
MEETING	EAST AREA PLANNING SUB-COMMITTEE
DATE	11 NOVEMBER 2010
PRESENT	COUNCILLORS HYMAN (CHAIR FOR MINUTE ITEMS 31B-31F), CREGAN (VICE-CHAIR IN THE CHAIR FOR MINUTE ITEM 31A), DOUGLAS, FIRTH, FUNNELL(EXCEPT FOR MINUTE ITEM 31D), B WATSON, MOORE, ORRELL, TAYLOR AND WISEMAN
IN ATTENDANCE	COUNCILLORS RUNCIMAN AND POTTER

INSPECTION OF SITES

Site	Attended by	Reason for Visit
The Fossway, 187-189 Huntington Road	Cllrs Hyman, Moore and B Watson	As objections had been received and the officer recommendation was to approve.
62 Brockfield Park Drive, Huntington	Cllrs Hyman, Moore, B Watson and Funnell	As objections had been received and the officer recommendation was to approve.
Minster Alarms, Suncliffe House, 157 New Lane, Huntington	Cllrs Moore, B Watson and Orrell	As objections had been received and the officer recommendation was to approve.
Derwent House Residential Home, Hull Road, Kexby	Cllrs Hyman, Moore and B Watson	As objections had been received and the officer recommendation was to approve.

28. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were invited to declare at this point in the meeting any personal or prejudicial interests that they might have in the business on the agenda.

Councillor Firth declared a personal non prejudicial interest in plans item 4a (Minster Alarms, Suncliffe House, 157 New Lane, Huntington) as his house alarm was provided by Minster Alarms.

Councillor Funnell declared a personal and prejudicial interest in plans item 4d (The Fossway, 187-189 Huntington Road) under the provisions of the Planning Code of Good Practice. She spoke from the floor as Ward Member after which she left the room and took no part in the discussion or vote on this item.

Councillor Wiseman declared a personal non prejudicial interest in plans item 4d (The Fossway, 187-189 Huntington Road) as she knew the teacher from Huntington School who had submitted a letter in respect of this application.

Councillor Hyman declared a personal and prejudicial interest in plans item 4a (Minster Alarms, Suncliffe House, 157 New Lane, Huntington) as the owner of the property was a personal friend of his. He stood down from the Chair and left the room for this item and took no part in the discussion or vote on this application.

29. MINUTES

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the East Area Planning Sub-Committee held on 14 October 2010 be approved and signed subject to Minute 27 (Enforcement Cases Update) being amended to include the following sentence.

“Some Members expressed concern about the high number of enforcement cases”.

30. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

It was noted that there had been no registrations to speak under the Council's Public Participation Scheme on general issues within the remit of the Sub-Committee.

31. PLANS LIST

Members considered a schedule of reports of the Assistant Director (Planning and Sustainable Development), relating to the following planning applications, outlining the proposals and relevant policy considerations and setting out the views and advice of consultees and officers.

31a Minster Alarms, Suncliffe House, 157 New Lane, Huntington, York. (10/00342/FUL)

Members considered a full application from Mr Hazan Hazar, for a change of use of part of the ground floor of a two storey detached building from retail (use class A1) to sale of hot food (initially thought to be use class A5) for delivery purposes only.

Officers advised the Committee that following further investigation, it was clear that the proposed use did not fall within use class A5 as the proposed uses primary purpose was not for the sale of hot food to take away for consumption off the premises by visiting members of the public. The delivery to home service would involve the preparation of a product for sale which would be manufacturing with related distribution activity and was usually considered by inspectors to fall within use class B2 (General Industry). However given the potential for odours, it would fall outside class B1 (Business)

Officers explained that their recommendation and proposed conditions remained unchanged due to the change of use but asked the Committee to

note that the application description should read “Change of Use of part ground floor from retail (use class A1) to hot food delivery-to-home service (use class B2). They also advised that Reference to Policy S6 should be replaced with Policy E4 (Employment development on Unallocated Land). This policy allows employment uses of a scale appropriate to the locality within defined settlement limits where it involves conversion of existing buildings. The requested that Condition 4 be amended to refer to the preparation and cooking of food for consumption off the premises by delivery only and for no other purpose.

