

## **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**28 AUGUST 2014**

Present: Councillor R Martins (Chair)  
Councillor G Derbyshire (Vice-Chair)  
Councillors S Bashir, N Bell, J Connal, S Johnson, I Sharpe,  
M Watkin and P Jeffree (Present for minute numbers 20 to 25)

Also present: Councillor Ian Brown and Councillor Karen Collett

Officers: Development Management Section Head  
Major Cases Manager  
Senior Planning Officer (MS)  
Committee and Scrutiny Support Officer (RW)

### **20 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP**

There was a change of membership for this meeting: Councillor Jeffree replaced Councillor T Williams.

### **21 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS (IF ANY)**

Councillor Jeffree explained that he had an interest in the item at minute number 26 and said that he would leave the Chamber whilst this application was discussed.

### **22 MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 August 2014 were submitted and signed.

### **23 OUTSTANDING PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

RESOLVED –

that the report be noted.

### **24 2 FERN WAY**

The Committee received a report of the Development Management Section Head including the relevant planning history of the site and details of five responses to the application.

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the proposal and advised that the room sizes for the two flats had complied with the minimum standards in place when the application had been received. He explained that whilst, in the intervening period, new standards had been adopted, planners' recommendations had been based on the criteria at the point of the application; he added that the room sizes mostly complied with the new standards.

The Chair invited Mr Ken Emmons to speak to the Committee.

Mr Emmons said that he represented the residents of the Kingswood estate who wished to object to the application on grounds of road safety. He referred to page 10 of the report and noted the response from the Highway Authority who recommended refusal.

Mr Emmons advised that the roads in the vicinity of the proposed development were frequently used as a short-cut. He explained that there were two schools and an Early Years Centre in the area resulting in many parents parking near by whilst dropping off or collecting children. The proposal to partially demolish the wall at the application site would reduce parking space for road users and impact on road safety.

Mr Emmons commented on several road safety issues as noted in the report reiterating that this area was extremely busy and a frequent 'rat run'. He concluded by asking that the Committee add conditions to ameliorate the situation.

The Chair then asked Mr McAndrew to address the Committee.

Mr McAndrew explained that the property had been purchased earlier in the year to provide accommodation for a family member. The intention had originally been to build a detached house on the side garden; this proposal, however, had not been approved. It had subsequently been decided that this relative would live in the original house, 2 Fern Way.

Mr McAndrew then advised that two further family members would be looking for accommodation in the near future and his aim was to provide homes for them in the flats.

Mr McAndrew stressed that all regulations had been fulfilled. He added that there would be no changes to the public highway other than widening the access to accommodate the driveway and that the Highway Authority had made no objection to this feature.

Mr McAndrew concluded by stating that if approval were not granted due to safety issues connected with widening the proposed access he would consider alternative arrangements at the rear of the property.

The Chair asked the Senior Planning Officer to comment on the Highway Authority's views and also on alternative arrangements.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the Highway Authority had raised objections to the existing crossover being used for vehicle access on the basis that the original dropped kerb had been installed for pedestrian rather than vehicular use. The crossover had, however, been used by vehicles for some considerable time and the current proposal would merely continue this use.

The Senior Planning Officer added that the Highway Authority had made no objections to the proposed widening of the other access in Briar Road. He advised that if Members had concerns regarding the Briar Road crossing being widened, a different design could be submitted which would give access via the rear service road. The application could be granted with this further condition attached.

The Committee then discussed the application.

Councillor Sharpe advised that applying a condition requiring an alternative arrangement for access via the rear service road rather than directly from Briar Road could make the decision vulnerable in the event of an appeal by the developer: it would be unwise to impose a condition where this was not strictly necessary. He expressed his surprise that the Highway Authority had recommended refusal on an aspect of the development which would not be changed from its current usage.

The Senior Planning Officer said that the Highway Authority had not wished to condone the inappropriate use of a dropped kerb. He agreed that to impose the additional condition could make the Council vulnerable at appeal.

