

BATH AND NORTH EAST SOMERSET COUNCIL

LICENSING SUB-COMMITTEE

Thursday, 6th December, 2018, 10.00 am

Councillors: Les Kew (Chair), Rob Appleyard and Anthony Clarke (in place of Deirdre Horstmann)

Officers in attendance: John Dowding (Senior Public Protection Officer), Terrill Wolyn (Senior Public Protection Officer), Ian Nash (Public Protection Officer (Licensing)) and Shaine Lewis (Team Leader Resources - Legal Team)

24 EMERGENCY EVACUATION PROCEDURE

The Democratic Services Officer advised the meeting of the procedure.

25 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND SUBSTITUTIONS

Apologies were received from Councillor Deirdre Horstmann, for whom Councillor Anthony Clarke substituted.

26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were none.

27 TO ANNOUNCE ANY URGENT BUSINESS AGREED BY THE CHAIR

There was none.

28 MINUTES: 25 OCTOBER 2018

These were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

29 TAXI VEHICLE PROCEDURE

The Chair drew attention to the procedure to be followed for the next two items of business.

30 CONSIDERATION OF VEHICLE SUITABILITY TO BE LICENSED AS A PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE

The applicant confirmed that he understood the procedure to be followed for the hearing.

The Senior Public Protection Officer presented the report. The issue was whether a vehicle over five years was suitable to be licensed as a private hire vehicle. The vehicle in question was previously licensed with the Authority until 17th May 2018. On that date the applicant replaced the vehicle (a Skoda Superb) with a newer vehicle registered in 2018. The applicant now wished to re-licence the Skoda Superb, which was at the time of this application 6 years and 5 months old, as a private hire vehicle. The Council's current policy provides "that all vehicles will normally be less than five years old when first licensed" and that applications for a licence for vehicles older

than this will be referred to the Licensing Sub-Committee. The vehicle was not available for inspection because of the absence of parking space on account of the Christmas Market.

The applicant stated his case. He explained that when originally licensed in February 2014 the vehicle was less than 2 years old. The vehicle had been damaged in an accident which had been entirely the fault of the other driver, who had been uninsured. His insurance company had provided a replacement vehicle. While his own vehicle was being repaired, he had transferred the licence plate to another vehicle. He now wished to re-license Skoda Superb and was surprised that its age should be an issue, since it was under five years old when first licensed. He suggested there was an ambiguity in the Council's policy. Surely this was not the first time something like this had happened. He felt a sense of grievance at the unfairness of the situation. He had incurred significant expense. Because the other driver had not been insured, he had lost the excess on his insurance policy, lost his no claims bonus, had to make a claim on his own policy, and had lost three weeks earnings. As far as he was aware the other driver was not being prosecuted. The applicant wondered what he should have done. If he had kept the licence plate on the Skoda Superb, that would have been an additional cost for him. If he had insisted that his insurance company had provided a replacement vehicle, they would have incurred considerable cost, but this situation would not have been avoided. An appointment for transferring the plate from the Skoda had been made with the claims management company, who had informed him that he was to come to collect his vehicle. The applicant had arranged to meet the driver of his vehicle in advance, so that he could inspect the vehicle and check that everything was in order. The driver had turned up late, so that the applicant had to conduct an inspection of the vehicle while being under great pressure to transfer the licence plate. It had not occurred to him that if he transferred the licence plate that his application to re-license the Skoda Superb would be treated as a new application. At the time he was not sure if he was going to have the vehicle repaired, because he had not heard from his insurance company about how badly damaged it was. Eventually he decided to buy the vehicle back from the insurance company and have it repaired at his own expense. The vehicle had a current MoT and was fully roadworthy. In correspondence with Licensing he had offered to have the vehicle subjected to any tests that were thought appropriate.

[Understand Breathe Campaign, believe it's called. New vehicle less than 10 years old. 140g/km, which I understand to be EU5. Possibly E5 emitting vehicle. EU6 106g/km. No intended use after 2020. Road fund licence payable according to annual guidelines. low emissions £30.

In response to questions from Members the applicant stated:

- The vehicle had been returned to him in August. He had delayed his application until September to enjoy the current taxation.
- He had now had two vehicles

After an adjournment the Sub-Committee **RESOLVED** that the applicant's vehicle was suitable to be licensed as a private hire vehicle.