They stated that the Environmental Protection Unit and Highway Network Management Team had been consulted and had raised no objections subject to conditions. They also advised that additional correspondence had been received from local residents reiterating their objection to the application on the basis of increased traffic, noise and smell and seeking a guarantee that the business would remain delivery only. *(A full copy of the officer’s update was published online with the agenda after the meeting)*

Representations in objection to the application were received from a neighbour, speaking on behalf of residents of New Lane. He raised concerns that any further deliveries or increase in traffic would impact on safety at what was already a busy junction in a predominantly residential area with a lot of elderly residents. He also stressed that the increased noise and smell associated with the business would impact on residential amenity with the business operating 15 hours a day seven days a week. He questioned the viability of the business and raised concerns that the conditions may not be adhered to. He asked the Committee to refuse the application.

Members noted the concerns raised by the speaker. They acknowledged that the application had the potential for increased noise and disturbance leading to loss of amenity for local residents especially due to deliveries in the evening and noted the possible increase in traffic at a busy T junction and issues regarding access for delivery vehicles due to overnight parking of Minster Alarms vehicles on the site. They voiced the opinion that the need to deliver food to residents who may live very nearby, and would normally be able to collect from a takeaway, was not environmentally sustainable.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

REASON: The proposal, due to the nature of the use and location in a predominantly residential street, would introduce activity late into the evening from potentially frequent vehicle movements associated with the delivery service. This would result in increased noise levels and disturbance at a time when adjacent residents could expect less disturbance from commercial activity and vehicle movements, to the detriment of the residential amenity that adjacent occupants presently enjoy.

31b 2 Heathfield Road York YO10 3AE (10/02057/FUL)

Members considered a revised full application from Mr Mark Hutchinson, for a single storey side and rear extension (revised scheme).

Officers advised that they had received a further objection from a neighbour which reiterated concerns set out in the objections and raised the point that the student occupiers of a HMO do not contribute to the city through council tax and that the beneficiary was a landlord who lives outside York.

Representations were received from the applicant's agent in support of the application. He circulated plans, which showed the extent of the previously refused application, the extent of the current proposals and also what was allowed under permitted development rights. He reminded Members that whether or not the property was let to students was not a planning consideration.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to the effect on the amenity and living conditions of adjacent occupiers and the impact on the streetscene. As such the proposal complies with Policies H7 and GP1 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan and the 'Guide to extensions and alterations to private dwelling houses' Supplementary Planning Guidance.

31c Derwent House Residential Home, Hull Road, Kexby, York. YO41 5LD (10/01818/FULM)

Members considered a full planning application by Mr Martin Taylor, for the erection of 26 high dependency units with associated facilities within a two storey extension to the side of the existing residential nursing home.

Officers provided the Committee with an update. They advised that the Sustainability Officer had confirmed that additional information submitted shows a commitment to BREEAM requirements and providing a proportion of energy from renewable sources therefore they were happy for appropriate conditions to be applied. They advised that this refers to conditions 10 and 11 of the report and that condition 10 be reworded to begin "prior to commencement" not "Prior to start").

They advised the Committee that objectors had raised concerns about the poor electricity and water supply in the village and that the applicant had advised them that any requirements requested by the statutory services providers in relation to potential upgrades of existing supplies or new supplies to the site would be undertaken. A further letter from an objector

stated that the amendments to the internal layout did not change their concerns about the development.

Officers advised that with reference to paragraph 4.21 of the report, Highways had raised no objections to the scheme as amended but recommended that an additional condition be added in respect of cycle parking areas and that draft condition 3 (HWAY9) be removed as surfaces were shown on the plans. They advised that Drainage Officers had raised objections due to the lack of information supporting the application. However, they believed that drainage of the site could be achieved, including the attenuation of drainage where necessary in principle, and suggested a condition be added to ensure that all drainage details were submitted and agreed before development commenced on the site.

