

Planning and Rights of Way Committee

30 March 2021 – At a meeting of the Committee held at Virtual meeting with restricted public access.

Present: Cllr High (Chairman)

Cllr Kitchen, Cllr Atkins, Cllr Baldwin, Cllr Barrett-Miles, Cllr Burrett, Cllr McDonald, Cllr Millson, Cllr Montyn, Cllr S Oakley, Cllr Patel and Cllr Sudan

Apologies were received from Cllr Goldsmith

Also in attendance: Cllr A Jones and Cllr Lord

Part I

18. Declarations of Interest

18.1 In accordance the County Council's Constitution, including the Code of Conduct as well as the Code of Practice on Probity and Protocol on Public Participation in Planning and Rights of Way Committees, the following declarations were made:

In relation to agenda Item 4 - planning application WSCC/055/20, Woodlands Meed College, Burgess Hill:

- Cllr High (Chairman) and Cllr Atkins both declared a personal interest because they had been lobbied about the application.
- Cllr Barratt-Miles declared a personal interest because he lives in Birchwood Grove Road, and because he has been lobbied about the application and also because he was the author of the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan as a councillor for Burgess Hill Town Council.
- Cllr Burrett declared a personal interest because he was involved in early discussions relating to plans for the school whilst in the role of Cabinet Member for Education and Skills prior to October 2019.

In relation to agenda Item 5 - application to register land known as Rascals Wood Field in the parish of Shipley as a Town or Village Green:

- Cllr Atkins declared a personal interest because he has been lobbied about the application.
- Mrs Becky Moutrey, Solicitor and Mrs Ami Dye, Legal Assistant both declared a personal interest because a member of their team is related to the applicant, Mrs Tessa Nash.

19. Minutes of the Previous Meeting of the Committee

19.1 Resolved - That the minutes of Planning and Rights of Way Committee held on 2 March 2021 be agreed and that they be signed by the Chairman.

20. Urgent Matters

20.1 There were no urgent matters.

21. Planning Application: Regulation 3

WSCC/055/20 – Construction of new two storey Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND) College building with associated soft and hard landscaping, a floodlit all-weather pitch, car parking and drop off/pick up facilities and alterations to existing access arrangements. Woodlands Mead College, Birchwood Grove Road, Burgess Hill RH15 0DP

21.1 The Committee considered a report by the Head of Planning Services, including changes to conditions as amended by Agenda Update Sheet (copy appended to the signed copy of the minutes). The report was introduced by Chris Bartlett, Principal Planner, who gave a presentation on the proposals, details of the consultation and key issues in respect of the application. The following points of clarification were made:

- The changes proposed via the Agenda Update Sheet were as a result of the late submission of a Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) the previous week. However, the NIA had not affected the overall recommendation for approval of the application.
- Proposed new condition 13 should also include the following additional sentence: "Once approved, the details shall therefore be implemented as specified within the approved document and maintained throughout the lifetime of the development.". The Committee was requested to delegate the form of final wording of the condition to the Head of Planning Services.
- It should not be inferred from the proposed change to condition 11, which removes reference to the MUGA, that there should be no controls on the hours of the MUGA. To make this clear, a further condition was proposed, along the lines of: "The use of the MUGA shall only be for the College and College activities within normal College hours of between 08.45 and 15.45 Monday to Thursday and 08.45 and 13.50 on Friday". The Committee was requested to delegate the form of final wording of the condition to the Head of Planning Services.
- At a virtual site visit on 24 March, Committee members requested that additional information be provided in relation to drainage. Drawings were submitted by the applicant and passed to the County's drainage officers for consideration. Drainage Officers were still considering these, in discussion with the applicant and, therefore, they could not be included along with the approved plans. However, there should be no reason to suppose there would be an unacceptable impact on the site. Drainage Officers are still content with the proposals, in principle. Approval of a drainage scheme can be dealt with as a pre-commencement condition, which is standard practice for planning applications.

21.2 The Chairman advised that he had used his discretion to allow Cllr Kirsty Lord, County Councillor for Hassocks and Burgess Hill South to speak on the application due to the close proximity of her electoral division to the site, the fact the Woodlands Meed School is in her division and because of the local interest from residents in her division.

