Cherwell District Council

Planning Committee

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held at Virtual meeting, on 10 December 2020 at 4.00 pm

Present:

Councillor James Macnamara (Chairman)
Councillor Maurice Billington (Vice-Chairman)
Councillor Andrew Beere
Councillor John Broad
Councillor Hugo Brown
Councillor Phil Chapman
Councillor Colin Clarke
Councillor Ian Corkin
Councillor Chris Heath
Councillor Simon Holland
Councillor David Hughes
Councillor Cassi Perry
Councillor Lynn Pratt
Councillor George Reynolds
Councillor Barry Richards
Councillor Les Sibley
Councillor Katherine Tyson

Substitute Members:

Councillor Barry Wood (In place of Councillor Mike Kerford-Byrnes)

Apologies for absence:

Councillor Mike Kerford-Byrnes

Officers:

Sarah Stevens, Interim Senior Manager – Development Management
Andy Bateson, Team Leader – Major Developments
Nat Stock, Minors Team Leader
Matt Chadwick, Principal Planning Officer
Bob Neville, Senior Planning Officer
Karen Jordan, Deputy Principal Solicitor
George Smith, Planning Officer
Lesley Farrell, Democratic and Elections Officer
Natasha Clark, Governance and Elections Manager

98 **Declarations of Interest**

8. Hornton Grounds Quarry, Hornton.
Councillor George Reynolds, Non Statutory Interest, as the Clerk to Drayton Parish Council

Councillor James Macnamara, Non Statutory Interest, as a customer of the applicant Certas Energy Limited.

Councillor Phil Chapman, Non Statutory Interest, as a Local Authority Board Member of Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

9. E P Barrus Limited, Launton Road, Bicester, OX26 4UR.
Councillor Les Sibley, Non Statutory Interest, as a member of Bicester Town Council which had been consulted on the application.

Councillor Lynn Pratt, Non Statutory Interest, as a member of Bicester Town Council which had been consulted on the application.

10. Land North and West of Bretch Hill Reservoir, Adj to Balmoral Avenue, Banbury.
Councillor Andrew Beere, Non Statutory Interest, As a member of Banbury Town Council which had been consulted on the application.

Councillor Barry Richards, Non Statutory Interest, as a member of Banbury Town Council which had been consulted on the application.

Councillor Colin Clarke, Non Statutory Interest, as a member of Banbury Town Council which had been consulted on the application.

99 **Requests to Address the Meeting**

The Chairman advised that requests to address the meeting would be dealt with at each item.

100 **Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 5 November 2020 were agreed as a correct record and would be signed by the Chairman in due course, subject to the following amendment to resolution (2) of Minute 99, Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford:

Under the heading “Access and movement” insert the following:

- Resurvey traffic flows and undertake reassessment using traffic models of whether the proposed mitigation scheme at Middleton Stoney remains the most appropriate solution

- Form a working group to consider solutions to relieve congestion at Middleton Stoney and advise on additional mitigation measures for other villages that may arise as a result of any such solution

101 **Chairman's Announcements**

The Chairman made the following announcements:

1. There had been three supplements to the Planning Agenda;

- Written Updates
- Great Wolf late report
- Update on Bretch Hill decision

2. After consideration and approval of the Heyford Park Master Plan it had been before the Secretary of State. The Department of Communities and Local Government has decided not to call in application 18/00825/HYBRID so there would not be a Public Enquiry and the Committee's decision stands.

102 **Urgent Business**

There were no items of urgent business.

103 **OS Parcel 8975, North of Middle Farm and West of Featherbed Lane, Mixbury**

The Committee considered application 20/02328/F for the erection of 2 acres of polytunnels and a circular coated steel water tank (50m3) at OS Parcel 8975 North of Middle Farm and West of Featherbed Lane, Mixbury for PC & IC Rymer Limited.

Ms Melissa Balk, Agent for the application addressed the meeting in support of the application and read a statement from Mr Peter Rymer the applicant in support of the application.

It was proposed by Councillor Corkin and seconded by Councillor Wood that application 20/02328/F be approved contrary to officer recommendations as it would cause no significant harm. Suitable conditions delegated to officers.

In reaching its decision the Committee considered the officer's report and presentation, the addresses of the public speakers and the written updates.

Resolved

(1) That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director Planning and Development to grant permission for application 20/02328/F contrary to officer recommendations.

