

PLANNING POLICY & BUILT HERITAGE WORKING PARTY

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party held on Monday, 20 February 2023 at the Council Chamber - Council Offices at 10.00 am

Committee Cllr A Brown (Chairman)
Members Present: Cllr N Dixon
Cllr P Heinrich
Cllr G Mancini-Boyle
Cllr P Fisher
Cllr R Kershaw

Substitute Cllr W Fredericks
Members Present: Cllr V Holliday

Other Members Present: Cllr A Fitch-Tillett

Officers in Attendance: Planning Policy Manager (PPM)
Planning Policy Team Leader (PPTL)
Senior Landscape Officer (SLO)
Democratic Services Officer (DSO)
Senior Planning Officer – MG
Senior Planning Officer - ST

73 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr P Grove-Jones (Vice-Chairman), Cllr V Gay, Cllr N Pearce, Cllr J Punchard, Cllr C Stockton, Cllr J Toye.

Cllr W Fredericks was present as a substitute for Cllr P Grove-Jones, with Cllr V Holliday present as a substitute for Cllr J Punchard.

74 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

None.

75 MINUTES

The Minutes of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party meeting held Monday 16th January (meeting adjourned and resumed Monday 30th January 2023) were approved as a correct record.

76 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS

None.

77 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

78 UPDATE ON MATTERS FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING (IF ANY)

None.

79 ANY OTHER BUSINESS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND AS PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED UNDER ITEM 4 ABOVE

None.

The Chairman re-ordered the Agenda and took Item 9 before Item 8.

80 NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK - CONSULTATION ON PROPOSED CHANGES

- i. The PPM introduced the Officers report and advised the background to the report and recommendation. He informed Members that the government had gone out to consultation on a series of proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), expected to be followed by a further 2 to 3 rounds of consultation in 2023 including the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill, additional consultation on the NPPF, and standard development management policies. These consultations would form a fundamental review of planning, with the expectation that Local Plans would be more streamlined, strategic, quicker to prepare, and subject to regular review roughly every 5 years or so.

The PPM highlighted the proposed changes 1 to 9 (Pages 99 to 103 of the Officers report) and invited Members questions regarding the Officers report, any of the specific changes and proposed responses.

Change 1 – Page 99 - The PPM advised that North Norfolk does not follow the standard methodology used to establish how many houses were required, and noted concerns about the 2014 household projections used in the formula. NNDC was classified in the exceptional circumstances category and used their own methodology, similar to other Local Authorities. He affirmed the UK government did not intend to remove the standard methodology, however proposed for this to be referred to as ‘an advisory starting point’ within the NPPF. It was considered that this would provide Local Authorities greater flexibility as they would not have to demonstrate that circumstances were exceptional, rather they would simply have to argue that there is good reason to depart from the standardised approach. The PPM expressed his disappointment and preference that the standard methodology be removed altogether, allowing Local Authorities the ability to establish their own targets on the basis of locally produced need. The PPM concluded, that the proposed change was a step in the right direction, albeit disappointing that the standardised methodology was to remain.

Change 2 – Page 100 – The PPM advised that although greater flexibility was proposed, it was unclear what might constitute grounds for departing from standard methodology. He noted use of language in the document, in particular references to ‘Island of elderly’ which was vague. The PPM stated unless the guidance was extremely exhaustive and cites every single example, Local Authorities would likely challenge that their particular reasons for departure weren’t listed in the guidance, which would be problematic. He reiterated his earlier comments that the standard formula should be rescinded, with determination made by individual Local Authorities who better understood local factors.

Change 3 – Page 101 – The Working Party were advised this was not applicable to North Norfolk as it pertained to uncharacteristically high density.

Change 4 – Page 101 – The PPM advised this also was not relevant to North Norfolk as there is no Green Belt within the district. He confirmed that 'Green Belt' was a specific designation, separate to Countryside and Green Fields, with Green Belts only existing around urban areas. However, noted the proposed change may impact North Norfolk and other Local Authorities with growth being directed elsewhere instead of the Green Belt, resulting in a ripple effect of development.

Change 5 – Page 101 – The PPM expressed support for the proposed change. He noted that the current housing target did not account for surplus delivery one year, with a fall in the next, stating there was no benefit in delivering additional homes above the target. The proposed provision would allow for the surplus to be taken off future years.