21.3 Mrs Marion Wilcock, Chair of Governors, Woodlands Meed College spoke on the application. The County Council has statutory obligations to provide suitable accommodation under the School Premises Regulations 2012, and to comply with Building Bulletin 104 regarding SEND and Alternative Provision. The development meets national planning legislation and guidance, and objectives and policies in the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan and the Mid Sussex District Plan. There have been no objections from statutory consultees. The application is supported by Mid Sussex District Council and Burgess Hill Town Council. The development would replace the existing College, not introduce a new one. The numbers of students, staff and visitors will remain the same and so there would be no increase in traffic. The new buildings would be more environmentally sound. The use of the cut in and the low profile of the building means it would not be overly dominant. The amenity of residential properties to the northern and western boundaries would be maintained and enhanced, including trees and shrubs. The proposed new condition 14 to include an acoustic fence around the MUGA and all-weather pitch is strongly objected to. The school is very mindful of the interests of adjoining properties. The NIA makes no mention of fencing around the all-weather pitch, and it also notes that 12ft fencing along the MUGA to the rear of the property may not be feasible. An alternative arrangement of exchanging the location of the MUGA with the open grass area was suggested. There would be no objection to no community use of the MUGA; however, it would be critical that students can use the sports areas for out of school activities, like any other school in West Sussex.

21.4 Mr Andrew Edwards, Director of Property and Assets, West Sussex County Council spoke in support of the application. The school is in close proximity to residential areas and also Birchwood Grove Primary School. During construction and afterwards, the main concern would be safety, including the ingress and egress for pedestrians and traffic. The height of the buildings would keep disruption to the lives of neighbours to a minimum. Sympathetic landscaping would maximise the use of available space. Mitigation of the impacts of construction and also the transfer into the new school for pupils, staff and parents for both schools have been taken into account. Mitigation measures would include an increased County Council presence on site to help and sufficient hoardings and barriers to aid safety. Regarding the sloping site, more cut and fill has been used, but coupled with considerate landscaping would make the best use of the site. This would be a development to be proud of and it would meet the needs of pupils, parents, and teaching staff and would contribute to pupils to get the best start in life.

21.5 Cllr Kirsty Lord, County Councillor for Hassocks and Burgess Hill South spoke in support of the application. The current school buildings do not meet the needs of the pupils with mobility issues; there is poor access to hygiene and schooling facilities meaning pupils must go off-site to access pool and food technology facilities, losing significant time from their

school day due to travel. The new buildings provide access to hygiene and therapeutic facilities and would allow pupils to undertake their full curriculum on site. Traffic and residential amenity impacts on residents would be minimal. There is no objection from Mid-Sussex District Council or Burgess Hill Town Council. As mentioned by Mrs Wilcock, the proposals for acoustic fencing to the MUGA and all-weather pitch would be a concern, and the impact on loss of morning light into the school and loss of lighting and moisture to planting and mature trees were raised. It was questioned if the dampening effect of the new building on sound had been taken into account in the NIA. Sports England's assessment of noise was questioned; this is usually based on a standard class size of 30 pupils but Woodlands Mead College typically has smaller class sizes due to the needs of the pupils. This development would help prevent SEND pupils needing to be educated out of county and would enable the pupils to thrive.

21.6 Cllr Nigel Jupp, Cabinet Member for Education and Skills spoke in support of the application. The design and layout of the development has been formulated by a team which includes architects experienced in provision of special schools. The school governors and headteacher have been involved in the development of the proposals and stakeholders have been involved throughout the process, including parents who are fully supportive of the proposals. The proposals would provide an ideal facility and accommodation for the students. Pupils do attend from across the county, not just from the local area. However, there should be no change to traffic generation as there is no change to pupil numbers. The locality does experience noise from school activity, but the noise is from pupils attending both the College and also Birchwood Grove Primary School. Concerns regarding the impact on neighbouring roads during construction were acknowledged and apologies offered to residents; however, this is for a short time and would be managed by condition through a Construction Management Plan. The new school, as sited in a cut and fill, would cause minimum intrusion on neighbouring properties in terms of sightlines and daylight. The development was commended to the committee.

