

PLANNING COMMITTEE

19th October 2023

Present: Councillor Karen Lewing in the Chair

Councillors Agar (Vice-Chair), Allcott, Amos, Cleary, Cross, Denham (in place of Councillor Desayrah), Round, Smith and Udall

Apologies: Councillor Desayrah

45 Declarations of Interest

The following declarations of other disclosable interest were made:

Application 23/00621/FUL – Perdiswell Leisure Centre, Bilford Road
(Minute No. 57)

Councillor Allcott – Councillor Allcott and the Liberal Democrat Group were strongly opposed to this item. Councillor Allcott elected not to speak and vote on the item and left the room during its consideration.

Councillor Cleary – Councillor Cleary as a Member of the Communities Committee when the business case was approved. Councillor Cleary elected not to speak and vote on the item and left the room during its consideration.

Councillor Cross – Councillor Cross felt that he was pre-determined on this item following conversations with local residents. Councillor Cross elected not to speak and vote on the item and left the room during its consideration.

46 Minutes of Previous Planning Committee

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting held on 21st September 2023 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

47 Minutes of Previous Conservation Advisory Panel

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the Conservation Advisory Panel meeting held on 6th September 2023 be received.

48 Site Visits

The Committee visited the following site which was the subject of an application to be determined, prior to the commencement of the meeting:

Application 23/00551/FUL – Land adjoining 187 Drake Avenue

49 Public Participation

None.

50 Public Representation

Those representations made are recorded at the minute to which they relate.

51 Application 23/00414/FUL - 42 Foregate Street, Worcester, WR1 1EE**Introduction**

The Committee considered an application for the mixed-used refurbishment of the building, by retaining and re-modelling a commercial use (Class E) at ground floor with residential flats proposed above at first, second and third floor levels at 42 Foregate Street.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application had been referred to Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Denham.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the background to the proposal, the site and surrounding area, the proposal itself, relevant policies, planning history and representation and consultations where applicable.

There were no late papers circulated.

Officer Presentation

The information was presented as set out by the Corporate Director – Planning and Governance, in conjunction with a powerpoint presentation for the item.

Committee Members were informed that the proposals in this application were an amended version of the previously approved planning applications for the main building at 42 Foregate Street, 21/00470/FUL and 21/00471/LB which were granted on 15th March 2023.

The proposed amendments were highlighted in paragraph 3.2 of the report.

The Service Manager – Development Management informed Committee Members that this item would be considered in conjunction with Agenda Item 11 related to Listed Building consent, 23/00415/LB.

Public Representations

The following person had registered to speak on the application:

Nick Carroll of Nick Carroll Architects Ltd – Agent for the applicant.

Key Points of Debate

- The agent for the applicant in addressing the Committee explained the reasons behind the changes to the previously approved applications, which he felt was a betterment.

The proposal would see the remodeling of the ground floor for commercial use and reduce the number of flats on the upper floors from 13 to 9, which would meet the space standards as required and would be of a better quality.

- The agent for the applicant responded to questions and various points of clarification from Committee Members relating to car parking, air quality and ventilation plans, materials to be used to enhance the quality of the units, West Mercia Police comments and how they are being addressed, installation of fire sprinklers and crime risk management details.
- In response to questions around space standards and quality of materials, the Service Manager – Development Management informed Committee that they needed to look at what has already been approved, what is being proposed and decide if there is a betterment, officers were of the opinion that the scheme submitted warranted approval. The Listed Building consent will look at the details of the fabric of the building.
- Committee Members noted the removal of the existing fire escape at the rear of the property but were reassured of its replacement and would be dealt with under building regulations. Committee Members were also reassured by the type of materials to be used for the proposals and that air quality will be covered by building regulations.
- Some Committee Members felt that building more residential units in the city is an issue in relation to car parking, although the Local Highway Authority deemed the site as 'parking free' in line with the Streetscape Design Guide and its sustainable location.
- It was asked if the conditions are the same as the previously approved applications or had any additional conditions been added. The Service Manager – Development Management confirmed that the previous conditions were reviewed in line with this application and the Listed Building consent and additional elements were added.
- Generally, Committee Members found the debate useful as size and quality is important.

