

NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Tuesday, 5 March 2013

PRESENT: Councillor Flavell (Chair); Councillor Golby (Deputy Chair);
Councillors Aziz, Hibbert, Lynch, Mason, Oldham and Palethorpe

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Davies, Hallam and Lane.

2. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 12 February 2013 were agreed and signed by the Chair.

3. DEPUTATIONS / PUBLIC ADDRESSES

RESOLVED: That Mr Hofford be granted leave to address the Committee in respect of Item 7a Recommended Final Disposal of Applications N/2007/1161, N/2007/1344, N/2008/1036, N/2008/1256 and N/2009/0187.

That Councillor Markham and Messrs J. Miah, Rahman and Clift be granted leave to address the Committee in respect of application no. N/2012/0904.

That Mr Rawlings and Councillor Larratt be granted leave to address the Committee in respect of application no. N/2012/1211.

That Mr Rawlings and Councillor Larratt be granted leave to address the Committee in respect of application no. N/2012/1212.

That Councillor Hill and Mr Brice be granted leave to address the Committee in respect of application no. N/2012/1281.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST/PREDETERMINATION

Councillor Hibbert declared predetermination of item 9A N/2013/0102- Installation of Air Source Heat Pumps at 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, & 30 Lodge Avenue, Collingtree as being the Assistant Cabinet Member for Housing.

5. MATTERS OF URGENCY WHICH BY REASON OF SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES THE CHAIR IS OF THE OPINION SHOULD BE CONSIDERED

None.

6. LIST OF CURRENT APPEALS AND INQUIRIES

The Head of Planning submitted a List of Current Appeals and Inquiries and elaborated thereon.

RESOLVED: That the report be noted.

7. OTHER REPORTS

**(A) RECOMMENDED FINAL DISPOSAL OF APPLICATIONS:
N/2007/1161, N/2007/1344, N/2008/1036, N/2008/1256 AND N/2009/0187**

The Head of Planning submitted a report and elaborated thereon.

Mr Hofford, in respect of N/2008/1256 asked that this planning consent be extended to assist with the marketing of the site. He commented that it had been his father who had originally obtained the planning permission but he had died the previous year following a long illness and had not been able to act upon it. In answer to questions Mr Hofford commented that the family had not previously responded to correspondence about the issue as they had been dealing with their father's illness and that they had had little contact with Mr Kilsby, their agent, over the same period for the same reason.

The Head of Planning commented that he was sympathetic to Mr Hofford's situation however, a considerable length of time had transpired and the NPPF was now in place that meant all developments had to be assessed against a new policy context. The market was different today from that four years ago and so a scheme would be likely to be different and in any case a new flood risk impact assessment would be required. The Head of Planning further stated all the applications detailed in the report would need to be the subject of new planning applications so that they could be assessed against the new policy context that was now in place.

The Committee discussed the report.

RESOLVED: That planning applications N/2007/1161, N/2007/1344, N/2008/1256 and N/2009/0187 be "finally disposed of" under the provisions of the 2010 Development Management Procedure Order as set out in the report.

8. NORTHAMPTONSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL APPLICATIONS

None.

10. ITEMS FOR DETERMINATION

(A) N/2012/0904- TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSIONS AND ERECTION OF FRONT CANOPY (AS AMENDED BY REVISED PLAN RECEIVED ON 31 JANUARY 2013) AT 1 WHITTLEBURY CLOSE

The Head of Planning submitted a report in respect of application no. N/2012/0904, elaborated thereon and referred to the Addendum that noted the receipt of revised plans on 11 February 2013 and an amended proposed Condition 2.

Councillor Markham stated that she was opposed to the application; she believed that it was overbearing and out of scale with neighbouring properties; it represented overdevelopment with a loss of garden space with a knock on effect upon climate change and wildlife; and was out of character with the properties in Whittlebury Close. She also stated that parking was an issue; either parked cars or those passing them had to mount the pavement. Councillor Markham was aware that the applicant lived at number 9 Whittlebury Close where there were already issues of parking and felt that the applicant was over optimistic that four vehicles could be parked within the site. She believed that the parking issues compromised highway safety. Councillor Markham noted that the Localism Act transferred powers to Local Authorities to act on behalf of local communities and made reference to the Article 4 Direction and further noted that the applicant owned several other properties in the area that were being used not to the best interests of the local community.