Officers also advised that a condition should be added preventing a future increase in the number of bedrooms provided without the prior written approval through the submission of a formal planning application. *(A full copy of the officer's update had been published online with the agenda after the meeting)*

Members questioned whether the extant permission for an extension to the original hotel was still valid since permission had been granted for change of use to a care home for the elderly and officers provided clarification on this issue. Members pointed out that the treatment plant would restrict the growth of tree roots and requested that a condition be added to stipulate the type of trees to be grown in this location.

Representations were received in objection to the application from a neighbour. She raised concerns over the plans to increase the scale of the care home as the owner had advised her previously that they had no plans to expand in size. She informed Members that the Retreat and other care homes provided care for sufferers of Alzheimer's and other mental health issues. She explained that the water supply in the village was limited and the electricity voltage was low and demand from the care home for both services was high. She also raised concerns about the lack of facilities in the village and limited bus services.

In response to the concerns raised regarding the water and electricity supply in the village, Officers advised that water and electricity suppliers have to adhere to obligations regarding supply of services and that this was not a planning consideration. The applicant's agent confirmed that if any upgrade were needed to services, this would be done onsite as part of the development.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved after referral to the Secretary of State subject to the conditions listed in the report and the amended and additional conditions and informative below and the deletion of draft condition 3.

Amended Condition 7

No development shall take place until details have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council of the measures to be provided within the design of the new building and landscaping to enhance the biodiversity of the site. The works shall be completed in accordance with the approved

details in accordance with a timescale to be agreed in writing as part of the submitted scheme.

NB. Features suitable for incorporation include measures for species that use buildings such as bats and birds and enhancement of the existing landscape areas that form the boundaries of the site.

REASON - This is proposed to take account of and enhance the habitat and biodiversity of the locality in accordance with PPS9 ' Biodiversity and Geological Conservation'.

Amended Condition 14.

The landscaping scheme shown on Drawing no. AL (9) 901 rev D shall be implemented within a period of six months of the completion of the development. Prior to the commencement of the development details of all proposed tree species shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter implemented in combination with the landscaping scheme. Any trees or plants 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 next planting season with others of a similar size and species, unless alternatives are agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: So that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied with the variety, suitability and disposition of species within the site.

Additional Condition

No development shall take place until details of the proposed means of disposal of foul and surface water drainage, including details of any balancing works and off-site works, have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter the approved surface water and foul drainage works shall be implemented to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority before any dwelling hereby approved is occupied

Reason: To ensure that no foul or surface water discharge take place until proper provision has been made for their disposal and to ensure that the site is properly drained

Additional Condition

The internal layout of the development hereby approved shown on Drawing no AL (0) 001 rev D shall not be altered in any way that would increase the number of bedrooms provided without the prior written approval through the submission of a formal planning application.

Reason: To ensure that any future increase in use of the site does not impact on the openness of the green belt and in the interests of highway safety and the free flow of traffic.

Additional Condition

Prior to the development commencing details of the cycle parking areas, including means of enclosure, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The building shall not be occupied until the cycle parking areas and means of enclosure have been provided within the site in accordance with such approved details, and these areas shall not be used for any purpose other than the parking of cycles.

Reason: To promote use of cycles thereby reducing congestion on the adjacent roads and in the interests of the amenity of neighbours.

Informative

You are advised to liaise with electricity and water suppliers to ensure supplies are adequate to serve your site, as enlarged as well as others users on the supply lines.

REASON:

The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report and the amended and additional conditions above, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to: Policy Background; principle of the development within green belt and consideration of very special circumstances; need for the facility; proximity to Local Facilities; design and Landscaping; highways, access and parking; ecology; drainage; sustainability and restriction of use. As such the proposal complies with Policies GB1, H17, C1, GP1, GP4a and GP9 of the City of York Local Plan Deposit Draft.

In addition, the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that there are very special circumstances in this case sufficient to clearly outweigh the limited harm that would be caused to the Green Belt. In particular, it is considered that the extant permission represents a 'fall back position' and that the physical differences between the two schemes are limited, the use of the extension as a care facility will have less impact on the openness of the Green Belt and the landscape quality of the scheme will reduce the impact on the openness of the green belt. Furthermore the approval of the extension will allow for the imposition of conditions to ensure that the development meets sustainability, ecology and drainage objectives. Thus it is considered that the proposal does not conflict with national planning advice contained within Planning Policy Guidance Note 2 "Green Belts".

