

BRIGHTON & HOVE CITY COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

11.00am 7 JUNE 2023

COUNCIL CHAMBER, HOVE TOWN HALL

MINUTES

Present: Councillors Loughran (Chair), Allen (Deputy Chair), Hamilton, Nann, Shanks (Opposition Spokesperson), Pumm and Earthey

Officers in attendance: Liz Hobden (Head of Planning), Nicola Hurley (Planning Manager), Jane Moseley (Planning Manager), Alison Gatherer (Lawyer), Russell Brown (Principal Planning Officer), Sonia Gillam (Planning Officer), Emily Stanbridge (Senior Planning Officer), Jack Summers (Planning Officer), Michael Tucker (Senior Planning Officer) and Shaun Hughes (Democratic Services Officer).

PART ONE

1 PROCEDURAL BUSINESS

a) Declarations of substitutes

1.1 Councillor Earthey substituted for Councillor Fishleigh. Councillor Pumm substituted for Councillor McGregor.

b) Declarations of interests

1.2 Councillor Allen stated they had relatives who recently graduated from Vardean, however, they remained of an open mind. Councillor Loughran stated they were a member of the Withdean Sports Complex, however, they remained of an open mind.

c) Exclusion of the press and public

1.3 In accordance with Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 ("the Act"), the Planning Committee considered whether the public should be excluded from the meeting during consideration of any item of business on the grounds that it is likely in view of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during it, there would be disclosure to them of confidential information as defined in Section 100A (3) of the Act.

1.4 **RESOLVED:** That the public are not excluded from any item of business on the agenda.

2 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

2.1 **RESOLVED:** The committee agreed the minutes of the meeting held on 5 April 2023.

3 CHAIR'S COMMUNICATIONS

3.1 The Chair Stated the following: Welcome to the newly convened committee. We ask applicants to submit proposals in a clear and transparent way and to consult the community, as the council's Statement of Community Involvement states, as does the National Planning Policy Framework. The committee needs to run efficiently, and all parties should come well prepared, so we can get through the order of business efficiently. Thank you.

4 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

4.1 There were none.

5 TO AGREE THOSE APPLICATIONS TO BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS

5.1 **RESOLVED:** That the following site visits be undertaken by the Committee prior to determination of the application:

Application:	Requested by:
BH2023/00157 - Rottingdean Bowls Clubhouse, Falmer Road, Rottingdean, Brighton - Full Planning	Councillor Earthey (Committee voted by 5 to 1, with 1 abstention, to defer to allow a site visit to take place).

6 TO CONSIDER AND DETERMINE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

6.1 The following items were not called by the committee and were taken to be agreed in accordance with the officer's recommendation:

- o Item I: BH2023/00478 - 24a Saxon Road - Full Planning
- o Item J: BH2022/03130 - 5 Cambridge Mews, Cambridge Grove, Hove - Householder Planning Consent

All other applications were called for discussion.

A BH2022/03486 - Varndean College, Surrenden Road, Brighton - Outline Application

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Speakers

2. Neighbouring Ward Councillor Fowler stated that they were generally in support of the scheme and there were benefits, however there were concerns relating to the use of the area and the impact on the views, as these would be lost due to the development.

3. Sue Dibb addressed the committee as the secretary of the Green Varndean Group, who objected to the development and stated that the group had been instrumental in saving the views across the area and that are now protected in the City Plan. The importance of replacing the temporary huts on site was recognised. The proposed development was considered to be of a poor design resulting in the loss of a valuable view. The STEM building is higher than the teaching buildings on site and should not be used as a height guide, and the development should be conditioned to not exceed the existing teaching block. The development is considered out of keeping and many objections have been raised. The committee are requested to protect the views and not accept the development.
4. Donna-Marie Janson addressed the committee as the applicant and Head of College, stating that the college was thriving and one of the top ten in the UK. The development is considered to look after the environment and the local residents. The design is not considered to obstruct the view. The masterplan is to replace the temporary teaching rooms which are less secure than other rooms, uncomfortable, hot in summer and cold in winter. The buildings are inaccessible for disabled users which often leads to changes in rooms. The scheme is much needed for the college.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

5. Councillor Earthey was informed that the height of buildings is confirmed in this application and reflects the operational requirements of the college.
6. Councillor Shanks was informed that the strategic view was from Surrenden Road north of the site. The case officer stated that the site is high up and the views referred to are looking south across the site.
7. Councillor Hamilton was informed by the case officer that the height of the development was informed by the operational requirements of the college and while higher, would minimise the reduction in open space on the site.
8. Councillor Loughran was informed that the layout balanced the need to maintain open space, with width verses height. The college would also need to meet the requirements of the Department of Education in coming up with the layout of buildings.

