

## **BROUGHTON PARISH COUNCIL**

Minutes of the Meeting of the Parish Council, held at Broughton Village Hall on Wednesday, 22 May 2013, commencing at 7.00pm.

Present: Cllr. Mrs. MC Rust (in the Chair).  
Cllrs. R Baxter, Mrs. JC Chester, Mrs. PA Cope, DJ Perkins, R Shrive, Mrs. C Taylor, and Clerk to the Parish Council, Mr GA Duthie.  
Borough Councillors J Hakewill and C Moreton.  
One member of the public.

**13/6856** **APOLOGIES.** Apologies for absence were tendered by (and accepted for the reasons noted):

Cllr. Mrs. HJ Bull (on holiday)  
Cllr. P Gordon (on holiday)  
Cllr. Mrs. P Roke (unwell)  
County Cllr. C Groome (conflicting engagement)

**13/6857** **ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIRMAN.** This being the annual meeting of the Parish Council, consideration of business was preceded by the election of the Chair and Vice-Chairman for the ensuing year. The following appointments were confirmed after nomination and being duly seconded without competing nominations being made:-

Cllr. Mrs. MC Rust was re-appointed as Chair.  
Cllr. R Shrive was re-appointed as Vice-Chairman.

**13/6858** **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.** None were made.

**13/6859** **MINUTES.** The draft minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 17 April 2013, copies having been circulated, were approved by members and authorised for signature by the Chair after a minor amendment to 13/6853.

**13/6860** **COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS.** Councillors considered the membership of the two standing committees for the consideration of consultation material and agreed the composition of the District Matters one would remain unchanged for the year, comprising:

### **District matters**

Cllrs. Baxter, Perkins and Shrive.

In respect of the County Matters one, a seat was now vacant following the resignation of former Cllr. Manning, so it was agreed to review the membership of this at the June meeting. No changes were made in respect of representation on the Broughton Charities of Bentham and Others.

**13/6861** **RIGHT TO SPEAK.** No addresses were made.

**13/6862**

**MATTERS ARISING.** Arising from 13/6853, it was confirmed that the Borough Council had acknowledged the complaint concerning chicken manure storage at Wellingborough Road and had sought further information as to the believed proprietor of the holding, which was provided.

Arising from the recent designation of the village hall playing field as a Queen Elizabeth II Field, members noted an exchange of correspondence had occurred between the Village Hall Committee and Borough Council concerning apparent anomalies in the dedication deed in terms of the intended beneficiaries of the dedication and the description of the field. It had been advised these issues would not compromise the use or management of the area and the scope of the dedication would be amended.

Arising from 13/6849, in connection with the current round of planning policy consultations, the Chair had established that the Borough Council was about to embark upon a consultation intended to identify potential sites to bring forward for use as Gypsy/Traveller pitches. It appeared a number of 'new' sites in the parish were proposed for consideration, including two at Wellingborough Road (one being at the former abattoir), one at Bypass Farm, and one at Highcroft Farm. Councillors noted the consultation was to commence imminently and the material would be circulated as soon as to hand. Experience of similar exercises elsewhere indicated there was the potential for the consultation to be contentious and it was important the issue was approached on the basis of land-use planning considerations.

Arising from 13/6847, the meeting was advised by the Chair that a judging assessment in connection with the 'Best Village' competition entry had now occurred on 2 May. The visiting assessors had been given a thorough tour and had taken note of particular highlights pointed out to them; the outcome was now awaited.

Arising from 13/6838, members noted that deliveries of the new edition of Broughton News had now been completed and the publication seemed well received. It was agreed thanks were due to Cllr. Shrive for overseeing production.

**13/6863**

**CORRESPONDENCE.** The following items of correspondence were reported and action, as detailed, was agreed to be taken, with other general items being placed on circulation:-

- a) A letter from Broughton Playing Fields and Village Hall Association advising that a date had been set for a fifth Village Show and Fun Day, on 14 September 2013. Copies of the proposed schedule of activities were provided, as were contact details for offers of help, stall entries and raffle/tombola prizes etc.
- b) A consultation notification received from Kettering Borough Council, on local validation requirements for planning applications. Members noted the scope of the consultation, open until 17 June 2013.
- c) Confirmation received from the Borough Electoral Services Manager that following public notice being given of the current casual vacancy on the Parish

Council, the statutory period had now expired with no election being requested. Consequently, it was open to the Parish Council to fill the vacancy by co-option and the criteria for eligibility were advised. It was agreed that if intending candidates were known, they should be asked to confirm that candidacy to the Clerk and the matter would be placed on the agenda for the June meeting.

