

ROYAL BOROUGH OF KINGSTON UPON THAMES

Decisions 61 - 64 can be called in up to, and including Thursday 11 April 2019

Enquiries to Marian Morrison 020 8547 4623, email: marian.morrison@kingston.gov.uk
Democratic Support, Guildhall, KT1 1EU

KINGSTON TOWN NEIGHBOURHOOD COMMITTEE

27 MARCH 2019

7:30 pm – 11:59 pm

Canbury Ward	Councillor Zain Abbas Councillor Olivia Boulton Councillor Caroline Kerr (Chair)
Grove Ward	* Councillor Fiona Boulton Councillor Rebekah Moll (Vice-Chair) Councillor Jon Tolley
Norbiton Ward	Councillor Emily Davey Councillor Dave Ryder-Mills Councillor Olly Wehring
Tudor Ward	Councillor David Cunningham Councillor Katrina Lidbetter Councillor Maria Netley

* Absent

51. QUESTIONS

1. The Chair stated that a written question had been received about waste being left in an alley between Acre Road and East Road. She confirmed that this has been passed on to officers and a written response will be sent to the questioner who was unable to attend this meeting.
2. Mr Nick Armfield raised a concern about the increasing numbers of oversized lorries and out of service buses using Orchard Road (a turning off Wheatfield Way) and requested consideration be given to making Orchard Road one way or no entry or alternative ways of preventing breaches of the 7.5 tonne zone. Photographic evidence was circulated to members of the committee. He explained that he had raised the matter with Transport for London and whilst there was temporary reduction in use of the road by buses, the problem has returned.

Councillor Jon Tolley stated that he lives in Fairfield South, recognised the problems and would consider this issue. The Highways Engineer added that Mr Armfield had raised the matter with him previously and stated that signage

and road markings had been added. However, further changes would be difficult to enforce particularly if vehicles have a legitimate reason for access. He agreed to give the matter further consideration.

3. Mr Roger Hayes of Beaufort Road raised concerns about the Hotel Antoinette site. Planning permission was granted in 2017. He understood that James Taylor Homes had purchased the site and intend to build a larger 99 unit development for which they do not have planning permission.

He asked why a planning consultation item had not been brought to this Committee and whether there is the intention for a new application to be considered by Development Control Committee in the near future.

The Vice Chair explained that the Leader of the Council has been in contact with James Taylor Homes, both members and officers have received many emails and it is clear that residents have not been kept informed.

The Planning Officer stated that he would be meeting with James Taylor Homes on 28 March. He confirmed that some works on site may have exceeded planning permission and may affect the viability assessment. The viability assessment is needed before an application can be brought to committee for decision and he hoped to be able to advise members and residents about the position during the following week.

4. Andrea Craig raised concerns about road works in the vicinity of Kingston Town Centre and the resulting traffic chaos which has continued for many months. She also drew attention to the poor level of communications and warnings of up-coming road closures.

The Chair accepted that there had been traffic problems but that this is temporary and whilst some had been planned eg the cycle bridge (which overran) there had been unforeseen events eg a burst water main and university gas works.

Councillor David Cunningham pointed out that the Liberal Democrat manifesto included the suggestion to appoint an officer to pre-plan works but this appointment had not been made. The Highways Engineer advised that permits are required to undertake works on the public highway and that the processes consider the bigger picture, however, emergencies have to be addressed.

52. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Fiona Boulton.

53. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Caroline Kerr (Chair), Rebekah Moll (Vice Chair) and David Cunningham declared interests in item 8, Appendix B – 4 Manorgate Road, Kingston upon

Thames KT2 7EL (18/13000/FUL) as they are members of the Development Control Committee which would determine the application. They would not participate in the discussion on this item but would listen to comments made.

54. MINUTES

RESOLVED that: the minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2019 were confirmed as a correct record.

55. PETITIONS

Two petitions concerning King's Road were handed in:

1. A petition (both paper and a copy of the electronic petition which together totalled 826 signatures) which stated:

"The Council are proposing to narrow the pavements in this part of King's Road by 0.5m on each side to allow cars to flow more freely up and down. They plan to start a trial in July making cars park on both sides of the pavement as they do in King's Road below the mini roundabout. This will do nothing to reduce traffic volumes or the air pollution they cause and will reduce the pavement available for pedestrians. We do not want the Council to proceed with this alterations to our pavements."

