

EAST DEVON DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the consultative meeting of Strategic Planning Committee held online via the zoom app on 6 September 2022

Attendance list at end of document

The meeting started at 9.30 am and ended at 2.38 pm. The meeting was adjourned at 12.08pm and reconvened at 12.45pm.

23 Public speaking

Councillor Kelvin Dent, Chair of Planning, Sidmouth Town Council, spoke on behalf of Sidmouth Town Council who expressed disappointment that the three sites for allocation in Sidmouth were recommended for allocation. The site they were most unhappy about was Sidm_06 on the western side of Two Bridges, Sidford for the proposal of 268 new houses and asked that the assessment for this site be reconsidered. He highlighted the land was protected under Policy 3 of the Sid Valley Neighbourhood Plan and that a lot of time and money and public involvement had been spent preparing the Neighbourhood Plan and a desire to prevent the coalescence of Sidford and Sidbury was one of the key messages. Councillor Dent also advised that as well as objecting to the proposed allocations Sidmouth Town Council Members were not happy with Central Government ridiculous housing targets which have been imposed and felt that East Devon had done more than its share in the past and there was a lack of infrastructure to support further growth and in Sidmouth's case, a sewerage system which can't cope with the existing population. Sidmouth Town Council resolved last night to invite representatives of the six towns, Devon County Council, EDDC and our local MPs to tell the Government that 'enough was already more than enough' and Councillor Dent hoped that the Strategic Planning Committee would support that initiative.

Martyn Cross addressed the Committee on the enormous task of meeting a Central Government imposed target for housing in the area made difficult by the fact that many of the proposed developments are sited in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty with the additional complexity of environmental and cultural heritage issues. He suggested given the invidious position the Committee have been put in and the enormity of the task, would it not be a sensible approach to focus the Committee's time and resources on the developments where net big wins are possible and let smaller developments proceed through planning permissions channels. Sidm_017 for 11 new dwellings was given as an example. When in reality this could only be achieved by demolishing 7 existing houses most of which are used as social housing resulting in a net maximum gain of just 4 houses. Mr Cross urged the Committee not to allow itself to be manipulated in this manner and instead focus on the larger developments in more detail.

The following statement was read out on behalf of Mr W Cope, resident of Ottery St Mary:

I wish to formally request that the EDDC Strategic Planning Committee takes into account this submission in its consideration of the list of applications it has received from landowners and developers to be put forward for consultation for the next local plan to run to 2040. I am a resident of Ottery St Mary and unable to attend the meeting in person.

- Firstly, it is quite clear that there is already major road congestion problems in and around Ottery St Mary as we struggle to cope with the impact of the new significant

housing developments built around the town in recent years. Any additional development will add considerably to these difficulties.

- There is serious overloading of both secondary and primary school provision and existing health service provision is unable to cope, with both the GP and dentist services struggling to meet increasing levels of demand.
- I would like to point out that your current Local Plan is totally misleading and contains serious errors in how it describes public transport links for Ottery. You use the term “good”, but the facts are that Ottery St Mary is not “well-connected” by bus routes and does not have a train station. There are extremely limited bus services with no local buses between the town centre facilities and outlying parts of the town and there is most certainly no bus service to Exeter Airport as the document states. The schedules show that the last bus back from Exeter is 18.40 and that there are only 2 buses on Sundays.
- When I attended the recent special meeting of the Ottery St Mary Town Council called last week to consider the Site Assessment Summaries provided with detailed interim findings at Tier One and Tier Two Settlements for each of the 13 sites listed, I was extremely concerned at the complete lack of a strategic overview that identified the critical infrastructure requirements such development inherently creates with large population increases and the need to recognise and plan for additional school provision, doctor and dentist surgeries and public amenities.
- As a key requirement of any local development plan is the need to establish a spatial strategy and ensure that a sustainable pattern of development is recognised that seeks to align growth and infrastructure, then that seems to be overlooked with the list of sites in and around Ottery St Mary that is being recommended for development.
- When you consider that Ottery St Mary is clearly the smallest of the five Tier 2 towns identified, why is it that Ottery St Mary has a total of 248 houses listed in the “Preferred Allocation” category compared to 182 for Honiton, which is a much bigger town and has the essential rail links to Exeter and London that Ottery St Mary lacks.
- This is such a disproportionately larger number of new homes, compared to the other towns listed. I would also point out that greenfield sites in Ottery St Mary have been chosen when brownfield sites in Honiton are available.
- I would therefore formally request that the Committee rejects all of the sites proposed as Preferred Allocations as well as a Potential 2nd Site Allocation for part of a site as detailed for Ottery St Mary.