Mr Clifft, on behalf of some residents in Hinton Road and Whittlebury Close, commented that they objected to the application as it extended beyond the building line in Hinton Road and were concerned that it would set a precedent. Residents also had concern that a first floor extension could be added to the ground floor extension at some point in the future. Mr Clifft concurred with the previous comments in respect of parking and expressed concerns that the property could be used for multi occupancy. Mr Clifft noted that the applicant would need an access agreement with 3 Whittlebury Close for any works on the boundary but so far no approach had been made. He hoped that the Committee would refuse the application. In answer to a question Mr Clifft commented that the parking problems generally in Whittlebury Close had been reported to the Police who had suggested referral to the Highway Authority who in turn had proposed that double yellow lines be provided. Residents were encouraged to park within the curtilage of their properties.

Mr J Miah, the applicant and property owner, commented that he currently lived at 9 Whittlebury Close which was owned by his brother. He was getting married later in the year and wanted to move into 1 Whittlebury Close and wanted to make it comfortable. He had taken advice and met with planning officers and reduced the scale of his original proposals. He did not believe that parking was an issue as four parking spaces would be provided within the site; he had not been approached by residents about his plans; did not believe that his application was out of scale; and that he would not need an agreement with his neighbours at 3 Whittlebury Close as he was not developing up to the boundary. Mr Miah noted that any further extensions would require separate planning consent and he would be happy to discuss his plans with the neighbours. In answer to questions Mr Miah agreed that his brother had been the person that had supported the application in respect of the consultation responses and that the current tenants of 1 Whittlebury Close would be vacating the property to allow the works to take place.

Mr Rahman, the agent, commented that the property was not going to be used as a HIMO. Part of the proposal was to create a 16' x 11' lounge that would not be found in a HIMO. He believed that there was sufficient parking within the curtilage of the site and the extensions were essentially being built on the existing footprint of the garage and conservatory. He commented that the original scheme had been scaled down as a result of objections and that any future first floor extension would require a separate planning consent. Mr Miah should be able to make the property suitable for his needs. Mr Rahman restated that the property was not going to be used as a HIMO and that Mr Miah would be happy to accept a condition to prevent development of a HIMO. In answer to a question Mr Rahman commented that the applicant did not feel that provision of a garage was necessary; many garages across the country were being converted for other use.

The Head of Planning commented that the HIMO situation was covered by the Article 4 Direction; any change of use would require planning permission: in respect of the building line, which was a notional concept in any case, the ground floor extension would extend beyond it as did the existing conservatory that would be replaced and would be mostly screened by the boundary fencing and was felt in this case to be acceptable as set out in the report. In respect of the boundary issues the applicant would have to have regard to the Party Wall Act. In answer to questions the Head of Planning noted that it would be possible to issue an informative with any planning consent reminding the applicant that any change of use would require planning consent; that there would be no direct overlooking of the neighbour's property from the two storey side extension and confirmed that in this instance the extension beyond the building line as it would be mostly hidden was considered to be acceptable.

The Committee discussed the application.

Councillor Palethorpe proposed and Councillor Aziz seconded "That the application be approved as set out in paragraph 1.1 of the report as amended by the Addendum."

Upon a vote the motion was lost.

Councillor Golby proposed and Councillor Mason seconded "That consideration of the application be deferred so as to allow further discussions between the Applicant and Officers in respect of the Committee's concerns."

Upon the casting vote of the Chair the motion was lost.

Councillor Hibbert proposed and Councillor Oldham seconded "That the application be refused as:

- (1) The proposed development, by reason of design and siting, would create an unacceptable overlooking and overbearing effect to adjoining properties detrimental to visual and residential amenity contrary to Policies H18 and E20 of the Northampton Local Plan.
- (2) The proposed development would result in the removal of the existing garage and the reduction in the number of parking spaces available to serve the

occupiers of the existing dwelling. This would lead to the increase in demand of on-street parking detrimental to highway safety contrary to Policy H18 of the Northampton Local Plan.”