2. A petition presented by Mr Adrian Braun and signed by residents of 25 homes in King's Road which stated:

"The residents of King's Road petition the council to work with residents to design and implement changes to the road which:

1. Ensure compliance by all traffic with the 20mph speed limit
2. Ensure the safety and access of pedestrians using pavement areas
3. Ensure traffic using King's Road comply with restrictions (eg no HGV, other than for access)
4. Minimise any impact on traffic flows and number of parking spaces available to residents.

All proposals agreed by residents to be implemented no later than December 2019.

The residents suggest proposals should include the following:

- a) The creation of 4-5 full width speed bumps of sufficient height to slow cars to below 20mph along the length of King's Road between Acre Road and Park Road, spaced no less than 50m apart.
- b) Introduction of on lamp post speed cameras.
- c) Move the on-pavement street car parking to the main carriageway on both sides of King's Road.

- d) The widening of pavement sections where there is on-street parking to ensure that the narrowing effect of the road is sufficient to deter speeding.
- e) The planting of trees/installation of wooden posts at certain points on the pavement to deter cars and delivery vehicles from mounting the kerb when parking.
- f) The addition of new signage at the entrance to King's Road making it clear that it is 20mph, and applicable restrictions.
- g) Additional signage on Park Road by roundabout sign indicating that the road is closed to HGVs.
- h) The removal of redundant street posts / signs that currently obstruct the pavement.
- i) Repairs and improvements to the pavement on both sides of King's Road."

56. NEIGHBOURHOOD MANAGER'S REPORT

There were no items to report.

57. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

A summary of the reasons for granting permission and of any relevant development planning policies and proposals is included in the report of the Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Infrastructure on each application where permission is recommended.

Permitted applications are subject to the conditions, informatives and other requirements set out in the report together with any other details on late responses to consultations or comments received since the agenda was printed, revised drawings circulated at the meeting and amended recommendations, additional conditions and informatives set out below.

Applications refused are for the reasons set out in the report by the Assistant Director of Strategic Planning and Infrastructure and any amended reasons set out below.

58. PLANNING APPLICATION - THE BARGE DOCK SITE, DOWN HALL ROAD, KINGSTON UPON THAMES,KT1 1PS (18/12421) Appendix A

In his introduction the Planning Officer stated that revised plans addressing the error in the drawings had been submitted earlier in the day and therefore inaccurate plans was no longer a reason for refusal and therefore reasons 1 and 4 for refusal no longer applied. However, the remaining reasons for refusal were still relevant including that the application does not optimise the use of the site, the risks of flooding and the site is on Metropolitan Open Land.

In considering the application for nine residential units, the Committee noted that the application was recommended for refusal. The Committee identified that the risk of flooding posed a greater threat for residential use than for restaurant use which had been agreed previously. The Committee also opposed the use of Metropolitan Open

Land for residential purposes. Furthermore the residential use presented an anomaly in view of the nearby public Canbury Gardens.

RESOLVED that: the application is refused for the reasons 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7 in the report.

Voting – unanimously in favour of refusal

59. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR FOR THE PLANNING CONSULTATION ITEM

The Chair requested the Committee to appoint a Chair for the Planning Consultation item as both the Chair and the Vice Chair are members of Development Control Committee and wish to take part at the meeting when this planning application is determined.

RESOLVED that: Councillor David Ryder-Mills is appointed as Chair for the planning consultation item.

Voting – unanimously in favour

60. PLANNING CONSULTATION: 4 MANORGATE ROAD, KINGSTON UPON THAMES, KT2 7EL (18/13000/FUL) Appendix B

The proposal was brought to this committee for consultation prior to determination on 8 May 2019 by the Development Control Committee.

The proposal as set out in the report (Appendix B) seeks permission to demolish the existing buildings (Use Class B8 – storage or Distribution) and to erect a retail foodstore (Use Class A1) with undercroft car parking (44 spaces), external car parking (23 spaces), servicing, landscaping, public footpath improvements, substation, plant equipment and other associated works. The retail area would be at the first floor. Whilst the application seeks permission for an unrestricted operator, it is anticipated that the foodstore will be occupied by Lidl. Access to the site would be as existing onto Manorgate Road with widening to allow service vehicles. Customers would be advised to exit left to avoid the Manorgate Home Zone and store deliveries will be restricted from 7am – 7pm Mondays to Saturdays and 10am – 4pm on Sundays.

