
BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

GENERAL PURPOSES COMMITTEE

**Held on Wednesday, 7 November 2007 at 10.00 am in
Norfolk Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

PRESENT

Mr R.W. Duffield (Chairman)	Mrs K. Millbank
Mr P.J. Duigan (Vice-Chairman)	Mr D.S. Myers
Mr G.P. Balaam	Mr I. Sherwood
Mr S.H. Chapman-Allen	Mr W.H.C. Smith
Mr R.P. Childerhouse	Mrs L.S. Turner

In Attendance

Sue Daniels	- Electoral Services Manager
Sian Harland	- Senior Committee Officer
Michael Horn	- Head of Legal Services
Stephen McGrath	- Principal Committee Officer
Patrick O'Brien	- Technical Officer - Licensing
Keith Stevens	- Acting Business Transformation Director
Ian Vargeson	- Democratic Services Manager

Action By

62/07 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)

(a) Revised Health and Safety Policies and Procedures (Minute No. 59/07)

It was noted that the Harassment and Bullying Prevention Policy should have been included among the policies which had been implemented.

RESOLVED that the Harassment and Bullying Prevention Policy be implemented with immediate effect.

(b) Out of Hours Services (Minute Item 60/07)

On 25 October 2007 Council had agreed to the request of the Chairman of the General Purposes Committee to defer this item and refer it back to General Purposes for further discussion.

The original decision read as follows:-

RECOMMEND to Council that the Out of Hours Service be approved as set out in option 4.1 of the report, subject to the inclusion of the amendments shown in bold, as follows:

- (1) The Policy of Breckland Council is not to provide a service out of hours; except in life threatening or emergency '*Blue Light*' requests, **and at the Manager's discretion.**

Action By

- (2) **The call outs that have not been 'Blue Light' emergencies must be reported and reviewed within six months.**
- (3) There is a flat standby payment of £100 per week for an Officer on standby.
- (4) Callout and telephone calls that extend into overtime are claimed as overtime **or time off in lieu as appropriate.**
- (5) The Working Time Directive and HASAWA 1974 are integral to operating out of office hours working.
- (6) Implement the Out of Hours Policy and Procedure and review this within six months.
- (7) Amend the contract of employment for each designation of Officer in scope to include a clause requiring them to participate in a standby rota if requested.

Members agreed that recommendation one and two regarding call outs for 'Blue Light' emergencies were clear and acceptable.

With regard to recommendation three, six and seven it was agreed that these should be amalgamated. However, it should be made clear that Human Resources should review, within six months, the standby payment arrangements and produce a model, which was equitable to all parties, which should include incorporating a lump sum into officers' salaries which they would retain if they took a different post which required out of hours working. This sum would be consolidated and would therefore attract pay increases and would be pensionable. If agreed the contracts of employment of officers receiving this payment would be amended to include a clause requiring them to participate in a standby rota, if requested. Services Managers would be requested to provide information relating to how many staff in their service area would be affected which would provide the final cost implications.

In respect of recommendation four and five it was agreed that the Human Resources Team together with the Service Managers should review the overtime arrangements for callout and telephone calls that extend into overtime but should be being mindful of the Working Time Directive and HASAWA 1974 which was integral to operating out of office hours working.

Members discussed the possibility of recouping costs when officers had been called out to incidents involving such things as dilapidated buildings where the owner was at fault for allowing the property to fall into disrepair. Another example would be when owners persistently allowed their dogs to stray which caused the dog warden to be called out. This list was not exhaustive and costs should be reclaimed wherever possible.

Action By

RESOLVED that

- (1) the Policy of Breckland Council is not to provide a service out of hours; except in life threatening or emergency '*Blue Light*' requests, and at the Manager's discretion.
- (2) the call outs that have not been '*Blue Light*' emergencies must be reported and reviewed within six months.
- (3) the flat standby payment of £100 per week be maintained until the Human Resources Team have reviewed, within six months, the standby payment arrangements and produce a model which was equitable to all parties, which should include incorporating a lump sum into officers' salaries which they would retain if they took a different post which required out of hours working. This sum would be consolidated and would therefore attract pay increases and would be pensionable. If agreed the contracts of employment of officers receiving this payment would be amended to include a clause requiring them to participate in a standby rota if requested. Service Managers to provide information relating to how many staff in their service area would be affected which would provide the final cost implications.
- (4) the Human Resources Team together with the Service Managers review the overtime arrangements for callout and telephone calls that extend into overtime being mindful of the Working Time Directive and HASAWA 1974 which is integral to operating out of office hours working.
- (5) where possible costs associated with out of hours payments be reclaimed for such incidents relating to stray dogs and dilapidated buildings.

