example. She explained the consultation process that had been undertaken by herself and the Trust with local residents and how the Trust had listened to the community's concerns; such as in the removal of the roof garden in the block of flats and considerations for the privacy of those closest to the new dwellings. Also, the steps taken to reduce any noise pollution from the nearby A405 North Orbital Road by the installation of double glazing and mechanical ventilation. In relation to the potential overlooking of Leavesden Green School, she asserted that there was no evidence to suggest that residents living by schools would be a danger to children. She outlined the benefits of the Trust managing the scheme and concluded by asking that if the application was approved an additional condition of contractors only working from Monday to Friday be applied.

The Chair consulted the Committee against discussing issues relating to the people who may reside in the development. He stressed the Committee's role was to consider the proposed development and not the likely occupants of the housing units. He opened the debate to Committee Members.

Councillor Sharpe explained that the trend was now towards more intensive urban development and he outlined government policy on the issue. He argued that more affordable housing was needed. He did not consider that the potential overlooking of the Leavesden Green School was valid; in fact it was probable that parents who resided on the development may send their children to the school. There was more to welcome than to fear - adding that the police had not objected to the application. He concluded by saying that the development brought more affordable housing and a derelict area in to use.

Councillor Bell welcomed the development, commenting that the number of houses was very good and that flats were needed. The proposal would make use of a brown field site and the Trust had taken on board the concerns of residents. Overall, he was content with the plans and was in favour of the application.

The Chair established with the Planning Officer that the potential overlooking of the Leavesden Green School was not a material planning consideration in respect of who may or may not occupy the dwellings.

Councillor Bashir also welcomed the application, commenting that he had not seen such a scheme in the last eighteen months. He concurred about the effective consultation conducted by the Trust and listening to local concerns. He did not consider the potential overlooking of the school to be an issue commenting that some school play grounds were located right next to dwellings. He considered the design of the development to be sound, with no noise issues and resulting in an improvement in the character of the area. Councillor Johnson agreed with Councillor Bashir's comments, adding that the Trust had responded well in removing a storey from the block of flats. Councillor Turmaine further complemented the consultation process and proffered his support for the 100 percent affordable housing provided by the Trust.

Councillor Derbyshire reiterated government policy on the issue commenting that as there were 28 affordable homes it was only right that the Committee should support the application. The only negative issue mentioned was having the flats near the school; and the hollow in the ground would help in this regard. In any event, he could not see that the flats proximity would cause harm to the school or to the children.

In response to a question from Councillor Williams, the Interim Development Management Section Head explained that Hertfordshire County Council was strict regarding the prevention of flooding and was satisfied that adequate drainage was being provided on the development. In response to a further question from Councillor Williams, the Interim Development Management Section Head clarified that contractors only working Monday to Friday was already a planning condition contained in the report. Councillor Bashir raised some concerns about the Monday to Friday only working and reassurance was provided by the Chair.

The Chair then moved the officer recommendation.

That planning permission be granted, subject to the completion of a planning obligation under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) as set out below, and subject to the following conditions:

Section 106 Heads of Terms

- i) To secure the provision of fire hydrants as required by the County Council in accordance with Policy INF1 of the Core Strategy and saved Policy H10 of the Watford District Plan 2000.
- ii) To secure all of the 28 dwellings as affordable housing comprising 14 affordable rented units and 14 units for Low Cost Home Ownership.

Conditions

1. The development to which this permission relates shall be begun within a period of three years commencing on the date of this permission.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings:-
Location plan 010
0412_01-05_PL_020
0412_06-10_PL_021
0412_PL_100 Rev C
0412_PL-101 Rev B
0412_PL_102 Rev C
0412_PL_200 Rev C
0412_PL_201 Rev C
0412_PL_202 Rev C
0412_PL_203 Rev A
0412-PL-204 Rev A
0412_PL_300 Rev A
0412_PL_400 Rev A
0412_PL_401 Rev A
3. No demolition or construction works shall take place before 8am or after 6pm Mondays to Fridays, or at any time on Saturdays, Sundays and Public Holidays.
4. No construction works shall commence until details of the materials to be used for all the external finishes of the new buildings, including all external walls, roofs, doors, windows, balconies and privacy screens, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved materials.
5. No demolition or construction works shall commence within the site until a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This Plan shall include details of temporary access for demolition/construction vehicles, contractors parking, the delivery and storage of materials, measures to mitigate noise and dust, wheel washing facilities, plant and equipment and a contact procedure for complaints. The Plan as approved shall be implemented throughout the relevant demolition and construction periods.
6. No part of the development shall be occupied until the new access junction has been completed in full and the central reservation barrier has been reinstated on the North Orbital Road (Kingsway) adjacent to the site as shown in principle on drawing no. 0412-pl-100 Rev B.

