

**BRECKLAND COUNCIL**

**At a Meeting of the**

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE**

**Held on Monday, 29 March 2010 at 9.30 am in  
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

**PRESENT**

Councillor E. Gould (Chairman)	Mr T.J. Lamb
Mr P.J. Duigan	Mr S. J. F. Rogers
Mr P.S. Francis	Mr B. Rose
Mr M. Fanthorpe	Mr F.J. Sharpe
Mrs D.K.R. Irving	Mrs P.A. Spencer
Mr R. Kemp	Mr M. Spencer
Mr J.P. Labouchere	Mr N.C. Wilkin (Vice-Chairman)

**Also Present**

Mr S. Askew	Mr P. Hewett
Mr. A. Stasiak	

**In Attendance**

Gilbert Addison	- Tree & Countryside Officer
Heather Burlingham	- Assistant Development Control Officer
Mike Brennan	- Principal Development Control Officer
John Chinnery	- Solicitor & Standards Consultant
Sheila Cresswell	- Committee Officer
Phil Daines	- Development Services Manager (Capita Symonds for Breckland Council)
Sue Hammond	- Environmental Health Officer
Helen McAleer	- Senior Committee Officer
Nick Moys	- Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects)
Mr J. Shaw	- Norfolk County Council (Highways)

**Action By**

**51/10 MINUTES (AGENDA ITEM 1)**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 8 March 2010 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**52/10 APOLOGIES (AGENDA ITEM 2)**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C. Bowes and M. Chapman-Allen.

**53/10 DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED (AGENDA ITEM 3)**

Members and Officers were asked to declare any interest at the time the applications were introduced.

- Mrs D. Irving declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10(5) as Norfolk County Councillor for Adult Social Services.
- Mr P. Francis declared a prejudicial interest in Agenda Item 10(6) as the Chairman of the Appeals Committee which had dealt with the Tree Preservation Order on the Ash tree.

Action By

**54/10 REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA  
(AGENDA ITEM 5)**

The Development Services Manager (DSM) informed the meeting that Agenda Item 10(2) (Ref: 3PL/2009/1166F) – Attleborough: Victory Park, London Road had been deferred.

The DSM acknowledged a concern about the potential impact of major housing development planned for Attleborough, but said that this application would need to be considered via the usual process, and on its merits. The Planners would be mindful of this point when the application was brought back for consideration.

**55/10 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (STANDING ITEM) (AGENDA  
ITEM 7)**

The Principal Development Control Officer (PDCO) drew Members' attention to the fact that the Site Specific document would be put before a special meeting of the Cabinet and Overview & Scrutiny Commission on 26 April at 10.00 a.m. at Watton Sports Centre. An 800 page document produced by the LDF Task & Finish Group would be considered, covering the proposed sites and allocations for the three rural market towns, as well as local village centres and the 83 rural settlement boundaries in the District.

Subject to the Cabinet's decision, a six week public consultation process would commence on 24 May 2010.

**56/10 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 8)**

Noted.

**57/10 ATTLEBOROUGH; PROPOSED ANAEROBIC DIGESTION UNIT, LAND  
AT ATTLEBOROUGH POULTRY FARMS, OFF B1077 FOR S S  
AGRISERVICES: REFERENCE: 3PL/2009/1143/F (AGENDA ITEM 8A)**

The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) (PPO MP) presented the report. This item had been discussed by the Committee on 15 February 2010. The application had been deferred in order to gather further supporting information, as well as to invite representatives from the Environment Agency to attend, along with the applicant, to answer questions.

Members were shown photographs and drawings of the site, especially in relation to nearby buildings which included St Luke's hospital, a veterinary practice and an adjacent turkey farm. The nearest residential property was 250m away.

The PPO MP said that National and local policies were generally to encourage renewable energy projects, subject to certain criteria. He also said that the new landscaping proposed by the applicant was acceptable to the Planning Officers.

In terms of impact on surrounding properties, there had been much local opposition, with approximately 150 letters having been received, many of which raised concerns about smell and emissions. There was some uncertainty about the status of the turkey farm tenancy, and the current

**Action By**

operator had strongly objected on a number of grounds, including potential noise and emissions affecting his turkey breeding, which he said was particularly sensitive.

