

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Held on Monday, 28 November 2011 at 9.30 am in
Anglia Room, The Conference Suite, Elizabeth House, Dereham**

PRESENT

Councillor C Bowes	Mr S. J. F. Rogers
Mr T R Carter	Mr F.J. Sharpe
Councillor E. Gould (Chairman)	Mrs P.A. Spencer
Mr T.J. Lamb	Mr N.C. Wilkin (Vice-Chairman)
Mrs J A North	Mr P.J. Duigan (Substitute Member)
Mr W. R. J. Richmond	Mr T. J. Jermy (Substitute Member)
Mr M. S. Robinson	

Also Present

Lady Fisher (Ward Representative)	Mr A.C. Stasiak (Ward Representative)
Mr K.S. Gilbert (Ward Representative)	Mr K. Martin (Ward Representative)
Mr S.G. Bambridge (Ward Representative)	Mr M. A. Wassell (Ward Representative)

In Attendance

Paul Jackson	- Planning Manager
Nick Moys	- Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects)*
Mike Brennan	- Principal Planning Officer*
Sue Bloomfield	- Planning Obligations Officer*
Jane Osborne	- Committee Officer
Michael Horn	- Solicitor to the Council

* Capita Symonds for Breckland Council

170/11 MINUTES

With regard to minute number 164/11 (i) Item 9, page 6, in the paragraph prior to the deferred outcome, the word bio should read 'by'.

Subject to the above amendments, the Minutes of the meeting held on 31 October 2011 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

171/11 APOLOGIES & SUBSTITUTES

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr C Clark, Cllr T Jermy was in attendance as his substitute.

Cllr Rogers could not attend the start of the meeting, so Cllr P Duigan was in attendance as his substitute until his arrival.

172/11 DECLARATION OF INTEREST AND OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

With regard to Agenda Item 12, Schedule of Planning Applications, the following declarations were made :

Action By

Action By

Cllr Sharpe declared a prejudicial interest in Item 5 Mileham, by virtue of being an Executive Support Member for Asset Management.

Cllr Bowes declared a prejudicial interest in Item 7 (Watton) as her family owned land adjacent to the site, and a prejudicial interest with regard to Item 10 (Watton) as the applicant owned a strip of land in front of her property.

Cllr Martin, declared a prejudicial interest by virtue of living in Edenside Drive with regard to Item 9 Attleborough.

173/11 REQUESTS TO DEFER APPLICATIONS INCLUDED IN THIS AGENDA

Scheduled Item No. 3, Dereham, of Agenda Item No. 12, Schedule of Planning Applications, had been withdrawn.

174/11 LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK (STANDING ITEM)

Site Specifics – The Council was currently carrying out consultation requested by the Inspector examining the soundness of the Site Specifics DPD in relation to his proposed changes to the allocations for Shipdham. These changes included a reduction in the size of site of the allocation at SH.1 and the reapportionment of the balance onto a second site at Old Post Office Street (SH.2). The consultation period closes on 5 December and subject to responses, it was envisaged that the Inspectors Report would be received by the end of the year. This would hopefully enable the Site Specifics to be adopted in February 2012.

Thetford Area Action Plan (TAAP) – The Council had now submitted the TAAP for Examination in Public. The Planning Inspectorate had appointed Mr Ian Broyd as Examining Inspector who will hold hearings into the soundness of the document. The hearings are expected to be held in Spring 2012.

Attleborough and Snetterton Heath AAP – Further evidence gathering was taking place with a view to further consultation later in 2012.

175/11 EPR THETFORD LIAISON GROUP

Deferred - The item would be discussed on 29 November by the Thetford Town Council; therefore the item would come back to the Planning Committee on 19 December 2011.

176/11 INTERNAL DRAINAGE BOARDS (IDBS)

RESOLVED to include the IDBs as consultees in the planning process, by providing them with a copy of the weekly Planning Lists.

177/11 DEFERRED APPLICATIONS

177 .a Roudham/Larling & Bridgham : Change of use of agricultural buildings for commercial storage at buildings 1, 3, 8 and 15 Camp Farm, Roudham Road : Applicant : Paul Rackham Ltd : Reference : 3PL/2011/0851/CU

Members had received various documents and correspondence with regard to the item.