**31d The Fossway, 187 - 189 Huntington Road, York, YO31 9BP.
(10/01435/FUL)**

Members considered a full application from Mr David Lavery for a change of use from a public house (use class A4) to a mixed use, which included a youth club, day nursery, place of worship with associated office space, 1 flat on the first floor and 1 flat on the second floor.

Officers provided the Committee with updated information, which had been received since the report was published. They advised that paragraphs 3.10 (should read 4.10) of the report should refer to 40 people not 40 families.

They stated that a response from the Council's Family Information Service had been received which raised the following issues in relation to the proposed nursery;

- That the plans were basic and much information had been omitted.

- That the plans indicated car parking in the road, and that there were concerns regarding the dropping off and picking up of children on a main road.
- There was not an identified need for additional nursery provision in this area, although currently reassessing this with more up to date information available in Jan 2011.
- That 20 places in nursery was very small and viability may be difficult.
There had been no indication on how the nursery would access the outdoor area – this would be important from security perspective & need for free flow play.
- That the baby room had a door which connects to the main entrance corridor for the church/main hall which would raise security concerns
- That the laundry was situated in an inappropriate area for the nursery.
- That no provision had been made for buggies and storage.

Officers advised that an e-mail had been received from the agent on 8 November and their comments in response to issues raised by the agent had been included within the officer's update. They also advised the Committee that a further letter of objection had been received from a local nursery owner, which stated that there was not a need for another nursery in the area and raised concerns over the job security of her employees, if another nursery was to open in close proximity.

Officers advised that a further letter of support had been received from Dodsworth Area Residents Association (DARA) offering their support and the support of the Muncaster Area Residents' Associations in support to the initiative of the Living Word Church to purchase and convert the building and transform it into a community facility and church. They noted that the inclusion of childcare facilities, space for community uses as well as scope for debt advice, marriage guidance and youth work by trained members of its congregation would be valuable to those living in their respective association areas. This letter was circulated to Members for their information. *(A full copy of the officer's update was published online with the agenda after the meeting)*

A revised parking survey had been received from the agents on the day of the meeting and so had not been fully reviewed. Highway Officers did however note that it had been conducted on a single Sunday

Representations in objection to the application were received from a local nursery owner. She advised that the need for additional nursery places in the area was low with sufficient nurseries nearby to satisfy the need. She commented that more and more parents relied on the use of family for childcare rather than nurseries due to financial constraints. She advised Members that since her nursery had opened in 2005, two family centres had also opened which offered childcare.

Representations in support of the application were also heard from the applicant's agent. He addressed concerns, which had been raised in relation to parking. He stated that the plan showed that the parking bays were in accordance with the required standards and explained that they had undertaken a parking survey and briefed Members on the result of

this, which concluded that there would be adequate space for vehicles to safely manoeuvre into and off the site. He advised that in addition to parking available on the site, there was sufficient parking on nearby roads without affecting the traffic flow. He stated that the development would bring a derelict building back into use and provide a much needed nursery, would add to the economy and increase the value of the neighbourhood.

A further representation in support of the application was received from the secretary of the Heworth Ward Planning Panel. He advised Members that, at a recent meeting, the Planning Panel had given their support for the application. He stated that it would be a good asset for the city and would enable a derelict structure to be developed. In relation to parking issues raised, he suggested that parents of children attending the nursery would only need to park for short periods while dropping off and collecting their children. He offered his support for the scheme.

Councillor Potter, Ward Member for Heworth, spoke in objection to the application on behalf of residents living on Huntington Road. She stated that Huntington Road was a busy road and drew Members attention to the Spar shop adjacent to the site for which people parked on the road and lorries parked to unload deliveries. She stated that the ten available parking spaces would be insufficient for the number of staff working at the premises without even taking into account the needs of others and explained that due to the lack of space on site, which limited manoeuvring, cars would need to reverse back out onto the busy road which raised safety concerns. She asked the Committee to refuse the application due to the cumulative impact on the road.