The following statement was read out on behalf of Mrs Tompsett, resident of Ottery St Mary:

Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to this meeting. I am an Ottery St Mary resident. Please would the Committee take into account the following factors when approving sites for future housing development in East Devon:

- Ottery’s infrastructure has not been improved to cope with existing expansion of the town. There is a lack of secondary and primary education provision (as acknowledged in appendix 2). Health service provision is also inadequate. The minor

injuries unit has been moved to Honiton and it is very difficult to see a GP within an acceptable timescale at Ottery's one medical centre. It actually feels quite precarious from a healthcare perspective.

- There are factual inaccuracies in the emerging Local Plan and appendix 2 (page 20) concerning public transport links for Ottery. These are not 'good'. Ottery has no train station and is not 'well-connected' by bus. The last bus back from Exeter is 18:40, there are only 2 buses on Sundays and there is no bus service to Exeter Airport (as is asserted in appendix 2, page 20). There is only a very limited and infrequent local bus service between the town centre facilities and the outlying parts of the town which means people generally have to take their cars into town for, say, a supermarket shop.
- All of the above inevitably forces people onto the narrow roads including the single narrow route through Ottery town centre and the narrow approach roads to the north, south and east which are highlighted in the emerging Local Plan. This means road congestion is already a problem.
- From a strategic point of view, given these infrastructure problems and the fact that Ottery is the smallest of the five Tier 2 towns, it does not seem balanced for Ottery to have 248 dwellings in the 'preferred allocation' category compared to say Honiton's 182 when Honiton is a much bigger town and has rail links to Exeter and London.
- In view of all the aforementioned, I urge the Committee to reject recommendation 1 of the report and not endorse all of the sites proposed as preferred allocations. Please would you instead instruct officers to return with a more strategic district wide approach which takes account of infrastructure variations between the five towns and considers the elevation of Honiton and Seaton's '2nd best' sites over Ottery's 'preferred allocation' sites.
- Such strategic considerations should also be given to recommendations 3 and 4.
- At a local Ottery level, of the sites identified in appendix 2, those to the west of the town are preferable to the others since there is road access to the west (Exeter and the M5) and to the east (Honiton and the A30) without the need to snake through the town.

Philip Morgan raised concerns about ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees. He referred to the Exe View Woods which Lymp_09, Lymp_15 and Exmo_12 all border and queried why these sites were being considered when there were so many other options available.

24 **Minutes of the previous meeting**

Members accepted the minutes of the consultative Strategic Planning Committee on 9 August 2022.

25 **Declarations of interest**

Minute 28. UPDATE REPORT: Site selection for the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040 - interim findings at Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements.
Councillor Dan Ledger, Affects and prejudicial Non-registerable Interest, Seat_02 - neighbouring resident.

Minute 28. UPDATE REPORT: Site selection for the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040 - interim findings at Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements.
Councillor Olly Davey, Affects Non-registerable Interest, Met with some residents of Douglas Avenue to discuss Exmo_04; In respect of Exmo_10 neighbouring resident, just off Hulham Road.

Minute 28. UPDATE REPORT: Site selection for the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040 - interim findings at Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements.
Councillor Paul Hayward, Affects Non-registerable Interest, Employed by Axminster Town Council.

Minute 28. UPDATE REPORT: Site selection for the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040 - interim findings at Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements.
Councillor Philip Skinner, Affects and prejudicial Non-registerable Interest, Exmo_07 Bystock Court, Exmouth and Land east of Old Bystock Drive, Exmouth.