Before being able to operate, the proposed anaerobic digestion plant would require an Environmental Permit from the Environment Agency (EA) which would ensure detailed controls over the day-to-day management of the plant. The PPO MP added that there would be tighter emission controls imposed by the EA permit on the elements located in the open air, than those contained in buildings. The Environment Agency had made no further comment on the proposal: they did not object, subject to the imposition of certain conditions.

Having seen the details of the EA requirements before permit issue, the Environmental Health Officer had confirmed that she was comfortable with them, and had withdrawn her initial objection.

The PPO MP concluded by saying that the EA had declined to accept an invitation to attend. With respect to noise and appearance, the anaerobic digestion unit was felt to be acceptable in terms of the impact on neighbouring properties, since noise levels were unlikely to be vastly different from those produced by general farm equipment, and silage clamps were fairly common on many farms nowadays.

With regard to traffic concerns, the report detailed the additional information which had been received since the previous discussion. Highway improvements were part of the planning application. Work would need to be done on the forward visibility splay at the junction with the B1077. However the figures quoted were based on reasonable traffic projections in terms of the proposed business combined with existing movements. It was felt that the additional traffic was not likely to have a significant impact.

The recommendation was for approval, subject to conditions as listed in the report.

Speaking on behalf of the objectors, Mr Irvine expressed disappointment at the level of further information provided, some of which he felt conflicted with what had been provided in February. He mentioned the concerns from the turkey farmer in terms of the potential effect of this proposal on both the turkeys and farm employees. Government guidelines recommended that this type of plant should be located near industrial or sewage works. In addition, many objectors had strong reservations about enforcement resting with the Environment Agency – with problems at Banham Poultry being cited as an example. Finally, there were real doubts that the figures quoted with respect to traffic movements were realistic in terms of numbers, as well as the degree of visibility, at the access to the B1077.

Representing the applicants, Mr Evans said that whilst the production of Biogas was virtually unknown in the UK at the moment, the technology was not new. There were over 10,000 plants located on the continent. The company had been in operation for over 10 years and were involved with the running of over 30 plants. He added that the company would not be proposing to invest up to £4 million in an operation which was likely to fail stringent environmental requirements. The plant would also bring jobs to the area.

**Action By**

He explained that there would be no smell associated with the process. Primary and secondary agricultural products were used: not actual 'waste' itself. With regard to the turkey farm, the applicant had been given an option to purchase both the application site and the turkey farm. Mr Evans said that in the event that permissions were not granted for the AD, the site might be used for other forms of farming, such as pig farming, which were not subject to planning permission, but which could potentially produce emissions.

Mr Adrian Stasiak, Ward representative, expressed strong reservations about this application and believed that it should be refused. He remained unconvinced that previous concerns about smell and Highways issues (including ownership of the land which would comprise the visibility splay) had been fully addressed. He also believed that there were still doubts about the location of the fuel supply – and the possible further impact on traffic that this might create. In addition, he was very concerned that the Environment Agency would have the responsibility for the effective overview of the site and permit issue, given their track record with Banham Poultry. On balance, he felt that the site was in the wrong place: it would be generally less intrusive if it could be located 2-3 fields further away.

The Chairman asked Mr Evans to give the Committee specific assurance that there would be no solid (i.e. animal) waste on the site. Mr Evans confirmed this, adding that there was no associated smell with this process.

Mr P. Francis raised concerns about the fact that the site was located immediately above an aquifer which supplied public drinking water for local residents. He drew attention to a letter which he had received from the Environment Agency and asked the Environmental Health Officer if a water assessment had been received.

The PPO MP and Solicitor and Standards Consultant explained that this would be required by conditions. If the EA were not happy that all their conditions were being met, then they would not issue the permit – without which the plant could not operate.

Mr Francis reminded Members that when this application had come before the Committee 9 months previously, the Environment Agency had raised concerns about how close the site was to the town and local businesses. Their recommendation at that time had been for the silage clamp to be housed within a building.

The PPO MP acknowledged this, saying that the previous application had been almost identical to the current one and that, *at the time*, the EA had raised strong objections. However, they had since changed their position with regard to this type of renewable energy production, and the Council had to base their decision on current advice.