- d) A communication received from the Northamptonshire Police and Crime Commissioner, providing information and survey material concerning a campaign entitled 'Victims' Voice'. Members noted the scope of this was to assess the experience of victims of and witnesses to crime; and that the initiative was running until 5 July. Publicity material was placed on circulation.

#### **13/6864**

#### **REPORTS OF MEMBERS ATTENDING MEETINGS OF OTHER BODIES.**

A report was made by the Chair of a meeting held on 19 April involving herself, with Cllrs. Shrive, Mrs. Bull, Baxter, Gordon, Perkins, and with Mr I Gore, Mr I Boyes and Mr R Hall of MGWSP, representing the Highway Authority. The meeting was in Broughton and commenced with an inspection of the High Street area with particular reference to the Cransley Hill junction in the light of the Redrow housing proposal.

All agreed that a roundabout here was not preferred and that any S106 Agreement should secure contributions 'for improvements to the High Street'; with the detail being settled in due course. This would facilitate matters such as layby enlargement being picked up.

The issue of flooding in this location was discussed and members were advised that flushing of drains was being carried out to address.

The meeting then inspected the area adjacent to the former Sun Inn, and discussed the possibility of railings being installed at The Bank. Although possible, it was agreed this may prove expensive and there was no actual evidence of an unacceptable safety risk notwithstanding the levels. Consequently agreed to leave presently but revisit if necessary.

Turning to the parking provision in Darlow Close, it was confirmed that the grassed area was not owned by the County Council. There was nothing to prevent the Parish Council making an approach if the land-owner could be identified.

At Wellingborough Road, the junction with Northampton Road was inspected and the Highways representatives suggested the best means of slowing traffic would be by the introduction of a mini-roundabout for which sufficient room existed, with an alternative being changed priorities. A design would be prepared and submitted to the Parish Council for consideration, possibly including dropped kerbs to improve accessibility and a central refuge for pedestrians.

The recent informal consultation on parking/waiting restrictions (High Street and Coxs Lane) was discussed; it being agreed the Highways Authority would progress. In respect of road surfacing, the village was not scheduled for any resurfacing work in the near future so ad-hoc repairs would continue as necessary.

Discussion of Area Action Plans, to pool development contributions for major improvement works, occurred but it was advised the village was not (yet) quite large enough to support this approach. If large scale proposals affecting Mawsley arose, it was likely contributions to improve the A43 roundabout would be sought and such would benefit Broughton too.

Although it was accepted the A43 junction at Kettering Road was operating beyond capacity, this did not necessarily mean future developers would be required to contribute to improvement, although this might be one focus of any Neighbourhood Plan.

The Chair then reported upon the meeting of the Village Hall Committee held on 14 May 2013. Business there included confirmation the licensing application was still being progressed as previously advised, liaison with Northamptonshire Touring Arts was occurring with a view to a village event in the Autumn, a request for participation on the Village Show Committee, an exploration of how additional parking provision might be made and funded, and that a request would be made for the release of support funding raised by precept. The meeting had also heard that problems had arisen with the upkeep of the village hall website and a volunteer was being sought to take over this.

Minutes of the Village Hall Committee meeting held on 9 April were placed on circulation and councillors noted the next meeting of the Village Hall Committee was scheduled for 11 June, following the Annual General Meeting of the Association.

**13/6865**

**POLICE REPORT.** No officers were in attendance at this meeting so discussion was limited to a sharing of information on various matters of local concern.