Minute 28. UPDATE REPORT: Site selection for the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040 - interim findings at Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements.
Councillors Howe, Ingham, Lawrence, Ledger and Skinner advised lobbying emails on various sites.

Non-Committee Members

Minute 28. UPDATE REPORT: Site selection for the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040 - interim findings at Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements.
Councillors Paul Millar and Nick Hookway advised lobbying on various sites in Exmouth

Minute 28. UPDATE REPORT: Site selection for the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040 - interim findings at Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements.
Councillor Maddy Chapman, advised lobbying on various sites in Exmouth and advised predetermination on sites North of Goodmore Farm, Exmouth

Minute 28. UPDATE REPORT: Site selection for the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040 - interim findings at Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements.
Councillor Geoff Jung, advised lobbying on sites Exmo_04, Exmo_07, Lymp_07, Lymp_08, Lymp_09, Lymp_10, Lymp_12, Lymp_13 and Lymp_14.

Minute 28. UPDATE REPORT: Site selection for the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040 - interim findings at Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements.
Councillor Jake Bonetta, Affects Non-registerable Interest, Honiton Town Councillor - all sites in Honiton and surrounding areas.

26 **Matters of urgency**

There were no matters of urgency.

27 **Confidential/exempt item(s)**

There were no confidential/exempt items.

28 **UPDATE REPORT: Site selection for the emerging East Devon Local Plan 2020 to 2040 - interim findings at Tier 1 and Tier 2**

settlements

The Committee considered the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management's report updating on the role of any proposed new community and redevelopment of Exmouth to help address the shortfall in housing sites that some Members had queried at the previous meeting.

The report outlined that consultants had been appointed to consider options for a new community and their findings would be reported back to Members at a future meeting. The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management addressed a number of leading challenges for a new community including the timescale which could be in the region of 10 years before homes could start to be delivered.

In terms of development within Exmouth Town Centre the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised this area had significant constraints to delivering new homes including substantial flood zones. He referred Members to the detailed flood zone map in paragraph 3.4 advising government policy would suggest housing development would not be a viable option in these areas as it would put property and lives at risk. He also referred to the redevelopment options of Exmouth Town Centre advising the potential number of houses within Exmouth Town Centre would be relatively small and therefore not a realistic approach.

Members noted an additional update for Seat_03. The numbers cited in the report were different to those detailed in the site assessments in the appendices.

In response to questions raised by public speakers the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management clarified the following points:

- Officer assessments of sites were based on absolute constraints (AONBs, ecological and heritage impacts) and continuing with existing policy framework would not make sense when the council was trying to establish a new policy framework. Communities will however have an opportunity to provide their views, concerns and issues through the consultation stage of the draft Local Plan.
- Ottery St Mary had higher number of proposed sites as it had fewer constraints than Exmouth, Sidmouth or Seaton. The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management acknowledged there would be significant impacts on infrastructure and advised this would need to be factored into future work and reminded Members, in the meantime, the purpose for this meeting was to seek views on their preferred approach sites and their second choice sites to frame the consultation and to enable infrastructure providers to understand the implications and to enable them to comment on the proposed growth.
- In response to Mr Morgan's concerns about the impact on ancient woodlands around Exmouth he highlighted that essentially all sites had some kind of constraint/s which we would prefer to avoid. He emphasised that difficult choices needed to be made which would impact on something that was important, whether that be ancient woodland or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- Finally in response to Mr Cross's comments about smaller sites the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised that government policy states that 20% of our housing supply must be delivered on smaller sites of less than half hectare in area.

The Chair sought clarification on whether developers would perceive the outcome of this meeting as a green or amber light for their sites. The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised he could not stop developers thinking that but in his mind at this stage it was clearly an initial assessment and further work would be required and developers need to be aware that the emerging Local Plan cannot carry any significant weight at this stage.

The Chair sought clarification on the outcome if Members struggled to identify 2nd best sites into the preferred allocation sites. The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised that the draft Local Plan could go out to consultation with the sites as shown but emphasised that in order to meet the shortfall in housing sites there was a need to allocate all the preferred sites and the 2nd choice sites.

