

MINUTES of a meeting of the **REGULATORY – PLANNING COMMITTEE** held at County Hall, Matlock on 11 April 2016.

PRESENT

Councillor T Southerd (in the Chair)

Councillors G Birkin (substitute Member), C Cox (substitute Member for reconvened meeting), M Ford, R Hosker, R A Parkinson, J Twigg, J Williams and B Wright

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors D Charles, J Dixon and Julie Hill

No Declarations of Interest were received.

29/16 **SITE VISIT** In accordance with the Code of Practice the Committee visited the site at Clay Cross (Minute No 31/16).

30/16 **MINUTES RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 7 March 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

31/16 **THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF AN ENERGY RECOVERY FACILITY (ERF) AND ANCILLARY FACILITIES, COMPRISING OFFICES AND WELFARE FACILITIES, VISITOR CENTRE, ACCESS ROADS AND WEIGHBRIDGE FACILITIES, ELECTRICAL COMPOUND, TOGETHER WITH PERIPHERAL LANDSCAPING, DRAINAGE AND SECURITY FENCE, AT BRIDGE STREET, CLAY CROSS APPLICANT: CLAY CROSS BIOMASS LIMITED (CODE NO: CW4/1114/98)**

The proposal was for planning permission to develop an Energy Recovery Facility (ERF), which would be contained within a purpose-built building on vacant employment land at Bridge Street, Clay Cross.

Details of the proposal, together with comments received from consultees and following publicity, were contained in the report of the Strategic Director for Economy, Transport and Communities. Objections and concerns had been received from Clay Cross Parish Council, North East Derbyshire District Council and local residents and details of these were also given in the report and addressed in the planning considerations section.

The Head of Planning made reference to key points in the report and also referred to the site visit which had been undertaken which had included viewpoints into the site from several locations including the nearest property. He also presented a projection of slides which showed the site location in relation to the conservation area, a photograph of the site from Bridge Street, an impression of how this view would appear if the proposed development proceeded, other impressions of views of the completed facility and drawings from the St Modwen Development proposal for development of the adjacent former Biwaters site.

The Strategic Director's representative informed the Committee about late representations which had been received since the report had been prepared; these were from St Modwen Developments, from North East Derbyshire District Council, and from the Applicant.

The application had been considered in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004; other material considerations had also been taken in to account, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), the National Planning Practice Guidance and National Planning Policy for Waste.

The Strategic Director's representative affirmed that the main issues to be considered were need, location, sustainability and economic impact, and environmental impacts; and these issues were examined in the report.

He was satisfied from the information available that the proposal would provide a facility for treatment for residual wood waste which was much more environmentally sustainable compared to being sent to landfill, and that it would address a current need for such a facility. Surplus electricity generated from the use of the facility would be supplied to the grid and there would be an opportunity for the thermal energy generated to supply water for heating through a future Combined Heat and Power scheme. The sustainability credentials of such proposed development were recognised by the NPPF, and 'Successful Places – A Guide to Sustainable Housing Layout and Design' document adopted by North East Derbyshire District Council as Interim Planning Guidance on 1 December 2013.

It was recognised that there were concerns about the safety of energy from waste plants and reassurance was required that such plants were safe. Such a facility would require not only planning permission but also an environmental permit before it could be operational.

Statutory consultees Public Health England and the Environment Agency had not objected to the proposed development. Public Health England had concluded that it had no significant concerns regarding risk to

health of the local population from any environmental emissions from the development. The Environment Agency had no objection subject to conditions relating to land contamination investigation and remediation actions, groundwater and drainage and advisory notes relating to flood, river pollution, historic landfill, and groundwater.

The Strategic Director's representative explained that the evidence provided in the representations submitted by the Leader of the District Council and its officers, and by St Modwen, in support of the assertion of negative economic impact, were also to be given weight as a significant material consideration, but this was not considered by him to be so compelling as to justify departing from the recommendation for approval. The ERF development allowed for residual waste to be diverted from landfill and non-fossil fuel derived electricity to be generated, and represented an opportunity for heat to be taken up by nearby commercial and residential occupiers and/or occupiers of future nearby development under the redevelopment of the former Biwaters site. These were positive features of an efficient energy-from-waste plant which was also considered to represent a positive economic benefit in line with the regeneration of Clay Cross.