Mr Evans appreciated Members' concerns about smell, but confirmed that the company would be unable to apply for the EA permit until the plant had actually been built. The company would not go forward if they had any reservations that they would be unable to fully comply with all regulations.

It was also pointed out that the minimum distance between the site and nearest dwelling was a 'recommendation', rather than a 'regulation'.

**Action By**

Wider discussion highlighted the following points:

- There remained some concern about the visibility splay, and road safety - not least because there was a considerable dip in the road.

Mr Shaw, NCC, explained that the Highways authority had undertaken adequate research into the site. Acknowledging that they would have preferred that the splay be transferred and dedicated as part of the public highway, he said that they were content with the proposal, subject to various conditions being in place in advance of work commencing.

- It was confirmed that visibility splay would remain under the ownership of the current landowner, but that he had accepted the condition of keeping this clear for Highways purposes.
- It was acknowledged that as this was a fairly new business in the UK the Environment Agency did not yet have a standardised permit regime.
- The Chairman pointed out that an agricultural site could potentially be used for pigs or sugar beet production without need for any planning permission – both of which would produce smell. She added that she had visited a similar operation in North Norfolk and confirmed that there was no smell and very little noise – no more so than from many farms.
- Many local farms operated small-scale silage clamps without any problems with odour.

**RESOLVED** that

1. the application be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report; and
2. the Overview & Scrutiny Commission be invited to request a representative from the EA to attend a meeting to explain how they dealt with planning applications of this nature.

**Mark  
Broughton**

**58/10 THETFORD: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT, FORMER THETFORD COTTAGE HOSPITAL, EARLS STREET FOR NORFOLK NHS PRIMARY CARE TRUST: REFERENCE: 3PL/2009/0977/F (AGENDA ITEM 8(B))**

The PPO MP introduced this report which concerned an application for residential development on the site of the former Thetford Cottage Hospital. This application had previously been deferred to enable further consideration to be given to the relationship of the proposed houses with the adjacent, established, Thetford Snooker Centre.

From the Planning perspective, the amended application was deemed acceptable, with the proposed additional screening between the development and the Snooker Centre. This was a town centre development and in its current form there would be provision for affordable housing, albeit there would be further consultation with the District Valuer in this respect.

**Action By**

Mr Mossop, speaking as the owner of Oddfellows and an objector, said that, in his view, the amended proposals for properties 12 and 13 showed no real improvements. They still sat 2.4m from the boundary line. His business was currently licensed to play live music (and discos) until midnight, with the busiest times being over the weekends. The proposed properties had bedrooms which directly overlooked the Centre entrance/exit. The properties would need to keep their doors and windows shut during the summer months in order to minimise disturbance which, even with the best of care, would inevitably occur as people arrived and departed from the Snooker Centre.

Mr Nolan, Agent, spoke in favour of the proposed development, saying that they had moved the two dwellings. However, if they needed to make any more amendments, this would reduce the viability of the whole development, including the amount of affordable housing units available.

General discussion covered the following:

- Members felt that if permission were granted, it would only be a matter of time before complaints were made against the licensing hours, which might affect the viability of the business. The potential loss of the Snooker Centre could then impact on the youth of the town.
- Others felt that this was a town centre site and, as such, would inevitably be subject to a certain amount of noise and disturbance.
- The proposal had only been slightly re-jigged, rather than re-designed.
- The PPO MP explained that moving the proposed access to the site would not be practical from a Highways perspective, or in terms of overall viability of the development. He added that there was a risk that if the development were not allowed to proceed, then the site could be left in a semi-derelict state for some time. However, some Members felt that viability was not their concern – and pointed out that some local people felt the site could more usefully be developed for some sort of public building, such as a dental surgery.

**RESOLVED** that the application be refused on the grounds of the viability of the neighbouring business premises and the development being unacceptable in its current form and layout.

**59/10 SNETTERTON: LAND AT SNETTERTON PARK AND LAND AT SHIP'S GALLEY RESTAURANT, HARLING ROAD: DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS, ERECTION OF 4 B1 UNITS, CAR PARKING, LAYING OUT OF ACCESS AND SERVICING ROADS, LANDSCAPE, ETC FOR CLIFFSKY LIMITED: 3PL/2007/1820/0 & 3PL/2009/1204/F (AGENDA ITEM 9)**

This application concerned proposals to redevelop the existing Snetterton Sunday market site. The PPO MP reminded Members that outline permission had been granted for a new business park on adjacent land, which was owned by Motor Sport Vision.