Debate

9. Councillor Allen welcomed the application and considered the principle of the development to be good. The site is inadequate at it stands and the temporary teaching cabins are not good and long overdue for replacement. The Councillor supported the application.
10. Councillor Shanks welcomed the application as the temporary teaching cabins were no good. The pedestrian crossing was good. The Councillor supported the application.
11. Councillor Earthey stated they were not happy with phases one and two and would prefer single storey buildings.

12. Councillor Loughran stated that they supported education but considered it a shame there was no detailed roof design in the application which could have been a hybrid, rather than outline application. The Councillor supported the application.
13. Councillor Nann supported the application.
14. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
15. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to be **MINDED TO GRANT outline** planning permission subject to a s106 agreement on the Heads of Terms set out in the report and the following Conditions and Informatives as set out in the report, **SAVE THAT** should the s106 Planning Obligation not be completed on or before the **5th August 2023** the Head of Planning is hereby authorised to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in section 14.1 of the report.

B BH2022/03439 - Withdean Sports Complex, Tongdean Lane, Brighton - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee and the case officer informed the committee that the wording for condition 38 has been changed.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Shanks was informed by the Transport & Highway Development Team Manager that a pedestrian crossing was being looked at in a location near to the bus stop. It was confirmed that a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) would be subject to consultation, including publishing it on the council website and any objections would be considered.
3. Councillor Nann was informed that “Lux” is unit of measurement for light spill.
4. Councillor Shanks was informed that the County Ecologist had been consulted regarding the impact on wildlife adjoining the site, including badgers.
5. Councillor Hamilton was informed that the previous applications had received three objections when Brighton and Hove Albion were using the site.

Debate

6. There was no debate.

Vote

7. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.

RESOLVED: That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

C BH2022/00867 - Birch Grove Nursing Home, 1-3 Stanford Avenue - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Allen was informed that the replacement fence would follow the slope of the ground along the front of the property.
3. Councillor Nann was informed that the management of elderly and other patients in the building was not a material planning consideration, but that they would be on separate floors with separate staff.

Debate

4. There was no debate.

Vote

5. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant Planning permission.
6. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the following Conditions and Informatives in the report.

D BH2022 02167 - Egremont Place, Brighton - Deed of Variation

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Shanks was informed by the Housing Enabling Officer that the council would look at buying the homes themselves but if not viable a commuted sum would be sought to invest in affordable homes across the city. It is hoped that Registered Providers will be interested in the scheme as the flats are now in a separate block.
3. Councillor Shanks was informed that the wording of the Head of Terms meant that if a commuted sum was to be used rather than on-site provision, the decision would not come back to committee.

Debate

4. Councillor Shanks stated they were abstaining as the council should accept affordable housing not commuted sums.

Vote

5. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed by 5 to 2 abstentions to grant Planning permission.

6. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **AGREE** the amended Head of Terms to the proposed S106 Agreement, subject to a review mechanism.

E BH2022/01609 - The Meeting Place Café, Kings Esplanade, Hove - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee and the case officer informed the committee that an additional representation had been received, however, no new objections had been raised.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Earthey was informed that the existing external seating would be incorporated into the new building.

Debate

3. Councillor Pumm considered the proposals to be a significant improvement for the sea front. The councillor supported the application.
4. Councillor Allen considered the development to be a great enhancement to the area and there was no significant harm. The councillor supported the application.
5. Councillor Hamilton considered the application to be good for the sea front and was pleased to note disabled toilets would be provided.

Vote

6. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
7. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

F BH2023/01025 - Brighton i360, Kings Road Arches, Brighton - Full Planning

1. The Case Officer introduced the application to the committee.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Allen was informed by the case officer that the impact on pedestrian use of the external stairs adjoining the i360 was acceptable.
3. Councillor Loughran was informed by the Heritage Officer that the harm resulting from the development was considered less than substantial given it was for a temporary period, was not considered to interrupt the wider views of the sea front. It was noted that the decision regarding the balance of public benefit against heritage harm rested with the case officer.