Members were reminded that the application site had a history of waste uses. The design of the structure proposed would be of a modern industrial style and appearance with no obvious conflict with the relevant requirements of the local plan policies. It was considered that the buildings and proposed stacks and associated plumes, on balance, should not have an unduly negative overall impact on the landscape and visual character of the area, that there would be no significant adverse ecological impacts arising from the proposed development and that any issues relating to the disturbance of the ground from construction could be addressed by appropriate conditions.

The traffic impacts associated with the proposal had been examined and it was not considered that the number of vehicle movements involved provided any substantive grounds for refusal.

The development in the form proposed, however, would have some adverse impacts. The most obvious and direct adverse impact being the construction of the proposed development; but these would be temporary and could be reduced by conditions to control the dust and noise emissions.

The potential for impacts from gasification plant emissions on human health had been considered in the context of the advice received from the Environment Agency, the main regulator of the processes to be operated in the plant by the Environmental Permit. There was perception of a risk to health, which was also to be taken into account. However, officers did not

consider that a refusal to the proposal on such grounds could be sustained by the Authority.

The need to provide facilities to manage the waste arising in Derbyshire was very evident but the actual provision had to be done in ways that respected the Waste Hierarchy, whilst affording sufficient protection against adverse impacts for the people and environment of the area. The Strategic Director was satisfied that there was a need for the proposed development and on that basis he concluded that the application site was appropriate for the type of activity proposed and that it accorded with the provisions of the development plan. He was satisfied that it could be operated in an environmentally acceptable manner and not harm the regeneration of Clay Cross, but potentially support it.

Mr K Walters, who lived near the site and had made representations, addressed the Committee. He referred to concerns relating to traffic and suggested that the current 30mph speed limit at Bridge Street was already exceeded by about 90% of traffic. He also expressed concern that the proposed development was to be situated on an old mineshaft. Other concerns he raised related to the quality and supply of the wood and fire risks, emissions and pollution, and noise levels. He concluded that residents should be entitled to live in a clean environment and that a more suitable location for the facility would be at Markham Vale.

Mr M Hicks addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant. He referred to the details of the proposal in the report and reiterated that the facility would contribute to sustainable waste treatment in the County; it would provide energy to homes; would direct waste wood from landfill; provide employment, including apprenticeships; and would generate payment of business rates and other financial benefits. He commented that operations would be inside the building thereby creating minimum impact to the area and that the site had an existing waste permit. He stated that the location was an existing waste site, that there would be no harmful environmental impact, and that operations would tackle climate change, and would provide benefits to Clay Cross.

As requested by the Chair, the Strategic Director's representative responded to the issues referred to by Mr Walters in his address. He explained that the Council when examining the proposal as Highway Authority had considered the accident record for the road and had evaluated that the proposal should not create any additional problems; that in relation to the mineshaft and contamination issue these problems would need to be addressed whenever the site was developed; that the current proposal would use up to date technology and gas emissions would be monitored and be in accordance with the Waste Incineration Directive; that staff safety training

would be included in the permit; that noise levels from the facility would meet the appropriate standards for both day and night time; and that the quality of the wood would be for consideration under the permitting process.

Councillor Wright remarked that he was the local Member for the site and was familiar with the history of its use for tipping waste but felt that the site should not be used further for waste and that a non-waste use would be appropriate. He expressed dissatisfaction with the height and mass of the designed chimney stacks and the plumes that would be emitted. He considered that the regeneration of the area was an overriding priority and felt that this proposal would be detrimental to that, especially since there were no contracts in place for the Combined Heat and Power heating.

Councillor Ford commented that there were both positive and negative effects to be weighed up but that he was persuaded that the proposal was acceptable, taking into account that the building was well designed, that he did not feel that the building would cause undue light loss for the neighbouring development site, and that the creation of apprenticeships and employment would be welcome.

Councillor Twigg agreed that the building was well designed and felt that the development would improve the area.

The Strategic Director's representative pointed out that there were provisions in the proposed conditions to require appropriate remediation of the site in advance of construction and reminded the Committee of the Employment allocation of the site in the local plan.