Change 6 – Page 101 & 102 – The PPM advised that Local Plans needed to be 'justified' in order to meet legal tests. To justify Plans, Local Authorities must consider a series of options and prepare a vast array of supporting evidence and background studies. The formal test of 'soundness' if softened would diminish the importance of supporting evidence.

Change 7 – Page 102 – Not relevant to North Norfolk.

Change 8 – Page 102 – Proposed changes to 'Duty to Co-operate' were considered by the PPM to be significant. Duty to Co-operate was a legal requirement which offered the Local Plan Examiner little by way of discretion of judgement. The replacement 'alignment policy' was not yet known, but would likely enable sensible strategic planning across authorities but not having to meet duty to co-operate standard.

The PPM spoke broadly about the other proposed changes outlined in the consultation document.

With reference to the Councils 5 year Housing Land Supply (HLS) and housing targets referenced in the document, the PPM advised that the government had indicated intention to streamline this process. Local Authorities would still be expected to deliver 5 year HLS but rather than be judged exclusively on the housing delivery test, Councils would be assessed on planning permissions granted. The PPM reflected this was a beneficial change as the granting of planning permissions was within the Local Authorities control, whereas the enacting of those permissions and building of developments was in the control of third parties.

The PPM considered the Council should object to the government's intention to introduce a standard set of national development management policies, and considered that whilst there were policies shared amongst several Local Authorities including flood risks, AONB, dark skies and more, the proposed change argued that where there was a conflict between local policies and national policies, national policies would take precedence. The PPM argued the proposal would devalue local democracy and undermine Local Plans. He reflected that contention surrounding Local Plans related not to development management policies, rather it was the strategic content, therefore the time-consuming part would remain.

The PPM noted the transitional provisions proposed, which recognised that Local Authorities were developing Local Plans at present and encouraged Councils to continue to develop and submit their Local Plans. Under the proposed transitional arrangements those submitted Plans would be examined under the existing regime. The PPM contended that it would be better for the government to introduce the proposed new tests, including the removal of duty to co-operate, in relation to current Plans, and expedite the process of current Plan preparation.

- ii. The Chairman noted the Council challenged the standard methodology calculation relying on the 2014 projections, and asked why the 2014 figures were still being used.
- iii. The PPM advised the Council had successfully challenged and won on appeal when arguing that the 2014 figures and projections for North Norfolk were wrong. The certainty offered by the 2014 figures was increasingly outdated, with the 2021 census expected to provide a benchmark of what was happening in the real world as opposed to projections. It was noted that the 2021 census figures would not be available till 2024.
- iv. The Chairman asked if Local Authorities would have a buffer for its housing delivery target, and commented on the deliverability of the governments housing targets.
- v. The PPM advised that the government sets a higher national target than the sum total of all Local Plans across the country to build in a plan failure contingency. He argued that government were aware that the national housing target figure would not be achieved, and commented there was little prospect the 300,000 figure would be delivered.
- vi. Cllr N Dixon welcomed the proposed change to enable the 5 year HLS calculation to be judged on permissions granted, but contended that this may not go far enough. He affirmed that the Council were limited in the delivery of homes after allocating land in the Local Plan. Whether permissions were granted on those allocations was beyond the Local Authorities reach, and would be subject to planning proposals being submitted in the first instance, and in developers desire to build on the allocated land. He asked if the 5 year HLS assessment could instead be based on allocations made, not the delivery of those allocations. Cllr N Dixon noted that site allocations were subject to discussions with developers and land owners, and were assessed for their viability.
- vii. The PPM acknowledged that in preparing the Local Plan, the Council were required to undertake a deliverability test to ensure that the Local Authority were confident the allocated land could be developed upon. This process involved discussions with developers, land owners and others. Under the current and transitional arrangement, if the Council could evidence housing growth in its Local Plan (when considered by the Planning Inspector), it would not be required to show a 5 year HLS outside the plan preparation process for the first 5 years. At the end of the 5 year period the Plan would be subject to review, the streamlined process would ensure Plans be subject to cyclical ongoing review processes. The PPM advised this would offer protection, as those Local Authorities which had adopted a Plan would not be subject to the presumption in favour of sustainable development. In order to

refuse planning permission under the presumption, Councils must demonstrate the adverse impacts of the development significantly outweigh the benefits. In practice this results in the approval of otherwise unsatisfactory development.