Decision and reasons

Members have had to determine an application for a Private Hire Vehicle Licence. In doing so they took account of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, Human Rights Act 1998, the Council's Policy and the applicant's oral representations.

The applicant accepted the vehicle fell outside the council's policy. He stated that he had been involved in a no fault accident and it had taken a while to repair the vehicle. Now that the vehicle has been repaired he wanted to re-licence it. He feels let down by the insurance process which has cost him a considerable sum in financial terms and the delay.

Due to parking constraints Members did not have the opportunity to inspect the vehicle. Members nevertheless reminded themselves of the legal framework and the Council's Private Hire Vehicle Licence general conditions. These state Members must be satisfied that a vehicle is suitable in type, size and design for use as a private hire vehicle and furthermore is safe, comfortable and less than 5 years old at the date of first licensing.

Members noted the vehicle was licensed by the council until 17 May 2018 and after the accident only became roadworthy in late August. In the circumstances Members consider that with such a short passage of time since the licence expired, the vehicle continues to be suitable in type, size and design. Accordingly authority is delegated to the licensing officer to issue the license subject to all necessary certification being provided.

31 CONSIDERATION OF VEHICLE SUITABILITY TO BE LICENSED AS A PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE

The applicant confirmed that he understood the procedure to be followed for the hearing.

The Senior Public Protection Officer presented the report. The applicant's vehicle, a Peugeot 508, was licensed by the Authority as a Private Hire vehicle from 25th November 2016 until 31st October 2018. The applicant applied for a new licence for this vehicle on 14th November 2018, at which date the vehicle was 6 years and 6 months old. The Council's current policy provides "that all vehicles will normally be less than five years old when first licensed" and that applications for a licence for vehicles older than this will be referred to the Licensing Sub-Committee. All Private Hire Vehicle licenses in the Authority's area expire on the 31st October each year. Renewal letters were sent to all Private Hire licensees in the first week of September 2018 inviting them to renew their license before the expiry date. The applicant arranged a number of appointments to renew the licence, but these were subsequently cancelled by the applicant. The deadline of 31st October had passed, so that this application has to be treated as a new application. According to information on the GOV.UK Check MoT website the applicant's vehicle was first presented for a test on 29th October 2018 and had failed. The vehicle was not available for inspection because of the absence of parking space on account of the Christmas Market.

The applicant stated his case. He stated that the vehicle had failed the MoT the first time because of a faulty engine light. The requirement for cars to have engine lights had only been recently introduced. Bath MoT do not have specific expertise in

Peugeots and advised him to go to a Peugeot dealer, which he did. The dealer gave him the error codes for the problem, but he decided to have the work by a colleague in Bristol. This colleague had completed all the necessary work, but had been unable to reset the engine light, which remained on. He went back to the Peugeot dealer, who downloaded and installed updated software for the car, which is a top-of-the-range Peugeot and a diesel hybrid. He had emailed Licensing every time that he had had to rearrange an appointment. Delays had been caused by taking the car to his colleague in Bristol and having the software installed.

The Senior Public Protection Officer advised that the applicant's vehicle had been tested at Bath MoT on 1st November 2018 and that the applicant now held a MoT certificate for the vehicle.

Replying to a question from the Chair he explained that he had had to rearrange his appointment with Licensing five times and each time had sent an email explaining the reasons for the delay.

Following an adjournment the Sub-Committee **RESOLVED** that the applicant's vehicle was suitable to be licensed as a private hire vehicle.

Decision and reasons

Members have had to determine an application for a Private Hire Vehicle Licence. In doing so they took account of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, Human Rights Act 1998, the Council's Policy and the applicant's oral representations.

The applicant stated that for the first time since its purchase the vehicle failed its MOT which was due to expire on 1 November 2018. The failure was due to an engine light and this took some time to resolve in part due to a software update. In all this took 5 appointments and as a result the renewal deadline passed. The applicant stated licencing were informed throughout and appointments were cancelled in a timely manner.

Members did not have the benefit of an inspection given parking restrictions. Members nevertheless reminded themselves of the legal framework and Council's Private Hire Vehicle Licence general conditions. These state vehicles must be suitable in type, size and design for use as a private hire vehicle and furthermore safe, comfortable and less than 5 years old when first licensed.