21.7 Cllr Anne Jones, County Councillor for Burgess Hill East, the local member, spoke in support of the application. The current school site is not fit for purpose. Throughout the development of the proposals the people who matter – parents, the governing body and teaching staff – have been listened to. The new school would meet a need and would prevent pupils from having to go out of county. The site is tight but officers have provided fantastic plans. Local residents support both schools and are in favour of the proposals. The proposed amendment to require a 12ft fence around the MUGA was a shock; this would be like a prison. The pupils using the MUGA have special educational needs and disabilities and are unlikely to cause the same amount of noise as, for example, the children at Birchwood Primary School. This condition should be refused. Hours of use should not be restricted either; use of similar facilities at other schools impact on other residents more and are not restricted. If approved this proposal would provide a school that is fit for purpose for pupils with special educational needs and disabilities.

21.8 In response to points made by speakers Planning Officers clarified the following:

- It was acknowledged that it was not ideal that the NIA was submitted the week before this Committee meeting, especially since it was dated December 2020. The proposed conditions, as per the Agenda Update Sheet, were a necessary and pragmatic response because the NIA stated there would be an impact on neighbouring properties.
- Regarding proposed condition 14 requiring acoustic fencing around the MUGA and all-weather pitch, the condition does not outline a specific fence height or treatment. It states that specifications would need to be submitted to the County Planning Authority for agreement.

21.9 During the following debate, Planning Officers advised that the paragraph at the end of the Agenda Update Sheet, beginning with the number "8.32" and referring to the acoustic report being submitted, should be disregarded because this was included in error.:

21.10 During the following debate, the following further point of clarification regarding proposed conditions was provided by Planning Officers:

- All references to the word 'MUGA' would need to be removed from condition 7 'Community Use Agreement', so that it accords with the proposed amendment, as per the Agenda Update Sheet, to condition 11 'Hours of Use...etc'.

21.11 During the debate the Committee raised the points below and a response or clarification was provided by the Planning and Legal Officers, where applicable, as follows:

Drainage matters

Points raised – Concern was raised that there may be an issue with water run-off, particularly on the western side of the land, due to the sloping site, the presence of Wealden Clay in the locality, the use of cut and fill and the increase in impermeable areas – MUGA, all-weather pitch and parking areas. It would have been helpful to see a drainage strategy and/or plans for mitigation as part of the Committee report rather than relying on condition 4, which states that a Drainage Strategy will be reviewed and approved by the County Planning Authority following any approval of the application. The Committee report should at least reference the various professional standards, building regulations and also the water run-off storage capacity. It was suggested that condition 4 'Drainage Strategy' should include the following sentence at the end: "The Drainage Strategy once approved shall thereafter be implemented as specified within the approved document and maintained throughout the lifetime of the development."

Response – There is no evidence that there are currently any issues or that there would be a drainage problem. Drainage Officers have not objected to the proposals and have approved the application, in principle. It is standard practice for drainage matters to be reserved, as is proposed in condition 4 'Drainage Strategy'.

Proposed acoustic fencing

Points raised – Concern was raised regarding the proposed acoustic fencing, as per new condition 14 outlined in the Agenda Update Sheet. It was noted that the number of pupils at the school would not increase and, therefore, noise levels would remain the same, and also that due to the mobility of the pupils at the school noise levels are not the same as at other schools. It was questioned whether the acoustic fencing would be necessary in planning terms.

Response – Should the Committee feel it appropriate, condition 14 could be amended to require monitoring of noise to take place for a period of time to assess whether any acoustic fencing would actually be required.

Design of the buildings

Points raised – The Committee noted that the design of the buildings, using the cut and fill, is an innovative, exciting and imaginative solution. It would minimise overlooking. There would be no steep gradients or steps, which would allow proper access to all areas for the pupils. The inclusion of ceiling track hoists is crucial for the dignity and personal welfare of the students. The new school site, once built, would be more aesthetically pleasing than the current buildings and portacabins.

Response – None required.

Community Use of MUGA

Points raised – Disappointment was expressed regarding the proposal to prevent community use of the MUGA. The Committee agreed that it wished to retain community use of the MUGA.

Response – Should the Committee feel it appropriate, proposals for community use of the MUGA could be retained, with appropriate amendments to conditions to reflect this.

Provisions for pick-up and drop-off during transition period

Point raised – It was queried what the provisions would be for pick-up and drop-off during transition period, when the existing area is no longer available but before the new area is built.

Response – Information regarding the provisions for pick-up and drop-off during transition period were not provided. However, this matter would be addressed in the 'Construction Management Plan' and specific reference could be made in condition 3, should the Committee wish it.