(c) **Adoption**

Subject to the above the Minutes of the meeting held on 19 September 2007 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

63/07 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 2)

An apology for absence was received from Mr D.R. Williams.

64/07 LOCAL JOINT CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE : DATE 13 SEPTEMBER 2007 (AGENDA ITEM 5)

(a) **Out of Hours Services (Minute No. 22/07)**

This item had been discussed at Minute No. 62b and the recommendations of the Local Joint Consultative Committee with regard to Out of Hours Services were not approved.

Action By

(b) Adoption

RESOLVED that, subject to 6407 (a) above, the Minutes of the Joint Local Joint Consultative Committee meeting held on 13 September 2007 be adopted.

65/07 LICENSING TEAM SERVICE PLAN (AGENDA ITEM 6)

The Principal Environmental Health Officer informed Members that the Council's Service Team Plan and local government best practice required that the Licensing Team's work followed an agreed Service Plan. Best Value Performance Indicator 166 scored enforcement best practice within Environmental Health and required such a service plan.

Legislation which impacted on the work of the Licensing Team was as follows:-

Licensing Act 2003

This would be the major area of work in 2007/2008. The Team aimed to visit all licensed premises to risk rate them in accordance with the procedure agreed with the Licensing Committee in Appendix B.

However, experience suggested that the visits themselves generated considerable work as the Team became aware of the need for licence transfers, Designated Premises Supervisor variations, Gambling Act issues etc.

Smoke Free Legislation

The Health Act 2006 introduced a ban on smoking in virtually all workplaces and vehicles. The Principal Environmental Health Officer led the implementation of this new legislation but significant issues included compliance in licensed premises and 'taxis' where the Licensing Team would have considerable involvement.

Gambling Act 2005

This was a major piece of legislation passing responsibility from Magistrates Courts to Local Authorities for a variety of premises/activities. The Licensing Team produced a Statement of Particulars on how it would deal with the Gambling Act and applications made under it and this had been adopted by Full Council. During 2007/2008 the Team would have to prepare guidance and application processes for many new types of licence which would be time consuming.

All premises would be visited as part of a Licensing Act 2003 inspection. The Licensing Team had made a point of visiting the premises most affected by the introduction of the Gambling Act 2005, e.g. potential adult gaming centres/family entertainment centres. It was expected that other licensed premises would be visited in 2007/2008, the majority in combination with the Licensing Act inspection to avoid duplication.

Changes to Taxi Licensing Function

In early 2007 the Licensing Team completely overhauled the 'taxi' licensing procedures and standards. The implementation of these new standards and enforcement of them would take considerable time in late 2007/early 2008 but it was anticipated this would lead to an improved standard of vehicles and public safety. As part of the licensing processes the Team would ensure that:

- Every vehicle would receive a mechanical test and its MOT certificate would be checked.
- All vehicles would have their insurance checked.
- All drivers applying for or renewing their licences would have an enhanced Criminal Records Bureau check.
- All drivers applying for or renewing their licences would have their DVLA licence checked.

The Team anticipated considerable work in 2007/2008 as a result of effective enforcement due to:

- The bedding in of the new and approved standards.
- Increased out of hours monitoring.
- The introduction and use of the new penalty points system.

It was anticipated that there would be an increase in private hire licenses due to the repeal of an exemption in Section 75 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 relating to contract hire, e.g. school run vehicles. This could include hospital cars and community car schemes although not for profit schemes would not be affected.

The Team had increased the number of garages which could service taxis within the District.

Introduction of Skin Piercing Regulations

Wider byelaws allowing regulation of 'cosmetic piercing' rather than just acupuncture, ear piercing, electrolysis and tattooing were currently with the Department of Health for adoption. This registration function was carried out by the Health and Safety Team but would impact on the Technical Admin Officer who serve both teams.