Upon a vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED: That the application be refused as:

- (1) The proposed development, by reason of design and siting, would create an unacceptable overlooking and overbearing effect to adjoining properties detrimental to visual and residential amenity contrary to Policies H18 and E20 of the Northampton Local Plan.
- (2) The proposed development would result in the removal of the existing garage and the reduction in the number of parking spaces available to serve the occupiers of the existing dwelling. This would lead to the increase in demand of on-street parking detrimental to highway safety contrary to Policy H18 of the Northampton Local Plan.

(E) N 2012/1281 - SINGLE STOREY FRONT PORCH EXTENSION, FIRST FLOOR BALCONY/TERRACE TO REAR & DETACHED TRIPLE GARAGE WITH STUDY ABOVE AT 5 BELFREY LANE, COLLINGTREE PARK

The Head of Planning submitted a report in respect of application no. N/2012/1281, elaborated thereon and referred to the Addendum that set out a representation from a resident of Belfry Lane and the Officer response thereto.

Councillor Hill, as Ward Councillor, commented that residents did not object to the balcony terrace or the front canopy elements of the application but did object to the triple garage element of it. 5 Belfry Lane had a comparatively narrow frontage. The next door neighbour at number 7 had a much wider frontage. All the properties in Belfry Lane were set back on their plots with long vistas along the lane; the garage would be prominent and he believed contrary to policies E20 and H18 of the Northampton Local Plan. He believed that the garage element represented an overdevelopment of the site and noted that the case officer had originally recommended refusal of the application.

Mr Brice as Chairman of Collingtree Parish Council, commented that the Parish Council did not usually make observations on planning applications but had decided to in this instance. This vicinity was characterised by large houses with large plots. The Parish Council had had some concerns about the balcony element of the proposal in respect of overlooking but felt that the proposed garage was too prominent. They also believed that its positioning was close to or over some existing flood drainage measures and reminded the Committee that the area had flooded several times since 1998. He asked that the Committee either refuse the application or defer it to allow changes to be made to the application. Mr Brice queried that if the application was originally to be refused but was now recommended for approval who arbitrated.

The Head of Planning commented that in respect of the recommendation set out in the report that was what the Committee had to consider. It was true that the case officer had had some reservations but on balance the application was presented for approval and reminded the Committee that they had to consider the application as a whole. In respect of the comments made about drainage the Applicant would also need Building Regulation approval and in answer to a question the Head of Planning stated that the garage block would be 9 metres from the front of the house and 8 metres from the front boundary.

The Committee discussed the application.

Councillor Golby proposed and Councillor Palethorpe seconded "That consideration of the application be deferred so as to allow the Officers to discuss with the Applicant the garage element of the application in terms of its inclusion as an element of the application, its proposed size and location within the plot."

RESOLVED: That consideration of the application be deferred so as to allow the Officers to discuss with the Applicant the garage element of the application in terms of its inclusion as an element of the application, its proposed size and location within the plot.

(B) N/2012/1211- APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS OF OUTLINE APPLICATION 11/0053/OUTWNN (N/2011/0865) FOR A WAREHOUSE DISTRIBUTION DEVELOPMENT WITH ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AND LANDSCAPING AT UNIT 1. SITE NORTH OF FORMER CATTLEMARKE T, LILIPUT ROAD

The Head of Planning submitted a report in respect of application no. N/2012/1211, elaborated thereon and referred to the Addendum that set out further correspondence on behalf of the Applicant, the Officer's response thereto and an amended proposed condition 4.

Councillor Larratt, as the Ward Councillor commented that he supported the objections of Great Houghton Parish Council and the residents. Their main concern was noise especially as the building had been turned to face Great Houghton. He was aware that Environmental Health were already investigating late night lorry noise issues relating to other units. He concurred with the views of Environmental Health set out in the report. Councillor Larratt considered that the proposed wording of condition 4 set out in the Addendum was not as robust as the original set out in the report. Councillor Larratt asked that if the Committee were minded to approve the application that the ongoing maintenance of the noise attenuation works be made to be in perpetuity.