7. No flats forming part of the development shall be occupied until the enhanced Type B glazing, as specified in the acoustic report 10179-NEA-01 Rev. A, has been fitted to all windows on the eastern elevation of the apartment block adjacent the North Orbital Road.
8. No flats forming part of the development shall be occupied until the mechanical ventilation system, as set out in the acoustic report 10179-NEA-01 Rev. A, has been fitted to all rooms fitted with Type B glazing.
9. No part of the development shall be occupied until the 34 car parking spaces shown on the approved drawings (unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority) have been laid out, demarcated and constructed in full. These spaces shall be retained at all times for the parking of cars of the residential occupiers only.
10. No part of the development shall be occupied until the bin stores for the houses and the flats have been provided in accordance with the approved drawings (unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority). The stores shall be retained at all times for bin storage only and shall not be used for any other purpose.
11. No part of the development shall be occupied until details of the cycle storage shown on the approved drawings, for a minimum of 28 cycles and providing weather protection, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the cycle storage facilities have been provided in full. These shall be retained at all times.
12. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved flood risk assessment carried out by SDP Consulting Engineers (referenced job no. E15.041 dated August 2015) and only in accordance with the following mitigation measures:

i) Providing attenuation to ensure no increase in surface water run-off volumes for all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year + climate change event.

ii) Implementing appropriate SuDS measures as shown on drawing E15-041-10 dated August 2015.

iii) Implementing appropriate drainage strategy based on infiltration.

iv) Provide storage volume of 135m³ through the use of permeable paving, ring and geocell soakaways.

The mitigation measures shall be fully implemented prior to occupation and subsequently in accordance with the timing / phasing arrangements embodied within the scheme, or within any other period as may subsequently be agreed, in writing, by the Local Planning Authority.

13. No development shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site based on the approved flood risk assessment carried out by SDP Consulting Engineers (referenced job E15.041 dated August 2015) and drawing E15-041-10 'sustainable drainage principles' and an assessment of the hydrogeological and hydrological context of the development has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage scheme should demonstrate the surface water runoff generated up to and including 1 in 100 year + climate change critical storm will not exceed the runoff from the undeveloped site following the corresponding rainfall event. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed.
 - Detailed engineering drawings of the proposed SuDS features including their size, volume, depth and any inlet and outlet features including any connecting pipe runs.
 - Details of how the scheme shall be maintained and managed after completion.
14. The development shall be carried out only in accordance with the approved tree protection scheme and method statements (reference JPL/150257/AMsa/sh). The tree protection measures shall be installed in full before any demolition or construction works commence.
15. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any modification or re-enactment thereof), no development permitted under Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B and F of the Order shall be carried out to any of the dwellings hereby approved without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.
16. No impact piling shall take place until a piling method statement (detailing the depth and type of piling to be undertaken and the methodology by which such piling will be carried out, including measures to prevent and minimise the potential for damage to subsurface sewerage infrastructure, and the programme for the works) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any piling must be undertaken in accordance with the terms of the approved piling method statement.
17. No part of the development shall be occupied until full details of a soft landscaping scheme have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include the retention of existing trees and hedging where possible and measures to enhance the ecological biodiversity of the site. The approved landscaping scheme shall be carried out not later than the first available planting and seeding season after completion of the development. Any trees or plants whether new or existing which within a period of five years die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the next planting season with others of similar size and species, or in accordance with details approved by the Local Planning Authority.

18. No part of the development shall be occupied until full details of a hard landscaping scheme, including details of all site boundary treatments and all fencing within the site, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and the works have been carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Informatives