**13/6866**

**DEVELOPMENT CONTROL.**

**Planning Applications submitted for the Parish Council's observations:-**

In respect of the following application, just notified, it was agreed the scale and significance of the application warranted a special meeting of the Parish Council being held, either to be on 29 May 2013 or 5 June 2013, depending on whether the planning authority could allow a short extension of time for a response to be formed:

Glebe Avenue (off)	67 dwellings and access etc	Glanmoor Investments
--------------------	-----------------------------	----------------------

**Planning Decisions notified:-**

The following Decision Notices were received, all being conditional approvals:

51 Wellingborough Road	Extensions to side and front	Mr & Mrs Greatrix
56 Church Street	Dwelling with access	Mrs K Hurford
Headlands Farm	Replacement dwelling	Mr R Redden

**Update on KET/2012/0709 (Cransley Hill) – S106 obligations and extension of time for completion:-**

In connection with this, it remained the case that no draft of the intended Section 106 Agreement had been shared by the Borough Council despite the requests made and it also remained the case that the Borough were persisting with the view that the extension of time for completion of the same (see minute 13/6847) was lawful despite

the apparent breaches of statutory law and the Council's own procedural rules that had been flagged. In addition, a communication had been received from a Deputy Chief Executive of the Borough Council that appeared to be making further co-operation of that authority on the Neighbourhood Plan exercise contingent upon the administration of the application not being subjected to an application for Judicial Review. In respect of this latter aspect, members agreed there was no justification for this claimed linkage and that the way for the Borough Council to avoid proceedings was for it to correct its administration as invited. Borough Cllr. Hakewill went so far as to declare the conduct of the planning authority in the matter as being 'disgraceful'. The Clerk was asked to continue pressing the Parish Council's concerns and to keep members briefed.

Parallel to this discussion, senior Borough officers had now invited parish councillors to meet with them to discuss the infrastructure consequences of the Cransley Hill proposal, and this should also afford an opportunity to discuss the wider issues of planning policy (five year housing supply, NPPF, village boundary etc), and how the Neighbourhood Plan could be progressed despite the indications mentioned earlier. It was agreed to engage with this opportunity but not to get drawn into a discussion of the legal issues raised with the Borough, where the Parish Council's position had been made very clear indeed.

#### **Public meeting held on 11 May 2013.**

The Chair reported upon the public meeting convened by Borough Cllr. Hakewill and held on 11 May. The meeting heard that approximately 200 members of the public turned out to join with Philip Hollobone MP, Borough Cllrs. Hakewill and Moreton, County Cllr. Groome and representatives of the Parish Council to consider the current development pressures affecting the village. It was notable that representatives of the landowners sponsoring the proposals at Cransley Hill and at Glebe Avenue present were freely able to participate.

The meeting had been opened by Cllr Hakewill explaining the context provided by the lack of a demonstrated five-year housing land supply, which, under the NPPF, served to render local policies that prevented development in open countryside ineffective in locations where sustainability was still demonstrable. This accounted for the current large scale applications being seen in Broughton and other similar communities.

Mr. Hollobone commented upon the drivers for housing need as he perceived them, and described that a parliamentary petition and debate might be possible in order to enable MPs to consider the exceptional pressures now affecting the village.

County Cllr. Groome had confirmed he was happy to assist with the proposed Neighbourhood Plan and this would dovetail with his being a member of the CPRE committee. Parish Cllr. Mrs. Bull had described the purpose and process of devising a Neighbourhood Plan, which seemed to be the best tool in the circumstances.

The Parish Council Chair had presented to the meeting an account of the difficulties being encountered in properly engaging with the Borough Council, including upon the handling of the Redrow application at Cransley Hill. The Clerk had described the legal concerns around the self-imposed timetable for completion of the S106 Agreement.

Questions and contributions were sought from the floor, which included from the landowners' representatives mentioned previously, who were respectfully listened to and also described problems being encountered with the Borough Council over the timetable for the planning agreement. Overwhelmingly, public opinion was expressing concern at the amount and speed of growth in the village, the impact on its rural character, and the lack of infrastructure capacity to absorb and service the same.

Clear and strong support for a legal challenge, if thought appropriate, was expressed with offers of financial assistance for a 'fighting fund' being made. Similarly, volunteers for the Neighbourhood Plan exercise came forward and contact details were noted.

The meeting had concluded after approximately two and a half hours or so and had been generally good-natured despite the level of concern at these matters being displayed.

Subsequent to the meeting, the parliamentary debate sought by Mr. Hollobone had occurred on 21 May 2013 and copies of the Hansard record of this were placed on circulation (noted from 11am onward).