A presentation was given by Walsingham Planning on behalf of the Applicant which gave details of the design stages, public engagement, the planning application and proposals and questions were answered.

The committee and members of the public in the gallery were invited to ask questions and comment on the application.

Questions and Comments from the public:

- Manorgate is a “Home Zone” and vehicle movements should not exceed 100 per hour. This is already exceeded. The entrance to the site should be outside the Home Zone.
- Concerns were raised about air quality arising from the proposal. Levels of NO₂ and NA will increase but already now exceed safe limits. Following recent leafleting it has been identified that people in flats in the Norbiton station area would drive to the store. The Applicant confirmed that an Air Quality Assessment has been undertaken and there will be an increase in certain emissions. Lidl would make a S106 financial contribution for offsite mitigation.
- Increasing traffic movements to a new store is in conflict with other approaches to reduce pollution eg the recent increase in on street car parking charges dependent on car emissions.
- Conflicts with the new Go Cycle scheme were referred to.
- Will the traffic impacts be put before Development Control Committee? The Applicant explained that information about traffic movements at Mitcham and Cricklewood stores had been used as they were broadly comparable on a number of factors to the proposed site. However, the gallery took a different view suggesting that residential density and car ownership in those areas were different compared to Norbiton. The Applicant explained that the two in-borough locations were not directly comparable as the New Malden store had a shared car park and the residential density at Chessington was lower. The applicant had carried out an independent survey at the roundabout and whilst the store will change the traffic flow at the roundabout this will not amount to over-capacity.
- Crowd funding by residents has supported an independent transport consultant and the view is that this development is likely to cause disruption in the local traffic system which could be the equivalent of permanent road works. Six travel policies will be breached.
- Epsom and Ewell Borough Council refused a Lidl application on traffic grounds one month ago. The site was entirely comparable and the Epsom view was that increased traffic would give rise to gridlock and safety issues. The applicant stated that he would be prepared to share the traffic movement data for that application site.
- Will officer views on traffic impacts will be put to Development Control? The Highways Engineer confirmed that views will be available for DC. The Planning Officer confirmed that he had listened to the concerns and had not formulated a recommendation as yet. He confirmed that he was aware of the Epsom and Ewell decision and air quality was being assessed.
- The car park and service area design could be unsafe due to HGV delivery lorries passing through the customer car park. In response the applicant stated it is common to have shared routes and to try to reduce movements. Service journeys would be outside the peak shopping hours and there would be a maximum of three vehicles per day. It is anticipated that the car park would be at 80% occupancy at peak times at the weekend. There will be a dedicated footway for pedestrians and the crossing point close to the entrance will be clearly marked in red as a safeguard.

- The need for a further supermarket in the Norbiton area was questioned as this has not been identified as a need in the Local Plan. The Planning Officer, however, confirmed that this was not a planning consideration.
- The supermarket will impact on existing retailers.
- Concerns were expressed on the plans: residents' properties face the east elevation which will be obscuring the present view; the height of the proposed flat roof is 3.2m higher than the existing ridge; the corrugated roof will be an eyesore, there will be negative effects on properties in Burnham Street (conservation area).
The Applicant confirmed that the proposal would be set back 1.2m from the existing boundary; the existing footpath will be widened and lit.

Comments from Members of the Committee

- A question was asked about the traffic analysis undertaken prior to the development of the Chessington Lidl and the Applicant stated he would be happy to share this. He confirmed that Lidl have submitted vehicle tracking through the roundabout at the junction with Manorgate Road.
- It was questioned whether Kingston Hill can enable access to the store for super HGVs and concerns about traffic volumes down Kingston Hill made by members of the public were echoed.
- It was suggested that discouraging right turns from the site would not necessarily stop traffic moving in that direction.
- How does car parking space compare to retail space at three Kingston sites? The applicant confirmed that the Chessington store has 52 parking spaces whereas the Manorgate Road application site has 76. The New Malden site car park is shared. However, the retail space for Chessington and Manorgate is similar although the back room space at the proposed site is larger.
- It was suggested that customers make "large shops" at larger supermarkets eg Sainsbury on Richmond Road, whereas "little shops" are made at smaller local stores. The Applicant explained that Lidl's discount business model offers 1800 lines whereas Sainsbury's will carry 18,000 to 30,000 lines. Lidl customers generally make "top up" shops or shop for certain products and their average time in store is 30 minutes.
- A question was asked about whether store comparisons are limited to Lidl or whether other comparable discounter stores are used. The Applicant stated that they interrogate the trade database and the best comparable sites were as stated.
- The earlier concern about the visual height made by members of the public was echoed.

