

WAVERLEY BOROUGH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE - 9 JUNE 2015

SUBMITTED TO THE COUNCIL MEETING – 21 JULY 2015

(To be read in conjunction with the Agenda for the Meeting)

**Present**

Cllr Robert Knowles (Chairman)  
Cllr Julia Potts (Vice-Chairman)  
Cllr Brian Adams  
Cllr Kevin Deanus  
Cllr Carole King

Cllr Tom Martin  
Cllr Wyatt Ramsdale  
Cllr Stefan Reynolds  
Cllr Stewart Stennett  
Cllr Simon Thornton

**Also Present**

Councillor Anna James

The Executive wished Roger Standing, Head of Customer, IT and Office Services, a happy and long retirement and thanked him for his hard work over the last 28 years at Waverley.

1. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN (Agenda item 1)

RESOLVED that the Leader of the Council, Cllr Robert Knowles, be confirmed as Chairman of the Executive for the Council year 2015/16.

2. APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN (Agenda item 2)

RESOLVED that the Deputy Leader of the Council, Cllr Julia Potts, be confirmed as Vice-Chairman of the Executive for the Council year 2015/2016.

3. MINUTES (Agenda item 3)

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 31 March 2015 were confirmed and signed as a correct record.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS (Agenda item 5)

Cllr Kevin Deanus declared a pecuniary interest in respect of Agenda Item 21 – Property Matters and left the meeting during discussion and consideration of the matter.

5. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC (Agenda item 6)

The Executive received the following question from Mr Jerry Hyman in accordance with Procedure Rule 10:-

“Council Leader. My question addresses the core principles of the EIA Directive, which are,

- (i) that the EIA legislation defines planning consent as being the decision which allows the project to commence, as was confirmed authoritatively by the Grand Chamber in the White City Case, C-508/03 (*Commission v UK*) which at paragraph 100 states that,

“... it should be noted that Article 1(2) of that directive defines ‘development consent’ for the purposes of the directive as the decision of the competent authority or authorities which entitles the developer to proceed with the project.”

- (ii) that the parallel ‘Barker’ Case, C-290/03 at paragraph 48 further established the principle that the implementing decision

“... cannot extend beyond the parameters set by the principal decision ...”,  
and

- (iii) that the Directive precludes the granting of consent in the absence of a complete and up-to-date Environmental Statement, which the ‘Barker’ Case also established,

“... must be of a comprehensive nature, so as to relate to all the aspects of the project which have not yet been assessed or which require a fresh assessment.” ;

so in view of those principles, does Waverley therefore accept that when determining an Application for an implementing consent for an EIA Project, and where it is known that the Environmental Statement is flawed, outdated, incomplete and/or would enable commencement of development on terms that alter the parameters of the original approval, then the Application cannot be considered to be non-material and cannot be lawfully granted?”

The Leader of the Council responded as follows:-

“Thank you very much Mr Hyman. Well, it’s difficult to answer a hypothetical question, but I am happy to confirm that in undertaking all of its duties, the Council will meet all of the legal requirements imposed upon it”.

## **PART I - RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNCIL**

### **Background Papers**

Unless specified under an individual item, there are no background papers (as defined by Section 100D(5) of the Local Government Act 1972) relating to the reports in Part I of these minutes.

#### **6. WITLEY CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL (Agenda item 11)**

- 6.1 Witley is one of 43 Conservation Areas (CA) in Waverley. Currently eight Conservation Area Appraisals (CAAs) have been completed (Wrecclesham, Bramley, Farnham Town Centre, Wheelerstreet, Godalming Town Centre, Milford, Chiddingfold and Haslemere).

- 6.2 In 2011 the Executive agreed a programme for the commencement of CAAs. This is the sixth CAA to be completed since the programme commenced. Wheelerstreet was the pilot appraisal which was used to test the guidance set out by English Heritage. Following successful adoption of the Wheelerstreet CAA, this approach formed the basis of all future CAAs.
- 6.3 CAAs are undertaken to identify and explain the character of the Conservation Area (CA). This document will identify the specific qualities of the Witley CA and thereby help to manage change within the area. The Management Plan section also identifies a variety of projects that should be implemented to preserve and enhance the area. The need to undertake CAAs is set out in the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (section 71) and is supported through saved policy HE8 of the Waverley Local Plan.
- 6.4 It is therefore considered pertinent for Waverley to undertake CAAs with the aim to appraise the character of each CA; identify the qualities which should be preserved and enhanced, and produce a management plan to include proposals for enhancement where necessary. This process also allows a review of the boundary and an assessment of adjacent areas to evaluate whether the boundary should be extended. The CAA is attached at Annexe 1.
- 6.5 Five amendments to the conservation area boundary are proposed within the Witley CAA. The amendments have been proposed following careful consideration of English Heritage guidance, and the architectural and historic interest of each area. The boundary has not been reviewed since 1980, and there have been significant changes to Witley and CA guidance in that time. There are few opportunities to review the boundary of a CA, so it is timely to undertake this work as part of the CAA. It is unknown when the opportunity to assess the boundary will present itself again. The reasons for each amendment are fully explained in the following paragraphs.

#### Extension: Enton Mill

- 6.6 The properties in this area reflect a wide range of architectural detailing styles which are typical of the Surrey vernacular. Traditional tile hanging, timber framing, brick nogging, leaded light windows, tall red brick chimneys and galletting all add to the character of the lane. Additionally, the vestiges of the historical use of the mill found in the materials such as the weatherboarding, and the varied roof heights and detailing, such as an eyebrow dormer on Enton Mill, provide particular interest and beauty to the area. The architectural detailing of this group of properties is akin to the properties within the current CA boundary, but additionally supplements further the architectural interest of Witley in terms of traditional Surrey styles and the historic connection with the Ponds.
- 6.7 The setting of the Enton Mill area adds to the character of the properties. The ponds to the south of Enton Mill are fed by Witley Ponds, and the rural character of Witley is mirrored at Enton Mill by the surrounding trees and woodland.

Extension: Garden at Witley Lodge

- 6.8 Since the CA was designated, the curtilage of Witley Lodge has been extended, and thus the existing CA boundary now dissects the garden of Witley Lodge. The Lodge has significant architectural interest, and the inclusion of the lodge within the original designation is supported. However, to ensure there is no future confusion, the full garden is proposed to be included within the CA.

Removal: George Eliot Close (in part)

- 6.9 George Eliot Close was developed in the 1980s, after the Conservation Area was designated. The current CA boundary dissects 22 George Eliot Close, and does not include the full estate. The road is a modern development, which does not contribute to the special architectural or historic interest of the wider CA, and thus it is proposed for removal from the CA.

Removal: Tree Nursery to the rear of Churchfields and All Saints Church

- 6.10 The piece of land east of Churchfields and west of George Eliot Close has been recommended for removal from the CA following assessment of the land in accordance with guidance from English Heritage. Conservation Areas are defined as 'an area of special architectural and historical interest, the character or appearance of which is desirable to preserve or enhance'. The guidance is clear that CA designation is not generally appropriate for protecting areas of wider landscape, unless the character or appearance of the open area particularly relates to the historic fabric of which the CA designation relates.
- 6.11 The tree nursery area has been recommended for removal from the CA firstly as there is no architectural interest on the site, and there is no evidence of any historical links between the tree nursery and the wider CA to warrant the protection of an area of wider landscape. Whilst there have been suggestions that Witley Manor previously occupied this site, there is no current evidence to support this contention. SCC Archaeologists have been consulted on this point specifically and have confirmed that there is no indication in their records or resources that the area was ever anything other than open space.
- 6.12 There is limited visibility of the tree nursery from the churchyard, as there is a physical boundary defined by mature evergreen trees. Therefore the setting of the church and churchyard is not deemed to be sufficiently attributed to the tree nursery and therefore does not merit designation. The footpath which runs alongside the tree nursery is recommended to remain within the CA due to its historic link between the church, school and surrounding village outside of the CA.
- 6.13 It should also be noted that the CAA, and any proposed amendments to the boundary, is assessed taking into account the value of the CA and surrounding area in terms of architectural and historic interest. The potential for future development is not a consideration within the assessment of the

CA boundary, and it is not appropriate to designate land to protect it from future development. Indeed, CA designation does not prevent development. In this instance, the site is also within the Green Belt and the CAA will not alter this designation.

Removal: South-west corner of CA on Church Lane

- 6.14 The small area of land at the south-west corner of Church Lane is part of a larger field. English Heritage guidance is clear that CA designation is not appropriate for areas of landscape, and as this will be the sole opportunity for Waverley to assess and amend the boundary of the Conservation Area for the foreseeable future, it is recommended that the small piece of field should be removed from the Conservation Area. English Heritage has confirmed its support of the proposed amendments to the boundary.

**Consultation on the draft CAA**

- 6.15 A walkabout was conducted with Local Councillors and representatives from the Parish Council. A public consultation was undertaken between 12 December 2014 and 23 January 2015 to support the development of the CAA and to ask the public's views of the proposed extensions. Full details of the consultation, together with a summary of the comments received and the officers' response are set out in the Consultation Statement which is attached at Annexe 2.

- 6.16 69 responses were received to the draft document, of which 28 were a copy of a proforma circulated within the village. 4 additional copies of the proforma were received with no contact details. A petition was received with 156 signatures. The responses fell into one of five categories:

a) Key consultees

- English Heritage considered the appraisal a very thorough assessment of the conservation area and is supportive of the suggested boundary changes which follow the guidance in their documents.
- Witley Parish Council noted resident's concerns, but the Committee understood that these did not constitute grounds for rejecting the draft document which followed guidelines from English Heritage.
- Surrey County Council Archaeology do not object to the removal of the tree nursery from the CA after assessment of its contribution to the historical significance of the area.
- No comments were received from SCC Highways or Landscape.
- Natural England did not wish to comment on the consultation.
- The Waverley Tree Officer responded suggesting inclusion of a notable tree within the document. The CAA has been updated accordingly.

b) General comments on the CAA and Management Plan

A number of comments were received which gave additional local knowledge and information of the CA. Additionally, comments were received regarding the CAA process (the consultation procedure, the purpose of the CA and why it has been produced now), the inclusion of further vistas and plans,

specific site queries (such as Miltons Yard and 26 George Eliot Close) and clarification of Management Plan projects. Where appropriate, the report has been amended accordingly.

c) Comments on the proposed extensions to the CA

Comments were received in support and objection to the proposed extensions. Those who objected predominantly objected to all changes in the CA boundary. In terms of the specific additions to the CA, the majority of respondents supported the changes. The comments received both for and against the additions to the CA are summarised in the Consultation Statement (Annexe 2). Officers recommend that due to the special interest of these sites, the proposed additions to the CA be agreed.

d) Comments on the proposed removals from the CA

Comments were received in support and objection to the proposed removals. The majority of those commenting on the specific changes were opposed to the removal of sites from the CA. It should be noted, however, that the main concerns raised regarding the removal of land from the CA were about possible future development on the land resulting from its removal from the CA, rather than the historic or architectural special interest of the land. Whilst the concerns are acknowledged, officers remain of the view that the removal of these specific sites from the CA are justified on conservation/heritage grounds. Details of the comments received in relation to the removal of sites from the CA are included in the Consultation Statement (Annexe 2).

The potential for archaeological remains on the tree nursery site was also raised; Surrey County Council Archaeology were consulted and researched this in some detail. They concluded that there was no evidence to support this contention. Officers continue to recommend these removals based purely on conservation grounds and these areas do not accord with the criteria as set out in English Heritage guidance.

e) Suggestion for other boundary amendments

The following areas were suggested for inclusion in the CA:

- Field to west and south west of Enton Mill
- Land west of Witley Lodge
- SHLAA site 366 (Land west of George Eliot Close, Witley) and Chandlers School Playing Field
- Roke Farm
- Witley Recreation Ground and SHLAA site 618 (Land west of Petworth Road, Witley).

Response: English Heritage guidance states that CA designation is not an appropriate means of protecting the wider landscape and therefore it is not considered appropriate to include these areas within the Conservation Area.

- 6.17 The Witley CAA document identifies the specific qualities of the CA and thereby helps to manage change within the area. It has been subject to a robust consultation process to ensure residents and interested stakeholders had the opportunity to comment on and shape the final document.
- 6.18 It is proposed that the appraisal including the proposed changes to the CA boundary, be adopted as a material consideration to be used in the determination of applications for planning permission and listed building consent within the conservation area. Each of the proposed boundary changes are shown on Figure 22 (page 24) of the Witley CAA document (attached at Annexe 1).
- 6.19 Subject to adoption by the Council, the next steps are to advertise the proposed extensions and removals in the local paper and London Gazette (in accordance with the Act). In addition the Secretary of State will be notified.
- 6.20 The Executive now

**RECOMMENDS that**

1. **the Conservation Area Appraisal for Witley be adopted as a material planning consideration, to include the following amendments to the boundary:**
  - a. **inclusion of Enton Mill Area**
  - b. **inclusion of the Gardens at Witley Lodge**
  - c. **removal of the Tree Nursery to the rear of churchfields and All Saints Church**
  - d. **removal of George Eliot close (in part)**
  - e. **removal of the south-west corner of the Conservation Area on Church Lane.**

*[Reason: to recommend the adoption of a Conservation Area Appraisal as a material planning consideration].*

7. AMENDMENT TO MILFORD CONSERVATION AREA BOUNDARY (Agenda item 13)

- 7.1 Milford is one of 43 Conservation Areas (CA) in Waverley. It is one of the nine CAs where Conservation Area Appraisals (CAAs) have been adopted (Wrecclesham, Bramley, Farnham Town Centre, Wheelerstreet, Godalming Town Centre, Milford, Chiddingfold, Haslemere and Godalming Crownpits).
- 7.2 In 2011 Executive agreed a programme for the commencement of CAAs which has now been extended to 2020.
- 7.3 Following a review of all the CA boundaries on Waverley's mapping system an anomaly was identified within Milford CA. Normally it is expected that a CA boundary would follow a physical feature such as a road or a garden boundary, but in the case of Milford the boundary dissects the rear gardens of 1-15 Ockfields and the Surgery on Church Road (built post-CA designation). As a result the affected properties and most of their curtilages

are outside the CA, but a small part of each curtilage is currently shown as being within the CA. In order to rectify this, it is proposed that the boundary of the CA should be amended slightly to follow the rear boundary of the above properties and to remove the affected properties from the CA entirely.

- 7.4 A plan of the amendment to Milford Conservation Area boundary is attached at Annexe 3. A focused consultation on this amendment took place between 13 March and 24 April 2015, including those affected by the change and key stakeholders such as the Parish Council and Historic England.
- 7.5 The only comment received was from Historic England, which supports the change to the CA boundary. This minor amendment to the Milford CA boundary resolves an existing anomaly and will not have any detrimental impact on the wider CA or its purpose.
- 7.6 The Executive

**RECOMMENDS that**

- 2. the amendment to the Milford Conservation Area boundary be adopted.**

*[Reason: to agree a small amendment to the boundary of the Milford Conservation Area].*

**8. POLICY FOR DEALING WITH 'UNREASONABLY PERSISTENT' AND 'UNREASONABLE' COMPLAINTS (Agenda item 14)**

- 8.1 Waverley's current complaints policy has a section on how the Council will deal with unreasonably persistent complainants. However, following the Ombudsman's recent advice, officers believe that it would be preferable to have a 'stand-alone' policy on dealing with such complainants, which can be shared with complainants if they start to behave unreasonably, and ensure that they understand how the Council will deal with their complaint. The policy will also help staff and Members understand what actions are available to manage unreasonable behaviour, and to ensure that staff are protected from potential harassment and harm.
- 8.2 The draft policy, attached as Annexe 4, sets out the overarching principles on which the policy is based and gives examples of unreasonable actions and behaviours that could result in a complainant being regarded as being unreasonably persistent. The draft policy also identifies the issues to be considered before taking action, and options for taking action to manage the behaviour of unreasonable or unreasonably persistent complainants.
- 8.3 It is proposed that a decision to regard a complainant as being unreasonable or unreasonably persistent will be the responsibility of the Executive Director who will write to the complainant, enclosing a copy of the policy, and will explain:

- Why the decision has been taken
  - What this means for his or her contact with the Council
  - How long any restrictions on access will last; and
  - What the complainant can do to have the decision reviewed.
- 8.4 Any complaints received from the complainant that are about new issues will be treated on their merits, and consideration will be given to whether any restrictions previously applied are still appropriate, proportionate and/or necessary.
- 8.5 The draft policy was considered at the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 24 March 2015. The Committee noted the policy and asked the Corporate Complaints Officer to review the draft in the light of the issues raised by Members. In particular, it was considered that it would be helpful if the annual report on complaints handling included information on the number of 'unreasonable' complainants. The Committee also questioned whether including examples of unreasonable behaviour was helpful.
- 8.6 The draft policy has since been amended to reflect some of the issues raised by the Corporate Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The draft now contains clear advice on the options for reviewing of a decision by the Council to regard a complainant as unreasonable or unreasonable persistent, ie the complainant can raise their complaint with the relevant Ombudsman service. The draft also makes clear that the annual report to Members on complaint handling will in future include the number of complainants designated as being unreasonable or unreasonably persistent in the previous year.
- 8.7 However, the section of the draft policy that gives examples of unreasonable behaviour (para 4) has been retained. This paragraph reflects the recent guidance published by the Local Government Ombudsman referred to above, and officers believe that it will help complainants understand what aspects of their behaviour has led to the Council deciding that they are either being unreasonable or unreasonably persistent.
- 8.8 The Executive now

**RECOMMENDS that**

- 3. the draft policy for dealing with unreasonably persistent and unreasonable complainants be approved to come into effect at the earliest opportunity.**

*[Reason: to propose the introduction of a stand-alone policy for dealing with unreasonably persistent and unreasonable complainants].*

**PART II - MATTERS OF REPORT**

The background papers relating to the following items are as set out in the reports included in the original agenda papers.

9. EXECUTIVE FORWARD PROGRAMME (Agenda item 7)

RESOLVED that the forward programme of key decisions for Waverley be adopted.

10. REVENUE OUTTURN 2014/15 (GENERAL FUND AND HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT) (Agenda item 8)

RESOLVED that

1. the Revenue Outturn position for 2014/15 be noted;
2. Revenue Carry Forwards of £136,000 on the General Fund from 2014/15 to 2015/16 be approved, as detailed at Annexe 3;
3. an additional budget of £7,500 be approved from the 2014/15 General Fund underspend to meet the cost of the enhanced recycling information campaign, as set out in paragraph 16 of the report;
4. the transfer of the net General Fund underspend, after identified commitments, to the Revenue Reserve Fund be approved;
5. Revenue Carry Forwards on the HRA of £170,000 from 2014/15 to 2015/16 be approved, including £150,000 to fund the fitting of Smoke Alarms in 2015/16, as detailed at Annexe 3; and
6. officers be requested to undertake a mid-year budget review for 2015/16 and report to the Executive in October.

*[Reason: to receive the final budget report for 2014/15 setting out the outturn position].*

11. CAPITAL PROGRAMME OUTTURN 2014/15 (GENERAL FUND AND HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT) (Agenda item 9)

RESOLVED that:-

1. the Capital Outturn position for 2014/15 be noted;
2. the transfer of budgets totalling £963,895, as shown in Annexe 1, from the 2014/15 General Fund Capital Programme to the 2015/16 General Fund Capital Programme be approved;
3. the transfer of budgets totalling £1,273,125 (in addition to the £550,000 already approved) be approved, as detailed in Annexe 2 from the 2014/15 HRA Capital Programme to the 2015/16 HRA Capital Programme;
4. the transfer of budgets totalling £4,858,809 be approved, as detailed at Annexe 3, from the 2014/15 New Affordable Homes programme into 2015/16;

5. the transfer of budgets totalling £55,000 be approved, as detailed at Annexe 4 from the 2014/15 Stock Remodelling programme into 2015/16; and
6. the capital financing set out in paragraph 16 of the report be approved.

*[Reason: to receive the outturn for the capital programme in 2014/15 and agree rescheduled expenditure and minor slippage into 2015/16].*

12. AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND INFRASTRUCTURE CONTRIBUTION THRESHOLDS (Agenda item 10)

RESOLVED that:

1. the changes in the National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) on seeking contributions for affordable housing and tariff-style planning obligations be noted; and
2. the approach to apply a lower threshold for affordable housing or tariff style contributions on sites within the AONB be agreed.

*[Reason: to report on changes to Government policy guidance and choose the appropriate threshold for affordable housing contributions]*

13. THE ELSTEAD AND WEYBURN NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA APPLICATION (Agenda item 12)

RESOLVED that the neighbourhood area application from Elstead Parish Council be approved for the purposes of the Elstead and Weyburn Neighbourhood Plan.

*[Reason: to agree the neighbourhood area that the neighbourhood plan should cover]*

14. PROPERTY MATTER - EASEMENT OF ACCESS AT RICARDO COURT, BRAMLEY (Agenda item 15)

RESOLVED that an easement of access be granted over Waverley-owned land, as shown on the plan annexed to the report, on the terms and conditions set out in the (Exempt) Annexe, and with other terms and conditions to be negotiated by the Estates and Valuation Manager.

*[Reason: to seek authorisation for an easement of access across Council land]*

15. APPOINTMENT OF EMPLOYER'S NEGOTIATING TEAM 2015/2016 (Agenda item 16)

RESOLVED that the following members be appointed as the Employers' Negotiating Team on the Waverley Joint Negotiating Committee for Pay and Conditions for 2015/2016:-

Cllr Robert Knowles (Leader)  
Cllr Pat Frost  
Cllr Peter Isherwood

Cllr Julia Potts (Deputy Leader)  
Cllr Stefan Reynolds  
Cllr Simon Thornton

16. APPOINTMENTS TO SURREY COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE TASK GROUPS 2015/16 (Agenda item 17)

RESOLVED that the following appointments to the Task/Sub-Groups of the Waverley Local Committee be agreed:

Farnham Task Group (3 members)

Cllrs Wyatt Ramsdale, Julia Potts and Chris Storey

Godalming, Milford and Witley Task Group (2 members)

Cllrs Simon Thornton and Denis Leigh

Haslemere and Western Villages Task Group (2 members)

Cllrs Brian Adams and Stephen Mulliner

Cranleigh and Eastern Villages Task Group (2 members)

Cllrs Simon Inchbald and Mary Foryszewski

Youth Task Group (2 members)

Cllrs Carole King and Jeanette Stennett

17. APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES 2015-2017 (Agenda item 18)

RESOLVED that the appointments to Outside Bodies for 2015-2017 be agreed, as attached at Annexe 5, for information.

18. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S ACTIONS (Agenda item 19)

The Executive noted the following actions taken by the Executive Director after consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman since its last meeting:

i. A3 Litter Picking

To authorise an urgent litter-pick of the verges of the stretch of the A3 through Waverley for which the Council is responsible, at a cost of £17,000 to be met from a virement from the unused inflation provision for 2015/16.

ii. Riverside Improvement Works

To authorise the following improvements to the Riverside Car Park, Farnham:-

- a. construction of four speed humps to be installed at intervals on the main roadway of Riverside Car Park, to reduce the possibility of cars travelling too fast in an area in which pedestrians will be present;

- b. the construction of wooden knee-rails between parking bays to lessen the ability for anti-social driving in large open spaces; and
- c. the provision and installation of CCTV cameras.

The costs of these works being £9,400 to be met from the underspend on the capital programme.

iii. Museum of Farnham

To authorise urgent repair works to the brickwork and carry out a survey of the front façade of the Museum of Farnham at an estimated cost of £9,500, to be met from the urgent Capital Schemes Budget in 2015/16.

19. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC (Agenda item 20)

At 7.14 pm it was

RESOLVED that pursuant to Procedure Rule 20, and in accordance with Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following item on the grounds that it is likely, in view of the nature of the business to be transacted or the nature of the proceedings, that if members of the public were present during the item, there would be disclosure to them of exempt information (as defined by Section 100I of the Act) of the description specified in Paragraph 3 of Part I of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, namely:-

Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information).

20. PROPERTY MATTERS (Agenda item 21)

RESOLVED that the recommendations set out in the (Exempt) Annexe to these minutes be approved.

**The meeting commenced at 6.45 pm and concluded at 7.16 pm**

**Chairman**