Nightsafe

The Licensing Team was playing a lead role in partnership with Norfolk Constabulary and introducing Nightsafe which was a partnership project aimed at sharing information, coordinating resources and intelligence aimed at making the night time economy a success whilst helping reduce the fear of crime and disorder.

Action By

Members queried whether BVPI 166 would improve as a result of the Service Plan. In response the Principal Environmental Health Officer stated that at one time Health and Safety and Licensing produced one Service Plan which covered both areas. However, as a result of the increase in legislation relating to licensing it was agreed that the Licensing Team should produce its own Service Plan which would therefore be a necessity to fulfil BVPI 166.

With regard to the use of contractors to alleviate the workload the Principal Environmental Health Officer stated that all work was undertaken in-house. However, there was the capacity to employ a temporary member of staff to assist the Team from time to time. Further to this a reasonable fee was charged for all licences which enabled the Team to recover a portion of its costs.

In response to queries regarding 'surprise visits' the Principal Environmental Health Officer informed Members that premises inspections were often 'surprise visits'. However, if there was a need to speak to proprietor in person an appointment would be made. Members were further informed that the Licensing Team also made night visits, accompanied by the police, to nightclubs and pubs.

The Chairman of the Licensing Committee thanked the Principal Environmental Health Officer and his Team for all the work undertaken in relation to the above legislation.

RESOLVED that the Licensing Team Service Plan for 2007/2008 be approved and adopted.

66/07 WATTON – REQUEST FOR DESIGNATION UNDER CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND POLICE ACT (AGENDA ITEM 7)

The Democratic Services Manager informed Members that Watton Town Council had requested that the District Council make an Order under the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 for the designation of an area within which the consumption of alcohol in public places may be challenged by a Police Officer.

The power for a District Council to make such an Order was contained in Sections 12 to 15 of the Act. The procedure was set out in regulations made under the Act. The effect of an Order would be to empower the Police to ask persons drinking in public places in a designated area to stop; failure to do so would lead to confiscation of the alcohol and failure to surrender the alcohol without reasonable excuse was an arrestable offence.

Before making an Order the local authority was required to consult the Police, the Parish Council (and any adjoining Parish Councils that may be affected by the designation), licensed premises and the owners or occupiers of any land proposed to be identified. Any representations received had to be taken into account before an Order was made.

The Watton Town Council had already been in contact with the Police, at whose suggestion the proposed designation had been drawn up.

Action By

Before making an Order, the District Council must publish a press notice identifying clearly the place proposed to be designated, setting out the effect of the Order and inviting representations. An Order could not be made until at least 28 days after that. Following the making of an Order, and before it took effect, the local authority must publish a further notice which, amongst other things, indicated the date on which the Order came in. Any objections to the Order would be presented to the General Purposes Committee.

Before an Order could take effect, signs must be erected in the designated area. These must be sufficient in number and location to draw the attention of members of the public to the area covered by the Order. Siting was normally agreed with the Highway Authority. In the past the signs had been made of metal but new cheaper signs were now constructed of cardboard. It was hoped that the Home Office would provide funding for signage. Watton Town Council had indicated that it might consider making a contribution once the final cost of making the order was known. Members agreed that even though a contribution had not been requested from other Town Councils with designation orders, as Watton Town Council had offered it should be approached to request a contribution.

RESOLVED that

- (1) an Order under section 12 of the Criminal Justice and Police Act 2001 be made for Watton, for the area indicated, subject to formal consultation resulting in no objections;
- (2) a further report will be made to the Committee on any unresolved objections; and
- (3) once the final cost for the making of the order was known Watton Town Council be approached to request a contribution.

67/07 REVIEW OF POLLING DISTRICTS AND PLACES (AGENDA ITEM 8)

Before the Democratic Services Manager presented the report the Chairman wished to thank the Working Group on the Review of Polling Districts and Places for the work they had undertaken.

The Democratic Services Manager informed Members that the Working Group had taken account of a submission from the Returning Officer, which was a requirement of the review process, as well as observations received from all parties. A draft summary of the Working Group's findings and recommendations was attached to the report. The Working Group had met before the General Purposes Committee and had agreed with the draft and confirmed the report.