Those Local Authorities who had passed Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 stages, and were far advanced in their plan making would, under the transitional arrangements, only be required to demonstrate a 4 year HLS rather than the 5.

- viii. Cllr N Dixon reiterated his preference that the 5 year HLS assessment be underpinned on site allocations contained in the Local Plan, not permissions granted.
- ix. The PPM noted the process of development, from initial thoughts, through application and to completion, and advised, provided the Council could demonstrate the scheme would be deliverable in the 5 year period, that even those fledgling thoughts and conversations could be included within the Authorities 5 year HLS.

After the Local Plan had been examined and approved by the Inspector, the PPM advised the relevant site allocations would be added to the Councils 5 year HLS. The PPM agreed that it was only correct that sites be considered as part of the Councils 5 year HLS if they have been part of the aforementioned process.

The PPM affirmed that Nutrient Neutrality had significantly stymied house building in the district, and noted that the mechanisms available to the Council to promote development were limited. He advised that it appeared that there would be a new process brought in which would allow for the Local Authority to consider the Character of the applicant when considering planning applications. This would enable the Local Authority to consider whether a specific developer was sitting on permissions without developing them out. The PPM expressed some scientism about any mechanism intended to accelerate build out rates based on the behaviour of individual applications and developers. Rather, he contended that build out rates were determined by market conditions.

- x. Cllr V Holliday asked whether proposal 3 could apply to high growth villages, regardless she expressed her support for the proposed condition.
- xi. The PPM advised that density, as referenced in the proposal related to areas where there was no other option other than to build up at much high densities. The density considerations had nothing to do with delivering housing targets, and was different from the term densification. This proposal would not apply to North Norfolk which had ample room to grow out rather than up.
- xii. In response to questions from the PPM and Chairman about the timeline for Consultation response, the DSO advised that the recommendation could not be altered to enable the PPM delegated permission from the Working Party to respond to the Consultation. The Working Party was not a decision making Committee and was bound by its terms of reference to make recommendations to Cabinet. It could not pass decisions in its own name.

- xiii. Cllr P Heinrich proposed and Cllr R Kershaw seconded the Officers recommendation.

IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY AGREED by 8 votes for.

That Members of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party recommend to Cabinet that the Authority respond to the consultation as outlined in this report.

81 NORFOLK COAST AONB UPDATED MANAGEMENT PLAN (2019-2024), REVISED 2022

- i. The SLO introduced the Officers report and recommendation. She advised that the Council had a statutory duty as a partner of Norfolk Coast Partnership to prepare and publish a plan for the management of the AONB, and to review that plan at intervals of no more than 5 years.

It was noted that Norfolk Coast Partnership had been undertaking a structural review. The Partnership included representatives an Officer and Member representative from Norfolk County Council, Kings Lynn and West Norfolk, Great Yarmouth Borough Council, North Norfolk District Council and Natural England.

The SLO advised this was a slight refresh of the existing management plan and the intention was that a major review of the management plan be undertaken in due course pending guidance following the Glover review.

The SLO noted the main changes, as set out in section 1.5 of the Officers report.

- ii. The Chairman noted North Norfolk was the third most bio-diverse area in the County and asked if there was a case to argue for an international dark skies designation. He reflected that light pollution had been a key issue for the Development Committee.
- iii. The SLO advised there were areas of the UK which held the international designation, and commented that there was the intention to obtain other designations within the AONB. She acknowledged this was an area already covered NNDC Local Plan Policy EN1 specifically references Dark Skies and Policy EN2 which looks at retention of nocturnal character. The AONB team were working as a priority to publish further guidance. The SLO advised she would be happy to feedback any requests from the Council to Norfolk Coast Partnership.
- iv. The PPM echoed the SLO comments and affirmed as a partner in the organisation, perhaps more could be done to effectively influence what it is the organisation does. The PPM reflected that when he was the Officer Representative that it was not the norm to routinely report back the work of the Partnership to the Council, which may have adversely impacted Members understanding of the Partnership and its functions. He considered the Council could be more active in directing the Partnership on what it does on the Councils behalf, including issues surrounding Dark Skies, and that this ought to feature in the next management review in the next cycle.