A proposal to approve the application had been made and this was seconded. There being no further points made the Chair requested the voting of each Member of the Committee who were eligible to vote. Following the recording of the votes the proposal to approve was agreed as follows.

For – 9
Against – 1
Abstentions – 0

Councillor Amos asked for his vote against the proposal to be recorded in the minutes.

RESOLVED: That the Committee grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in section 9 of the report.

52 Application 23/00415/LB - 42 Foregate Street, Worcester, WR1 1EE**Introduction**

The Committee considered an application for the mixed-used refurbishment of the building, by retaining and re-modelling a commercial use (Class E) at ground floor with residential flats proposed above at first, second and third floor levels at 42 Foregate Street.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application had been referred to Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Denham.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the background to the proposal, the site and surrounding area, the proposal itself, relevant policies, planning history and representation and consultations where applicable.

There were no late papers circulated.

Officer Presentation

The information was presented as set out by the Corporate Director – Planning and Governance, in conjunction with a powerpoint presentation for the item.

Committee Members were informed that the proposals in this application were an amended version of the previously approved planning applications for the main building at 42 Foregate Street, 21/00470/FUL and 21/00471/LB which were granted on 15th March 2023.

The proposed amendments were highlighted in paragraph 3.2 of the report.

Public Representations

The following person had registered to speak on the application:

Nick Carroll of Nick Carroll Architects Ltd – Agent for the applicant.

Key Points of Debate

See previous item – Application 23/00414/FUL

A proposal to approve the application had been made and this was seconded. There being no further points made the Chair requested the voting of each Member of the Committee who were eligible to vote. Following the recording of the votes the proposal to approve was agreed as follows.

For – 9

Against – 1

Abstentions – 0

Councillor Amos asked for his vote against the proposal to be recorded in the minutes.

RESOLVED: That the Committee grant listed building consent, subject to the conditions set out in section 9 of the report.

53 Application 22/01053/FUL - Former Berwick Arms, 250 Bath Road, Worcester

Introduction

The Committee considered an application for the change of use from a dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to a 3-bedroom House of Multiple Occupation (HMO) (Use Class C4) at the former Berwick Arms, 250 Bath Road.

During the course of the application, the submitted proposals had been revised along with amended plans submitted changing the proposals from an originally proposed 8-bedroom HMO to a 3-bedroom HMO. The revised plans were submitted by the Agent following concerns raised by officers with the original 8-bedroom HMO, these related to overdevelopment, impact on parking and highway safety and the level of amenity for future occupiers.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application was originally referred to Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Denham on the grounds as set out in paragraph 1.2 of the report.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the background to the proposal, the site and surrounding area, the proposal itself, relevant policies, planning history and representation and consultations where applicable.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the late paper which related to the correction of the recommendation in the report, which should read as follows:

The Corporate Director – Planning and Governance recommends that the Planning Committee approves the planning application, subject to the conditions as set out in section 9 of the report.

Officer Presentation

The information was presented as set out by the Corporate Director – Planning and Governance, in conjunction with a powerpoint presentation for the item.

Public Representations

There had been no one registered to speak on the application.

Key Points of Debate

- Reference was made to paragraph 7.43 of the report and it was asked what will happen to the remaining rooms and how this will, be enforced if they

become HMO rooms. The Service Manager – Development Management referred Committee Members to condition 3 which limits the number of bedrooms. As part of the housing process, they will need a licence and this will tie up with the planning permission and was satisfied that this would be enforceable and clarified what that would be.