Councillor Funnell, also Ward Member for Heworth, spoke in support of the application on behalf of the Dodsworth Area Residents' Association and Muncaster Area Residents' Association and the Vicar of the Living Word Church. She acknowledged that traffic was an issue but pointed out that if the building was developed for residential use this could result in parking being required for more than 18 cars. She reminded Members that a parking survey had been undertaken by the architects at a cost to the applicant. She stated that the building was currently an eyesore and was used by fly tippers and vandals and voiced the opinion that this was a creative proposal which would provide resources and services, including provision of specialist advice, to the local community, would create jobs, and would be available for general social use by the local community. She stated that the site was well served by bus routes.

Members noted that the area was a mixture of shops and residential premises and the site was highly sustainable with two bus routes. They agreed that the proposals were imaginative and would bring a disused building back into use, which would be available for community use two days each week. However, they noted the objections from Highways and raised concerns that cars would need to reverse out of the site across a pavement onto a busy road. They also questioned whether there was the need for more nursery places in the area, with places available in some nurseries in Huntington, and therefore whether it would be financially viable and suggested that it might become environmentally unsustainable, if it needed to draw in children from further a field who would travel by car. They raised concerns over the mixed use of the building and the security of the children in the nursery due to the nursery layout with the nursery being

at the front of the building, opening onto the main corridor, and play area at the rear.

Councillor Moore moved and Councillor Firth seconded a motion to approve the application subject to conditions being agreed with officers and the Chair and Vice Chair in relation to car/cycle parking and the layout and operation of the nursery to be agreed in liaison with the Council's Family Information Service. On being put to the vote, the motion fell.

Councillor Taylor moved and Councillor Hyman seconded a motion to refuse the application due to the concerns raised by the Family Information Service regarding the layout of the proposed nursery and also due to the impact on highway safety.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

REASON: The Local Planning Authority considers that the proposed number and intensity of uses on the site would result in an increased demand for on-street parking. The present demand for the available on-street parking in the vicinity of the site is high. It is not considered that the additional demand for parking that would be likely to be generated by the proposal can be satisfactorily accommodated within the public highway, without unacceptable compromises being made both in terms of highway safety and traffic congestion.

31e 62 Brockfield Park Drive, Huntington, York. YO31 9ER (10/01871/FUL)

Members considered an application from Mr Imam Harman for a change of use from retail (use class A1) to hot food takeaway (use class A5) and the provision of external extract flue.

Officers updated that, as outlined in the Committee Report a specialist extraction consultant had produced a document regarding the installation of a ventilation system to control odour without creating a nuisance through noise. Officers advised that the Environmental Protection Unit (EPU) had examined this report and made comments on the document. Officers conveyed these comments to the Committee and confirmed that the EPU was happy that it would be feasible to install a suitable system but noted that exact details of what would be installed had not yet been agreed.

Officers drew Members attention to the revised list of suggested conditions which had been republished with the agenda noting that Condition 4 required an extraction system to be agreed and installed prior to the hot food takeaway coming into use and thereafter being maintained. Officers provided Members with clarification on the proposed siting of the extraction system and the intended hours of operation. *(A full copy of the officer's update was published online with the agenda after the meeting)*

Representations in objection to the application were received from a neighbour. She reminded Members that a previous application for a hot food take away on this site had been refused due to concerns surrounding noise, litter and smells. She stated that the existing drainage system would

not be able to cope with commercial waste produced by the takeaway and questioned whether there was in fact demand for such an outlet stating that no survey had been carried out. She pointed out that the Spar shop closes at 10pm but that the amenity of local residents would be affected by the take away remaining open until 11pm with potential for an increase in problems of anti social behaviour in the area.

Representations in support of the application were also received from the applicant's agent. He stated that they had made every effort to overcome any issues or concerns raised regarding the application and all issues raised with regard to the previous refused application had been dealt with through changes to the design or revised opening hours. He clarified that the EPU has raised no objections as the proposal would meet the required standards and that concerns raised about drainage were unfounded as no objections had been raised by the relevant body. He noted residents' concerns over litter but expressed the opinion that litter was not normally a problem linked to hot food outlets.