Members noted the vehicle was licensed until 31 October 2018 and the renewal date was missed due a number of appointments having to be rescheduled. Given the time lapse since the vehicle licences expired and its renewal Members found the vehicle continued to be suitable in type, size and design. Accordingly, authority is delegated to the licensing officer to issue the licence subject to all necessary certification being provided.

32 LICENSING ACT PROCEDURE

The Chair drew attention to the procedure to be followed for the next item of business.

33 APPLICATION FOR A PREMISES LICENCE FOR PUB IN THE PARK, ROYAL VICTORIA PARK, MARLBOROUGH LANE, BATH BA1 2NQ

Applicant: Brand Events TM Ltd, represented by Patrick Toland (Operations Manager), Neil Levene (Operations Director) and Jim Davey
Witness for Applicant: Peter Nash (sound consultant)

Other Persons: Cllr Sue Craig, Cllr Andrew Furse, Stephen Huard (Chairman of Marlborough Lane and Buildings Residents' Association)

The parties confirmed that they understood the procedure to be followed for the hearing.

The Senior Public Protection Officer presented the report. Representations had been received from Other Persons relating to the licensing objectives of the prevention of public nuisance and the protection children from harm. There were no representations from the Responsible Authorities. Additional information from the applicant and other persons had been received and circulated before the meeting.

Mr Levene stated the case for the applicant. He said that Brand Events had been in operation for nearly twenty years and organised indoor and outdoor events throughout the UK as well as many events throughout the world. They had organised Pub in the Park in the Royal Victoria Park in June of this year. The company prided itself on putting on events to the very highest of standards. The Pub in the Park series of events had been awarded the National Outdoor Events Association 2018 award for the best live event. Pub in the Park was originally launched in Marlow by the river. The event had worked well, and the company felt that it would work well in other towns. They were planning to do eight events next year, including in Bath, St Albans, Leeds and Warwick. Pub in the Park is a unique event; it was not just a food festival or a music festival, but a combination of the two. Besides the pub, there are eight restaurants allowing attendees to sample conveniently-sized portions. Music is presented on stage in the evening. There are two music acts on Friday, each of about forty minutes in length. and about two hours of live music on Saturday morning, afternoon and evening. Generally about 3000-3500 people attend on a day. He drew attention to the conditions they had offered as detailed in paragraph 5.2(8) of the report. A noise management plan would be submitted to Environmental Health for them to approve it writing. The noise levels achieved at this year's event were lower than those agreed in the noise management plan. Twenty-five stewards had been employed on site to keep people safe. No adverse reports about noise levels had been received after this year's event. He noted that the Responsible Authorities had made no representations to this application.

Members put questions. Mr Levene said that he considered that the location that had been selected for the stage in Royal Victoria Park was the best possible from the noise control point of view. Mr Nash said that there were national guidelines for this type of event, with which the company complied. They also worked with the Environmental Health Department to minimise noise. An effort was made to focus sound for the benefit of attendees and to prevent noise nuisance for those outside the venue. He would attend the event and take noise measurements offsite. If he felt the level was too high, he would advise management of this. The control of the overall level of sound would be taken away from the musicians if this was necessary to ensure compliance with the limits.

Mr Levene stated that currently attendees were not permitted to leave events with alcohol. There is generally little or no litter on the routes to and from event sites. Routes are checked about half an hour after an event to see if there are any people who have not been able to find their way home.

The Senior Public Protection Officer asked Mr Levene for clarification of his statement that attendees would not be permitted to leave the site with alcohol, given that the application was for sales on and off the premises. Mr Levene explained that people were not permitted to take alcohol off the premises in open vessels. Most off sales are for wine or craft gin; very little beer is sold for consumption off the premises. In response to a further question, he said that he would be willing to accept a condition that alcohol in open containers could not be taken from the premises.

Mr Huard stated his case. He began by asking whether there was any point in today's proceedings, given that the Bath Pub in the Park event for 2019 was already being advertised. The Chair assured him that the Sub-Committee had the power to grant or refuse the application.

Mr Huard said that he was representing six different residents' associations. There had only been a short time to prepare for today's hearing and people who might have liked to attend had had to go to work.