1. All new units granted planning permission and to be constructed require naming or numbering under the Public Health Act 1925. You must contact Watford Borough Council Street Naming and Numbering department as early as possible prior to commencement on streetnamenumbers@watford.gov.uk or 01923 278458. A numbering notification will be issued by the council, following which Royal Mail will assign a postcode which will make up the official address. It is also the responsibility of the developer to inform Street Naming and Numbering when properties are ready for occupancy.
2. In dealing with this application, Watford Borough Council has considered the proposal in a positive and proactive manner having regard to the policies of the development plan as well as paragraphs 186 and 187 of the National Planning Policy Framework and other material considerations, and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010, as amended.
3. The applicant is advised that the storage of materials associated with the construction of this development should be provided on land which is not public highway, and the use of such areas must not interfere with the public highway. If this is not possible, authorisation should be sought from the Highway Authority before construction works commence. Further information is available from the Highway Authority via the website: <http://www.hertsdirect.org/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.
4. It is an offence under section 137 of the Highways Act 1980 for any person, without lawful authority or excuse, in any way to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway or public right of way. If this development is likely to result in the public highway or public right of way network becoming routinely blocked (fully or partly) the applicant must contact the Highway Authority to obtain their permission and requirements before construction works commence. Further information is available from the Highway Authority via the website: <http://www.hertsdirect.org/services/transtreets/highways/> or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

5. Before commencing the development the applicant shall contact Hertfordshire County Council Highways (0300 123 4047) to obtain i) their permission/ requirements regarding access for vehicles involved in the construction of the new roads; ii) a condition survey of any adjacent highways which may be affected by construction vehicles together with an agreement with the highway authority that the developer will bear all costs in reinstating any damage to the highway.

6. Works to be undertaken on the adjoining Highway will require an agreement with the highway authority. Before commencing the development the applicant shall contact Hertfordshire County Council Highways (0300 123 4047) to obtain their permission and requirements. This is to ensure that any works undertaken in the highway are constructed in accordance with the specification of the highway authority and by a contractor who is authorised to work in the public highway.

7. Roads to remain private: The applicant is advised that all new internal roads and car parking areas associated with this development will remain unadopted and the developer should put in place a permanent arrangement for their long term maintenance. At the entrance to these private areas all road name plates should indicate their private status to inform users of their status and purchasers of their future maintenance liabilities. Further information is available via the web page <http://www.hertsdirect.org/services/transtreets/highways/info/roadadopting> / or by telephoning 0300 1234047.

48

15/01456/DIS106 14 NASCOT ROAD

The Committee received the report of the Interim Development Management Section Head.

The Interim Development Management Section Head introduced the item and invited any questions from Members of the Committee.

In response to a series of questions from Councillor Bell, the Interim Development Management Section Head informed the Committee that the loss to the Council was in the region of £25,000; but she was unaware as to why the matter had taken so long to resolve as she was not working in the Council in 2011. She explained that with the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), a dedicated CIL/S106 officer post had been created to monitor Section 106 obligations and CIL and to pursue any outstanding matters under five years old.

In response to concerns expressed by Councillor Bashir about the loss of taxpayer's money, the Chair undertook to raise the issue with the head of department to ensure the circumstances did not arise again.

RESOLVED -

That the report be noted.

49

REVIEW OF DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE 1 APRIL TO 13 NOVEMBER 2015

The Committee received the report of the Interim Development Management Section Head.

The Interim Development Management Section Head introduced the item referring to Table One in the report that demonstrated the achievement of targets and excellent performance by officers. She added that the 'approved' ratings shown were in excess of government requirements; further demonstrating very satisfactory outcomes. She discussed Table Two in the report making reference to the low level (26 percent) of appeals upheld which again demonstrated very good performance by officers.

Councillor Bashir congratulated those involved for these levels of performance. He asked whether there was a list of appeals that had emanated from Committee decisions and whether these had been granted or refused. The Interim Development Management Section Head explained that there had been no such appeals this year. In response to a further question from Councillor Bashir in relation to mechanisms to identify whether officer decisions leading to dismissal could have been dealt with better; the Interim Development Management Section Head explained that all decisions were 'delegated decisions'. She said that when analysing the inspector decisions that were upheld, there was a degree of inconsistency in approach so it was difficult to determine commonality.

Councillor Bell congratulated officers on the high levels of performance as shown in the report and suggested that this provided evidence of the pre-application stage working well.

Councillor Sharpe said that it was important that there were such measuring mechanisms and it was good that there was a target around taking decisions. He wondered where the Council stood in national rankings commenting that previously the Council had been in the top quartile. He considered the present figures to be a phenomenal effort by officers. He then discussed issues around appeals, government policy on planning matters and the approach the Committee should take with regard to decision making.

The Chair summarised discussions and complimented officers on their efforts. He formally thanked the Interim Development Management Section Head (who

was shortly to leave the Council) on behalf of the Committee for all of her hard work. He wished all those present a happy festive season.

RESOLVED -

That the report be noted

Chair
Development Management
Committee

The meeting started at 7.30 pm
and ended at 9.00 pm