The Development Management Section Head explained that when Members impose conditions, six tests must be applied. One test related to 'necessity': if a condition is not necessary then this condition must not be imposed.

In response to a question from Councillor Johnson, the Development Management Section Head advised that since the Committee would not be approving an aspect of the development which was already in existence (i.e. the continued use of the crossover for vehicular access to the front drive), the Council could not be held liable for a possible future accident.

Councillor Watkin assured the meeting that were the Highway Authority to consider that the crossing was unsafe, it had the means to prohibit this use. The authority had not done so in this case.

Councillor Derbyshire said that it was important that the design blended with its surroundings. He considered that the development would be appropriate in the locality. Councillor Derbyshire noted that there were a number of terraces of four dwellings on this estate and that other corner semi-detached homes had been similarly extended. He added that the current application's design change to incorporate a front door as well as a side door was an improvement over the previous application.

On the issue of parking and access, Councillor Derbyshire agreed that since the access arrangements for the front drive were not part of the application this aspect should be disregarded.

RESOLVED –

that, in consequence of a unilateral undertaking under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) having been entered into to secure the contributions set out in the report, planning permission be granted subject to the following 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. Construction of the development hereby permitted shall not take place before 8am or after 6pm Mondays to Fridays, before 8am or after 1pm on Saturdays and not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays.
3. No windows or doors, other than those shown on the plans hereby approved, shall be inserted in the walls of this development unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
4. The walls shall be finished in render to match the colour, texture and style of the existing building. If the render of the existing building (which is currently unpainted) were to be painted, the render of the development shall be painted the same colour unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The roof tiles shall resemble those used on the existing house. The window frames (except those of the proposed roof-lights) shall be white to resemble those of the existing house.
5. The rear gardens shall be arranged as shown on drawing 14/VM-6B. The two flats shall both have access to the shared rear garden and to the 2 parking spaces at the end of that shared garden. The new fence that is to separate the two rear gardens shall not exceed 2m in height, nor shall the existing brick boundary wall have its height increased to more than 2m. The proposed new gate connecting the rear garden of the house to the rear service road shall be installed as shown on drawing 14/VM-6B and its height shall not exceed 2m.
6. The new section of hardstanding that is to form the parking area at the foot of the rear garden shall be constructed in such a way that any rain water falling on the hardstanding shall soak away into the soil within the site, and shall not run off onto land outside the site, nor enter public drains or sewers.
7. The flats shall not be occupied until the two parking spaces have been created as shown on the drawings hereby approved, including the lowering or partial removal of boundary walls to create visibility splays as shown on drawing 14/VM-6B.

Informatives

1. The planning officer's full report gives more detail than is to be found in the Decision Notice. The full report can be obtained from the Council's website [www.watford.gov.uk](http://www.watford.gov.uk), where it is to be found as an appendix to the agenda of the meeting of the Development Control Committee of 28 August 2014. Alternatively a copy can be provided on request by the Regeneration and Development Department.

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. The applicant was provided with pre-application advice.

3. The applicant is reminded that this planning permission does not obviate the need to obtain the separate consent of the owner of the adjoining property prior to commencing building works on, under, above or immediately adjacent to their property (e.g. foundations or guttering). The Party Wall Etc Act 1996 contains requirements to serve notice on adjoining owners of property under certain circumstances, and a procedure exists for resolving disputes. This is a matter of civil law between the two parties, and the Local Planning Authority are not involved in such matters. A free guide called "The Party Wall Etc Act 1996: Explanatory Booklet" is available on the website of the Department for Communities and Local Government.

4. This planning permission is accompanied by a planning obligation in the form of a unilateral undertaking, which is binding upon the owners and their successors in title. It obliges the owners to make certain contributions to local services and infrastructure when work commences on implementing this permission. It includes an obligation to inform the Local Planning Authority when work commences by contacting the Section 106 Co-Ordinator in the Planning department.