Routing of construction traffic

Point raised – Concern was raised regarding the narrowness of Birchwood Grove Road, which is classed as a bridleway, and its unsuitability for use by construction vehicles. It was suggested that HGV traffic should be routed via Wykekham Way and Ferndale Road. Construction traffic routing should be specifically mentioned in condition 3 'Construction Management Plan'.

Response – Reference to traffic routing could be included in condition 3 'Construction Management Plan' should the Committee wish it. However, the actual route would need to be reserved because it would need to be agreed with WSCC Highways.

Other additions to condition 3 'Construction Management Plan'

Point raised – It was suggested that the following matters should be referenced in condition 3 'Construction Management Plan':

- 'Demolition' should be mentioned wherever 'construction' is mentioned throughout the condition.
- Details should be provided for proposed hours of work at the site including times that deliveries would be allowed.
- A named contact for residents should be provided for residents during construction and demolition.
- Details should be provided regarding dust suppression measures.
- Details should be provided regarding noise mitigation measures.
- Details of should be provided regarding external lighting during construction and demolition.
- Details of should be provided for waste management including prohibition of burning at the scheme, and for the storage and disposal of waste and disposal and control of litter and provision of temporary domestic waste and recycling collection arrangements.

Response – In the first sentence of condition 3 'Construction Management Plan' it is made clear that "no development shall take place, including any works of demolition". However, all suggested matters could be included in condition 3 'Construction Management Plan' should the Committee wish it.

Protection of Trees and Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) on neighbouring properties

Point raised – Clarification was sought on whether there are any TPOs on trees in neighbouring properties. Clarification was sought on the species of tree shown on the view of the cross-section from the north, and it was questioned whether the tree would have an adequate water supply because of the cut and fill, noting that loss of the tree would affect screening.

Response – There are some TPOs on trees around the boundary of the site. The species of the tree queried is a Silver Birch. Condition 5 'Tree Protection' states that a root protection scheme will be submitted as part of the Arboricultural Method Statement. Also, it should be noted that condition 9 'Landscaping Scheme' allows for replacement of damaged trees for a period of 5-years.

21.12 During the debate the meeting was paused at 12.11 a.m. due to a lost connection with Cllr MacDonald; the Committee meeting continued at 12.16 without Cllr MacDonald, who took no further part in the debate or voting on planning application WSCC/055/20.

21.13 Cllr Sudan had provided apologies before the start of the meeting that she may be called away urgently for a short period; because of this she was unavailable to take part in any of the voting on this application.

21.14 The following amendments to conditions were proposed by the Committee:

Condition 3 - Construction Management Plan

Whilst acknowledging that the final sentence of the initial paragraph of the condition states that "The Plan shall provide details as appropriate but not necessarily restricted to the following matters", the additional amendments should be made, including further requirements that should be listed in the Plan, as follows:

- The condition should make reference to 'demolition' wherever 'construction' is mentioned throughout the condition.
- Details should be provided regarding the arrangements for picking up/dropping off during the transition period during construction where there is no pickup/drop off point available.
- Details should be provided for routing of construction and demolition traffic, plus details of consultation with residents on routing.
- Details should be provided for proposed hours of work at the site including times that deliveries would be allowed.
- A named contact for residents should be provided for residents during construction and demolition.
- Details should be provided regarding dust suppression measures.
- Details should be provided regarding noise mitigation measures.
- Details of should be provided regarding external lighting during construction and demolition.
- Details of should be provided for waste management including prohibition of burning at the scheme, and for the storage and disposal of waste and disposal and control of litter and provision of temporary domestic waste and recycling collection arrangements.

The form of wording of the condition was delegated to the Head of Planning Services.

Condition 4 - Drainage Strategy

The following words to added to the end of the condition:

“The Drainage Strategy once approved shall thereafter be implemented as specified within the approved document and maintained throughout the lifetime of the development.”

Condition 7 - Community Use Agreement

The condition shall be retained, as proposed in the report. Therefore, this would mean that community use of the MUGA (and the all-weather pitch, sports hall and hydrotherapy pool) would be allowed.

Condition 11 – Hours of Use (Floodlit AWP, MUGA, sports hall and hydrotherapy pool)

In reference to the proposed amendment to the condition, as stated in the Agenda Update Sheet, the word ‘MUGA’ should be reinstated in the condition.

