



East Cambridgeshire District Council

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee

Held at The Grange, Nutholt Lane, Ely, CB7 4EE at 2:00pm on
Wednesday 10 June 2026

Present:

Cllr Chika Akinwale
Cllr Christine Colbert
Cllr Lavinia Edwards
Cllr Martin Goodearl (Vice-Chair)
Cllr Julia Huffer
Cllr Bill Hunt (Chair)
Cllr Alan Sharp
Cllr Ross Trent
Cllr John Trapp
Cllr Lucius Vellacott

Officers:

Patrick Adams – Senior Democratic Services Officer
Kevin Breslin – Locum Planning Lawyer
Sophie Brown – Planning Team Leader
Rachel Gordon – Planning Team Leader
Daisy Hill – Senior Planning Officer
Shayleen Kirkland – Locum Planning Lawyer
Catherine Looper – Major Projects Planning Officer
David Morren – Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager
James Stringer – Highways Agency
Gavin Taylor – Major Projects Officer

In attendance:

ECDC Comms
Maria Socea – Bottisham Parish Councillor
Members of the public

14. Apologies and substitutions

Apologies for absence were received from Cllr Christine Ambrose Smith, Cllr Mark Goldsack, Cllr James Lay and Cllr Christine Whelan. Cllr Chika Akinwale substituted for Cllr Whelan, Cllr Julia Huffer substituted for Cllr Ambrose Smith and Cllr Lucius Vellacott substituted for Cllr Goldsack.

15. Declarations of interest

None.

16. Chair's announcements

The Chair explained that agenda item 7, Planning Performance Report – April 2026, had been deferred from the previous meeting on 3 June 2026.

17. 25/01206/RMM – Land at High Flyer Farm, Ely

Catherine Looper, Major Projects Planning Officer, presented a report (AB14, previously circulated) which recommended approval for a reserved matters application for layout, scale, appearance, access and landscaping for 536 dwellings (Phase 3) following outline planning permission 11/01077/EDO.

Tom Gillum-Webb made a statement, as an objector. He explained that he lived on Redman Close, which was close to the proposed development. Protected trees were on his property and when an extension to his home was built, he was prohibited from putting any building materials within 10 metres of the tree. However, he stated that the application proposed paving and tarmacking over the root protected area and he was concerned that this would damage his trees. He stated that pedestrians and cyclists currently used the track to the High Flyer Farm and he was concerned that increasing vehicles on this track would be a health and safety risk.

Councillors were invited to ask questions to Tom Gillum-Webb.

In reply to Cllr John Trapp, Tom Gillum-Webb stated that he would be surprised if his were the only trees affected by the development. He explained that tractors and Heavy Goods Vehicles currently used the private road to High Flyer Farm and he was concerned about cyclists and pedestrians using this route.

In reply to Cllr Christine Colbert, Tom Gillum-Webb explained that his property was located half-way between the entrance to the private High Flyer Road and the old RAF base.

David Bainbridge made a statement on behalf of the applicant. He expressed his gratitude to officers for their assistance during the application process and for their detailed report. He stated that the outline application had been drawn up 11 years ago. The three house builders had 17 years' experience and a five star rating on house building. The development would include fully equipped play areas and made good use of open space. It would deliver much needed housing to the area. The 20 planning conditions had been agreed with officers and would be adhered to. An extensive pre-application meeting had been held with the City of Ely Council. The access route to the cottages by High Flyer Farm would remain. An aboral impact assessment had been carried out to ensure that protected trees would not be harmed. He thanked officers and hoped that the Committee would agree the application.

Councillors were invited to ask questions to David Bainbridge.

In reply to Cllr Chika Akinwale, David Bainbridge stated that the three play areas were larger than the minimum requirements. They would be wheelchair accessible and include items of inclusive play. In reply to Cllr Akinwale's question regarding the provision of wet rooms, he explained that 23% of the properties would meet the criteria within the Habitineg Lifetime Homes Standard, regarding the need for adaptable homes.

In reply to Cllr Chika Akinwale, David Bainbridge explained that providing 1 visitor space per 5.3 dwellings, whilst not ideal, satisfied policy COM8.

In reply to Cllr Lucius Vellacott, David Bainbridge believed that the loss of watercourse habitat could be minimised. In addition, whilst the Biodiversity Net Gain target was not mandatory, the decision had been taken to meet the target as if it was mandatory.

In reply to Cllr John Trapp, David Bainbridge stated that no alternative access route to the site would be provided, the existing route to the farm would be used.

In reply to Cllr Alan Sharp, David Bainbridge explained that discussions with the County Council were still ongoing regarding the provision of a primary school, which would be required when the 536 homes were occupied.

In reply to Cllr Christine Colbert, David Bainbridge confirmed that the tree on the existing private road would not be disturbed.

The Chair invited comments from officers.

Kevin Drane, Trees Officer, stated that the roots of the tree on Redman Close only reached the edge of the construction area, as existing structures had restricted their growth. This meant that development was seen as acceptable.

James Stringer, Highways Authority, stated that the track providing vehicular access to the existing cottage would remain.

Councillors were invited to ask questions to the officers.

David Morren, Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager, stated that whilst more shops were required, these would be located outside the site boundary and so were not part of this application.

The Committee moved into debate.

Cllr Julia Huffer stated that she was impressed with the application and its use of open space. She proposed that the Committee approve the application. Cllr Christine Colbert agreed, stating that she approved of the sensory provision in the play area. She seconded the proposal to approve the application.

Cllr John Trapp suggested that the play areas should be more centrally located and he expressed concern regarding pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles all using the same access road.

Cllr Bill Hunt estimated that the track to High Flyer farm had been there for the last 200 years and was part of the area's history. He felt reassured by the report from the Trees Officer. He had every confidence that the Planning Department would ensure that the conditions were met.

Cllr Alan Sharp hoped that officers would prevent any damage to protected trees and make every effort to ensure that a primary school was built in good time. He supported the application.

Cllr Julia Huffer proposed and Cllr Christine Colbert seconded the recommendation in the report with the updated plans condition. A vote was taken and with 9 votes in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention, it was agreed to

resolve to:

approve the application, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1.

18. 25/01348/FUM – Bens Yard, Soham Road, Stuntney

Rachel Gordon, Planning Team Leader, presented a report (AB15, previously circulated) on an application for a change of use to allow retail of goods, sale of food, hot drinks and other services and the resurfacing of an overflow car park. She explained that in Condition 6, E(c)(iii) the words needed to be amended from "Monday to Saturday" to "Daily".

Alistair Morbey made the following statement on behalf of the applicant.

"My family are local, multi-generational farmers who have managed the 1,500-acre Stuntney Estate for many years. Traditionally, the estate has produced a wide range of crops, including potatoes, wheat, oilseed rape and sugar beet.

"However, like many farming businesses, we recognised that agriculture alone could no longer provide sufficient financial security for the long-term future of the estate. We therefore looked to diversify and create a sustainable new source of income that would support both the estate and the wider local economy.

"Ben's Yard was born from that vision. From the outset, our aim has been to create a vibrant, retail-led mixed-use village that offers quality, choice and convenience, while complementing rather than competing with nearby town centres. We have always sought to provide a distinct visitor experience that attracts people to the area and supports the wider district.

“The development was entirely funded by our family, and since opening in June 2023 we have continued to own and actively manage the site, ensuring high standards are maintained and that Ben’s Yard remains a destination we can all be proud of.

“As with many new enterprises, the first few years have provided valuable lessons. While Ben’s Yard has attracted many successful businesses, we have also experienced challenges, particularly with smaller start-up tenants. Several businesses have unfortunately been unable to survive beyond their first few years, resulting in vacant units, financial losses and reduced confidence among both visitors and prospective occupiers.

“We remain fully committed to Ben’s Yard and to its role as an important employment hub, providing jobs and opportunities for local people. We continue to invest heavily in marketing, events and activities that drive footfall and support our tenants.

“However, experience has shown that some of the restrictions attached to the original planning permission have limited our ability to respond quickly to changing market conditions. On several occasions, we have had to turn away high-quality businesses that would have strengthened the offer at Ben’s Yard and brought further investment into East Cambridgeshire.

“For the past year, we have worked closely and constructively with your planning officers to identify the changes needed to secure the long-term success of the development.

“Importantly, we are not proposing any significant physical expansion of Ben’s Yard. The appearance and scale of the development will remain largely unchanged.

“What we are seeking is greater flexibility to:

- respond more effectively to changing market demands;
- attract larger, high-quality retailers and businesses that can strengthen the overall offer; and
- make more efficient use of existing floorspace through the introduction of mezzanine levels where appropriate.

“These changes will help ensure that Ben’s Yard remains vibrant, occupied and economically sustainable, protecting local jobs, encouraging further investment and securing the future of this important rural diversification project.

“Finally, I would like to thank the planning officers for the considerable time and attention they have given to this application. Their assessment has been thorough and constructive, and we are grateful for their support.

“We respectfully ask that you support this proposal. Approval will allow us to move forward immediately with prospective tenants, reduce vacancy levels and continue building a successful destination that benefits our existing businesses, local residents and the wider district.”

Councillors were invited to ask questions to Alistair Morbey.

In reply to Cllr Chika Akinwale, Alistair Morbey stated that car park marshals would be appointed when there were special events, otherwise car parking would be managed through the existing car park provision.

In reply to Cllr John Trapp, Alistair Morbey explained that the site had employed 50 people since 2023 but did have a peak of 100 employees and they wanted to maximise employment. He added that there were very few near neighbours to the site and the estate owned the farmhouse.

In reply to Cllr Lucius Vellacott, Alistair Morbey confirmed that the landscaping would be completed, as agreed in the original plan.

Members of the Committee were invited to ask questions to officers.

In reply to Cllr Alan Sharp, James Stringer, Highways Authority, stated that cars queuing on private land was not a Highways issue. He recognised that the road between Ely and Soham was a busy one, accommodating 19,000 cars a day, and this meant delays for vehicles entering and exiting the site. However, the installation of a roundabout or signalling was not practical and the Highways Agency had assessed the risk as acceptable. Cllr Colbert suggested that a safe area between the lanes was required. In reply to Cllr Julia Huffer, James Stringer confirmed that the area was not an accident hotspot, with only one incident since 2023.

In reply to concerns about parking, David Morren, Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager, stated that a Travel Plan was one of the conditions, to ensure a safe flow of traffic on the highway.

The Committee moved into debate.

Cllr Lucius Vellacott stated that the conditions were sufficient to ensure safe travel to and from the site. He asserted that it was important to support employment in the area and proposed that the Committee approved the application. Cllr Julia Huffer agreed, stating that the retail industry was in particular need of support. She seconded the application.

Cllr John Trapp, expressed his support for the application, as the site was located away from residential areas.

Cllr Bill Hunt stated that he would vote for the application. The site was sensibly located away from neighbours and the local district and county councillors had raised no objections to the application.

Cllr Lucius Vellacott proposed and Cllr Julia Huffer seconded that the application be approved, as recommended by the officer. A vote was taken and the Committee unanimously agreed

to resolve

to **approve** the application, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1 with the amendment of “Monday to Saturday” to “Daily” in paragraph E(c)(iii) in Condition 6.

19. 25/01350/FUL – 56 High Street, Bottisham

Daisy Hill, Senior Planning Officer, presented this report (AB16, previously circulated), which recommended that the Committee approve the application for the regularisation of the development, with the change of units 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 to Class E with accompanying ancillary storage area and associated works.

Objector, Patricia Dalrymple made the following statement:

“We do welcome the redevelopment of this site and the amenities it provides the village. We appreciate all the work that has gone into preparing the various reports, however little regard seems to have been paid to the internal anti-social noise created by the Barn Gym. Throughout the forty plus years we have lived next door to this site we have never had reason to complain about noise. We are now subject to the sound of loud music, bleeping machines, thumping treadmill and instructors shouting – occurring as early as 6am and as late as 9pm. Unfortunately, our repeated requests to discuss this with the tenant have been ignored. We request that the Committee consider conditioning the requirement for additional adequate interior soundproofing and an agreed limited music volume. We welcome the proposed reduced opening hours but feel the unlimited 7-day opening does not in fact safeguard our residential amenity but actually compromises our right to respect for private and family life. A return to the former weekend hours would at least provide us with some respite.

“Because of its proximity to our house, the ADZ Takeaway has severely impacted us with regard to the cooking smells emitting from the recently installed chimney. We fully support the recommendations that this unit be treated individually and would hope the regulations regarding opening hours, cooking smells and noise will be vigorously enforced.

“Any conditions applied to the whole of the site will require enforcement, which, given the Applicants proven history of ignoring Planning regulations gives us cause for concern.”

Objector Nick Jerman made a statement to the Committee. He stated that he was not opposed to the businesses on the site, but he was concerned about the impact on the neighbourhood, though he welcomed the conditions in the report. He reported that historically, services on the site had not operated on a Sunday. He explained that he could hear the gym operating whilst the doors

were shut and he argued that there should be an additional condition to reduce the level of noise. He asserted that no vehicles should be reversing on or off the site. He suggested that the containers were too close to the site boundary and they should be moved back.

In reply to Cllr Lucius Vellacott, Nick Jerman explained that it was the loud music from inside the gym that was bothering residents, not external music. In reply to Cllr Alan Sharp, he agreed that internal insulation would help but no insulation was put in the roof of the building when the chimney was installed and it was single glazed.

In reply to Cllr John Trapp, Gemma Jerman stated that she was concerned that conditions would not be complied with and if necessary the applicant would simply apply for retrospective planning permission.

Ian Coward made the following statement, on behalf of the applicant:

"I am the agent and we welcome the recommendation to approve. We accept that this is a retrospective proposal. The owner was of the view that the site fell under the garage use which was primary light industrial and so that would have been class E. The history is more complicated than that and so this application is before you to regularise.

"As advised, it does not include the vets in units 2-5 and seeks permission for class E across the remainder. The businesses are now getting established and in addition to the vets there is a café, gym, bathroom/flooring shop and barbers. They are in the heart of the village and provide local services that were not previously there. They bring money into the village, provide employment and serve the local population. It is all small businesses and always will be; it is also sustainable as it has reduced commuting. The storage containers at the rear of the site are ancillary to the units on site. The uses replace the garage, post a period of vacancy; this was partly controlled and partly not and we are not aware of any opening hours. The site needed a new use, and this is the optimum response."

Councillors were invited to ask questions to Ian Coward.

In reply to Cllr Lucius Vellacott, Ian Coward stated that any external noise should be measured and if necessary mitigated. He noted that the new National Planning Policy would weigh against retrospective planning permission.

In reply to Cllr John Trapp, Ian Coward explained that the planning history of the site was complicated. It was a garage with consent for retail and there was a credible argument that further planning permission was not required. He was unsure who was using the containers on the site.

In reply to Cllr Alan Sharp, Ian Coward agreed that as the freeholder, the applicant was able to add additional sound proofing to the buildings being used by the tenant.

In reply to Cllr Bill Hunt, Ian Coward reported that he was not aware of any attempt to mitigate between the neighbours and the tenants in order to address concerns.

Parish Councillor Maria Socea spoke to the Committee, as a representative of Bottisham Parish Council.

"I am aware that the planning application is recommended to be approved and I respect that, but I need to represent the parish council's continuing concerns and those of the neighbours. Let me be clear upfront, Bottisham Parish Council does not oppose these businesses. They have all become valued parts of village life and we recognise and appreciate their contribution. The tenant businesses have acted in good faith, occupying units made available to them, likely unaware of complex planning histories. At the same time, our responsibility as the Parish Council is to protect neighbourhood wellbeing. That's why we need individual assessments of each business and an assessment of cumulative impacts. They also operate together on one site. The cumulative impact affects residential tranquillity in ways a single business wouldn't. That's why blanket Class E is inadequate. It removes the ability to assess what combination of businesses operates and their combined impact on neighbours. We're requesting individual assessment with specific permissions - like the veterinary practice received - to protect both business and neighbourhood wellbeing.

"With regards to the storage containers, paragraph 142 of the officer report states: 'robust evidence has been received demonstrating that the storage containers are actively advertised in the local village magazine for independent hire'. The officer admits having robust evidence these containers are commercially let. Then paragraph 143 states: 'the Local Planning Authority must determine the application as it stands on the submitted information—which details the storage containers as ancillary storage'. Let me translate: 'We know the application description is wrong, but we're approving it anyway and will deal with reality through enforcement later.' This is backwards. Condition 12 prohibits subletting to third parties. If they're already advertised commercially - which the officer confirms evidence of - an immediate breach of this condition is created. I formally request deferral until the applicant confirms in writing whether these containers are ancillary to on-site businesses only or available for commercial letting, with supporting evidence. Don't approve a description that you know is questionable.

"With regards to Class E, this means businesses can change without permission. A gym can become a nursery. Lexi's Café can become an office or medical centre, with no permission needed. That's how the law works. Condition 7 restricts to "Class E only" - but Class E includes shops, cafés, gyms, nurseries, offices, medical centres. That's not a restriction. You cannot write one set of conditions that works for all these uses. They have opposite needs with different operating times to ensure that they are viable. We know that last year the veterinary practice was granted specific Class E permission only. The officer report calls that approach 'robust.' Why are we taking a different approach for the rest of the site? Your own Environmental Health Officer has

stated that Class E is far more encompassing, and he was concerned about the residential amenity. That's why detailed conditions are needed, but again, they are not going to allow businesses to operate, as the business needs. Each business needs to be assessed individually.

“With regards to biodiversity, the officer is right that Section 73A retrospective applications are exempt from the mandatory BNG (Biodiversity Net Gain) pre-commencement condition. I accept that legal position, but the Environment Act says that if the site is cleared after February 2024 the baseline is its pre-clearance state. This site was cleared in 2025 and 2026 - allotments, vegetation, mature hedgerows removed, replaced with hardstanding and containers, well after BNG became law. Under anti-avoidance rules, the biodiversity loss should still be compensated through Section 106 agreements, Local Plan Policy ENV7, or post-commencement enhancement conditions. The officer report uses none of these powers. It simply states 'retrospective, therefore exempt' and ignores actual environmental loss. The Council has power to require compensation.

“What we are requesting is Class E subcategory restrictions per unit to mirror the veterinary practice control and prevent unassessed use changes. There should be a quarterly monitoring of what is happening on site and an enforcement commitment within 30 days, with actions with written timelines. Furthermore, there should be an annual review in 12 months. Paragraph 142 should trouble you, as it admits robust evidence of misrepresentation, then recommends approval of that misrepresentation anyway. We want these businesses to succeed, as they've all become valued parts of village life. But we need planning control that protects both business vitality and resident wellbeing. We request refusal or deferral for accurate information. If you approve, impose the additional protections I've requested. Bottisham deserves planning control, not damage limitation. Thank you.”

Councillors were invited to ask questions to Maria Socea.

In reply to Cllr John Trapp, Maria Socea stated that the different tenants required different conditions, she suggested that later opening hours could put the gym out of business, whilst other tenants did not need sound insulation.

The Senior Democratic Services read out the following statement from Cllr Charlotte Cane, local ward member:

“The Old Garage Site in Bottisham housed some small businesses that operated within the normal day, produced little noise (the main noise, which was infrequent testing of petrol motors after repair, came from the garden machinery repair shop at the end which became Units 11 and 12); the others were a garage, and some very light industrial or R&D businesses. Ranks Petrol Station is now Unit 1 and it was open from 8am to 5pm Monday to Friday and 8am to 1pm Saturday. It was closed on Sunday and Bank Holidays. It is estimated that it ceased trading about 30 years ago.

"It is good to see the site being used to provide local facilities and employment. However, this must not be at the loss of residential amenity to the many neighbours. So, I welcome the proposed conditions to restrict the hours, noise, smells and traffic movements of the units so that they don't add significantly more disturbance to the residents next to and close to the site than was previously acceptable.

"I also welcome the restrictions on the positioning, height and use of the storage containers. I welcome the clarity that they would need to seek Planning Permission should they wish to change this. I also welcome the clarity that this permission, if granted, would not cover the existing Takeaway business and that will follow its own enforcement/planning process if it wishes to remain on the site.

"I am concerned about the impact on the Highway, especially from deliveries using large lorries. I therefore welcome the conditions covering parking spaces and the need to keep them free from any other use in perpetuity.

"Allowing a blanket Class E use across the site provides flexibility for the site, but does carry risk for residential amenity, so I welcome the removal of permitted development rights, so that any significant proposed changes would need prior consent.

"I think the recommendation, with the proposed conditions is a balanced approach to allowing the businesses to thrive and maintaining residential amenity. I think all the proposed conditions are critical to maintaining this balance."

Officers were invited to comment.

David Morren, Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager, explained that there was a need to be flexible when agreeing conditions. Historically, businesses had not operated on Sunday, but it made sense to allow organisations the flexibility to be open for business all week. Any noise conditions would have to apply to all businesses on the site. He suggested that delegated authority could be given to him to liaise with Environmental Health and word an additional condition on noise nuisance. Condition 9 stated that cars must be allowed to enter and exit the site in forward gear. It was not possible to agree a condition that prohibited vehicles from reversing into the street. Enforcement action could be taken if containers were being used in a way that contravened existing agreements.

Daisy Hill, Senior Planning Officer, explained that any complaints about odours would have to be investigated. It could be challenging to add a ventilation system to one of the units. David Morren, Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager assured the Committee that action would be taken if it was found that conditions had been breached. If a chimney flue needed to be installed at the restaurant, that would require an additional planning application.

Members were invited to ask questions to the officers.

In reply to Cllr Lucius Vellacott, David Morren, Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager, explained that he would need to speak to an Environmental Health Officer to determine whether noise control was necessary and how noise could be mitigated.

In reply to Cllr Alan Sharp, David Morren, Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager, stated that the gym could submit a Section 73 notice to alter their opening hours if they wished to open earlier than the time of 8:30 am set in the conditions to this application.

In reply to Cllr Martin Goodearl, James Stringer, Highways Authority, explained that the level of traffic on this site was insufficient to justify the need to designate separate areas for pedestrians.

In reply to Cllr John Trapp, the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager stated that no additional external lighting was included in the application. The Committee could delegate the wording of a condition on noise control to him. There should be a reasonable degree of separation between the containers and the edge of the site. The application was technically exempt from Biodiversity Net Gain regulations and comments were still awaited from the ecologist.

In reply to Cllr John Trapp, James Stringer, Highways Authority, stated that the largest vehicle visiting the site was likely to be a rigid lorry. There was a condition to ensure that vehicles could drive in and out of the site in forward gear. It was not possible to add a condition that would regulate driving behaviour.

The Committee moved into debate.

Cllr Bill Hunt stated that in his experience, all villages needed more facilities and residents lamented the closing of shops and facilities. He proposed that the Committee agree to approve the application with a condition to delegate authority to the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager to limit the noise emitting from all the units, with advice from Environmental Services. Following a brief discussion it was agreed to include an amendment to Condition 10 to make it clear that the requirement applied to all parking and turning areas in the plan. Cllr Lucius Vellacott seconded this proposal.

Cllr Lucius Vellacott stated that this was an acceptable application, with sensible conditions to mitigate residents' concerns. He recommended that the Committee approve the application.

Cllr Julia Huffer supported a condition that would keep noise to acceptable levels. Cllr Alan Sharp agreed and hoped that efforts could be made to ensure that storage units were being used appropriately.

Cllr John Trapp supported the proposed blanket conditions for the site that all present and future tenants would have to abide by. The conditions needed to be monitored to protect the neighbours of the site.

Cllr Bill Hunt proposed and Cllr Lucius Vellacott seconded that the application be agreed, as recommended by the officer with the agreed amendments to the conditions. A vote was taken and with 9 votes in favour, 0 votes against and 1 abstention, the Committee

resolved:

To **approve** the application, subject to the conditions set out in Appendix 1, with the following amendments:

- 1) The first sentence in Condition 10 to be amended to “All parking and turning areas shown on the approved plan ‘S3717/012A Proposed Site Layout Rev A received 22 April 2026’ shall be kept clear of obstructions and shall at no time be used for external customers seating, tables, outdoor displays, sales, or any other commercial or business activities.”
- 2) To further delegate power to the Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager permitting liaison with the Environmental Health Officer in adding an additional condition directed at controlling the levels of noise emitting from all the units.

20. Planning Performance Report – April 2026

David Morren, Strategic Planning and Development Management Manager, presented a report summarising the performance of the Planning Department in April 2026.

The Committee agreed

to resolve to **note** the report.

The meeting concluded at 5:08 pm.

Chair.....

Date.....