Action By

Paul Jackson, Planning Manager had returned the application to the Planning Committee in the interests of transparency of process and explained his reasons why.

The Minutes were an entirely accurate record of the meeting he attended on 31 October 2011. He was not aware of the source of the inaccurate allegations made with regard to the time between the writing of the report and the Committee meeting, all of which were without exception, without foundation.

The resolution reached following a lengthy debate, was arrived at by Members entirely properly and was soundly based.

He welcomed openness and transparency. The Camp Farm file had been open and available for public inspection and it still was, with documents also available on the Council website, despite no requirement in law for Councils to publish their planning records online. Members of the public along with Parish Councils were well consulted with, and the entire process had been transparent and robust.

The Planning Inspector's earlier decision and the details contained within the report prepared by Reading Agricultural Consultants Ltd set out why the buildings had become "redundant". Taking into account all the salient facts, Officers advised Members on 31 October 2011 that the first of the two reasons for refusal (failure to demonstrate that the use could not be on an allocated site) was in their view considered to be incapable of substantiation. He was not of the view that any of the information was not in the public domain. Statutory requirements were met and were exceeded. Additional representations received raised no new planning issues not previously considered in either the report itself or during the debate.

He concluded by inviting Members to consider if the process or the resolution was unusual or flawed and to endorse their earlier resolution.

The Head of Legal Services explained the process that would then be followed.

Comments from Members were that the Planning Manager's report was succinct and completely accurate and that the process carried out on 31 October 2011 was a normal planning one.

Lady Fisher, Ward Representative, stated that a letter from Knights Solicitors had been sent to the Principal Planning Officer on 28 October 2011 which had not been made available in the public domain until 31 October and questioned whether the Chairman had seen the letter prior to the Committee meeting held on 31 October 2011. The two reasons put forward by Officers for refusal had not been expanded on and were scanty in the extreme. She questioned how Members had familiarised themselves with the site as it was not visible from the country lane.

The Chairman clarified that the letter had been clearly referred to by the Principal Planning Officer during his presentation of the application on Monday, 31 October 2011 and a frank discussion followed. The Planning Manager added that the letter which was in the public domain on Friday, 28 October 2011 did not add anything to the application submission and did not raise any new significant information. All conditions were debated and the Planning Manager was specifically asked by the Chairman to read out to Members all the conditions, before they voted, to ensure the conditions

Action By

were clear and precise.

The Chairman added that no formal site visit had been undertaken, but Members did drive past the site on their way back from having attended a site visit elsewhere.

RESOLVED that the previous resolution at Minute 164/11 (g) including the imposition of conditions and a legal agreement being entered into be re-confirmed.

The Head of Legal Services advised therefore, that there would not be a re-consideration of the merits, and the resolution by the Committee held on 31 October 2011 stood.

177 .b Lyng: Change of Use of Land to Stand Touring Caravans at The Mallards, Farman Close by Mr Mark Woods: 3PL/2011/0953/CU

The Parish Council no longer objected to the proposal and wished that the whole site could benefit from a March–December season. 2 further letters of support had been received and one of objection with regard to a 3m gap required between the bungalows and the site before any standing of caravans was allowed.

Mr Lambley, Lyng Parish Council, advised that whilst they had not objected, there was a history of caravans on site and were keen to ensure a series of conditions. Quarry Lane was already under a great deal of pressure due to the Lakeside development, and should only be used for emergency use. A gate was felt to be better than a sign with regards to providing a clearer marker. They felt if the season of use was the same for the proposed piece of land as it was for the existing caravan park, it would be more enforceable. The site was adjacent to a County Wildlife Site and he brought attention to the Tree & Countryside Officer's comments in the report.

Mr Butcher, supporter, had owned a shop in Lyng for the last six years and the caravan park generated a lot of his turnover and if the site closed a significant amount of his trade would be lost. It was important for Lyng to remain a community and support businesses within them.

Mr Sneesby, Objector, stated that if planning permission was granted, it would allow the applicant to have more caravans, as the site licence had been ignored for many years. The village sustained a shop and garage for decades before the caravan park opened. It was a nature conservation area.