The PPM considered that the update presented to Members was effectively an interim review with the expectation that a more substantial review take place which would better engage with the district partners.

- v. The PPTL stated that it was important not to confuse 'Dark Skies' designation with planning designation. Dark Skies designation applied to areas which were particularly dark and provided astrological views of skies in dedicated remote locations away from artificial lights. The Local Plan focused more on the character of the landscape, and the value features of the landscape as demonstrated through landscape studies.
- vi. The SLO endorsed the PPTL comments that an international dark skies designation was not a planning designation. She argued there was much to be gained with working with other Partnerships in the wider AONB family.
- vii. The Chairman asked how the duty to co-operate could be promoted.
- viii. The PPM confirmed that as Member of the AONB Partnership, it was reasonable to ask for the Partnership to look into specific areas or projects i.e. Dark Skies designation. He noted that the Partnership had considered Dark Skies Designation, but it was considered that it may be challenging to achieve international status given the rigor of the application process. There were two tiers of designation, the first was locally designated dark sky observatory sites (which existed within the district), and the other was international designation.
- ix. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett advised of changes to the Partnership in the last year, with a great change in the Officer lead and representation. Further, the publication of the Glover Report had impacted on the management plan. The document for consideration was intended to be a quick refresh to serve as place holder pending a large review which would implement guidance from the Glover Report. She offered insight as Vice-Chairman of the Partnership regarding the restructured team, and the intention for a Coastal Manager to be appointed.

With reference to the wider AONB family, Cllr A Fitch-Tillett commented that the various AONB Partnerships met annually and that she and the NNDC Officer representative would feedback discussions surrounding Dark Skies.

She recommended the refreshed report and commended the SLO for her input, noting the extensive list in Appendix 2 of all the aspects which needed to be considered as part of the Management Plan.

- x. The Chairman commended the SLO and the Partnership for the document, and spoke highly of the glossary contained therein.
- xi. Cllr W Fredericks thanked Officers and Cllr A Fitch-Tillett for her work. She asked if her ward of Mundesley could be considered within the AONB going forward.
- xii. Cllr A Fitch-Tillett advised there was no intention to change AONB boundaries, and noted the challenges in achieving this status which would essentially require an act of parliament.
- xiii. Cllr V Holliday echoed the Chairman's comments that more should be done

to protect dark skies. She questioned how GIRAMS payments were agreed to be spent, as it was considered by residents that they did not have enough say. In addition, she was interested with how the North Norfolk AONB compared with others, noting that out of 7 conditions, 5 were Amber, one of which had gone from Green to Amber in this administration. Cllr V Holliday enquired what assurance could be made that the document was actually protecting the District's excellent countryside and shoreline.

- xiv. The SLO advised that the condition monitoring should influence priorities and actions, a matter from which the SLO as the NNDC representative on the Partnership has championed.
- xv. The PPM defined GIRAMS and its purpose in collecting tariff payments off developers to be used in mitigation against visitor pressures on international designated wildlife sites. Since 31st March 2022 money had been collected (payable on the commencement of development) and pooled by Local Authorities. No agreement was in place as to how this money would be spent and administered. The current proposal was that a joint body would be established across the county with a Member and Officer Representative from each administration which would establish the rules, receive and agree bids.

He noted that it was not the AONB Partnership's tariff payment, nor was it for them to spend. However, Kings Lynn Borough Council had entered into a service level agreement with the AONB Partnership which would permit the Partnership to vet applications for funding, and make recommendations for expenditure.

The fund was expected to collect £17 million over the next 20 years, which would be utilised on many exciting and significant projects.

- xvi. Cllr G Mancini-Boyle asked when the substantial review was to take place and if it would built on the good things contained within the current management plan. He asked if there was a consultation process with Local Member's and others who had greater knowledge of their area.
- xvii. The SLO advised that the Partnership were awaiting guidance from the Glover review which would impact the next tranche of management plans. She affirmed that there was benefit in keeping what worked well and in engaging with the wider AONB family to share ideas. As part of the re-structure of the Partnership, sub-groups would be established to look into particular projects, such sub-groups were expected to consult more broadly with third parties and relevant stakeholders.
- xviii. Cllr N Dixon advised he was content with the update, and was minded that there was scope for a broader discussion pending the larger review. He proposed acceptance of the Officer recommendation.
- xix. The Chairman noted section 1.5 of the Officers report and the absence of reference to the Glaven Valley Rural Conservation Area designation and asked if this could be added. The SPO advised this would be added in due course.
- xx. Cllr P Heinrich seconded the Officers recommendation.