One resident had complained about vomit in the street after last year's event. The Q&A sheet from the Cabinet meeting of 27 June stated that there had been 15 complaints about last year's event. He thought this considerably understated the impact on residents. He himself had made a complaint about the Saturday evening session. A number of the representations from residents focussed on Sunday evening. This was also one of the issues raised by residents' associations. Last year the Sunday session event went on till 22:00 or 22:30. There are children living in the vicinity, who need to go to bed early on Sunday evening to get ready for school the next day. Some of them were preparing for exams at that time of year, yet the event had actually been advertised as family-friendly. He submitted it was neither sensible nor responsible to have a Sunday evening session. The circus which regularly comes to the common does not have a Sunday evening performance, nor does the fun fair. He noted that large stores are restricted to six hours trading on a Sunday. He requested that a six-hour limit should be placed on the Sunday session of Pub in the Park to protect children. He also requested that the permitted noise levels should be reviewed. Some of the objectors present had recordings of last year's event taken at Sion Hill, which is half a mile from the venue, which show that the stage is actually located in the worst possible position from the point of view of local residents, however convenient it may be for electrical power connections.

Councillor Furse stated his case. He said that he was objecting on three main grounds:

1. Noise and nuisance to neighbouring properties;
2. Noise and nuisance to other park users;
3. Protection of children from harm.

He said that people do like a quiet Sunday night to prepare for work and school, and some children needed to prepare for exams. He submitted there was a strong case

for limiting the hours on Sunday and that 18:00 would be a reasonable terminal hour. He had made his views known to Cabinet about the appropriateness of this type of event in Royal Victoria Park. He questioned whether any normal pub would be allowed to put on outdoor music all weekend. He knew of pubs that had wanted to have events in their gardens in residential areas at the weekend that had been refused. This gave rise to perceptions of inconsistency in the Council's policy. The event might last only three days, but there was also a setting up period and a packing up period, which also impacted on residents. Sound did tend to travel in the evening when the normal background noise of the City had died down. The Grade I listed properties nearby do not have double glazing. For occupiers of nearby flats the Park was the equivalent of their back garden, where they went for rest and recreation. There are bye-laws banning drinking in the Park; how can it be fair to say to local residents that they cannot enjoy a bottle of wine in the Park on a Sunday afternoon and yet grant a licence for Pub in the Park? There is a cumulative impact on residents from the number of events that are held in the Park, including the circus and the fun fair. It is good that there are events in Bath, but the impact on residents should be diluted by holding them at other locations around the City as well as the Park.

Councillor Sue Craig said that she fully supported what Councillor Furse had said. She noted that the applicants' noise compliance report stated that "the noise impact must be considered low for an event of this type". That was all well and good, but she questioned whether an event of this type was appropriate for a Sunday evening during term time in the summer when people had to go to work and school the next day. She therefore urged the Sub-Committee to limit the hours on Sunday.

Members put questions to the Other Persons to which the following answers were given:

- Few of the neighbouring properties are in single occupation. Most are divided into flats, some of which are occupied by families with children or by older people.
- The vomit had been deposited about half a mile from the Park. This was the first time that vomit had been found in that area, according to the resident who had complained. More people had passed through that area during Pub in the Park than is usual.

In response to a question from the Senior Public Protection Officer explained that in a 4.5 hour music slot, there would be only be about 2 hours of live music, because of a change of bands and equipment. Mr Huard noted that the application was for live and recorded music. Mr Levene responded that the recorded music would only be background music played between acts.

The parties summed up.

Councillor Furse said there was a substantial impact on residents from this kind of event. He thought the Park was the wrong place for it. However, if the Sub-Committee was minded to grant the application, he urged a reduction in the permitted hours for Sunday evening.

Mr Levene asked for advice on the licensing objective of the protection of children from harm. His understanding was that this referred to harm on licensed premises. The Team Leader (Legal) confirmed that this was the case, and that therefore the Sub-Committee should disregard the impact on children off the premises of activities on the premises.

Summing up, Mr Levene said that there had been a total of 16 complaints relating to last year's Pub in the Park. These events generally attract 13-14,000 people from the local area. 3,000-3,500 had attended on Sunday in Bath last year. Local residents who had attended had demonstrated their support for the event. He submitted that what was relevant was Brand Events' use of the Park, not any other event organiser's use of the Park. Pub in the Park had been managed successfully last year and there were no representations from the Responsible Authorities.