5. The development will involve the creation of addresses for new properties. The applicant must apply to the Council to allocate a street number or name. This is a requirement of the Public Health Act 1925. Applications for this purpose should be made to the Local Land and Property Gazetteer Officer at Watford Borough Council, Town Hall, Watford, WD17 3EX.

Drawing numbers

Site location plan; 14/VM-1; 14/VM-3; 14/VM-4A; 14/VM-5A; 14/VM-6B.

25

**7, 9, 15 BRIDLE PATH**

The Committee received a report of the Development Management Section Head including the relevant planning history of the site and details of one letter in response to the application.

The Major Cases and Enforcement Manager drew the meeting's attention to the Update Sheet and noted that a formal request by the applicant for an extension of time for the completion of the section 106 undertaking had been agreed by the Development Management Section Head. Recommendation B had consequently been changed to allow time for the undertaking to be checked.

Councillor Jeffree advised that, were the Committee to approve the outline plans whilst not raising concerns regarding the details, it would be difficult to reverse their decision at a later date. He added that he would wish to see drawings of the proposal in the context of the surrounding buildings. In particular he would wish to understand the impact the proposal would have on the listed buildings: the hotel and former stables range.

Councillor Jeffree proposed that the application be deferred in order to request that the developer provide greater details.

Councillor Watkin said that the proposal was unclear. He advised that the site was a somewhat confused area and that the 'mix' of residential / office space needed to be clarified before the Committee could agree and approve the application.

Councillor Derbyshire agreed with Councillor Jeffree's point that greater detail could have been provided. He drew attention to the nearby Holiday Inn which he considered to be an attractive building. He felt that the entrance to the hotel should not be downgraded by the sight of refuse bins and general residential 'clutter' associated with the proposed development.

The Major Cases and Enforcement Manager pointed out that the current application was for outline planning permission. He noted that the developer had asked for extra time in order to complete the s.106 undertaking and suggested that this would provide an opportunity to request information on further details.

The Major Cases and Enforcement Manager stressed that the developer did not seek approval for design within the current application. Were the Committee to find the design unacceptable at the next stage of application, they could refuse to approve a reserved matters application at that point.

With regard to Councillor Watkins' concerns regarding the 'mix' of uses, the Major Cases and Enforcement Manager advised that conditions 14 and 15 set appropriate parameters and that this should help to address those concerns.

Addressing matters relevant to the Holiday Inn, the Major Cases and Enforcement Manager advised that the application would have no unfavourable effect on the hotel. Bins and cycles were currently left adjacent to the hotel's entrance; the proposal would have no more adverse impact than the current arrangements.

The Major Cases and Enforcement Manager agreed that additional details could be requested if desired.

The Chair asked whether the Committee would have adequate powers to refuse a reserved matters application at the site at a later date if they agreed the design parameters within the current proposal.

The Major Cases and Enforcement Manager advised that the current application asked only for access arrangements to be approved. He assured the meeting that if the applicant wished to continue with the development, detailed plans would be submitted at a later date. The application could be refused then if Members were not satisfied with the proposals.

Councillor Sharpe agreed that possible unacceptable designs should be dealt with at the next stage in the procedure. There were no grounds for refusal at the current time.

Councillor Sharpe reminded the meeting that refusal was only appropriate where harm could result from the scheme going ahead. He drew attention to page 44 of the agenda and noted that, as the Council's design team had concluded that there would be 'less than substantial harm', there could be no reason to refuse the application. Were Members to consider that the outline plan was unacceptable then they should vote for a refusal; alternatively they should wait until the reserved matters came to Committee.

The Chair said that he too had a degree of unease regarding the application and advised that it would be possible to defer a decision whilst awaiting further information in addition to the likely impact on the listed building. He cautioned the Committee that there was insufficient reason to refuse the application outright.

Councillor Jeffree MOVED that the decision be deferred pending;

- the receipt of additional information regarding the impact of the proposal in the context of the area and nearby heritage assets
- the provision of 3-D views from all vistas in order to assess the proposal's massing and impact on the area.