Mr Rawlings, as Agent on behalf of the applicant commented that Dascher would, if the application were approved, be able to relocate from three existing sites on Brackmills to this one. This proposal represented a £25m investment by Dascher together with the creation of additional jobs and would release 100,000sq foot of space on Brackmills to other potential users. The site would become Dascher's UK headquarters. This application was for a building a third smaller, in terms of square footage, than the proposal granted outline consent. It was also lower and the office element had been doubled in size to 20,000sq foot. Mr Rawlings commented that Great Houghton Parish Council and residents had been consulted including from the

outline consent stage and noted that the NPPF provided support for sustainable economic development. If approved, the applicant intended to start work onsite in June or July 2013. Mr Rawlings hoped that the Committee would approve the application. In answer to questions Mr Rawlings commented that the applicant intended to maintain the noise attenuation measures together with the bunding and native planting; that the dual aspect of the main building was necessary as its main function was as a goods transmission centre; that the colour blue to be used was the applicant's corporate colours; that the applicant's business plan provided for an increase in jobs of 35% over five years- many of these to be office based; confirmed that the applicants had attended Great Houghton Parish Council meetings at outline stage and since and corresponded with them; and confirmed that he had had experience of similar noise attenuation schemes elsewhere- the design put the operation inwards facing with other measures on the boundary. He noted that Condition 4 regulated this and that ultimately Environmental Health would monitor it.

The Head of Planning noted that proposed condition 3 required the ongoing maintenance of noise mitigation measures and noted that the revised condition 4 set out in the Addendum provided for Environmental Health to agree a Night Noise Management Plan and noted that the condition could be amended to include, in the sixth line, reversing sirens.

The Committee discussed the application.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved in principle subject to the conditions set out in the report and amended by the Addendum and above and the matters in paragraph 1.2 below as the details submitted accord with the parameters for the development that were approved at outline stage under application reference (11/0053/OUTWNN). The appearance of the development was considered to be acceptable and the visual impact of the development could be adequately mitigated through the structural landscaping proposed. The scale of the building was substantially lower than the maximum parameters agreed at outline stage and tested through the Environmental Impact Assessment. The layout of the proposal was acceptable in terms of highway safety and, whilst concerns have been expressed regarding the potential for noise and disturbance in relation to residential properties in Great Houghton it was considered that the mitigation measures proposed and the imposition of appropriate conditions would ensure that there would be no adverse impact resulting from the scheme. Therefore, the details submitted were acceptable in relation to saved policies E1, E6, E9, E14, E20, E40 and T12 of the Northampton Local Plan and the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

- 1.2 As the statutory consultation period did not expire until 12th March 2013, the final decision on the application be delegated to the Head of Planning providing that no material considerations additional to those presented to the Committee were raised within this timescale.

(C) N/2012/1212- APPLICATION FOR APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS OF OUTLINE APPLICATION 11/0053/OUTWNN (N/2011/0865) FOR A WAREHOUSE AND DISTRIBUTION DEVELOPMENT WITH ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AND LANDSCAPING UNIT 2. SITE NORTH OF FORMER CATTLEMARKE T, LILIPUT ROAD

The Head of Planning submitted a report in respect of application no. N/2012/1212, elaborated thereon and referred to the Addendum that set out further correspondence on behalf of the Applicant, the Officer's response thereto and an amended proposed condition 4.

Councillor Larratt, as the Ward Councillor commented that he supported the objections of Great Houghton Parish Council and the residents. Their main concern was noise and he was aware that Environmental Health were already investigating late night lorry noise issues relating to other units. He concurred with the views of Environmental Health set out in the report. Councillor Larratt considered that the proposed wording of condition 4 set out in the Addendum was not as robust as the original set out in the report. Councillor Larratt asked that if the Committee were minded to approve the application that the ongoing maintenance of the noise attenuation works be made to be in perpetuity.