RESOLVED to authorise the grant of planning permission for the development proposed in application planning ref CW4/1114/98, subject to (1) conditions substantially in accordance with the conditions contained within the report of the Strategic Director for Economy, Transport and Communities; and

(2) the prior completion of an agreement or unilateral deed containing obligations under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) which shall make provision to the satisfaction of the Strategic Director of Economy, Transport and Communities and the Director of Legal Services substantially in accordance with the draft Heads of Terms referred to in the report.

32/16 PROPOSED ERECTION OF TWO DETACHED EDUCATIONAL BUILDINGS, A CANOPY AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW SCHOOL DRIVE AT CRESWELL C OF E INFANT AND NURSERY SCHOOL, GYPSY LANE, CRESWELL APPLICANT: DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL (CODE NO: CD5/1115/116) This was an application for the construction of two new educational buildings, a canopy and a new school

drive at Creswell Infants and Nursery School, Creswell. Details of the proposal, together with comments received from consultees and following publicity were contained within the report of the Strategic Director for Economy, Transport and Communities.

The Strategic Director's report explained that the school was currently 'over capacity' and the pupil projections showed that there would be a sustained demand within Creswell for nursery and infant school places, exceeding current capacity of the school. He commented that the proposed developments would result in the loss of playing field land and that Sport England had objected on the grounds that the proposal was considered to be contrary to policies of the Bolsover District Local Plan (BDLP), the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Sport England's Playing Field Policy. He also reported that construction of the new drive and access point was dependent on the development of an adjacent housing estate and until this access point was provided the application proposed to continue to use the existing access from Gypsy Lane. The Highway Authority had raised highway safety concerns as the junction of Gypsy Lane/Elmton Road was considered to be substandard.

The application had been considered in accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004; other material considerations had also been taken into account, including Government policy in the National Planning Policy Framework and Sport England's Planning Policy Statement.

The Strategic Director concluded that there was an accepted need for the development in order to meet the demand for school places in the Creswell area. He had noted that the development would result in the loss of school playing field, which was not to be compensated for and, as such, could not be considered to accord with relevant policies contained in the Bolsover District Local Plan and in the National Planning Policy Framework. However, the loss of the playing field when balanced against the need to provide sufficient school places was not considered to be so significant so as to recommend the refusal of the application. It was recognised that the development could potentially impact on highway safety and the concerns of the Highway Authority were acknowledged. However, he was of the view that a condition to require either the construction of the new drive and access or the approval of a scheme to restrict the use of the existing access from Gypsy Lane prior to the buildings being brought into use would address these concerns.

Subject to the recommended planning conditions being imposed, the Strategic Director did not find the development to be unacceptable. He recommended that the application be authorised for a grant of permission with

conditions, subject to first consulting with the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (as required by the Town and Country Planning (Consultation) (England) Direction 2009) on the basis that it was minded to grant planning permission for the development.

RESOLVED that (1) the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government be consulted on this application in accordance with the 2009 Directions, on the basis that the Committee is minded to grant planning permission for the Development: and

(2) provided that the Secretary of State decides not to call in the application for his own determination, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions contained within the report of the Strategic Director for Economy, Transport and Communities.

33/16 ENVIRONMENT ACT 1995: SCHEDULE 13 INITIAL REVIEW OF MINERAL PLANNING PERMISSION (ROMP), FOR BONEMILL QUARRY, RYDER POINT, HOPTON, WIRKSWORTH APPLICATION FOR DETERMINATION OF CONDITIONS FOR THE CONTINUATION OF EXTRACTION OF MINERALS AND SUBSEQUENT RESTORATION APPLICANT: LONGCLIFFE QUARRIES LIMITED (CODE NO: R3/0198/20)

In accordance with requirements of the Environment Act 1995 an application had been submitted to review the conditions of an 'old mineral permission' in respect of Bonemill Quarry situated at Ryder Point, Hopton, Wirksworth. The report of the Strategic Director for Economy, Transport and Communities explained that the principle of the permission for the development was not under question and a valid planning permission existed for the site. The main planning issue was whether the proposed planning conditions were sufficient to ensure that the development could be controlled such that it did not cause unacceptable impacts upon local residents or the wider environment.