In carrying out the review, the Working Group sought to ensure that:

- All electors had such reasonable facilities for voting as is practicable in the circumstances.
- So far as was reasonable and practicable, the polling places were accessible to all electors.

Action By

The Working Group accepted that there were some places that fell short of the full recommended criteria, but where in practice there was no viable alternative (a fact acknowledged by the Electoral Commission). The Working Group had taken account of all observations received, before coming to its conclusions, which were believed to be the best available currently.

It was noted that there was a need to find alternatives to using caravans at polling stations but these continue to be used in the event of there being no other option.

In Thetford an additional station had been introduced to serve the Cloverfields development (Cloverfield Church and Community Hall). An adjustment was needed to the Register to ensure that electors in that part of the Guildhall Ward were directed to the most convenient station.

The Working Group acknowledged that consultation had given rise to comments on some aspects of electoral arrangements which were outside the scope of the current review, for example the need for alteration of existing boundaries.

RECOMMEND to Council that

- (1) the proposals for polling districts and places put forward by the Working Group is adopted; and
- (2) the conclusions of the review and all related correspondence and evidence be publicised in accordance with Electoral Commission guidance.

68/07 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC (AGENDA ITEM 9)

On the advice of the Council's Solicitor it was agreed that the application for the grant of a licence for a sex establishment be heard above the line. However, the Committee would move to exclude the press and public if Members felt the need to ask questions which would be considered confidential under the categories of exempt information under Section 100 (A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972.

69/07 APPLICATION FOR A SEX SHOP LICENCE (AGENDA ITEM 10)

The following were present for the Application to Grant a Licence for a Sex Establishment on the First Floor of Unit 1, Cloverfield Industrial Estate, Lopham Road, East Harling:-

Applicant – Mr Christopher Bottrell, Mr B. Hardie (Applicant's Representative), Mrs Kathryn Bottrell (Wife of Applicant)

Objectors – Mr Nigel George (Solicitor) on behalf of Mr Andrew Taylor and Reverend Nigel Kinsella (Observer)

The Chairman introduced the Officers present and gave a brief description of their role in relation to the hearing of the application.

Action By

All those present were informed of the procedure the General Purposes Committee would follow and all agreed to that procedure.

The Technical Officer – Licensing presented his report which outlined the details of the application. The applicant was requesting a licence for a sex establishment on the First Floor of Unit 1, Cloverfield Industrial Estate, Lopham Road, East Harling. It was against this application that objections had been made.

The applicant was afforded the opportunity of making a presentation to the Committee on the application.

Applicant – Mr B. Hardie on behalf of Mr Christopher Bottrell

- The application had been made under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982.
- The application was for a sex shop not a cinema or a sex encounter.
- It was purely an application for the sale of adult material by retail either in person, mail order or internet.
- As the applicant wished to sell adult material an application had to be made.
- The type of product which would be for sale may be known to the Committee as they would be similar to that of the Ann Summers chain which was a £110 million business.
- Mr Bottrell was the freehold owner of the unit which was on a small industrial estate and would require planning permission for change of use.
- This was a chicken and egg scenario as the applicant had not been sure whether to apply for the licence or the planning permission first. As the grant of a licence would be the more difficult of the two applications Mr Hardie had advised Mr Bottrell to seek the licence first. However, Mr Bottrell had approached the Planning Team of Breckland Council and had received a letter on 18 August 2007 that it would not be a material change of use.
- The sex shop would only operate on the first floor as the ground floor would be used to the wholesale import and export of 18 rated videos.
- There were no windows and there would be no shop front with pictures. It was an industrial unit where personal customers could browse just like any other shop.
- The predicted sales for the personal side of the business would only be £12,000 per year.
- It would be an incidental business to the wholesale.
- The applicant expected no more than 4 – 5 customers per day.
- There were eight units on the site and only two were occupied.
- The owner of the other active unit had sent his best wishes and understood that no disruptions would take place. The owner had asked that no fixed signage be erected and this had been agreed by the applicant. Any signage would be mobile and would be removed when the shop was closed.
- The applicant was requesting opening hours until 9.00 pm and this would allow personal shoppers an exclusive half hour browse.