(2) That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director Planning and Development to add suitable conditions to application 20/02328/F.

104 **Hornton Grounds Quarry, Hornton**

The Committee considered application 20/02453/F for a fuel depot including ancillary offices, the installation of plant and hardstanding at Horton Grounds Quarry for Certas Energy Limited and FINSCO Property Company.

Councillor Douglas Webb, Local Ward Member addressed the meeting in objection to the application.

Sir David Gilmour, Chairman of (Campaign to Protect Rural England CPRE) Oxfordshire, addressed the meeting in objection to the application.

Parish Councillor Steven Tilling Hornton Parish Council addressed the meeting in objection to the application.

Mr Peter Frampton, Agent for the applicant addressed the meeting in support of the application.

In reaching its decision the Committee considered the officers report and presentation, the addresses of the local ward member and public speakers and the written updates.

Resolved

(1) That application 20/02453/F be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development represents an unjustified and unsustainable form of development in a rural location, which lack opportunities for sustainable travel to and from the site and would in significant adverse impacts on the character of the surrounding environment, for which it has not been demonstrated that exceptional circumstances exist for such development in this unsustainable location. The proposals are therefore contrary to the provisions and aims of Policies SLE1, SLE4 and ESD1 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. By virtue of its siting, scale and form and associated lighting and significant HGV vehicle movements the proposed development would appear as an alien feature within the rural landscape, intruding into the open countryside. The proposals would have a detrimental visual impact on the rural character and appearance of the locality, causing significant and demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of the area and open rural landscape. The proposals are therefore contrary to Policies ESD13 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, saved Policy C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996

and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The proposals have failed to demonstrate that safe and suitable access with appropriate vison splays can be achieved at the site, to accommodate the proposed significant intensification of the use of the site and associated vehicular movements. The proposals are therefore contrary to Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The proposals would generate frequent heavy-goods vehicle movements through residential areas, including the villages of Drayton and Wroxton and Hardwick and Ruscote on the periphery of Banbury. It has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the levels of such movements would not adversely affect the amenity of these residential areas and villages, to the detriment of the living environment in these locations. The proposals are therefore contrary to saved Policies TR10 and C31 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1.

5. The applicant has failed to demonstrate that an appropriate surface water drainage strategy, and mitigation measures necessary in the event of spillage of fuel, can be achieved at the site that would ensure that the proposed development would not be to the detriment of the water environment/surrounding natural environment and that water quality would be maintained and enhanced by avoiding adverse effects; contrary to saved Policy ENV1 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996, Policies ESD7 and ESD8 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

105 **E P Barrus Limited, Launton Road, Bicester, OX26 4UR**

The Committee considered application 20/02139/F for the demolition of existing VOSA buildings and the erection of two new commercial buildings at Launton Road, Bicester, OX26 4UR for Morleys Stores Limited.

Paul Troop, Bicester Bike Users Group addressed the Committee in objection to the application.

In reaching its decision the Committee considered the officer's report and presentation, the address of the public speaker and the written updates.

Resolved

(1) That authority be delegated to the Assistant Director Planning and Development to grant permission for application 20/02139/F subject to the following conditions (and any amendments to those conditions considered necessary):

CONDITIONS

Time Limit

1. The development to which this permission relates shall be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

   Reason - To comply with the provisions of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

Compliance with Plans

2. Except where otherwise stipulated by conditions attached to this permission, the development shall be carried out strictly in accordance with the following plans and documents: Site Location Plan (210,34-40 rev A); Proposals for Block 1 – plans (210,34 – 41 rev A); Proposals for Block 2 – plans (210,34 – 43 rev A); Site Utilities with proposed new buildings (210,34 – 50 rev A); Site Layout plan as proposed (210,34 – 51 rev B); Proposals for Block 1 – elevations (210,34 – 42 rev B); Proposals for Block 2 – elevations (210,34 – 44 rev B); Preliminary planting layout plan (BD 0216.3 SD 003 R02); Proposed Access Arrangements and Swept Path Analysis (2020-F-018-004); Proposed Access Arrangements and Swept Path Analysis (2020-F-018-005); Proposed Access Arrangements and Swept Path Analysis (2020-F-018-006); Proposed Access Arrangements and Swept Path Analysis (2020-F-018-007); Proposed Access Arrangements (Ghost RTL) (2020-F-018-008I REV B) and Proposed Access Arrangements (Ghost RTL) (2020-F-018-008II REV B).