Mr Bude, Objector, who had lived next door to the site for 5 years stated that two objections had been submitted last week. One of the reasons the 2006 planning application was rejected was due to its close proximity, noise and disturbance. Extending the season by two months would increase activity. The tranquil atmosphere would not remain until 2023. The narrow piece of land at the back of 2 Farman Close had been regularly used for 2 or 3 caravans without a 3m space. A buffer zone would serve both parties best.

Ms Jarvis, Applicant, stated she had run the site for 26 years as a tranquil retreat mostly for those suffering illness and who had mobility difficulties. Caravans had been positioned on the site concerned for 20 years. She was very keen to regularise the situation with regard to planning

Action By

permission, and the proposal would allow more space between the caravans and ensure her business remained running. It was very important to her to make the site disabled friendly. The Drift would not be used, noise would not increase and the gate was not intended to be used significantly more than it was at present, unless for emergencies. There was no legal requirement for an emergency exit but she wanted to provide one as a precautionary measure.

Mr Bambridge, Ward Representative informed Members that whilst it was important for the village that the caravan site remained, the rights of those who lived beside it needed to be reserved, and that an area should be designated where caravans were kept clear. Seasonal restrictions should be the same for the whole of the site. The applicant did not intend to seek to increase the number of caravans on the site.

Guidance was provided by the Planning Manager with regard to not duplicating matters covered by the Site Licence.

RESOLVED that the application be approved as recommended with the extra condition of additional planting between the nearest dwellings and the site.

178/11 VARIATION OF SECTION 106 AGREEMENT : RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT : LAND OFF THE LAMMAS/MALSTERS CLOSE, MUNDFORD : REFERENCE : 3PL/2007/0356/F : APPLICANT : BENNETT HOMES

Cllr Jermy supported and welcomed shared ownership.

RESOLVED as recommended, that the Section 106 Agreement be varied to allow the shared ownership units to be let as social rented units by the provider.

179/11 SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED that the applications be determined as follows :

- (a) Item 1 : Attleborough : Change of use of land for siting of 6 static caravans & 2 tourers, erection of general purpose building & associated work : Reference : 3PL/2011/419/F

Correspondence had been received by Members. An Enforcement Notice was valid on the site. The Town Council had raised objections, and Highways had recommended refusal of the scheme. Four representations had been received from local residents.

Messrs Harvey & Becker, Objectors, questioned it if was a Romany site or not. Commercial fridges on site were being disposed of without a licence. Conditions had not been adhered to. 5 static caravans were there and no tourers. There was a long history of anti social behaviour and local businesses had to provide 24 hour security. There were very large vehicle and container movements, with litter and human waste on the site.

Mr Jones, Applicant, lived in Leys Lane, as his family had done for 4 generations and he wished to extend the site to make it less crowded. Whilst he accepted the site had been untidy in the past, it was now clear and if permission was granted it would stay in a tidy

Action By

condition. He owned the site which he called a Romany site but he did not want gypsies or travellers to live there, only his family, who would remain there.

Members were advised, that if they were minded to approve the application, names could be provided of those who would occupy the static caravans.

Refused, as recommended.

- (b) Item 2 : Necton : Residential development (10 dwellings) :
Reference : 3PL/2011/0877/O

Refused, as recommended, with an additional reason given by Members being the lack of noise assessment information.

- (c) Item 3 : Dereham : Change of use of land for parking provision for additional two lorries : Reference : 3PL/2011/0896/CU

Application withdrawn.

- (d) Item 4 : Necton : Residential development (10 dwellings) :
Reference : 3PL/2011/0909/O

Refused, as recommended.

- (e) Item 5 : Mileham : Construction of 13 dwellings : Reference :
3PL/2011/0938/O

Cllr Sharpe declared a prejudicial interest by virtue of being an Executive Support Manager for Asset Manager, he left the room.

Concern from Members covered the possibility that the 6 parking spaces could get blocked in, the development would be cramped, and there was no children's play area.

Deferred, to allow Officers the opportunity to investigate if the drainage lagoon area could be a play area and look into the points raised by Members, which were over development of the site, poor design, and no provision for open space.

