

LISBURN & CASTLEREAGH CITY COUNCIL

Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held in the Council Chamber and in Remote Locations on Monday, 2 December, 2024 at 10.09 am

PRESENT IN CHAMBER:

Alderman M Gregg (Chair)

Councillor S Burns (Vice-Chair)

Aldermen O Gawith and J Tinsley

Councillors P Catney, D J Craig, U Mackin, G Thompson and N Trimble

IN ATTENDANCE:

Director of Regeneration and Growth
Head of Planning & Capital Development
Senior Planning Officers (MB, PMcF and LMcC)
Member Services Officers (CR and CH)

Mr B Martyn (Cleaver Fulton Rankin) – Legal Advisor

Commencement of Meeting

At the commencement of the meeting, the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, welcomed those present to the Planning Committee. He pointed out that, unless the item on the agenda was considered under confidential business, this meeting would be audio recorded. He went on to outline the evacuation procedures in the case of an emergency.

1. **Apologies**

It was agreed to accept apologies for non-attendance at the meeting on behalf of Councillors D Bassett and A Martin. It was noted that the Vice-Chair, Councillor S Burns, would be arriving late to the meeting.

2. **Declarations of Interest**

The following declarations of interest were made:

- Alderman J Tinsley, in respect of application LA05/2021/0772/F, as he had been contacted by the applicant regarding speaking rights. Alderman Tinsley had stated that he was a member of the Planning Committee and had provided only general guidance; and
- Alderman J Tinsley, in respect of application LA05/2023/0932/F, as he had been contacted by the applicant regarding the procedure for having the application called in. Alderman Tinsley had stated that he was a member of the Planning Committee and had provided only general guidance.

3. Minutes of Meeting of Planning Committee held on 4 November, 2024

It was proposed by Councillor G Thompson, seconded by Alderman J Tinsley and agreed that the minutes of the meetings of Committee held on 4 November, 2024 be confirmed and signed.

4. Report from the Head of Planning & Capital Development

4.1 Schedule of Applications

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, advised that there were 1 major and 5 local applications on the schedule for consideration at the meeting, with 2 applications having been withdrawn from the schedule.

4.1.1 Applications to be Determined

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

Alderman O Gawith arrived to the meeting at 10.14 am.

(i) LA05/2022/1135/F – Retention of change of use from single dwelling to serviced accommodation at 72 Antrim Road, Lisnagarvey, Lisburn

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

The Committee received the following to speak in opposition to the application:

- Ms U McCloy, accompanied by Mrs W McConnell; and
- Councillor N Parker.

A number of Members' queries were addressed by the speakers.

A number of Members' queries were responded to by Planning Officers and the Environmental Health Manager (Acting), who was in attendance for consideration of this application.

Debate

During debate:

- Councillor D J Craig referred to T0U7 (a), which related to meeting the needs of those whose mobility was impaired, and stated that it was a very liberal interpretation of policy to consider the needs of a person who was mobility-impaired to be met by the fact that the property was level with the footpath. There was no access through the door for someone in a wheelchair, no ramp or anything to provide support. Within the property

(i) LA05/2022/1135/F – Retention of change of use from single dwelling to serviced accommodation at 72 Antrim Road, Lisnagarvey, Lisburn (Contd)

there was no provision for anyone with impaired mobility as there was no downstairs toilet or bedroom and no stairlift to assist with access to the first floor. In respect of TOU7 (b), which related to landscaping arrangements being of a high quality and promoting sustainability and biodiversity, Councillor Craig stated that the photographs provided showed an area that was very poorly maintained with regard to the gardens and aspects to the rear. Councillor Craig was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission;