**13/6867**      **FINANCE.** The following items of income and expenditure were noted/agreed:-

<b>Income</b>				<b>£</b>
No income was noted.				
 <b>Expenditure</b>				 <b>£</b>
Barclays Bank PLC	Commission	(direct debit )		4.00
Broker Network Ltd	Insurance renewal premium	(101551 )		680.77
GA Duthie	Salary and WP	(101552 )		250.33
HMRC	Income tax	(101553 )		141.20
GA Duthie	Telephone and Electricity	(101554 )		64.69

Members noted that the insurance renewal was on the basis of sums insured being index-linked to reflect inflation (3% uplift from last year) and the premium had actually reduced slightly to reflect accruing no-claims discount and the long-term agreement that exists.

**13/6868**      **PARISH COUNCIL WEBSITE.** Members were pleased to note that, with the kind assistance of local resident, Mr Carl Sharman, a model for the creation of a basic but expandable parish council website had been identified. Costs appeared to be low in that domain registration and hosting looked likely to amount to an equivalent of about £7.00 per month depending on providers. Discussion ensued around the best web address or URL to adopt for the site and it was agreed, if available, 'broughton-parish-council.org.uk' should be secured given this clearly identified the Council as being UK based.

**13/6869**      **BROUGHTON POCKET PARK.** Members heard that co-ordinator designate, Mr. S Collins, was no longer able to devote any time to the project and it was therefore

agreed to include an item on the June meeting agenda in order to review the future of the facility so far as Parish Council involvement is concerned.

**13/6870**

**GENERAL INTEREST ITEMS.** Cllr. Shrive confirmed the Northampton Road planters had been tended and the verges cut. Members agreed the Borough and/or County should be asked to include the cutting of these areas on their grounds maintenance contracts.

Cllr. Baxter raised a concern about the use of an answer-phone service for the village hall booking service, which seemed impersonal.

Cllr. Perkins mentioned that at the High Street recreation ground, the second young tree in from the High Street on the Bakehouse Lane row was looking diseased. Cllr. Baxter agreed to raise with the Borough tree officer.

Cllr. Perkins then commented that he was aware of recent incidents of the bus timetables locally not being adhered to, with would-be passengers being disappointed.

Cllr. Mrs. Chester reported that the Pytchley Road crossroads were in need of cutting.

The Chair advised that the Rural Forum meeting on 27 June would include an agenda item concerning open countryside development pressures, prompted by the Cransley Hill application.

The Chair mentioned the possibility of any S106 contributions forthcoming from the Glebe Avenue proposals to be used for the improvement of the junction of St Andrews Way with Church Street, where visibility was poor.

The Chair queries whether Parish Council insurance cover would be sufficient for an event to be promoted by the Baptist Chapel on the High Street recreation ground. It was confirmed that the Parish Council's policy would only relate to events organised by the Council and the query might be better directed to Kettering Borough Council as owner and manager of the site in case cover existed under the Borough umbrella.

**13/6871**

**DATE OF NEXT MEETING.** It was reported that the next scheduled meeting of the Parish Council would be on Wednesday 19 June 2013, at 7:00pm in the Village Hall.

**13/6872**

**URGENT ITEMS ADMITTED BY THE CHAIR.** None were raised.

*The meeting was closed at 9:05pm*

19 June 2013

Signed.....

## BROUGHTON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Special Meeting of the Parish Council, held at Broughton Village Hall on Wednesday, 5 June 2013, commencing at 6.30pm.

Present: Cllr. Mrs. MC Rust (in the Chair).  
Cllrs. R Baxter, Mrs. HJ Bull, P Gordon, Mrs. P Roke, R Shrive, and Clerk to the Parish Council, Mr GA Duthie.

County Cllr. C Groome  
Seven members of the public

**13/6873** **APOLOGIES.** Apologies for absence were tendered by (and accepted for the reasons noted):  
Cllr. Mrs. J Chester (work commitment)  
Cllr. D Perkins (away)  
Borough Cllr. J Hakewill (prior engagement)

**13/6874** **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.** None were made.

**13/6875** **DEVELOPMENT CONTROL.**  
**Planning Applications submitted for the Parish Council's observations:-**  
**In respect of the following application**, and after hearing concerns voiced by local residents concerning proposed boundary treatments, traffic impacts, construction nuisance through noise and dust, infrastructure deficiencies, conflict with locally preferred policies, and the loss of important open space, it was **RESOLVED** to object to the proposal as bulleted below; these being immediate comments with it being agreed there may be need to revisit the application in the light of amendments or further information becoming known:

- The site lies outside the village boundary so development imposed there would be fundamentally contrary to extant and emerging policy that has been locally consulted upon.
- The site has been considered recently and identified as historically and visually important open space during formulation of Site Specific Options proposals. The submitted archaeological evaluation confirms the historic value of the site and members are particularly concerned at the loss of the increasingly rare ancient ridge and furrow landscape that will result from this proposal.
- As agricultural land in open countryside, any development that is supportable on this site should depend on some proven functional justification related to that agricultural use or to some re-use of otherwise redundant agricultural buildings. This scheme does neither so is not supportable.
- The proposed Broughton Conservation Area adjoins the site and the setting of this, and views into and out of the prospectively designated area, will be harmed by built development in this location.



- To the north-east and south-east, the site is bounded by currently rural public rights of way that are a locally important and well-used recreational facility, that enable easy village access to the countryside and also serve the nearby pocket park. Implementation of this proposal will result in the intrinsic rural character of this facility being lost and represent further unacceptable urbanisation of the village fringe in an especially sensitive location.
- The adopted Parish Plan for Broughton evidences local support for infill development only in the village and also evidences that local people oppose built extension beyond the established village framework, and overwhelmingly wish for the settlement to retain a rural feel. There are other sites within the framework on which development could be accommodated within a dispersed growth model more according with local preference without threatening established rural character.
- If it is accepted that a shortfall exists in terms of an assured five-year housing land supply (which seems not to be evidenced in market terms currently where a recent search of the 'RightMove' website revealed around 900 houses presently for sale within 5 miles of Broughton), this scheme will have little impact on addressing any locally referenced shortfall, certainly not such as should overreach and outweigh the significant harm the development will cause. It is noteworthy the application focuses on the perceived five-year supply issue globally, without attempting to provide any local context or demonstrate village needs or desires being met by this scheme.
- Approval of this scheme, if considered in conjunction with the recent Redrow proposal, will result in Broughton alone absorbing the vast majority of the assessed rural housing shortfall in the District despite policy protections that local people had been consulted upon and supported to prevent this overloading of one settlement.
- Church Street, off which Glebe Avenue is served, has clear and valued character in the village as a historic rural street as is recognised in the draft Conservation Area Appraisal; it is already under stress from traffic levels especially at peak times due to its layout and limited capacity to accommodate modern traffic. Traffic movements resulting from this scheme would inevitably result in the character of the street being harmfully changed to that of a more urban nature detrimental to the currently rural nature of the village, whilst still being deficient in terms of the design capacity reasonably necessary to sustainably service contemporary housing provision of this scale.
- Church Street, Gate Lane, and Wellingborough Road via which the site will be accessed, already struggle to service existing traffic levels and types (they comprise part of a circular through route leading to many village amenities, as well as significant agricultural facilities generating large vehicle movements), so are unsuitable to absorb the additional traffic movements associated with further housing development and have no scope for improvement to increase capacity given the constraints of the in-village junctions either side of the application site and the proximity of adjacent properties. The junction of Glebe Avenue with Wellingborough Road especially suffers from poor visibility due to parked traffic

and these problems will be exacerbated or problems will be displaced by any measures taken to address that issue.

- Glebe Avenue itself, although a simple estate access road, is narrow in key parts (especially toward Wellingborough Road) and not suited to carrying the significant additional traffic movements that will certainly result. Glebe Avenue and Church Street are both locally notorious for suffering difficulties with ice and snow in winter time
- Significant additional housing provision in the village (even without the imminently approved Redrow scheme coming on-stream) can only exacerbate congestion and safety issues already acknowledged by the Highway Authority as existing at peak times at the two A43 junctions serving the village. The A43 itself is also acknowledged to be under stress and approval of this proposal can only worsen those pressures with no immediate enhancements being planned. The same applies to the length of the A14 most closely serving Broughton where failures to secure timely improvement now impact seriously on congestion and safety.
- The likely increase in traffic using the junction of Church Street with High Street, given the constraints arising from the close proximity of key features including the pedestrian crossing, residential accesses and existing commercial uses in the vicinity, coupled with higher levels of traffic movements generated by a significant housing scheme, can only worsen the already existing difficulties with congestion and accidents in this area, especially at peak times. These potential impacts have not been assessed adequately.
- Village facilities are not adequate to support further development of this scale, especially when cumulative effects with the Redrow scheme are considered. The village has no doctors' surgery accessible without travel (likely to be mainly car-borne in practice), inadequate school capacity (secondary age pupils particularly will be necessarily dependent on car-borne journeys to schools dispersed elsewhere due to restrictive school transport policies) , only very limited local retail provision just capable of serving existing demands, and minimal employment opportunity. The location is not sustainable on any sensible assessment and local people are overwhelmingly opposed to Broughton becoming a dormitory of Kettering, which seems intended without allowing time for infrastructure to catch-up.
- The proposed density is considered to be too high for a village scheme and, in addition to over-loading local infrastructure, will result in amenity space for occupants being too limited.
- The site and surrounding area is considered locally to afford considerable habitat value, so particular regard should be had to NERC Act duties to preserve and enhance biodiversity when considering this proposal.
- Any consent granted for this scheme would increase pressure and encourage aspirations for the speculative release for development of other agricultural land external to the village boundary; where the objections identified above similarly apply and would be compounded.

- If approval is given, a planning obligation should require ‘pepper-potting’ of social housing units so as to promote cohesiveness, rather than a clustered layout.
- The provision of additional play facilities is not thought necessary given the proximity of the site to the existing High Street and Village Hall recreation grounds although facilities at both should be improved by equivalent value S106 contribution should the scheme be permitted.
- The Parish Council would prefer to see methods other than grass swales used for the disposal of surface water run-off, as this method is considered likely to be disproportionately costly in terms of future maintenance liabilities. Disposal of increased surface water run-off generated by built development in this location appears not to have been properly assessed where the submitted Flood Risk Assessment seems to be predicated on 50 units only, rather than 67 (Appendix G). Local knowledge and experience indicates this site will be quite unable to absorb significant additional run-off without flood risk.
- The Applicant’s claims on its own consultation exercise are not recognised. Whilst it is correct the proposals were publicised, the Parish Council is aware responses were not favourable to the scheme and have, so far as can be ascertained, not resulted in any modifications being made. There has been no on-going dialogue.
- Any consent given should be tightly conditioned to ensure construction traffic does not unduly impact residential amenity given the road constraints in the area, and that contractors’/operatives’ vehicles are entirely accommodated on site. Additionally, measures are required to minimise the effects of dust and noise etc arising from construction.
- Neighbours are concerned that boundary treatments with existing properties (especially in the vicinity of the new access) are adequately secure and not onerous in terms of resulting maintenance liabilities (hedges are not considered appropriate for example).
- In light of the Parish Council’s experience of the handling of the Section 106 process relating to the Redrow proposal, the Parish requires early sight of and full consultation upon the detailed terms of all planning obligations contemplated including definitions, triggers and outputs. If obligations are required for the provision or enhancement of facilities within the purview of statutory bodies other than the Borough Council, then those bodies should be party to any agreement creating the same so as to ensure certainty of delivery.

**Glebe Avenue (land off) Full application - 67 dwellings (KET/2013/0284)  
Glanmoor Investments Limited**

**13/6876**

**NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN – CONSIDERATION OF AREA BOUNDARY FOR PLAN.** After Cllr. Mrs. Bull briefly explained the background and purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan request, members gave consideration to the extent of the neighbourhood area proposed to be included within the plan. After agreeing the essential issue was whether the plan area should include the immediate village only, or

whether it should extend further, and after considering whether there was merit in discussing with neighbouring parishes any potential for land outside the parish to be included, it was **RESOLVED** to notify Kettering Borough Council that the parish boundary be designated as the Neighbourhood Area boundary for the purpose of the Neighbourhood Plan application and exercise. It was agreed, that for the purpose of continuity, the initial correspondence suggesting the need for the Plan be resubmitted when this designation is notified.

**13/6877**      **DATE OF NEXT MEETING.** It was reported that the next meeting of the Parish Council would be on Wednesday 19 June 2013, at 7:00pm in the Village Hall.

**13/6878**      **URGENT ITEMS ADMITTED BY THE CHAIR.** None were raised.

*The meeting was closed at 7:50pm*

19 June 2013

Signed.....