Following an adjournment the Sub-Committee **RESOLVED** to grant the application with conditions as detailed below.

Decision and reasons

Members have determined an application for a new Premises Licence for the Pub in the Park, Royal Victoria Park, Marlborough Lane, Bath. In doing so, they have taken into consideration the Licensing Act 2003, Statutory Guidance, the Council's Policy, Human Rights Act 1998 and case law.

Members are aware that the proper approach under the Licensing Act is to be reluctant to regulate in the absence of evidence and must only do what is appropriate and proportionate in the promotion of the licensing objectives based on information put before them. Members noted that an application must be considered on its own merits.

The Applicant

The applicant stated they have run high standard events for over 20 years. It was stated that the event is a food and drink festival with music over a number of sessions throughout the 3 days. The applicant further stated there will be a 6 month lead in period with key dates for notification and sign off purposes. This would ensure maximum engagement with Responsible Authorities.

The applicant stated that whilst they had recorded a number of complaints during this year's event their monitoring records showed there were no breaches of the agreed Noise Management Plan. This together with there being no objections from Environmental Health demonstrated the event was well managed. The applicant also expressed surprise by the representations relating to security as the security team on site had incidences reported to them.

In terms of noise the noise management company stated they worked within national guidelines and given the duration and nature of the performances the noise impact was considered low. In the circumstances it was felt the levels were correct and the stage was correctly located.

Interested Parties

Representations were received from a number of individuals, resident groups and Councillors.

The representations centred on noise nuisance from this year's event and referred to a Cabinet paper which stated 15 complaints were made to the Council. The Interested Party suggested a number of other complaints had been made although these appeared not to have been recorded for unknown reasons. It was stated the noise impacted on residents' ability to enjoy their properties as volume levels were loud and sustained throughout the 3 day period. This was particularly so on the Sunday evening. Residents were fearful, therefore, that absent severe noise restrictions noise nuisance would continue to be experienced during future events. It was also stated that noise from crowds leaving the area was experienced and this was due to poor crowd control. Moreover, it was felt that organisers failed to consult adequately, the stage was placed inappropriately and this led to more residents being adversely affected.

Members

Members reminded themselves of the Statutory Guidance. This recognises the important role licensed premises play in the local community and states the Act is a permissive regime that minimises the regulatory burden. Members further noted the Council's Events Policy which advocates the need to support and facilitate events as these contribute to economic development and vibrant sustainable communities that are active, lively and inclusive. Members also reminded themselves of their Statement of Licensing Policy which aims to facilitate a healthier economy that feels safe and reduces alcohol related crime and anti-social behaviour.

In terms of representations Members noted all written and oral representations. Members also noted an absence of representation from Responsible Authorities in particular the Local Safeguarding Children Board, the Police and the Public Protection Service. In any event, Members were careful to take account of all representations received and to balance the competing interests. Nevertheless, Members were bound to disregard irrelevant representations which on this occasion related to the need and frequency of events, cumulative impact, traffic, the necessity for a quiet Sunday evening and any competition that events might pose to other licenced premises. In terms of the protection of children from harm Members reminded themselves that this is limited to the effects licensable activities have on children on licensed premises rather than those living near licensed premises. In all the circumstances Members found the application reasonable in extent and the applicant a professional company who on balance managed a successful event with very low level of complaint in accordance with the Event and Noise Management plans. Members therefore resolve to approve the application with the imposition of conditions consistent with the operating schedule, Mandatory Conditions and that offered by the applicant.

Members, however, would encourage greater communication between the applicant and residents with a view to resolving issues going forward for example the closure of Cow Lane. The Interested Parties were also advised of the Licensing Act Review process which is the key protection mechanism for the community and must be supported with evidence.

Authority is delegated to the Licensing Officer to issue the licence with the addition of the condition offered by the applicant:

- No open containers of alcohol to leave the premises.

35 APPLICATION TO CREATE A STREET TRADING PITCH (141-148) - NEW ORCHARD STREET BATH

Applicant: Jimmy Deane's Fruit, Veg and Salad Ltd, represented by Charlene and Simon Deane

Objector: Cleo Newcombe-Jones, Project Co-ordinator – Waterways and Public Realm, B&NES

The parties confirmed that they understood the procedure to be followed for the hearing.