- The size of the outdoor garden space was questioned and whether it was adequate. The Service Manager referred Committee Members to paragraph 7.22 of the report which identified that there would be a satisfactory level of amenity space for future occupiers of the HMO. Paragraph 7.23 of the report also highlighted that there was a condition removing permitted development rights.
- Committee Members did raise concerns about the future use of the storage rooms and also car parking if these rooms were occupied. The Local Highways Authority representative stated that there were concerns originally, but this proposal requires 2 parking spaces which are provided, there are no grounds for refusal. The Service Manager clarified the storage space for the benefit of Members.
- In referring to condition 9 it was asked why the landscaping scheme could not be in perpetuity rather than 5 years. The Service Manager stated that the 5-year maintenance was established in case law and was set out in government guidance. If Members felt this was important then a condition for a maintenance plan can be included.
- It was asked on what basis had parking been decided. The Local Highway Authority representative stated that the assessment had been carried out on a 3 bed HMO, the storage rooms are not classed as bedrooms. For the benefit of Member's the Service Manager referred to paragraph 7.17 of the report which related to the floor plans.
- Clarification was requested on the numbers related to occupiers of the property in paragraphs 7.44 and 7.45 of the report. The Service Manager explained for clarity.
- It was proposed that condition 9, as previously alluded to, could be amended to include maintenance of future years. This was agreed.

A proposal to approve the application had been made and this was seconded, subject to the amendment of condition 9. There being no further points made the Chair requested the voting of each Member of the Committee who were eligible to vote. Following the recording of the votes the proposal to approve was lost as follows.

For – 4
Against – 6
Abstentions – 0

- On the basis of the vote the Chair asked Committee Members for their reasons for refusal. These were insufficient parking in terms of layout and locality and highway safety as the road is very narrow.

There were also concerns that the storage rooms would become occupied, but the Service Manager stated that Members cannot speculate what might happen and in any event this would require a further application if it happened, in terms of parking and space it was acceptable. The Local Highway Authority representative also reiterated their assessment of the parking which meets the standard for this location.

- Committee Members continued to debate the proposal as far as car parking was concerned and it was proposed by the Service Manager that Members may wish to defer the application to visit the site and a visit within the property to look at in more detail in terms of the layout. The Chair also agreed that a deferral would allow the agent to attend the meeting as they were unable to do so today.
- Following further discussions, the Service Manager stated that any refusal reasons needed to be evidenced and a deferral may help Members reach this.
- Some Committee Members were not content with a deferral and that a decision had been made to refuse the application. Although the Chair and Vice Chair of the Committee can agree the final wording of the decision notice, the Service Manager stated that Members need to agree the specific reasons. He went on to say that the Streetscape Design Guide outlined the parking spaces for HMOs and Members would need to demonstrate why this location needs great number of parking spaces than the parking standards require.
- The Local Highway Authority representative explained to Members that when making a recommendation, paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework needs to be taken into account, paragraph 7.28 of the report refers. She stated that in the refusal reasons this would need to be clarified.
- The Head of Planning stated that Committee Members concerns were understandable and that it would be difficult to substantiate refusal on the grounds so far, an appeal could be allowed, and costs awarded. Deferral may be prudent so the applicant can be asked to provide additional information, particularly around the rooms to be used as storage.
- Several Committee Members were very familiar with the area and the parking issues and raised concerns over highway safety.
- In terms of the debate the Service Manager read out reasons for refusal. The Head of Planning stated that the officer's recommendation still stands and this wording is what the officers are suggesting but it will be up to Members.

A proposal to defer the application had been made and this was seconded. There being no further points made the Chair requested the voting of each Member of the Committee who were eligible to vote. Following the recording of the votes the proposal to defer was lost as follows.

For – 3
Against – 6
Abstentions – 1

On the basis of the voting the Chair stated that another motion needed to be established and a proposal was made to refuse the application. As a reminder the Service Manager read out the reasons for refusal. The motion was seconded. There being no further points made the Chair requested the voting of each Member of the Committee who were eligible to vote. Following the recording of the votes the proposal to refuse was lost as follows.

For – 5
Against – 5
Abstentions – 0

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, as there were equal number of votes for and against, the Chair used her casting vote. The Chair voting against refusal of the proposal.

For – 5
Against – 6
Abstentions – 0

The chair stated that the Committee needed to get to a decision therefore another motion was needed.

The Service Manager outlined the options available to Committee Members which would be to reconsider one of the previous motions i.e. defer for a site visit and allowing the applicant to provide more information; refuse the application and review the reasons for refusal; or consider a motion to approve the application with additional conditions.