Representations were also received from Councillor Runciman, Ward Councillor for Huntington and New Earswick on behalf of local residents who had raised concerns regarding litter, general disturbance, noise and smells. She referred to this area being a ward hot spot due to incidents which had taken place and general anti social behaviour. She stated that although there had only been a few incidents in the last few years, the shops had caused problems in the past and residents feared that the anti social behaviour would start again. She raised the following specific concerns;

- an increase in night time traffic and noise from traffic as well as additional delivery vehicles during the day.
- an increase in the amount of litter produced as a result of food being consumed in the area – insufficient litter bins to cope with increase in litter.
- Problems of groups congregating outside the premises.
- Harmful to living conditions of local residents.

Members raised and discussed the following areas of concern;

- noise from the extractor and air conditioning unit (experienced at site visit)
- Drainage
- Increase in traffic generated in the evening – traffic currently eases off as shops close and increase in evening traffic would be noticeable. Also increase in noise from delivery vehicles.
- Concern over close proximity of shop selling alcohol – opportunity for people to buy food from takeaway, alcohol from neighbouring shop then congregate by the premises leaving a potential anti social behaviour.
- Parking issues – the area would be very busy until other shops close in evening

Members agreed that the cumulative impact of the issues raised would harm the amenity of neighbours and be detrimental to the area and agreed that the application be refused on the grounds of increased noise, traffic activity, smells and anti social behaviour.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused.

REASON: The local planning authority consider that the establishment of a hot food takeaway in this predominantly residential area would have a serious detrimental impact on the amenities of surrounding residents by virtue of an accumulation of noise, traffic, litter, odour, and anti-social behaviour which would detract from the quiet enjoyment and amenity of their homes. The proposal is therefore considered to be contrary to Policy S6 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan which aims to ensure that such uses do not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of surrounding occupiers.

31f Store to the rear of 69 Fourth Avenue, York. YO31 0UA (10/02061/FUL)

Members considered a revised application by Mr Gordon Harrison to convert an existing outbuilding to a self-contained residential unit and the erection of a single storey extension and the demolition of the existing flat roof garage to create an enclosed patio area.

With reference to paragraph 1.2, Officers provided an update regarding access to the site. They advised that there were two ways to gain access into the site, with the main access being via the service road at the back of 69 Fourth Avenue with access also possible from Fourth Avenue via an alleyway.

Officers informed the Committee that the contamination assessment report requested by the Environmental Protection team had been submitted and Environmental Protection had confirmed that there was no issue with the use of the land for residential subject to informatives relating to contamination, and noise on construction sites.

They also advised that Heworth Planning Panel had responded to the consultation and had not raised objections but stated that the scheme should not set a precedent for more residential development in an area next to a service road in an unsuitable environment. *(A full copy of the officer's update was been published online with the agenda after the meeting.)*

Representations in support of the application were received from the applicant's agent. He circulated plans of the proposed work and a photograph for Members information. He reminded the Committee that planning policy encourages the re-use of old buildings. He stressed that this was a stand alone proposal, which was different to other schemes. He advised Members that that the building was not disused but had been in constant use as a builders store and stated that this area was predominantly of residential use.

Representations were also received from Councillor Potter, Ward Member for Heworth. She spoke in objection to the application on behalf of local residents. She stated that the proposals were not substantially different to

the application which was refused earlier in the year and that the reasons for refusal on that occasion still applied. She raised concerns over access to the proposed property and voiced the opinion that it was overdevelopment.

Members agreed that that the proposals were a good example of a small property, that it was a sustainable and attractive design and that the change of use of this building to residential would be better for the area than its current use.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions listed in the report.

REASON: The proposal, subject to the conditions listed in the report, would not cause undue harm to interests of acknowledged importance, with particular reference to residential and visual amenity, impact on the living conditions of future occupants and highway safety. As such the proposal complies with national planning advice contained within Planning Policy Statements 1 (Delivering Sustainable Development") and 3 ("Housing"), and Policies H4A, GP1, GP3, GP4A, GP9, GP10, L1C and NE1 of the City of York Development Control Local Plan.

Cllr K Hyman, Chair

[The meeting started at 2.00 pm and finished at 4.40 pm].