The Public Protection Officer summarised the application.

Charlene Deane stated the case for the applicant and was questioned by Members. She said that Jimmy Deane's had had a stall in Bath since 2006. They had had to move their stall because of redevelopment around Marks and Spencer's. They wanted a pitch from which they would not have to move again and wanted to be in a more central area. They had worked closely with the Metro Bank and Transport and Highways about the siting of the stall. There had been a lot of support from the public. She referred to the plan and said that there would be more than the required minimum of 2.6 metres around the pitch for pedestrians and access to retailers' premises. They might need not as much space as they currently have. They had plans to invest in a new improved look for the stall.

A Member said that from the hatched area on the plan it might look as though they were applying to occupy the whole of New Orchard Street, but that he supposed that what they wanted was the ability to move the stall within this area, so that did not have to make a new application if they had to relocate because of future works, and that wherever they were located within this area there would be a 2.6 metre clearance around the pitch. Mrs Deane confirmed that this was the case.

Cleo Newcombe-Jones stated her case and was questioned by Members. In response to a question from the Team Leader (Legal) she explained that she was representing the Public Realm Team, not Highways. She said that in general the location was a good one, but the hatched plan showed a very wide area. She felt it would be better for a fixed location to be designated. The main concern was about the footway of 66cm around the stall and wondered whether it would be large enough for retailers to be able to put A-boards outside their premises. The footway might be further reduced by people queueing to be served at the stall. The narrowest point of the area is where there is likely to be the greatest footfall.

The Team Leader (Legal) asked how it could be consistent to base an objection on the impact of this application on retailers' ability to place A-boards outside their premises when there were many examples of the A-board policy not being enforced against retailers who were in breach of it. Ms Newcombe-Jones said that she was unable to answer, as enforcement did not fall within her job description.

Following an adjournment the Sub-Committee **RESOLVED** to grant the application as detailed below.

Decision and reasons

Members have had to determine an application to create a Street Trading Pitch at New Orchard Street, Southgate, Bath. In determining the application members have taken into account the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982, the Council's Policy on Street Trading and the Human Rights Act 1998.

The Applicant

The applicant stated they are a small business that has been trading in Bath since 2006. The applicant stated they are consent holders in New Orchard Street trading 5 days per week over the last 8 years without issue. The applicant also stated they have relocated a number of times over the years to facilitate city centre redevelopment and most recently as a result of the M&S/Metro Bank construction works. The current application has been widely consulted on and is designed to future proof their presence in New Orchard Street so far as that is possible. It was stated that the proposed pitches will provide adequate pedestrian access on each side, will not have an adverse impact on shop based traders and new canopies and signage will improve the general appearance and bring vibrancy to the area.

Objectors

The objectors stated it will be impossible for the trader to comply with the Street Trading Conditions as they would inevitably cause danger, nuisance or inconvenience in that location. Further, the position of the stalls will not provide sufficient room to accommodate pedestrians, those traders wishing to use an A Board and have a detrimental effect on shop based trading whilst representing over development in the area.

Members

In reaching a decision Members took account of the relevant representations and balanced the competing interests of the applicant, supporting representation and objectors. Whilst determining the matter on its merits Members were mindful that a pitch has been long established in close proximity to this application and there were no objections from the Highways Team or Environmental Services. These are the teams responsible for enforcement under the Highways Act and Street Trading Consent Conditions.

In terms of creating the pitches Members considered their Policy and found as follows. With adjustments having been made to the street furniture it was unlikely the pitches would cause danger, nuisance or inconvenience. Further, Members considered there would be safe access and egress of customers and staff from the pitches and premises in the immediate vicinity. Moreover, the nature of the goods sold will accord with the Policy, not impact on any proposed use of A Boards and bring vibrancy, interest and footfall to the area together with maintaining consumer choice in an otherwise fashion centric area of the city.

Accordingly, Members found it reasonable to create these pitches which provide over 2.66 meters on either side for A Boards and pedestrians to pass and repass and therefore grant the application as applied for. Authority is delegated to the licensing officer to grant the consent subject to the Standard Conditions.

The meeting ended at 1.12 pm

Chair(person)

Date Confirmed and Signed

Prepared by Democratic Services