IT WAS UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED by 8 votes for.

That Members of the Planning Policy & Built Heritage Working Party recommend to Cabinet that the contents of the updated Norfolk Coast AONB Management Plan (2019-2024) are endorsed for use as a material planning consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Cllr A Fitch-Tillett left the meeting at 11.36am

82 LOCAL PLAN PROCESS AND BACKGROUND PAPERS UPDATE INCLUDING INFRASTRUCTURE DELIVERY PLAN (IDP) UPDATE - VERBAL REPORT/PRESENTATION

- i. The PPTL introduced the Officers presentation and outlined the current areas of work for the Planning Policy Team, Next stages for submission of the Local plan, Background Papers and Neighbourhood Plan update.

Current Areas of Work – Local Plan

The PPTL advised that the main focus and priority for Officers was the Local Plan, with Officers reviewing representations and creating a Schedule of proposed modifications for consideration through the examination. The next stage required the combining of the 5 Schedules into a single Schedule, as required for submission. Accompanying the submission would be a track changed version of the Local Plan which would consolidate the proposed additional modifications. The PPTL advised that Officers were reviewing the challenges and undertaking early high level work to pre-emptively prepare responses. Officers were also in the process of preparing the statement of common grounds, which would aid the Planning Inspector to narrow down key areas for examination.

The PPTL advised the purpose of the background papers was to bring together the evidence to justify the reasoning behind the topic area, they would also help clarify matters for the Planning Inspector. Some of the background papers were required for legal purposes to meet legal tests i.e. demonstrate compliance with the duty to co-operate. The background papers, consulted in at Regulation 18 and or 19 stages, included(not exhaustive) ; approach to setting the housing target, distribution of growth, approach to employment, infrastructure delivery plans, green infrastructure, site selection methodology, housing construction standards, approach to renewable energy, coastal change and management, historic impact assessment, small growth village boundary review, strategic policy identification, D2C compliance statement, AGS study update, equalities statement, soundness/legal check sheets, site assessment booklets and examination library. The PPTL advised majority of work on these background papers was in progress to bring them up to date.

The PPTL noted the submission preparation process which included the appointment of a programme officer (pending submission) whose role would be to act as the co-ordinator the between the Council and the Examiner. This would ensure that the Planning Inspector remained impartial. Further, Officers would be expected to set up an examination library; an online resource where all submission documents, evidence, supporting documents, correspondence and examination matters would be published.

Other Work

In additional to Local Plan work, Officers continued to work on Nutrient Neutrality, fulfil monitoring requirements (5 year HLS, Housing flow return, and AMR 2022/2023) which required months of dedicated Officer work, provide pre application advise, maintain brownfield register, Self-Built Register, Norfolk Strategic Framework including GIRAMS and Neighbourhood Plan Support, which has been significant time resource this year to date.

Neighbourhood Plans

The PPTL advised that it had been a very busy year so far with Neighbourhood Plans, with two plans at examination stage – Blakeney & Holt. Blakeney was in late stages of examination with work actively ongoing to implement the 14 recommendations for modification following independent review, with a further 3 incorporated that are required by Officers, all of which would be subject to referendum in due course.

With regards Holt, an examiners report was expected within the coming weeks. Significant work had been undertaken to slim down, refocus and reappraise the Holt Plan to ensure it be more bespoke in its local purpose.

The PPTL noted that the Wells-next-the-sea Neighbourhood Plan was progressing well, with a consultation undertaken summer-time last year on regulation 14. Since, detailed feedback had been provided by Officers, with HRA/ SEA screening reports out for statutory consultation due to end 27th February 2023. Following that the required Decision notices on whether further Habitats Assessment and a Strategic Environmental Assessment are required will be issued.