Comments during discussion included:

- Coastal Protection Zones was queried and whether Members understood the purpose of a coastal protection area. It was advised these were policies in the current Local Plan and would need to be reviewed and recommendations made in terms of what happens to the coastal preservation areas in the new Local Plan;
- Would like to see more refined assessments of the sites to enable Members to score and prioritise each site. In response the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised officers would need a steer from Members on the assessment work and scoring process and urged it would significantly delay the timetable to review the work. He further advised if Members were minded and sought to provide officers a steer about priorities there would be an opportunity towards the end of the consultation stage and before the publication draft of the plan to do further assessment work on the sites which could feed into the final assessment work. The Chair, who supported this becoming a fifth recommendation sought Councillor Bailey's views. In response Councillor Bailey confirmed she was in favour of this and supported officers proactively seeking development opportunities within brownfield sites in a bid to avoid the sprawl on the edge of our towns.
- Disappointed to see the focus was on urban intensification and not redevelopment of town centres;
- A suggestion was made to receive a comprehensive report detailing the opportunities and intensification of use for all of the sites including brownfield sites. The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised that a lot of information had been brought to committee in the past and referred to the Urban Capacity Study and the Brownfield Register. Evidence showed that East Devon did not have many brownfield sites and that landowners/developers were not putting these sites forward. He suggested, if Members wished, a proactive approach could be taken through compulsory purchase powers but emphasised numbers would be relatively low.

The Chair addressed the Committee about their direction of travel for the meeting and advised in his view it was to hear about the sincere concerns about the sites for each town. To assist the Committee he proposed the following amendment to the first recommendation which was seconded by Councillor Eleanor Rylance:

That Strategic Planning Committee recommend endorsement of the sites of the preferred allocations and 2nd choice sites proposed as suitable for allocation.

Further comments during discussion included:

- It was suggested that the council lobby Central Government with a concerted effort from local MPs to address the unsustainable and inappropriate way housing numbers were calculated;
- It was suggested that any sites brought forward on the edge of villages should be allocated as social housing with a local restriction to enable young people to stay within their communities;
- Infrastructure needs to proceed in parallel with any development;
- What are we going to do with the Magnolia Centre?
- A query was raised about compulsory purchase powers and whether additional resources could be provided to instigate this so that empty shops could be turned into affordable housing for young people rather than building on the outskirts of towns?
- Reference was made to the recent AONB report that showed East Devon had contributed to more than its fair share of housing numbers and how the AONB would be swallowed by with housing sprawl;
- Reference was made to the amendment to site assessment Seat_07 and Seat_12 since the working draft Local Plan and clarification sought on how many other sites had amendments and why these had been amended. The Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management advised it was the result of further assessment work and emphasised if Members wished for an additional report on this it would take valuable resources away from progressing with the consultation;
- A query was raised about why the sites assessments had not been done on a scoring basis as had previously been done on the Working draft Local Plan. The scoring system had made it a lot easier. It would be helpful for Members to understand how sites were graded when considering the shortfall. In response it was confirmed further work could be done but emphasised the ‘no’s’ would remain definite ‘no’s’ due to the significant constraints identified and every other site identified as preferred and 2nd choice sites had been put forward to meet the shortfall of housing numbers.
- There was a need to look at the Magnolia Centre as there was a potential for a minimum of 500 homes which would add vitality back into the town and a suggestion was made for a further recommendation to read ‘this committee asks that the redevelopment of the Magnolia Centre in Exmouth be brought to this Committee at the next available meeting for agreement on the way forward to get this started’. The Chair acknowledged the importance of the recommendation and suggested that it be brought forward for consideration before the end of the year;

The Chair drew Members’ attention to the recommendations on page 18 of the report. He reminded Members of his amendment to the first recommendation that Strategic Planning Committee ‘recommend endorsement of the preferred sites and 2nd choice sites as suitable for consultation’ and said this would enable the consultation to go ahead in the autumn. A discussion took place on the remaining recommendations where it was agreed that recommendation 2 would remain the same; recommendation 3 would be removed as this was reflected in recommendation 1 and a further recommendation be added to read ‘that a report be brought to a future meeting of Strategic Planning Committee to set out options for the weighting of site constraints and assessments to inform future assessment work, post consultation of the draft Local Plan. Following advice from the Service Lead – Planning Strategy and Development Management on recommendation 4 the Chair advised recommendation 4 would be deferred for later consideration with the site assessment work on the tier 3 and tier 4 settlements.