   Reason – For the avoidance of doubt, to ensure that the development is carried out only as approved by the Local Planning Authority and comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The premises shall be used only for purposes falling within Classes B1, B2 and B8 as specified in Schedule 1 to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended) and for no other purpose(s) whatsoever, including any other purpose(s) within Class E of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended).

   Reason - In order to safeguard the character of the area and safeguard the amenities of the occupants of the adjoining premises and in the interests of highway safety and in accordance with Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 Part 1, Saved Policies C28 and C31 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. No development shall commence unless and until full details of the means of access between the land and the highway, including, position, layout, construction, drainage and vision splays have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The means of access shall be constructed in strict accordance with the approved details and shall be retained and maintained as such thereafter.

   Reason - In the interests of highway safety and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework, the requirements of Bicester LCWIP and LTN 1/20.

5. No development shall commence unless and until full specification details (including construction, layout, surfacing and drainage) of the turning area and 49 parking spaces within the curtilage of the site, arranged so that motor vehicles may enter, turn round and leave in a forward direction and vehicles may park off the highway, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The turning area and car parking spaces shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the development shall be retained as such for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles at all times thereafter.

6. No development shall commence unless and until a detailed scheme for the surface water and foul sewage drainage of the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved surface water drainage scheme shall be fully carried out prior to the commencement of any building works on the site, and the approved foul sewage drainage scheme shall be implemented prior to the first occupation of any building to which the scheme relates. All drainage works shall be laid out and constructed in accordance with the Water Authorities Association's current edition "Sewers for Adoption".

   Reason - To ensure satisfactory drainage of the site in the interests of public health, to avoid flooding of adjacent land and property and to comply with Policy ESD6 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 Part 1, Saved Policy ENV1 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

7. If contamination is found by undertaking the development hereby permitted, prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, a scheme of remediation and/or monitoring to ensure the site is suitable for its proposed use shall be prepared by a competent person and in accordance with DEFRA and the Environment Agency's *'Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination, CLR 11'* and submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No development shall take place until the Local Planning Authority has given its written approval of the scheme of remediation and/or monitoring required by this condition

Reason - To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Saved Policy ENV12 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

8. If remedial works have been identified in condition 7, the development shall not be occupied until the remedial works have been carried out in accordance with the scheme approved under condition 7. A verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation carried out must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

   Reason - To ensure that risks from land contamination to the future users of the land and neighbouring land are minimised, together with those to controlled waters, property and ecological systems, and to ensure that the development can be carried out safely without unacceptable risks to workers, neighbours and other offsite receptors in accordance with Saved Policy ENV12 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. No development shall commence unless and until a Construction Environment Management Plan (CEMP), which shall include details of the measures to be taken to ensure construction works do not adversely affect residential properties on, adjacent to or surrounding the site together with details of the consultation and communication to be carried out with local residents, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with approved CEMP.

   Reason - To ensure the environment is protected during construction in accordance with Saved Policy ENV1 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

10. Prior to the first occupation of the development, a scheme for the provision of vehicular electric charging points to serve the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The vehicular electric charging points shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the unit they serve, and retained as such thereafter.

    Reason - To comply with Policies SLE 4, ESD 1, ESD 3 and ESD 5 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 and to maximise opportunities for sustainable transport modes in accordance with paragraph 110(e) of the National Planning Policy

Framework.

11. Prior to the first occupation of the development, a scheme for the provision of solar PV to serve the development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The solar PV shall be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to the first occupation of the unit they serve, and retained as such thereafter.

    Reason - To support the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy in accordance with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

12. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in accordance with BS 4428:1989 Code of Practice for general landscape operations (excluding hard surfaces), or the most up to date and current British Standard, in the first planting and seeding seasons following the occupation of the building(s) or on the completion of the development, whichever is the sooner. Any trees, herbaceous planting and shrubs which, within a period of five years from the completion of the development die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased shall be replaced in the current/next planting season with others of similar size and species.