Action By

- The products on sale would be mainstream lingerie and marital aids.
- Impact on the industrial site would be minimal. It was not the most attractive site and in reality this was a specialist market; products would also be sold via the internet and mail order.
- There was a big market for this kind of merchandise and the Ann Summers shop in Norwich was prominent if Members wished to go and see the type of product which would be on offer.
- It was a very specialist shop which was almost hidden away and most residents would not be aware that the shop existed.
- Conditions would be imposed to protect the interests of children. The applicant had 3 young children of his own and his family lived in East Harling.

The Committee was afforded the opportunity of asking the applicant relevant questions, reproduced below with answers provided.

Under the regulations the relevant character of the locality and the use of the premises was a consideration. You have indicated that your customers would only be invited by invitation; would you be open to customers who hadn't made an appointment?

Between 9.00 am and 6.00 pm we will be open but we open after 6.00 pm for a customer to come and see us at a specific time.

How would customers know that you have a shop?

We will be placing advertisements in the local press.

Would you turn away customers if they had not made an appointment after 6.00 pm?

From 6.00 pm until 9.00 pm would be by appointment only.

The objectors were afforded the opportunity of asking the applicant relevant questions, as follows:

You will have an ever growing business if you want the shop to be a success and would want to exceed £12,000 per year. A lot of products you sell will be expensive. Will you, realistically, be aiming to attract quite a number of customers?

Only part of the shop will be for customers and we don't want to attract lots of business.

Will they be able to find you after dark?

We have sufficient lighting outside the shop.

There is one external light and no pavement it won't be easy trying to find you through East Harling in the dark.

It will be easy to find us.

Action By

On the photographs it looks as if you only have parking for one or two cars and any more would block the access.

There were four designated parking spaces – two outside the shop and with other spaces at the other side of the industrial estate. However, you could fit six cars in the space outside the shop.

Would any of them have difficulty of getting in and out?

No.

If you don't want to attract customers why are you advertising?

The £12,000 turnover was a rough estimate and we would use the cheapest form of advertising which would be the yellow free ads at £40 per month. We want to be very discreet and almost exclusive. We just want to have an outlet in addition to the wholesale business. If we wanted to have a shop we would have chosen a different location.

With the wholesale business do you use mail order or do the customers pick-up?

We use a courier service but some local shops arrange for a pick-up.

The objector was afforded the opportunity of making a presentation to the Committee on the application.

Objector – Mr Nigel George (Solicitor) on behalf of Mr Andrew Taylor

- If this application was for an Ann Summers on the high street I would have to ask myself whether I would be here. It is not on the high street but in the location of East Harling on an industrial estate.
- Mr George circulated two plans showing the location of the premises.
- As you can see the premises lies between the A11 and the A1066 and is a rural setting which you would have no cause to go to unless you were living in the village.
- The industrial estate was very close to a large housing development and my client's property is next door.
- There was space for at least 200 – 300 houses and that land currently led to the rear of people's gardens. It was in close proximity to where a number of people were living.
- The grounds to refuse included the character of the area and also whether the shop was inappropriate to the character and locality.
- It was in a residential area in East Harling which was an established village. East Harling primary school and nursery was only half a mile away and there were 2 campsites in the vicinity.
- There was no regular police presence in East Harling.
- There was no footway and little lighting outside the premises.
- You would not have seen the notice of the proposal unless you had stood outside the premises and you would just drive past the notice pinned to the tree.

Action By

- The Committee should have regard to these grounds as well as the justification of refusal on the grounds of whether the application would exceed the number of sex establishments in the locality. There was a shop in Thetford and there were six in Norwich. Was there a need for another sex shop when a customer could go to either Thetford or Norwich?
- Other local authorities had policies which related to whether the sex establishment would be located near a church, school or leisure facilities and the location of this sex shop would be near all these facilities.
- There would be not problem with having a sex shop on the high street but there are concerns with customers coming to a rural community for sex products.
- Many people may come to the area at night and not being able to find the shop may be knocking on people's doors asking for directions.
- The Parish Council has raised objections but was unaware that this was being applied for.
- Reverend Nigel Kinsella was surprised and local residents would be concerned had they known.
- There were concerns with regard to the nature of some people wishing to find the sex shop.
- Would it be safe for children to be playing outside with people trying to find a sex shop and maybe stopping and asking the children for directions?
- To site a sex establishment in that location would be wholly inappropriate.
- I have discussed the grounds for refusal with the Reverend Nigel Kinsella and he is happy to endorse those grounds.