Furthermore, in reference to the proposed new condition to restrict the use of the MUGA to College use and College activities, as proposed by Planning Officers, this would not now be required. Therefore, this would mean that community use would be allowed.

Condition 13 – Plant Noise and Specifications

In reference to the proposed new condition, as stated in the Agenda Update Sheet, and as further suggested by Planning Officers, the following wording to be added to the end of the condition, as follows:

“Once approved, the details shall therefore be implemented as specified within the approved document and maintained throughout the lifetime of the development”.

Condition 14 - Acoustic Monitoring

In reference to the proposed new condition, as stated in the Agenda Update Sheet, and as further suggested by Planning Officers, the following amendments to the condition should be made:

“Prior to the use of the all-weather pitch and MUGA (including for community use) details shall be submitted to and approved by the County Planning Authority. Prior to installation of acoustic fencing, there shall be a reasonable period of monitoring of the noise impacts of College use and community use of the all-weather pitch and MUGA to see if the acoustic fencing is required to mitigate any adverse impacts on residents.”

The final form of wording of the condition was delegated to the Head of Planning Services.

The amendments to conditions were put to the Committee and approved unanimously.

21.15 The substantive recommendation including changes to Conditions and Informatives as set out in Appendix 1 of the Committee Report and as amended by the Agenda Update Sheet including further amendments approved by the Committee, as noted in minute 21.14, above, was proposed by Cllr Barratt-Miles. The proposal was seconded by Cllr Atkins and approved unanimously.

21.16 Resolved – That planning permission be granted subject to the Conditions and Informatives as set out in Appendix 1 of the report and amended as agreed by the Committee.

21.17 The Committee recessed at 12.28 p.m. and reconvened at 12.45 p.m. including Cllr MacDonald and Cllr Sudan.

22. Registration of land to become a Town or Village Green under Section 15(2) of the Commons Act 2006

Application to Register Land known as Rascals Wood Field in the Parish of Shipley as a Town or Village Green under Section 15(2) of the Commons Act 2006

22.1 The Committee received and noted a report by the Director of Law and Assurance (copy appended to the signed copy of the minutes). The report was introduced by Ami Dye, who gave a presentation on the key points of the application, legal provisions, the applicant's case, objections, consideration of application including the reasons for the hearing by an independent barrister, details of the inquiry, the inspector's decision and the conclusion in respect of the application.

22.2 A written submission in support of the application from Mrs Tessa Nash, the applicant was read out. Concern was raised about possible impartiality of the Inspector leading the inquiry because of his being from the same Chambers as the objector's barrister. Objectors had access to professional expertise, supporters did not. COVID-19 made it difficult for some to attend the inquiry because phoning in was not allowed. Supporters had no financial or other incentive, yet the fact that they provided partially pre-filled questionnaires was questioned by the Inspector, even though subsequent letters were provided stating they were genuine. Objectors letters also all said the same thing. The objectors' statements that they had full lines of sight and their dogs alert them to activity were found to be untrue. The Driscolls have only lived in their property for a quarter of the period in question. There has never been an attempt by the owners to fence off the area, nor has there ever been any signage. Households of properties which straddle Shipley and Southwater have used the field for recreation and dog walking for many years. The statement by the Inspector regarding what is a "cohesive community" was not agreed with. The statement of Mr Driscoll regarding permission from Lady Burrell to ride on the footpath – the only access to Dragons Estate – was called into question because for part of the way this footpath has a clear sign stating, "no public bridleway".

22.3 A written submission in support of the application from Mrs Magda Haire, who provided a witness statement for the application was read out. It was difficult for some elderly residents to attend the enquiry held on 'Teams', particularly those who wanted to phone in – original paperwork had said they could, but the facility was withdrawn. Concerns were raised about conflict of interest because the Inspector and Barrister for Catesby Estate and objectors were from the same Chambers. The report gives the impression the Inspector was more sympathetic to the objectors. The applicant, Mrs Nash, is a lay person whose aim was to benefit the whole of Southwater. It is felt that the Inspector made implications about the integrity of the supporters who provided partially filled questions, even though they all provided a letter stating they understood what they signed. The forms filled in by objectors were almost identical to each other. The objectors all have a different beneficial interest in Rascals Farm. The Inspector's comments that he heard no dogs and that vegetation obscures view across Rascals Wood Field shows the objectors' statements on these points to be incorrect. Mrs Nash had only disagreed over the part of the sworn statement that the Driscolls had permission from Lady Burrell to ride over the footpath, which is not a bridleway, not any other part of Lady Burrell's evidence on this point – the Inspector seems to have misinterpreted Mrs Nash. The criteria for neighbourhood and locality are almost impossible for a lay person to understand.