Before taking the meeting to a brief adjournment the Chair invited Committee Members to vote on the following recommendations separately:

RECOMMENDATION:

That Strategic Planning Committee:

1. Recommend endorsement of the preferred sites and 2nd choice sites as suitable for consultation;
2. Note the likely shortfall in housing sites identified within this committee report'
1. That a report be brought to a future meeting of Strategic Planning Committee to set out options for the weighting of site constraints and assessments to inform future assessment work, post consultation on the draft Local Plan.

Committee Members were in support of the three recommendations.

The Chair paused the meeting for a brief adjournment and advised Members that on their return he would be inviting them to discuss each of the settlements in tier 1 and tier 2.

The meeting was adjourned at 12.08pm and reconvened at 12.45pm.

Members considered each of the settlements in Tier 1 and 2 as follows:

Members' concerns for site selections for Axminster included:

- Axminster Ward Members were very supportive of a relief road;
- The area needs investment to sustain the high level of growth;
- Supportive of numbers coming forward but with the support of infrastructure.

Members' concerns for site selections for Exmouth included:

- Exmo_06 – Douglas Gardens. Concerns for the Maer Valley Park; mature trees and hedgerows should be preserved and access is extremely poor. Maer Lane is too narrow for development and the site is too steep;
- Exmo_08 & Exmo_16 - Similar concerns as Exmo_06. All three sites will need access to Douglas Avenue and Littleham Cross;
- Exmo_17 – The original proposal for the new road was down Castle Lane, before the bridge. This needs to go beyond Rodney Close to have a real benefit;
- Do not agree with any development within the Lympstone/Exmouth gap and should remain green to protect the pebblebed heaths;
- The existing infrastructure cannot support any more development;
- Lymp_14, Lymp_13, Lymp_10 & Lymp_09 will have a significant impact on the residents;
- The Dinan Way extension is desperately needed for the northern side of the town;
- Lymp_10 & Lymp_15 – The top end of Hulham Road is a fast, dangerous narrow road and unsustainable as it is too far away from facilities;
- Would prefer not to build all around the periphery of Exmouth
- Concerns about further development in Exmo_20, Exmo_07, Lymp_08, Lymp_10 and Lymp_9 as this will affect the Green Wedge

Members' raised no concerns for Honiton.

Members' concerns for site selections for Ottery St Mary included:

The following statement was read out on behalf of Councillor Vicky Johns:

I am writing as one of the East Devon District Councillors for Ottery St Mary and I am horrified by the draft proposal that looks to offset a large amount of housing in the Ottery Parish. Ottery is the smallest of the Parishes that is being looked at by East Devon for the housing allocation and yet it is being looked at for one of the largest allocations in comparison to its size. Over the last few years Ottery has grown more than any other East Devon town without any growth in its infrastructure, including no banks at all, resulting in schools that are at capacity, as pointed out by your own inspections. A doctor's surgery that is struggling under the sheer volume of patients, not to mention the fact that the buses, which have been mentioned in this report have been significantly reduced as of the end of July 2022.

The sites that have been put forward state that there are issues with the roads in Ottery due to their narrowness

Otry_01 - states that the lack of infrastructure would require a new roundabout and primary and secondary school provision. The report states that there is medium sensitivity with regards to the landscape of this site and that a roundabout, which would be necessary, would be a visually dominant feature. As a resident of Ottery I can state that the sensitivity of changes to this landscape would actually be high, this is one of the main approaches to Ottery and is mentioned in the Neighbourhood plan for the Parishes of Ottery and West Hill 2017-2031 page 2 'The countryside around the parish is its crowning glory and the plan has made it clear that this should be protected for future generations'. To build houses on this site would have a detrimental effect on Ottery as a whole, as it would change the approaches to Ottery. The survey states itself that if this site was used within allocation then there would be a requirement for archaeological assessment as historic use suggests there is potential subterranean archaeology. The land itself is Grade 3 agricultural land and as a council we have declared a climate emergency so how is removing agricultural land complying with our climate emergency or assisting in anyway? The road itself is quite narrow and there are no paths from this site down into Ottery itself.