It was noted that progress with the Stalham Neighbourhood Plan was thought to slow, but was still ongoing. Cley-next-the-sea would be launching their initial consultation on 8th March, and it was understood that work was no longer progressing in relation to Overstrand and Mundesley Parish Councils Neighbourhood Plans.

LCWIP

The PPTL advised that Norfolk County Council were consulting on the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWI) for Norfolk and that this had now been rescheduled until after the Local Elections. The detail of the emerging LCWIP had been reported to the Working Party in December 2022. The PPTL showed early examples of mapping where potential improvements to the cycling and walking network could be improved, where feasibility studies could be conducted, and investment may be required. He contended that it was important that the Council engage with this consultation, and noted that this would not commence till mid-May and not Q1 as previously thought.

- ii. Cllr N Dixon expressed his disappointment that the Officers presentation and verbal update had not been provided in the form of a written report or other written submission, and circulated to Members ahead of the meeting. He considered this would have allowed members time to digest information and

form meaningful questions on the details provided.

- iii. The PPM advised this report was for information only and did not require resolution, it was intended to offer Members an update on the depth and spread of what the team were working on and provide an update to the background work required ahead of submission.

Cllr W Fredericks left the meeting at 12.00pm

- iv. The PPTL advised the background papers had been viewed by Members at earlier stages of the Local Plan process (Regulation 18 and 19), they were Officer Papers which justify the Plan and the approaches taken but do not make recommendations to the Plan.
- v. Cllr N Dixon reiterated his comments that the Working Party should have been supplied the Officers presentation with the Agenda. This would have allowed Members to ask meaningful questions, and aided in the efficacy of the meeting.
- vi. The Chairman considered the Local Plan had been discussed at length by the Working Party, and Members had been offered ample time to debate its contents.
- vii. The PPM acknowledged Cllr N Dixons comments, and understood his frustration that the single line item on the agenda did not capture the full extent of the Officers presentation. He noted the Neighbourhood Plan update was not referenced on the agenda, and therefore Members may not have been prepared to discuss this matter. However, the PPM assured the Working Party that this item was for information only, and was to inform Members of current work.
- viii. Cllr N Dixon endorsed the submission of the Local Plan, which had been developed on for over 6 years, and commented it would be remise for the Local Plan not to be agreed for submission within this Administration. With respect of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), Cllr N Dixon advised he had benefited from a 1 to 1 meeting with the PPM, and considered all Members of the Working Party would benefit from greater insight on the IDP. This would better enable Members to have a greater understanding of where the IDP fits within the overall Local Plan, its site allocations, and where the all-important infrastructure would be adequately considered and integrated in the Plan.
- ix. The PPTL advised the IDP builds on the Infrastructure Delivery Statement, published during the Regulation 18 stage and shared on the Council's website. The IDP collates all the Infrastructure delivery requirements within the Local Plan, adding contextual information, outlines various investment strategies (i.e. Anglian Water), and pulls together where site allocations specially call for any level of investment. He advised it was a live-document, regularly updated as new information comes to light. The PPTL commented that the IDP would help the Council going forward to align priorities and funding opportunities which would help in the delivery of the Local Plan and the priorities in respect of economic investment, in turn influencing the priorities of the corporate plan. The PPTL reminded members that the IDP was circulated to all members of the working party as an action of a previous meeting before Christmas and he offered to provide an overview at the

meeting .Members declined such an insight at this time.

- x. The PPM agreed with Cllr N Dixon that raising the profile of infrastructure delivery, how it works and the contents of the IDP, would be of interest collectively to the Working Party. He advised, following submission of the Local Plan, that he would there was an option to include an item on a future agenda to discuss the wider Infrastructure Delivery, which could include the IDP. He noted that infrastructure delivery was a matter of interest to the public, and it was important Members understood this important area of work.

xi.

83 EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

None.

84 TO CONSIDER ANY EXEMPT MATTERS ARISING FROM CONSIDERATION OF THE PUBLIC BUSINESS OF THE AGENDA

None.

85 ANY OTHER URGENT EXEMPT BUSINESS AT THE DISCRETION OF THE CHAIRMAN AND AS PREVIOUSLY DETERMINED UNDER ITEM 4 ABOVE

None.

The meeting ended at 12.12 pm.

Chairman