Mr Rawlings, as Agent on behalf of the applicant commented that Dascher would, if the application were approved, lease this unit to another user. Mr Rawlings commented that Great Houghton Parish Council and residents had been consulted including from the outline consent stage and noted that the NPPF provided support for sustainable economic development. Mr Rawlings hoped that the Committee would approve the application. In answer to questions Mr Rawlings commented that the applicant intended to maintain the noise attenuation measures together with the bunding and native planting; confirmed that the applicants had attended Great Houghton Parish Council meetings at outline stage and since and corresponded with them; and confirmed that he had had experience of similar noise attenuation schemes elsewhere. He noted that Condition 4 regulated this and that ultimately Environmental Health would monitor it.

The Head of Planning noted that proposed condition 3 required the ongoing maintenance of noise mitigation measures and noted that the revised condition 4 set out in the Addendum provided for Environmental Health to agree a Night Noise Management Plan and noted that the condition could be amended to include, in the sixth line, reversing sirens.

The Committee discussed the application.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved in principle subject to the conditions set out in the report and amended by the Addendum and above and the matters in paragraph 1.2 below as the details submitted accord with the parameters for the development that were approved at outline stage under application reference (11/0053/OUTWNN). The appearance of the development was considered to be acceptable and the visual impact of the development could be adequately mitigated through the structural landscaping proposed. The scale of the building was substantially lower than the maximum parameters agreed at outline stage and tested through the Environmental Impact

Assessment. The layout of the proposal was acceptable in terms of highway safety and, whilst concerns have been expressed regarding the potential for noise and disturbance in relation to residential properties in Great Houghton it was considered that the mitigation measures proposed and the imposition of appropriate conditions would ensure that there would be no adverse impact resulting from the scheme. Therefore, the details submitted were acceptable in relation to saved policies E1, E6, E9, E14, E20, E40 and T12 of the Northampton Local Plan and the principles of the National Planning Policy Framework.

1.2 As the statutory consultation period did not expire until 12th March 2013, the final decision on the application be delegated to the Head of Planning providing that no material considerations additional to those presented to the Committee were raised within this timescale.

(D) N/2012/1271- CONSTRUCTION OF NEW CAR DEALERSHIP INCLUDING TWO STOREY SHOWROOM, MOT WORKSHOP AND ANCILLARY BUILDING, VALET BUILDING AND CAR PARKING AREAS AT CAROUSEL WAY, NORTHAMPTON.

The Head of Planning submitted a report in respect of application no. N/2012/1271, elaborated thereon and referred to the Addendum that set out an additional condition 10 in respect of noise control.

The Committee discussed the application.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved in principle subject to the conditions set out in the report and as amended by the Addendum as the proposed development would have a neutral impact upon visual amenity and highway safety and would result in the appropriate commercial development of a vacant site and therefore complied with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Policies E20, E40 and R15.

(F) N/2013/0047- CHANGE OF USE FROM AMENITY LAND TO PRIVATE GARDEN INCLUDING ERECTION OF FENCING 1.8M HIGH TO THE FRONT SIDE AND REAR OF LAND ADJACENT TO 36 BOOTH MEADOW COURT.

The Head of Planning submitted a report in respect of application no. N/2013/0047 and elaborated thereon.

In answer to a question, the Head of Planning commented that the planting shown on the aerial photograph was the existing.

The Committee discussed the application.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report as the proposed development would not adversely affect the character of the street scene or residential amenity and was

considered to be acceptable and in accordance with Policy E20 of the Northampton Local Plan and the NPPF.

(G) N/2013/0048- ERECTION OF 15NO. DWELLINGS COMPRISING OF 11NO. DWELLING HOUSES AND 4NO. SELF CONTAINED APARTMENTS INCLUDING ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND PARKING (RE-SUBMISSION OF PLANNING APPLICATION N/2012/0987) AT FORMER MORRIS MAN PUBLIC HOUSE, WITHAM WAY, KINGS HEATH

The Head of Planning submitted a report in respect of application no. N/2013/0048, elaborated thereon and referred to the Addendum which set out representations from Northamptonshire Police's Crime Prevention Design Advisor and the officer response thereto.