East Devon have stated themselves in the report that 'the scale of development on this site would help deliver the district-wide housing requirement in a manner that is consistent with the spatial strategy.' So it is not good for Ottery but good for East Devon District Council as it helps them this is not a good enough reason to put even more housing in a parish that is already at capacity.

Otry_09 - Land at Thorne Farm Way - This site is identified in the Neighbourhood plan for education and community use not for housing, this site has recently had a planning application put forward which has already been turned down by EDDC. To put the site forward again makes a mockery of the whole system, not to mention the issues that have been mentioned above also stand for this site.

Otry_10 Lane at North and South Salston Barton - This site is on a narrow road with no path leading to Ottery itself, the report mentions the possibility of connecting with the new Bovis site but there is no path on that side of the Bovis site and a busy road would need to be crossed to get to the Bovis site. There is mention of a cycle/footpath along strawberry lane but the road is not wide enough to facilitate this. The site itself is prone to flooding and would leave the house below it open to more risk of flooding as they are situated at a lower level to this site.

GH/ED/27 - Strawberry Lane - This site is also along the narrow Strawberry Lane road there is mention in the report of the impact of j29 on the M5 during busy periods. It is unclear why that is on this particular allocation when it does not impact Ottery. This site

has the same issues as the above site Otry_10 and should not be considered within the sites allocations.

All of the sites put forward for Ottery above mention the issues with the infrastructure but are basically ignored in favour of assisting EDDC with the housing allocations needed by the Government. Ottery is the smallest town being put forward with very limited infrastructure it is also the town that has seen the most growth, percentage wise, over the last few years and cannot sustain any more housing of a significant size. The committee was asked to take this point of view into account.

- The historic layout of the town centre and network of narrow lanes makes traffic and pedestrian and cycle access to facilities more difficult;
- Otry_01 – A new roundabout would be required by Devon County Council Highways. The site would impact on the AONB and there is also a lack of available spaces at the secondary and primary schools. The site is outside the BUAB with the loss the Grade III agricultural land
- Otry_09 – A new roundabout would be required and the development would be visible;
- Strawberry Lane/Slade Road has highway issues as it is a dangerous road;
- Green wedges should be upheld

Members' concerns for site selections for Seaton included:

- Seat_05 – Strong wish to retain the employment allocation for this site.

Members' concerns for site selections for Sidmouth included:

- There are no high ranking sites in the Sid Valley;
- Sidm_06 – Risk of coalescence and should only be acceptable if it does not impact on the visual and physical separation of Sidford and Sidbury. It is within the AONB and has a high landscape sensitivity to new development;
- Sidm_06 – Would add to traffic in the already narrow roads;
- Sidm_24 – Same concerns raised as Sidm_06;
- Sidm_13 - Close to AONB and would change the entrance to Sidford and Sidmouth
- Sidm_14 – Same concerns as Sidm_13.

Attendance List

Councillors present:

P Arnott (Chair)

O Davey (Vice-Chair)

J Bailey

S Chamberlain

P Hayward

M Howe

B Ingham

R Lawrence

D Ledger

A Moulding

G Pratt

E Rylance

P Skinner

Councillors also present (for some or all the meeting)

M Armstrong
J Bonetta
C Brown
M Chapman
P Faithfull
M Hartnell
N Hookway
G Jung
J Loudoun
P Millar
H Parr
M Rixson
E Wragg

Officers in attendance:

Wendy Harris, Democratic Services Officer
Ed Freeman, Service Lead Planning Strategy and Development Management
Damian Hunter, Planning Solicitor
Debbie Meakin, Democratic Services Officer
Anita Williams, Principal Solicitor (and Deputy Monitoring Officer)

Councillor apologies:

M Allen
K Blakey

Chairman

Date: