

LISBURN & CASTLEREAGH CITY COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting of the Planning Committee held remotely and in the Council Chamber, Island Civic Centre, The Island, Lisburn on Monday 6 July 2020 at 10.30 a.m.

PRESENT:

Present in Chamber:

Alderman O Gawith (Chairman)

Alderman D Drysdale (Vice-Chairman)

Aldermen WJ Dillon, J Tinsley

Councillors J Craig, M Gregg, U Mackin, J Palmer and A Swan

Present in Remote Location:

Councillor J McCarthy

OTHER MEMBERS:

IN ATTENDANCE:

Present in Chamber:

Head of Planning and Capital Development

Member Services Manager

Member Services Officer

Attendance Clerk

Present in Remote Location:

Director of Service Transformation

Principal Planning Officer (RH)

Senior Planning Officer (MB)

Senior Planning Officer (RT)

Environmental Health Officer (RH)

Department for Infrastructure

Mr C Dickinson

Mr S Cash

Legal Advisor:

B Martyn - Cleaver Fulton & Rankin

Commencement of Meeting

The Chairman, Alderman O Gawith, welcomed everyone to the meeting which was being live streamed to enable members of the public to hear and see the proceedings. He advised that eight members were present in the Council Chamber and one was participating in the meeting remotely.

He stated that planning officers, the Council's Legal Advisor and those speaking for or against the applications would also be attending the meeting remotely.

The Head of Planning and Capital Development advised on housekeeping and evacuation procedures. The Member Services Manager then read out the names of the Elected Members in attendance at the meeting.

1. Apologies

It was agreed to record apologies from Alderman A Grehan.

2. Declarations of Interest

The Chairman sought Declarations of Interest from Members and reminded them to complete the supporting forms which had been left at each desk. He indicated that a form would also be available for those Members attending remotely.

The following Declarations of Interest were made:

- Councillor J Craig in S/2014/0884/F as he is on public record supporting the application.
- Councillor J Palmer referred to LA05/2019/0168/F, LA05/2018/0655/F and LA05/2019/0640/F stating that whilst he had been contacted regarding these applications he had not formed an opinion and would be taking part in the determination of the applications.
- Alderman D Drysdale in LA05/2018/0655/F as he would be making representations regarding it at the meeting.

He also referred to LA05/2018/0533/F and advised that whilst he was the Chairman of a Business Park in Dundonald he did not feel that there was any connection to this application.

- Councillor U Mackin referred to LA05/2019/0168/F and stated that he had facilitated a meeting with the applicant but had not formed an opinion on the merits of the application and he would be taking part in the determination of the application.

The following Declaration was made via a completed form:

- Councillor U Mackin in respect of LA05/2019/0533/O stating that he had met with an MLA and responded to some queries on procedure which were resolved. He provided no opinion on the outcome and did not feel that he had predetermined the application.

During the above item Councillor J McCarthy joined the meeting remotely at 10.40 am.

3. Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Wednesday 17 June 2020

It was proposed by Councillor J Craig, seconded by Alderman J Dillon, and agreed that the Minutes of the Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 17 June 2020 as circulated be signed.

4. Report from the Head of Planning and Capital Development

4.1 Schedule of Applications

The Chairman reminded Members that they needed to be present for the entire determination of an application. If absent for any part of the discussion they would render themselves unable to vote on the application.

The Legal Adviser highlighted paragraphs 43 - 46 of the Protocol for the Operation of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Planning Committee which, he advised, needed to be borne in mind when determinations were being made.

(Councillor J Craig left the meeting at 10.46 am having declared an interest in the next application).

1. (i) S/2014/0884F – Proposed new rail halt and park and ride facility (incorporating track realignment platforms footbridge ticket office staff facility on footbridge, 350car parking spaces 22 disabled parking spaces, 2 electric car charging points and bus turning area) including associated ancillary works (Amended Scheme) (Additional noise assessment) on land east of Knockmore Park, south of no 68-80 Addison Park and No's 8-10 Knockmore Road and North of Flush Park Lisburn.

The Principal Planning Officer (RH) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report.

The Committee received Mr M Crothers who wished to speak in support of the application. He advised that Mr Knox and Mr Sterritt from Translink were also available to respond to questions as was Mr C Dickinson from Department for Infrastructure (Roads). Members had been provided with a written submission from Mr Crothers in advance of the meeting. Mr Crothers summarised as follows:

- He welcomed the recommendation to approve.
- He advised that this would meet a need, promote the use of public transport, lower carbon footprint and reduce journey times.
- The development would meet the requirements of Regional strategy.
- Objections from residents had been taken on board and accommodated where possible.
- Department for Infrastructure (Roads) had confirmed that the scheme met their requirements.

Mr Crothers then responded to Members' queries when the following issues arose:

- Mr Crothers confirmed that he was satisfied with Traffic Management at the site.
- Clarification was provided on the Traffic Impact Assessment submitted.
- Further clarification was provided by Mr C Dickinson from the Department for Infrastructure who further updated on the Traffic Impact Assessment and advised that that there had been a number of developments in the area and their Traffic Impact Assessments had fed into the information generated in respect of this application and it was considered that traffic has not varied significantly from the submitted data.
- Mr Knox provided information on the frequency and numbers of passengers expected to enter and exit the station on any given day.

There then followed a question and answer session with the Planning Officers and DfI Roads officials during which the following issues arose:

- Further clarification on the historic nature of the information within the Traffic Impact Assessment and the reasons why signalisation was not considered necessary was provided. Mr C Dickinson from DfI Roads explained that there had been a number of surrounding development in the area and their Traffic Impact Assessments had fed into the information generated in respect of this application and it was considered that traffic has not varied significantly from the submitted data. He outlined the traffic modelling process which indicated that the junction had excellent visibility, that the right turn facility has more capacity than is likely to be required and that there was no justification for signalisation. He explained that this was the only junction between two traffic signals and that this would have a natural pausing effect.
- Confirmation was sought that Moira and Lisburn stations would remain open and it was highlighted that not all passengers would be driving, some would be using public transport, walking or being picked up.

During the debate that followed, the following comments were made:

- Alderman D Drysdale felt that the current Covid-19 pandemic situation may have a bearing on future traffic as there appeared to be a move towards working from home, where possible, in the future. He felt that if the Department for Infrastructure officers were content then the application should be approved.
- Councillor A Swan agreed as they were the experts in that particular field.
- Councillor M Gregg welcomed the scheme as it promotes sustainable transport. He voiced his disappointment at the lack of signalisation however he was content to support.
- Councillor U Mackin said that after having his concerns addressed he was now content to approve.
- Councillor J Palmer said he would have preferred signalisation to be included from the start.
- Alderman J Dillon welcomed this as one of the most important elements of the development of Lisburn.
- Alderman D Drysdale said that as civic leaders it was incumbent on the Committee to ensure safety and that all the necessary questions had been asked in respect of this application.

- The Chairman, Councillor O Gawith, stated that this facility was very much needed in the area.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the report of the Senior Planning Officer and by those making representations, agreed by a majority of 9:0 with 0 abstentions to approve the application as outlined in the Officer's report and subject to the conditions contained therein.

(Councillor J Craig returned to the meeting at 11.45 am)

- (ii) LA05/2019/0533/O - Site for mixed-use development comprising residential and Industrial/Business Units at site to the north of 60 Rathfriland Road and south of 52 Rathfriland Road, Dromara, Dromore.

The Principal Planning Officer (RH) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report.

Adjournment of Meeting

At 11.47am a technical issue arose in relation to the operation of the meeting remotely and the Chairman, Councillor O Gawith declared the meeting adjourned so that this could be addressed.

Resumption of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor O Gawith declared the meeting resumed at 11.55 am

The Committee received Mr B Starkey and Mr T Cousins who wished to speak in support of the application. Members were also advised that Mr S Cash from the Department for Infrastructure (Roads) was available to respond to questions from the Committee should this be required. Members had been provided with a written submission from Mr Starkey in advance of the meeting. Mr Starkey summarised as follows:

- He endorsed the decision of the Planning Unit to approve.
- He outlined that a comprehensive public consultation exercise had taken place.
- There had been a collaborative approach between the Planning Unit and the Applicant.
- This was a sustainable form of development which complies with planning policy.

Mr Starkey then responded to Members' queries regarding the following issues:

- Clarification of the right turn into Woodvale and the proposed time-frame for the construction of the industrial units. Mr Starkey explained that this would be considered at the detail stage as this was an Outline Planning Application. Mr Cousins provided further clarification explaining that the threshold for a filter arrow had not been met and that traffic calming measures would deter larger vehicles from using Woodvale. This could also be further developed at the design stage.

- Mr Starkey explained that the Local Development Plan identified a 50/50 split between housing and industrial use and that the application had been progressed along this basis.
- The issue of flooding was raised and it was explained that this had been taken on board and would be borne in mind at the design stage, land subject to flooding had been excluded from the scheme.
- Mr Sharkey outlined that public consultation had been carried out, an event had been held in the village and a leaflet drop had been carried out to make residents aware of it. The event had been relatively well attended and received with some attendees expressing an interest in the industrial units.

There then followed a question and answer session with the Planning Officers during which the following issues arose:

- The issue of flooding was raised by Councillor J Craig who sought clarification on how historic flooding in the area would be addressed asking what mitigation measures would be put in place. The planning officer explained that a drainage assessment had been carried out and that Department for Infrastructure (Rivers) were content. He explained that a topographical survey had been submitted which had indicated that the land susceptible to flooding had been excluded. He confirmed that the appropriate agency was content that this development would not contribute to flooding and that it satisfied policy test.

There was significant discussion on this during which paragraphs were read out to the Committee from the drainage assessment report in respect of policy FLD1 and the Head of Planning and Capital Development clarified the mitigation options open to developers in terms of either using oversized pipes with a hydrobrake or another process should that not be feasible. This, he advised, would be clarified at the design stage.

The possibility of obtaining an independent assessment on drainage was raised and the Committee was advised by the Head of Planning and Capital Development that it would not be normal practice for the Department for Infrastructure to obtain their own drainage assessment. He went on to outline the modelling process which would then be assessed by a competent official within the Department. He further explained to the Committee that, during the debate stage of the meeting, if they were minded to approve the application, they could request that drainage plans be submitted.

- It was confirmed that there had been 19 letters of objection from local residents and that none of these had raised the issue of flooding.
- There was concern that there was no reference to the phasing of the industrial units and members voiced their concern that, at a future stage, the developer may request that the entire site be used for housing. The Head of Planning and Capital Development advised that the Committee could seek phasing information at the Reserved Matters stage.

During the debate that followed the following comments were made:

- Councillor U Mackin felt that the Committee needed to request that they receive detail on flooding risk information and how this can be remedied, he also felt that it would be necessary to receive information on how the management of traffic through Woodvale would be carried out. He also felt that further information on the phasing of the construction of the industrial units needed to be provided.
- Alderman J Tinsley said that he would support the application subject to information being provided on the phasing of the construction of the industrial units.
- Councillor M Gregg said that it would be important to him that conditions were placed on the phasing of the construction of the industrial units and suggested that this should commence after the construction of the 36th dwelling. He also suggested requesting a right hand turning pocket be incorporated and that the drainage plans over-compensate on what was required. He also felt that the type of industry suitable at the location should be specified.
- Councillor J Craig said that he liked the idea of job creation but was unsure about the need for additional housing. He felt that some level of phasing in respect of the construction of the industrial units was necessary. He had concerns around the issue of flooding given the history at the location and felt that the Department for Infrastructure (Rivers) needed to specify this appropriately.
- Alderman J Dillon said that this area needed some growth and this would create employment. He highlighted the importance of putting conditions on the application which could be implemented.
- Alderman D Drysdale felt that technology was now available which could resolve the historic flooding issues and that this could be dealt with at the Reserved Matters stage.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the report of the Planning Officer and by those making representations, agreed by a majority of 10:0 with 0 abstentions to approve the application as outlined in the Officer's report.

It was further proposed by Councillor M Gregg, seconded by Alderman J Tinsley and agreed by the Committee that the wording of conditions to be placed on the application be delegated to the Planning Unit however it was specified that they must include the following:

- (a) That drainage design plans be submitted and brought before the Committee to enable environmental matters to be fully considered;
- (b) That traffic calming measures be put in place at the residential element of the development to discourage non-residential traffic
- (c) That infrastructure to serve the industrial element be put in place first and that phasing plans be included with the Reserved Matters application.

Adjournment of the meeting

The Chairman, Councillor O Gawith, declared the meeting adjourned at 1.25 pm.

Resumption of the meeting

The Chairman, Councillor O Gawith, declared the meeting resumed at 2.05 pm.

- (iii) LA05/2018/0319/RM – Proposed development of 87 bed dementia care nursing home and 13 two bed independent living units to replace 12 apartments and existing industrial building, improvements to access onto Old Mill Grove, closure of access onto Greengraves Road and ancillary siteworks at Rockfield, 29 Greengraves Road, Dundonald.

The Senior Planning Officer (RT) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report.

There were no requests to make representations on this application.

There then followed a question and answer session with the Planning Officers during which the following issues arose:

- Councillor M Gregg proposed that a site visit take place as he advised that changes had taken place on the ground since this application had been in the system. The proposal was not seconded and therefore fell.
- The change in access point was highlighted and the Senior Planning Officer suggested that this was likely due to the listing of the gate-lodge and protection of its setting.

During the debate that followed, the following comments were made:

- Councillor M Gregg stated that whilst he welcomed the application he felt that, on balance, the access onto Old Mill Grove was not suitable and therefore he felt he could not support it.
- Alderman D Drysdale understood these concerns but did not feel they carried enough weight to refuse the application.
- Councillor A Swan advised that he would be supporting the recommendation and that it was good use of a listed building.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the report of the Senior Planning Officer agreed by a majority of 9:1 with 0 abstentions to approve the application as outlined in the Officer's report and subject to the conditions contained therein.

- (iv) LA05/2019/0750/F – Replacement of redundant non-residential building with a single dwelling in compliance with planning policy statement 21 CTY3 on lands 45 metres east of 54 Lisnabreeny Road, Lisnabreeny, Castlereagh.

The Senior Planning Officer (MB) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report.

The Committee received Mr Thompson and Mr Floyd who wished to speak in support of the application. Written submissions had been received from Mr Thompson which had been circulated to the Committee in advance of the meeting. Mr Thompson summarised by highlighting the following:

- The submission sets out that this was a redundant commercial building and not an agricultural one.
- There would be environmental benefits to this construction in that oil and asbestos would be removed and the commercial use would have drawn traffic to the area with the associated environmental impact.
- He highlighted information within the report which he considered to be inaccurate
- He referred to a similar situation where a store was replaced by a three storey building.

Mr Thompson then responded to Members' queries regarding the following issues:

- There was some discussion on the evidence produced to demonstrate the commercial activity referred to.
- Mr Thompson clarified that the commercial element had ceased in 2018.

The Committee received Councillor M Guy who wished to speak in support of the application. A written submission had been received from Councillor Guy which had been circulated to the Committee in advance of the meeting. Councillor Guy summarised by highlighting the following:

- The previous use of the building was not agricultural
- This is a non-residential and redundant building and therefore meets the policy requirements.
- The Environmental benefit this would create is not simply aesthetic there are hazards such as oil and asbestos which would be removed.

Councillor M Guy then responded to Members' queries regarding the following issues:

- The fact that the building was previously rated as 'agricultural' may have been an over-sight of the previous owner. There is nothing else to substantiate this however there is evidence that its use was commercial.
- She confirmed that the present owner has owned the building since 2018.

The Committee received Councillor N Anderson who wished to speak in support of the application. A written submission had been received from Councillor Anderson which had been circulated to the Committee in advance of the meeting. Councillor Anderson summarised by highlighting the following:

- The estate agent's sales brochure refers to an income being generated from this building and local residents can attest to this as can the sales agent.
- The garage is too large to be a domestic garage.
- This is a redundant business and therefore meets the policy test.
- The applicant has a sound reputation in the area.

Councillor N Anderson then responded to Members' queries regarding the following issues:

- Councillor N Anderson outlined evidence available from Companies House which shows that there was a business run from this building which is now redundant and this, he stated, demonstrated that the policy test was met.

The Committee received Mr Edwin Poots who wished to speak in support of the application. A written submission had been received from Mr Poots which had been circulated to the Committee in advance of the meeting. Mr Poots summarised by highlighting the following:

- Mr Floyd had planned to run a business from the address and had researched the use of the building before purchasing the property, it was a commercial building.
- The building was now redundant.
- It was not a domestic garage.
- It was not an agricultural building.
- It therefore met the policy test.
- The fact that the previous owner did not pay commercial rates should not be held against this owner.

There were no questions from the Committee for Mr Poots.

There then followed a question and answer session with the Planning Officers during which the following issues arose:

- The Planning Officer clarified the policy requirements in terms of replacing a redundant commercial building.
- The Head of Planning and Capital Development clarified that there were a number of buildings associated with the site and these were highlighted to members on a map. He advised that the question to be asked was which one of these buildings does the Companies House documentation refer to. Commercial activity had taken place at the site but there was no evidence to show that it took place in this specific building.
- Councillor J Craig referred to evidence of commercial activity in the building which had been viewed by members at the site meeting and the Head of Planning and Capital Development responded that this was a matter of judgement. There were vehicle shells and some oil but the issue is whether or not the activity was carried out commercially or as a hobby or someone just maintaining their own vehicles. The burden of proof is on the applicant to provide evidence. No detailed information, apart from supporting correspondence from neighbours had been received. He went on to state that the second requirement of the policy also needed to be engaged with and that was the need for significant environmental impact.

- The Senior Planning Officer (MB) provided clarification on a PAC decision which had been referred to as being broadly similar and he stated that the impact re environmental improvements needed to be significant.
- In response to a question from the Chairman, Councillor O Gawith, the Head of Planning and Capital Development outlined the policy and what was eligible under it. The applicant stated that it was a non-residential building used for Commercial activity but there is no evidence of this and in the absence of evidence officers deem it to be a shed or a store and therefore not eligible for replacement.
- The Principal Planning Officer explained that the other buildings at the site (and highlighted that one) appeared to be used for charity purposes.
- The Head of Planning and Capital Development stated that there was oil on the floor and some parts of cars visible but some of the usual features of a garage such as an inspection pit were absent. The estate agent sales brochure also stated that not all of the buildings had been used for commercial activity.
- The option of limiting future development was discussed and the Committee was advised by the Head of Planning and Capital Development that this would take them beyond the scope of what was being applied for.

Adjournment of the meeting

The Chairman, Councillor O Gawith, declared the meeting adjourned at 3.30 pm.

Resumption of the meeting

The Chairman, Councillor O Gawith, declared the meeting resumed at 3.37 pm.

During the debate that followed, the following comments were made:

- Councillor J Craig said that having visited the site his experience tells him that this was a commercial site. Regarding environmental improvements he considered that the removal of oil and asbestos contamination would be a big environmental improvement and that as the entire building was an eyesore the surrounding environs would benefit from its removal.
- Councillor A Swan said that he had not seen enough evidence to convince him that this building was used for commercial activity. If a building benefits from being commercial then commercial rates should have been paid on it. He said that he would be voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse.
- Alderman J Dillon said that there were a lot of matters in relation to this application which did not tie up and he would be voting in favour of the recommendation to refuse.
- Councillor U Mackin said that he had mixed views initially regarding this but the site visit had alleviated some of his concerns. He said that the decision should be in favour of development where there is no demonstrable harm and he felt that this was the case in this instance. He said that he felt that what was there now was the important thing, it hasn't been used for years so it is redundant. He felt that there would be environmental benefits as the building was in a poor state and will only get worse. There are dwelling houses nearby and asbestos material in close proximity to these dwellings creates a risk. He stated that he would be voting against the recommendation.

- Councillor J Palmer concurred with the comments made by Councillor U Mackin stating that Haynes manuals and signage which were in the building had provided enough evidence of commercial activity to reassure him and that he would be voting against the recommendation.
- Alderman J Tinsley stated that the balance of physical evidence led him to vote against the recommendation.
- Councillor M Gregg said it was disappointing that there was no Certificate of Lawfulness and stated that online searches had been disappointing however the statements from local residents had convinced him that commercial activity had been carried out and therefore he would be voting against the recommendation.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the report of the Senior Planning Officer and by those making representations, voted on the application and the vote was tied at 5:5 with 0 abstentions. The Chairman, Councillor O Gawith had the casting vote and voted in favour of the officer recommendation and the application was therefore refused.

Adjournment of the meeting

The Chairman, Councillor O Gawith, declared the meeting adjourned at 3.58 pm.

Resumption of the meeting

The Chairman, Councillor O Gawith, declared the meeting resumed at 4.10 pm.

- (v) LA05/2019/0168/F – Proposed dwelling and detached garage on a vacant site 25 metres south west of 33 Carnreagh, Hillsborough.

The Principal Planning Officer (RH) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report.

At this juncture, Councillor U Mackin proposed that a site visit be convened to view the site and context, this was seconded by Alderman J Dillon who stated that he felt a site visit would be essential, and it was subsequently agreed by the Committee by a majority vote to defer the determination of the above planning application pending a site meeting being convened.

(Alderman D Drysdale left the meeting at 4.26 pm having declared an interest in the following application).

- (vi) LA05/2018/0655/F - Agricultural shed for purposes of agriculture plant and livestock at Peartree Hill, Belfast, 80 metres east of Road junction with Gransha Road and Peartree Hill.

The Principal Planning Officer (RH) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report.

The Committee received Alderman D Drysdale who wished to speak in opposition to the application. A written submission had been received from Alderman Drysdale which had been circulated to the Committee in advance of the meeting. Alderman Drysdale summarised by highlighting the following:

- This would create a ribbon of development.

- There was no supporting evidence that this was an active farm.
- This would impact on the surrounding area.
- This was contrary to governing policy and did not satisfy statutory consultees
- This would be located on a very narrow, windy road which would be hazardous in winter

Alderman Drysdale then responded to Members' queries regarding the following issues:

- In response to a question from Alderman J Tinsley he confirmed that there had not been any buildings at the location.

The Committee received Mr E McMinnis who wished to speak in support of the application. A written submission had been received from Mr McMinnis which had been circulated to the Committee in advance of the meeting. Mr McMinnis summarised by highlighting the following:

- Planning Officers had acted unprofessionally, he went on to outline the various officers assigned to the case over the period of time it was in the system and their conflicting advice.
- The field had been farmed by his wife's family for many years.
- There were no sheds were on the holding which hinders farming and integration.
- His application for a herd number was rejected as he is unable to provide isolation facilities.
- He was in process of applying for single farm payment.
- He requested that a site visit take place to view the site and context.

During the above the Chairman, Councillor O Gawith reminded Mr McMinnis that this meeting was a public forum and that individual names of Planning Officers should not be used.

Mr McMinnis then responded to Members' queries when the following issues arose:

- Mr McMinnis outlined the specific issues he had experienced during the time this application had been in the system.
- Mr McMinnis outlined his farming activity and stated that he cleaned out sheughs, cut hedges, sorted drainage and activites along those lines.
- He advised that he acquired the field in 2010 and that it had been in his wife's family for 45 years.
- In response to a question from Councillor U Mackin he advised that he was unable to have livestock as there were no isolation facilities.
- On being asked whether Single Farm Payment had been claimed for 2020 he advised that he was in the process of doing so and that a third party had claimed this under conacre for part of the year.

There then followed a question and answer session with the Planning Officers during which the following issues arose:

- On being asked whether he was satisfied that all information had been assessed despite changes in personnel the Head of Planning and Capital Development responded that paragraphs 38 – 78 set out all of the facts of the case and weighed it up against planning policy leading to the recommendation to refuse.
- Councillor J Craig referred to one of the refusal reasons stating that there was insufficient reason to justify a farm building away from the farm and asked for clarification on this. The Head of Planning and Capital Development responded that the land was inherited in 2010, the policy test was whether or not it was essential for the functioning of the business, this has been addressed in the officer's report and led to a recommendation to refuse.
- On being asked whether this was a case of not being convinced of the need for the shed or that the shed was being located in the wrong place the Head of Planning and Capital Development responded that it was a combination of both factors.

During the debate section of the meeting no comments were made.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the report of the Senior Planning Officer and by those making representations, agreed by a majority of 8:1 with 0 abstentions to refuse the application as outlined in the Officer's report.

(Alderman J Dillon left the meeting at 5.10 pm)

Due to the time of day the Chairman declared the meeting adjourned stating that it was hoped to re-convene during the week beginning 20 July 2020.

Councillor U Mackin stated that he would be unavailable that week and requested that his apology be recorded.

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 5.11 pm.

CHAIRMAN / MAYOR