Consultations had taken place and the Strategic Director's report summarised responses. The local Member's comments were reported at the meeting; Councillor Ratcliffe had expressed support in general to the proposed conditions, but commented on the impact that increased traffic on the roads would cause within her Division.

The report referred to the Strategic Director's assessment the application against the relevant development plan policies and other material considerations had also been taken in to account, including the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance. The effects on local communities and neighbouring land uses in relation to noise, dust, blast vibration and other inappropriate lighting had been examined in the report, together with other pollution or disturbance.

A draft set of conditions were recommended in Appendix A to the report, which included a number of changes from the set of conditions proposed by the applicant, which had been submitted with the application. The draft conditions were recommended in order to bring appropriate updates and much improved control to mitigate against any significant harmful environment impacts as the proposed works progressed at the quarry.

The report explained that generally methods of quarry working, landscaping, restoration and aftercare of the site would be brought in line with modern planning permissions and the requirements of the consultees. In considering changes to the scheme of conditions as submitted by the applicant, the Strategic Director reported that he had given appropriate consideration in each case to the potential effect on working rights, the economic viability of the operations concerned and the asset value of the site. He had also taken into account the information provided by the applicant's submission, including the Environmental Statement.

The report noted the Council might be liable to compensation for loss attributable to the scheme if (i) it determined conditions which differed in any respect from those submitted by the applicant; (ii) the effect of the alteration, compared with the conditions which applied previously, was to restrict working rights at the site (other than through restoration and aftercare conditions); and (iii) the restriction was such as to prejudice adversely and to an unreasonable degree, the economic viability of operating the site or the asset value of the site. It explained that where provisos (i) and (ii) were satisfied the Authority had to issue a notice to identify the restriction and to state whether in its opinion the third proviso was satisfied or not.

In this case the existing permission, so far as controlled by the existing conditions, lacked any fixed formal parameters for depth of working. Therefore the proposed new set of conditions would restrict the working rights. However, it was not considered that the draft conditions would prejudice the mineral asset value or the economic viability of the site.

A revised draft condition 8 was circulated for consideration at the meeting, which featured a limit on overall volumes of minerals won and worked to those which would be reasonably required to produce 825,000 tonnes of mineral for export in any single year, with a specific provision for enabling production to a higher limit only through prior submission to an appropriate a mitigation scheme and approval in writing by the authority of such a scheme. The Strategic Director's representative explained that the proposed revised version had been prepared in consultation with the applicant following concerns expressed on its behalf that the draft condition 8 in the report would require a limit on output that would be inflexible and restrictive to the extent that it might impact adversely on the economic viability of its

working the quarry. The Strategic Director's representative further explained that he found the revised version of the draft condition to be satisfactorily for its purpose, although a yearly limit of 825,000 tonnes would be ten percent above that which had been proposed in the report, it would still be low enough to secure the reliability of the assessments of impacts from the development which were contained in the applicant's environmental statement.

It was also noted at the meeting that to secure compatibility of the conditions with the full potential scheme of working referred to by the applicant, which included the working phases depicted on drawings numbered B26/44 and B26/45, these drawings also needed to be included in the list of documentation to appear in condition 3.

RESOLVED to authorise the Strategic Director for Economy, Transport and Communities to issue (1) for the purposes of Paragraph 9 of Schedule 13 of the Environment Act 1995, a set of planning conditions to apply to the relevant permission ASR/1255/3 (1884/402621/5) for Bonemill Quarry that shall replicate or be substantially similar to the draft conditions set out in Appendix A to the report of the Strategic Director for Economy, Transport and Communities, subject to the substitution of draft condition 8 by the revised version circulated at the meeting, and the inclusion of the drawings B/26/44 and B/26/45 as documents in draft condition 3; and

(2) a notice as required by Paragraph 10 (2) of Schedule 13 of the Environment Act 1995 in accordance with the wording in Appendix B to the report.