22.4 A written submission from Mr Neil Robins, who had submitted a witness statement in support of the application was read out. Mr Robins has lived in Southwater since 1996 and regularly walked on Rascals Wood Field with his children since 2000 and dogs since 2005. It was questioned whether it is normal practice to have an Inspector from the same Chambers as the objectors' Counsel. The Inspector's report focuses on process rather than the merits of the case. The objectors were able to engage professional advisors and Counsel, paid for by the property developers. The supporters are lay people and the Inspector's report is critical of the processes they used. The Inspector focused on neighbourhood and locality; however, case studies presented showed that this would not necessarily invalidate an application. The Inspector criticised the way questionnaires were completed and submitted and then largely discounted them; supporters followed advice from the County Council, including the use of pro-forma letter. The Inspector disputed or downgraded some evidence due to lack of photographs or precision: no-one records exact details of taking their dog or children for a walk in anticipation of cross-examination in 20-years' time. This testimony was given under oath, but called into question. The thrust of the Inspector's report seems to have been to compare financial and technical resources available to the local residents versus an out of area property development company.

22.5 A statement from Cllr Amanda Jupp, County Councillor for Billingshurst, the local member was read out. Cllr Jupp stated she supports the recommendation in the Committee report as follows: 'that the application for the registration of land known as Rascals Wood Field as a Town or Village Green be refused for the reason set out in the Inspector's report dated 15 February 2021.'

22.6 In response to points made by speakers, Legal Officers clarified the following:

- The matter relating to the Independent Inspector being from the same Chambers as the objectors' Counsel is common practice because there are only a very small number of Chambers in England which specialise in legislation relating to rights of way. Chambers have codes of practice and Barristers have Bar Council standards which they must adhere to.

22.7 During the debate the Committee raised the points below and a response or clarification was provided by the Legal Officers, where applicable, as follows:

Conflict of interest by Barristers at the same Chambers

Point raised – It is noted that the applicant is a solicitor and so it was felt that Mrs Nash should be aware that there would be no conflict of interest by barristers from the same Chambers.

Response – See minute 22.6, above.

Cost of the application to the County Council

Points raised – The cost of making a Town or Village Green application was queried and also the cost to the County Council of the inquiry. It was noted that the Inspector stated that there is nothing wrong in making an application of this nature to prevent a housing development. Although some sympathy was expressed for the supporters, it was also felt that it doesn't seem right that the West Sussex tax-payer must foot the bill for what appears to an attempt to prevent a housing development.

Response – There is no charge to make a Town or Village Green application. The County Council bears the cost of the processing the application, including any inquiry.

Reason for non-statutory inquiry ahead of the Committee meeting

Point raised – Clarification was sought on the reason that a non-statutory inquiry had been heard before the matter was considered by Planning and Rights of Way Committee.

Response – A decision was taken by Mr Tony Kershaw, Director of Law and Assurance, to hold a non-statutory inquiry first, on the basis of conflict of information and the fact that the Committee cannot cross-examine all of the evidence. Use of a non-statutory inquiry ahead of a decision whether to register land as village green is the standard process used by the County Council when there is a conflict of evidence because there is no right of appeal.

22.8 The substantive recommendation was proposed by Cllr Atkins. The proposal was seconded by Cllr Kitchen and approved unanimously.

22.9 Resolved – That the application for the registration of land known as Rascals Wood Field in the Parish of Shipley as a Town or Village Green be refused for the reasons set out in the Inspectors report dated 15 February 2021, as detailed in Appendix 1 of the Committee report.

23. Date of Next Meeting

23.1 The Chairman thanked the Committee members and Officers for their work and dedication during the 2017-2021 electoral term.

23.2 The next scheduled meeting of Planning and Rights of Way Committee will be on Tuesday, 8 June 2021 at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting ended at 1.30 pm

Chairman