

## **PRESENT**

### **Members of the Committee**

Councillors Terence Buxton (Chairman), David Campion, Professor Sir Anthony Coates, John Corbet-Singleton, Keith Cunningham, Ian Donaldson, The Lady Hanham, Andrew Lamont, Dez O'Neill and Barry Phelps.

### **Others in Attendance**

Mr Geoff Burrage, Senior Transport Planner

Mr Mark Harnett, S106 Legal Advisor

Mr David McDonald, Conservation and Design Team Leader

Mr Angus Morrison, Tree Preservation Officer

Mr Luke Perkins, Acting Area Team Leader (North)

Mr David Prout, Executive Director of Planning and Borough Development

Mr Derek Taylor, Head of Development Control

Ms Heidi Titcombe, Senior Solicitor

Ms Anne Wright, Senior Governance Administrator

## **A1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillors John Cox and Mrs Priscilla Frazer.

## **A2 MEMBERS' DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were none.

## **A3 GUIDE TO THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND MAJOR PLANNING DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEES - FOR INFORMATION**

The report was noted.

## **A4 TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 - APPLICATIONS**

With the permission of the Chairman, the Executive Director, Planning and Borough Development, circulated a sheet of amendments to the report before the Committee, a copy of which had been placed on the Minute Book.

**Action by: EDP&DC**

## **Agenda Item 47 - The Commonwealth Institute, 224-238 Kensington High Street, W8 6NQ**

The Chairman made his opening remarks and explained to the audience present that the Committee was not bound by any comments made at the previous meeting on 7 July 2009 when the Committee gave a steer about the proposal. Moreover the application has been amended since that time.

The Area Planning Officer introduced the report and highlighted that there were three planning applications before the Committee, namely: Planning Permission, Listed Building Consent and Conservation Area Consent. He outlined the main six elements of the applications:

- The internal and external alterations to the Commonwealth Institute building along with the demolition of the administrative block;
- The basement extension under the exhibition building;
- The non-residential element to the application e.g. the restaurants and cafes;
- The three new residential buildings comprising of 62 residential units as well as commercial units;
- The new basement linking all three residential units for parking, utilities, services etc.; and
- The hard and soft landscaping on the site.

The Area Planning Officer went on to summarise the main comments of the Committee on 7 July 2009, namely:

- The future of the 'Tent' was imperative and should be secured;
- Securing an appropriate new use through a S106 agreement for the 'Tent' was essential;
- Only the minimum amount of development necessary to save the exhibition building should be allowed;
- There was great concern regarding the height and bulk of the proposed residential blocks;
- The views of the 'Tent' were very important and should be enhanced and retained;
- The loss of trees was a great concern and should be resisted as much as possible;
- Any transplanted trees were unlikely to survive;
- A more prominent entrance to the 'Tent' from the High Street should be designed; and
- The proposed landscaping was inappropriate and should be modified.

The Area Planning Officer presented a series of slides outlining the amended proposals and illustrated the reduction in heights of all three residential units; directing the Committee to the table in section 3.4.4 of the report. He confirmed that all the heights in the table were set out in metres. He said that the developers had decreased square footage by approximately 1700m<sup>2</sup>. His presentation also

provided a number of views of the development comparing the original proposals with the new reduced building heights.

The Area Planning Officer said that the High Street entrance had been amended through the addition of void space which increased the sense of openness at the front. He also confirmed that the amount of walk space from the High Street had been increased and the proposed gates abandoned, having been replaced by automatic bollards. He explained that this would eliminate the sense of a 'gated development' that the fences may have created. He also updated the Committee on the changes to the proposed interior work to the exhibition building, specifically that a hidden floor was no longer proposed and that internal views of the roof would be retained.

The Area Planning Officer reported that the Heads of Terms of the proposed s106 agreement had been negotiated and improved since the Committee Report was produced and the amendments were set out in the Addendum Report. He also confirmed amendments to the proposed number of trees being lost on the site and said that seven more trees would be retained but two of those trees were Category C and therefore of lesser quality. He also explained the proposed access routes on the site which had not been substantially amended. He confirmed that the application would be subject to a Vehicle Management Plan secured through the s106 agreement, specifically setting out how taxis and buses would be managed on the site.