RESOLVED that:

The comments listed above are considered by the Development Control Committee when determining the application on 8 May 2019.

Councillors Caroline Kerr (Chair), Rebekah Moll (Vice Chair) and David Cunningham declared interests in this item as they are members of the Development Control Committee which would determine the application. They would not participate in the discussion on this item but would listen to comments made.

61. KING'S ROAD OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION

Appendix C

The report outlined the results of a local consultation on the introduction of new traffic management measures in the King's Road area i.e. to make King's Road and New Road one way westbound towards Park Road and to make Tudor Road one way eastbound towards Queen's Road as shown on Annex 1 to the report. The other option was to do nothing. The results of the consultation exercise were set out at Annex 2.

The officer explained inaccuracies in the report on page 4, para 15. Instead of 64.5% of the overall responses received supporting the introduction of one way working between Queen's Road and Park Road and New Road and Tudor Road being one way with 31.6% against, the results should read 47.5% in favour of one way and 50.2% against.

As a consequence of the results and current data on traffic flows the officer's view was that the proposed one-way system should not be taken forward. However, the officer recognised that there was a need to address the current issues in King's Road and an alternative proposal was put forward in the report for footway parking as shown at Annex 5. This would introduce, on an experimental basis, footway parking outside 267/269 King's Road to 303 King's Road inclusive and between 284 to 328 King's Road inclusive. This proposal would enable cars to pass safely whilst still providing a footway width of 1.7m. This proposal, however, has not been consulted on.

The Committee noted the two petitions against the proposal to introduce footway parking which were presented earlier in the meeting (see Minute 55 for full details).

Members of the public in the gallery were invited to give views:

Views against pavement parking and in favour of a trial of the one-way system included:

- One of the petitioners drew attention to the wider context of the area including visitors to Richmond Park. He suggested that pavement parking will not address the traffic flow in King's Road and considered the one way system which had been approved by this committee for consultation would offer a more holistic, safer and forward thinking approach.
- There would be pedestrian / cyclist conflicts in King's Road.
- One way should be trialled and monitored.
- There would be congestion and air quality impacts arising from a narrow two way streamer into a one way street and there are articles available on the web to demonstrate this.

Views against the one way system proposal:

- Tudor Road and New Road residents group was formed after consultation came out and represents views of about 96% of respondents.
- A resident of Tudor Road drew attention to regular flooding issues at Tudor Court which were 6-12 inches deep across width of road and presented a road hazard. The one way proposal will increase traffic flow in this dangerous area.

- A second Tudor Road resident expressed sympathy for King's Road and suggested the issue is too much parking on King's Road and there is very little drop kerb parking.
- A suggestion was made that there was a lack of transparency as residents were not aware of the decisions until the consultation.
- Impacts on surrounding area won't be acceptable.
- Kingston cycling campaign had objected to one way system and stated that would be more dangerous for cyclists and would lead to "dooring".
- Views were expressed that the one way system should not be trialled.
- Congestion and air pollution will increase in Tudor Road.
- Traffic speeds will increase

Views supporting further action:

- Traffic blockages occur every day, there are increasing physical assaults and multiple occasions of blockages but no serious injuries so far.
- GPS is a probable factor in traffic increase and Richmond Park is a more popular venue.
- The King's Road issue has been raised since 2010 and petition made in 2017. Recent workshops led to one way system proposal and pavement parking rejected as an option at this point.
- Another scheme to reduce traffic volumes should be possible. King's Road residents would be happy to work with residents of other roads and the council to reach a solution.

General point

- It was felt that the consultation exercise was well-constructed.

In response to a question about why Alexandra Road had not been included as part of the one-way system, the officer explained that there are different proposals being discussed around school journeys would could involve road closure at the beginning and end of the school day.

In considering the proposals for one-way system and on-pavement parking members acknowledged that a range of views and concerns had been expressed by the gallery and made the following points:

- With resources being tight, money should not be spent on a trial.
- Pavement parking could be allowed on a single side of King's Road.
- The results of the consultation should be respected.
- The one-way system has been rejected by residents of New Road and Tudor Road and perhaps the scheme and trial should be rejected by this committee.
- A suggestion was made for the appointment of a consultant to undertake a full holistic traffic management survey from Kingston Hill into the town centre to look at improving traffic management and options.
- GPS is probably a contributory factor in increased traffic flow and to Richmond Park.
- Steps must be taken to stop HGVs using "rat runs".
- Queen's Road could be 20 mph.

In response to questions the officer confirmed that if a trial were agreed, traffic speeds and air pollution would need to be measured both before and after the trial. A trial would need to last for six months in order to let the traffic flows to normalise. The officer acknowledged that the one-way system would lead to increased speed and traffic calming measures would be included as part of the trial. The costs of a Traffic Management Order would be £1500 and traffic calming measures in the region of £10k to £15k. He added that the trial would provide valid data rather than estimates.

The Chair suggested that if members were minded to reject the recommendation for on-street parking, she would discuss the King's Road issues with the Leader of the Council and see if a meeting/visit could be arranged for the Leader and herself to King's Road.

RESOLVED that:

1. The results of the consultation as set out in Annex 2 are noted; and
2. Not to progress the scheme shown in Annex 5 to authorise footway parking on an experimental basis under the provisions of Section 15 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974 on the footway outside 267 / 269 Kings Road to 303 Kings Road inclusive, and between nos 284 to 328 Kings Road.

Voting:

For – Councillors Zain Abbas, Olivia Boulton, David Cunningham, Emily Davey, Caroline Kerr, Rebekah Moll, Maria Netley, Dave Ryder-Mills, Jon Tolley, Olly Wehring

Against – none

Abstain – Councillor Katrina Lidbetter

62. LATCHMERE LANE AREA - RESULT OF PARKING BEAT SURVEY

Appendix D

A petition was received from residents of Latchmere Lane at the Committee meeting held on 22 January 2019 requesting the introduction of a Controlled Parking Zone in the Latchmere Lane Road and Tudor Drive areas. The request was made as a result of displacement parking following the introduction of the new Permit Parking Area (PPA) for the roads east of Richmond Road (Durlston Road, St Albans Road, Studland Road, Fernhill Gardens and Earle Gardens).

A parking beat survey was carried out at different times of the day to assess the extent of the parking problem and the full results were set out at Annex 1. The reserve capacity was identified as follows: at 5am 24%, 9am 30%, 1pm 35%, 7pm 37% and 9pm 32%. However, Latchmere Road is busy at school opening and closing times, Bertram Road is occupied to 90% of capacity at 5am (resident parking) and Kelvedon Close is over-capacity at 106% at 9pm, (again resident parking due to parking across driveways). The officer view was that there is reserve capacity in

most roads during the day and the highest level of on-street parking is due to overnight resident parking. The introduction of daytime parking schemes will not impact on the night parking situation. The officer recommended that a further review is carried out once the PPA scheme in the roads east of Richmond Road has been in operation for one year. In the meantime a Traffic Management Order is recommended to make yellow line waiting restrictions in Latchmere Lane between Latchmere Road and Tudor Drive to create passing places which would assist drivers and pedestrians along this section of the carriageway at locations to be agreed with the Chair, Vice Chair and Ward Members.

During discussion it was observed that the introduction of yellow lines would reduce the availability of parking and this could give rise to a greater need for CPZ. The Officer responded that a further parking beat survey would identify a change in parking demand.

It was suggested that Traffic Management Orders are not the best way of advising residents about changes and the officer advised that if the Committee considered that there were any road safety issues then it would be appropriate to advise them about the introduction of restrictions on the grounds of safety. However, the officer did not consider that the introduction of yellow lines to create passing places provided sufficient grounds for road safety and therefore a consultation about the change would be required. There was support for this approach and agreement reached that the consultation letter including details about the further planned parking beat survey and details about the increasing costs of resident parking.