34/16 PROPOSED EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THE SUBMISSION OF AN APPLICATION UNDER THE ENVIRONMENT ACT 1995 (SCHEDULE 14) FOR APPROVAL OF CONDITIONS TO WHICH A PLANNING PERMISSION IS TO BE SUBJECT (FIRST PERIODIC REVIEW OF MINERAL PLANNING PERMISSIONS OR 'ROMP' APPLICATION) AT HILLHEAD QUARRY, BUXTON (PLANNING PERMISSION CODE NUMBERS 1986/9/6 (DISPOSAL OF MINERAL WASTE/MINERAL WINNING AND WORKING); 1986/9/8 (DISPOSAL OF MINERAL WASTE/MINERAL WINNING AND WORKING); CHA/262/11 (DISPOSAL OF MINERAL WASTE); CHA/864/13 (DISPOSAL OF MINERAL WASTE); CHA/865/17 (DISPOSAL OF MINERAL WASTE) APPLICANT: TARMAC LIMITED Hillhead Quarry was an inactive limestone quarry near Buxton. The owner and operator, Tarmac Limited, had asked for the agreement of the Mineral Planning Authority to further postpone the date by which an application had to be made to determine a new scheme of conditions from 28 April 2016 to 28 April 2020.

The report of the Strategic Director for Economy, Transport and Communities gave a planning background of the site. In making the request to postpone the first periodic review, Tarmac Limited had made reference to the new provisions for greater flexibility in the scheduling of reviews of mineral permissions set out in the Growth and Infrastructure Act 2013. The Strategic Director commented that a deferral to 2020 would be in accordance with the spirit of this legislation. He considered that the conditions relating to environmental impacts, such as noise, dust, blast, vibrations, etc, approved in 1998, were still robust and would allow mineral extraction and processing operations at the site to be controlled to acceptable modern standards. He, therefore, considered that a deferment of the first periodic review to April 2020 would not appear to present any fundamental problems.

RESOLVED to authorise the Strategic Director – Economy, Transport and Communities to agree in writing to the due date for the submission of an application under Paragraph 6 of Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 1995 for approval of new conditions with the planning conditions to which planning permissions 1986/9/6, 1986/9/8, CHA/262/11 CHA/864/13, and CHA/865/17 at Hillhead Quarry is to be subject, being deferred until 28 April 2020.

35/16 PROPOSED EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THE SUBMISSION OF AN APPLICATION UNDER THE ENVIRONMENT ACT 1995 (SCHEDULE 14) FOR APPROVAL OF CONDITIONS TO WHICH A PLANNING PERMISSION IS TO BE SUBJECT (FIRST PERIODIC REVIEW OF MINERAL PLANNING PERMISSIONS OR ‘ROMP’ APPLICATION) AT HINDLOW QUARRY, BUXTON (PLANNING PERMISSION CODE NUMBER CHA/1156/3 (DISPOSAL OF MINERAL WASTE/MINERAL WINNING AND WORKING OF MINERALS) APPLICANT: TARMAC LIMITED Hindlow Quarry was an inactive limestone quarry near Buxton. The owner and operator, Tarmac Limited, had asked for the agreement of the Mineral Planning Authority to further postpone the date by which an application must be made to determine a new scheme of conditions from 28 April 2016 to 28 April 2020.

The report of the Strategic Director for Economy, Transport and Communities gave a planning background of the site, including the approval of a Non-Material Amendment to planning permission CHA/1156/23 in November 2014 (Minute No 10/15 refers), which introduced a new condition requiring an ecological survey of the Phase 1 area (as defined by the current approved development scheme and conditions), prior to the resumption of winning and working of minerals.

In making the request to postpone the first periodic review, Tarmac Limited had made reference to the new provisions for greater flexibility in the scheduling of reviews of mineral permissions set out in the Growth and

Infrastructure Act 2013. The Strategic Director commented that a deferral to 2020 would be in accordance with the spirit of this most recent relevant legislation. He considered that the conditions relating to environmental impacts, such as noise, dust, blast vibrations, etc, approved in 1998, were still robust and that they would allow mineral extraction and processing operations at the site to be controlled to acceptable modern standards. He, therefore, did not foresee any immediate threat to the environment which would call for a more urgent reconsideration of the schedule of conditions approved in 1998, than would be the case with the RoMP due date being extended to 28 April 2020 as requested.