4. Councillor Shanks was informed by the agent, Ben Barfield-Marks, that shipping containers were sustainable buildings, prefabricated off site and installed quickly. The exteriors would be timber clad with large windows. The black timber cladding was considered to be appropriate coastal architecture.
5. Councillor Earthey was informed by the agent that there were no black timber buildings in the immediate location, however, other buildings along the south coast had won major awards.
6. Councillor Loughran was informed by the agent that the cricket set up included a bowling machine and guests would hit balls at targets, with each player being scored. Nets would be installed to prevent balls escaping. The development would include two further bowling areas in the existing i360 building. The nets would take 6-8 people at one time. Booking would be through the i360 website.
7. Councillor Nann was informed the costs of playing would be available on the i360 website.
8. Councillor Loughran was informed by the agent that a fee would be paid to the i360 for the use of the site.
9. Councillor Allen was informed by the agent that there would be a security presence on site.

Debate

10. Councillor Hamilton considered the development would not be seen easily and noted it was an interesting activity. The councillor supported the application.
11. Councillor Pumm considered the development to be an interesting addition to the sea front. The councillor supported the application.
12. Councillor Shanks supported the application.
13. Councillor Allen considered the temporary nature of the development outweighed any harm. The councillor supported the application.
14. Councillor Earthey supported the application.

Vote

15. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
16. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

G BH2023/00481 - 26 Glebe Villas Hove - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.
2. Speakers
3. Councillor Sankey submitted a speech read out by the Democratic Services officer: Houses of Multiple Occupancy (HMOs) represent a significant and growing proportion of the mix of housing in the city and make an important contribution to the housing on offer. The councillor had concerns regarding the application for a six bedroom small house in multiple occupation (C4). Multiple representations from residents. The six proposed bedrooms are too many for a house of this size. The change of use could allow 12 people with inadequate communal areas, especially cooking and bathroom/showering facilities. The councillor was concerned that condition requiring a maximum of six persons, was difficult to enforce.

City Plan Part 2 is clear that (a) where additional bedrooms are created in conversions of existing buildings, these will be expected to meet the internal space standards set out in Policy DM1 Housing Quality, Choice and Mix and (b) well sized, proportioned and equipped communal areas and adequate bathroom and cooking facilities should be provided, relative to the expected number of occupants.

If there were six residents, the communal living/dining room space only just meets the recommendation that 4 square metres should be provided per person. The conservatory is clearly intended for overspill and policy is clear that this should not be the case. The key point is that as soon as there are 7,8 or even possibly 12 residents, this property is overcrowded, negatively impacting those living there and other residents of Glebe villas.

The councillor was also concerned that there will be insufficient parking spaces for the proposed HMO inhabitants.

4. Andrew Robinson addressed the committee as an objecting neighbour and stated that the street had existing noise and disturbance from a HMO, and this damaged the health of neighbours. The space standards have not been met. The committee were requested to refuse the application as there were many objectors. The development is contrary to City Plan policy CP21 as it will damage local amenities.
5. Steve Leung addressed the committee as the applicant and stated that he had grown up in the street so was not a property developer as claimed. The use classes C3 and C4 were for flexible use and there would not be 12 residents in the property. Only 2 noise complaints over the last 6 years had been received in relation to the adjacent HMO also within their ownership and they had been dealt with. The property is for 6 residents only and CP21 supports the use. The change would mean there are only 1.4% HMOs in the area, and 20% is allowed for HMOs. The application is in line with policy.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

6. Councillor Pumm was informed that whether the rents were affordable was not a planning consideration.

7. Councillor Nann was informed that the plausibility of the scheme was not a planning consideration. It was noted that the space standards on the plans were acceptable, and if they were made smaller, then enforcement action could be taken.
8. Councillor Shanks was informed that the space standards were met, and the property would be limited to 6 persons.
9. Councillor Loughran was informed that the scheme was considered under policy DM1 and considered acceptable in terms of space standards. It was noted that Building Control would check the accessibility if relevant.
10. Councillor Earthey was informed that the first floor fire escape and the thickness of the dividing walls was a matter for Building Control.
11. Councillor Allen was informed that there was no change in the provision of parking; two spaces were provided.
12. Councillor Loughran was informed that the applicant can change between use classes C3 and C4, however, at the end of ten years the class would be defined as the use at that time.

Debate

13. Councillor Shanks considered there was no reason to refuse the application as it complied with policy. The Councillor supported the application.
14. Councillor Allen considered the application inappropriate and was an over development of the site. The councillor was against the application.
15. Councillor Nann considered the application would have a negative impact on the amenities of the neighbours. The councillor was against the application.
16. Councillor Earthey considered the application an over development of the site.