It was suggested that if permission was granted then an additional condition for a residential Car Parking Management Plan could be requested. Although those Committee Members who were familiar with this area stated that this would not be of any use and asked officers to show the relevant slide of Stanley Street for clarification.

The Head of Planning stated that as useful as the slides are, if a planning inspector found that a site visit was made it would make the Committee's decision before the inspector easier.

A proposal to defer the application had been made and this was seconded. There being no further points made the Chair requested the voting of each Member of the Committee who were eligible to vote. Following the recording of the votes the proposal to defer was lost as follows.

For – 4
Against – 5
Abstentions – 1

The Service Manager referred to the additional condition put forward for a Car Parking Management Plan and this was for Members to decide if they wished to proceed with this.

A proposal to approve the application was made and this was seconded, subject to the additional condition relating a Car Parking Management Plan. There being no further points made the Chair requested the voting of each Member of the Committee who were eligible to vote. Following the recording of the votes the proposal to approve, with the additional condition, was lost as follows.

For – 3
Against – 6
Abstentions – 1

It was then proposed that the application be deferred, pending the receipt of the Car Parking Management Plan, plus a site visit. This was seconded. There being no further points made the Chair requested the voting of each Member of the Committee who were eligible to vote. Following the recording of the votes the proposal to defer the application for the reasons given was agreed as follows.

For – 6
Against – 3
Abstentions – 1

RESOLVED: That the Committee defer the application in order for a Car Parking Management Plan to be submitted and a site visit carried out.

54 Application 23/00014/FUL - 8 Bromwich Lane, Worcester, WR2 4BH

Introduction

The Committee considered an application for the reconfiguration of a dwelling to provide a total of 3no. apartments consisting of 3no. 1-bedroom residential apartments and external changes, inclusive of the removal of the existing side conservatory at 8 Bromwich Lane.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application had been referred to Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Amos.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the background to the proposal, the site and surrounding area, the proposal itself, relevant policies, planning history and representation and consultations where applicable.

There were no late papers circulated.

Officer Presentation

The information was presented as set out by the Corporate Director – Planning and Governance, in conjunction with a powerpoint presentation for the item.

The Service Manager – Development Management informed Committee Members that condition 5 was to be amended to refer to secure, covered and accessible cycle storage.

Public Representations

There had been no one registered to speak on the application.

Key Points of Debate

- Concerns were raised over the lack of parking for this development and asked on what basis did officers assume that people who will live there, will walk to work, walk go the shops etc. and do not need a vehicle, and if they do have vehicles where will they park. There were already concerns about displaced parking in this area.
- The Local Highway Authority representative in response confirmed that this is a sustainable location with day-to-day facilities on the doorstep. She stated that it was important to note that as currently laid out the site is already deficient in car parking spaces and couldn't refuse for this reason. From a highways point of view the site location is acceptable as a parking free development in line with the Streetscape Design Guide.
- Reference was made to paragraph 2.2 of the report and in response to a question on the current lawful use of the single dwelling house, the Service Manager provided clarification for Members.
- When asked if a parking plan could be provided and conditioned, the Service Manager stated that a parking plan condition would not be a legitimate condition as at the moment there is no parking, and the proposal does not include parking either. It was noted that there are parking restrictions in the vicinity of the site to prevent displacement parking.
- Reference was made to paragraph 7.44 of the report which stated that traffic from the proposed development should have safe access and there should be capacity in the road network to accommodate this, it was asked where the capacity was. The Service Manager stated that advise was provided by the Local Highway Authority on the current site around traffic generation and compared with the proposal it is considered there is capacity within the existing network. The whole area is assessed and not just particular roads.
- The Local Highway Authority representative reminded Committee Members that the authority has to have regard to paragraph 111 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the relevant wording outlined in paragraph 7.45 of the report.

A proposal to approve the application had been made and this was seconded. There being no further points made the Chair requested the voting of each Member of the Committee who were eligible to vote. Following the recording of the votes the proposal to approve was agreed, subject to the amendment of condition 5, as follows.

For – 6
 Against – 2
 Abstentions – 1

Councillors Amos and Smith asked for their vote against the proposal to be recorded in the minutes.

RESOLVED: That the Committee

- 1. grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in section 9 of the report and to the amendment of condition 5 to refer to secure, covered and accessible cycle storage; and**
- 2. delegate authority to the Corporate Director – Planning and Governance, subject to consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning Committee, to confirm the final wording of the above condition and issue the Decision Notice.**

For voting purposes Councillor Udall had left the meeting before the consideration of this item.

55 Application 23/00551/FUL - Land adjoining 187 Drake Avenue, Worcester, WR2 5RT

Introduction

The Committee considered an application for the erection of a new dwelling with new vehicular access on land adjoining 187 Drake Avenue.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application had been referred to Planning Committee at the request of Councillor Lamb as outlined in paragraphs 1.4 and 1.5 of the report.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the background to the proposal, the site and surrounding area, the proposal itself, relevant policies, planning history and representation and consultations where applicable.

There were no late papers circulated.

The application was originally reported to Planning Committee on 24th August 2023, but was deferred to allow for a site visit to take place. Following the deferral, a set of amended plans were submitted which had been designed to address a number of concerns raised by Committee Members.

Officer Presentation

The information was presented as set out by the Corporate Director – Planning and Governance, in conjunction with a powerpoint presentation for the item.

The Senior Planning Officer drew the Committee's attention to paragraph 3.2 of the report which highlighted the amendments made to the application which were addressed throughout the report.

Public Representations

There had been no one registered to speak on the application.

Key Points of Debate

- Committee Members acknowledged the amendments made by the applicant and commented that deferring applications can be seen as a positive rather than a negative.
- There were still concerns however that the proposal over dominated the adjoining property. Building in gardens was seen as an issue and that garden spaces were important. Access was also considered an issue as it is very close to the corner.
- Following the site visit, although some concerns raised by Committee Members had been addressed, some still felt that the proposal would still result in a loss of amenity space.
- Clarification was provided by the Service Manager – Development Management, when asked, on the extant planning permission outlined in paragraph 7.44 of the report relating to Application 20/00637/FUL.
- Reference was made to paragraphs 7.24 and 7.25 of the report, related to light access for existing and future residents. The Service Manager confirmed that it was considered that there was adequate natural day light.
- In referring to condition 8 Committee Members felt that it did not precisely remove permitted development rights. The Service Manager confirmed that they would need to submit an application for any further development but was happy to take away and look at the wording of that condition.
- For clarification the Service Manager stated that the existing hedge would be retained, and if as part of the construction works was damaged, it would need to be removed and replaced.

A proposal to approve the application had been made and this was seconded. There being no further points made the Chair requested the voting of each Member of the Committee who were eligible to vote. Following the recording of the votes the proposal to approve was agreed as follows.

For - 4
 Against - 4
 Abstentions – 0

In accordance with the Council's Constitution, as there were equal number of votes for and against, the Chair used her casting vote. The Chair voting in favour of the proposal.

For – 5
 Against – 4
 Abstentions - 0

RESOLVED: That the Committee grant planning permission, subject to the conditions set out in section 9 of the report.

For voting purposes Councillor Allcott had left the meeting before the consideration of this item.

56 Application 23/00569/FUL - Horizon Community Centre, Midland Road, Worcester, WR5 1DS

Introduction

The Committee considered an application for a single-story extension to accommodate classroom space at the Horizon Community Centre, Midland Road.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application had been referred to Planning Committee as the applicant is Worcester City Council.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the background to the proposal, the site and surrounding area, the proposal itself, relevant policies, planning history and representation and consultations where applicable.

There were no late papers circulated.

Officer Presentation

The information was presented as set out by the Corporate Director – Planning and Governance, in conjunction with a powerpoint presentation for the item.

Public Representations

There had been no one registered to speak on the application.

Key Points of Debate

- With regard to the comments of Worcestershire Regulatory Services, the Service Manager – Development Management clarified that the initials MVHR stood for Mechanical Ventilation Heat Recovery.
- It was requested that condition 5 could be amended to include secure, covered and accessible cycle storage. This was agreed.
- Committee Members welcomed the proposal for the area and noted the comments of the West Mercia Constabulary Crime Risk Manager who encouraged the police preferred standard, Secure by Design PAS24:2022 when considering recessed downpipes, windows and roof lights.