From a policy perspective, Snetterton Heath had been identified as a strategic location for employment development. Whilst a large part of this

**Action By**

application was not actually within the designated employment area, and would therefore require some justification, the PPO MP believed that it could be argued that part of the proposal was effectively an expansion of the existing toy and model business. Where appropriate, matters would be brought before future Committee meetings. In addition, the Tank Museum and Exposition buildings both needed large areas, and appropriate access to the primary road network. The proposed business units would also link to, and feed off, visitors attracted to the rest of the site.

The agents acting on behalf of the circuit (Motor Sport Vision) had been generally supportive, but had raised a few concerns about increased traffic. Various letters of support had been received from local businesses and key toy manufacturers.

With regard to the retail elements there would be a significant reduction in overall floor space.

The proposal was seen as an opportunity to enhance the wider policy objectives for the area, with a recommendation for approval, subject to listed conditions and a S.106 Agreement.

Mr S. Askew, Ward representative, felt that overall this project was positive and would rejuvenate the site. He therefore welcomed the proposals, albeit with concerns about relevant conditions, including:

- adequate screening adjacent to the proposed hotel;
- suitable measures to be taken in terms of noise/bounce from any proposed development;
- clear and adequate road signage.

Other points raised in discussion included:

- It was generally felt to be an exciting proposition, along the A11 corridor and in an area which was already popular for visitors, especially for the Sunday markets.
- Members were keen that there should be a proper Business Plan in place for the whole package.
- Whilst the proposed new market would comprise lock down units, with shutters, there would be scope for a limited number of fold-away stalls in the market square itself.
- It was acknowledged that the establishment of a more formal retail centre on site, with permission to trade for seven days per week during the season, would bring with it an element of competition to local towns. However, there would be conditions imposed as to the type of goods allowed on site. It was also noted that many stallholders would only wish to trade on site at the weekends.
- It was confirmed that both the Highway Agency and Local Authority were satisfied that the existing road network could cope with likely traffic loads.
- Snetterton Parish Council had no planning issues with the application. However, they were concerned that the new

**Action By**

development should be compatible with ongoing plans for the development at the race track.

**RESOLVED** that:

- 1) full planning permission be granted for the main site, comprising the development of a Model & Toy Expo, tank museum, garden centre and a covered market, to include ancillary retail areas, a café and an outdoor play area subject to conditions and a S.106 Agreement (3PL/2009/1204/F); and
- 2) outline planning permission be granted for the development of four B1 business units on other parcels of land which formed part of the market site (3PL/2007/1820/O).

**60/10 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS (AGENDA ITEM 10)**

**RESOLVED** that the applications be determined as follows:

- (a) Item 1: Snetterton: Land at Snetterton Park and Land at Ships Galley Restaurant, Harling Road: Demolition of existing buildings, erection of 4 B1 units, car parking, laying out of access and servicing roads, landscape, etc for Cliffsy Limited: Reference: 3PL/2007/1820/O

**Approved, See Minute No 59/10.**

- (b) Item 2: Attleborough: Victory Park, London Road: Proposed fuel depot including erection of office/amenity building and gantry, installation of fuel tanks and change of use of land for J R Rix & Sons Ltd: Reference: 3PL/2009/1166/F

**Deferred, see Minute No 54/10.**

- (c) Item 3: Roudham/Larling: Oak House Farm, Larling: Erection of agricultural building for Mr Brendan Larwood: Reference: 3PL/2009/1173/F

The PPO MP introduced this item, which was a major application for an agricultural building to house livestock in the winter and store machinery during the summer.

It was noted that the proposed building would sit neatly amongst a group of existing buildings.

**Approved, as recommended.**

- (d) Item 4: Snetterton: Snetterton Park, Harling Road: Erection of model and toy expo building, garden centre, tank museum, covered market and café, relocate market and play areas, etc for Cliffsy Ltd: Reference: 3PL/2009/1204/F

**Approved, see Minute No 59/10.**

**Action By**

(e) Item 5: Scarning: Oak Manor, Dereham Road: 24 assisted care bungalows for Caring Homes Group: Reference: 3PL/2010/0035/O

Mrs D. Irving declared a personal interest as the NC Councillor responsible for Adult Social Services.