RESOLVED that:

1. The results of the Parking Beat survey set out in Annex 1 are noted;
2. Residents are consulted in the very near future on the introduction of parking restrictions to create passing places in Latchmere Lane between Latchmere Road and Tudor Drive which would assist drivers and pedestrians in this section of the carriageway; and
3. No other action be taken on parking in the areas subject to the parking beat survey at this stage but to review the areas after the new Permit Parking Area scheme in the roads east of Richmond Road has been in operation for a year to assess its impact on the areas.

Voting:

For – Councillors Zain Abbas, David Cunningham, Emily Davey, Olivia Boulton, Katrina Lidbetter, Maria Netley, Dave Ryder-Mills, Olly Wehring,

Against - none

Abstain – Councillor Caroline Kerr, Rebekah Moll, Jon Tolley

63. NEIGHBOURHOOD WORKING ARRANGEMENTS

Appendix E

Following the review of the Council's governance and the role of Neighbourhood Committees during the latter half of 2018, the report outlined options for the Committee to take forward some of the new powers. The Committee was asked to consider:

- Whether or not to appoint a Sub Committee to consider planning and related issues
- The membership of the sub committee
- Whether or not to introduce a guillotine at Neighbourhood Committee meetings and at what time. (Note - the guillotine may not apply to Planning Sub committees.)

RESOLVED that:

- 1 A Sub committee is established to consider planning and related issues within the remit of the Neighbourhood Committee composed of two members from each ward;
- 2 the Chair and Vice Chair of the Sub committee will be the Chair and Vice Chair of the Neighbourhood Committee;
- 3 A guillotine at 22.30 shall be applied to meetings of the Neighbourhood Committee with the discretion to extend by resolution where necessary; and
- 4 The operation of the guillotine will be reviewed by this committee in 6 months' time.

Voting:

Resolution 1 – Unanimously in favour

Resolution 2 – Unanimously in favour

Resolution 3

For – Councillors Zain Abbas, Olivia Boulton, Emily Davey, Caroline Kerr, Katrina Lidbetter, Rebekah Moll, Dave Ryder-Mills, John Tolley

Against – Councillors David Cunningham, Maria Netley, Olly Wehring

Resolution 4 – unanimously in favour

64. COMMUNITY GRANTS PROGRAMME

Appendix F

The report set out the funding streams that would be available in 2019/20 and requested the committee to agree the proposed working arrangements for the allocation of grants. The funding sources are:

- **Neighbourhood Community grants** (maximum £3,000) - £20,000 per Neighbourhood and the guidance is set out at Annex 1.
- **Borough-wide Community Grants** (maximum £3,000) - £20,000 across the Borough and the guidance is also included in Annex 1.
- **Councillor Ward Funding** - £2,000 per councillor and the guidance is at Annex 2.
- **Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)** – the amount varies and it may be spent on infrastructure. Guidance is set out at Annex 3.

The committee discussed how the CIL grants could be made in 2019/20 and it was considered that there would be a need to draw up priorities and it may also be beneficial to set a cap. A request was made for a report to develop these points to be brought to the next meeting on 4 June 2019.

RESOLVED that:

- 1 the Neighbourhood Community Grants arrangements are agreed;
- 2 the Borough-wide Community Grants budget is noted;
- 3 the existing Councillor Ward Funding Scheme is retained;
- 4 the opportunities for the further grant funding and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) receipts are noted; and
- 5 a report is brought to the next meeting on proposed criteria, possible cap and process for CIL allocations.

Voting – unanimously in favour

65. WORK PROGRAMME

Appendix G

The work programme and dates for future meetings were noted.

Neighbourhood Committee Meetings

Tuesday 4 June 2019

- Gloucester Road/Cambridge Road Junction
- Richmond Road/Bank Lane Junction
- Albany Park Road CPZ
- Road Safety in Kingston

Thursday 5 September 2019

Tuesday 5 November 2019

Thursday 16 January 2020

Tuesday 10 March 2020

Planning Sub Committees

Tuesday 16 July 2019

Wednesday 18 September 2019

Tuesday 3 December 2019
Wednesday 12 February 2020
Tuesday 21 April 2020

Community Forums

Tuesday 7 May 2019
Thursday 17 October 2019
Thursday 7 January 2020

66. URGENT ITEMS AUTHORISED BY THE CHAIR

There were no urgent items.

Signed.....Date.....
Chair