On being put to the committee the Motion was CARRIED

RESOLVED –

That the decision be deferred pending receipt of additional information regarding the building's massing and impact on the surrounding area and nearby heritage assets.

26

## **BOUNDARY WAY**

The Committee received a report of the Development Management Section Head including the relevant planning history of the site and details of thirteen

letters in response to the application; one in support of the application and the others making objections.

The Major Cases and Enforcement Manager advised that all Members of the Committee had attended a site visit. He noted the Update Sheet and explained that a s.106 unilateral undertaking had been received to secure the heads of terms as set out in Recommendation (A) of the report and that Recommendation (B) was no longer required.

The Chair invited Catherine Birch to address the Committee.

Ms Birch advised that she was a resident in Boundary Way and then described the estate. She noted that many homes had no front gardens, no private driveways on which to park and no windows at the front of their homes. She further noted that the design had won an award for maximum density when it had been built in the 1970s. Ms Birch advised, however, that whilst the plans might have appeared good, the reality was not so pleasant.

With regard to the proposals in the application, she agreed that although some were positive others would have a negative effect on residents. She considered that the changes would lead to overcrowding and would impede sunlight and outlook.

Ms Birch commented on the proposed design stating that less grass and more alleyways would inevitably result in increased noise pollution. She added that since there would be more concrete and fewer grassed areas there would be fewer places where children could play.

Ms Birch considered that the designs would also result in parking problems. She enumerated the planned spaces and calculated that there would be insufficient parking availability for visitors.

Ms Birch concluded by affirming that residents realised that there was a need for more homes but asked that they not be built on the Boundary Way estate.

The Chair invited Mr Euan Barr of the Watford Community Housing Trust to address the Committee.

Mr Barr advised that the Trust had made a commitment to make considerable investment in the estate: thirty four new affordable homes would be built in addition to increased parking. Existing parking spaces would be enhanced and extended. The existing depot would be purchased by the Trust and the housing supply increased.

Mr Barr said that a number of garages would be removed and additional parking installed with the resultant benefit of passive surveillance.

Mr Barr noted the improvements inherent in the scheme: more affordable homes, improved parking facilities and extra amenity space. He concluded by



stating that he considered the application to be a well designed and relevant proposal.

The Chair then invited Councillor K Collett, a ward councillor for Woodside ward to address the meeting.

Councillor Collett noted that the estate had been built in the 1970s as a joint collaboration between Watford Borough Council (WBC) and Three Rivers District Council (TRDC).

Councillor Collett considered that the current application did not allow for adequate parking and noted that, since most homes housed more than one driver, the plans would make conditions worse for residents. She commented that the proposed parking spaces would not be near the homes and would also restrict the width of the road. Narrowing of the road would impact on access for emergency vehicles.

Councillor Collett said that whilst residents supported some aspects of the scheme, such as the Hub, she felt that, although targets had been met in general, residents' needs had not been considered. As examples of residents' needs, Councillor Collett noted the lack of privacy and amenity space. She pointed out that Boundary Way had houses in close proximity to one another and that there was a need to retain green spaces.

Councillor Collett advised that TRDC had questioned various aspects of the scheme. She suggested that it would be wise for the Committee to wait until these questions had been answered before making their final decision.

The Chair asked the Major Cases and Enforcement Manager to address the question of parking and overlooking as noted by the speakers.

The Major Cases and Enforcement Manager advised that a professional parking survey had been conducted at 1.00 a.m. over two nights and results evaluated and tabled at page 101 of the agenda. It was noted that there remained a significant number of free spaces on the estate at the time of the survey and that, whilst there was a degree of illegal parking, spaces were still available at that time.

The Major Cases and Enforcement Manager agreed that residents preferred to park outside their homes but that the design of the estate prevented this. He noted that many homes were only accessible via alleyways and advised that although this scheme of design would not be considered acceptable today, it was necessary for the developers to work with the design as it now existed. The scheme as proposed would provide a surplus of 43 spaces in which to park.