The PPO MP presented the report. The application sought outline planning permission for the erection of 24 assisted care bungalows within the grounds of an existing residential care home. The layout proposed was almost identical to that approved by the Committee in 2005 but which had not been developed.

NCC Social Services were supportive of this development as there was clear evidence of a need for these bungalows and assistance could be provided from the adjacent Care Home. Similar schemes had identified this type of accommodation as akin to C2 use ("residential home"), which did not warrant an affordable housing element.

The application was recommended for approval, subject to a legal agreement and conditions.

Discussion focussed on access for ambulances and wheelchair users, and the amount of parking to be available (including covered areas for mobility scooters). However, Ms Thornton, speaking on behalf of the applicants, confirmed that the scheme was indicative only at this stage and these concerns, alongside other internal design elements, would be addressed at reserved matters stage.

As the Ward representative, the Chairman said that the Parish Council were very supportive of the scheme – but noted that they wished more garages had been built at a similar scheme in Swanton Morley.

**Approved, subject to a legal agreement and conditions.**

(f) Item 6: Tittleshall: 13 High Street: Domestic extension and wall and pedestrian access for Mr N Medlar: 3PL/2010/0084/F

Mr P. Francis declared a prejudicial interest as Chairman of the Appeals Committee which had dealt with the Tree Preservation Order.

The Principal Development Control Officer (PDCO) presented the report, explaining that this concerned a re-submission of an application which had first been considered in November 2009. That application had been refused. Whilst there had been no objection to the design itself, the proposed extension would have resulted in the loss of a mature Ash which was the subject of a Tree Preservation Order (TPO), to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The application was recommended for refusal as these elements still applied.

The PDCO said that the only change to the original application was to replace the Ash tree with a semi-mature field maple, as well as plant two trees and holly hedge in the front garden.

**Action By**

A photo-montage, provided by the applicant, was shown to the Committee, illustrating the impact of the removal of the Ash tree and the proposed new planting.

The Parish Council strongly supported the revised application.

Objections had been received from the Tree & Countryside Officer, as well as two letters concerning ownership and access rights to the drive, and the impact/change of character.

Speaking on behalf of the applicant, Mr Yardley explained that the Ash was not suitable for its location and would impact on any potential attempt to increase the current property to a reasonable-sized family home.

The proposed replacement trees would range between 16-20 feet and could be protected by TPOs. They would also have a greater visibility splay and impact on the street scene. He added that there was strong local support for this amended application.

Mr Garner, on behalf of the Parish Council, expressed some concern that this development had not been allowed to progress, not least because it would enable a young family to make their home in the village.

As Ward Representative, Mr J. Labouchere said that the tree, which was in an inappropriate position, was between 40-50 years old and would clearly grow much larger. He strongly concurred with the PC view that the proposed replacement planting would enhance the overall street scene, and was therefore in support of this application.

The Tree & Countryside Officer showed Members photographs comparing the current tree cover at the site, with that in 2006. He pointed out that the Ash was the only remaining tree. The proposed replacement for the Ash tree would actually be planted where another tree had previously stood: i.e. there would be a net loss of tree cover in what was a conservation area.

**Approved, contrary to the recommendation on the grounds that the loss of the Ash tree would be counterbalanced by a gain through the increased visibility splay on the High Street, as well as to the local environment.**

- (g) Item 7: Shipdham: The Gilbert Stud, Ash Farm, King Row: Extension to farmhouse, replacement garage, tractor shed and workshop: Reference: 3PL/2010/0100/F

The PPO MP explained that this application concerned a substantial extension to an existing farmhouse. In addition, there would be the erection of a detached pitched roof garage and tack room, as well as a detached pitched roof tractor garage and workshop (the latter necessitating the demolition of an existing poultry unit).

No objections had been received as a result of consultations.

**Action By**

However, the PPO drew attention to the two key policies which were relevant for this application: DC3 (which concerned extensions to dwellings in the countryside); and DC16 (with regard to design).