    Reason - In the interests of the visual amenities of the area, to ensure the creation of a pleasant environment for the development, to encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport and to comply with Policies ESD1 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan (2011-2031) Part 1, saved Policy C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

13. No goods, materials, plant or machinery shall be stored, repaired, operated or displayed in the open without the prior express planning consent of the Local Planning Authority.

    Reason - In order to safeguard the visual amenities of the area in accordance with Policy ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 Part 1, Saved Policy C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

106 **Land North and West of Bretch Hill Reservoir, Adj to Balmoral Avenue, Banbury**

The Committee considered application 20/01643/OUT, an outline application for the erection of up to 49 homes, public open space and other infrastructure, with all matters reserved except access at Land North and West of Bretch Hill Reservoir Adj to Balmoral Avenue Banbury for Lone Star Land Limited.

This application had been considered by Planning Committee on 8 October 2020 and was refused contrary to the officer's recommendations.

In light of advice from the council's legal team, the application had been resubmitted to clarify and/or inform the Committee regarding the site's Development Plan status and the Banbury Vision & Masterplan SPD, and to seek confirmation of the wording of the three reasons for refusal:

It was proposed by Councillor Colin Clarke and seconded by Councillor Chris Heath that the original decision on application 20/01643/OUT made at 5 November 2020 Planning Committee be dissolved and the application be reconsidered at the 14 January 2021 meeting of Planning Committee when a new report with information received after the October meeting be included.

The Chairman advised the Committee that as the application would be including additional significant information for Members' consideration, to ensure fairness, public speakers would be permitted to address the meeting.

Resolved.

(1) That the original decision on application 20/01643/OUT be dissolved and the application be reconsidered at the 14 January 2021 meeting of the Planning Committee.

107 **Great Wolf Public Inquiry**

The Assistant Director Planning and Development submitted a report on the Great Wolf Public Inquiry.

In introducing the report, the Team Leader – Major Developments explained that the report was being presented to Members to address suggestions made by the Appellant (Great Lakes UK Limited) that the Council's decision to refuse planning permission and its reasons for doing so were arrived at, in some respects, without regard to information which had been provided at the end of the application process, by the then Applicant.

The Team Leader – Major Developments explained that the application (reference 19/02550/F) had been refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development by reason of its location would result in the loss of an 18-hole golf course when the Local Planning Authority's evidence indicates the course is not surplus to requirements and there is a need for more provision for golf courses in the Bicester sub-area over the plan period. The evidence and proposals for alternative sports and recreation provision included with the application is not considered sufficient to make the loss of the golf course acceptable. The development is contrary to Policy BSC10 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 which seeks to protect existing sport and recreation provision and enhance the existing provision. It is also contrary to

Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The proposed development would result in the creation of a substantial leisure and hospitality destination in a geographically unsustainable location on a site largely devoid of built structures and beyond the built limits of the nearest settlement. It has no access via public transport and would not reduce the need to travel or offer a genuine choice of alternative travel modes over the private motor vehicle. Given the predominant guest dynamic (families with children) the majority of trips are likely to be made via private motor vehicle, utilising minor rural roads. Furthermore, the proposal is for retail and leisure development in an out-of-centre location and no impact assessment has been provided as required by Policy SLE2. The Council do not consider that exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated to justify the development in this location, and as such the proposal is contrary to Policies SLE1, SLE2, SLE3, SLE4 and ESD1 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, Saved Policies T5, TR7 and C8 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

3. The proposed development fails to demonstrate that traffic impacts of the development are, or can be made acceptable, particularly in relation to additional congestion at the Middleton Stoney signalised junction of the B4030 and B430. As such the proposal is contrary to Policy SLE4 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, Saved Policy TR7 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1, Policy 17 of the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

4. The development proposed, by virtue of its considerable size, scale and massing and its location in the open countryside beyond the built limits of the village of Chesterton, along with its institutional appearance, incongruous design, and associated levels of activity including regular comings and goings, will cause significant urbanisation and unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area, including the rural setting of the village and the amenities enjoyed by users of the public right of way, and would fail to reinforce local distinctiveness. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies ESD13 and ESD15 of the Cherwell Local Plan (2011-2031) Part 1, Saved Policies C8 and C28 of the Cherwell Local Plan 1996 and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