On the matter of noise, the Major Cases and Enforcement Manager advised that this nuisance was currently exacerbated due to many garages on the estate facing onto the highway; the presence of grass or trees would not lessen noise pollution.

The Major Cases and Enforcement Manager referred to comments regarding TRDC and advised that the Committee could not take into account that part of Boundary Way which lay in TRDC. He reminded Members that they had a statutory duty to determine the application which was within the WBC area.

The officer concluded by noting that there had been no objections to the proposals in Area D (within WBC's boundaries) and that Areas F and G were in TRDC.

Councillor Sharpe agreed that the application could not be refused on the basis of those parts of the estate which were in the TRDC area. He said that the areas of development in WBC were broadly acceptable and confirmed that the Committee had no jurisdiction over TRDC.

Councillor Derbyshire expressed his sympathy with residents but considered that the objectives of WCHT were good and that the proposals would result in improvements for the estate. As an example, he advised that the standard of construction would be significantly better for the new homes than those built in the 1970s. He said that the garages were unsightly and unused and that it would be wise to remove them.

Councillor Derbyshire then addressed the subject of parking and said that he was satisfied that the proposals would increase parking space and, moreover, make the spaces themselves more attractive. He said that he felt that the advantages of the changes far outweighed the disadvantages.

Councillors Bell and Bashir both considered that the proposed changes were a great improvement. They noted the regeneration of the play areas, the increases in housing and the extra parking and agreed that there were no planning reasons for a refusal.

In response to a question from Councillor Bashir, the Major Cases and Enforcement Manager advised that the majority of homes would be for affordable rent but that an element of social housing would be located in the TRDC portion of the estate.

Councillor Johnson noted Condition 3 in the recommendations and MOVED that construction take place between Monday and Friday only.

On being put to the Committee the Motion was CARRIED.

The Major Cases and Enforcement Manager pointed out that it would be better if TRDC also agreed to work only Monday to Friday. He agreed to inform TRDC of the Committee's decision on this matter.

RESOLVED –

that planning permission be granted subject to the completion of an agreement under s.106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the following obligations and subject to the conditions listed below:

## Section 106 Heads of Terms

- i) To secure the provision of fire hydrants as required by the County Council in accordance with Policy H10 of the Watford District Plan 2000.
- ii) To secure all of the 11 new dwellings within Watford Borough as affordable housing.

## Conditions

1. The development to which this permission relates shall be begun within a period of 3 years commencing on the date of this permission.

2. The development shall only be constructed in accordance with the following approved drawings, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority:

422\_PL\_001B, 002B, 003, 004B, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016A, 017A, 018, 019, 020, 050, 051, 052, 053

C-120217-X-00-DRG-100\_1.0, 101\_1.0, 102\_1.0, 103\_1.0, 104\_1.0, 105\_1.0, 106\_1.0, 200\_1.0, 201\_1.0, 202\_1.0, 203\_1.0, 204\_1.0, 205\_1.0, 206\_1.0

3. Construction of the development hereby permitted shall not take place before 8am or after 6pm Mondays to Fridays, and not at all on Saturdays, Sundays and Public Holidays.

4. No development shall commence until the scheme has been registered with the Considerate Constructors Scheme and a certificate of registration has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The construction shall be carried out in accordance with the requirements of this scheme.

5. No development shall commence until a Development Phasing Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This Plan shall include for each phase a site plan delineating the following works to be undertaken in that phase:

- i) the dwellings to be constructed;
- ii) the parking spaces to be constructed;
- iii) the garages to be refurbished;
- iv) the improvement works to be undertaken within the highway;
- v) the footpath improvement works to be undertaken.