Policy DC3 could be satisfied provided the proposal was not deemed “..disproportionate to the scale of the original dwelling”. Policy DC16 existed to ensure the “preservation and enhancement of the existing character of the area, as well as to complement the natural landscape”.

Bearing these in mind, Officers felt that the proposed extension was excessive (effectively a 150% increase in the floor area of the dwelling). Also, the existing farmhouse was built in a fairly simple style. There was therefore some concern about the range of design materials and features proposed, not least for the outbuildings which were utilitarian and should not, therefore, be unduly fussy or domestic in appearance.

The PPO concluded by saying that their recommendation was therefore one of refusal.

Speaking on behalf of the applicant, Mr Thorne gave some background to the application, explaining that this was part of a project which had involved major investment in Shipdham. He and his fiancé were running an international business, including breeding falcons and keeping horses. They had acquired the site some three years ago and had since been gradually improving and developing it. However, as their clientele included very wealthy visitors from abroad, they wanted to have an impressive site with suitable facilities and the ability to offer hospitality. He argued that, in that context, the proposed buildings were not overly fussy in terms of design or material.

Finally, he added that they currently employed two full-time and six part-time staff, and also had contacts with a local agricultural college.

Speaking as the Ward Representative, Mr P. Hewett endorsed this application, not least as he believed that such a business was likely to be of benefit to the local and wider community. He drew Members’ attention to the fact that no external objections had been received, so the decision essentially revolved around Breckland planning policies. Highlighting some key ones, he drew attention to the fact that the proposal would help raise the quality of life; offer local employment opportunities; and would not have a negative impact on the local amenities. With regard to DC3, he said that the buildings being removed were larger than the ones proposed to replace them.

On DC16, Mr Hewett reminded Members that the Planning Inspectors had said that there should not be too much emphasis placed on maintaining the character of the local area. He argued that this, alongside PPS1 (concerning improving the character and quality of an area), meant that this sort of application should perhaps be considered from a more rounded perspective. Finally, he felt that the designs were not over-fussy in terms of the nature of the business, and the fact that it would attract a global clientele, as

**Action By**

well as bring clear economic benefits to the area.

In general discussion it appeared that Members were somewhat indecisive, many agreeing that the overall development would be positive for Shipdham and the wider area, but also having reservations about the proposed design. Other points included:

- This application would effectively involve a change of use from agriculture to 'equiculture'.
- Whilst some felt that it would be a shame to lose the existing old farm building; others acknowledged that many such buildings were no longer suitable for modern agricultural purposes.
- The standard of work already undertaken on the site was of an extremely high quality, including fencing and current reconstruction work, etc.

A Member pointed out that there was another recent example where the general view had been that some of the existing policy was not entirely satisfactory. However, the Development Services Manager (DSM) reminded Members that, reservations notwithstanding, the planning policies had been adopted by full Council in December 2009 and therefore had to be complied with. That said, they were open to interpretation with regard to design issues. He also added that the Planning Officers had no objection in principle to this application.

**Deferred, for further discussions about the proposed design.**

**Notes to the Schedule**

<b><u>Item No</u></b>	<b><u>Speaker</u></b>
1 & 4 Agenda Item 9	Ms Spencer – Agent Mr Hill – Agent Mr Askew – Ward Representative
5	Ms Thornton – for Applicant
6	Mr Addison – Tree Officer Mr Yardley – For Applicant Mr Garner – Parish Council
7	Mr Hewett – Ward Representative Mr Thorne – For Applicant
Agenda Item 8a	Mr Stasiak – Ward Representative Mr Shaw – NCC Highways Mrs Hammond – EHO Mr Irvine – Objector Mr Evans – For Applicant Mr Keymer - Agent
Agenda Item 8b	Mr Mossop – Objector Mr Nolan - Agent

**Action By**

**Written Representations taken into account**

<b><u>Reference No</u></b>	<b><u>No of Representations</u></b>
3PL/2009/0977/F	5
3PL/2009/1143/F	150
3PL/2009/1204/F	1
3PL/2010/0084/F	2

**61/10 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE  
(FOR INFORMATION) (AGENDA ITEM 11)**

Noted.

**62/10 APPEALS DECISIONS (FOR INFORMATION) (AGENDA ITEM 12)**

Noted.

The meeting closed at 2.03 pm

CHAIRMAN