In terms of the landscaping, the Area Planning Officer said that a new pond was proposed which would be reminiscent of what was currently on the site and that the proposed birch trees had been replaced by park trees. He also outlined the levels of public, non-accessible and privately accessed spaces and confirmed that the public space would be increased.

The Area Planning Officer said that the key issue was the future of the Grade II\* listed building and if it could be secured through this development and if the s106 agreement goes far enough to conserve its future. He said that even though the development would impact on the Conservation area, there were a number of positive elements to the scheme which needed to be balanced against any negative impact. He added that a degree of realism was necessary when making a decision in this particular case.

The Area Planning Officer updated the Committee on the number of representations that had been received since the report had been published. These are outlined below:

- The total number of objections had increased to 226;
- The total number of letters of support had increased to 62;
- There had been one petition and one letter of comment; and
- A number of late representations that had been received after the Addendum Report had been produced.

The Area Planning Officer also updated the Committee on consultation with the Greater London Authority, The Environment Agency and The Council of British Archaeology. He drew the Committee's attention to the Addendum Report outlining additional conditions and amendments to the Heads of Terms of the S106 agreement.

The Chairman asked Mr Mark Harnett, Legal Advisor, to provide an update on the amendments to the proposed Heads of Terms of the proposed S106 agreement concerning the works to the Tent and securing the future use of the Tent. Mr Harnett explained that the Heads of Terms had been updated in the following respects from the version attached to the Addendum Report:

- (1) The gap funding referred to in paragraph (10) would be provided prior to the fitting out of the High Street Kensington Block.
- (2) The interim milestones to be reached before work can proceed beyond a certain stage on the residential development are as follows:
  - (a) Steps 1 to 3 in Schedule 1 of the Heads of Terms must be completed before any works on the residential development can commence above ground;
  - (b) Steps 1 to 4 must be completed before work can commence above ground on the High Street Kensington Building.

He said that some changes had also been made to wording relating to other provisions in the Heads of Terms since the Addendum report was produced but these were not material changes.

Ms Heidi Titcombe, Legal Adviser advised that there are a number of other planning obligations required as part of the proposal as outlined in paragraph 6.82 of the report. She explained that further negotiations had taken place regarding these obligations since the report was produced and drew the Committee's attention to the amendments in the Addendum Report. She also confirmed that the Council would no longer be seeking a cycle hire scheme, open space contribution and streetscape improvements as these were either not considered necessary or were otherwise already covered by the other planning obligations set out in the Heads of Terms. She confirmed that the Council is seeking a Cycle Hire contribution of £10,000 and confirmed that all the proposed planning obligations set out in the Heads of Terms in the Addendum report had been agreed with the applicant.

In response to questions from the Committee, The Executive Director of Planning and Borough Development explained the way the s106 agreement had been structured and the level of certainty it provided the Council. He confirmed that before the development could commence the developer would need to have 100 per cent of their funding in place and the proposed user of the exhibition building would need to have 70 per cent of their funding in place. He added that the developer would need to provide gap funding if the user did not reach 100 per cent funding through fundraising. He explained that a period of exclusivity was proposed to give the Design Museum time to secure its funding and the Council and Design Museum

were confident that this would be achievable. He said that if for any reason the Design Museum pulled out of the scheme, the developers would have to find another public institutional user that would need to be approved by the Council.

The Area Planning Officer answered questions relating to accessibility of the proposed development and confirmed that general access arrangements had been approved by the Council's Access Officer but specific access elements of the exhibition building were reserved matters and would need future permission and would be subject to listed building consent.

The Committee expressed concerns regarding the cladding of the exhibition building and the possibility of light seepage from it. The Area Planning Officer explained that the cladding would be a reserved matter and subject to further approval to ensure the correct material would be used. The Conservation and Design Team Leader explained that the current cladding was only ten years old and was not the original material.

In response to questions relating to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) on the 'Tent in the Park' and the level of security that the proposals afforded the Council, Mr Harnett explained that a primary objective of the SPD was to secure the use of the exhibition building before the enabling development was occupied. He confirmed that this requirement would not be met and said that it was acknowledged in the SPD that it may not be possible to comply with every element of the SPD. The question to ask was if the measures put in place were sufficient to secure the use of the listed building. He confirmed that it was in the Committee's power to grant the applications providing that they understood the risks that the building might not end up being used by a public institution and the extent to which the proposals amounted to a departure from the SPD.

The Area Planning Officer provided a brief outline of the history of the site and the limited amount of interest that had been expressed to develop the site over the years. He confirmed that the site had been vacant for 14 years and that the applicant had provided a detailed account of its history in their submission.

The Executive Director of Planning and Borough Development explained how the viability of the development had been assessed, namely through the Valuation Office Agency who had used the Three Dragons Toolkit which was recommended by the GLA and was widely used. He said that the Three Dragons Toolkit did not take into account what the developer had paid for the site. He confirmed that no affordable housing was proposed for this site.

The Conservation and Design Team Leader confirmed that the emphasis of the listing of the exhibition building related to the structure of the building and its roof. He said that the gardens were Grade II registered.

**Councillor Daniel Moylan, Design and Heritage Champion, then read out the following statement:**

*'I take the view that the Commonwealth Institute is one of this country's iconic buildings of the mid-twentieth century and that its adaptation and re-use as well as*

*any new development within its curtilage must be carried out sensitively and be of the highest quality.*

*However, this is a debatable view. There are others who have regarded the Commonwealth Institute building as little more than a gimcrack eyesore. Only a few years ago, the Trustees of the Commonwealth Institute were campaigning for its de-listing, preparatory to demolition: distinguished former Foreign and Commonwealth Secretaries such as Lord Hurd and the local M.P. Sir Malcolm Rifkind supported that campaign. When it failed, the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport threw her weight behind what would have been a government bill to permit the demolition. The Royal Borough Council and others opposed it and it made no headway. Even local residents who today show a laudable zeal for the building's charms and historical significance have not been so enamoured of it in the recent past. I recall no organised local campaign to save it from the government's plans for demolition.*

*We are in a paradoxical position where the claimed defenders of a Listed Building wish to see this application called in for determination by a government department that only three years ago was promoting a bill to demolish it.*

*I can think of no other already Listed Building that has teetered between death and immortality in quite this way. It is an indication of the power the building has to provoke strong feelings in us. It is also a warning to us not to be too precious about a building that still provokes debate as to its architectural merits.*

*When this Committee considered this application before the summer, you welcomed, as I did, the proposed occupation of the main building by the Design Museum. A use such as this could be a great asset to the Royal Borough, not only culturally but also in its regeneration potential for Kensington High Street. We agreed that the architectural significance of the Commonwealth Institute was not confined to but was most powerfully expressed in its roof, a hyperbolic paraboloid form echoing contemporary work by leading international architects such as Oscar Niemeyer. The proposal secures the roof in good condition, dealing with its perennial drainage problems. The exterior curtain wall is to be refurbished and careful conditions must be imposed to ensure this is done acceptably. The reworking of the interior was broadly acceptable to you and has been altered since in an attempt to meet the views of English Heritage. I believe that this application preserves the essential character of the tent. I consider the administration and conference wing to be of lesser quality than the main building and I would not mourn its passing.*

*Turning to the proposed residential blocks, the message given by the Committee before the summer was that there was too much bulk to the development; especially that the height then proposed needed moderation. That has now been achieved while preserving the capacity of the development to secure the future of the tent building and bring it back into use. I continue in the view that the architecture of the new blocks is rather understated, not inappropriately for the area; and the block proposed on Kensington High Street has, as I had hoped, been improved to add both greater visual interest and to achieve a much more pronounced access from the street to the front door of what will be a major new museum for the borough and London at large.*

*The other comments I made when you considered this application before have also been addressed.*

*In conclusion, I support this development and believe it should now go ahead. An iconic if controversial building will have an opportunity for a new life and a new opportunity to earn the love of its neighbours. The new buildings are distinguished in themselves and will improve a part of Kensington that is becoming a little sad. The view from Holland House and Holland Park will change, but it has been changing periodically over the last century and this change will, in my view, be one that we shall come to be proud of. I support the officers' recommendation.'*

Mr Tim Taylor, on behalf of the Phillimore Estate, objected to the application on the following main grounds:

- Not much had changed since the proposals were presented in July 2009;
- There had only been marginal reductions in the height of the proposed residential buildings;
- The proposed residential buildings were still too bulky;
- The views of the exhibition building would be adversely affected;
- The Council's own SPD called for 'significant' views of the 'Tent' from the High Street (Section 3A);
- The High Street residential building would be dominant and therefore the exhibition building subservient;
- The proposed development was inappropriate for the site;
- Their principle point related to requirement one of the SPD which would not be met through this development;
- The s106 did not secure the requirements of the SPD; and
- A decision to grant the application would be unlawful.

Following Mr Taylor's comments regarding the lawfulness of a decision to grant the application, Ms Titcombe said that the Addendum Report clearly sets out that the proposals do not comply with some elements of the SPD, which is a material planning consideration. However, it is for the Committee to decide whether they consider the proposed S.106 obligations go far enough to achieve the objectives of the SPD to grant the application. Mr Harnett commented on Mr Taylor's remarks regarding 3A in the SPD and the requirement for significant views of the 'Tent'. He explained that the Committee had seen the computer generated images of proposed views and it was for them to decide whether they considered them significant or not. He added that it was lawful for the Committee to form the view that the extent to which the proposals departed from the SPD were not sufficient to justify a refusal or, alternatively, that they were sufficient reasons for a refusal.

Sir Angus Stirling, President of the Friends of Holland Park, also objected to the application and raised the following main issues:

- Even with the small reductions, the heights of the residential buildings would have a detrimental effect to views in the area and the setting of Holland Park;
- According to the Holland Park Conservation Policy, the views from the park 'should not be further intruded upon';
- The removal of the Northern boundary wall would be detrimental to the park and they deplored the proposed fencing which would blur the separation between the park and the High Street;
- The entire wall should remain in place;
- The loss of trees was still too high; and
- A conservation-led approach was necessary for this site and a significant rethink was required.

Ms Amanda Frame, on behalf of the Kensington Society, also spoke in objection to the application and raised the following main points:

- English Heritage had provided an excellent summary of the impact the original proposals could have had on the site and the amended scheme did not address any of these potentially detrimental effects;
- The proposals needed to be radically changed but only miniscule revisions had been made;
- Why couldn't the administrative building be retained, and the proposed High Street building removed from the scheme?;
- The site was never intended for housing;
- The Planning Officer's presentation had not addressed the number of planning policies in the UDP and nationally that would be ignored if the development were to go ahead;
- There was a high risk and a high cost in this proposal;
- If the cost of the refurbishment of the 'Tent' was halved, could the housing element be halved as well?;
- If the administrative block was not demolished, the costs would plummet;
- It was not the developers role to respect and protect the Borough's historical assets;
- The Design Museum would be an expensive user;
- They were still concerned about the loss of trees, public space and the possible damage to the exhibition building;

- A decision to grant could not be justified as the losses would be too great; and
- The proposals departed from UDP policies, the Council's own SPD and national policies.

Mr Anthony Walker, on behalf of ESSA, spoke in objection to the application and raised the following key points:

- A conservation-led approach was needed;
- Why destroy what we have fought so hard to save!;
- The loss of the setting of the listed building would be tragic;
- Views will be damaged by the residential blocks and the narrow view of the 'Tent' from the High Street was insufficient;
- There were other alternatives for the site, namely:
  - The retention of the administrative block and
  - A self-funded application that did not rely on an enabling development.
- The application was in conflict with national policies, supplementary planning guidance, the views of English Heritage and the UDP;
- The destruction of the interior, spoiling of the landscape and other detrimental effects would be too big a price to pay.

Mr Michael Baldwin, on behalf of the Melbury Court Residents Association, also spoke in objection to the application and highlighted the following main areas of concern:

- Their objections outlined in July had not been adequately addressed and their concerns were largely unchanged;
- The height reductions to the residential blocks were negligible;
- UDP Strategy 1 should be of paramount importance;
- The proposed development would have a significant negative impact on Melbury Court's amenity;
- The proposed development would lead to overlooking, overshadowing, increased sense of enclosure and encroachment;
- The oppressive nature of the proposed development contravened UDP Policy CD36;
- The loss of open space would be regrettable;

- The applicant had still not provided any images of the proposed views from Melbury Court and the Committee should be allowed to consider those predicted views;
- There were still concerns regarding the increases in traffic and parking pressure in the area and the residents of Melbury Court had not been consulted on the Travel Plan;
- There was concern regarding the increase of noise levels in the area especially if commercial premises would be open late and the disturbance that could be caused to neighbours, specifically to those who were elderly; and
- The proposals were contrary to PPG15, the London Plan and UDP Policies.

*The Chairman called for a five minute adjournment before the hearing of the Applicant's case.*

Sir Stuart Lipton introduced the amended application and expressed concern that there had been a number of misunderstandings expressed by objectors that evening. For clarity he told the Committee that the site was owned by Ilchester Estate and his company, Chelsfield Partners LPP. He said that there had been a number of proposals over years and attempts to secure funding for the site, all of which had failed as the site was very difficult technically. Responding to the concerns of the Friends of Holland Park, he said that the current Northern boundary wall with Holland Park was built in the 1950's and if there was strong opposition to retain this wall, they would not remove it. He confirmed that the site had indeed been used as a Golf Club with squash courts and tennis courts in the past. Sir Stuart went on to say that he wished to dispel the idea that they were spending as much money as possible on this project. He assured the Committee that they were responsible developers and would be sympathetic to the site.

Sir Stuart introduced Matthew White, Planning Solicitor, to address the comments made by Mr Tim Taylor regarding the lawfulness of a decision made by the Committee that evening. He stressed that a decision to grant or refuse would indeed be lawful and not unreasonable, and reliance should be placed on the package offered by the applicants in the agreed planning obligations and the fact that there were a number of protections in place for the Royal Borough including:

- No works would commence until an agreement of the lease was entered into; and
- A binding building contract would be approved by the Council.

Mr Roger Ridgedale-Smith, ARUP, discussed the reuse of the existing building. He explained that the exhibition building was well designed for its period and had been a response to a specific brief but was inflexible and the plant was unfit for modern use. He outlined what parts of the building would need to be retained in order to support the floors and roof. He explained that they would need a higher

floor loading. In terms of the cladding, he explained that the existing cladding was a weather break not a thermal break and was therefore completely unsuitable for modern use and would not meet building regulations. He said that the administrative building had specifically designed slabs that would be very difficult to use and extra floors could not be added.

Sir Stuart addressed the Committee again and went through a number of elements of the proposed development and the challenges of the site, specifically:

- The amended heights of the residential blocks fitted into the pattern of the surrounding buildings and would not be out of place in Kensington;
- The existing accommodation building had been built at a very low cost and was sub-standard in modern terms;
- The exhibition building was tailor-built for the Commonwealth Institute and had a lack of flexibility; and
- The areas that needed to be addressed were: fire safety, disabled access, floor loading, energy standards and occupancy.

Sir Stuart presented slides of a previous development he had done at Her Majesty's Treasury building in London which was the restoration of a Grade I listed building. He said that the proposals for the Commonwealth Institute were in the spirit of the existing building but with a new look.

Mr Deyan Sudjic, Director of the Design Museum, addressed the Committee and said that the Design Museum was very excited about the prospect of returning to the Royal Borough. He said that they were very grateful for the positive responses from the Borough and they definitely had something to offer especially as the museum would be the leading museum of its kind in the world if approved. He said that the building had to work for them in the long term and 68 per cent of their funding was in place.

Mr Mark Wenlock then spoke about what was needed for a successful exhibition building that would be competitive and economically viable. He explained how it would not be possible to convert the administrative block into residential units that would be viable in the housing market.

Mr Reinier de Graaf (OMA), gave a presentation of the amended designs to the Committee. He said that to date there had been approximately 34 changes to the design since the meeting in July, including:

- green roofs proposed for the residential units,
- a more park-like setting,
- the combination of trees and vegetation,
- the re-introduction of a pond and bridge leading to the entrance,
- provision of a children's play area,

- the retention of more trees,
- hedges playing a role to demarcate the site,
- greater public space,
- the use of natural stone,
- the reduction of hardscape,
- reduction in height of the residential units,
- ground floor of the High Street building has been raised to open up the entrance, and
- the hidden floor element removed from the exhibition building.

In response to questions from the Committee, Mr Sudjic said that they needed greater certainty to obtain the remaining funding. He said that they had strong support from the Conran Group which provided a good foundation for fundraising. He explained that the level of intervention proposed was necessary in order to accommodate a fixed exhibition as well as temporary exhibition space. He said he was absolutely confident that the Design Museum could live up to the trust that the Royal Borough has placed in them.

Sir Stuart responded to a question from the Committee relating to the effect the development would have on views in the conservation area. He said that there would of course be changes to the views from the Park but that they would be sympathetic as the residential blocks were a simple design and were not trying to compete with the exhibition building. He explained that the views from the High Street would be interesting and the 'Tent' building would be visible.

Responding to further questions regarding the level of development on the site, Sir Stuart said that they had done a complete re-evaluation of the residential units and reduced the floor space by 1700m<sup>2</sup> but beyond that, the project would not be viable.

The Committee expressed concern regarding the effect of the development on Melbury Court residents. The Area Planning Officer confirmed that the edge of Melbury Court was approximately 18 metres from the proposed tip of the garden residential unit. The applicant's light expert assured the Committee that there would be no material impact on sunlight and a very small impact on daylight that was insignificant in planning terms.

The Committee entered into their deliberations and each Member expressed their views on the proposed scheme. The following main points were noted:

- The Council had been included and heavily involved in the development of the scheme;
- The development would have a positive effect on the High Street and would benefit the Borough as a whole;

- The Commonwealth Institute had deteriorated dramatically over the years and was 'unloved';
- No viable alternatives have come forward over the years;
- The Design Museum would be a great addition to the Borough and fabulous user for the space;
- The developers had done a great deal to address issues raised at the July meeting and had listened to the Committee;
- There was a great deal of respect for the Residents Associations and their concerns;
- It would be very difficult to use the existing exhibition structure as is;
- The residents of Melbury Court would be severely affected by the proposals;
- The views from Holland Park would be damaged;
- A high quality of architecture was proposed;
- The developers had taken into account comments from the Council's Architectural Appraisal Panel;
- The 'Tent' had not been visible enough and this would be addressed;
- The development would be something for the Borough to be proud of;
- The bulk of the development was still too big;
- The exhibition building would be removed from the Buildings at Risk Register;
- The openness of the site would be lost along with the special park setting;
- The price to residents was too high to pay;
- The Council had a duty to protect their built heritage and the proposed development would destroy the reasons for listing the building in the first place;
- The decision would be ill-judged and flawed;
- The risk was too great, specifically as outlined in paras 6.73 and 6.80 of the report and as outlined in the Addendum Report and as such the user of the Tent had not been secured;
- A degree of realism was necessary in this case and other options for the site were not persuasive;
- The development would do a lot of good for the High Street;

- The administrative block was secondary to the exhibition building;
- There would be much better access to the site and landscaping on the site;
- The proposed residential buildings were in keeping with those nearby; and
- A decision to grant would be correct on balance.

It was noted following the Committee's deliberation that five Members supported the application and five Members opposed the approval of the development. The Executive Director of Planning and Borough Development confirmed that, according to Section 11.3 of the Guide to the Proceedings of the Committee and Paragraph 45.01 of the Standing Orders of the Constitution, the Chairman had a casting vote.

The Chairman chose to exercise his right to a casting vote and voted to grant the application. He asked Committee if they wanted Conditions 11(a), (b) and (c) to be brought back to the Major Planning Development Committee for approval as well as all those conditions relating to boundary walls, means of enclosure and railings on the site. The Committee agreed to this proposal.

**RESOLVED -**

- i) That Planning Permission, Listed Building Consent and Conservation Area Consent be granted subject to:
  - the conditions as set out in the respective reports as amended in the Addendum Report ;
  - authorisation from English Heritage and The Greater London Authority;
  - the completion of a section 106 agreement to secure the planning obligations the principles of which are specified in the Addendum Report as updated at Committee;
- ii) The approval of any future user of the Exhibition Building would be by the Council's Major Planning Development Committee rather than the Executive Director; and
- iii) That authority be delegated to the Executive Director Planning and Borough Development to issue the Planning Permission following completion of the section 106 agreement.

**ANY OTHER URGENT MATTERS**

It was noted that it was The Executive Director of Planning and Borough Development, Mr David Prout's, last meeting at the Council and the Chairman thanked him for all his hard work and contributions to Planning in his time working for the Borough.

The meeting ended at 10.55pm

Chairman