No dwelling shall be occupied in any given phase until all works within that phase and each preceding phase have been completed in full, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

6. No development shall commence within any phase as approved in the Development Phasing Plan until a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority for that phase. This Plan shall include details of contractors' parking, arrangements for the delivery and storage of materials, any temporary access/egress points to adjoining highways, measures to mitigate noise and dust, and wheel washing facilities. The Plan as approved shall be implemented throughout the construction period for each phase.
7. No development shall commence within any phase until fencing of a style, height and in a position to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority shall have been erected to protect all trees which are to be retained. No materials, vehicles, fuel or any other items shall be stored or buildings erected or works carried out inside this fencing and no changes in ground level shall be made within the spread of any tree or shrubs (including hedges) without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority.
8. No demolition of the two blocks of flats shown to be demolished (nos. 274-285 and 286-297) shall commence until a further bat survey has been undertaken, to include full internal inspections of the roof voids and a bat mitigation strategy and method statement, and has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The survey shall be undertaken at least 8 weeks prior to the demolition of the buildings. The demolition shall only be undertaken in accordance with the approved bat mitigation strategy.
9. No construction works shall commence until full details and samples of the materials to be used for the external surfaces of the buildings (including walls, roofs, windows, doors, balconies and solar panels) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the approved materials.
10. No construction works shall commence until details of a lighting scheme for the development have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be installed as approved prior to the first occupation of each phase of the development to which it relates.
11. No construction works shall commence until a Design Stage Assessment has been undertaken to demonstrate that the development can achieve, as a minimum, Code Level 3 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and this has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Within 3 months of the occupation of each dwelling, a post-completion certificate, to certify that, as a minimum, Code Level 3 has been achieved, shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.
12. No removal of trees, scrub or hedges shall be carried out on the site between 1<sup>st</sup> March and 31<sup>st</sup> August in any year unless a suitably qualified ecologist has previously searched the trees, scrub or hedges and certified in writing to the Local Planning Authority that such works of removal may proceed.

13. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Flood Risk Assessment and Sustainable Drainage Strategy by Conisbee (ref. 120217/TG dated 16 June 2014) and the approved drainage layout drawings, with each hydro-brake flow control having a maximum discharge flow of 5 litres/second.
14. The existing children's play area (within Zone F) shall not be removed until full details of the new play area, including the type of play equipment to be installed, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
15. All hard surfaced areas shall be finished in accordance with the materials and details shown on approved drawing no. L-204, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
16. The approved soft landscaping scheme shown on drawing no. L-502 shall be carried out not later than the first available planting and seeding season after completion of each phase of the development to which it relates, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. 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.
17. No dwellings shall be occupied in any phase of the development until the respective refuse and recycling facilities and cycle storage facilities to serve the dwellings, as shown on the approved drawings, have been constructed. These facilities shall be retained as approved at all times.
18. No dwelling shall be occupied until the respective vehicle parking accommodation, as shown on the approved Development Phasing Plan has been provided and made available for use. This parking accommodation shall be permanently retained and shall not be used for any other purpose than the parking of vehicles of occupants of the development or visitors to the site.
19. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any modification or re-enactment thereof), no development permitted under Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B, C, D and E of the Order shall be carried out to the houses hereby approved without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority.

### Informatives

1. This planning permission is accompanied by an agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the provision of affordable housing and the provision of necessary fire hydrants to serve the development.

2. This planning permission grants consent only for that part of the proposed development within Watford Borough. Any development within Three Rivers District can only be granted planning permission by Three Rivers District Council.

Drawing numbers

422\_PL\_001B, 002B, 003, 004B, 005, 006, 007, 008, 009, 010, 011, 012, 013, 014, 015, 016A, 017A, 018, 019, 020, 050, 051, 052, 053  
C-120217-X-00-DRG-100\_1.0, 101\_1.0, 102\_1.0, 103\_1.0, 104\_1.0, 105\_1.0, 106\_1.0, 200\_1.0, 201\_1.0, 202\_1.0, 203\_1.0, 204\_1.0, 205\_1.0, 206\_1.0

Chair

The Meeting started at 8.30 pm  
and finished at 10.00 pm