The Committee was afforded the opportunity of asking the objector questions, as follows:

You mention that the larger area behind the industrial estate will be developed for residential use is this in the local plan?

It's a large area of scrubland and it's not known whether this is within the settlement boundary. It may be just outside.

So it's very much a possibility rather than a probability that this area will be developed?

It's next to the industrial estate; it's not being used and is a brownfield site.

So there is no planning permission and no current planning application?

It is my client's intention to apply for planning permission.

The objectors were afforded the opportunity of asking the applicant questions, as follows:

With regard to the notices these were adjacent to the premises for 21 days and were displayed in an area where the public could see. There were two notices which were in quite large print.

Action By

The Council's Solicitor interjected and stated that no-one had made allegations about the statutory notices and requested that Mr Hardie address the objector with any questions.

Have your clients applied for planning permission?

There were two empty industrial units and my client will be developing these units.

So your client hasn't got planning permission?

No.

The applicant was afforded the opportunity of summarising his reasons for the application to the Committee.

- Mr Hardie stated that he had no idea how many houses were sited near to the location of the industrial estate but only four had correctly made objections and these were shown on a plan. There were twenty houses shown on the plan whose occupants had not objected and they probably would have known about the application if the four households which had complained knew about the application. It is unbelievable that the other people were not aware of the application.
- Why East Harling? Mr and Mrs Bottrell both live in East Harling and they own the premises and wishes to utilise the first floor of those premises.
- The Planning Department has been approached and you have heard the response. The applicant intends to apply for a proper change of use.
- The application was advertised properly and Mr Bottrell has CCTV evidence of all those who read the notice.
- Four houses had made objections but the remaining houses had not.
- This would be a low key operation and most of the sales would be by mail order and internet and would be sent by courier or posted.
- The premises were on an industrial estate which was quite unattractive with only one other occupied unit by Waterfront Manufacturing who had sent a letter of support.
- Apologies that the application was not for a sex establishment in the high street with neon signs.
- It has been said that the premises were near a church but this was at the other side of the village and was at the edge of the village boundary.
- People would only go there for one intent and purpose: to use the shop.
- A licence was needed to sell by mail order and the internet.
- There had been no indication that the vicinity of the sex shop would be detrimental to the area.

Action By

The objector was afforded the opportunity of summarising his reasons for the application to the Committee.

- Two applications were needed before the applicant could use the premises as a sex establishment, one for the licence and one for planning permission. It would be imperative that the Committee regard this as totally separate to the planning application.
- Where would be the proper place for a sex establishment in a high street or a rural community where customers would have to drive through that rural community to get the shop?
- It had been stated that the applicant did not want many customers and would only want the licence for occasional use. However, the applicant was seeking to bring people to the property into an area where a lot of families lived.
- The notice was placed in a location where there was no pavement and there was no real need to walk past the premises and therefore a lot of people would have been ignorant of the application. Reverend Nigel Kinsella knew nothing about the application.

The Principal Environmental Health Officer stated that he had nothing to add and stated that the applicant had complied with the law with regard to the notices.

The Council's Solicitor stated that the licence application had to be decided upon completely separately and the change of use planning application was not relevant and the application must be considered on its own merits. Members were informed that there had been no evidence to refuse the application on mandatory grounds. Therefore Members must consider whether or not the application could be refused on discretionary grounds. Any refusal would have to be justifiable and be evidenced as the applicant had a right of appeal to the magistrates' court.

The Committee then retired to consider the application in private together with the Solicitor and the Senior Committee Officer.

On re-opening the meeting the Chairman informed those present of the Council's decision in the terms of the following resolution:-

RESOLVED that having carefully considered all the oral and written evidence submitted there is no sustainable reason to refuse the application and the resolution is therefore to grant the Licence for a Sex Establishment on the First Floor of Unit 1, Cloverfield Industrial Estate, Lopham Road, East Harling, Norfolk with the proviso that any future renewal shall be decided by the General Purposes Committee.

70/07 NEXT MEETING (AGENDA ITEM 11)

The next meeting of the General Purposes Committee would be held on 12 December 2007 at 10.00 am.

The meeting closed at 12.20 pm

CHAIRMAN