Vote

17. A vote was taken, and by 1 to 6 the committee voted against the officer recommendation.
18. Councillor Nann proposed the application be refused on the grounds of impact on local amenities, over development due to the number of people in the property, and noise nuisance contrary to policy DM20. The motion was seconded by Councillor Earthey. It was agreed that the final wording would be agreed with the Planning Manager.

Vote

19. A recorded vote was taken, and Councillors Allen, Hamilton, Nann, Pumm, Earthey and Loughran voted to refuse, and Councillor Shanks voted against the refusal.

20. **RESOLVED:** The Committee voted to refuse the application on the grounds of impact on local amenities, over development and noise nuisance contrary to policy DN1. It was agreed that the final wording would be agreed with the Planning Manager.

H BH2022/03894 - Land to the rear of 28-34 Longhill Road, Ovingdean - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor Fishleigh addressed the committee and stated that one of the houses to be built was advertised as being raffled off online. The reduction of green spaces was an issue, given the development of 45 other homes in Ovingdean already under construction. The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) of £291,000 is too little. Originally the 4 homes were refused and then allowed in 2021. A library was promised, as was a better bus service, which have not appeared.
3. Alex Bateman addressed the committee as the agent and stated that the application is an amendment to the existing approved scheme for 4 detached homes. The total will be six dwellings, with 2 being added to the approved 4. The relationship between the buildings will be the same as before. Consultations with ecology, trees and highways raised no objections. The proposals are policy compliant. The £291,000 commuted sum is acceptable. The committee were requested to approve the application.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

4. Councillor Allen was informed that one elm tree would be removed, which was not known to have Dutch elm disease. Each dwelling will have an off street parking space and garage, also two visitor bays will be provided and there is provision for on street parking.
5. Councillor Earthey was informed that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) sum was achieved using the CIL calculator.
6. Councillor Shanks was informed that the district valuer had agreed with the viability of the £291,000 sum in relation to the affordable housing commuted sum, and CIL money was also to come.
7. Councillor Allen was informed that the original 4 dwellings did not attract a s106 agreement in relation to affordable housing, however, 6 dwellings was over the threshold and would therefore attract contributions.
8. Councillor Loughran was informed that the street design was approved in the previous permission for 4 dwellings and two cars are able to pass on the access road. The objections received for this application were the same as those received for the previous application for 4 dwellings.

9. Councillor Hamilton was informed that the plan on the agenda showed an extension that was not constructed, and the access road would not therefore pass through a house.

Debate

10. Councillor Shanks supported the application.
11. Councillor Allen supported the application and considered the development not to be out of character with the area.

Vote

12. A vote was taken, and by 5 to 2, the committee agreed to grant planning permission.
13. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to be **MINDED TO GRANT** planning permission subject to a s106 agreement and the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

I BH2023/00478 - 24a Saxon Road - Full Planning

1. This application was not called for discussion and the officer recommendation was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.
2. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

J BH2022/03130 - 5 Cambridge Mews, Cambridge Grove, Hove - Householder Planning Consent

1. This application was not called for discussion and the officer recommendation was therefore taken as having been agreed unanimously.
2. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

K BH2023/00157 - Rottingdean Bowls Clubhouse, Falmer Road, Rottingdean, Brighton - Full Planning

1. This application was deferred following the request for a site visit, which the committee agreed.

L BH2022/02808 - St Agnes Church, Newtown Road, Hove - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee. It was noted that the presentation was for all three applications for the site and comments would therefore relate to all three unless specified.

Speakers

2. Ward Councillor O'Quinn addressed the via a speech read out by the Democratic Services officer: Objection to Natural Fit gym applications: I believe there are three applications to make objecting difficult. The case has ongoing for nearly 3 years. The doorway to the terrace was created without gaining planning permission and the club has not asked for permission as their view is they don't have to. Without the doorway they would not have access to the terrace and there would be no issue about a hospitality terrace. I was informed that everything was permissible as it was part of the purpose of the gym. However, my understanding is that there are planning laws that protect the historic church. I would argue that a real lack of respect has been shown for the planning system by the gym and for local residents who have not been consulted.

I object to the creation of a hospitality area on the 1st floor terrace, including the lights, glazed terracing and music. There is a restaurant/café inside the club and members are allowed to take their drinks to the poolside area – this was allowed in the licence that the club applied for. However, no licensing permission was granted for the terraced. How can the terrace be used as a hospitality area where alcohol is being served? And how can it be considered a part of the gym's purpose as it already has a licenced cafe.