A proposal to approve the application had been made and this was seconded. There being no further points made the Chair requested the voting of each Member of the Committee who were eligible to vote. Following the recording of the votes the proposal to approve was agreed as follows, subject to the amendment of condition 5.

For - 8
Against - 0
Abstentions - 0

RESOLVED: That the Committee

- 1. grant planning permission pursuant to Regulation 3 of The Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 (as amended), subject to the conditions set out in the section 9 of the report and to the amendment of condition 5 to refer to secure, covered and accessible cycle storage; and**
- 2. delegate authority to the Corporate Director – Planning and Governance, subject to consultation with the Chair and Vice Chair of the Planning Committee, to confirm the final wording of the above condition and issue the Decision Notice.**

57 Application 23/00621/FUL - Perdiswell Leisure Centre, Bilford Road, Worcester, WR3 8DX

Introduction

The Committee considered an application for the creation of a 3G Artificial Grass Pitch (AGP) with perimeter fencing, hardstanding areas, storage container, floodlights, an access path and associated bund at Perdiswell Leisure Centre, Bilford Road.

Reason Why Being Considered by Planning Committee

The application had been referred to Planning Committee as the applicant is Worcester City Council.

Report/Background/Late Papers

The report set out the background to the proposal, the site and surrounding area, the proposal itself, relevant policies, planning history and representation and consultations where applicable.

There were no late papers circulated.

Officer Presentation

The information was presented as set out by the Corporate Director – Planning and Governance, in conjunction with a powerpoint presentation for the item.

The Committee's attention was drawn to paragraph 3.4 of the report relating to the hours of opening. The Service Manager informed Committee Members that the Council had no plans to extend the opening hours on the weekend from 20.00-22.00 hours. There were no proposed changes to the opening hours of the centre.

The Service Manager informed Committee Members that following publication of the agenda, the Local Highway Authority had submitted a further consultee response, received 18th October 2023, who had confirmed that they had no objection to the proposal following receipt of further information. The response from the Local Highway Authority was read out to Committee Members. In view of this the Service Manager proposed that the recommendation be amended.

Public Representations

There had been no one registered to speak on the application.

Key Points of Debate

- Reference was made to the objections made by Sport England. Committee Members were referred to paragraph 6.8 of the report which outlined that they had initially raised concerns but following the provision of additional justification, they no longer raised an objection as it was now considered to meet exception 5 of their policy.
- Concerns were raised about the use of microplastics and the environmental impact these will have. The Chair stated that this had been reviewed by the Property Team. The Service Manager stated that in terms of weight there was no planning policy, although it was a material consideration. Members were reminded that they needed to weigh up these concerns against the benefits.
- Condition 8 relating to the South Worcestershire Land Drainage Partnership was referred to which would ensure that the development is properly drained, avoiding flood risk and pollution. The Service Manager also referred Committee Members to Condition 7 which would ensure that the pitch met FIFA Quality Concept for Football Turf and that the facility is registered on the Football Association's Register of Football Turf Pitches.
- In response to a question relating to biodiversity and trees, the Service Manager referred Committee Members to condition 9 and to the comments of the Council's Landscape Officer in paragraph 7.40 of the report whereby mitigation measures were in place.
- Members welcomed the reference to the Planning for Health in South Worcestershire Supplementary Planning Document as highlighted in paragraph 4.8 of the report.

A proposal to approve the application had been made and this was seconded. There being no further points made the Chair requested the voting of each Member of the Committee who were eligible to vote. Following the recording of the votes the proposal to approve was agreed, as per the amended recommendation, as follows.

For - 5
Against - 1
Abstentions - 0

Councillor Round asked for her vote against the proposal to be recorded in the minutes.

RESOLVED: That the Committee grant planning permission pursuant to Regulation 3 of The Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 (as amended), subject to the conditions set out in Section 9 of the report.

For voting purposes Councillors Cleary and Cross left the room prior to the consideration of this item.

58 Any Other Business

None.

Duration of the meeting: 3.00p.m. to 6.53p.m.

Chair at the meeting on
14th December 2023