- Alderman O Gawith also referred to TOU7 and stated he believed Officers, during the course of questions, had accepted that this proposal did not entirely meet the needs of people whose mobility was impaired and did not currently promote sustainability and biodiversity. As he did not consider the proposal to meet policy TOU7, Alderman Gawith was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission;
- Councillor N Trimble stated that the proposal did not meet policy TOU7. In addition to the comments made by the previous speakers, part (h), which related to not harming the amenity of nearby residents, was not met. He had heard significant evidence of the impact on neighbours' amenities. TOU1 stipulated the requirement for high quality design and high quality service provision. Councillor Trimble stated that there were no suggestions of changing or upscaling the property in any way to make it appropriate for use as tourist accommodation. He stated that policy TRA2 required that the proposal must not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of vehicles. Councillor Trimble referred to comments made by neighbours about being blocked into their driveways by guests using the accommodation but unable to use the associated garage. This was an impact on the flow of vehicles. Whilst not compelled to, the fact that the applicant had not attended the meeting to advocate for the application did not give Councillor Trimble confidence that this was a good proposal. Councillor Trimble was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission;
- Councillor G Thompson stated that she did not consider the proposal to meet TOU7 (a) in terms of accessibility for those with impaired mobility, given that they had no access to toilet or sleeping facilities. The proposal did not meet TOU7 (b) for the reasons already outlined, nor did it meet TOU7 (h) in terms of noise nuisance and parking issues. Councillor Thompson was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission;
- Councillor P Catney stated that TOU7 (a) was not met in that someone with a disability had no toilet facilities within the property. He concurred with the comments made by previous speakers and was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission;
- Alderman J Tinsley referred to TOU7 (a) and the comments by the Head of Planning & Capital Development that that related to transport means and ease of access to the property. He stated that this application was finely balanced and there were many pros and cons. Whilst he was concerned with what had been presented regarding antisocial elements, considering purely the planning policies and reports he had read, and the fact that a Service Management Plan would be put in place if the application was

(i) LA05/2022/1135/F – Retention of change of use from single dwelling to serviced accommodation at 72 Antrim Road, Lisnagarvey, Lisburn (Contd)

approved, Alderman Tinsley was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission;

- Councillor U Mackin was not convinced that policy TRA2 was met. A photograph had been shown of a car parked outside the property and it was either just at the end of double yellow lines or on double yellow lines. He had listened to the lived experience of neighbours and stated that he would not wish this accommodation to be next to his property. Councillor Mackin did not consider the proposal to meet TOU7, with there being no toilet or sleeping facilities available for disabled persons. He was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission; and
- the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, stated that the Planning Committee did not welcome retrospective applications, but the benefit on this occasion was that Members had heard the lived experience of the impact on local residents. Whilst the Service Management Plan suggested may go some way to mitigating that, it was a case of retrospective action – the residents reporting issues and the applicant having to deal with those issues and, as this was a short-term residency accommodation, it could happen quite often. Alderman Gregg did not consider policy TOU1 to be met in that it did not respect the site context. In respect of TOU7 (a), Officers' interpretation was that that related to transportation and access to transportation, but it did not explicitly say that. Alderman Gregg's interpretation was that it also included the site itself and the use of it. In respect of TOU7 (c), relating to appropriate boundary treatment, the Committee had heard the impact this was having on neighbours. There was no boundary treatment or means of enclosure provided, with overlooking having an impact on neighbours' privacy. TOU7 (g), which related to compatibility with surrounding land uses, was not met. This was a mid-terrace house in a row of 4. In respect of TOU7 (h), this proposal clearly did harm the amenity of nearby residents. Alderman Gregg was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission.

Vote

On a vote being taken, it was agreed not to adopt the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission, the voting being:

In favour: Alderman J Tinsley (1)

Against: Councillor P Catney, Councillor D J Craig, Alderman A Gawith, Councillor U Mackin, Councillor G Thompson, Councillor N Trimble and Chair, Alderman M Gregg (7)

Given that the Officer recommendation to approve planning permission had fallen, the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, stated that a new proposal was required. It was proposed by Councillor P Catney and seconded by Councillor N Trimble that planning application LA05/2022/1135/F be refused.

- (i) LA05/2022/1135/F – Retention of change of use from single dwelling to serviced accommodation at 72 Antrim Road, Lisnagarvey, Lisburn (Contd)

It was proposed by Councillor N Trimble, seconded by Councillor P Catney and, on a vote being taken, agreed that the application be refused, the voting being as follows:

In favour: Councillor P Catney, Councillor D J Craig, Alderman A Gawith, Councillor U Mackin, Councillor G Thompson, Councillor N Trimble and Chair, Alderman M Gregg (7)

Against: Alderman J Tinsley (1)

In agreeing to refuse the application, the following reasons were offered:

- the application was contrary to policy TOU7 on a number of points. One of the requirements of TOU7 (a) was that the overall design meet the needs of people whose mobility was impaired. This proposal failed to demonstrate it was suitable for anyone whose mobility was impaired, in that it did not have a bedroom or bathroom on the ground floor. Its primary function as tourist accommodation could not be met in any way from the property as it was currently;
- the application did not meet policy TOU7 (b) as nothing had been demonstrated that the property would be modified or enhanced in any way and would not, in the Committee's estimation, be a high quality offering;
- the application did not meet policy TOU7 (c) as there was no boundary treatment or means of enclosure provided;
- the application did not meet policy TOU7 (h), given that extensive evidence had been provided by neighbours citing multiple instances when their amenities had been directly impacted – in terms of a degree of overlooking, shared access to the rear, parking and access being impacted by the use of this property as a tourist accommodation and indeed elements of antisocial behaviour and trespass.

Councillor P Catney also pointed out that the requirements of the Tourism (NI) Act relating to self-catering accommodation were not met by this application.

It was proposed by Councillor G Thompson, seconded by Councillor N Trimble and agreed that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning & Capital Development to formulate the precise wording of the reasons for refusal.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, declared the meeting adjourned at this point for a comfort break (12.05 pm).

Resumption of Meeting

The meeting was resumed at 12.20 pm.

- (ii) LA05/2022/0831/F – Proposed retention of recently constructed agricultural building on land adjacent to 112 Back Road, Drumbo

The Senior Planning Officer (PMcF) presented the above application as outlined within the circulated report.

The Committee received Mr N Reid to speak in support of the application.

Alderman J Tinsley referred to the Planning Officer's report that indicated that the NIEA Water Management Unit had been consulted and had requested further information. Whilst the agent had been emailed in this regard in March 2024, the information had not been submitted to date. Mr Reid stated that he had not been aware of a request for further information prior to today's meeting. That being the case, it was proposed by Alderman J Tinsley, seconded by Councillor D J Craig and unanimously agreed that this application be deferred for one month to allow the information to be submitted.

- (iii) LA05/2023/0632/F – Proposed farm dwelling and garage at 35a Lurganure Road, Lisburn

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

No-one was registered to speak on this application.

A number of Members' queries were responded to by Planning Officers.

Debate

During debate:

- Councillor N Trimble stated that, having looked on Google Street View, he agreed that the access did seem a bit substandard and quite congested. He did think there was potential mileage in the future to suggest that that access was closed and the other one used. On Google Street View the agricultural buildings could not be seen at all so he did not consider it had a huge visual impact. Councillor Trimble was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission.

Vote

Having considered the information provided within the report of the Planning Officer, the Committee agreed unanimously to adopt the recommendation to refuse this application.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, declared the meeting adjourned at this point for lunch (12.55 pm).

Resumption of Meeting

The meeting was resumed at 1.35 pm.

Councillor S Burns arrived to the meeting at this point.

- (iv) LA05/2021/0772/F – Proposed new dwelling in compliance with Policy COU2 on land between 56a-60 Halfpenny Gate Road, Moira, Craigavon

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, stated that Members had just now been provided with an envelope containing confidential information in respect of this application. The information related to medical history and Alderman Gregg pointed out to Members that it should not be repeated in the public forum.

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

The Committee received Ms B Johnston to speak in opposition to the application and a number of Members' queries were addressed.

The Committee received the following to speak in support of the application:

- Mr C Crossan, accompanied by the applicant; and
- Mr D Honeyford MLA.

A number of Members' queries were addressed by the speakers.

A number of Members' queries were responded to by Planning Officers.

Debate

During debate:

- Alderman J Tinsley stated that the site visit had been helpful to assist in understanding the cluster. He did have a problem with the requirement for the site to be bounded on both sides with other development, given that there was a dwelling 6 metres away one side but the school on another side was substantially further away at 28 metres. Alderman Tinsley was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission;
- Councillor N Trimble stated that this application was finely balanced. With regard to policy COU2, he considered a cluster did exist at this location and that it appeared as a visual entity. In relation to the site being bounded on two sides, the agent had referred to development to the north and east and to the school. This was a reasonable argument but Councillor Trimble was unsure given that the school was located across the road. However, the school could be considered as the focal point of the cluster and he deemed it reasonable that if the site was adjacent to the focal point, it was bound in the cluster. Councillor Trimble considered that the application did meet with the spirit of policy COU2 and, on a technicality, the argument could be made that it met the letter of it. It was rounding off a cluster by the general

- (iv) LA05/2021/0772/F – Proposed new dwelling in compliance with Policy COU2 on land between 56a-60 Halfpenny Gate Road, Moira, Craigavon (Contd)

look of it. Councillor Trimble was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission;

- Councillor D J Craig stated that the site visit had been useful. In relation to the cluster, there had been many viewpoints from which he had been able to see all of the buildings. The boundaries of this application were the problem. Having seen the site itself, it was very clear that the school was quite a distance away from what would be perceived as the boundary; it was 4 times further away than the other existing boundary and had a field, a road and a playground in between. Councillor Craig was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission;
- Alderman O Gawith stated that he did not consider the site to be bounded on two sides. The school building was too far away to create a boundary in his view and it was not then forming part of a cluster, rather it was adding to an end of a cluster. He acknowledged that medical information had been submitted and, whilst he sympathised with the applicant, it did not mean it was an absolute necessity that this dwelling be built at the location applied for. Alderman Gawith was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission; and
- the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, concurred with Alderman Gawith. Whilst he sympathised in terms of the medical information supplied with regard to policy COU6, he did not consider there was enough evidence to outweigh the policy decisions in front of the Committee. Building on Traditions showed a scenario extremely similar to this application, where part of the cluster was on the other side of the road, and it would not be considered to meet with policy.

Vote

On a vote being taken, it was agreed to adopt the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission, the voting being:

In favour: Councillor S Burns, Councillor D J Craig, Alderman O Gawith, Councillor U Mackin, Alderman J Tinsley, Councillor G Thompson and Chair, Alderman M Gregg (7)

Against: Councillor P Catney and Councillor N Trimble (2)

At this point, the confidential information circulated to Members earlier was retrieved.

- (v) LA05/2021/0033/F - Proposed mixed-use development comprising 31 no. Class B2 & B4 industrial/employment units (4,320 sqm in total) and 95 semi-detached and detached residential dwellings with associated private amenity provision; public open spaces; associated car parking; landscaping; creation of new accesses from Carrowreagh Road and Ballyoran Lane with associated works to the public road; and other ancillary development at Lands formerly occupied by the Rolls Royce factory north of Upper Newtownards, south of Inspire Business Centre, east of Ballyoran Lane and west of Carrowreagh Road, Dundonald

The Head of Planning & Capital Development advised Members that this application had first been presented to the Planning Committee in February 2024. The Planning Officer who had prepared the report was no longer an employee of the Council. In the intervening period of time, Officers had continued to engage with the applicant in relation to the drafting of a Section 76 Planning Agreement; no planning decision could be made until that Agreement was finalised. During this period, an objection had been received in March 2024. The report was brought back to the Committee now as that representation had been further considered. Whilst Mr P McFadden, Senior Planning Officer, would be taking this application forward, the Head of Planning & Capital Development had drafted the addendum report as the late representation addressed a point that was highlighted as a consequence of his answer to a question at the previous Committee meeting.

The Senior Planning Officer (PMcF) presented the above application as outlined within the circulated report.

Mr G Dodds was in attendance and addressed a number of queries raised by Members.

A number of Members' queries were responded to by Planning Officers.

Debate

During debate:

- Councillor D J Craig stated that, whilst he would welcome it, common sense told him that there would never be 100% employment back on this site. The fact that there would be 40% employment land retained here would hopefully mitigate some of the original objections to the proposal. Councillor Craig was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission;
- Councillor S Burns stated that this site had lain vacant for a long period of time and had antisocial behaviour associated with it. A balance had been made of 40% employment and 60% residential. Councillor Burns was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission; and
- the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, stated his surprise that the application was before the Committee again. He did not consider that any of the representations put forward for the application had changed. He was also surprised that a new PAN had not been done for this change of application. Many of the local comments in favour of the application had been in respect of the removal of the building that was attracting antisocial behaviour – that

- (v) LA05/2021/0033/F - Proposed mixed-use development comprising 31 no. Class B2 & B4 industrial/employment units (4,320 sqm in total) and 95 semi-detached and detached residential dwellings with associated private amenity provision; public open spaces; associated car parking; landscaping; creation of new accesses from Carrowreagh Road and Ballyoran Lane with associated works to the public road; and other ancillary development at Lands formerly occupied by the Rolls Royce factory north of Upper Newtownards, south of Inspire Business Centre, east of Ballyoran Lane and west of Carrowreagh Road, Dundonald
(Contd)

building was now gone and the level of antisocial behaviour had reduced. A lot of other favourable comments had related to the petrol station and retail units, but those were no longer part of the application. Alderman Gregg was surprised that NI Water had not been consulted, given that its approval was from 2 years ago and was only valid for 18 months. The last time the application was before the Committee, it had been Alderman Gregg's understanding that Officers were impressing that this was on unzoned land which was how housing could be put on as far as ED7 was concerned. Now Officers were advising that the land had been used for employment in BUAP and in draft BMAP it was still zoned for employment. Alderman Gregg did not see how the application could possibly comply with ED7 as zoned land did not allow for the provision of housing. He referred to the Officer's report stating that the loss of this land would not prejudice the amount of land within the Council area. However, the response from Invest NI was completely different, stating that it would completely imbalance the distribution of land in the Council area and allowing mixed use and housing development on this plot of land would be premature. Its opinion was as Alderman Gregg's – that any change of zoning should be done within the local policy plan. There could be any number of applications in front of the Committee for changing zones or seeking transitional arrangements as developers did not want to wait. Alderman Gregg stated that it would be great to see this land developed as employment land, or even a majority of employment, as that was what Dundonald needed. This proposal took away the potential for jobs in the area. Alderman Gregg was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission.

Vote

On a vote being taken, it was agreed to adopt the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve planning permission, the voting being:

In favour: Councillor S Burns, Councillor P Catney, Councillor D J Craig, Alderman O Gawith, Alderman J Tinsley, Councillor G Thompson and Councillor N Trimble (7)

Against: Councillor U Mackin and Chair, Alderman M Gregg (2)

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, declared the meeting adjourned at this point for a comfort break (3.35 pm). Councillor N Trimble left the meeting at this point.

Resumption of Meeting

The meeting was resumed at 3.44 pm.

- (vi) LA05/2023/0932/F – Three pigeon sheds (retrospective) at 21 Little Wehman, Moira

The Senior Planning Officer (PMcF) presented the above application as outlined within the circulated report.

The Committee received Mr G Tumelty to speak in support of the application and a number of Members' queries were addressed.

A number of Members' queries were responded to by Planning Officers and the Environmental Health Manager (Acting), who was in attendance for consideration of this application.

Following discussion, it was proposed by Alderman J Tinsley and seconded by Alderman O Gawith that the application be deferred to allow for further negotiation around steps that could be taken to mitigate issues, eg. raising the sheds off the ground. The proposal was agreed on a vote being taken, the voting being as follows:

In favour: Councillor S Burns, Councillor D J Craig, Alderman O Gawith, Councillor U Mackin, Alderman J Tinsley and Councillor G Thompson (6)

Against: Councillor P Catney and Chair, Alderman M Gregg (2)

Councillor U Mackin left the meeting at this point (4.30 pm).

- 4.2 Proposed stabling and maintenance rail depot for ballast material, maintenance buildings and associated staff accommodation and ancillary works on lands at Ballinderry Road (east of Moira Road and south of existing railway line)

The Head of Planning & Capital Development stated that he had received an email earlier in the day advising that the pre-application community consultation events associated with the above had been postponed from 15 January, 2025 to 19 February, 2025. Adequate notification would take place before the revised date, as per Statute, and an update would be provided at a subsequent stage. The Head of Planning & Capital Development confirmed that the submission had been made in accordance with legislation; however, there must be at least 12 weeks between notice of the PAN and the submitted application. As the consultation

4.2 Proposed stabling and maintenance rail depot for ballast material, maintenance buildings and associated staff accommodation and ancillary works on lands at Ballinderry Road (east of Moira Road and south of existing railway line) (Contd)

events had been delayed for 4 weeks, the Head of Planning & Capital Development could not stand over the date specified in his report that the application was likely to come to Committee; the earliest would be after the consultation events.

It was proposed by Councillor D J Craig, seconded by Councillor P Catney and agreed to note information in respect of the above Pre-Application Notice and that it be submitted in accordance with the relevant section of the legislation and related guidance.

4.3 Statutory Performance Indicators – October 2024

It was proposed by Councillor P Catney, seconded by Alderman O Gawith and agreed that information relating to Statutory Performance Indicators for October 2024 be noted.

At this stage, the Legal Advisor having advised that he had to leave the meeting, the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, asked if any Members had items of a confidential nature to raise. No matters were raised. Alderman Gregg thanked the Legal Advisor for his attendance and wished him a Happy Christmas. He left the meeting at 4.39 pm.

4.4 Appeal Decision – LA05/2021/1248/F

It was proposed by Councillor D J Craig, seconded by Alderman O Gawith and agreed that the report and decision of the Planning Appeals Commission in respect of the above appeal be noted.

4.5 Appeal Decision – LA05/2020/0011/O

It was proposed by Councillor D J Craig, seconded by Councillor G Thompson and agreed that the report and decision of the Planning Appeals Commission in respect of the above appeal be noted.

4.6 Appeal Decision – LA05/2023/0024/F

It was proposed by Councillor P Catney, seconded by Alderman O Gawith and agreed that the report and decision of the Planning Appeals Commission in respect of the above appeal be noted.

4.7 Notification by Telecommunication Operator(s) of Intention to Utilise Permitted Development Rights

It was proposed by Councillor D J Craig, seconded by Councillor G Thompson and agreed to note from the report, information regarding notification by telecommunication operators of intention to utilise Permitted Development Rights at a number of locations in the Council area.

5. Any Other Business

5.1 Date of Next Meeting

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, advised that the next meeting of the Planning Committee would be held on Monday, 6 January, 2025.

Alderman Gregg wished everyone a very Happy Christmas. The Head of Planning & Capital Development also wished Members a Happy Christmas and thanked them for their participation in meetings throughout the year.

5.2 January Reports

The Head of Planning & Capital Development advised of two reports that would be presented to the January meeting of the Committee – (a) an update on judicial review proceedings; and (b) a paper relating to changes to the Protocol for the Operation of the Planning Committee.

5.3 May Meeting of the Planning Committee

The May 2025 meeting of the Planning Committee was due to be held on Monday 5th; however, as this a bank holiday, it was agreed that the meeting would take place on Monday 12th.

Conclusion of the Meeting

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, thanked those present for their attendance.

There being no further business, the meeting was terminated at 4.45 pm.

Chair/Mayor