If the committee decides to grant this application, then I suggest the hours that have been put forward by the Environmental Officer are implemented and all the other conditions put forward in the officer's report.

I also object to the retrospective application for the ventilation ducts. They run from 7am-9pm and are a constant irritant to the neighbours. The noise is not such that you would get used to it and block it out. It does affect the nearby resident's quality of life and ability to enjoy their garden space. I visited in Autumn 2022 and another 2 air conditioning vents had been added to the ground floor of the building. They were very noisy and were only placed there recently. I urge the committee to reject all three applications.

3. Peter Rayner, as the applicant addressed the committee and stated they had bought the site in 2017 and the building had been used for the previous 35 years as a gymnastics space with large numbers of attendees. The current gym has 700 members, 15 full time members of staff and 15 part time. The building has won a Sussex Heritage Fund award. The use class covers all areas of the building, where members can relax. The balcony has a no alcohol or music policy. The protective screens are to be protect the neighbours. The windows are acceptable; however, the suggested conditions are not.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

4. Councillor Loughran was informed that the Environmental Health Officers had sought the conditions and the noise management plan will be placed online for comments, but that members would not specifically be consulted.

5. Councillor Shanks was informed that consent for the balcony was previously agreed. The case officer confirmed that the entire building was covered by the same use class. The door inserted to allow access to the balcony requires planning permission and therefore the conditions.
6. Councillor Nann was informed by the case officer that the building was not very accessible for those with mobility issues but never had been so this was not considered sufficient reason to refuse the application.

Debate

7. Councillor Allen considered the changes did not harm the building or area. The councillor supported the application.
8. Councillor Earthey requested that the noise management plan come to committee for agreement and therefore proposed that items BH2022/02809 and BH2022/02810 deferred. The motion was presented by Councillor Loughran and Seconded by Councillor Earthey.

Vote

9. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission for BH2022/02808.
10. A vote was taken and the committee by 6 to 1 to defer BH2022/02809 and BH2022/02810 in order to obtain a noise management plan from applicant.
11. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

M BH2022/02809 - St Agnes Church, Newtown Road, Hove - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee and noted that applications BH2022/02808, BH2022/02809 and BH2022/02810 would be discussed together.
2. For minutes for BH2022/02809 please see BH2022/02808.

Vote

3. A vote was taken and the committee by 6 to 1 to defer BH2022/02809 and BH2022/02810 in order to obtain a noise management plan from applicant.

N BH2022/02810 - St Agnes Church, Newtown Road, Hove - Full Planning

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee and noted that applications BH2022/02808, BH2022/02809 and BH2022/02810 would be discussed together.

2. For minutes for BH2022/02810 please see BH2022/02808.

Vote

3. A vote was taken and the committee by 6 to 1 to defer BH2022/02809 and BH2022/02810 in order to obtain a noise management plan from applicant.

O BH2023/00981 - 20 Albion Hill, Brighton - Removal or Variation of Condition

1. The Planning Manager introduced the application to the committee.

Answers to Committee Member Questions

2. Councillor Shanks was informed that parking provision was managed through a Traffic Regulation Order. The removal of the condition does not mean residents will be allowed a parking permit in future The case officer confirmed that the Highways team considered there was no reason to not remove the condition. It was noted that there was no potential to increase the parking as the development replaced two dwellings with two dwellings.

Debate

3. Councillor Loughran considered a uniform procedure was required and the removal of the condition captured that.

Vote

4. A vote was taken, and the committee agreed unanimously to grant planning permission.
5. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the report and resolves to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the Conditions and Informatives in the report.

7 TO CONSIDER ANY FURTHER APPLICATIONS IT HAS BEEN DECIDED SHOULD BE THE SUBJECT OF SITE VISITS FOLLOWING CONSIDERATION AND DISCUSSION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

- 7.1 There were none from this meeting.

8 LIST OF NEW APPEALS LODGED WITH THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

- 8.1 The Committee noted the new appeals that had been lodged as set out in the planning agenda.

9 INFORMATION ON INFORMAL HEARINGS/PUBLIC INQUIRIES

- 9.1 None for this agenda.

10 APPEAL DECISIONS

- 10.1 The Committee noted the content of the letters received from the Planning Inspectorate advising of the results of planning appeals which had been lodged as set out in the agenda.

The meeting concluded at 5.06pm

Signed

Chair

Dated this

day of