5. The submitted drainage information is inadequate due to contradictions in the calculations and methodology, lack of robust justification for the use of tanking and buried attenuation in place of preferred SuDS and surface management, and therefore fails to provide sufficient and coherent information to demonstrate that the proposal is acceptable in terms of flood risk and drainage. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies ESD6 and ESD7 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1

and Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

6. In the absence of a satisfactory unilateral undertaking or any other form of Section 106 legal agreement the Local Planning Authority is not satisfied that the proposed development provides for appropriate infrastructure (including highway infrastructure) directly required as a result of the development and necessary to make the impacts of the development acceptable in planning terms, to the detriment of both existing and proposed residents and contrary to Policies SLE4, INF1, and PSD1 of the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 and Government Guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Committee was advised that the appellant had submitted additional information and raised queries with regards the decision and refusal reasons. The Team Leader – Major Developments advised the Committee that it was recommended that the Council maintain its first, second, third and fifth reasons for refusal of application 19/02550/F (whilst also still maintaining refusal reasons 4 and 6) and continue to argue at the forthcoming Inquiry on 9 -17 February 2021 that appeal APP/C3105/W/20/3259189 should be dismissed for all the reasons specified in its original decision notice, dated 12 March 2020.

Resolved

(1) That notwithstanding the information submitted on behalf of the Appellant regarding potential alternative golf course re-provision at Bicester Hotel, Golf & Spa (*listed below), which suggested the District Council had failed to appropriately consider or interpret relevant evidence and planning guidance, the Council still wishes to maintain its first, second, third and fifth reasons for refusal at the forthcoming Inquiry on 9 -17 February 2021.

***(Paragraph 5.5 of the Appellant's Rule 6 Statement) and the further submissions (made in paragraphs 5.9, 5.14 and 5.35 of the Appellant's rule 6 Statement)**

"*5.5…the Appellant had in fact put forward the offer of a planning obligation prior to the determination of the application to secure the provision of an 18-hole course on the remaining golf course site, combined with investment in the practice range and a scholarship fund to support youth golfers. The evidence of that offer (which was not addressed by CDC in the determination of the application) is set out in the email and attachments from DP9 to CDC and England Gold, dated 11 March 2020 (included as part of the material submitted with this Appeal). A formal response was never received. This meant that CDC determined the planning application on an incorrect basis and on an assumption that clearly would have tainted their whole approach to the Proposed Development and its benefits*.

5.9 The allegation of the absence of any impact assessment referred to in Policy SLE2 is also misconceived. This is dealt with in paragraphs 6.58 to 6.63 of the Planning Statement. The relevant policy requirements in the Development Plan and NPPF are identified. An assessment was provided. Neither CDC's Planning Policy team, nor the Committee addressed it, and the resultant reason for refusal demonstrates a flawed approach by CDC. There appears to have been an assumption by CDC that a quantitative assessment was required, but that runs contrary to the guidance in the NPPG, as identified in the Planning Statement.

5.14 At the time of determination of the Planning Application, the only outstanding concern from OCC related to the B430/ B4030 junction in Middleton Stoney. The TA, however, demonstrates that the Proposed Development will not result in a material change in vehicle trips at the B430/ B4030 Middleton Stoney junction and therefore the Proposed Development will not result in a material impact on the operation of this junction. Notwithstanding this, the Appellant had in fact put forward a scheme of highway improvement works to provide additional traffic capacity at the Middleton Stoney junction. This will ensure that the Proposed Development will not have any impact at this junction. Motion, on behalf of the Appellant, has prepared an additional technical note (dated 4 September 2020), and summary note of discussions with OCC, which are included at Appendix 4. A formal note from OCC is expected but based on these ongoing discussions, it is still the Appellant's intention to resolve this reason prior to the Inquiry.

[and]

5.35 CDC commissioned Tyréns to undertake a review of Curtins' flood management and drainage work, as well as other material. Tyréns report was provided to the Appellant on 26 February 2020. The Appellant's experts Curtins responded in detail on 9 March 2020. This response does not appear to have been considered by CDC as part of their determination of the application. It has never been considered and responded to as part of the correspondence prior to the submission of this appeal."

108 **Appeals Progress Report**

The Assistant Director Planning and Development submitted a report which informed Members on applications which had been determined by the Council, where new appeals have been lodged, public inquiries/hearings scheduled or appeal results achieved.

Resolved

(1) That the position statement be accepted.

The meeting ended at 6.15 pm

Chairman:

Date: