

MINUTES of the Planning Committee of Melksham Without Parish Council held on Tuesday 21st February 2017 at Forest Community Centre, Bowmans Court, Melksham, SN12 7FF at 7.00 p.m.

Present: Cllrs. Richard Wood (Council Chair), Alan Baines, Rolf Brindle, Gregory Coombes, Mike Sankey and Paul Carter.

Officers: Teresa Strange (Clerk) and Jo Eccleston (Parish Officer).

Cllrs. Terry Chivers as an observer.

Apologies: John Glover (Council Vice-Chair) as he was representing the Parish Council at a planning training seminar as per Min.325/16.

Housekeeping: Cllr. Wood welcomed all to the meeting and explained the evacuation procedure in the event of a fire and the procedure for public participation.

360/16 **Declarations of Interest:** Cllr. Wood declared an interest in agenda item 6c as a resident of Semington Road, and Cllr. Baines declared an interest in agenda item 6b as a resident of Woodrow Road.

361/16 **Invited Guests:**

a) **Meril Morgan, Wiltshire Council Art Officer:** The Committee noted that due to the change of date of the planning meeting to accommodate public interest in two planning applications being considered by the Parish Council, Ms. Morgan was unable to attend, and her visit had been postponed until the Planning Committee meeting on Monday 3rd April 2017.

b) **Henry Waite (Elgar Middleton Bio Power Ltd.) & Mathew Pearson (Pegasus Group) – Agents for Proposed Anaerobic Digester on Land at Snarlton Farm (P/A 16/12469/WCM):** Mr. Waite reported that several issues had been addressed following feedback from the pre-application presentation that he made at the Planning Committee meeting held last March at Melksham Oak School. He outlined these as follows:

1. The proposed access had moved east by approximately 50m to reduce the nuisance of traffic emerging from the previously proposed access next to Lopes Close and to enable an enhanced visibility splay to comply with the recent change of speed limit on that stretch of road, from 30mph to 40mph.
2. The plans were to now take food waste in addition to agricultural slurries and crop residues. This was due to a change in Government direction, which was now encouraging Anaerobic Digester Plants to utilise more food waste. There is a distinct difference between Plants that just take slurries and crop residues from those that take food waste. Food waste needs to be de-packaged and prepared into a “food soup” before it can be processed by the Anaerobic Digester and this procedure will take place off site. The “food soup” will then be delivered to the Plant in a “sludge/soup” format in sealed containers. This will be compliant with all the industry requirements and monitored by the Environment Agency.
3. To enable the plant to be compliant to accept food waste there had been a design amendment as the proposal now included 3 additional tanks which

were taller but thinner than the other tanks. These will be visible above the tree line.

Since the planning application had been publicised on Wiltshire Council's website, there had been public concern and questions raised via this portal. Mr. Waite answered some of these queries as follows:

- Smell: There can be some smell associated with Anaerobic Digester Plants, but this is down to the design of the Plant and what it is processing. With the use of "food soup", this arrives in sealed containers and is pumped directly into the tanks and a smell would only occur if there were to be a spillage. There are very strict tests enforced by the Environment Agency on how to manage that process. There will be odours associated with the on-site storage of agricultural crop residues in silage clamps. Layers of plastic should be placed over these silage clamps to prevent smells, but they will occur when the crop residues are loaded into the Digester. However, these smells are no different to those on an average dairy farm where silage is used as cattle feed. The Digester extracts all the energy from the gas of raw slurry, which is what smells, and produces an organic digestate that is spread onto the land. This results in a big improvement in smell to that of slurry, which the farmers spread on the land as a fertiliser at the moment.
- Traffic: The traffic survey data showed that there were approximately 8,000 daily traffic movements past the site, and that there would be 6 to 12 movements each day from the Plant via Praters Lane, not a significant number. There had been questions over the safety of the access point, but the access point had been moved to comply with highway safety legislation with regard to visibility splays to accommodate the change in the speed limit of the road.
- Location: Queries had been made as to why the Plant had not been located directly behind the farm. The proposed location puts the Plant the furthest distance from residential properties in the area and it can be linked directly to the gas main from this site. It is screened from the north and south by existing tree lines. It gives the opportunity to get traffic off the main A road before it gets into Melksham and the Distributor road.

The Council agreed to suspend standing orders for a period of public participation.

362/16 **Public Participation 1.- Proposed Anaerobic Digester on Land at Snarlton Farm (16/12469/WCM):** There were 27 members of the public present who wished to object to this proposal. Their concerns were as follows:

- Prevailing winds and the potential smells generated by the Plant.
- Concerns over the need for slurries to be transported to the site.
- Queries over the application description, which describes the plant as being set into the hillside, but a resident stated that the site is flat.
- Some felt that this was an industrial application in a rural setting.
- The potential weight of the lorries exceeding the weight limit of the road.
- Queries over the need to ship out 90% of the digestate, and why it could not all be spread on the land of Snarlton Farm.
- Questions over the accuracy of the traffic data – a resident felt that the deliveries in and out could not be accomplished in 19 loads a day.
- Concerns over road safety and this stretch of road being an accident blackspot. A resident reported that there had been 3 deaths on this road and

multiple accidents, some of which had not been reported. The resident felt strongly that the police should be consulted, and that a further traffic survey should be carried out, now that the speed limit of this road had been increased to 40mph.

- Further concerns with regard to HGVs exiting the site from a stationary position and having to gather speed up the hill.
- Prater's Lane is a bridle way and there were concerns over the safety of horse riders and walkers sharing this with delivery lorries.
- Residents of Lopes Close were concerned about the noise of HGVs using Praters Lane as the surface of the lane was just hardcore.
- A resident reported that when the "food soup" and slurries were pumped into the tank, that air needed to come out and had concerns over how this air was filtered.
- A resident stated that there was no mention in the design statement about hydrogen sulphide (H₂S) and carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions and how these will be removed safely. He stated that a worker had died and that there had been 4 injuries on another Anaerobic Digester Plant elsewhere in the country. He queried what training would be given for workers of the plant.
- Concerns over what would happen if the Digester exploded.

Mr. Waite responded as follows:

- The traffic survey that took place was undertaken over 24 hours for a period of 7 days. He acknowledged comments about the numbers of accidents that had taken place on this stretch of road, but explained that the report had taken its data from the police, and as such could not take account of accidents that had not been reported. He urged people to look at the transport statement published on line.
- With regard to the number of deliveries in and out of the site on a daily basis, he reported that this figure had been generated from data from existing Plants that the company had. He stated that if the resident emailed him directly he would be answer the query more accurately.
- With regard to slurries, he stated that only slurries generated by Snarlton Farm would be used by the Plant, no additional slurries would be brought in. However, digestate would be shipped out as there would be too much produced to be used exclusively by Snarlton Farm. Additionally, there were rules about how much digestate could be spread per hectare of land.
- With regard to the noise over the access track, the plan is to re-lay the surface to deal with the traffic over a 20 year period. There is a maintenance agreement to ensure that this is a well maintained tarmac surface to reduce noise and dust.
- With regard to the risk of potential explosions and the digestate leaking out, he stated that Environment Agency permits were required to operate the plant and these detailed the permitted emissions of H₂S and CO₂ and any potential spillages. He explained that the emissions go through a process called scrubbing and that all of the data relating to this is available in the reports on line. There is a requirement for a bund to be put in place to contain any potential spillage, which has to be able to contain 1.5 times the amount of the total volume in all of the storage tanks.
- With regard to the accuracy of the data, he stated that he considered the data to be robust, but was happy to go into more specific detail if residents emailed him.

Councillors queried the following:

1. Whether the “food soup” could be processed on site to save transportation and traffic movements.
2. Where the “food soup” was coming from. This was an important consideration as the traffic survey showed an annual average of traffic movements, however, at harvest time there would be more traffic movements as crop residues were brought to the site. Therefore, it was important to know what the maximum amount of traffic movements would be in one day and from which direction they would be coming to understand the impact of traffic on the town and local residents.
3. The visual appearance of the Plant as from Sandridge Hill it would be visible between the existing trees.
4. Whether there was a bond in place should something happen to the company running it.

Mr. Waite gave the following response:

1. There were approved sites for the processing of food waste into “food soup” which were usually in industrial/commercial areas to deal with the de-packaging of the food waste, and that the Digester needed to be in rural areas near to where the digestate was to be spread.
2. He acknowledged that there would not be the same traffic movements each day and that at certain times of the year traffic movements would be greater. However, the site only had the capacity to store up to 3 months worth of crop residues, therefore any excess crop residues would need to be stored at neighbouring farms. He was unable to comment on the direction of any vehicles delivering “food soup” as commercial contracts would need to be entered into, and this had not happened yet.
3. He stated that some of the storage tanks would be partially sunk into the ground, but the three narrower tanks would be visible above the tree line. He stated that the tanks could be made in any colour to blend into the surroundings, and that he was happy to agree that with the Council. There could also be additional tree planting to assist with the screening of the site.
4. He reported that there was a bond in the contract with the landowner to reinstate the land back to its use at the end of the term, which was for 21 years.

The Council re-convened and agreed to bring agenda item 6a forward for discussion.

363/16 **16/12469/WCM – Land at Snarlton Farm, Snarlton Lane:** Erection of on-farm Anaerobic Digestion Plant for agricultural/food waste with weighbridge, combined heat and power unit, gas network entry facility, concrete apron, landscaping, land re-profiling and associated infrastructure and new access created off A3102.
Applicant: Thornfield 007 Ltd.

Cllr. T. Chivers reported that he had called this application in for consideration by Wiltshire Council Planning Committee.

It was suggested that if Wiltshire Council decided to approve the application that a request was made for conditions to be imposed on the hours that deliveries could take place. Additionally, any crop residues or slurries generated by Snarlton Farm should be transported internally using tracks across the farmland rather than using the A3102. As the bridleway will be used by both vehicles accessing the plant and

horse riders and pedestrians, this will need to be carefully managed to ensure that there is an adequate separation between the access track and the bridleway and that users of the bridleway have precedence. A suggestion was made that all traffic to the site came from the north east, but it was noted that this would not be able to be enforced. The Committee recognised that Core Policy 42 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy encouraged and supported standalone renewable energy installations, including Anaerobic Digestion Plants, and that the location of the proposed site met the criteria of being rural, by a gas main and a main road. The issues and concerns raised by residents were acknowledged and the Committee recommended that these were included in the Parish Council's comments.

Comments: *The Council do not object but wish to see some conditions imposed upon the proposal and support some of the concerns raised by the 27 residents who attended the planning meeting:*

1. *They wish to see a condition imposed upon vehicle movements to the site, both deliveries of waste materials in and digestate out, which would allow deliveries to be carried out only between the following times:
Monday to Friday – 08.00hrs to 18.00hrs
Saturday – 10.00hrs to 14.00hrs
Sunday – NO Deliveries*
2. *Any deliveries made to and from Snarlton Farm should only use the internal tracks across the farm's own land and not use the A3102.*
3. *An adequate separation is made between the access track and the bridleway on Praters Lane, and where the access track crosses the bridleway that users of the bridleway have precedence over any vehicular movements on the track.*
4. *The storage tanks to be the colour grey/green to blend in with the surrounding landscape.*
5. *Additional tree planting to take place to screen the site from view from Sandridge Hill.*
6. *The Parish Council recognise the concerns raised by Mr. Freeman in his letter of 17th February 2017, and wish to echo some of these views and seek to address some of the issues with the conditions that it wishes to be imposed should planning permission be granted.*

The Invited Guests and some members of the public left the meeting. The Council agreed to suspend standing orders for a second period of public participation.

364/16 **Public Participation 2.- 16/05644/OUT (AMENDED PLANS) – Land Off Woodrow Road:** REVISED DESCRIPTION: There were 47 members of the public present who wished to object to this revised planning application for up to 77 residential units. Their concerns were as follows:

- That due to the average price of a property in Melksham that the 30% of affordable properties proposed by the development would still not be affordable for families in Melksham.
- The site access is unsuitable, a bottleneck and dangerous with a footpath on only one side of Woodrow Road. A pedestrian crossing would need to be installed.
- Forest Road, Church Lane and Woodrow Road are considered to be very busy roads already and there are great concerns over the addition of any

further traffic created by this proposal. Furthermore, traffic using Woodrow Road do not stick to the speed limits.

- Wiltshire Police in their letter of the 6th February, 2017, have expressed concerns over the revised indicative layout and the proposal to have car ports and parking courts on the development. Due to the fact that these are remote from the proposed dwellings this increases the potential opportunity for crime to take place.
- The location of existing equestrian stables in Woodrow Road, and recently approved plans for the expansion of one of these means that there are always many horses being exercised on Woodrow Road, with the potential for this to increase. This was considered to pose an additional hazard to road safety and another reason why the increase in traffic brought about by this development would be inappropriate.
- Although the revised plans show a reduction in the number of units to be sited to the south of the overhead high voltage pylons to reflect the archaeological finds, there were concerns about the future of the land to the north of the site. What would happen to this land in the future, and could it potentially be built on later on? The precedent would be set from the development of the south side of the site.
- Concerns over schools and the stretched infrastructure of the area.
- It was considered that all of this land should remain as green open space and a recreational area.
- Two residents were concerned with regard to the accuracy of the plans as both of their properties, which abut the site access were not shown on the plan.
- As per Core Policy 2, this proposed development is outside of the settlement boundary and therefore development in the open countryside.
- Residents wished the Parish Council to hold firm to their previous objections to the original planning application.

The Council re-convened and agreed to bring agenda item 6b forward for discussion.

365/16 **16/05644/OUT (AMENDED PLANS) – Land Off Woodrow Road: REVISED DESCRIPTION** – Outline planning application for the development of up to 77 residential units (including 30% affordable housing), open space, ecological enhancements, play space, associated infrastructure (including drainage structures and works to the public highway), access, parking, servicing and landscaping. Applicant: Waddeton Park Ltd.

Cllr. T. Chivers reported that he had called this application in for consideration by Wiltshire Council Planning Committee.

The council's previous objections were read out, and it was noted that the reduction in the number of dwellings in the amended plans did not affect very many of those comments. There were concerns that the indicative plans for the revised application did not show any boundary treatment separating the south of the site from the north, and how any unauthorised or inappropriate use of this area of land would be prevented. The original illustrative plans for 152 dwellings showed the provision of 3 children's play areas; one LAP (Local Area for Play) and two equipped LEAPs (Local Equipped Area of Play). The latest revised plans show no play provision at all. If this

proposal does not intend to provide any provision for play, then the developer should include a contribution toward additional equipment or maintenance of the nearest play area in Methuen Avenue. There was concern that construction traffic was likely to pose a huge problem, it would be unable to come from the direction of Lacock and would therefore have to access the site via the Town and then a 17m wide road frontage at the site access point.

Comments: *The Council OBJECTS to this proposal and wishes to reiterate the comments in made on 9th August 2016, and add additional comments as follow:*

1) Highway issues:

- a) *The current width of Woodrow Road at the point of the proposed junction is 5m, with a suggestion that the road to the north will be reduced by 0.6m so that the necessary sighting distances are obtained. This would mean that the proposed access road at 5.5m wide will be wider than the main road it is joining which will be detrimental to highway safety.*
- b) *The only footway on Woodrow Road is on the western side, and narrows in portions towards the Town.*
- c) *The footpath from Savernake Avenue means that all residents have to cross the road to get to the side with a pavement to get into Town; some form of pedestrian crossing will be required here if the application goes ahead.*
- d) *There is no kerb on the eastern side of Woodrow Road to the north, and the narrowing of the road will mean that vehicles are likely to overrun the verges (as they do on occasion already).*
- e) *There is a large equestrian use from the many stables in the area, and the increased traffic will impact on the safety of both the horses and riders. There are many children/learners led by rein on the surrounding roads as well as more experienced riders.*
- f) *Woodrow Road is part of National Cycle Route 403, which cyclists are encouraged to use, and will be more at risk by increased traffic.*
- g) *An increased large amount of traffic is already using the unsuitable route to the north/A350/M4 from the East of Melksham (circa 800 new houses) development and this new development would add significantly to the flow of traffic in that direction namely: down the single track New Road, then Forest Lane (with S bends), left at the junction at Bewley Common over the medieval single lane bridge at Lacock (that regularly floods and is unpassable) and through the National Trust village of Lacock. New Road is already unsuitable for the amount of traffic using that road at present. In the opposite direction from the application, towards the Town Centre, and avoiding the route via New Road to the A350 etc is Forest Road which has its own limitations and traffic calming.*
- h) *Woodrow Road is acknowledged to have speeding traffic, it has 3 sites eligible for SIDs (Speed Indicator Device) and Community Speed Watch. Attached are the results of the metro count from 2010 which recorded 85% of traffic travelling at 38mph or below (in a 30mph zone). (Between 07/10/2010 and 14/10/2010 a total of 11067 vehicles were checked. The 85th percentile was 38.0mph (the 85th percentile is the speed at which 85% of the traffic is travelling at or below). This speeding traffic is the major concern for the points raised above about pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders.*

- i) *The Council also have concerns about the safety and impact of the construction traffic on this proposed development, due to the issues raised about Highway safety above.*
- j) *Doubts are raised about the credibility of the Traffic Survey and Traffic Plan as it talks about the “Village of Forest” that doesn’t exist, mentions bus stops that were removed in 2012 when the service was discontinued and incorrectly names the Public Rights of Way; PROW MELK 5 to Methuen Avenue is incorrectly referenced as 'Hardie Walk', which is MELK 34 between Spa Road & Milton Avenue.*

2) **Drainage issues:**

Whilst the attenuation ponds will restrict any run off from flowing into the river and impacting on the flood risk in the Town, the Parish Council is concerned about the danger of unfenced ponds in the vicinity of young children that would move into the new development and those from the existing area.

3) **Foul Drainage issues:**

There is no mention in the application documents of any provision for foul drainage. Woodrow is at the very end of the existing foul drainage system and was built to serve only 10 properties and so there is a big concern as to how this system will cope with an extra 77 properties. There is no mention of foul drainage in the latest plans and an independent assessment on foul drainage is required.

4) **Melksham Neighbourhood Plan:**

The Housing Task Group of the Neighbourhood Plan have scored all SHLAA (Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment) sites in the Melksham Designated Area (namely Melksham Town & Melksham Without) with a site scoring assessment tool (adapted from another local Neighbourhood Plan that has been adopted). SHLAA Site 3107 is the site of this planning application which scored worse than the site for the Gladman/Shurnhold application (W/14/11919) which was recently refused by the Planning Inspector. Despite the reduction in the number of proposed dwellings sought from the amended application, the overhead pylons and flood risk remain the same, and thus the scoring of this site has not changed.

5) **Children’s Play Area:**

The latest amended illustrative plans have removed all play provision from the proposed development. The Council wishes to see play provision provided, and if it is not, a contribution from the S106 Agreement to improve, enhance and maintain the nearest children’s play area in Methuen Park, should the application be approved.

6) **Boundary Treatment to Delineate the North from the South of the Site:**

Should the application be approved, boundary treatment should be made to delineate between the north side of the site and the development on the south of the site. This is to protect the north site from inappropriate use. Additionally, the Parish Council queries the land ownership of the land to the north of the overhead power lines, and how this will be managed in the future. The latest indicative plans show no buffer between the existing properties of Woodrow Road and the proposed “village green”, numbered “2” on the plan.

7) Settlement Boundary:

This proposal is outside of the Settlement Boundary and thus would be development in the open countryside. The Parish Council would like to point out that Wiltshire Council currently have a 5.13 year Housing Land Supply for the North West HMA (Housing Market Area) and thus are very close to meeting their 5.25 year target. If, by the time this application is considered by Wiltshire Council Planning Committee, the 5.25 year Housing Land Supply has been met then this application should be refused permission as outside of the Settlement Boundary.

In addition to the above comments, the Parish Council would like to make the Planning Officer aware that 42 members of the public attended their Planning Committee meeting on Tuesday 21st February, 2017 wishing to have their views heard with regard to this application. Additionally, residents have set up their own social media group specifically about this application.

Copy to: Melksham Town Council, Lacock Parish Council

366/16 **Planning Applications:** The Council considered the following applications and made the following comments:

- a) **17/00296/OUT - Land adjacent to 490, Semington Road:** Erection of a new dwelling (all matters reserved except access). Applicant: Mr. John Clark
Comments: *The Council have no objections.*
- b) **17/00335/FUL - Chestnut House, 53D Beanacre:** Velux window to roof on both elevation. Applicant: Mrs J Tubbs.
Comment: *The Parish Council have no objections.*
- c) **17/00503/FUL - 2 St. Athan Close, Bowerhill:** Single storey rear/side extension. Applicant: Mr & Mrs Keegan.
Comments: *The Parish Council have no objections.*
- d) **17/00569/FUL - Bridge House, 545 Canal Bridge, Semington:** Change of use of former B2 industrial building to dwelling. Applicant: Mr & Mrs S Payne.
Comments: *The Parish Council have no objections.*
- e) **17/00570/FUL - Windy Ridge, 514D, Shails Lane:** Demolition of existing block built garage and erection of replacement timber garage. Applicant: Mrs Gillian Ellis.
Comments: *The Parish Council have no objections.*
- f) **17/00662/REM- Land at 289 Sandridge Road, Northeast to Sandridge Hill, Sandridge Common:** Reserved Matters application following outline approval 16/06480/OUT for design of new dwelling and landscaping of site. Applicant: Mr Peter Harrold.
Comments: *The Parish Council have no objections.*
- g) **17/00650/FUL- 15, Bader Park, Bowerhill:** Conversion of existing conservatory to sun room and extension of existing garage and bedroom over. Applicant: Mr John Cottle.

Comments: *The Parish Council have no objections.*

- 367/16 **Public Consultation by Statera Energy: Proposal for two energy storage facilities using batteries up to 49.99MW capacity, to meet peak supply demands on the local distribution power network on land next to Westlands Lane Substation.** Several Councillors had attended this Public Exhibition Event and reported that the site would be totally unseen by anybody and that when the cells were charged they can make electricity instantly. Unlike diesel generators they are noiseless. The power stored in the units will be generated from renewable energy and as such met Core Policy 42 and Wiltshire Council's policy of encouraging renewable energy. Cllr. Baines reported that he had queried with Statera Energy the construction phase and advised them that they would need to ensure that construction traffic avoided going past Shaw School during drop off and pick up times, and that they would not be able to access the site via Westlands Lane from the east via the A350, due to the weight limit of the bridge. Statera Energy seemed receptive to the idea of providing community benefit, similar to that provided by solar farms, and that they had indicated that they would prefer to see this as a one off lump sum payment rather than an annual payment over a set number of years.
Recommended: *The Clerk to make initial contact with Statera Energy with regard to any potential community benefit funding.*
- 368/16 **Timescale of Proposed development of 450 Houses at Land East of Spa Road (Approved Outline Application 14/10461/OUT):** Cllr Brindle queried what was happening with this development and what the timescales were for the next stages of development. The Clerk reported that the Reserved Matters Application had not been submitted yet, and that nothing would happen until Wiltshire Council had received this. **Recommended:** *The Council to query with the developer the timescales for the next stages of the planning process.*
- 369/16 **Planning Enforcement: Queries raised about the new Oakfields Football/Rugby Club facilities (13/06739/FUL):** Cllr. Brindle raised the following issues:
- The plans had shown that the attenuation pond should be 600 – 900 cubic metres in size. He had measured the pond which he reported to be 10m in diameter and approximately 1.5m deep.
 - He reported that the elm trees that had been planted to screen the spa from the new facilities were dead and needed replacing.
 - He was concerned about light spillage from the flood lights and stated that in his opinion they were very bright and lit up 1sq km of area. He stated that the floodlights that faced towards the Spa were misaligned and threw too much light in that direction.
 - He reported that the row of strip lights that went on further than the access road, towards the back of the school were on when no-one was there, despite a reassurance at the time of the application that they would not be on when the club was not in use.
- The Clerk reported that she had already posed some of these questions to the Enforcement officer and was waiting for her reply. It was noted that the footpath up to the Football/Rugby Club and then on to the rear of Melksham Oak Community school was now open. Cllrs. Wood, Carter and Sankey offered to walk this route to establish whether it could be used by the children from the East of Melksham Development to access the school.

370/16 **S106 Agreements:**

- a) **Ongoing and New S106 Agreements:** None
- b) **New S106 Queries:** The Clerk reported that she had received a request from Wiltshire Council on Monday 20th February asking what commuted sum the Parish Council wished to receive for the future maintenance of the Play Area proposed for the Pathfinder Way Development (16/01123/OUT). Wiltshire Council had requested an answer by midday Wednesday 22nd February. The Council reply that to calculate a sum they require details to be provided on the type and amount of equipment, fencing, safety surfacing was to be installed, and how much grasscutting, landscape planting and bin emptying etc was involved.
- c) **S106 Decisions made under Delegated Powers:** None.
- d) **Correspondence received about s106 funding from Herman Miller for Campus Playing Fields:** An answer still has not been received on this, despite being reassured that a response would be made following an Officer meeting on Weds 25th January. Following that meeting it had been referred back to the original s106 Officer who had stated that the funding had not yet been spent but needed to look into if it had been committed and the history behind it before responding.

Meeting closed at 9.25pm

Chairman, 6th March, 2017