The Committee discussed the application.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved in principle subject to the conditions set out in the report and the matters in paragraphs 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 below as the proposed development would result in the effective reuse of this vacant site and would have a neutral impact upon visual and neighbour amenity and highway safety. The proposal was therefore compliant with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework and Local Plan Policies E20, E40 and H6.

1.2 As the statutory consultation period did not expire until 14th March, the final decision on the application be delegated to the Head of Planning providing that no material considerations additional to those presented to the Committee were raised within this timescale.

1.3 The prior completion of a Section 106 Legal Agreement covering the following Heads of Terms:

- (i) 35% affordable housing on-site
- (ii) A payment for the provision of primary school education facilities
- (iii) Training opportunities for construction workers and associated administration costs
- (iv) The Council's monitoring fee.

1.4 That in the event of the Section 106 Legal Agreement not being completed within three calendar months of the Committee meeting, and in addition to being able to grant planning permission as recommended above, the Head of Planning be given delegated authority to either refuse or finally dispose of the application (at their discretion) on account of the necessary mitigation measures not having been secured in order to make the proposal acceptable in line with the requirements of Northampton Local Plan Policy E19 and the National Planning Policy Framework.

(H) N/2013/0109- APPLICATION FOR NON-MATERIAL AMENDMENT FOLLOWING PLANNING PERMISSION N/2012/0314 - APPLICATION FOR

NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT FOLLOWING PLANNING PERMISSION N/2012/0314 FOR NEW BUS INTERCHANGE- MINOR MODIFICATIONS INCLUDING AMENDED KERB AND EXTERNAL WALL POSITIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO BOTH THE FACILITY MANAGEMENT OFFICES AND TOILET FACILITIES AT SHEEP STREET AND BRADSHAW STREET.

The Head of Planning submitted a report in respect of application no. N/2013/0109 and elaborated thereon.

In answer to questions the Head of Planning confirmed that one of the pedestrian crossings across Sheep Street had been removed from the scheme on the advice of the Highway Authority and that there were no proposed alterations in respect of bus manoeuvres.

The Committee discussed the application.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved as the proposed amendments were considered to be non-material and would not have any undue impact on visual amenity and highway safety.

(I) N/2013/0114- VARIATION OF CONDITION 11 OF PLANNING PERMISSION 10/0077/FULWNN (CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES BUILDING) TO ALLOW AMENDMENT OF FINISHED FLOOR LEVELS AT NORTHAMPTON MARINA, VICTORIA PROMENADE

The Head of Planning submitted a report in respect of application no. N/2013/0114 and elaborated thereon.

The Committee discussed the application.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved without compliance with Condition 11 imposed on planning permission 10/0077/FULWNN dated 8th July 2010 but subject to the other conditions imposed therein so far as they are still subsisting or capable of taking effect.

- 1.2 Subject to the expiry of the formal consultation period and delegated authority being given to the Head of Planning to address any further consultation comments received and to append or amend planning conditions as appropriate subject to the conditions set out in the report as the principle of development had already been established and the proposed variation would not have any undue impact on visual amenity, highway safety or flood risk in compliance with the guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

9. NORTHAMPTON BOROUGH COUNCIL APPLICATIONS

(A) N/2013/0102- INSTALLATION OF AIR SOURCE HEAT PUMPS AT 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, & 30 LODGE AVENUE, COLLINGTREE

Councillor Hibbert left the meeting in accordance with his earlier declaration of predetermination (see minute 4 above)

The Head of Planning submitted a report in respect of application no. N/2013/0102 and elaborated thereon.

The Committee discussed the application.

RESOLVED: That the application be approved in principle and as the consultation period for the application expired on 5 March 2013, the final decision be delegated to the Head of Planning provided that no additional material issues/representations not discussed in the report were received at the end of the consultation period, and subject to planning conditions set out in the report as the proposed development due its size, siting and design would not have an undue detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host buildings, street scene or amenity of neighbours to comply with Policies E20, H18 and E39 of the Northampton Local Plan and aims of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Councillor Hibbert rejoined the meeting.

11. ENFORCEMENT MATTERS

None.

12. ITEMS FOR CONSULTATION

None.

The meeting concluded at 20:25 hours.