RESOLVED to authorise the Strategic Director for Economy, Transport and Communities to agree in writing to the due date for the submission of an application, under Paragraph 6 of Schedule 14 of the Environment Act 1995, for approval of new conditions with the planning conditions to which planning permission CHA/1156/3 at Hindlow Quarry is to be subject, being deferred until 28 April 2020.

36/16 **CURRENT ENFORCEMENT ACTION** **RESOLVED** to receive the report on current Enforcement Action.

37/16 **OUTSTANDING APPLICATIONS** **RESOLVED** to receive the list on decisions outstanding on 11 April 2016 relating to EIA applications outstanding for more than sixteen weeks, major applications outstanding for more than thirteen weeks and minor applications outstanding for more than eight weeks.

38/16 **CURRENT APPEALS/CALLED-IN APPLICATIONS**
RESOLVED to note the report on current appeals/called-in applications relating to County matters.

39/16 **DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT MONTHLY PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT STATISTICS** **RESOLVED** to receive the Planning Services Development Management Monthly Performance Management Statistics for March 2016.

40/16 **MATTERS DETERMINED BY THE STRATEGIC DIRECTOR FOR ECONOMY, TRANSPORT AND COMMUNITIES UNDER DELEGATED POWERS** **RESOLVED** to note that the following applications had been approved by the Strategic Director for Economy, Transport and Communities under delegated powers on:-

(a) Delegation Meeting – 10 March 2016

- 1 Proposed Replacement of Single Glazed Steel Framed Windows with Double Glazed Aluminium Units at Darley Dale Primary School, Greenaway Lane, Hackney, Matlock
Applicant: Derbyshire County Council
Planning Application Code No: CD3/0116/129
- 2 Proposed Erection of Timber Gazebo at Wirksworth Junior School, Wash Green, Wirksworth
Applicant: Derbyshire County Council
Planning Application Code No: CD3/0116/130
- 3 Proposed Development: Section 73 Application to Not Comply with Conditions 3, 6 and 29 of Planning Permission CW4/0415/2 to Extend the Completion Date of the Remediation Project, to Further Amend the Final Landform of the Restored Site and Allow the Production of Separate Completion Reports for the Development Platform Area and the Remainder of the Site at the Former Avenue Coking Works, Derby Road, Wingerworth
Applicant: Homes and Communities Agency
Planning Application Code No: CW4/1115/112
- 4 Proposed Erection of a Polytunnel and Greenhouse at Lea Primary School, Church Street, Lea, Matlock
Applicant: Derbyshire County Council
Planning Application Code No: CD6/1215/118
- 5 Delegated Decision on Schemes Required by Planning Conditions:
 - SD2827
 - SD2823

(b) Delegation Meeting – 24 March 2016

- 1 Delegated Decision on Schemes Required by Planning Conditions:
 - SD2825

(c) Delegation Meeting – 31 March 2016

- 1 Proposed Replacement of a Single-Storey Building incorporating an Entrance Reception, Administration Offices and Single Classroom at Riddings Junior School, Church Street, Riddings
Applicant: Derbyshire County Council
Planning Application Code No: CD6/0116/132

- 2 Delegated Decision on Schemes Required by Planning Conditions:
 - SD2832
 - SD2833

(d) Delegation Meeting – 7 April 2016

- 1 Proposed Replacement of Single Glazed Aluminium Framed Windows and Doors with Double Glazed Aluminium Units at Fairmeadows Foundation Primary School, Fairfield Crescent, Swadlincote
Applicant: Derbyshire County Council
Planning Application Code No: CD9/0216/136
- 2 Delegated Decision on Schemes Required by Planning Conditions:
 - SD2836
 - SD2837
 - SD2814

41/15 **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC RESOLVED** that the public, including the press, be excluded from the meeting during the Committee's consideration of the remaining item on the Agenda to avoid the disclosure of the kind of exempt information detailed in the following summary of proceedings:-

SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS CONDUCTED AFTER THE PUBLIC, INCLUDING THE PRESS, WERE EXCLUDED FROM THE MEETING

- 1 To confirm the exempt Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 7 March 2016.

42/16 **MINUTES RESOLVED** that the exempt Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 7 March 2016 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.