- (f) Item 6 : Wretham : Potato/onion storage and general farm storage sheds : Reference : 3PL/2011/0954/F

The Parish Council raised no objection. Since the report had been written, further information had been received from the RSPB and they no longer raised an objection. Natural England raised no objection provided that certain mitigation was supplied. There were strong objections from the Policy Team and Officers. The Principal Planning Officer stated that the site was approximately 1200m from land within the Breckland Special Protection Area supporting or capable of supporting stone curlews, and the proposed development represented a significant intensification of the site. In light of lack of evidence to the contrary, it could not be concluded that the development would not have an adverse effect and given the Waddensee principle it was recommended that a precautionary approach be adopted in this instance.

Action By

Mr Abrey, Applicant explained that he and his family farmed 500 acres in Norfolk and Suffolk. Whilst the storage would only represent 30% of the company's sales, it would represent 100% of their storage for the future and would be bespoke and allow for expansion. Old fashioned, inadequate and unsustainable storage was currently rented elsewhere. Natural England supported the development as did RSPB who they had worked with since 1971, he added that stone curlews had increased in numbers on their land. He said the proposed development would be better inside the buffer zone rather than create a new yard outside the buffer zone. 50 staff were employed on the Norfolk farm, which was an important part of the local economy.

Mr Cowen, Ward Representative, stated that agricultural buildings had no impact on the stone curlew population. The proposal would reduce food miles and the business should be encouraged as 50% of the area was rural and agricultural businesses needed to prosper. RSPB had clearly written and stated they had withdrawn their objection. The company had liaised with experts, who had engaged with them and supported them.

The recommendation to refuse planning permission was not supported by Members as the proposed development was surrounded on 3 sides by existing buildings and they failed to see what proof there was to the detriment of stone curlews.

RESOLVED, that contrary to the recommendation, the application be approved subject to conditions listed below, as given the views of the Officers, RSPB and Natural England, Members concluded that with proposed restrictions, the development would not adversely affect the SPA.

The conditions were :

- (i) The construction of a 3m high bund to effectively screen low level human activity and vehicles on the application site to be completed outside the breeding season
- (ii) No external lighting facing the SPA
- (iii) Pest control imposed
- (iv) 10% on site renewable energy
- (v) Colour of buildings
- (vi) The construction of the potato store to be outside the breeding season

- (g) Item 7 : Watton : Erection of 69 residential dwellings with associated open space (revised scheme to 3PL/2010/0639/F) : Reference : 3PL/2011/0981/F

Cllr Bowes declared a prejudicial interest as her family owned land adjacent to the site, she would utilise her right to speak, and then leave the room.

As the Local Planning Authority were not in possession of the Inspector's report relating to the results of its examination of its site specific policies and proposals development plan, the Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) advised that Officers' views were that the application was "premature" in planning terms. He gave a verbal update on comments received from Highways.

Action By

The Application had raised a significant number of representations from residents and the Town Council.

Cllr Gilbert, Watton Town Council, stated that Hopkins Homes Ltd had not had a discussion with the Town Council on the current proposal. It was outside the Settlement Boundary. The Inspector's report detailed the situation, and the application made a mockery of the site specific process. The development was in the wrong place and the field opposite had been refused planning permission as it too was outside the Settlement Boundary.

Mr Hinkins, Saham Toney PC and local resident, advised that a single track bridge had to be crossed when the village was approached which was dangerous for pedestrians, and further traffic flow would make the area a greater "rat run".

Mr Bunce, Saham Toney PC, stated that the proposed development would increase flooding already in the area. Members of the Parish Council had listened to all objections and they strongly objected themselves to the proposal.

Mr Upton, Objector, made the Members aware of the residents' concerns of noise, road safety and the impact on the town's infrastructure which was already over burdened. The closeness of the affordable housing, lack of reference to a property in the Visual Assessment documentation, and that 91 homes were to be built on the site were also given as objections. 860 signatures of objection had been obtained which equated to 10% of the population of Watton. The estate would be out of character with the area.

Mr Smith, Applicant, informed Members that they had looked to address all fears and it was just prematurity that was outstanding due to the LDF report. They remained of the opinion it was a highly sustainable site and even with the LDF there would still be a 5 year land supply shortage.

Mr Wassell, Ward Representative, stated that Watton was the smallest area of Breckland's towns but was the most densely populated and did not appear to be short of future homes or those for sale. It was outside the Settlement Boundary and should not be considered for development and he urged Members to reject the application and make Watton a better place with a brighter future.

Cllr Bowes, Ward Representative, said that little had changed since the previous application was submitted. Local residents were genuinely concerned about keeping the character of their town. She left the room.

Concerns from Members were that the application was premature, it was sited in the wrong place, access was not sustainable, traffic movement would increase greatly and affordable housing should look like the other housing.

Refused, as recommended.

(h) Item 8 : Attleborough : Erection of 17 dwellings : Reference : 3PL/2011/0988/F

Action By

The presence of a high pressure gas pipe had determined the layout of the scheme as shown on the plans to Members. The scheme included 7 affordable units and not 6 as stated in the report. The applicant had provided further information with regard to the protected oak tree and how they proposed to undertake infilling however, the Tree & Countryside Officer had not changed his view on the impact on the tree.

Mr Hall, Attleborough Community Team, stated that the scheme should be considered in the context of the LDF proposals. Attleborough had doubled in size over the last 20 years. Objections had been received from Old Buckenham Parish Council, Norfolk County Council and Attleborough Town Council and along with the 3500 signatures he urged Members to listen to the local community and representatives.

Mr Cracknell, Attleborough Chamber of Trade and resident of Old Buckenham, stated ASHAAP (which he was a Member of) were opposed to any housing programme before the Attleborough infrastructure had been substantially improved.

Ms Aitkin, Agent, stated there was a mix of high quality house types and great care had been taken in providing flexible living spaces and well laid out houses, all of which would maximise from solar gain and high insulation. Sustainable life style choices had been accommodated. The site was adjacent to the Settlement Boundary and would use a currently underused site. Access had been planned to maximise visibility in both directions. No evidence of aquatic fauna had been found in the shallow pond which was of limited environmental value, and would dry out seasonally. There were other drainage ditch arrangements. Infill material would allow for water penetration with regard to the category 'B' oak tree. Her client would accept conditions.

Mr Cumming, Agent, added that a 100 year assessment, attenuation and water plan had been accepted following comments about the pond being dry. He advised Members that Code Level 3 would be easily achieved. Fossil fuel would be relied on and renewable energy used. Although no full assessment had been done, he suspected that Code Level 4 could be achieved.

Mr Stasiak, Ward Representative, told Members that the reaction of the close residents he had spoken to liked the proposed development as it was not the "usual bog standard builders' boxes", they liked the layout, design and the flair in which they had overcome the main gas pipe. The 40% affordable units would provide much needed affordable housing for those on the housing register.

Refused, as recommended.

Action By

- (i) Item 9 : Attleborough : Six single storey houses for persons with learning disabilities & alterations to access at 7 Edenside Drive : Reference : 3PL/2011/1010/O

Significant objection had been received from local residents which consisted of a 37 signature petition and 5 letters. 1 letter of support had been received and the Town Council did not object.

Mr Page, Objector, whilst he accepted the need for this type of development he was concerned about vehicle access as parking was congested already and would be a nightmare for residents.

Mr Becker, Applicant, stated that the site was perfectly suitable and sustainable and the end user had no requirement for cars. The development would provide independent living with support.

Mr Blake, for the Applicant, was a specialist consultant in the health and social care sector and stated that the proposal was a very much needed resource. Residents would be independent but carer support would be available should they require it.

Mr Martin, Ward Representative, declared a prejudicial interest as he lived in Edenside Drive which was a cul-de-sac. Access was of major concern, no parking areas were proposed only 3 parking spaces at the front of the site and he felt utility companies for example, would have a problem accessing the site as would visitors. He questioned the exit strategy for the dwellings in the event the scheme became unviable, as this could result in 6 residential units available on the open market. The outline application should have included more information with regard to vision splays. He left the room.

Mr Stasiak, Ward Representative, advised Members he supported the application as there was a shortage of this type of accommodation across the district. The Town Council raised no objection to the single storey houses and privacy would not be compromised. Caring in Attleborough had always been a high priority, and the proposed development would give the residents the opportunity to integrate. Whilst values should be looked at, property values should not.

Members' were concerned with access, parking and over-development. It was suggested that for residents' well-being, a green space within the development would be beneficial.

RESOLVED that the application be deferred and the Officers be authorised to approve it as recommended, subject to conditions, on completion of a legal agreement in relation to the bungalow to be kept for the use of the carer/warden and an additional condition for the erection of an acoustic fence.

- (j) Item 10 : Watton : Variation of condition 2 of pp 3PL/2006/1163/F – As-built drawings to parking, siting & elevations of plots 7-10 : Reference : 3PL/2011/1089/F

Cllr Bowes declared a prejudicial interest as the applicant owned a strip of land in front of her property and she left the room.

Action By

The Principal Planning Officer (Major Projects) showed photographs of the differences to the proposed application to that refused earlier in the year. He updated Members that the Town Council had confirmed that they wished to raise an objection as their view was that the internal layout should revert back to the original scheme. The removal of the larger balcony structures would address the concern raised by Members on the previous application.

Mr Gilbert, Ward Representative and Chair of Watton Town Council Planning Committee, explained that on the original plans, the lounge and kitchen were on the ground floor which they did not object to. Local people believed the new proposal was not a minor amendment, as the lounges would now look out at their gardens. Windows were still large and doors would be fully glazed where people would sit in their lounge and overlook people in their private gardens. The internal layout should revert back to the original application that local residents wanted.

Mr Crook, Objector, was the owner of an existing house on Fairway Drive, and stated the application was another revision of the March application. He raised concerns about inadequate parking, vehicle turning and that the reversal of living arrangements would result in some of the plots being overlooked.

Mr Irvine, Agent, advised that the balconies would be removed by Christmas. If buildings were to revert back to the original layout, the distances between buildings would be the same. Internal arrangements would have to be completely demolished to re-shape them. He spoke of the economic factor and that the application was to help and support Richmond Park Golf Club, and to rebuild would have serious implications. There would be no traffic plan with regard to speed. Building Control had passed the design of the buildings, which would meet disability requirements.

Mr Wassell, Ward Representative, stated the overlooking was relevant to the utilisation of rooms and local residents would still be overlooked. Economic affects were relevant to the application just as they were for local residents and a better place for local residents should be considered.

Issues raised by Members covered the narrow path and roadway, no site specific speed policy, the need for obscure glazing at least on the northern elevation and safety concerns with regard to vulnerability in having the kitchens upstairs with only one exit for each of the properties.

Approved, as recommended.

- (k) Item 11 : Attleborough : Erection of conservatory & brick wall (retrospective) : Reference : 3PL/2011/1157/F

Approved, as recommended.

Notes To Schedule

Item No.	Speaker
1	Mr Harvey, Objector Mr J Becker, Objector Mr Jones, Applicant
2	
3	Withdrawn
4	
5	
6	Mr Abrey, Applicant Mr Feakes, for Applicant Mr Cowen, Ward Representative
7	Mr Gilbert, Town Council Mr Bunce, Parish Council Mr Hinks, Parish Council Mr Upton, Objector Mr Smith, Applicant Mr Wassell, Ward Representative
8	Ms Aitken, Agent Mr Cumming, Agent Mr Hall, Attleborough Comm Team Mr Cracknell, Attleborough Comm Team Mr Stasiak, Ward Representative
9	Mrs Page, Objector Mr S Becker, Applicant Mr Mathews, Agent Mr Blake, for Applicant Mr Martin, Ward Representative Mr Stasiak, Ward Representative
10	Mr Crook, Objector Mr Irvin, Agent Mr Gilbert, Ward Representative Mr Wassell, Ward Representative
11	

Action By

Written Representations Taken Into Account

Reference No.	No. of Representations
3PL/2011/0419/F	5
3PL/2011/0877/O	2
3PL/2011/0896/CU	
3PL/2011/0909/O	6
3PL/2011/0938/O	2
3PL/2011/0954/F	
3PL/2011/0981/F	70
3PL/2011/0988/F	2
3PL/2011/1010/O	9
3PL/2011/1089/F	3
3PL/2011/1157/F	
3PL/2011/0953/CU	11
3PL/2011/0851/CU	15

180/11 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DIRECTOR OF COMMISSIONING

Noted.

181/11 APPEAL DECISIONS (FOR INFORMATION)

Noted.

182/11 APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY NORFOLK COUNTY COUNCIL (FOR INFORMATION)

Noted.

The meeting closed at 3.47 pm

Action By

CHAIRMAN